Rain or Shine II: Community Engagement in the Global Fund’s COVID-19 Response Mechanism in 2021

A Global Civil Society and Community Roundtable
27 January 2022 • 3:00-5:00 (Central European Time)

Convened by the Six CRG Regional Platforms, part of the Global Fund’s Community, Rights and Gender Strategic Initiative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3:00-3:05 | Welcoming Remarks                                                        | Kate Thomson  
              Head of the Community Rights and Gender Department, Global Fund                                                                 |
| 3:05-3:07 | Rapid Zoom Quiz – Audience Perception of Community Engagement in C19RM     | Gemma Oberth  
              CRG Regional Platforms Coordinator  
              CRG Strategic Initiative, Global Fund                                                                                             |
| 3:07-3:15 | Results from the Global Fund’s 2021 C19RM Community Engagement Survey      | Gilles Cesari  
              Senior Advisor, Key Populations and Community Responses, Community Rights and Gender Department, Global Fund                     |
| 3:15-3:20 | Lessons learned from community engagement in C19RM in Latin America and the Caribbean | Lidice López Tocón  
              Representative, CRG Regional Platform for Latin America and the Caribbean                                                                 |
| 3:20-3:25 | Lessons learned from community engagement in C19RM in Eastern Europe and Central Asia | Ivan Varentsov  
              Coordinator of the CRG Regional Platform for EECA, EHRA                                                                 |
| 3:25-3:30 | Lessons learned from community engagement in C19RM in Asia-Pacific        | Jeff Acaba  
              Coordinator of the CRG Regional Platform for Asia-Pacific, APCASO                                                                     |
| 3:30-4:00 | Q&A, Discussion and Reflection  
              • Experience sharing from participants (what worked well? What did not work so well?) | Gemma Oberth  
              CRG Regional Platforms Coordinator  
              CRG Strategic Initiative, Global Fund                                                                                             |
| 4:00-4:05 | Lessons learned from community engagement in C19RM in Anglophone Africa   | Onesmus Mlewa Kalama  
              Coordinator of the CRG Regional Platform for Anglophone Africa, EANNASO                                                              |
| 4:05-4:10 | Lessons learned from community engagement in C19RM in Francophone Africa  | Ida Savadogo  
              Coordinator of the CRG Regional Platform for Francophone Africa, RAME                                                                  |
| 4:10-4:15 | Lessons learned from community engagement in C19RM in the Middle East and North Africa | Samia Mahmoudi  
              Coordinator of the CRG Regional Platform for MENA, ITPC-MENA                                                                         |
| 4:15-4:20 | Lessons learned from key populations’ community engagement in C19RM      | Johnny Tohme  
              Senior Community Mobilization Manager, MPact                                                                                         |
| 4:20-4:50 | Q&A, Discussion and Reflection  
              • How to stay engaged in C19RM  
              • Applying lessons to NFM4 engagement                                           | Gemma Oberth  
              CRG Regional Platforms Coordinator  
              CRG Strategic Initiative, Global Fund                                                                                             |
| 4:50-5:00 | Closing Remarks                                                          | Gavin Reid  
              Community Engagement Lead, Community, Rights and Gender Department, Global Fund                                                          |
EN: My voice counted in C19RM in 2021 (yes/no)

RU: Мое мнение учитывалось в рамках C19RM в 2021 (да/не)

ES: Mi voz fue tomada en cuenta durante el C19RM 2021 (si/no)

FR: Ma voix a compté dans C19RM en 2021 (oui/non)

AR: تم احتساب صوتي في C19RM في عام 2021 (نعم / لا)
EN: C19RM was better in 2021 compared to 2020 (yes/no)

RU: Работа механизма C19RM была лучше организована в 2021 по сравнению с 2020 (да/нет)

ES: C19RM fue mejor en 2021 en comparación con 2020 (sí / no)

FR: C19RM était meilleur en 2021 qu'en 2020 (oui/non)

AR: كان C19RM أفضل في عام 2021 مقارنة بعام 2020 (نعم / لا)
EN: I understand my role in C19RM and fighting pandemics (yes/no)

RU: Я понимаю свою роль в C19RM и в борьбе с пандемией (да/нет)

ES: Entiendo mi rol en el contexto del C19RM y en la lucha contra las pandemias (sí/no)

FR: Je comprends mon rôle dans le C19RM et la lutte contre les pandémies (oui/non)

AR: أفهم دوري في C19RM ومكافحة الأوبئة (نعم / لا)
Civil Society and Community Engagement

COVID-19 Response Mechanism Survey Results

27 January 2022 – Rain or Shine II webinar
Purpose of discussion

1. **Share updates** on the Global Fund COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM) funding to date

2. **Present** the November 2021 C19RM engagement survey results
Update on C19RM funding (as of 13 January 2022)

C19RM 2020 and 2021:

| Grant Flexibilities approved in USD equivalent | 231,699,586 |
| Total COVID-19 RM 2020 approved in USD equivalent | 757,331,265 |
| Total COVID-19 RM 2021 approved in USD equivalent | 3,187,886,547 |
| Total approved in USD equivalent | 4,176,917,398 |
| Total countries and multlcountries | 128 |

C19RM 2021 only (107 countries and 14 Multicountry grants):

COVID-19 Response Mechanism 2021

Last updated: 13 Jan 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USD equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total mitigating COVID-19 impact on HIV, TB and malaria programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reinforcing national COVID-19 response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total urgent improvements in health and community systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Rights and Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total COVID-19 approved 2021 funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Engagement: requirements and support – Comparison

CCMs need to ensure meaningful consultation and inclusive decision-making during funding request development. CCMs were expected to make efforts to invite input from civil society and key populations using virtual tools.

2020

- Engagement of HTM communities during the process: Eligibility Criteria 1 assessed on Narrative and CCM endorsement

2021

- Engagement of communities beyond HTM, including those most affected by COVID-19: Eligibility Criteria 1 assessed on Narrative, CCM endorsement and list of communities' priorities
- 15% of CCM budget made available for engagement of CSO and Key and Vulnerable Populations (KVP)
- CRG SI partners leveraged (regional platforms, KVP networks, TA providers)
- Key changes to application material and guidelines (e.g., mandatory annex on communities' priorities, specific sections on CRG in the Narrative template, refined technical guidance on CRG-related interventions)
Purpose of discussion

1. **Share updates** on the Global Fund COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM) funding to date

2. **Present** the November 2021 C19RM engagement survey results
C19RM survey – demographics

- 411 respondents
- From all regions (half from Africa)
- From all gender identities (54% male)
- From all ages (few people below 30 years old)
- From all background (under-representation of Youth, women and malaria)
C19RM survey – results

Amongst the respondents who engaged in both C19RM 2020 and C19RM 2021 (87 respondents), 76% saw some or significant improvement in the C19RM 2021 process.

Have you noticed any improvement in the C19RM process between 2020 and 2021?

- I do not know: 16%
- No improvement: 28%
- Significant improvement: 48%
- Some improvement: 7%
C19RM survey – results

Improved efforts to support engagement compared to C19RM 2020, with clear improvement with non-CCM members (“very good or good” for 61% in 2021 versus 36% in 2020)

How would you rate the Global Funds efforts to support your engagement in the C19RM 2021 application process?

Response Rate 76.0%
C19RM survey – results

Response Rate 86.6%

Improvement (76% to 81%) in timely and relevant information on C19RM, with non-CCM members still less informed (35% informed in 2020 and 55% informed in 2021)

Have you received timely and relevant information on C19RM, i.e. have you been informed?

CURRENT CCM MEMBER

C19RM 2020

- Informedit: 24%
- Not informed: 76%

C19RM 2021

- Informedit: 81%
- Not informed: 19%

NON-CCM

- Informedit: 65%
- Not informed: 35%

Informed
- Not informed

No. of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current member of CCM (N=253)</th>
<th>Not a current member of CCM (N=103)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C19RM survey – results

Response Rate 86.6%

Improvement (76% to 81%) in timely and relevant information on C19RM, with non-CCM members still less informed (35% informed in 2020 and 55% informed in 2021)

Have you received timely and relevant information on C19RM, i.e. have you been informed?

CURRENT CCM MEMBER

C19RM 2020

- Informedit: 24%
- Not informed: 76%
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- Informedit: 81%
- Not informed: 19%

NON-CCM

- Informedit: 65%
- Not informed: 35%

Informed
- Not informed
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<tr>
<th>Current member of CCM (N=253)</th>
<th>Not a current member of CCM (N=103)</th>
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</table>
C19RM survey – results

More respondents were involved in the C19RM process, from 70% to 78%

Are you involved in the process?

C19RM 2020

- Yes (N=182) 70%
- No (N=78) 30%

C19RM 2021

- Yes (N=301) 78%
- No (N=87) 22%

Response Rate 94.4%
C19RM survey – results

Improved engagement across all sectors, with efforts to engage CBOs, Human Rights orgs and Youth orgs

Response Rate 100%
C19RM survey – results

Compared to 2020, more respondents involved in defining activities, commenting on drafts and who have consulted their own constituency outside the CCM.
C19RM survey – results
Perception of integration of community priorities remains a challenge for half the respondents (similar to 2020 survey)

Priorities included or not?

- 49.67% Issues included
- 50.33% Issues left out

Key issues left out:
- AGYW activities
- Community led responses activities
- Transgender related activities
- Human resources budget for communities
- Community awareness programs
- Mental health
- Community research, CLM and advocacy

Reasons given:
- Community priorities not budgeted/costed
- Global Fund mainly invests in commodities
- Use of vertical approach
- Limited budget allocation
- Lack of participation of KP, youth and women

Response Rate 100%
**C19RM survey – results**

Many respondents are still not seeing final drafts – similar level for CCM members (66-68%) but improvement for non-CCM members (84% “no” in 2020 and 63% “no” in 2021).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C19RM 2021</th>
<th>C19RM 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% Yes</td>
<td>43% No</td>
<td>52% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current CCM Member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% Yes</td>
<td>34% No</td>
<td>68% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not current CCM member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37% Yes</td>
<td>63% No</td>
<td>84% No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate 76.2%

Many respondents are still not seeing final drafts – similar level for CCM members (66-68%) but improvement for non-CCM members (84% “no” in 2020 and 63% “no” in 2021).
Next steps

1. Review findings from the survey with refinements based on consultations on 9 and 10 February 2022 (English, French and Spanish)

2. Share these findings and recommendations from civil society with leadership

3. Report back on the adjustments and/or further opportunities to enhance NFM4 and other GF processes
Thank you
Experiences of community participation in the consultation processes for the development of C19RM 2021 Global Fund applications in Latin America and the Caribbean Plataforma LAC

Plataforma LAC

Plataforma Regional
América Latina y el Caribe
Apoyo, Coordinación y Comunicación

vialibre
Lac Platform provided support to communities in all countries: directly or as linkage to a Technical assistance provider (ICASO)

- Develop and disseminate a tool to guide the consultation process
- (Translated into French and Russian)
- Other materials were disseminated
What worked well?

• The collaborative work between CSOs, CCMs, PRs and consultants was a successful experience.
• Having local consultants or someone that belonged to the communities or recognized by them.
• Different means of communication (phone calls, emails, use of WhatsApp, social media, etc.) allowed reaching different sectors.
Lesson Learned

• It is necessary to design the critical path that includes all the steps.

• The use of various information gathering tools and methodologies facilitated greater community participation and allowed for more robust information on their priorities.
Recommendations

• Define from the outset the lines to be funded and eligible interventions.
• Have a time, at the beginning, to explain how the Global Fund and its grants work.
• The inclusion of a lobbying strategy with the CCM and other key stakeholders
Thank you
Community Engagement in C19RM in Eastern Europe and Central Asia in 2021: What Are The Lessons To Be Learnt?

27.01.2021

Ivan Varentsov
EECA Regional Platform Coordinator,
Eurasian Harm Reduction Network
An Overview of the Platform’s Involvement in C19RM in EECA

Timeline: 15 April – 30 September 2021 (with most part of activities implemented by June 30)

EECA countries in which the C19RM related efforts of the communities were financially supported through the EECA Platform:

- Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Kazakhstan and Ukraine

Communities supported:
- People who use drugs, People living with HIV, sex workers, men who have sex with men, transgender people
- Women living with HIV
- Imprisoned and recently released people

Countries Supported Through C19RM Technical Assistance

- Russia (Secretariat of the Civil Society Based Coordinating Mechanism) - Track 1.
- Ukraine (Free Zone NGO - Imprisoned and recently released people) - Track 1.

The role of the EECA Platform was in consulting the applicant on the opportunities being available within the C19RM track of the CRG TA Program as well as on the Program itself and in reviewing the draft request before its submission.

Other Deliverables:

In April – June the EECA Platform conducted (on its own or jointly with Component 2 partners) 6 webinars and took part in 3 national online meetings on C19RM related issues for civil society and communities’ representatives from next EECA countries: Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

- 200 people covered by webinars and on-line meetings
- More then 2000 people reached through thematic listservs and social networks
- 8 documents on C19RM related issues translated into Russian
- Review of EECA regional civil society experience with C19RM process in 2021 conducted: https://eecaplatform.org/en/c19rm-review/

Total budget: 61 000 USD
What Went Well and Why – Innovations and Country Examples

- The involvement of the global and regional KAP networks into the C19RM related TA provision in the region allowed to increase the capacity of the communities’ representatives on taking part in the country dialogue and grant application development processes.

- The majority of the C19RM webinars were organized by the Platform in cooperation with such CRG SI Component 2 partners as INPUD, GATE, TBEC as well as with GF Secretariat which contributed to strengthening working relationships between EECA Platform and these partners.

- Close cooperation of the Platform with the assigned C19RM TA provider in EECA (ECOM) allowed to avoid duplication of TA being provided through different channels.

- Subcontracting local/national consultants to provide TA was the right thing to do considering necessity to know local content, national language and very tight terms.

- Even those interventions which were not included into final applications, but thanks to TA and expert support were justified and calculated, might become good instruments for further advocacy on national level, inclusion to other applications and / or to other donors.

- Experience obtained by certain communities and organizations from some countries within C19RM 2021 process has been immediately and successfully shared with communities and civil society organizations in other EECA countries and used by them.

**Case Example:** ensuring the interests of imprisoned and recently released people being taken into account within C19RM in Belarus, Moldova, Kazakhstan and Ukraine.

In Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine, support was provided through NGO FREE ZONE – a regional network based in Ukrainian providing support to imprisoned and recently released people. In Moldova, communities accessed technical assistance through the Global Fund.

**ALL FOUR COUNTRIES SET PRIORITIES FOR PRISON POPULATIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN THEIR C19RM GRANTS**

- **Belarus:** of two activities being developed and proposed one ended up in the national proposal for C19RM grant
- **Kazakhstan:** 8 budgeted interventions were proposed for the inclusion into the national C19RM proposal of which 2 ended up in the final version of the C19RM proposal
- **Moldova:** of 6 interventions being proposed 5 were included into the final C19RM application
- **Ukraine:** 43 interventions were proposed for the inclusion into the national C19RM proposal of which 23 ended up in the final version of the proposal.
Recommendations on What can be Improved and How

The Global Fund:

• Should ensure the next time C19RM process doesn't have such a limited timeline as in 2021 which eventually might influence the quality of applications and limit the ability of the communities to be meaningfully involved.
• Should mobilize Platforms and other CRG SI partners to provide support to civil society in countries much earlier than few weeks before the 1st submission window.
• For FPMs – to support the meaningful community and civil society engagement into the application development process not just declaratively, but with actual word and deed.

CCMs:

• Should clearly explain to all interested parties including the civil society and communities the approach to prioritization of the interventions to be included into the C19RM proposal
• Should prioritize the inclusion into the national C19RM proposals relevant activities under such areas of a great importance for civil society and communities
• Should better analyze, document and describe in the national proposal the impact of COVID-19 on gender-based violence and human rights

CRG SI partners involved in TA provision related processes in the region:

• Should better coordinate the planned C19RM related TA activities in countries among themselves. The Regional Platforms could play the leading role here
• Should simplify the communication language on TA available for communities to clearly understand what TA is, and how they can apply.
• Should make better effort to engage non-HIV/TB communities most severely affected by COVID-19 into C19RM related processes.

For the complete set of recommendations, download the Review of EECA regional civil society experience with the C19RM process in 2021

December 2021
C19RM 2021 | ЧТО НОВОГО?

**Аллокационные письма**
- с информацией о финансировании, доступном в рамках C19RM уже направлены в СКК. Они включают:
  1. Сумму основной аллокации в рамках C19RM.
  2. Сумму аллокации сверх основной в рамках C19RM.

- Запросы в рамках канала ускоренного финансирования (fast-track) на закупку товаров медицинского назначения первой необходимости в связи с COVID-19 должны направляться в первую очередь.
- Полные запросы на финансирование будут подаваться в рамках определенных сроков подачи.

**Требования к СКК** по вовлечению сообществ в процесс подготовки заявок, а также техн. взаимодействию с национальными органами, координирующими ответ на COVID-19.

**Другие обновления:**
- Техническое руководство
- Пакет документов для заявки
- Перечень интервениц, которые могут быть поддержаны
- Усиленные подотчетность, мониторинг и оценка
- Повышение прозрачности и ответственности
MEANINGFUL ENGAGEMENT IN THE COVID-19 RESPONSE MECHANISM (C19RM) PROCESS IN ASIA-PACIFIC
Meaningful Community Engagement in the C19RM

- Effective and meaningful community and civil society engagement is crucial for developing a robust response to the pandemic - C19RM Guidelines specifically calls for consultations with “civil society, key and vulnerable populations as well as communities, including those most severely affected by COVID-19”

- APCASO as host of APCRG and ACT!AP, with support from CRG SI, mobilized country partners – through webinars, info-materials, financial support, and other needed technical assistance – to ensure inclusion of members of key and vulnerable populations in the C19RM funding request process

- Support provided to 10 countries from Asia-Pacific:
  - General, cross-disease consultation – Vietnam, Cambodia, Pakistan, Indonesia, Bhutan, India, Lao PDR, Malaysia
  - TB specific consultation – Vietnam, PNG, Pakistan, Nepal, Indonesia, India, Bhutan
Key Learnings (Regional Perspective)

◉ Ensuring proper and appropriate mobilization against a tight timeline – due to the nature of C19RM, time was critical

◉ Being in the know of country level process flow and timeline – country partners needed to be vigilant and regularly updated

◉ Timely and extensive information-sharing due to the new mechanism setup of C19RM

◉ Financial resources to support mobilization of country partners - addressed the resource gap some country partners faced in mobilizing communities

◉ The need to adapt community engagement to the context of the country, including COVID-19 related restrictions
Info resources were useful to support partners in narrowing down priorities and identifying recommendations

Strategic positioning of issues (like GBV, human rights)

Working together and in coordination to pool available resources to achieve maximum impact and reach

Linking strategically to bring together diverse key and affected populations together

Coordination and communication with CCMs crucial to ensure recommendations are included and resourced in the FR

Constant communication and coordination with the CRG team and country teams – for quick updates and action

Low uptake of available TA
Investment in community engagement is an ongoing and long-term agenda
DISCUSSION
CIVIL SOCIETY AND COMMUNITY GROUPS’ ENGAGEMENT IN C19RM IN ANGLOPHONE AFRICA

By: Onesmus Mlewa
27 January 2022
Civil Society and Community Groups Engagement in C19RM Funding Requests

**OUR APPROACH**

Multiple Support to civil society and community groups during the C19RM funding request development

- Community, Rights and Gender Technical Assistance (9 assignments approved)
- Small grants provided through the Platform (9 small grants issued)
- Collaboration with key populations networks

**WHAT WORKED WELL**

- Multiple support (both CRG TA and Platform small grants) worked well to complement the engagement process
- Guided support from consultants better shaped community priorities
- Community priorities were shared with the writing teams and CCMs
- Use of country consultants proved much more efficient and quick

**WHAT DID NOT WORK SO WELL**

- Limited time for TA requests
- Technical Assistance did not support the writing process hence in some countries (Tanzania) the key populations priorities were not included in the final funding request
- Some Tas delivered through Virtual interactions not so well done due to limited knowledge of local operating environment

Regional platform for communication and coordination on HIV/AIDs, Tuberculosis and Malaria for Anglophone Africa
WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED?

1. Communities Require Engagement Support at **ALL** Stages

- Constituency Engagement in Country Dialogue
- Funding Request Writing Teams
- Grant Revision (grant-making)
- Grant Implementation

2. Using Consultants Who Understand the Local Environment is **ESSENTIAL** in delivering Technical Assistance
THANK YOU

Women in Zimbabwe Engaging in C19RM
RAIN OR SHINE II: Community Engagement in C19RM 2021 in Francophone Africa

Presented by Ida Savadogo
Coordinator, Francophone Africa CRG Regional Platform
CRG Regional Platform Support for the C19RM Process in Francophone Africa

- Recruitment of a C19RM focal point

- Development of 2 tools (Simplified modular framework, List of key populations Covid) and dissemination of information on C19RM (13 newsletters on C19RM sent, about 3800 people reached)

- 3 documents translated into French: Intégration du suivi communautaire (SC) dans les demandes de financement C19RM, Boîte à outils C19RM 2.0, Implication significative au C19RM

- Engagement grants allocated to 7 countries:
  - Countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Côte d’Ivoire, DRC, Senegal
  - Activities: Community Consultations, workshops, focus groups, facilitators

- Support through C19RM TA to 10 countries:
  - Countries supported: Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central African Republic, Côte d’Ivoire, DRC, Gabon, Madagascar, Sao Tome & Principe
  - TA Track: Needs Assessment, country consultations

Photo: Community consultations in Burkina Faso
### What Went Well and Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C19RM Focal Point</strong> support to countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | o Identification of technical assistance needs: 9 countries received TA from CRG-TA  
|  | o Development of 2 tools  
|  | o Review of the community sub-sections of the country funding application and provide comments and suggestions: in Senegal and Burundi |
| Civil society organisations in 7 countries supported with C19RM engagement **sub-grants** |  
|  | Organisation of civil society and community consultations, focus groups, workshops, facilitations  
|  | Examples – **DRC** – organisation of focus groups; **Côte d’Ivoire**: Provide a facilitator to the consultant to help navigate his mission with civil society |
| Production, translation and dissemination of **information** | About 3800 people reached through webinars (5), newsletters (13) and WhatsApp groups |
Areas for Improvements/Recommendations

- **Challenge:** Limited funding available to be able to sub-grant to countries to support community engagement
  - **Recommendation:** Increase resources available to communities at country level to support their ability to convene and set priorities for C19RM.

- **Challenge:** Limited number of participants in civil society consultations and writing workshops due to COVID-19 restrictions
  - **Recommendation:** Build capacity of civil society and communities in how to be more effective during online participation sessions for Global Fund processes.
    - Example – **Senegal** – virtual session was organized for 6 regions (Kedougou, Kolda, Matam, Sedhiou, Tambacounda and Ziguinchor). The quality of the interactions was not as high as it could have been. This situation affected the quality of the outputs and contributions from these regions.

*Photo: Workshop to validate the priority needs of key populations and vulnerable groups for C19RM funding request in Côte d’Ivoire*
C19RM Community Engagement in MENA Countries

The Regional Global Fund platform in MENA

Samia Mahmoudi
Assistant Coordinator of the MENA Regional Platform

January 2022
Between May and July 2021, the MENA regional platform conducted various community consultations as part of the preparation of the C19RM grant applications of the Global Fund.

The community dialogues and consultations were conducted in 6 countries: Morocco, Egypt, Tunisia, Mauritania, Somalia and Sudan.

The different organizations in these countries organized face to face workshops, focus groups and virtual meetings with civil societies and requested technical assistance from CRG.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
<th>Support available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>June 22-24, 2021</td>
<td>A face-to-face workshop</td>
<td>Al Shehab</td>
<td>PNLS, representatives of 11 NGOs from 6 governorates, PCs, PLHIV</td>
<td>ITPC-MENA, UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>May 20, 2021</td>
<td>Face-to-face workshop</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>The network of associations of people living with HIV, The network of organizations fighting against tuberculosis, The Association representing key populations Malaria, The association SOS Peers Educators, The STOP AIDS Association Nouakchott Solidarity Mauritania Association for Mother and Child Health</td>
<td>ITPC-MENA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>May 20, 2021</td>
<td>Face-to-face workshop</td>
<td>RDRI-Morocco</td>
<td>Representatives of key populations (sex workers (SW), injecting drug users (PUDI), men who have sex with men (MSM), PLHIV in CCM Morocco and a representative of young people not CCM Morocco and on the other hand the member and non-member associations of CCM Morocco</td>
<td>ITPC-MENA, CRF, AIDSUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>May 10-18, 2021</td>
<td>More than 10 virtual meetings with CSOs</td>
<td>GF Steering Committee (GFSC)</td>
<td>Civil society, PCV, representative of GFSC member communities and the C19RM technical working group</td>
<td>ITPC-MENA, CRG through Frontline Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>5 focus groups</td>
<td>CCM</td>
<td>PLHIV, human rights and GBV CSOs, Malaria CSOs and private sector, SW, MSM</td>
<td>ITPC-MENA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Between June and July 2021</td>
<td>13 focus groups and a restitution workshop</td>
<td>ATP+</td>
<td>MSM TS, PLHIV, GVGBV women, IDU, LGBTIQ++</td>
<td>ITPC-MENA, CRG through Initiative, Expertise France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What went well:

- Community involvement: an effective participation in the discussions
- All the countries respected the submission deadlines
- Approval of TA requested
- A transparent process: Perfect accessibility to the information
- Swiftness in the adaptation of documents to the region (synthesis, translation, etc.)
- A community commitment at the regional level

Why:

- A strong mobilization of all community actors
- The extensive partner networks at country and regional level
- Support from the CRG team
- Weekly meetings
- The disposition of CCM to support this process and collaborate with the regional platform
- Availability of financial resources to support countries
What can be improved and how, including recommendations to overcome the issues

- Key populations were not represented in all the dialogues. In some cases, this was due to the absence of community-based organizations representing them, and in others, to the time constraints.

- Attendance at the events organized under this framework does not necessarily imply effective participation in the discussions. Representatives of key populations do not have the same capacity to express themselves and represent their group in their contributions.

- All the experts reported on the challenge of the very tight deadlines attributed to the preparation of such a large grant application. These conditions did not always make it possible to mobilize representatives of all the affected communities nor for representatives to return to their groups.

- For Egypt, the period of preparation of the C19RM request coincided with that of the country's grant for the fight against HIV and Tuberculosis, which also did not help to assert the needs and recommendations of the groups concerned in the specific context of COVID-19.
How to overcome the issues faced

- Ensure anticipatory communication on the next grants to the actors of the response in order to guarantee favorable conditions for the preparation of future grant applications under this mechanism.

- Better adapt the deadlines for submitting requests to the resources and constraints of country teams.

- Advocate for a clear positioning of the Global Fund as regards the part of the subsidy to be dedicated to strengthening community action.

- Place resilience among the priorities to be discussed by response actors when new grants are made.

- Carry out an in-depth analysis of how the results of community dialogues are taken into account in the final grant applications in terms of the nature of the activities taken into account and the percentage of the budget dedicated.
Thank you for your attention!

https://www.themenaplatforom.org/

Samia Mahmoudi
The Regional Global Fund Platform Assistant Coordinator in MENA

E-mail: alia.amimi@itpcmena.org
Mobile: +212 6199 68 12
SUCCESES AND CHALLENGES OF THE GLOBAL FUND’S C19RM

In meeting the needs of key populations

A community-led reflection by

MPACT - NSWP - INPUD - GATE
Process

27 countries

EECA = 5
West Africa = 5
Sub-Saharan Africa = 8
Latin America = 2
Asia-Pacific = 4
MENA = 3

Forms of support

Translation and rolling-out of existing guidance
Development of new guidance
Sub-grants for community consultation
Consultants directly to coordinate consultations
Review of consultations reports and recommendations
Sub grants to regional partners for in-country support
Linkage with regional platform
Linkage with CRG-SI for obstacle resolution
What was successful

• Existing networks, partnerships and collaborations, and building on existing understanding and trust.

• Capacitated, engaged and mobilized country-level partners with solid communication channels, and previous involvement with similar (including GF) processes.

• Global Fund (CRG-SI) support including concrete information and guidance, regular communication, check-ins and sharing learnings, advocacy interventions to resolve conflicts.

• Engagement with CCMs where there were a strong civil society and/or key population representations (this however felt forced in some places).
What was challenging

• Overwhelming demand within a limited timeframe and available resources on all levels.

• Communication, particularly at country level (e.g., from CCMs and PRs, and in some cases also from Global Fund Country Teams) + the sheer volume of information and tools to share in an easy-to-read format.

• Competing priorities and conflicts of interest between CSOs, key population organizations.

• Limited cooperation from CCMs and PRs where they did not provide timely or any information about the engagement process, were unresponsive, mistrustful of community capacity and unsupportive of community consultations. This became worse in time of negotiation, disbursement and implementation.
What We Recommend

• Allow time for adequate, consultative community engagement and strengthening information, education and communication before, during and after the process.

• Increase resources available for ongoing, flexible TA (instead of a one-off).

• With funding and capacitating KPs for pandemic preparedness response + minimum country level investment in consultation and programming. And provide ongoing support after C19RM approval to ensure that key populations remain actively involved in grant making and subsequent implementation and monitoring. Simplify as much as possible the short-term TA applications, especially in emergency.

• Strengthen CCMs to promote meaningful engagement with key populations.

• With minimum standards for engagement, communication and community consultation.

Focus group discussions with the MSM community in Tunisia for C19RM
THANK YOU
HOW CAN WE STAY ENGAGED IN C19RM?

- Comment pouvons-nous rester engagés dans le C19RM?

- Как мы можем оставаться вовлечёнными в C19RM?

- ¿Cómo podemos seguir participando en la C19RM?

- كيف يمكننا الامتناع عن العامل في C19RM؟
THANK YOU!

For more information and to contact us, visit: