



GLOBAL FUND CS
IMPLEMENTERS MEETING
ANGLOPHONE AND
LUCIPHONE AFRICA
25TH AND 26TH JUNE 2019



ANGLOPHONE AFRICA CRG PLATFORM GLOBAL FUND CIVIL SOCIETY IMPLEMENTER'S FORUM MEETING REPORT

SPEAK RESORT, MUNYONYO, KAMPALA UGANDA.
25TH - 26TH JUNE 2019



PREPARED BY EANASSO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

7

SESSION 1: DISSEMINATION OF STUDIES
COMMISSIONED BY EANNASO

10

SESSION 2: PRACTICAL EXPERIENCES OF CS
PRS ON FUNDS ABSORPTION AND SR
SELECTION AND MANAGEMENT

12

SESSION 3: PROS AND CONS OF
IMPLEMENTING PRS – DEBATE

15

SESSION 4: CCM
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEES ARE NOT
NECESSARY – DEBATE SESSION

17

SESSION 5: AN INTRODUCTION TO
AIDSSPAN AND NAVIGATING FOR
TOPICAL GLOBAL FUND RELATED
INFORMATION

18

SESSION 6: LEVERAGING THE GLOBAL
FUND STRATEGY 2017-2020
TO ENHANCE GRANT PERFORMANCE.

19

SESSION 7: IMPLEMENTER'S
COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE- PLENARY
DISCUSSION ON OPERATIONALISATION..

21

WAY FORWARD

22

CLOSING REMARKS

ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

AGYW	Adolescent Girls and Young Women
ARFH	Reproductive and Family Health
CHAZ	Churches Health Association of Zambia
CoP	Community of Practice
CRG	Communities, Rights and Gender
CS	Civil Society
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CSPRN	Civil Society Principal Recipients Network
EANNASO	Eastern Africa National Networks AIDS Service Organizations
GF	Global Fund
INGOs	International Non-Governmental Organizations
KP	Key Population
KRCS	Kenya Red Cross Society
MoH	Ministry of health
NACOSA	Networking HIV/AIDS Community of South Africa
NANASO	Namibia National AIDS Service Organizations
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
OC	Oversight Committee
PRs.	Principal Recipients
RSTESA	Regional Support Team for Eastern and Southern Africa
SR	Sub Recipients
UNASO	Uganda National AIDS Service Organizations



BACKGROUND

In early 2015, UNAIDS Regional Support Team for Eastern and Southern Africa (RSTESA) and the Civil Society Principal Recipient (PR) Network (CSPRN) carried out a rapid assessment of capacity needs required by African civil society PRs to effectively implement Global Fund grants. The main challenges reported by survey respondents were setting up or modifying internal processes to align with Global Fund needs as well as working with in-country Global Fund stakeholders such as the CCM. Other challenges cited include understanding Global Fund processes and policies and sub-recipient management. In January 2016, EANNASO published a needs assessment survey which revealed that 33% of respondents noted that civil society organizations do not always have the capacity to implement large grants. A further 23% indicated that civil society recipients spent too much time on complicated reporting requirements. These are persistent challenges for civil society and community implementers..

Along with the UNAIDS, RSTESA and EANNASO surveys, participants at the Global Fund's High Impact Africa II meeting held in April 2016 in Maputo, Mozambique, re-affirmed the need for more spaces for learning and sharing among civil society PRs.

The Civil Society Global Fund Implementers Forum is thus convened against this background to present a learning platform and share best practices for CS implementers and stakeholders with a view to improving Global Fund grant performance in Anglophone Africa..



REPORT BACKGROUND

The overall objective of the meeting was to bring GF CSOs PRs together for experience sharing and learning as well as deliberate on existing implementation challenges and identify possible mitigation strategies. Specifically, the meeting targeted to;

1

Disseminate the findings of the 2019 EANNASO Assessment of challenges and bottlenecks faced by Civil Society Principal Recipients in Anglophone and Lusophone Africa.

2

Disseminate findings of the Grant absorption capacity conducted by EANNASO and understanding grant implementation bottlenecks and ways of improving grant absorption.

3

Share learnings, tools and experiences amongst the CS PRs as well as repository of best practices, protocols and guidelines available from the region;

4

Review and finalize on the draft calendar of events, topics for discussion and learning; and mode of exchange for the CSO PR Community of Practice;



MEETING EXPECTED RESULTS

The meeting targeted to enhance the grants implementation performance by CSOs PRs through sharing of best practices, challenges and corresponding mitigation strategies

- Dissemination of the CS PR Assessment report detailing strengths and implementation challenges affecting civil society PRs, and how to address them;
- Sharing of best practices and lessons learned from PRs to facilitate learning on how to resolve common challenges affecting CS PRs in the region, including grant absorption;
- A review of repository of knowledge, tools, protocols and guidelines developed by CS PRs and tools in the region which could be utilized by all implementers.
- Further institutionalization of a regional community of practice for CS PRs, including the endorsement of its governance structure and ToRs for accountability mechanisms and clear ways to communicate and to engage;
- Development of a robust calendar of events detailing topics for discussions and medium of interaction amongst the PRs i.e. (Annual CS Implementers Forum)
- Review, discuss and propose recommendation on the processes of SR selection and transparency on CCM selection on PRs



METHODOLOGY

The workshops employed a combination of approaches to ensure the objectives of the organizers and of the participants were met:

1

Document sharing and review: Participants and organizers reviewed a number of documents including the reviewing two study reports commissioned by EANNASO; a) Study on funds absorption capacities of CS PRs and b) Study on challenges and bottlenecks faced by CSO PRs in anglophone Africa. Participants also accessed a number of EANNASO publications.

2

Plenary presentation and interactive sessions: Overall introductions, presentation of study findings and sharing of good practices were delivered through plenary presentations. Participants had an opportunity to input and seek clarification on issues at the end of each plenary presentation.

3

Debates: To enhance sharing of best practices, participants actively engaged in topical debate sessions that targeted to capture implementers' experiences on two topical issues; a) CCM oversight and b) the benefits of non-implementer PRs.

4

PR Needs assessment survey: to identify the needs of the PR and how to improve implementation of GF grants.

5

Post workshop evaluation: To measure effectiveness of the workshop participants were asked to give feedback by completing a pre-designed questionnaire.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

The workshop brought together participants from Anglophone, francophone and Lusophone African countries. The participants included representative from GF Civil Society Organizations PRs and SRs at country and regional levels. The meeting was also attended by other relevant stakeholders, such as the CCM members of selected countries, the Global Fund FPM from Ghana and representation from the GF CRG Department, UNAIDS, the Chair of the CCM in Uganda, and the Ministry of Health Uganda and Frontline AIDS.

The Anglophone, Francophone and Lusophone Global Fund implementers meeting was officially open by Dr. Henry Katamba, Head of the GF Team at the Ministry of Health (MoH) Uganda, on behalf of Dr. Diana Atwine, the Permanent Secretary, MoH, Uganda. Dr. Katamba highlighted that the GF Implementers' meeting was timely as it enhanced learning by CSO PRs through sharing implementation experiences, best practices and lessons learnt. He noted that the three diseases, HIV, TB and malaria, are the causes of high mortality and morbidity in the region. He emphasized that the response to the three diseases should be centered on the individual at household level, pointing out that the CSOs are better placed to reach the households with services while the public sector focuses on providing health care at facility level. Dr. Katamba encouraged the participants to scale up efforts in strengthening community structures for effective and sustainable programming. He called on programmers to simplify programming processes and work more closely with the communities, in a more transparent and accountable manner. He called on the different players to work together noting that quality performance of grants relies on teamwork and collaboration between the public and civil society sectors. He encouraged participants to engage in productive discussions, share their learnings and best practices and keep dialoging beyond the meeting. He declared the meeting opened.



Olive Mumba, Executive Director, EANNASO

Olive Mumba, the Executive Director, EANNASO, gave her welcoming remarks. She called on the participants to learn from the previous challenges. She noted that in the 1980s, many PLHIV could not access much needed services, however the situation has since changed with tremendous improvements in diagnostics and treatment services. She encouraged the civil society to work towards increased access to HIV, TB and Malaria diagnostic and treatment services. She also pointed out that EANNASO is committed to continue engaging and working with stakeholders including CSOs and Community Groups, to enhance the quality of health programs,

and most important, empowering of communities to effectively participate in designing and delivering quality health programs in the region including to the most vulnerable communities. Olive emphasized the need for enhanced community action in responding to health challenges and building sustainable health care systems at community level.

Dr. Kerusha Kirabo, the UNAIDS Country Director, Uganda, gave welcoming remarks as the UNAIDS Country Director, Uganda. She appreciated the long-term partnership between UNAIDS and EANNASO. Dr Kerusha noted that, one of the critical policy decisions by the GF was to enhance active participation of communities in GF programs, through the dual track financing mechanism, which has enhanced community participation in the implementation of GF grants. She pointed out that development partners need to borrow from this mechanism and replicate its application in response to other health challenges. She hoped that the experiences documented in implementing grants would stimulate learning. She further reminded the participants that it is critical for CSO PRs not to forget their origins as CSOs and their GF roles should not influence or change their original mandate, which is to adequately represents and act on behalf of the communities. She emphasized the need to scale up advocacy for human rights, and gender equality as well as advocacy for increased domestic financing for health programs. Dr. Kirabo also applauded EANNASO for expanding its scope beyond HIV and AIDS to other community health challenges.

Mr. Ed Ngoskin, from the Global Fund, CRG Department, gave remarks as the GF representative attending the meeting. He appreciated the critical partnership between EANNASO and the Global Fund in supporting and enhancing community action in the GF programs at country and regional level. Mr. Ed was glad that the discussion was taking place at the right time and will enhance the implementation of gender and human rights components of GF programs. He echoed the importance of civil society in supporting governments to ensure that affected communities' access services. Furthermore, he noted that the meeting will identify programs needs and gaps and discuss how best to offer support to enhance grant implementation.



Ed Ngoskin, Global Fund, CRG Unit

SESSION 1: DISSEMINATION OF STUDIES COMMISSIONED BY EANNASO

The main focus for this session was to present findings of two studies commissioned by EANNASO; a) Grants absorption capacities of CSOs PRs in Anglophone Africa region and b). A study on challenges and bottleneck faced by CSOs PRs in implanting GF grants. The findings of the studies also captured possible solutions and mitigation strategies to address challenges affecting grant implementation by CSO PRs.

Study on Challenges and bottlenecks faced by GF Civil Society Principal Recipients in Anglophone and Lusophone Africa

Participants were taken through the findings of a study; “Challenges and bottlenecks faced by GF Civil Society Principal Recipients in Anglophone and Lusophone Africa. The study aim was to capture and document critical challenges and bottlenecks faced by PRs in the Sub-Saharan Arica region. The study also captured and documented possible solutions and mitigation strategies for the identified challenges.

Plenary reactions and inputs from participants



Who is responsible for SR selection? Participants sought to establish the entity responsible for SR selection. It was established that the SR selection is the responsibility of the PR as it is logical for PRs to select the grant implementers to ensure identification of capable SRs whom they can oversee and backstop.

SESSION 1: CONTINUATION

Lack of CCM involvement in SR

selection: Participants noted that some PR tend to sideline CCMs in the SR selection process. Participants agreed that although the PR are responsible for SR selection, it is prudent and best practice to involve the CCM in the process to enhance CCM-PR collaboration, and ensure effective oversight by CCMs.

International NGOs playing the role of

SRs: Participants sighted examples of INGOs playing SR role in some countries and expressed concern that local communities prefer local CSOs for SR role, due to their knowledge and understanding of issues at community level. Participants agreed that INGO should be restricted to playing PR role and work with local CSO as SRs

Study on GF Grant absorption capacities of Civil Society GF PRs in Anglophone Africa

The participants, in a plenary session, were take through the findings of the grant's absorption capacities of CSO PRs, this included; factors influencing budgetary utilization by CSOs PRs and possible solutions to low absorption capacities.

Plenary reactions and inputs from participants



Preferred definition of Absorption capacities: Participants noted that the GF definition of absorption capacity is limited to utilization of financial resources, and not considering the quality of grants outputs. The GF definition of absorption capacity is:

“Percentage of actual expenditure compared to the total grant budget”.

Participants proposed a recommendation to the GF to consider revising its definition of absorption capacity to ensure it includes grant efficiency, effectiveness and quality of grants outputs. Participants proposed the following definition;

The degree in which an organization is able to effectively and efficiently spend financial resources”.

“This will change the processes of monitoring burn rates by considering quality of grant implementation.

International NGOs collaboration with national NGOs for effective grants absorption; Participants expressed the need to strike a balance between the critical role played by International NGOs as PRs and the local NGOs. While it is evident that INGOs have the capacities to secure PR role, there is need to establish collaboration and effective partnership with nation NGOs in the grant implementation. Participants shared experience from the MENA region on how the INGO PR work closely with national NGOs through utilization of national NGOs in the implementation of community related activities, while INGOs focus in grants administration and capacity building.

Grants efficiency gains; participants from Nigeria noted that efficiency gains and income through exchange rates has been contributing to low absorption capacities, as the gains are reflected as unspent funds in a reporting period. This calls for improvement in real time capturing of financial data, as well as enhanced processes of reprogramming.

Continue adhering to prudent financial management processes: Participants noted that, although GF has strict financial management procedures that sometimes results to low absorption of funds, it is important for PRs to continue following and adhering to the financial management requirements. Participants emphasized that it is not advisable to relax financial management requirements, but PRs can identify additional requirements that don't pose a risk to prudent financial management, and negotiate how to relax, there additional measures that are not a threat to financial management.

Study findings are well known and reflect real PRs experiences; participants noted that the study findings are well known by PRs as they reflect the actual experiences at PR level. Participants emphasized that it is time to implement solutions and mitigation strategies.



SESSION 2: PRACTICAL EXPERIENCES OF CS PRS ON FUNDS ABSORPTION AND SR SELECTION AND MANAGEMENT

The session targeted to capture implementation experiences from PRs on a) grants absorption; this was presented by Association for Reproductive and Family Health (ARFH), Nigeria, and b) SR selection processes; this was presented by Networking HIV/AIDS Community of South Africa – NACOSA from Namibia, CHAZ from Zambia and a representative from Lady's Mermaid Bureau a KP organization from Uganda.

Plenary reaction and inputs from participants

GF PR/SR application requirements are stringent for KP organizations:

KP organizations seeking SR role are facing difficult and unreasonable requirements from PRs. One of the stringent requirements sighted by participants is that aspiring SRs are expected to submit 20 recommendation letters from 20 districts in Uganda. This requirement is difficult to meet making the organization ineligible for SR role. Providing proof of tax clearance was also sighted as a difficult requirement to meet by the KP organization, considering their legal status. It was noted that it is a big challenge for KP organization to access legal documents in Uganda, a condition imposed by PR and GF.

Inadequate information of GF programs at country level: Lack of information on GF country programs has made it difficult for local organization, including KP organizations, to fully participate in the GF grants implementation process. Participants gave examples of funds earmarked for KP activities go unspent mainly due to lack of information by PRs on KP organizations at grassroots level. Participants expressed the need for PRs to scale up their reach to all grassroots organization, to secure implementation support and increase community mobilization for service uptake

SESSION 2: CONTINUATION

Two-way accountability obligation: Participants noted that most PR are only accountable to GF and to some extent to the CCM, with no accountability obligation to the communities. To ensure increased accountability and increased oversight, to communities, participants sighted best practices in South Africa where PR do not implement grant activities, but focus on administering the grants. This has allowed SRs, who are closer to communities to assume full responsibility on activity implementation and interaction with communities. Participants also sighted quarterly stakeholders' consultative meetings by NACOSA (a regional PR in Southern Africa region) as a best practice in ensuring accountability to the community. These meetings bring together government, community leaders and the GF implementers for feedback and discussions on emerging issues and challenges.

GF requirements and guidelines are complicated to follow by local CSOs; Participants expressed concern that GF requirements and guidelines are complex for local CSOs and this limits chances for securing PR and SR roles. Participants recommended increased efforts and resources towards adequate preparations for CSOs for PR/SR role, through long term technical support (TS) to aspiring CSOs for PR and SR roles.

Innovative strategies for supporting local CSOs; Participants shared a best practice from Zambia on how to effectively build the capacity of local CSOs to secure they play an SR role more effectively. The key element of the best practice is the identification of Lead SRs who take up the responsibility of building the capacity of other SRs as part of their grant implementation process. This has ensured that a bigger number of local CSOs are reached through the Lead-SRs, while freeing up the PR's time for more strategic PR roles including grant administration. The Lead-SRs also take up procurement role on behalf of the other SRs and this limit and mitigate procurement related risks.

Mitigating the impact of frequent GF country team visits and other implementation interruptions; Participants noted that in some countries there are numerous GF country team visits that take up considerable amount of time to plan and execute, as well as disrupts implementation process. This in turn affects grant implementation and funds absorption. Participants sighted proper planning and scheduling of the visits to quarterly visits as a corresponding mitigation strategy.

SESSION 3: PROS AND CONS OF IMPLEMENTING PRS – DEBATE SESSION

The debate session aimed at capturing implementer's perspectives on advantages and disadvantages of implementing PRs compared to non-implementing PR. Participants in the debate outlined advantages of each type of PR. This session provided an opportunity to critically analyze the types of PRs and establish possible options for minimizing some of the existing PR challenges. Both supporters and opposers of the debate shared their experiences and outlines critical elements of the type of PR they support.

Key highlights from the supporters of the motion

Enhance quality control; Participants noted that implementing PRs are able to monitor and control the quality of grant activities, through inhouse quality assurance mechanisms. Participants emphasized that implementing PRs have full control of grant activities and have implementation strategies and approaches that have been designed inhouse and are common to all program staff, this allow for effective standardization and quality control.

Enhance risk management and mitigation; Participants highlighted that implementing PRs are in a better position to manage and mitigate risk, mainly because the occurrence of risk has a direct impact on the organization (PR). Participants sighted instances where PRs have paid for embezzled funds. It was therefore noted that implementing PRs have full control of the funds as well as full control of risk management activities.



Enhance risk management and mitigation; Participants highlighted that implementing PRs are in a better position to manage and mitigate risk, mainly because the occurrence of risk has a direct impact on the organization (PR). Participants sighted instances where PRs have paid for embezzled funds. It was therefore noted that implementing PRs have full control of the funds as well as full control of risk management activities.

SESSION 3: PROS AND CONS OF IMPLEMENTING PRS – DEBATE SESSION

The debate session aimed at capturing implementer's perspectives on advantages and disadvantages of implementing PRs compared to non-implementing PR. Participants in the debate outlined advantages of each type of PR. This session provided an opportunity to critically analyze the types of PRs and establish possible options for minimizing some of the existing PR challenges. Both supporters and opposers of the debate shared their experiences and outlines critical elements of the type of PR they support.

Key highlights from the supporters of the motion



Enhance quality control; Participants noted that implementing PRs are able to monitor and control the quality of grant activities, through inhouse quality assurance mechanisms. Participants emphasized that implementing PRs have full control of grant activities and have implementation strategies and approaches that have been designed inhouse and are common to all program staff, this allow for effective standardization and quality control.

Enhance risk management and mitigation; Participants highlighted that implementing PRs are in a better position to manage and mitigate risk, mainly because the occurrence of risk has a direct impact on the organization (PR). Participants sighted instances where PRs have paid for embezzled funds. It was therefore noted that implementing PRs have full control of the funds as well as full control of risk management activities.



SESSION 3: CONTINUATION

Achieve value for money; Supporter of the motion pointed out that implementing PRs are better places to implement activities in a more cost-effective manner through taking advantage of economies of scale and are also better placed to negotiate for better services and prices through bulk procurements.

Key highlights from the opposers of the motion

Enhanced checks and balances; Opposers of the motion noted that SRs provide mechanisms for checks and balances and give the PR opportunity for objective monitoring and oversight on grants. Non-implementing PRs become effective in questioning SRs on implementation processes and able to provide objective feedback.

Enhanced access to a wider range of skills and capacities; It was also noted that use of SRs provides an opportunity for accessing a wider range of skills and capacities including increased capacity to reach targeted grassroots communities. It was noted that SRs bring on board unique skills and capacities that are critical in working with communities, especially KP and other marginalized communities.

Ensure multi sectoral approach to the epidemics; Opposers of the motion highlighted that no single organization can be successful in responding to the three epidemics (HIV, TB and Malaria), and these epidemics require a multisectoral approach. Involving the SRs enhances the participation of communities, which is critical in the implementation of grants and supports increased utilization of grant services.

Providing support to weak PRs; It was noted that the use of SRs is also critical in cautioning weak PRs. Opposers shared instances where strong SRs have been able to help weak PRs in grant implementation.

SESSION 4: CCM OVERSIGHT COMMITTEES ARE NOT NECESSARY – DEBATE SESSION

The second debate session focused on the role of the CCM oversight committees, critically analyzing the usefulness of the committees in grants oversight. Participants engaged in a debate discussion on whether the CCM committees are needed for grant oversight, and exploring the notion that PRs are better placed to provide oversight without the engagement of the CCMs.



Key highlights from the supporters of the motion

PRs are signatory to the grant with full mandate; The supporter of the motion noted that PR are the signatory to the grants and have full responsibility for managing risk, while CCMs do not carry any risk on the grants. With this regard PRs should undertake the oversight role as they are responsible for the risk management of the grant and have more interest in ensuring risk is fully managed.

CCM have limited capacity to provide oversight; it was also noted that CCM do not have capacity to provide oversight on the grant and thus due to limited effective oversight CCMs in some instances add no value to grant oversight.

SESSION 4: CONTINUATION

CCM should focus on governance challenges; it was noted that there are many and serious leadership and governance challenges on the grants, and that CCMs have been weak in providing leadership and governance. It is therefore prudent for CCM to focus their efforts in governance and leadership and relinquish the oversight function to PRs especially those that solely manage grants and are not involved in grant implementation.

There are adequate tools for oversight; It was noted that there are adequate oversight tools, such as the PR dashboards, that support grant oversight effectively, and therefore there is no need for CCM oversight committees.

Key highlights from the opposers of the motion

CCM provide linkages between all players at country level; it was noted that CCM oversight committees (CCM OC) are better placed to provide linkages with other key players and link the grant to the wider health sector programs. This is critical for sustainability of the grants and ensuring the grants contribute to the national health outcomes.

Ensure checks and balances and accountability; Opposer noted that CCM oversight committees provide checks and balances and mitigate conflict of interest, as it is not prudent for PRs to oversight themselves. CCM OC are more objective on oversight and are able to give a more balanced and objective feedback to the PRs.

CCM OC Champion the interest of beneficiaries; it was noted that CCM OC are able to champion the interests of the targeted committees, and ensure services reach the grassroots level. CCM members as the community representatives, are responsible for ensuring the grant activities are effectively implemented, through monitoring and overseeing the PRs.

CCM OC have access to adequate technical capacity; CCM OC can access technical capacity from development and other technical partners such as UNAIDS, WHO, and Bilateral partners. This makes them stronger in providing grant oversight.

SESSION 5: AN INTRODUCTION TO AIDSSPAN AND NAVIGATING FOR TOPICAL GLOBAL FUND RELATED INFORMATION

The main objective of this session was to share information to the participants on how to access critical GF grants information that is vital in a) making GF grants related decisions and b) monitor GF grants for accountability and transparency purposes. The session provided an opportunity for implementers to discuss the usefulness of strategic information to enhance grant performance.

Plenary reaction and inputs from participants

The difference between GF and AIDSPAN information portals: Participants sought clarity on the difference between the GF and AIDSPAN information portals, as they both contain similar data. It was highlighted that GF information is removed after a period of time but the AIDSPAN portal keeps historical data.

Data reveal increased new infection among AGYW; Participants noted that integrating data in one platform has shown that new HIV infections are on the rise among the AGYW in the Eastern and Central Africa. This should inform the next GF programs in these countries and also alert other countries to prepare and monitor the trends.

Procurement and supply-chain observations; Participants noted that through interrogating the information portal it was revealed that a bigger percentage of grant go to procurement and that some countries, such as Kenya, have opted out of pooled procurement and are procuring at large scale independently. Participants were keen to continue monitoring and observing how such country manage to independently procure large volumes of commodities.



SESSION 6: LEVERAGING THE GLOBAL FUND STRATEGY 2017-2020 TO ENHANCE GRANT PERFORMANCE

The session targeted to share experiences on how some GF grant implementers have leveraged on the GF strategy to enhance grant performance. Through this session, implementers shared how they integrated GF strategic objectives into their programs and aligned their country priority goals to GF strategic objectives. Two PRs shared their experiences; a) Kenya Red Cross Society on integrating human right into country programs and , b) Catholic Relief Services, Sierra Leone, on integrating universal health coverage into the country GF programs.

Plenary reaction and inputs from participants on integrating human right into GF country programs

Increased understanding of human rights concepts and programing; It was noted that there is need to enhance the understanding and knowledge of human rights programing to ensure effective integration of human rights into country programs. It was noted that there is still a big gap among partners on the elements of human rights.

Building capacities of PRs in Human rights programing; It was also noted that there is need for targeted capacity building for PRs on human right programing to ensure the grants are effectively delivered.

Build strategic partnerships around human rights programing; It was appreciated that human rights issues are effectively addressed through partnerships that bring together organization with interest, capacity and experience in human rights programing.



SESSION 7: IMPLEMENTER'S COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE- PLENARY DISCUSSION ON OPERATIONALISATION

The main objective of the session was to brainstorm and agree on the next steps towards finalizing and operationalizing the implementer's community of practice. The CoP will bring together all implementers in sub-Saharan Africa and provide a platform for sharing and accessing information on GF grants implementation. Comprehensive initial discussions and preparations have been concluded, and EANNASO is now seeking inputs on the preferred operational modalities from the implementers.

Inputs from participants

Rollout and operationalize the CoP; after reviewing the progress made in the initial activities towards establishing the CoP, participants agreed that EANNASO should finalize the process and ensure the online CoP is operational. Participants brainstormed on the key action points for EANNASO to implement in realization of an operational CoP.

Financing the CoP: participants agree to adopt a CoP structure that will have minimum cost inputs. Nevertheless, it was agreed that EANNASO should engage in resource mobilization to support necessary CoP operational costs. EANNASO was advised to approach funding agencies for support.

CoP Coordination; Participants agreed that EANNASO as the hosting organization should also play a coordination role. This will entail appointment of a dedicated person at EANNASO to play a day to day coordination role. The coordinator will work with subscribers in moderating discussions and ensuring the platform operates at its optimum level. The coordinator will seek support from PRs on technical matters to ensure adequate support in moderating technical topical discussions.

CoP hosting arrangements; Participants agreed that EANNASO should host the CoP platform and, with the support of the leadership team, EANNASO should resource mobilize for hosting support.

SESSION 7: CONTINUATION

CoP Leadership:: Participants agreed to set up a 5-person leadership team to provide overall leadership of the platform. The leadership team should have a regional balance and will be charged with the responsibility of providing strategic direction and backstopping in the roll out of the platform. The following were appointed as the CoP leadership team

Emily Mega Kenya - Red Cross Society - Kenya

Bia Charm – ActionAid International – Gambia

Sandie Tjaronda - Namibia Network of AIDS Service Organizations - Namibia

Alfredo Francisco – World Vision International – Angola

Mumba Olive – EANNASO-CoP host organization - Tanzania

CoP content generation and agenda setting and frequency; participants agree that subscribers should be able to propose topics for discussions, but all confined to GF programing. The CoP coordinator will prioritize agenda items Participants also agreed that the CoP events should be held in every two months.

CoP Coordination; Participants agreed that EANNASO as the hosting organization should also play a coordination role. This will entail appointment of a dedicated person at EANNASO to play a day to day coordination role. The coordinator will work with subscribers in moderating discussions and ensuring the platform operates at its optimum level. The coordinator will seek support from PRs on technical matters to ensure adequate support in moderating technical topical discussions.



WAY FORWARD

The meeting participants agreed and committed on the following key action points;

- 1** **Community of Practice;** EANNASO has been mandated to rollout and operationalize the CoP platform, following the agreed process and mechanism. Subscription to the CoP should be extended to all PRs in the region.
- 2** **Partner communication;** a comprehensive mailing list for all PRs should be developed to include all national and regional CSO PRs in the region.
- 3** **Annual GF Implementers meeting;** Participants agreed that the GF implementers meeting should be institutionalized, structured and scheduled annually. To facilitate the annual meeting, participants agreed to capture the cost of the GF implementers meeting into their PR budget. EANNASO, in consultation with the regional implementers was mandated to organize, coordinate and convene the annual GF implementers meeting. EANNASO to should set and communicate the date and proposed venue for the next meeting in 2020.





CLOSING REMARKS

The meeting was officially closed by Mr. Muthius Mulumba, the UNASO Board Chairperson. Mr. Mulumba thanked the participants for fruitful discussion and for sharing practical experiences and best practices in GF grant implementation. He noted that there is a wealth of information among the implementers that facilitated peer to peer learning. Mr. Mulumba encouraged participants to continue working for the communities and enhance linkages with the communities. He further reminded participants that they play a key role in strengthening and sustaining community systems.

ANNEXES

Name	Organization
1. Alfredo Pascoal Francisco	World Vision International
2. Kofi Mawuena Diaba	West African Program to Combat AIDS and STI (WAPCAS)
3. Cecilia Senoo	Hope for Future Generation
4. Samuel Asiedu	AngloGold Ashanti (Ghana) Malaria Control Limited
5. Nana Gleeson	BONELA
6. Blessed Monyatsi	ACHAP AGYW Program
7. Nqobile Tsabedze	Coordinating Assembly for Non-Governmental Organisations (CANGO) AGYW
8. Bia Cham	ActionAid International The Gambia
9. Ogwang Brian	Uganda
10. Cyriaque Ako	Population Services International Liberia (PSIL)
11. Jared Oule	Amref Health Africa in Kenya
12. Emily Muga	Kenya Red Cross Society (KRCS)
13. Peter njane	ISHTAR
14. Dalitso Kuphanga	Actionaid International Malawi
15. Alexander Chikonga	World Vision
16. Yannick Rajibe	Prevention Information et lute Contre le Sida (PILS)
17. César Mufanequico	LAMBDA Mozambique
18. Sandie Tjaronda	Namibia Network of AIDS Service Organizations (NANASO)
19. ADEJO Isaac	MSH
20. Adeyemi Olalekan OLADEJI	Association For Reproductive And Family Health (ARFH),
21. Yembah Marah	Catholic Relief Services, Siera Leone
22. Bulumko Alwn Futshane	Beyond Zero South Africa
23. Phumelele Ngcobo	AIDS Foundation of South Africa
24. Mokgadi Malahlela	NACOSA
25. Geraldine Nyasha Kasere	SANAC
26. Dr Amos Nyirenda	Amref Health Africa –Tanzania
27. Nobelrich Makere	TACOSODE
28. Irene Murungi	The AIDS Support Organisation (TASO)
29. Dr. Egeesa John Joseph	TASO
30. Bekele Semieten	Social Services and Health Development
31. Micheal Kachumi	The Churches Health Association of Zambia (CHAZ)
32. Moraoetsi Rakuoane	PACT
33. Peter Kamau Maina	KANCO
34. Kalumiana Rosemary Nomweya	CHAZI
35. Mokoena Nthabiseng	ARASA
36. Hoda Khodr Mansour	Frontline AIDS
37. Djesika Amendah	AIDSPAN
38. Ed Ngoksin	GF CRG
39. Johnson Masiko	UNASO
40. Sylvia Nakasi	UNASO
41. Angela Kateemu	UNAIDS
42. Sarah Naku	UNAIDS
43. Dr. Karusa Kiragu	UNAIDS
44. Dr.Katamba Henry	Uganda MOH
45. Johnson Mutesingensi	GF Coordination Unite -UG
46. Mulumba Mthias	UNASO
47. Richard Lusimbo	Uganda
48. Maridadi K Bernard	ICWEA
49. Eriya Naweure	UHRN/EAHRN
50. Wamala Twaibu	UHRN/EAHRN
51. Salome Atim	CS REP CCM
52. Sanyu Hajarrah	KP REP on CCM
53. Joyce Achola	UGANET
54. Rhoda Iewa	Facilitator
55. Donald Tobaiwa	Facilitator
56. Robinson Tawili	Facilitator
57. John Beku	Facilitator
58. Olive Mumba	EANNASO
59. Onesmus Mlewa	EANNASO
60. Yvonne Kahimbura	EANNASO
61. Glory Chagama	EANNASO



The Eastern Africa National Network of AIDS and Health Service Organizations (EANNASO) is a regional network bringing together Civil society and Community voices to inform policies and improve the programming of HIV, TB, Malaria and other health issues present in our communities.

As of September 2017, EANNASO was pre-selected by the Global Fund Community Rights and Gender Strategic Initiative (CRG SI) to host the Regional Communication and Coordination platform for Anglophone Africa for the period of December 2017 to December 2019 covering 25 Anglophone Africa Countries.

The Regional Platform for Communication and Coordination has a key role in engaging Civil society organizations and Community Networks in Global Fund processes. It is responsible to foster regional dialogue, exchange knowledge and good practices among civil society and community actors and networks, as to disseminate information on technical assistance opportunities across all Anglophone countries where the Global Fund has grants countries.

CONTACT THE REGIONAL PLATFORM REGIONAL

Platform for Communication and Coordination for
Anglophone Africa

Hosted by EANNASO, Arusha, Tanzania

Tel: +255 739 210 598

Email: eannaso@eannaso.org | **Website:** www.eannaso.org

Facebook: www.facebook.com/eannaso.or |

Twitter: @eannaso