SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ON TECHNICAL REVIEW PROCESS

This draft represents input from the discussion on the Technical Review Process. Areas of possible agreement have been identified.

1. **Application Process**

   1.1. The Global Fund will need a clear and simple application format and process.

   1.2. The Secretariat will be responsible for facilitating the application process.

   1.3. The Global Fund will need to identify a process for accommodating proposals in various languages.

   1.4. The Secretariat will ensure that all the required information is included, before forwarding the proposal to the independent Technical Review Panel.

   1.5. A system for vetting the proposals will be explored, keeping in mind the need to simplify the process while not increasing transaction costs on countries, the Secretariat or the Technical Review Panel.

   1.6. The Secretariat will forward the recommendations from the Technical Review Panel to the Board for final decision.

   1.7. Technical support for preparing proposals and developing country level partnerships will be provided (and funded) by partners active in the country, such as bilateral donors and UN organizations. The possible role of the Fund in the provision of support for proposal preparation will be further explored.

   1.8. To enable more rapid transfer of funds and initial implementation of programs, the Board may consider adopting special procedures to approve “fast-tracked” proposals, particularly during the first year of Fund operation.

   1.9. In addition, other mechanisms may be developed for “interim” proposals to allow for rapid release of one or two smaller funding tranches, with additional funds contingent upon performance.

2. **Technical Review Panel**

   2.1. The technical review process should be an independent process that operates with openness and transparency.

   2.2. The Technical Review Panel is an independent, impartial team of experts appointed to guarantee the integrity and consistency of the proposal review process. It will review grant proposals submitted for Fund support, and make
recommendations to the Board for final decision.

2.3. The Technical Review Panel will consist of a 10, 20 or 30-member core team to review all proposals. As needed, it will draw from a larger pool of reviewers, from a broad range of organizations in both the developing and developed world, to advise on specific technical issues, depending on the nature of the proposal under consideration.

Option a): There would be one global panel plus regional panels (Africa, Asia, LAC). Some noted concerns that regional panels may threaten the consistency of proposal reviews and prolong the process.

2.4. The panel will include individuals from developing countries with extensive program experience to provide peer reviews of proposals and bring their substantive expertise to the process.

2.5. Members will have a balance of expertise in HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria and include experts from non-health areas such as economics, finance, management, and community development. Additional expertise required on the Technical Review Panel includes programme management and implementation in resource poor settings, working with NGOs, and on the overall sustainability and feasibility of proposals.

Option: The potentially large work load of the Technical Review Panel could merit its operating with three sub-groups to address HIV/AIDS, TB & malaria issues.

2.6. Panel members will not represent positions of Global Fund partners.

2.7. The role of the UN technical agencies in the technical review process needs to be more clearly defined so that the review process can benefit from their technical expertise, without compromising the independence of the review.

2.8. Panel members will be nominated by and approved by the Board.

Option: Members of the Technical Review Panel would be proposed by the Secretariat, and approved by the Board.

2.9. Panel members will serve for a two-year renewable period.

2.10. The Fund will make available resources to cover the expenses that panel members incur in the proposal review process to ensure independence,

2.11. The Panel may need a full-time convener, who could be a member of the Secretariat.
3. Technical Policy and Program Support

3.1. The Board will commission an appropriate body to address key technical and policy issues for Board consideration, such as: detailed criteria for reviewing proposals; options for monitoring and evaluation indicators; and possible floors/caps for funding. This function could be served through a standalone working group, ad hoc working groups, or assigned to the Technical Review Panel.

The TWG requested the sub-working group to further refine the options. In particular, an appropriate role for the UN technical agencies in the review process will need to be clearly defined. The working group will present more fully defined options at the December TWG meeting.