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Statement on the Report of the Executive Director (GF/B36/10)

The Developing Country NGO Delegation thanks Executive Director, Mark Dybul for this comprehensive report on the status of activities within his reporting portfolio.

We wish to flag the following observations or request clarity where indicated:

First, we are concerned, as highlighted in the report, that the response to TB in comparison to the two other diseases has been significantly underrepresented. We appreciate that the Director has acknowledged that this has resulted in inadequate impact on TB. While the report points to supporting new and evidence-based approaches for fighting TB, the strategic focus towards TB must be scaled up.

We would therefore request that a thematic update on TB and malaria be provided in each ED report.

Second, the vision and intention of the Global Fund to invest for impact should focus on quality of data that measure coverage and impact. Recent evidence and academic papers have cast doubt on the reliability of data and indicators from some technical partners. We share these concerns.

Third, what are the strategic approaches necessary, and that should be taken by the Fund to mitigate against any negative consequences to our objective to ‘protect and promote human rights and gender equality.’ What, in your opinion, are the steps necessary to ensure sustainability of the gains we have made over the years particularly in countries transitioning or have transitioned?

Statement on Resource Mobilization and Update on the 5th Replenishment (GF/B36/29)

We commend the team at the Secretariat and all partners on a successful replenishment.

We publicly express our sincere gratitude to all donors and welcome the support of new ones. Kudos as well to the governments from implementing countries who have made a pledge totalling over $73 million.

As a Delegation, and a Board, we commit to and stand ready to support the Secretariat in whatever way we can to ensure pledges are converted to contributions.

We wish as well to raise a few concerns regarding this update to the Board.

First, we request a breakdown of the contributions disaggregated per types of donors, including high-net-worth individuals, with the amounts and percentage increases (and decreases), if any, who supported the 5th replenishment.

Second, we request the Secretariat to strengthen its ongoing resource mobilization efforts between the Replenishment Conferences. We anticipate that there may be a funding shortfall in meeting the full Strategy period through 2022.

At the 35th Board Meeting, our delegation requested the Secretariat to present a full budget for the 2017-2022 Strategy, so that we will know the actual resources needed to be mobilized in order to achieve this strategy. This is still forthcoming. We request once again, that the Secretariat provides the Board with this forecasted budget by the 38th Board Meeting so that the Board is fully apprised and engaged in supporting ongoing resource mobilization and 6th replenishment.
Finally, in keeping with Gf/B34/DP06, kindly share how the Board has been utilized and engaged to achieve the replenishment goal. We request again that this decision point be fully operationalised and the Board be strategically engaged in setting and meeting the goals of the 6th replenishment.

**Statement on Risk Management Report (GF/B36/26)**

The Delegation thanks the Chief Risk Officer for this report.

We welcome new initiatives like the inception of a supply chain department as well as other achievements which have contributed to positive changes in the Global Fund risk profile.

We wish to flag the following concerns and request that the Board be provided with an update at the Board table.

First, we would appreciate the mitigating actions being explored, or being actioned, for the risks identified in relation to supply chain management, sustainability and transition, program and data quality and the Strategy implementation.

Second, the role of country implementers like PRs, community SRs and CCMs, in mitigating these risks, is not explicitly explained. What is their role?

Third, the pace of operationalizing the comprehensive risk management framework across all areas of the organisation has been relatively slow since the adoption of the risk management policy in 2014. We note that several agreed management actions related to this portfolio are yet to be achieved. We would therefore appreciate the provision of proposed actions and a clear timeline to further indicate when these would be implemented.

Fourth, we wish the risk office to speak more to the rationale for delays – than what has been shared in the progress update on the status of Implementation of OIG Agreed Management Actions.

Finally, we remain deeply concerned that human rights risks are not being reported on despite the mandate that we have set for ourselves in this regard. We have seen in recent times dire situations with respect to key and vulnerable populations in Philippines, Tanzania, and Indonesia. These situations pose real risks to people as well as investment. It is therefore important that we do not downplay human rights as a critical area that we need to closely monitor and take actions.