The Global Fund

October 2018

Risk & Assurance Toolbox

Objectives

The objective of Risk and Assurance Tool box is to provide the Local Fund Agents (LFAs) with a reference guide on the typology of mitigating actions and available assurance activities against the risks and mitigating actions.

Usage

The Risk & Assurance Toolbox is jointly developed by Technical Advisory and Partnership (TAP), Community Rights and Gender Department (CRG), Program Finance (PF), Supply Chain, Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support and Risk Departments. The Risk and Assurance Toolbox will be updated on an ongoing basis.

The Toolbox includes assurance activities that are provided by LFAs as well as other assurance providers.

Description inside each assurance activity provides only high level overview. Relevant terms of reference should be used for each assurance activity tailored to the country/implementer context and the needs of the Global Fund Country Team.

Overall structure

The Risk and Assurance Toolbox is structured as follows. 21 grant risks as per Intergrated Risk Module are categorized into four risk types:

Programmatic and M&E	Financial and Fiduciary
Health Product Management & Supply Chain	Governance, Oversight & Management

For each risk, there is a guidance on 1) typology of mitigating actions, 2) potential assurance activities, and 3) high level details of each assurance activity. The assurance activity details include general definition, assurance area, frequency requirement/recommendations, guidance/ToR availability and link, providers and average duration.

Programmatic and M&E

List of assurance activities

1	Review of data systems (community/facility)	2	Program and/or data quality spot checks	3	Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks
4	Health facility assessments	5	Data quality reviews	6	Review of Laboratory systems
7	Program reviews	8	Partner reviews	9	Routine programmatic analysis
10	Population-based surveys	11	Country evaluations	12	Thematic reviews
13	Prospective Country Evaluation	14	Community based monitoring		

Mapping of mitigations & assurance against risks

Risks	Typology of mitigating actions	Assurance activities
1.1 Inadequate program design and relevance	• Develop/update a costed National Strategic Plan. • Coordination with stakeholders (donor and government) for funding programs around the NSP • Improve human resources availability and training • Use of country specific epidemiological context for interventions and targets. • Specific activities to improve linkages between program design and supply chain	7 Program reviews 8 Partner reviews 9 Routine programmatic analysis 10 Population-based surveys 11 Country evaluations 12 Thematic reviews 13 Prospective Country Evaluation
1.2 Inadequate design and operational capacity of M&E systems	• Ensure sufficient grant funding on M&E systems strengthening. • Develop costed M&E strategy and Operational Plan. • Coordination of donor and government funding for M&E, improve human resource availability and training around the national (and/or disease specific) M&E strategy and Operational Plan • Institutionalize/improve data use culture and feedback into improving data quality as well as program quality. • Address known gaps M&E Systems specific to the country context. • Sufficient resources for planning, implementation, and TA of national HMIS (e.g. DHIS2) strengthening, scale-up, and maintenance, and linkages with other data sources. • Improve linkages between HMIS design and supply chain/HPM information system design (e.g. LMIS, Lab systems)	1 Review of data systems (community/facility) 7 Program reviews 8 Partner reviews 11 Country evaluations 13 Prospective Country Evaluation
1.3 Inadequate program quality and efficiency	• RSSH activities focused on HRH- recruitment, retention, training. • Institutionalize/improve in-country routine program quality assurance practices and processes (national or WHO program guidelines). • Improve routine supervision and feedback (following approved national/ WHO program guidelines of evidence based care). • Data gap mapping to understand the epidemic and specific program quality issues; and resource mobilization • Grant activities aimed to improve program quality and efficiency (for example activities included in PQE pilots) • Strengthen case detection, initiation on treatment and retention. • Improve referrals and linkages (e.g. TB/HIV, EID) • Improve the readiness to provide services at facilities and/or community sites (includes strong linkages with Lab, supply chain and HPM interventions). • Specific grant related activities for monitoring and addressing drug resistance. • Ongoing TA from partners • Implement National Laboratory Strategic Plan; and specific activities for national quality standards for lab services, lab quality management, and integration of lab services.	1 Review of data systems (community/facility) 2 Program and/or data quality spot checks 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks 4 Health facility assessments 5 Data quality reviews 6 Review of Laboratory systems 7 Program reviews 8 Partner reviews 9 Routine programmatic analysis 10 Population-based surveys 11 Country evaluations 12 Thematic reviews 13 Prospective Country Evaluation

1.4	Limited data availability and inadequate data quality	• Ensure sufficient grant funding on M&E systems strengthening. • Institutionalize/improve in-country routine data quality assurance practices, e.g. routine review process of DHIS2 DQR app reports, programmatic results reported every month jointly between M&E officers and program officers and/or health facility staff. • Sufficient resources for planning, implementation, and TA of national HMIS (e.g. DHIS2) strengthening, scale-up, and maintenance. • Integrate/link disease specific and/or other data (e.g. key LMIS indicators) reporting within the national HMIS • Improve routine supervision and feedback • Institutionalize/improve the community health information systems (CHIS) and integrate/link the CHIS within the national HMIS. • Improve country's ability to report on disaggregated data and ability to report on outcome and impact indicators. • Strengthen data use and analytical capacity at all levels of health system • Develop national HMIS Strategy and Operational Plan. • Coordination of donor funding for HMIS around the national HMIS Strategy and Operational Plan (and/or M&E Strategy). • Improve human resources availability and training for HMIS, particularly in coordination with other donors and government.	1 Review of data systems (community/facility) 2 Program and/or data quality spot checks 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks 4 Health facility assessments 5 Data quality reviews 7 Program reviews 8 Partner reviews 9 Routine programmatic analysis 11 Country evaluations 12 Thematic reviews 13 Prospective Country Evaluation
1.5	Limited use of data	• Ensure sufficient grant funding on M&E systems strengthening. • Include data analysis and use component in the M&E strategy and in the HMIS Strategy. • Coordination of donor funding for data use around the national (and/or disease specific) M&E strategy and Operational Plan. • Institutionalize/improve in-country routine data use practices, e.g. routine review process of DHIS2 Dashboard reports, routine review process of programmatic results jointly between M&E officers and program officers and/or health facility staff, etc. • RSSH activities focused on Human Resources for Health-recruitment, retention and training. • Improve resources and linkages from local research and training institutions/universities etc. to the Ministry of Health. Courses in analytical capacity and data use, etc.	1 Review of data systems (community/facility) 7 Program reviews 8 Partner reviews 9 Routine programmatic analysis 11 Country evaluations 12 Thematic reviews 13 Prospective Country Evaluation
1.6	Inadequate promotion of human rights and gender equality	• Increase investments in programs to reduce human rights-related and gender-related barriers to services; • Leverage matching funds and other available resources to scale-up programs to remove human rights and gender-related barriers; ensure quality gender-responsive and transforming programs for AGYW; and strengthen quality and innovative programs and approaches to address access barriers for key populations • Conduct baseline assessments to assess human rights-related barriers and programs to address them • Develop and implement 5-year action plans for comprehensive programs to remove human rights-related barriers; • Leverage different resources to advocate for a more equitable regulatory and cultural environment • Strengthen capacities for programmatic responses to human rights-related barriers and disparities (among key national stakeholders and within the Secretariat) • Use Performance Frameworks to monitor progress towards removing human rights-related and gender and age-related barriers and disparities including through use of sex/age disaggregated data • Develop standard operating procedures for pre-empting and responding to human rights-related crises in the frame of the response to the 3 diseases; • Work with technical and community partners for enhanced coordination in relation to safety and security of key and vulnerable populations	2 Program and/or data quality spot checks 12 Thematic reviews 14 Community based monitoring

1 Review of data systems (community/facility)

General Definition	There are different types of reviews that fall under this assurance option, but all have the characteristic of reviewing the status and functionality of the data systems (facility and/or community based in the country, paper-based and/or electronic. Key examples are: the review of M&E systems and capacity in the CAT, other independent or country-led data system reviews, or systematic data quality checks from routine data systems (e.g. reports from the WHO DHIS2 data quality review App).
Assurance areas	The data system review results provide information on the status and functionality of the data system(s) used in the country, as well as recommendations for improving the design, functionality, efficiency and quality of the data systems. These reviews often also provide real-time data quality results for the whole data system (e.g. on completeness and timeliness). This activity is therefore useful to assess, define mitigating actions for, and/or assure the M&E system design and capacity risk, particularly for Risk 1.2 Inadequate design and operation capacity of the M&E systems, as well as Risks 1.4 and 1.5.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Standard global guidance and tools on M&E systems and/or HMIS assessment (e.g. WHO, UNAIDS, and Measure) WHO DHIS2 Data Quality Review App
Providers	Usually conducted by a service provider contracted by the country to review its systems, but can also be provided by other service providers, including LFA, depending on the funding and implementation mechanism.
Average duration	4 – 6 weeks; systematic data quality checks from routine data systems is immediate to run results/reports once set up in the system.

2 Program and/or data quality spot checks

General Definition	Program and/or data quality spot checks are spot checks following standard TORs developed by GF to assess the program and/or data quality of specific programmatic services, particularly community services, at a targeted number of sites (ideally 20 - 40 sites).
Assurance areas	• This activity provides targeted information at the output level on the program and/or data quality for specific programmatic services, especially community-based services that are not traditionally covered in more facility-based surveys or assurance activities. • Program and/or data quality spot checks can be used for assurance purposes either to assess a risk and/or to assure a mitigating action, particularly for risk 1.3: Inadequate program quality and efficiency and risk 1.4: Limited data availability and inadequate data quality • The risk assessment and/or assurance that can be gained from this activity is limited to the sites that are visited - usually 20 - 40 sites; i.e. the results cannot be inferred to a larger sample or wider context given the small sample size. Therefore the scope and goals of this activity should be targeted by the CT - e.g. to assess the program and/or data quality of a specific service for a new SR in a certain geographic area. • When used in this targeted manner, this activity is useful for informing risk assessment and assurance of mitigating actions for specific program and/or data quality issues, and providing results that can be used for targeted discussions with the relevant PRs/SRs.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	There are 15 predefined Programmatic Spot Checks with standard TOR and data entry templates as listed below. Contact Country Teams for further guidance. o Community-based HIV testing services o Prevention services among key populations o Community-based malaria case management activities o Community TB activities (including MDR TB where appropriate) with focus on treatment o DHIS implementation and hospital data recording/coding system o Implementation of malaria vector control interventions (LLIN distribution and IRS) o Assessment of implementation of Opioid Substitution Therapy program o Assessment of supervision effectiveness in a given health program o Assessment of training activities and related expenses o HPM ACT Co-payment Mechanism First Line Buyers o HPM LMIS Implementation Review o HPM Procurement Review o HPM Quality Monitoring for Pharmaceuticals o HPM Supply Chain Management Review ToRs are also available on LFA website
Providers	LFA or other assurance providers
Average duration	4-6 weeks

3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks

General Definition	This activity should be used when either the Program Quality verifications and spot checks and /or Data Quality verifications and spot checks assurance activity(ies) are being conducted jointly with other spot checks (e.g. Finance, Supply chain , Laboratory etc.) for effective triangulation.
Assurance areas	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant

Providers	LFA
Average duration	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant

4 Health facility assessments

General Definition	This activity refers to health facility assessments of service availability and readiness and quality of care either using a nationally representative sample (generally around 150-200 sites) or a targeted sample (generally 20-40 sites). A health facility assessment is an assessment of the status of a country's health facility services, including but not limited to HTM programs. For each service, this includes 1) whether the service is offered, 2) whether the minimum staff, equipment, and medicines and communities to conduct the service are available, and 3) additional aspects of the quality of the service such as the process of care.
Assurance areas	A health facility assessment is useful for assessing, defining mitigating actions for, and/or assuring program quality risks. (1.3 and 1.4). 1) nationally representative HFA The results from a program quality health facility assessment provide extensive information at the output and outcome level on the state of services offered in health facilities across the country. 2) targeted HFA A targeted HFA provides targeted information at the output level on the state of services offered in health facilities. The risk assessment and/or assurance that can be gained from a targeted HFA is limited to the sites that are visited - usually 20 - 40 sites; i.e. the results cannot be inferred to a larger sample or wider context given the small sample size. Therefore the scope and goals of a targeted HFA should be targeted by the CT - e.g. to assess the program quality of a certain facility profile for a certain SR in a certain geographic area. When used in this targeted manner, this activity is useful for informing risk assessment and assurance of mitigating actions for program quality issues, and providing results that can be used for targeted discussions with the relevant PRs/SRs.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Recommended by WHO to be routinely conducted by a country to assess its health facilities' services as part of the national routine program monitoring and improvement cycle
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Standard global guidance, TORs, and tools. Examples include WHO Service Availability and Readiness Assessment (SARA):service availability and readiness assessment: http://www.who.int/healthinfo/systems/sara_introduction/en/; the USAID / DHS Program Service Provision Assessment (SPA): https://dhsprogram.com/What-We-Do/Survey-Types/SPA.cfm; the World Bank Service Delivery Indicators (SDI): http://www.sdindicators.org/ For a targeted HFA, the WHO SARA is also used for the TORs, with adaptations for use with a small sample size. Contact Country Teams for further guidance.
Providers	1) national: Conducted by the country with strong TA from technical partners, QA from GF OPEX if needed 2) targeted: LFA or other assurance providers
Average duration	1) national: ~6 months 2) targeted: 4-6 weeks

5 Data quality reviews

General Definition	This activity refers to assessments using the WHO Data Quality Review Toolkit either using a nationally representative sample (generally around 150-200 sites) or a targeted sample (generally 20-40 sites). A data quality review is an assessment of the quality of data reported through the national HMIS. This includes 1) a verification of the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of the data at each level of the system 2) an assessment of the M&E systems at each level 3) a further assessment of the data quality at the national level.
Assurance areas	Data quality reviews are useful for assessing, defining mitigating actions for, and/or assuring data quality risks. (1.3 and 1.4). 1) nationally representative DQR The results from a nationally representative DQR provide robust results at the output and outcome level on the quality of data reported through health facilities across the country. 2) targeted DQR A targeted DQR provides targeted information at the output level on data quality, most commonly for facility based data, but can also be used for community data quality. The risk assessment and/or assurance that can be gained from a targeted DQR is limited to the sites that are visited - usually 20 - 40 sites; i.e. the results cannot be inferred to a larger sample or wider context given the small sample size. Therefore the scope and goals of a targeted DQR should be targeted by the CT - e.g. to assess the data quality of a certain facility profile for a certain SR in a certain geographic area. When used in this targeted manner, this activity is useful for informing risk assessment and assurance of mitigating actions for data quality issues, and providing results that can be used for targeted discussions with the relevant PRs/SRs.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Recommended by WHO to be routinely conducted by a country to assess its data quality as part of the national routine program monitoring and improvement cycle
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Standard WHO guidelines: the WHO Data Quality Review Toolkit: http://www.who.int/healthinfo/tools_data_analysis/en/ For a targeted DQR, the WHO Data Quality Review Toolkit is also used for the TORs, with minor adaptations for use with a small sample size. For further guidance, refer to the LFA Website (https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/lfa/guidelines-tools/ongoing-grant-management/) or contact Country Teams.

Providers	1) national: Conducted by the country with strong TA from technical partners, QA from GF OPEX if needed 2) targeted: LFA or other assurance providers
Average duration	1) national: ~6 months 2) targeted: 4-6 weeks

6 Review of Laboratory systems

General Definition	This activity is a full or partial review of the structure, functionality, availability and the quality of the medical Laboratory services and systems in the country.
Assurance areas	The Laboratory system review findings provide information on the structure and functionality of the system(s) and the availability and quality of services in country, as well as recommendations for improving the national lab strategy, its performance, supply chain, efficiency and quality of services. i. Assess the availability and quality of laboratory services required by the national programmes ii. Assess the adequacy of the supply chain management systems and testing protocols/methodology used for HIV, TB and Malaria including laboratory equipment, reagents, and consumables iii. Understand the environment in which laboratory services are provided iv. Estimate the testing coverage and gaps in services, by cross-checking with programmatic results v. Identify the PSM related challenges that could be overcome with appropriate intervention in order to ensure continuous availability of equipment, quality test kits, reagents and consumables vi. Assess, define mitigating actions for, and/or assure the Laboratory system development is based on a strategy, is effective, functional and coordinated in a tiered quality assured service delivery network.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Based on standard global guidance and tools (e.g. WHO) ToR available on LFA web pages LFA webpages
Providers	Usually conducted by a service provider contracted by the country to review its systems, but may be also completed more independently as well, depending on the funding/implementation mechanisms. It may conducted by the LFA with adequate expertise.
Average duration	4-6 weeks

7 Program reviews

General Definition	National program reviews constitute periodic assessments of program activities and achievements against national strategic objectives and targets. National program reviews play crucial role in terms of informing the development and updating of national disease program strategic plans, which in turn, form the basis for resource mobilization, access to funding and strategic investment decisions.
Assurance areas	The epidemiological review, the findings and the recommendations from the national program review provide robust information about the status of the national and/or disease program at the outcome and impact level. These are useful to assess, define mitigating actions for, and/or assure the program design, relevance and quality risks, particularly risks 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Once every 3 years, particularly for High Impact countries
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Standard WHO guidelines. HIV: http://www.who.int/hiv/pub/toolkits/hiv-response-guide/en/; TB: http://www.who.int/tb/publications/framework-tb-programme-reviews/en/; Malaria: http://www.who.int/malaria/publications/atoz/whomprmalariaprogramperformancemanual/en/
Providers	Led by respective national health authorities and carried out jointly with WHO and other partners
Average duration	~3 months

8 Partner reviews

General Definition	This activity refers to any programmatic or M&E reviews conducted by other partners.
Assurance areas	Partners will have many different reasons for conducting programmatic and/or M&E reviews, so this activity largely will provide opportunistic (only) risk and assurance information. However the independence, technical expertise and scope of these reviews is generally very high, so these can be well suited to risk and assurance purposes. This activity also provides a cost effective method to obtain risk assessment and assurance, albeit ad hoc.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Varies
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Standard partner SOWs
Providers	Providers selected by partners
Average duration	Varies

9 Routine programmatic analysis

General Definition	This activity refers to non-population based special studies or evaluations funded by the grants and/or other donors and conducted by the country with technical assistance from technical partners. Examples of these types of studies include TB pathway analysis, ART cohort analysis, HIV cascade analysis, etc.
Assurance areas	These types of special studies or evaluations provide critical information at the outcome level about the country's specific epidemic that are needed to inform program design and effectiveness. These are particularly useful for assessing program design and program quality risks (1.1. Inadequate program design and relevance and 1.3 Inadequate program quality and efficiency), as well as for defining mitigating actions for these two risks. Triangulation of results from routine programmatic analysis can also be used as assurance for data quality risks For example, a TB pathway analysis study will provide results showing where TB cases are being missed and informing where to better target interventions to reach these missing cases. As another example, HIV cascade analysis results are used to identify issues of retention of HIV patients and can inform the interventions to improve retention. Some special studies can also be used for assuring program design and quality risk mitigating actions. For example, HIV cascade analysis repeated every year will show whether retention of HIV patients has improved over time.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Varies depending on the specific study
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Varies depending on the specific study. In general, specific global guidance or tools are adapted to country context with strong TA and QA from technical partners are used for each type of special studies.
Providers	Conducted by the country with strong TA and QA from technical partners
Average duration	4-6 months

10 Population-based surveys

General Definition	Population-based surveys, such as the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), AIDS Indicator Survey (AIS), TB Prevalence Survey, Malaria Indicator Survey (MIS) and Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS), are large surveys to generate nationally, sub-nationally and/or group-specific representative data on key measurements required for the program design, grant performance and impact progress tracking.
Assurance areas	The results from a population based survey provide critical information on the status of the epidemic surveyed at the outcome and impact level. These are useful for assessing, defining mitigating actions for, and/or assuring program design, relevance and quality risks (1.1. Inadequate program design and relevance and 1.3 Inadequate program quality and efficiency)
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Varies depending on the specific survey
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Varies depending on the specific survey. Some examples include DHS: https://dhsprogram.com/, MICS: https://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html, MIS: https://dhsprogram.com/what-we-do/survey-types/mis.cfm.
Providers	Conducted by the country with strong TA and QA from technical partners
Average duration	6-12 months

11 Country evaluations

General Definition	This activity refers to evaluations of the program and/or data quality of the country programs. One key example are the Focus country evaluations commissioned by the Global Fund that are required once every three years per Focus country as part of D4I requirements.
Assurance areas	The program evaluations provide evidence on effectiveness, impact, program and data quality, and address issues around sustainability. This evidence is useful for assessing, defining mitigating actions for, and/or assuring program and/or data design, relevance and quality risks (Risk 1.1-1.5)
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant; once every 3 years in Focus countries
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Standard SOWs (MECA Team)
Providers	Depending on funding source. For Focus country evaluations, consulting firms have been selected via RFP to perform the evaluations
Average duration	~3 months

12 Thematic reviews

General Definition	This activity refers to reviews that addresses special thematic issues across countries at a regional or global level. The results inform the further design, reprogramming and progress assessment of selected themes in any of three disease programs or cross-cutting aspects. Examples include HIV key population program globally, MDR-TB in EECA or iCCM for malaria in Africa, etc.

Assurance areas	These thematic reviews generate evidence whether the Global Fund is investing in the right interventions in the right groups and right places for the themes concerned. This evidence is useful for assessing, defining mitigating actions for, and/or assuring program and/or data quality risks (Risk 1.1 and Risk 1.3 – 1.5) across countries.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Standard SOWs (MECA Team)
Providers	Providers selected by GF through RFP
Average duration	3-6 months

13 Prospective Country Evaluation

General Definition	This activity refers to an in-depth, country-level, prospective evaluation that utilizes a variety of methods to provide a detailed picture of the implementation, effectiveness and impact of Global Fund-supported programmes in selected countries.
Assurance areas	PCEs are expected to support identifying outstanding risk and challenges (assessing and assuring)- related to both Global Fund practices and country contexts and practices that affect program performance - and opportunities that would strengthen programmatic outcome, in order to inform and improve program quality, impact, effectiveness, and value-for-money (defining mitigating actions), in the following 8 countries: Cambodia, Myanmar, DRC, Uganda, Mozambique, Sudan, Senegal and Guatemala.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Evaluation protocol (TERG)
Providers	Providers already selected by TERG
Average duration	3 years

14 Community based monitoring

General Definition	Community Based Monitoring (CBM) is a process by which service users or local communities gather and use information on service provision or information on local conditions impacting on effective service provision, in order to improve the responsiveness, equity and quality of services and hold service providers to account. CMB in relation to health can be general (e.g. scorecards for a range of health services at community level), or disease specific, or even sub-programme specific (e.g. monitoring of HIV and/or TB treatment access or of human rights barriers for key populations).
Assurance areas	CBM can be a critical component in efforts to strengthen program quality and impact. The model provides for rapid identification of a range of service and system related issues and bottlenecks including stock outs, retention in care and treatment, accessibility etc. CBM models contribute to the reduction in human rights and gender related barriers in access to services when data derived is strategically utilized to inform systems and service development as responsive and tailored to needs of different communities.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	CBM is an ongoing program activity.
Guidance/ToR availability and link	To be updated
Providers	Local community and civil society organization (in collaboration with MoH etc)
Average duration	Ongoing

Financial and Fiduciary

List of assurance activities

1	Budget Review	2	Review of adequacy of the funds flow	3	Value for money reviews and analysis
4	Review of independence and effectiveness of the audit arrangement and function	5	Domestic funding and co-financing, willingness to pay verification and analysis	6	Review preparedness for reliance on country financial management systems/assurance mechanisms
7	Review design and/or effectiveness of the internal control environment	8	Financial data quality review	9	Expenditure verification and / or review of compliance
10	Validation of financial statements	11	Audit related activities (a,b,c,d)	12	Country Coordinating Mechanism expenditure verification
13	Review of reconciliations of imprests, SR/SSR advances and decentralized activities	14	Financial spot checks	M&E 3	Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks
15	Fraud specific review	16	Review of Financial Management Transition	17	Analysis of root causes of systemic/structural bottlenecks
18	Budget Variance Analysis	19	Fixed (non-health) Asset Verification		

Mapping of mitigations & assurance against risks

Risks	Typology of mitigating actions	Assurance activities
2.1 Inadequate flow of funds arrangements	• Implement alternative fund transfer mechanism (mobile money, payment agent, etc) • Review monthly the aging balance of advances to sub-recipients	1 Budget Review 2 Review of adequacy of the funds flow 3 Value for money reviews and analysis 13 Review of reconciliations of imprests, SR/SSR advances and decentralized activities 17 Analysis of root causes of systemic/structural bottlenecks 18 Budget Variance Analysis
2.2 Inadequate internal controls	• Use of Fiscal/Fiduciary Agent to develop and ensure adherence to established policies and procedures • Technical Assistance to improve control design and operating effectiveness • Exception reporting to management on internal control weaknesses and actions to be taken to address the identified weaknesses and potential financial risks	1 Budget Review 4 Review of independence and effectiveness of the audit arrangement and function 6 Review preparedness for reliance on country financial management systems/assurance mechanisms 7 Review design and/or effectiveness of the internal control environment 9 Expenditure verification and / or review of compliance 10 Validation of financial statements 12 Country Coordinating Mechanism expenditure verification 16 Review of Financial Management Transition 17 Analysis of root causes of systemic/structural bottlenecks 18 Budget Variance Analysis 19 Fixed (non-health) Asset Verification
2.3 Financial fraud, corruption and theft	• Use of Fiscal/Fiduciary Agent • Design of anti-fraud policy and fraud awareness • Reporting to Audit Committee or those charged with governance on instances of suspected or actual fraud incidents covering a defined period of time • Implement a whistle-blower policy e.g. OIG Speak Out Campaign	2 Review of adequacy of the funds flow 3 Value for money reviews and analysis 7 Review design and/or effectiveness of the internal control environment 8 Financial data quality review 9 Expenditure verification and / or review of compliance 11 Audit related activities (a,b,c,d) 14 Financial spot checks M&E 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks 15 Fraud specific review 19 Fixed (non-health) Asset Verification

2.4	Inadequate accounting and financial reporting	• Change/upgrade implementer accounting system and map to donor reporting requirement • Technical Assistance on financial management/recruitment of competent financial manager/clerk • Use of Fiscal/Fiduciary Agent • Established procedures to ensure management is presented with account reconciliations on a periodic basis, including explanations on variances identified	5 Domestic funding and co-financing, willingness to pay verification 6 Review preparedness for reliance on country financial management systems/assurance mechanisms 7 Review design and/or effectiveness of the internal control environment 8 Financial data quality review 10 Validation of financial statements 11 Audit related activities (a,b,c,d) 16 Review of Financial Management Transition 17 Analysis of root causes of systemic/structural bottlenecks 18 Budget Variance Analysis
2.5	Limited value for money	• Use of a procurement agent e.g. PPM etc • Monthly budget monitoring with explanation of variances and reprogramming • Periodic review of pre-qualified lost of supplies and market conditions survey • Training on procurement policies and procedures • Development of required documentation (tools, templates) for all methods of procurements	1 Budget Review 2 Review of adequacy of the funds flow 3 Value for money reviews and analysis 9 Expenditure verification and / or review of compliance 13 Review of reconciliations of imprests, SR/SSR advances and decentralized activities 18 Budget Variance Analysis
2.6	Inadequate auditing arrangements	• Change external auditor • Reinforce internal audit function (skillset, training, etc)	4 Review of independence and effectiveness of the audit arrangement 8 Financial data quality review 10 Validation of financial statements 11 Audit related activities (a,b,c,d)

1 Budget Review

General Definition	This is the process of review of the Grant budget for reasonableness, relevance of proposed activities or modifications to the program objectives and considerations on cost efficiencies
Assurance areas	Budget review is designed to provide assurance that the grant budget is reasonable to achieve the grant objectives and is based on the most economic and efficient use of grant resources.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Mandatory throughout grant lifecycle
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 - LFA detailed Budget Review and Recommendation Form
Providers	- LFA
Average duration	

2 Review of adequacy of the funds flow

General Definition	Funds flow refers to the manner in which the disbursements of cash resources is channeled from the Global Fund to various grant implementers for the execution of program activities, in accordance with grant agreements and the agreed implementation arrangement map. This involves the need to understand how funds (including the various steps) will be transmitted from the Global Fund to a Principal Recipient and from a Principal Recipient to sub-recipients and other implementers in the implementation landscape
Assurance areas	Reviews aimed at providing assurance that that funds budgeted by the Global Fund are not used by Principal Recipient (PR) or Sub-Recipients (SRs) outside the timelines agreed in the grant budget due to: (i) inadequate implementation arrangements; (ii) bottlenecks in the flow of funds from the Principal Recipients to the SRs and other implementing partners including beneficiaries due to external factors; and (iii) inadequate cash flow management by the Principal Recipient.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Mandatory during grant-making for new PRs and strongly recommended throughout grant implementation - Strongly recommended for continuing PRs during grant-making and throughout grant implementation
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers (Suggested scope of work in section on Funds Flow) https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 - The Global Fund Guideline on Financial Risk Management (Specific ToRs yet to be developed) Note: Related LFA service will be available in LFA portal upon the issue of the respective terms of reference.
Providers	- LFA
Average duration	

3 Value for money reviews and analysis

General Definition	This is the process of reviewing grant budgets to identify: (i) whether a fair price is paid for program activities as compared to local market conditions and funds are not misused; and (ii) whether fund is allocated effectively and efficiently to reach the targets
Assurance areas	Review and analysis aimed at providing assurance that Global Fund resources are not lost because of the lack of Effectiveness and Efficiency and implementers not choosing the most economical options
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Strongly recommended during grant-making and throughout grant implementation
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers (Suggested scope of work in section on Funds Flow) https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 - The Global Fund Guideline on Financial Risk Management (Specific ToRs yet to be developed) Note: Related LFA service will be available in LFA portal upon the issue of the respective terms of reference.

Providers	- LFA - External Auditors
Average duration	

4 Review of independence and effectiveness of the audit arrangement and function

General Definition	This is the process where the Global Fund establishes, in consultation with the Implementer during grant-making, certain aspects of the conduct of the audit process, including the following: (i) the entity to conduct the audit (Supreme Audit Institution, Corporate auditors, UN OAI, contractual auditors) (ii) the overall approach to auditor selection and approval and an assessment of its adequacy (iii) whether the standard GF audit terms of reference would apply. It may also involve the review of the internal audit (IA) function of the implementer to assess its objectivity and independence, including the availability of qualified professionals to provide quality internal audit deliverables
Assurance areas	Reviews aimed at providing assurance that external and internal auditing arrangements are effective (design and operating effectiveness) to provide the Global Fund with the level of financial assurance expected in this area
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Strongly recommended at grand-making and for internal audit also throughout grant lifecycle
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - LFA Review of PR/SR Audit Arrangements - Guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 Note: Related LFA service will be available in LFA portal upon the issue of the respective terms of reference.
Providers	- LFA
Average duration	

5 Domestic funding and co-financing, willingness to pay verification and analysis

General Definition	The Global Fund Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing Policy https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/4221/bm35_04-sustainabilitytransitionandcofinancing_policy_en.pdf
Assurance areas	The Global Fund Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing Policy
Frequency requirement/recommendations	The Global Fund Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing Policy
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidance on LFA verification of Counterpart Financing (Available to CTs upon request) - Regional Audit - Terms of Reference (Optional Audit). Contact Country Teams for further guidance.
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor
Average duration	

6 Review preparedness for reliance on country financial management systems/assurance mechanisms

General Definition	This refers to the assessment performed by the Global Fund and/or partners to determine whether an implementer has adequate country financial management systems and capabilities to ensure accountability, including sound and robust financial management. The goal is to support effective transitioning from Global Fund and other donor financing by supporting the use and strengthening of country financial management systems
Assurance areas	Review outcome is aimed at providing a reasonable basis for decision-making by the Global Fund and/or partners, on whether host country financial management systems are adequate, with a long term view of building resilient and sustainable systems for Health to support the grant implementation and enhance the financial management and oversight capacity of national entities.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Strongly recommended during grant-making and throughout grant implementation
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Co-LINK Project Implementation Framework - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000

Providers	- LFA - External Auditor - Partners
Average duration	

7 Review design and/or effectiveness of the internal control environment

General Definition	This activity consists of: (i) identifying per key process, the main risks as well as the controls designed by management to prevent/ reduce the risks, (ii) assessing whether the controls, in their current design are effective or not (iii) test whether these controls are effectively implemented. In doing so, it is important for the reviewer to consider the role of those charged with governance in enforcing the culture of control in the entity and how the outcome of the reviews is used to improve the overall environment.
Assurance areas	Reviews aimed at providing assurance that Global Fund resources are not lost as a result of lack of (i) well designed and effective control at entity, process and transactional levels, (ii) compliance with policies, procedures and applicable law and (iii) safeguarding of Global Fund assets.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Mandatory during grant-making for new PRs and strongly recommended throughout grant implementation - Strongly recommended for continuing PRs during grant-making and throughout grant implementation
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers (Suggested scope of work in section on Funds Flow) https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 - The Global Fund Guideline on Financial Risk Management (Specific ToRs yet to be developed)
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor - Partners
Average duration	

8 Financial data quality review

General Definition	This involves carrying out a review of information provided by an implementer so as to drive accuracy of cash/stock/assets reconciliation, expenditure forecast, and cash flow forecast. This is essentially reconciling and correlating data from different Implementer reporting to confirm the quality of reported information and to facilitate decision-making
Assurance areas	Financial data quality review is to provide assurance on the completeness, accuracy, and reasonableness of cash/stock/assets reconciliation, expenditure forecast, and cash flow forecast
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Strongly recommended throughout grant lifecycle and at year end prior to external audit to ensure accurate and complete financial information
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000
Providers	- LFA
Average duration	

9 Expenditure verification and / or review of compliance

General Definition	This involves carrying out verifications of amounts reported by the implementer to source documents (tracing reported expenditures to approved budget lines/activities, checking invoices and other supporting documents justifying the use of funds to reported expenditures etc.). Compliance reviews involve assessing the implementer's adherence to local laws and regulations relating to expenditures or to specific requirements in the Grant Agreement
Assurance areas	Expenditure verification and / or review of compliance is an activity to aimed at providing assurance that the grant funds have been used in conformity with the provisions of the Grant Agreement, including the approved budget and work plan and any amendments thereto as contained in implementation letters. This service would usually be used at the PR level. On the SR/SSR level this type of activity is usually included in the Financial Spot Checks

Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Mandatory during grant reporting cycle for HI and Core portfolio (PU/DR reporting) and/or at year end during external audit process - Mandatory at year end during external audit process for Focused portfolio
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 - The Global Fund Guidelines on Financial Risk Management - PUDR Guidelines
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor
Average duration	

10 Validation of financial statements

General Definition	This is the process where the external auditor plans and performs the audit to obtain reasonable assurance, by the auditor obtaining sufficient and appropriate audit evidence, that the financial statements are prepared in all material respects in accordance with an applicable financial reporting framework. The auditor communicates this by forming an opinion in the audit report on whether the auditor concludes that he/she has obtained reasonable assurance that the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatements whether due to fraud or error.
Assurance areas	Validation of financial statements aims at providing assurance that the financial statements are accurate and complete
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Mandatory at year end during external audit process
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements
Providers	- External Auditor
Average duration	

11a Audit related activities: Review of audit terms of reference

General Definition	This activity requires the LFA (mandatory for Focused portfolio) to review the terms of reference for the audit of an Implementer to ensure that the proposed terms of reference is in compliance with the requirements of the standard terms of reference as stipulated in the guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements
Assurance areas	The review of the proposed terms of reference provides assurance that they are in compliance with the provisions of the standard terms of reference. Note: This service will not be required in the case of the regional audit initiative and the single audit approach with INGOs.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- 3 months after grant start date for Year 1 of IP - Subsequently, prior to start of auditor selection process
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements - LFA Review of PR/SR Audit Arrangement
Providers	- LFA
Average duration	

11b Audit related activities: Review of the auditor selection

General Definition	This activity refers to the review of the auditor selection process to ascertain whether the process was carried out in compliance with the guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements and the Global Fund procurement regulations.
Assurance areas	This review is aimed at providing assurance that the selected auditor meets the minimum requirements stated in the guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements, including ensuring that the Global Fund approved the selection process which was carried out following a competitive and transparent process
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Prior to start of audit field work but after finalization of auditor selection
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements - LFA Review of PR/SR Audit Arrangement
Providers	- LFA

Average duration	

11c Audit related activities: External audit report review and analysis

General Definition	This activity requires the LFA (for Focused portfolio) or the Finance specialist (for HI and Core portfolio) to review that the audit report presented by the external auditor to ensure that it has been prepared in compliance with the terms of reference as stipulated in the guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements
Assurance areas	The review and analysis of the audit report provides assurance that the audit was conducted in compliance with the terms of reference.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Upon submission of the final audit report by the external auditor
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements - LFA Review of PR/SR Audit Arrangement
Providers	- LFA
Average duration	

11d Audit related activities: Follow up on audit recommendations

General Definition	This activity refers to the monitoring by the LFA (for Focused portfolio) or the Finance specialist (for HI and Core portfolio) of the rate at which an implementer is clearing/addressing recommendations from the audit report and management letter.
Assurance areas	The follow up of audit recommendations provides assurance that the Principal Recipient has taken actions within specified timelines to address the findings included in the audit report and in the Management Letter
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Can be done by the LFA as part of their assurance work (semester with PU/DR reviews for HI and Core portfolio and annual for Focused portfolio - For Core and HI, Finance Specialist can monitor quarterly or as part of in-country missions
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements - LFA Review of PR/SR Audit Arrangement - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor
Average duration	

12 Country Coordinating Mechanism expenditure verification

General Definition	This involves carrying out verifications of amounts reported by the CCM to source documents (tracing expenditures to budgeted activities to see if the expenditure is included in the approved budget, checking invoices and other supporting documents to the amounts reported by the implementer). Usually done by the LFA or external auditors
Assurance areas	This review is aimed at providing assurance that CCM expenditures have been used in conformity with the CCM agreement
Frequency requirement/recommendations	CCM Funding Policy https://tgf.sharepoint.com/sites/inside/investing-for-impact/managing-grants/operational-guidance
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- CCM Funding Policy https://tgf.sharepoint.com/sites/inside/investing-for-impact/managing-grants/operational-guidance - Regional Audit - Terms of Reference (Optional Audits). Contact Country Teams for further guidance.
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor
Average duration	

13 Review of reconciliations of imprests, SR/SSR advances and decentralized activities

General Definition	This refers to the review of the periodic reconciliations that the Principal Recipient performs on cash advances made to the SRs/SSRs for the implementing of grant activities. The PR reconciles the cash advances made, the opening bank account cash balance of the SR/SSRs, expenditures made during the period under review and the ending cash balance, including forecast for subsequent periods.

Assurance areas	This review is aimed at providing assurance that there is (i) compliance with provisions of the grant agreement between GF and the PR and with that of the sub-grant agreements between the PR (SR) and the SRs (SSRs) (ii) accuracy of the financial and programmatic information provided by SRs (SSRs) and reported by the PR to the Global Fund as part of the PUDRs (iii) that Global Fund resources have been used appropriately in line with the approved work plan and budget for the intended purposes
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Strongly recommended throughout grant lifecycle
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 - The Global Fund Guidelines on Financial Risk Management Note: Related LFA service will be available in LFA portal upon the issue of the respective terms of reference.
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor
Average duration	

14 Financial spot checks

General Definition	This activity refers to the enhanced financial verifications that are done at the level of high-risk implementers or high risk activities or interventions that are susceptible to misuse whether due to fraud or misappropriation. It involves verifying reported amounts to source documents.
Assurance areas	This reviews is aimed at providing assurance that funds relating to high risk activities or interventions and/or high risk implementers, are being spent appropriately. Usually this service is requested at the SR/SSR level.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- CT prioritization in LFA work plan
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - LFA Manual - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 - The Global Fund Guidelines on Financial Risk Management - Terms of Reference on Financial Verification at SR/SSR level (available on the LFA website)
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor
Average duration	

M&E 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks

General Definition	This activity should be used when either the Program Quality verifications and spot checks and /or Data Quality verifications and spot checks assurance activity(ies) are being conducted jointly with other spot checks (e.g. Finance, Supply chain , Laboratory etc.) for effective triangulation.
Assurance areas	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant
Providers	LFA
Average duration	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant

15 Fraud specific review

General Definition	This activity refers to verifications that are performed following suspicions of instances of misappropriation or fraudulent use of grant funds at the level of implementers. Usually performed by the LFA and external auditor or other partners. Triggers include reports from assurance providers (LFA, external audit, partners, internal audit) or other risk mitigating mechanisms (fiscal/fiduciary agents etc.)

Assurance areas	This review is aimed at providing assurance that (i) Global Fund assets (financial and non-financial) are not misappropriated, (ii) financial statements reported to the Global Fund are not intentionally misstated and (iii) Global Fund does not incur financial loss as a result of corruption (including conflict of interest and bribery/extortion)
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As needed
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 - The Global Fund Guidelines on Financial Risk Management - The Global Fund Financial anti-Fraud Management Guidelines (under development) Note: Related LFA service will be available in LFA portal upon the issue of the respective terms of reference.
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor
Average duration	

16 Review of Financial Management Transition

General Definition	This activity refers to the review for introduction of “shared services, donor harmonization that is performed at the level of a country /implementer.
Assurance areas	This review is aimed at providing assurance that adequate financial management policies and procedures are available at the level of a country/implementer to be able to introduce the “shared services" approach to managing a grant via a Program Management Unit and also transition towards donor harmonization in relation to financial management as opposed to standalone, donor-specifics policies and procedures.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Based on country/implementer preparedness (maturity, control environment, political will, financial systems in place)
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Co-LINK Project Implementation Framework - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor - Partners
Average duration	

17 Analysis of root causes of systemic/structural bottlenecks

General Definition	This activity refers to the capacity assessment that is performed at the level of a country /implementer in order to identify the root causes of systemic or structural challenges and thereafter developing an appropriate mitigation plan to address the issues. The assessment is done on all financial management systems including internal control environment, financial management information systems, human capacity, leadership, accountability etc.
Assurance areas	This review is aimed at providing assurance that there is a clear understanding of the structural or systemic issues which are contributing to the identified risks and that any proposed mitigating actions are actually adequate, not just generic mitigating actions
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As needed
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Co-LINK Project Implementation Framework - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 Note: Related LFA service will be available in LFA portal upon the issue of the respective terms of reference.
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor - Partners
Average duration	

18 Budget Variance Analysis

General Definition	This activity refers to the analysis that is carried out in order to tying in the numbers reported by the Implementer as expenditure and forecast information for a given period to underlying documents and identify opportunities for reprogramming and portfolio optimization
Assurance areas	This review is aimed at providing assurance of rhe reasonableness of the assumptions and explanations of variance provided by the PR, as well as the accuracy and reasonables of the forecast in order to understand the rate of absorption and take appropriate actions in a timely manner
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Can be done by the LFA as part of their normal assurance work (semester with PU/DR reviews for HI and Core portfolio and annual for Focused portfolio - For Core and HI, Finance Specialist can monitor on a semester basis during semester expenditure reporting or quarterly during submission of cash balance information
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000
Providers	- LFA
Average duration	

19 Fixed (non-health) Asset Verification

General Definition	This activity refers to verifications carried at implementers to ascertain the existence, completeness of assets and reconcile the books amounts per the implementer records to the physical verifications on the ground. This process also involves providing evidence of the fixed asset management policies and procedures of implementers to order to identify gaps or weaknesses in the process.
Assurance areas	This review is aimed at providing reasonable assurance regarding misuse, loss or theft of grant's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements or the program
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Strongly recommended throughout grant lifecycle and at year end prior to external audit to ensure accurate and complete financial information relating to fixed assets.
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Guidelines for Annual Audits of Global Fund Grant Program Financial Statements - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor
Average duration	

Health Product Management and Supply Chain

List of assurance activities

1	Health Products quantification and budget review	2	Verification of procurement transaction reporting in the PQR database	3	Review of the in-country SC systems security and integrity
4	PSM arrangements and capacity review	5	Supply chain spot checks	M&E 3	Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks
6	Measuring availability of tracer medicines and diagnostic products at health facilities (KPI 6b)	7	Medical lab equipment deployment mapping, including installation, calibration, maintenance, use	8	Risk-based procurement transaction reviews
9	Verification of key internal Supply Chain controls and procedures	10	Review of quality monitoring activities	11	Stock level/inventory verification
12	LMIS review (full or partial)	13	Laboratory related supply chain review	14	Supply Chain review (full or partial)
15	Supply Chain Diagnostics				

Mapping of mitigations & assurance against risks

Risks		Typology of mitigating actions	Assurance activities
3.1	Inappropriate selection of health product and equipment	• Ensure use of appropriate/updated guidelines according to Standard treatment guidelines and introduction of new technologies • Up to date treatment guidelines and diagnostic protocol according to STGs, functional drug and treatment therapeutic committees • Up to date national essential medicines lists and formularies • Ensure effectiveness of controls and oversight	1 Health Products quantification and budget review 2 Verification of procurement transaction reporting in the PQR database 7 Medical lab equipment deployment mapping, including installation, calibration, maintenance, use 9 Verification of key internal Supply Chain controls and procedures 13 Laboratory related supply chain review
3.2	Unreliable forecasting, quantification and supply planning	• Up to date Forecasting and Quantification process with written procedures • Regular updated demand forecasts and supply plans for high-spend items, based on changes in program interventions or scale up plans • Ensure timely availability of logistic data and programmatic data for forecasting activities • Forecasting/Quantification committees are functional (regular meetings with minutes) • Stakeholders coordination mechanism for joint supply planning with TOR and centralized forecasting procedures with SOPs	1 Health Products quantification and budget review 5 Supply chain spot checks M&E 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks 9 Verification of key internal Supply Chain controls and procedures 11 Stock level/inventory verification 13 Laboratory related supply chain review 14 Supply Chain review (full or partial) 15 Supply Chain Diagnostics
3.3	Inefficient procurement processes and outcomes	• Use of PPM or a procurement service agent or third-party service provider • Validation of procurement manual with SOPs • Capacity development (training/mentoring, improve SOPs/records management, recruit qualified staff, etc) • Establish prequalified list of suppliers and/or a supplier performance monitoring tool • Joint supply and procurement planning with partners and tracking of disbursement of funds • CT approval of bid solicitation docs, evaluation reports and contracts for high-spend contracts (non-objection procedures for key procurement activities)	2 Verification of procurement transaction reporting in the PQR 8 Risk-based procurement transaction reviews 9 Verification of key internal Supply Chain controls and procedures 13 Laboratory related supply chain review 14 Supply Chain review (full or partial) 15 Supply Chain Diagnostics
3.4	Inadequate warehouse and distribution systems	• Capacity building (staff, information systems, operations management) • Outsource warehousing and distribution activities to a third party logistics • Strengthen controls and security of transport/warehouse facilities, track and trace systems • TA to optimize last mile (delivery schedules/routes, consolidation of loads, 3PL) • Update key SOPs for inventory management, ensure compliance with GWP/GDPs • Improve/maintain infrastructure (store conditions, fleet, equipment) • Optimize receiving, order processing, dispatch and housekeeping • Define/maintain max-min inventory levels for all levels, regular stock status monitor • Assets and inventory are appropriately insured against loss due to fire, theft, damage.	3 Review of the in-country SC systems security and integrity 4 PSM arrangements and capacity review 5 Supply chain spot checks M&E 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks 6 Measuring availability of tracer medicines and diagnostic products at health facilities (KPI 6b) 9 Verification of key internal Supply Chain controls and procedures 11 Stock level/inventory verification 13 Laboratory related supply chain review 15 Supply Chain Diagnostics

3.5	Inadequate information management systems (LMIS)	• Strengthen systems for collecting and reporting data throughout the SC (create supply chain dashboard, control tower) • Update SoPs for LMIS • Implement track and trace systems to improve visibility and traceability • Information systems capacity building (infrastructure, tools/processes, people) • Explore interoperability/linkages of SC data and programmatic data (DHIS2) • Integrate SC KPIs in national HMIS performance monitoring framework • Establish LMIS working group	5 Supply chain spot checks M&E 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks 6 Measuring availability of tracer medicines and diagnostic products at health facilities (KPI 6b) 9 Verification of key internal Supply Chain controls and procedures 11 Stock level/inventory verification 12 LMIS review (full or partial) 13 Laboratory related supply chain review 15 Supply Chain Diagnostics
3.6	Limited quality monitoring and inadequate product use	• Procure TA to develop/support in-country quality monitoring plan, including QC plan • Outsource QC sampling and testing to Lab ISO certified or WHO prequalified • Monitor adherence to treatment guidelines/protocols by monitoring product use/consumptions against treatment guidelines, programmatic data. • Build regulatory capacity to monitor compliance with GF QA policies including waste disposal through TA, CR, SOR development	7 Medical lab equipment deployment mapping, including installation, calibration, maintenance, use 9 Verification of key internal Supply Chain controls and procedures 10 Review of quality monitoring activities 13 Laboratory related supply chain review

1 Health Products quantification and budget review

General Definition	This is the range, quantity, value and schedule of health products based on national health products forecast that is funded by GF to support implementation of approved interventions under each grant. The content of list is reviewed periodically based on updated health product demand forecast assumptions, supply planning and program implementation.
Assurance areas	Review of the LoHP ensures that demand forecast assumptions are consistent with program objectives, scale/targets by intervention area, funding landscape, treatment/user guidelines, introduction of new solutions, stock and supply status, national/GF PSM policies. In addition, this review ensures that health product budgets are based on recognized benchmark prices (including PPM reference price for core products) and that these are correctly apportioned and entered by cost category
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Annually or quarterly
Guidance/ToR availability and link	LFA Manual; user instructions on GF website: https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/5907/fundingmodel_listofhealthproducts_instructions_en.pdf
Providers	LFA
Average duration	~ 2-4 days

2 Verification of procurement transaction reporting in the PQR database

General Definition	The verification ensures that reporting of procurement transactions for core HP products is complete and accurate. Procurement reporting by PRs of health products is grant agreement obligation.
Assurance areas	PQR is a publicly accessible online database that collects and displays data on procurement transactions made by Global Fund-supported programs for core health products. PQR data provides visibility of prices paid by reporting grant recipients as estimated at the time of delivery of the products in the recipient country. PQR checks the extent to which PRs achieve benchmark prices in their procurement processes. It also facilitates verification of compliance with GF QA policies for various categories of health products
Frequency requirement/recommendations	For all core health products as described on the PQR pages and user manual It is usually done during PUDR
Guidance/ToR availability and link	"LFA Guide to Price and Quality Reporting" available on the LFA website.
Providers	LFA
Average duration	~ 0.5-2 days

3 Review of the in-country SC systems security and integrity

General Definition	Builds on OIG reports on market surveillance to estimate the level of SC integrity and security as a proxy measure for risk of product leakage or verify the adequacy of implemented mitigation measures
Assurance areas	Assess security and integrity of levels of inventory management in the national SC, and review the level of residual risks to be addressed.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	The guideline is under development and will be available by 30 June. The related LFA service is not yet available in LFA portal.
Providers	LFA or Specialized providers
Average duration	~ 1-2 weeks

4 PSM arrangements and capacity review

General Definition	This is a mapping of the flow of funding, products and information in the procurement and supply of products financed by GF. In addition the map names key actors and responsibilities in product management. Capacity review relates to the tailored assessment of capacity of key actors to identify improvement areas to reduce risk and supply-chain vulnerabilities
Assurance areas	It provides visibility of all function areas in the health product management particularly for new implementers/actors at the start of the grant. It serves as a baseline for further and ongoing improvements in product supply management.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Grant making or as relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	LFA Manual Simplified Capacity Assessment Tool User Guide and Simplified Capacity Assessment Tool available on the LFA website The IRM User Manual will provide guidance for conducting capacity assessments. This is still under development and will be available by June 2018
Providers	LFA
Average duration	~ 10 days

5 Supply chain spot checks

General Definition	Use standard check list of requirements to measure performance or check compliance to procedures by the PR, verify reliability of product information.
Assurance areas	Applies to any area of SC/HPM management. Opportunities exist for jointly planning of some spot-checks with PHM&E or Finance
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Refer to LFA web link for examples of spot-checks. Refer to MECA web link for additional guidelines on spot-checks
Providers	LFA
Average duration	~ 5-10 days

M&E 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks

General Definition	This activity should be used when either the Program Quality verifications and spot checks and /or Data Quality verifications and spot checks assurance activity(ies) are being conducted jointly with other spot checks (e.g. Finance, Supply chain , Laboratory etc.) for effective triangulation.
Assurance areas	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant
Providers	LFA
Average duration	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant

6 Measuring availability of tracer medicines and diagnostic products at health facilities (KPI 6b)

General Definition	(corporate KPI 6b) % HF with tracer medicines/diagnostic services with tracer items (through HFA or spot check or routine LMIS reporting cycle)
Assurance areas	Assess availability of core medicines by program area at HF level Assess availability/readiness of diagnostic services at HF level Provides a one-time verification of product availability and gives indication on the supply chain performance
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Annually (may be more frequent)
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Refer to web link on board approved KPI definitions: https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7061/bm38_05a-2017-2022strategickpiperformancetargets_report_en.pdf
Providers	Specialized providers/LFA (spot check)
Average duration	~ 4 weeks

7 Medical lab equipment deployment mapping, including installation, calibration, maintenance, use

General Definition	Mapping of lab equipment (such as GeneXpert) location, capacity and utilization level versus testing needs, geographical test coverage and gaps and equipment standardization by level of care as per national guidelines
Assurance areas	Checks for testing coverage gaps, standardization of test platforms, installation, calibration & maintenance, as well as utilization of installed testing capacity and functionality of equipment
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	SC Department
Providers	LFA/specialized providers
Average duration	~ 4 weeks

8 Risk-based procurement transaction reviews

General Definition	This is a review of selected procurement transactions to determine if the implementer processes are effective and in line with the grant agreement as well as the applicable national or PR and GF procurement policies and principles
Assurance areas	The tool ensures that processes and outcomes of procurement activities financed by GF meet the requirements for competitiveness, transparency, value for money, product quality and cost-effectiveness.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Annually (HI or high risk for procurement) or as relevant

Guidance/ToR availability and link	LFA Manual "LFA procurement review tool" available on the LFA website
Providers	LFA
Average duration	~ 13 days

9 Verification of key internal Supply Chain controls and procedures

General Definition	Generally applies a tailored CAT and audit approaches to assess effectiveness of controls or procedures introduced to manage the SC and/or reduce SC risks.
Assurance areas	Any function area at any level of the in-country supply-chain management such as inventory management, receiving procedures, stock card use, etc.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	As part of CAT/internal audit
Providers	LFA
Average duration	Depends on the scope of work

10 Review of quality monitoring activities

General Definition	Review the implementation of quality monitoring activities for pharmaceuticals and diagnostics in accordance with the Global Fund's quality assurance policies
Assurance areas	Verify implementation of Quality monitoring activities, including QC testing conducted by WHO PQed lab/SRA for health products at country level as requested by the GF QA Policies
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Annually or as relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	Refer to LFA web link for QM scope of work
Providers	LFA
Average duration	Depends on the scope of work but usually maximum up to 2 weeks

11 Stock level/inventory verification

General Definition	The verification of stock levels/inventory is based on inventory stock status reports and enables analysis of the national inventory position for core products. It also informs on the analytical capacity of the implementers to take data driven actions on inventory management. Country's national stock status reports should include the minimum information below. - Stock on Hand (SoH) - Average Monthly Consumption (AMC) - Quantity on Order (& expected delivery dates) - Months of Stock - Expiry date
Assurance areas	Stock level/inventory verification provides visibility of the national inventory position and the likelihood of stock-outs and/or expiry of products in the country over the next six months. The verification should (1) guide the need for any adjustment of the supply plan and/or improvement of the demand planning and (2) inform on the capacity of the implementers to analyze consumption patterns against national treatment guidelines and other programmatic data.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Low and medium risk grants: Every 6 months or once a year. Review of stock information as per the description above; the LFA PSM expert provides inputs through a desk review and develop recommendations on the need for any supply plan adjustment and/or improvement of the demand planning. High risk grants: Every 6 months. Review of stock information as per the description above, can be combined with spot check verification of physical stock at the central level warehouse(s) (or at peripheral warehouses, as relevant) for consistency and accuracy of inventory stock status records/reports for a selection of core items, if requested by the Country Team; the LFA PSM expert provides inputs through a desk review and develop recommendations on the need for any supply plan adjustment and/or improvement of the demand planning.
Guidance/ToR availability and link	LFA website
Providers	LFA
Average duration	Depends on the scope of work

12 LMIS review (full or partial)

General Definition	This activity assesses the extent to which LMIS are established and functioning to enable informed policy and operational SC decision making.

Assurance areas	Tailored assessment of SC data management capacity to establish adequacy of LMIS tools/technology/processes, people (skills, numbers) and systems (structure, interoperability with HMIS systems, governance, financing, strategies)
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	ToR for LMIS Implementation Review available on the LFA website SC SharePoint
Providers	LFA
Average duration	~ 5-15 days

13 Laboratory related supply chain review

General Definition	Assess the adequacy of the supply chain management systems for lab commodities to ensure continuous availability of functional equipment and consumables. In addition, review the utilization and maintenance activities of equipment.
Assurance areas	This could potentially provide assurance over the whole lab supply chain system, including product selection; forecasting, quantification, and supply planning; procurement processes and outcomes; warehousing and distribution systems; quality monitoring and product use
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Every 3 years
Guidance/ToR availability and link	ToR on "Joint M&E/PSM Lab Services and Related Supply Chain Review" on the LFA website SC Department
Providers	LFA/specialized providers
Average duration	~ 5 weeks

14 Supply Chain review (full or partial)

General Definition	Assess the adequacy and maturity of the supply chain management systems and highlight areas that require improvement
Assurance areas	SC review is intended to obtain assurance that health product supply chain management is undertaken safely, efficiently and effectively. The review is usually tailored to target important risk areas such as SC integrity and security more than low risk areas such as SC integrity and security, LMIS (as above) distribution systems, inventory management more than low risk areas.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	ToR on Supply Chain Management Review available on the LFA website SC SharePoint
Providers	Providers selected by coountries/partners/LFA/SC contractors
Average duration	~ 1-4 weeks

15 Supply Chain Diagnostics

General Definition	Systematic review of national SC capacity, maturity and identification of improvement areas. The implementation of the SC diagnostics is undertaken in collaboration with all key stakeholders and builds on recent assessments to build consensus on a plan to transform SC
Assurance areas	Country selection is a Corporate decision in consultation with CT, government and its partners.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	SC Department
Providers	Various (19 contractors)
Average duration	~ 13 weeks

Governance, Oversight and Management

List of assurance activities

1	PR capacity assessments	2	Key implementer assessment	3	Targeted LFA review of progress on identified risks
4	LFA review of PUDR	FIN 7	Review design and/or effectiveness of the internal control environment	M&E 3	Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks

Mapping of mitigations & assurance against risks

Risks		Typology of mitigating actions	Assurance activities
4.1	Inadequate national program governance	• Strengthen implementation arrangements • Clearly define roles & responsibilities from national to local levels • Enhance collaboration between government and non-government stakeholders • Strengthen planning, budgeting, implementation and supervision across national disease programs	1 PR capacity assessments 2 Key implementer assessment
4.2	Ineffective program management	• Enhance HR capacity, control environment, risk management • Strengthen policies, processes and tools to identify and manage risks • Strengthen organizational structure to manage the program • Strengthen HR management such as policies, procedures, staff job descriptions to ensure sufficient and qualified human resources • Dedicated program management unit • Enhance information and communication systems and use of data for decision making	1 PR capacity assessments 2 Key implementer assessment 3 Targeted LFA review of progress on identified risks 4 LFA review of PUDR FIN 7 Review design and/or effectiveness of the internal control environment
4.3	Inadequate program coordination and SR oversight	• Improve engagement and coordination with other implementers, partners and stakeholders • Improve processes, procedures and systems for SR selection, reporting and oversight	1 PR capacity assessments 2 Key implementer assessment 4 LFA review of PUDR FIN 7 Review design and/or effectiveness of the internal control environment M&E 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks

1 PR capacity assessments

General Definition	When the CCM nominates one or more PRs, it is expected, in accordance with the CCM Eligibility Requirements and relevant Global Fund policies, to assess each nominated PR against a set of minimum standards and to capture this assessment in the concept note. Building on the information provided by the CCM, the GF Secretariat undertakes a further capacity assessment of the Principal Recipient and, as relevant, other key implementers nominated (such as key SRs). The GF will decide which implementers to assess based on an initial exercise to map the implementation arrangements.
Assurance areas	The capacity assessment serves to ensure that the proposed implementation arrangements, systems and capacities of key grant implementers are adequate for effective financial and programmatic management of the grant funds with the aim of achieving maximum impact against the three diseases. Based on the results of the capacity assessment, the Global Fund may propose capacity strengthening and mitigating measures for identified capacity gaps and risks, or changes to implementation arrangements.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As required & tailored to the information requirements of the CT
Guidance/ToR availability and link	LFA Manual Simplified Capacity Assessment Tool User Guide and Simplified Capacity Assessment Tool available on the LFA website The IRM User Manual will provide guidance for conducting capacity assessments. This is still under development and will be available by June 2018
Providers	LFA
Average duration	3-4 weeks

2 Key implementer assessment

General Definition	The management of sub-recipients is the responsibility of the Principal Recipient. The Global Fund has no direct contractual relationship with sub-recipients. Instead, it falls under the Principal Recipients' responsibility to select sub-recipients, assess their capacity to implement aspects of the grant, conclude agreements with them and oversee their activities. It is thus critical that Principal Recipients have the ability and adequate systems to manage sub-recipients. It is for this reason that the minimum standards for Principal Recipients specify that the Principal Recipient must have "the capacity and systems for the effective management and oversight of sub-recipients". The Principal Recipient is responsible for evaluating sub-recipients. If the Principal Recipient has, however, known capacity issues or is not deemed sufficiently independent to conduct a thorough assessment of key implementers that are critical to grant implementation and achieving impact, or the Country Team has another reason to request independent assessment of certain implementers, the Country Team may extend the scope of the capacity assessment conducted during grant making to key implementers, whether they are formally sub-recipients or not. The Country Team may alternatively decide to incorporate the key implementer/sub-recipient assessment into future LFA oversight activities. For additional circumstances that may trigger LFA assessment of key implementer/sub-recipient assessments, please refer to the LFA manual.
Assurance areas	The assessment could for example cover the key implementer's/sub-recipient's capacity, resources, systems and controls, but also reviews of the sub-recipient budget and work plan from a value for money perspective. The tools available for capacity assessments of Principal Recipients which take place before grant signing, can serve as guidance for areas to be considered for the sub-recipient assessment
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As required & tailored to the information requirements of the CT
Guidance/ToR availability and link	LFA Manual
Providers	PR/LFA
Average duration	

3 Targeted LFA review of progress on identified risks

General Definition	The LFA may be asked to verify the implementation or outcome of specific risk prevention or risk mitigation actions. This is generally done as part of the PU/DR review, where the LFA looks at the Principal Recipient's update on implementation of conditions or management actions. LFAs may also be asked to undertake a stand-alone verification outside the scope of the PU/DR.
Assurance areas	
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	PUDR Guidelines
Providers	LFA
Average duration	

4 LFA review of PUDR

General Definition	At the Global Fund request, the LFA verifies the Principal Recipient's progress report, reviews the disbursement request, provides a performance rating for the grant and makes an independent annual funding recommendation to the Global Fund. The Global Fund considers the Principal Recipient report and LFA recommendation in taking a decision on the annual funding decision and disbursement schedule. In cases where only a progress update (and not a disbursement request) is required to be submitted to the Global Fund, the Principal Recipient and LFA complete only the sections of the PU/DR form relevant to reporting on progress of implementation and grant performance and/or as agreed in advance with the Global Fund.

Assurance areas	The PU/DR form contains the following information: -The Principal Recipient's programmatic progress, tracking results reporting on impact/outcome indicators; -The Principal Recipient's financial information, including cash outflow, budget variance analysis, cash reconciliation, calculation of the disbursement request amount; -The Principal Recipient's update on the fulfilment of the conditions precedent, special conditions as well as management actions; -The Principal Recipient's Enhanced or Annual Financial Reporting (as applicable), to be completed once per year; -The Principal Recipient's comments/issues relating to procurement of pharmaceuticals and other health products; -An annex on sub-recipient financial information, to be completed at the discretion of the Global Fund; -LFA comments are provided in separate sections that mirror the Principal Recipient's sections. There is also a section for the LFA findings and recommendations.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	Varies
Guidance/ToR availability and link	LFA Manual/OPN on annual funding decisions and disbursements PUDR Guidelines
Providers	LFA
Average duration	

FIN 7 Review design and/or effectiveness of the internal control environment

General Definition	This activity consists of: (i) identifying per key process, the main risks as well as the controls designed by management to prevent/ reduce the risks, (ii) assessing whether the controls, in their current design are effective or not (iii) test whether these controls are effectively implemented. In doing so, it is important for the reviewer to consider the role of those charged with governance in enforcing the culture of control in the entity and how the outcome of the reviews is used to improve the overall environment.
Assurance areas	Reviews aimed at providing assurance that Global Fund resources are not lost as a result of lack of (i) well designed and effective control at entity, process and transactional levels, (ii) compliance with policies, procedures and applicable law and (iii) safeguarding of Global Fund assets.
Frequency requirement/recommendations	- Mandatory during grant-making for new PRs and strongly recommended throughout grant implementation - Strongly recommended for continuing PRs during grant-making and throughout grant implementation
Guidance/ToR availability and link	- Guidelines for Grant Budgeting https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3261/core_budgetinginglobalfundgrants_guideline_en.pdf?u=636486806820000000 - Financial Management Handbook for Grant Implementers (Suggested scope of work in section on Funds Flow) https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7034/financial_grantimplementersmanagement_handbook_en.pdf?u=636487747740000000 - The Global Fund Guideline on Financial Risk Management (Specific ToRs yet to be developed)
Providers	- LFA - External Auditor - Partners
Average duration	

M&E 3 Joint programmatic, financial and supply chain spot checks

General Definition	This activity should be used when either the Program Quality verifications and spot checks and /or Data Quality verifications and spot checks assurance activity(ies) are being conducted jointly with other spot checks (e.g. Finance, Supply chain , Laboratory etc.) for effective triangulation.
Assurance areas	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant
Frequency requirement/recommendations	As relevant
Guidance/ToR availability and link	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant
Providers	LFA
Average duration	See guidance section for program, data, financial and/or supply chain spot checks as relevant