

Representative of people living with or affected by HIV – Temo Sasau

4.1.1. *Having a consultant to help with developing the GFR11 is essential because it seems that SPC is way under-staff today to do this job on top of their workload; I am recommending that you contact Yiga at TSF straight away in order to recruit a good consultant immediately; that said, we are so late in processing this request that we might get a 'not so good' person... but then again, we dont know... It might also be useful to look at those who were involved in the drafting of the GFR2 and GFR7. For we know that they already have the knowledge of Pacific issues and GF as it relates to Pacific.*

4.1.4. *GMU/ PR – It is vitally important that SPC be given the necessary funds to oversee PRSIP, RF, and be the PR for the Pacific. This is the system that has worked for us to this date. While the structure can be reviewed, it is important to acknowledge the role that SPC has played in building the HIV Response and sustaining the resources available.*

Representative of civil society organisations – Siula Bulu

4.1.1 *Funding of around AUD60,000 to support the appointment of a consultant to assist PICTs in the putting together of the Round 11 proposal to the GF whilst TA support will be provided by SPC under the existing budget allocation.*

I agree with this proposal to assist countries with their multi-country proposal to GF Round 11.

4.1.2 *Funding support AUD150,000 for PIAF for 2011 and 2012 to ensure the continued viability of the organization as the main representative and voice of the Pacific advocating for and on behalf of HIV + people.*

I understand the very important role that PIAF is playing at the regional level, especially in what it is doing to provide support to positive people around the region. It's role in the regional response to HIV is very important and needs to be supported. I agree in principal to RF providing some financial support to PIAF but only as an interim measure, to give them time to secure long term funding for the organisation. These are some of my questions on this issue ☒

Did PIAF request this funding? Or are we offering it to them because we are aware of the difficult financial situation they are in at the moment?

Is there a work plan and budget that can be accessed by the PRFC? I feel that is it is important for us to have this available to members so that we know what the money is going to pay for.

Is part of this money going to be put towards assisting PIAF find long term funding? Or this kind of assistance is not required?

Although in principal I agree with this, I would like to say that maybe we should approve funds for up to the end of 2011 and then discuss the funding for 2012 based on a work plan and budget in the

meeting in November. There is an urgency to this, especially for this year but I feel that it would be much better to discuss funding for 2012 in the November meeting.

4.1.3 Funding support to the amount of AUD109,000 for AHD salaries in 2011.

This is to pay only for salaries for SPC AHD staff? Or for the AHD coordinators in countries? And what about activities? Do they have funds for activities? If not, then it does not make sense to pay only their salaries. I am happy for this to be done but would like to ask that a breakdown be provided in the November meeting for information of the PRFC.

4.1.4 Support SPC GMU and Technical Team Suva office relocation to the 2nd floor of the Lotus Building to the amount of AUD60,000.

The reasons given for this proposed funding are understandable. But I do not see why RF has to pay for this. To me, this is an SPC internal matter and SPC should be shouldering the costs of the relocation. I would like this to be further discussed in the November meeting.

4.1.5 Support for Laboratory Specialist to the amount of AUD72,000 for the period April 2012 to March 2013.

I think it makes sense for the RF to provide this assistance as it is in line with the objectives of the fund.

Donor representatives – Melinia Nawadra

While the Concept Paper is well written, it is limited in offering us options on the under spend. We feel that most of the focus of the paper is to assist SPC rather than focusing on assisting the countries first and foremost. In most of our discussions (SPC/NZ-MFAT/AusAID) and papers presented the key reasons for low disbursement/burn rates has been the low absorptive capacity of PICTs, late and incomplete reporting, and cumbersome internal processes to name a few. We would assume the first options to be presented would be focused on how to mitigate these challenges. We would be keen that the un-committed funds be focused on improving the situation at the country and grants level by sourcing resources and where appropriate. We note that operational costs need to be met but thought that country supports (very critical elements) are missing.

4.1.1 Funding of around AUD60,000 to support the appointment of a consultant to assist PICTs in the putting together of the Round 11 proposal to the GF whilst TA support will be provided by SPC under the existing budget allocation.

We would be interested to know why RF would be asked to support GF work. While we see value we suggest that this consultant be contracted to be part of the team undertaking the Regional Strategy MTR which will apparently get underway soon. That way the Rd11 application will benefit from a stronger analysis of what's working and where the gaps lie. That said, timing may be an issue.

An additional option is for SPC to seek the assistance of technical advisory mechanisms available such as the Technical Support Facility through UNAIDS.

4.1.2 Funding support AUD150,000 for PIAF for 2011 and 2012 to ensure the continued viability of the organization as the main representative and voice of the Pacific advocating for and on behalf of HIV + people.

It is still quite unclear why we should provide assistance to PIAF and are concerned that this is presented as an option for the RF to fund. It must be made clear that the RF has not been set up for core funding, it has been set up to support PICTs with their HIV and STI activities. The RF will not be setting a good precedence if we provide core assistance – we could be opening up a door for other organisations that may be in a similar position to use the RF as a bail out option.

In addition, it would be useful if a workplan and budget for what the requested money be used for, rather than just asking for a blanket approval with no proper accountability for what the funds will be used for.

We would suggest that SPC look at existing grant streams for regional organisations and see whether there is a fit.

Another option is to allow PIAF to reprogramme their existing RF grants to include operational costs, possibly with an increased funding envelope. This would be more consistent with existing RF policies. Don't see any reason for PIAF to be remunerated specifically for PRSIP coordination work. If the grant stream rules does not allow core funding then RF may be asked to make an exception to policy. We do need to be mindful of precedent. We agree that PIAF should play a coordination role for NGOs but not seeking funding to do so.

4.1.3 Funding support to the amount of AUD109,000 for AHD salaries in 2011.

We are not favourable to this proposition unless there is a natural fit with one of the existing grant streams (along the lines of the way we wish to see PIAF treated). Should this not be the core responsibility of SPC and not specific programs?

4.1.4 Support SPC GMU and Technical Team Suva office relocation to the 2nd floor of the Lotus Building to the amount of AUD60,000.

We would think that this was a corporate responsibility and could be met from project management fees.

4.1.5 Support for Laboratory Specialist to the amount of AUD72,000 for the period April 2012 to March 2013.

We see value on this. Our understanding is that this position was co funded with Global Fund? It would be good for Secretariat to clarify that.

4.2.2 Consider a No-Cost Extension for 18-24months to allow effective programming of underspend.

The focus now should be on how SPC can ensure that funds are disbursed, activities implemented and outcomes achieved over the next 12 months at least before we look at the option of a no cost extension. It is important that SPC properly plans for the utilisation of what will be a significant underspent and how we (PRFC, SPC, donors and grantees) can all work together over the next few months to properly plan for viable options, and implement these to ensure the RF is meeting its

objectives and achieving results. The key focus should be on implementing and achieving outcomes within the existing timeframe - the importance of seeing analysis and range of options set out as per the last PRFC.