

Meeting Minutes - CCM Working Group 16-17th March 2017 Geneva

Day 1

16 March 2017

1. CCM Strategy – Part 1

There was a good mix of participation both from the existing (Grant Management Solutions (GMS), International HIV/AIDS Alliance, GIZ BACKUP, USG and French (MoFA and 5% initiative) and new (AIDS Accountability International, WHO, UNAIDS, Stop TB, Bilateral Partners Italians and Australian) partners including Ethics and Governance Committee (EGC) members and Community, Rights and Gender (CRG) colleagues.

The session started with Mark Edington's welcoming remarks. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss together how to evolve CCMs to contribute towards the operationalization of the new Global Fund's Strategy.

Mark Edington highlighted that the group consider important points below:

- Back to basics on CCM – while we discuss how to support CCM to implement the new strategy it is vital to keep in mind the core CCM functions as laid out in the Global Fund Framework Document. Noting that the framework document refers to CCMs as a coordination function rather than a governance one.
- Fit for purpose – creating a baseline on how CCMs have evolved and adapted to respond to the current needs, assess what CCMs would need in order to enable them to be more effective in coordinating across diseases.
- Resources available for CCMs – what are current available resources eg. Induction role out and performance enhancement workshops.

Points discussed:

- The Working Group acknowledged that good functioning of CCMs is fundamental for an efficient implementation of the grants disbursed by the Global Fund. This goal requires good **coordination and cooperation** between the Global Fund and its international and local partners: the more inclusive the process is, the higher the chances of success are, keeping in mind that the Global Fund can only recommend options to CCMs, which are **national multi-sectoral body**.
- Mark Edington showed his sincere gratitude for the incredible 10 years of continued collaboration and support from Grant Management Solutions (USG/USAID/GMS) provided to the Global Fund. Their dedication, professionalism, high-quality services, tools and performance is truly exemplary.
- This multi-stakeholder cooperation faces a **major challenge** as GMS projects ends by September 2017. GMS provides 80% of Technical Assistance budget in support to CCMs capacity building activities. The Working Group participants acknowledged GMS closure as a huge loss. The Working Group will elaborate discussions on how to fill in this gap.

- Rethinking about CCM role involves extensive consultations on how to integrate CCMs in the existing systems and within country context. This may not be easy, especially because a one-fits-all solution does not exist: each CCM is specific, and it mirrors the social and political situation of its country. The priority for the Global Fund would be to guarantee the inclusive nature of CCMs: any change process has to make sure that every stakeholder, especially the key affected populations, can raise his/her voice at the CCM table. Therefore there are principles that cannot be put apart in the new CCM Strategy, in particular:
 - CCMs are the expression of the "Country ownership" principle in the context of the Global Fund;
 - Evolution in CCM role is not a unique path but will be different depending on the country realities;
 - The role of the CCM Strategy is identifying the best option for each context.

- The Working Group discussions should focus on three aspects:
 - Lay down foundations on **how CCMs should evolve** in the next few years to more effectively deliver each strategy, discuss about its implementation process, rather than its content (changing the current framework at a Board level would take too long, and it would not be feasible).
 - Differentiate - delineate options for different CCM models taking into account, CCM strengths and weaknesses, adaption needed to deliver on Global Fund Strategy particularly under challenging operating environment (COE) and Transition and Sustainability.
 - Prioritize – according to how much value will this add verses how easy is it to implement.

2. CCM Strategy – Part 2

In four different groups (reflecting the four GF Strategy dimensions), the group discussed three specific items.

- How should CCM's evolve to be fit for purpose?
- Differentiation: How will this differ for different country context?
- Prioritization: How much value will this add verses how easy is it to implement. In a scale of 1 to 10 how would you prioritize?

Outcomes of the Working Group discussions:

1. Maximize Impact Against HIV, TB and Malaria

- *Multi-sectorial engagement:* Defeating the three diseases (HIV, TB and Malaria) implies actions that go beyond the health sphere. It is imperative that at the CCM table multiple stakeholders sit at the table and are involved in the decision-making process. For instance, we should make sure different ministries (of course the Health-related one, but also the Finance one) participate to CCM activities, but also guarantee a permanent access to CCMs for civil society. To defeat the diseases you indeed need more mobilization power, and this can happen outside the health sector.
- *Cross-disease cooperation:* we cannot think to tackle one disease at a time. The negative repercussions of these diseases on society are often interconnected, and so are the solutions. A cross-disease coordination also in terms of service delivery should be envisaged.
- *Oversight Committee:* it plays a fundamental role in the grant implementation process, by incentivizing an optimal management of the process. To increase the weight of this

committee, it should be more professionalized, and the participation of external experts should be envisaged.

- *Networks of people living with the disease:* we cannot be 100% sure; a CCM is actually working well, if we do not listen to those groups who should benefit from the Global Fund investments. Strengthening local networks of people living with the disease, and considering them as *watchdogs* for CCM deliverables could incentivize better and more inclusive performances. Community monitoring and an effective exchange of information can provide the Global Fund with a better picture of the situation: it could be achieved through dedicated websites, or through cellphones in those areas with connectivity problems.
- *Smaller CCMs:* in certain countries, especially in challenging operating environments, we could opt for smaller CCMs, in order to have more likely a quorum, and not obstruct the decision making process.
- *Transition:* the transition process, especially if it envisage a deeper integration of CCMs in the local realities may worry civil society, because traditionally local political institutions were not incentivized to include civil society in the discussion. The Global Fund should advocate to have key affected population and civil society at the table, but new incentives have to be developed.

2. Build Resilient & Sustainable Systems for Health

- Consider the skill and expertise required as CCM members in view of the a differentiated approach.
- Link CCMs with other broader coordination platforms: The Global Fund has a big influential power to move authorities in this direction. A deeper integration of CCMs in national reality could indeed foster the development of national sustainable health systems.
- Private Sector: Sustainable Health systems have conspicuous needs and capacity. Private sector can provide them, and be a fundamental contributor for this goal.
- What are the skill sets required as CCM members?

3. Promote & Protect Human Rights and Gender Equality

- Bottom-up Approach: key affected populations (KAP) should be included in the decision-making process. They should not only sit at the CCM table, but being able to raise their voice and influence the process itself. We should then focus on KAP meaningful engagement, i.e. on their empowerment.
- Accountability: there is the need to simplify the current tools to ensure accountability (the before mentioned Code of Conduct for CCM could represent here a good solution).
- Diversification of CCM model: sub-committee representatives could feedback in the CCM so that KAP members feel safe, empowered to respect confidentiality. Such practice could be positive for human rights protection and implementation.
- Inclusion of faith-based communities: are important in the service delivery networks and could provide a great additional support. There is the need to link their activities with CCM KAP protection strategy, or even strengthen faith-based communities inside CCMs.

4. Mobilize and Increase Resources

- *Mobilize resources beyond the Global Fund:* in order to make CCMs more and more autonomous in the fight against the three diseases, it is important CCMs progressively raise resources for their activities beyond the Global Fund. Some CCMs have already started this process, but this practice should be scaled up, in a sustainability scenario.
- *Minister of Finance at the table:* for purposes of multi-sectorial differentiation – as mentioned before – but also to economically link CCM activity with national Health-related strategies, a direct involvement of Finance Ministry.

- *Differentiation inside the Global Fund*: differentiating processes inside the Global Fund could also facilitate CCM autonomy. For instance, Countries could be allowed to repay debts to other countries through the Global Fund (Debt2Health).
- *Encourage the alignment and harmonization between existing organization and/or make use of already existing coordination structures and their capacity*: the presence of multiple organizations with similar roles and missions can make the coordination for defeating the diseases more difficult and bureaucratically more complicated. In this case, if national organizations against HIV, TB and Malaria already exist, creation of CCM should be discouraged, and rather the work with the existing organizations and their inclusion in Global Fund strategy should be envisaged.
- *Diversification of CCM tasks*: in light of a bigger CCM autonomy, the involvement of CCMs in non-Global Fund projects should be envisaged.

3. CCM Situation Room

The Working Group discussed a potential initiative “CCM Situation Room”. A multi-stakeholder decisional forum (Situation Room) with the capacity and technical expertise required to solve crosscutting issues unresolved at the national level.

This is the idea that was proposed following the existing Disease Situation Room.

Points Discussed:

- **Working Group vs Situation Room**: the composition of the two institutions does not differ too much. A better differentiation and description of roles and responsibilities is required. An alternative would be an extension of Working Group responsibilities.
- **Composition**: would be impacted by clarity on what the purpose and objectives of this group should be to have a positive impact, the composition of the Situation Room should be carefully thought, to make sure that all the required expertise is around the table. There is the need to have the right people at the right place.
- **Shared responsibility**: what does *shared responsibility* actually means? The discussion between participants focused a lot on this issue, which had not been explained during the preliminary presentation. For instance, how much impact the partners will have in the decision-making? The final decisions will be common responsibility for all the members of the Situation Room. *Shared responsibility* means also *shared financial responsibility*.
- **A more detailed plan needed**, for a productive evaluation of the benefits of this initiative, and in order to avoid the proliferation of similar institutions the Working Group felt a detailed analysis of current practices and demands should be carried out prior to such proposals. It is essential that transparency be embraced on the part of the Global Fund regarding country specific issues, or else the partners operate less effectively.

Outcomes:

- The Working Group unanimously agreed to drop off the proposed CCM Situation Room initiative in view of lack of clear understanding of expected need for this room.
- The Working Group agreed that this was not a priority at this stage due other competing deliverables.

4. Partners Champions

Points Discussed:

- Partners Champion - officially nominate and recognize exceptional entities who contributed extensively in promoting the Global Fund work in any given country.
- The most meaningful recognition would come from the country rather than the Global Fund.
- It could be a positive initiative to recognize an individual engagement, but at the same time it conflicts with the principle of country ownership, it could create more distance between the local organizations and the international ones.

Outcomes:

- Participants recognized this initiative would not add value to the work of the Global Fund and recommended that the Working Group should focus on more strategic directions to empower the CCMs. Some stakeholders also highlighted the potential risk that the Global Fund would empower Partners in CCMs that could be perceived as a threat by Civil Society stakeholders.

5. GMS Dashboard Updates

This was an opportunity to openly check with Partners around the table to see who would have the capacity and resources to fill in some areas of the Technical Assistance gap currently provided to Principle Recipients and CCMs. Over the 10 years period GMS has invested around Five Million US Dollars in the development of these tools including training of consultants, capacity building of CCMs and PRs. It is imperative for the Working Group to find a suitable solution to keep the knowledge and learnings of the GMS legacy.

Point Discussed:

- Dashboards: the first version was developed in 2008, a fourth one is going to be finalized and will be very useful to manage multi-country grants. It is an oversight tool aiming to monitor and evaluate performance through specific indicators and provide all the needed information for an efficient and effective grant management.
- It would be optimal for Principal Recipients and CCMs to use Dashboard (there is a partnership with SAP for software license). However, in the absence of GMS, the achievement of this goal is not sure. In particular, there are a few questions we need to answer:
 - How many Dashboards will the Global Fund and partners willing to manage?
 - How many countries will each partners be able to support?
- So far, there are 75 PRs using the Dashboards (Dashboard for PRs is not mandatory, but only an option!); it is already an impressive number which should be maintained, and that could create an incentive for other PRs to ask for this tool.
- To manage this tool, **well-trained consultants** are needed. GMS colleagues gave several examples to demonstrate how greatly the costs can vary, e.g. a whole of country approach vs. 1 or 2 PRs. One of the example was a of the total management cost in Liberia GMS and German colleagues spent around \$200,000 over 9 months which included TA support as listed below. This is just one of the few examples of costs and services that you be included.
 - 5 consultants
 - 4 country visits

- CCM Summary production
- Evaluation Performance Assessment (EPA) production

Outcomes:

- **German colleagues** expressed their willingness to contribute, and guaranteed their engagement on a short/medium term.
- **CCM Hub**
 - the Help Desk function will be maintained;
 - SAP license will continue to be provided to countries for free;
 - 4 CCM staff members will join the last opportunity to be trained on the Dashboard;
 - Work with the Country Team to use PR some cash balances to finance Dashboard maintenance and development.
- **French colleagues** from the Ministry indicated that, again due to the assessment that it is undergoing, they are currently not in a position to commit further. They also expressed some doubts about the possibility to carry on the PR dashboard project due to the volume it represent, and the fact that the initiative has worked on one PR dashboard pilot project so far.
- **Key Points for EGC** to report to the Board - **GMS closure will inevitably affect Global Fund ecosystem as a whole**, and bridging the gap between the expectation and reality is challenging and Board should be informed of this.
- Deeper discussion on this topic were then postponed to another session of the meeting.

6. Update Shadow EPA, Preliminary Findings

AIDS Accountability International conducted a shadowed EPA research in nine countries and presented the preliminary results in this session. The purpose of this research was to understand the civil society engagement in the CCM functioning and how to **improve accountability and empower civil society** at the national level.

Point Discussed:

- Samples only from nine Anglophone African Countries; some of the outcomes were:
 - CCM Roles, mandates and actions not widely understood by most stakeholders
 - Conflict of Interest “dealt” with bureaucratically but not in reality
 - Civil society exclusion usually on basis of criminalisation (& moral policing) or social marginalisation
 - CCM Hub and even CCM unknown by many

Outcomes:

- **Need to include civil society in the decision process:** the results of the research are very interesting and highlight how difficult it is to guarantee a concrete participation of civil society in social and national mechanisms. Even if they sit at the table in CCMs (this is one of the requirements of CCMs) it is still hard for civil society to have a real impact.
- **Problems with international evaluation:** international consultants may not be fully aware of the political and social dynamics inside the countries they are evaluating. International consultants have also to validate the results they produce with the CCM Chair, who in general tends to increase the rates, especially for what concerns CCM Chair and Vice-Chair performance.
- **Potential bias:** this research can present some bias as well, especially in those countries like Swaziland, where Civil Society has a very well organized and with high-expectations civil society movements, traditionally critical towards any form of power. Another important

aspect to consider is the methodology used and the sample size of nine Anglophone Africa countries.

- **New ways for EPAs:** the way of EPA production can be rethought. For instance, the self-assessment experienced in 2016 showed weaknesses, because it can be too biased in favor of the CCM. Consultants may for instance work in collaboration with civil society representative in EPA production. Local consultants may be preferred to international consultants.
- **Shadow EPAs every 2 years:** in case EPA methodology does not change, we can think about doing Shadow EPAs regularly.
- **Fragile equilibrium with CCMs:** a risk to be taken into consideration is breaking the good relationship with the CCM. If the EPA process is completely changed, CCM may feel challenged, and see Geneva as an “enemy”: they would not be incentivized to collaborate or improve their performances any more. Sometimes it is better to do small steps at a time and concretely work together to defeat the three diseases.
- **In light of GMS closure, it is inevitable that the EPA methodology should be rethought** to reduce cost but also to incorporate lessons learned from the AAI study.

7. GMS Handover Cont.

Point Discussed:

- **Learning Hub:** training portal on grants management launched in 2015 through GMS website. It counts today more than 300 registered users, and more than 400 participants to online courses.
- **Network with other 12 regional partners with technical capacities:** the technical network developed under GMS leadership has had an important role in service delivering, and it should not disappear after July 2017.
- **Data Management Tool:** GMS also developed a consultant database, which today includes more than **1000** consultants (among them, 500 are active, 130 are certified, 50 are team leaders, 5 are coordinating team leaders). It is important this tool does not get lost: GMS consultants are famous for their expertise and their skills. After GMS closure, they could continue their collaboration in technical assistance with the Global Fund and other partners.
- **Tools for consultants supporting:** these tools, developed by doing, are useful instruments to overcome those problems consultants may face during their activities in the field, these will be made available on GMS website (under *Resources* section).
- Sadly, the 21 September 2017 will mark the end of GMS project.

Outcomes

- The Working Group acknowledged that GMS support is impossible to replace under the current realities of respective Technical Partners to absorb 80% of the Global Fund TA needs at the country level.
- **Global Fund Board** needs to recognize that the incredible support provided by GMS will no longer be available for PRs and CCMs and should **push for alternative solutions or to ask the Secretariat to lower the expectations.**
- Transitioning period events: GMS will organize trainings for Global Fund and TA partners' staffs and consultants in May 2017 to continuously support the Global Fund work.
- GMS Handover: colleagues from the Alliance, Germany and the French 5% Initiative expressed their willingness to contribute as much as they can during this transitioning period, knowing that their resources remains limited. They all acknowledged the incredible work conducted by GMS in the last 10 years and the **guidance role** it has played for all of them.

The session ended with the general admission that more cooperation and involvement is needed from all the technical partners and the Global Fund to fill the gap that will be left by GMS, however there are no certainty on how the Technical Assistance landscape would look like from September 2017.

Day 2

17 March 2017

8. CCM Code of Conduct

The draft version of this ethical framework for CCM members was distributed to the Working Group participants (you can find the power point presentation of this intervention in the attachments

- Value of a new Code of Conduct: can avoid misbehaviors that provoke inefficiencies and mistrusts, and therefore accelerate the process to END the epidemics. The Global Fund ecosystem already used codes of conduct (for GF staff, PR, Suppliers etc.) except the CCM members.
- Development: consultation process with wide stakeholders including GMS, Anglophone and Francophone countries.
- Core: is addressed to the individuals, not to the institution. It does not exist in a vacuum, but it is strictly connected to the CCM Guidelines. It was thought as a booklet written in an easy language (no legal terminology), for a more rapid adoption.
- Content: it will not only prohibit dangerous practices, but it will also promote good behaviors implementing GF values. An accent has been put on the promotion of honest and truthful information & acting with dignity and respect, in order to incentivize a general proactive engagement. Everyone should also be able to speak out loud, and be able to report bad attitudes from other CCM members.
- CCM Code of Conduct positive effects: it will not only promote good behavioral practices inside national organizations, but also increase CCMs ability to manage themselves, therefore their autonomy and efficiency.
- Timeline: to be approved by the Board in May; CCMs should receive dedicated trainings between June and December 2017; its enforcement should be envisaged for late 2017.

Outcomes:

- **Protection:** how can we guarantee the protection for those people reporting bad practices inside CCMs? The Code of Conduct can work only if people feel themselves safe enough to speak out loud. Without any guarantee, people are not incentivized to implement the Code.
- **Accountability:** All CCM members will sign the Code of Conduct on a regular basis.
- **Investigation:** into allegations are challenging and that the balance between confidentiality and response will need to be worked out in practice.
- The Working Group strongly supported the CCM Code of Conduct.

9. CCM Transition / Sustainability

This session focused on Sustainability Transition and Co-financing. The aim of this process is to ensure that CCMs are able to **continue their mission** in fighting the three diseases even when the Global Fund funding support ends. All countries should therefore be encouraged and guided to embed sustainability considerations within their national policies.

Points Discussed:

- **Transition Planning:** the transition toward a CCM activity without GF funding support is a complex process whose main components are as follows:
 - Sustainability
 - Government financing
 - Focus on KAP and human rights protection
 - Grants for thematic areas
 - Robust health national strategies
- **Where we can apply the transition policy:** the transition process should be adopted first of all by countries that are not eligible any more for receiving GF funding, or countries with a low burden disease, i.e. those countries that will become not eligible for GF funding in the short/medium term. Currently:
 - **10** countries are transitioning
 - **35** countries are going to transition in the next 3 / 6 years.

Outcomes:

- **Governments:** It is important governments understand the urgency to think about a transition and sustainability strategy **before** receiving their transitioning grants. **Timing** here is fundamental, and countries should plan the transitioning phase in advance in order to be well prepared.
- **Financial means:** do countries have the means to go through the transitioning period? A potential solution may be thinking CCMs in a different way, for instance by incentivizing new partnerships between CCMs and other agencies (like GAVI for instance).
- **Communication:** often, CCMs do not even know what the term *transition* actually means. An early, proactive, and inclusive dialogue around transition planning can make CCMs clear about what they are called for.

10. French 5 % CCM Interventions Update

Points discussed:

- Scale of involvement: 5% Initiative currently spends 18 million euros per year in technical assistance to CCMs. It is the first Global Fund European partner (and the second one globally, after GMS). 5% Initiative falls under the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Methodology of Engagement:
 - A Urgent Channel for concept notes (to finalize concept notes in 2 / 3 days);
 - Capacity Building activities;
 - Short / medium term technical assistance (for 12 months maximum);
 - Epidemiological studies (since 2014): since data availability is often a hot topic, it is good to be able to produce data on your own;
 - The initiative worked on 17 EPAs since its creation and supported 6 in 2016.
- Distribution of activities: around 83% of its activities are in the African region. The challenging operating contexts are then classified as follows:
 - Context of Political Tensions and Insecurity;
 - Context with Strong Tensions with the Global Fund (countries where funds have been suspend for several years);
 - Context with Civil Society and KAP are marginalized.

11. New Impact through Partnership (ITP) design

To guarantee efficiency and a maximization of money value, the Global Fund has defined a new initiative (ITP), which should incentivize a multi-stakeholder engagement in funding and grant management. The main ITP components was outlined during this 11th session though a power point presentation that you can find in the attachments. You can also read a short summary of the presentation below:

- **ITP development:** the initiative has been the result of an analysis conducted in 20 countries, and its main purpose is to increase **accountability, data use** and **improvements** in the grant management process.
- **ITP principle:** ITP is based on the assumption that stronger multi-stakeholder partnerships at the county level can contribute to a better grant management.
- **3 Steps to support impact investment:** Needs, Accountability and Resources.
- **Approach:** country-tailored approach, because a one-fits-all solution does not exist. ITP should respond to the different national features.
- **Resources:** resources for ITP are embedded in the existing project budget, there is not the allocation of a specific budget portion for this project.
- **ITP vs the existing order:** ITP is not creating a “new order”, but it is going to be integrated in the existing grant management system at the national level. It is however, going to provide a value added to what already exists.
- **Potential issues:** ITP implementation may not be as easy as it seems. There are indeed a few aspects that have to be analysed and overcome in order to have an efficient ITP implementation:
 - How can we maintain **country ownership** (not only at the time of request but along the whole escalation process)?
 - What if there are not reliable local partners? What will happen at the global level?
 - How can we make sure global-level proposals to support will still be accepted and implemented/monitored at the country level?

Outcome:

- Role of CCMs in ITP should be clear and understood by the CCMs, The Global Fund and relevant stakeholders.
- CCMs are part of escalation process and should be consulted, and involved in the oversee of the ITP's activities to embody country ownership.

12. CCM Orientation Program

Points Discussed:

- Knowledge-transfer tool: CCMs are national organizations with high turnover (on average, once every two years). New members have often difficulties in working efficiently because they are not aware of the role; mission and functioning mechanisms of CCMs. CCM Hub will address this need by this training tool, “the Orientation Program” to brief new CCMs members about their responsibilities as CCMs members.
- This CCM Orientation Program has been developed in joint collaboration between the Global Fund, Leadership, Management, and Governance (LMG) and USAID.
- Orientation Program Structure: has both e learning and in person sessions (this latter provided by a consultant in the field). The learning modules are focused on CCM **governance**, but there are also optional **thematic modules** (for instance, on the role of civil society in CCMs, Resilient and Sustainable Systems for Health), which are available only in e learning.

- Face to face component: it provides an incredible value added to the program, because it allows to link the theory to the practice. Consultants manage and tailor session to the local reality where they are operating, by providing also studies. The face-to-face component is not mandatory in the Orientation Program.
- E-learning platform: it is easily accessible through Global Fund website. CCM Hub also provides USB keys with all the learning materials for those CCMs with connectivity problems.
- Success of the program: the Orientation Program (is available in English and French and will have materials to be downloaded in all the GF official languages). The program was launched only a couple of weeks ago and CCM Hub has received a high number of requests, (there are countries on the waiting list!). As for now, CCM Hub will deliver more than 30 Orientation Programs by beginning 2018. Given the high interest in this program, it was decided to enlarge it not only to new CCMs members, but to each member / stakeholder who needs more information about CCMs functioning.

Outcomes:

- **Upcoming Orientation Program modules:** specific modules on Sustainability & Transition and Code of Conduct could be part of the Program in the near future .
- Overall, the Working Group highly appreciated this important piece of work to support CCMs.

13. CCM Strategy

This last session of the day analysed in the detail the steps for the development of the new CCM Strategy, and provided a tentative division of tasks between all the Working Group members for the next months.

Points Discussed:

- The development of the CCM strategy is divided into 3 phases:

Phase 1: Diagnose and Assess Current State

- Define ecosystem and partner's role:

Identify data sources and commence compilation

CCM Audit Team, OIG, CRG can already provide more than 1000 CCMs members impressions as well as documentation of feedback and recommendations from civil society engagement in the CCMs.

Establish portfolio baseline

Define which changes should come with the new CCM Strategy: from the discussion, the professionalization of the CCM Oversight Committee is the priority.

Develop vision

Refine CCM vision, guiding principles, key enablers.

Develop outline of key topics to include in strategy” Articulate benefits of the strategic approach

- **Phase 2: Finalization strategy**

- According to partners', Phase 2 should have at several rounds rounds of negotiations with specific Board committees, in order to discuss the preliminary draft coming from Phase 1, and make the discussions effective.

➤ **Phase 3: Operationalization**

This phase should start in November 2017. Since it is early (we do not have a draft of the strategy yet), it is better to develop a work plan for this phase at a later stage.

Outcomes:

- The Working Group partners to get back with clearer definition of the role they can play in the process of defining the CCM Strategy have after having reviewed the updated work plan CCM Hub is attaching here.
- The Phase 1 should end in late May 2017 (Please note: this is a very close deadline, which may need to be extended to ensure adequate time for consultation to set the vision).
- During Phase 1, create a smaller group of partners to work on the process. Each partners to get back to the CCM Hub on their commitment on how they would like to contribute to this process. A smaller group of partners shall include a representative from key and/or vulnerable populations
- At the end of Phase 1, produce and circulate a vision and guiding principle of the CCM Strategy for Working Group validation.
- The Phase 2 stage should take place between June and November 2017. The Global Fund is going to work on the details of the workplan and communicate accordingly.
- Operationalization of the new CCM Strategy should be included in the 2018 budget for September 2017 Board Approval.
- This is the summary of the Working Group inputs that will be the base for CCM Hub to develop the detailed work plan

CONCLUSIONS

As a follow-up:

- Participants will receive the Meeting Minutes (this document), and all the presentations used during the meeting.
- An update work plan for the next months of CCM Strategy development, and a description of the roles we need partners to have in this phase. Partners are then invited to communicate to CCM Hub the role their institution would like to play during the CCM Strategy development process.
- After finalizing the division of roles and tasks, a detailed roadmap will be established for Phase 1 and partner coordination.

Annex A (below): Participant List

Attachments:

Day 1 and 2 presentations

Regional CCM Workshop Report, Dakar

CCM WORKING GROUP MEETING PARTICIPANTS

#	Title	Family Name	First Name	Entity / Organization	E-mail
1.	Ms.	Tucker	Phillipa	AIDS Accountability International	phillipa@aimsaccountability.org
2.	Dr.	Poletti	Timothy	Australian Permanent Mission	timothy.poletti@dfat.gov.au
3.	Ms.	Fischer	Judith	BACKUP GIZ	judith.fischer@giz.de
4.	Mr.	Schnellbach	Klaus	BACKUP GIZ	klaus.schnellbach@giz.de
5.	Mr.	Ludwig	Harriet	BMZ (German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development)	Harriet.Ludwig@bmz.bund.de
6.	Mr.	Mader	Jacques	Département fédéral des affaires étrangères DFAE, Switzerland	jacques.mader@eda.admin.ch
7.	Ms.	Boulanger	Christelle	5% Initiative	christelle.boulanger@expertisefrance.fr
8.	Mr	Boff	José	5% Initiative	Jose.boff@expertisefrance.fr
9.	Ms.	Bourdenet	Sylvie	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development	sylvie.bourdenet@diplomatie.gouv.fr
10.	Ms.	Branchi	Saran	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development	saran.branchi@diplomatie.gouv.fr
11.	Ms.	Severo	Catherine	Grant management solutions (GMS)	csevero@gmsproject.org
12.	Ms.	Onyango	Christine	Grant management solutions (GMS)	conyango@gmsproject.org
13.	Ms.	Pruyn	Nina	Grant management solutions (GMS)	npruyn@gmsproject.org
14.	Mr.	Page	Todd	International HIV AIDS Alliance	tpage@aidsalliance.org
15.	Mr.	Mok	Peter	International HIV AIDS Alliance	waimanmok@yahoo.com
16.	Ms.	Ruff	Amina	International HIV AIDS Alliance	aruff@aidsalliance.org
17.	Ms.	Chawla	Revati	International HIV AIDS Alliance	rchawla@aidsalliance.org
18.	Mr.	Ligrone	Stefano	Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation	stefano.ligrone@esteri.it
19.	Ms.	Bek	Anne	PACCI - Site ANRS de Côte d'Ivoire	anne.bek@gmail.com
20.	Ms.	Ditiu	Lucica	STOPTB	lucicad@stoptb.org

21.	Ms.	Koch	Carla	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	carla.koch@eda.admin.ch
22.	Ms.	Von Zinkernagel	Deborah	UNAID	vonzinkernageld@unaids.org
23.	Ms.	Rushton	Laurie	USAID	larushton@usaid.gov
24.	Mr.	Edington	Mark	Grant Management, GF	Mark.edington@theglobalfund.org
25.	Ms.	Moreland	Abigail	Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support, GF	Abigail.moreland@theglobalfund.org
26.	Mr.	Plain	Rene-Frederic	CCM Hub, Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support, GF	Rene-frederic.plain@theglobalfund.org
27.	Ms.	Boada De Tapia	Maria	CCM Hub, Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support, GF	Maria.boadadetapia@theglobalfund.org
28.	Ms.	McDaid	Grainne	CCM Hub, Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support, GF	Grainne.mcdaid@theglobalfund.org
29.	Ms.	Sapkota	Deepanjali	CCM Hub, Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support, GF	Deepanjali.sapkota@theglobalfund.org
30.	Ms.	Garcia	Mercedes	CCM Hub, Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support, GF	Mercedes.garcia@theglobalfund.org
31.	Ms.	Veronica	Pedroni	CCM Hub, Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support, GF	Veronica.pedroni@theglobalfund.org
32.	Mr.	Jackson	Nick	Office of the Executive Director, GF	Nick.jackson@theglobalfund.org
33.	Ms.	Wierzynska	Aneta	Risk Management Department, GF	Aneta.wierzynska@theglobalfund.org
34.	Mr.	Kerr	Timothy	Office of the Executive Director, GF	Timothy.kerr@theglobalfund.org
35.	Mr.	Hansen	Peter	Technical Advice and Partnerships, GF	Peter.hansen@theglobalfund.org
36.	Ms.	Mangiaterra	Viviana	Technical Advice and Partnerships, GF	Viviana.mangiaterra@theglobalfund.org
37.	Ms.	Thomson	Kate	Community Rights and Gender, GF	Kate.thomson@theglobalfund.org
38.	Mr.	Appolinario	Uliane	Community Rights and Gender, GF	Uliane.appolinario@theglobalfund.org
39.	Mr.	Ngoksin	Ed	Community Rights and Gender, GF	Ed.ngoksin@theglobalfund.org
40.	Ms.	Comon	Nelly	Donor Relations, GF	Nelly.comn@theglobalfund.org
41.	Ms.	Zagrebelsky	Laura	Donor Relations, GF	Laura.zagrebelsky@theglobalfund.org
42.	Ms.	Takayama	Makiko	Donor Relations, GF	Makiko.takayama@theglobalfund.org
43.	Ms.	Bonnel	Claire	Donor Relations, GF	Claire.bonnel@theglobalfund.org
44.					
45.	Ms.	Kantengwa	Kathy	Health Financing and Governance, Political & Civil Society Advocacy Department, GF	Kathy.kantengwa@theglobalfund.org