

UPDATE ON CURRENT ISSUES BEING DISCUSSED BY THE CIVIL SOCIETY DELEGATIONS AND THE BOARD OF THE GLOBAL FUND.

The main focus of the Global Fund Board and the NGO Communities Delegations has been the Global Fund's 5th Voluntary Replenishment, which was held in Montreal, Canada, in September 2016.

For many, the 12.9 Billion USD pledged, which is just under the 13 Billion needed, represents a great success. However as the joint statement from the 3 NGO Delegations acknowledges: "this figure is only the minimum of what is needed. The Global Fund's Investment Case states that \$13 billion is just 80% of its full need. Without further investment, it will certainly mean communities disrupted, lives lost, and preventable new infections."

The three NGO Delegations are the Communities Delegation (those living with or directly affected by the three diseases and includes an NSWP staff member), The Developed Country NGO Delegation (includes Pye Jakobsson, NSWP President) and the Developing Country NGO Delegation.

For full implementation of the 3 Global Plans for HIV, TB and Malaria, approximately 134.5 Billion USD is needed. The Global Fund expects 41 Billion USD to come from domestic financing. This means the world will be 20 percent short of what is needed to combat the 3 diseases. This assumes that all governments will meet their domestic contributions promises.

At the April 2016 Board Meeting in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, the Board tasked the Global Fund Secretariat with "reviewing the business model in high-risk countries and present possible options to the Board after review by the Standing Committees at their second meetings in 2016."

In response to this request, the Global Fund Secretariat has started a project to review its business model and options around country presence.

Five options are being discussed:

1: Current model: the Global Fund maintains its current model with offices and country teams based at HQ in Geneva. For sex workers in the community this means nothing changes and the entry points to Global Fund processes, contact points and liaison points all remain the same.

2: Regional Hubs: the Global Fund could use 3-4 Regional hubs to cover the main working regions in the organisation. Potentially this option could offer an additional entry point for sex workers but it is unlikely it would make any substantial difference.

3: Country teams in all countries: the Global Fund would have office and staff presence in every country that it is operating in. This option would offer increased opportunities for sex workers, in the same way that UNAIDS or other UN entities

with Country Offices do. However, there would be considerable operational costs for the Global Fund, which would impact funding available for programmes.

4: Country teams in subset of countries: the Global Fund would have offices and country teams in countries based on risk, impact and strategic importance. This is basically a less expensive option for the Global Fund compared to option 3 and would only offer increased opportunities for sex workers in the selected countries.

5: Liaison in subset of countries: the Global Fund would have a liaison in key countries to coordinate with partners and support projects. Again this would depend upon the countries selected but it is unlikely this option would offer significant opportunities for sex workers beyond what already exists.

Nothing has been decided yet and consultation with stakeholders is ongoing. The Communities Delegation may advocate for keeping the current model with some minor efficiency improvements and will oppose Country Teams in all countries. What this means is that should the Communities (and others) opposed to country offices for the Global Fund prevail, the situation would remain the same. The question regarding country offices for the Global Fund goes beyond increasing opportunities for sex workers and other key population groups. They relate to the kind of organisation the Global Fund should be and if replicating other UN system organisations is the best way forward for the Global Fund.

Results from the key stakeholders will be presented to the Committees in October, so it is unlikely that a Board decision will happen until next year.