



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Has Global Fund Support for Civil Society Advocacy in the Former Soviet Union Established Meaningful Engagement or 'a Lot of Jabber About Nothing'?

Citation for published version:

Harmer, A, Spicer, N, Aleshkina, J, Bogdan, D, Chkhatarashvili, K, Murzalieva, G, Rukhadze, N, Samiev, A & Walt, G 2013, 'Has Global Fund Support for Civil Society Advocacy in the Former Soviet Union Established Meaningful Engagement or 'a Lot of Jabber About Nothing'?', *Health Policy and Planning*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 299-308. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czs060>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1093/heapol/czs060](https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czs060)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Health Policy and Planning

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Harmer, A., Spicer, N., Aleshkina, J., Bogdan, D., Chkhatarashvili, K., Murzalieva, G., Rukhadze, N., Samiev, A., & Walt, G. (2013). Has Global Fund Support for Civil Society Advocacy in the Former Soviet Union Established Meaningful Engagement or 'a Lot of Jabber About Nothing'?. *Health Policy and Planning*, 28(3), 299-308. [10.1093/heapol/czs060](https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czs060).

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy


The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





**Has Global Fund support for civil society advocacy in the
Former Soviet Union established meaningful engagement or
'a lot of jabber about nothing'?**

Journal:	<i>Health Policy and Planning</i>
Manuscript ID:	HEAPOL-2011-Sep-0378.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Country of Expertise:	Former Soviet Union
Keywords:	advocacy, HIV, health policy



1
2
3 **Has Global Fund support for civil society advocacy in the Former Soviet Union established**
4
5 **meaningful engagement or ‘a lot of jabber about nothing’?**
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Abstract**
12

13
14 Although civil society advocacy for health issues such as HIV transmission through injecting
15 drug use is higher on the global health agenda than previously, its impact on national policy
16 reform has been limited. In this paper we seek to understand why this is the case through an
17 examination of civil society advocacy efforts to reform HIV/AIDS and drugs-related policies
18 and their implementation in three former-Soviet Union countries. In-depth semi-structured
19 interviews were conducted in Georgia, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine by national researchers with
20 representatives from a sample of 49 CSOs and 22 national key informants. We found that
21 Global Fund support resulted in the professionalisation of CSOs, which increased confidence
22 from government and increased CSO influence on policies relating to HIV/AIDS and illicit
23 drugs. Interviewees also reported that the amount of funding for advocacy from the Global
24 Fund was insufficient, indirect, and often interrupted. CSOs were often in competition for
25 Global Fund support, which caused resentment and limited collective action – further
26 weakening capacity for effective advocacy.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Introduction**
46

47 In May 2010, shortly before the XVIII International AIDS Conference in Vienna, the Global
48 Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Global Fund) and UNAIDS published a
49 framework for *Community Systems Strengthening* (CSS), the principal aim of which was to
50 strengthen ‘civil society engagement with the Global Fund’ (Global Fund 2010: iv-v). Civil
51 society organisations (CSOs) perform various functions in a country’s health system: they
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 deliver services, monitor government behavior, and advocate on behalf of particular
4
5 communities including marginalised groups (Rau, 2006; Cohn et al, 2011; Ibrahim & Hulme,
6
7 2010). Studies suggest that CSO capacity – understood in terms of leadership, networking,
8
9 credibility, and possession of information and resources – is essential for effective advocacy,
10
11 while limited transparency and openness to CSO engagement among some governments are
12
13 significant impediments (Nathan et al, 2002; Price 2003; Pollard and Court, 2005; and Court
14
15 et al, 2006; Parker, 2009; Kendall and Lopez-Uribe 2010; Spicer et al 2011). Less is known
16
17 about the effects of international funding on CSO advocacy in specific health or policy areas,
18
19 such as HIV and injecting drug use (Caceres et al 2009; Edwards and Hulme 1998; Doyle
20
21 and Patel 2008).
22
23
24
25
26

27 The Global Fund has channeled substantial resources to CSOs to implement HIV/AIDS
28
29 programmes: nearly 20% of the Global Fund's Round 7 funding was channeled through
30
31 CSOs (Cohn et al, 2011:3). Our study provides an in-depth, geographically focused study of
32
33 the direct and indirect effects of Global Fund support for CSO advocacy for a specific health
34
35 policy issue – an HIV/AIDS epidemic driven by intravenous drug use.
36
37
38
39
40

41 In many countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia, criminalisation of injecting drug use
42
43 stimulates risky practices and can lead to human rights abuses and poor access to HIV/AIDS
44
45 services, and hence represents a major structural driver of the HIV/AIDS epidemic (Wolfe &
46
47 Malinowska-Sempruch, 2004; Rhodes et al, 2005; Latypov, 2009; Open Society Institute,
48
49 2009; Sarang, et al 2010). We focus on three former Soviet Union (FSU) countries – Georgia,
50
51 Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine – with low level/concentrated HIV/AIDS epidemics driven to a
52
53 great extent by risky behaviors such as needle sharing between IDUs. Global Fund
54
55 HIV/AIDS programmes have provided significant external resources for HIV/AIDS control
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to these countries, which has enabled substantial scale-up in the delivery of HIV/AIDS
4 services and population coverage (Chkhatarashvili et al, 2008; Murzalieva et al, 2009;
5 Semigina, 2009). Key epidemic data and features of the Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants in
6
7 the three countries are summarised in Table 1.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Table 1: about here**
19

20
21
22
23 We adopt a health policy analysis approach to explore both *national* level advocacy by CSOs
24 around national policy and laws, and *local level* advocacy focusing on sub-national
25 government including law enforcement and its implementation of national policy in each of
26 the three focus countries. Health policy analysis theory has made important progress in
27 understanding how policy contexts and the strength of policy actors influence the
28 prioritisation of certain health policies or health issues over others (Walt and Gilson 1994;
29 Shiffman and Smith 2007). The aim of our paper is to identify the effects of Global Fund
30 financing on CSO advocacy. One might hypothesise that Global Fund HIV/AIDS funding
31 allocated specifically for advocacy would strengthen civil society actors' capacity to
32 advocate for changes in HIV/AIDS and drugs-related policies and their implementation, or
33 lead to increased cooperation amongst CSOs as they take advantage, collectively, of a much-
34 needed additional source of financing. One might also reasonably anticipate indirect effects
35 of Global Fund country programmes on CSO advocacy including: have the Global Fund's
36 Country Coordinating Mechanisms assisted advocacy by strengthening relations between
37 government agencies and CSOs; have CSO Principal Recipients of Global Fund grants taken
38 advantage of their privileged position to further advocacy?.

Methods

The paper presents data from in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted in Georgia, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine by national research teams (February - August 2010) with representatives from CSOs sampled on the basis of the following selection criteria: a) Global Fund HIV/AIDS programme grantees; b) working in the field of harm reduction for IDUs; c) operating in the capitals – Tbilisi, Bishkek and Kyiv; and d) agreeing to participate in the study. Based on these criteria our sample was: Georgia n=14, Kyrgyzstan n=16 and Ukraine n=19. While the sampled CSOs worked in the field of harm reduction for IDUs, some also provided related HIV/AIDS interventions targeting specific groups (Table 2). Interviewees were managers/directors, all were paid employees of these organisations, and some were also PLWHA and/or former IDUs or commercial sex workers (CSWs). In-depth semi-structured interviews were also conducted with purposively sampled national level stakeholders including representatives of government agencies and development agencies including donors and UN agencies (Georgia n=7, Kyrgyzstan n=9 and Ukraine n=6).

Table 2: about here

Semi-structured interviews were administered by national researchers using topic guides jointly designed with the authors. These were piloted in Tbilisi in January 2010 by researchers from Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine and UK. Reflecting country contexts, minor adaptations were made to the topic guide. The fieldwork was conducted by professional researchers who were experienced in qualitative data collection and familiar with the sensitive topic area. They were employed by research organisations that were independent of

1
2
3 the organisations and individuals they interviewed. Interviewees gave informed consent
4 before participating, and interviews were conducted in private spaces to ensure anonymity
5 and confidentiality.
6
7
8
9

10
11 CSO interviewees commented on the advocacy they had engaged in, the effects of Global
12 Fund HIV/AIDS programmes on their advocacy activities, factors enabling or undermining
13 advocacy and how relations with government and other CSOs had changed. National
14 informants commented on these themes from their organisational perspective. Interviews
15 followed *a priori* themes, but allowed respondents' frames of experience and meaning to
16 emerge, and were conducted until saturation of new themes was achieved. All interviews
17 were recorded and transcribed, and translated professionally.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 The lead analyst undertook a systematic thematic analysis of the qualitative data adopting a
31 framework approach described by Pope & Mays (2000) whereby *a priori* and emerging
32 themes were drawn out and tabulated in a common analytic framework to enable cross-
33 country comparison. An investigator triangulation approach was adopted (see for example
34 Seale, 2004): multiple researchers contributed to interpreting themes, which reinforced our
35 confidence in the findings reported. When investigators' interpretations differed, data were
36 reexamined before agreeing on an interpretation; where this was not possible we do not
37 report these themes. The analysis involved the following stages: 1) transcripts were
38 systematically coded by the lead analyst and major themes drawn out; 2) themes were jointly
39 agreed by country investigators and the lead analyst and interpretations revised if necessary;
40 3) cross-country findings were summarised by tabulating them in the common analytic
41 framework and agreed by the country investigators; 4) the paper was drafted and reviewed
42 by country teams to confirm the accurate and coherent presentation of findings.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Ethical approval for the study was granted by the London School of Hygiene and Tropical
6
7 Medicine (reference 5078) and by the Kyrgyz Medical Ethics Committee. The Georgian
8
9 government requires ethical approval only for studies involving patients/biological samples.
10
11 No ethical approval is required in Ukraine.
12
13

14 15 16 **Results** 17

18
19
20
21 We interviewed 14 of 16 Georgian CSOs receiving Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants, more
22
23 than one third of all Kyrgyz Global Fund HIV/AIDS CSO grantees (n=16, 36%), but fewer
24
25 in Ukraine (n=19, 14%). While it was difficult to interview large numbers of government
26
27 officials due to problems of availability and a lack of willingness to participate, those we did
28
29 interview were key informants in the field. We found considerable consistency between most
30
31 interviewees' accounts, including between CSO and government interviewees. In this section,
32
33 we draw out the most important, commonly agreed themes across the different groups
34
35 interviewed.
36
37
38
39
40

41 Our study revealed a growing appetite among CSOs to advocate on HIV/AIDS and injecting
42
43 drug use-related issues and policies, and there are several examples of active advocacy
44
45 activities (Box 1). Where external support was provided, respondents cited two donors as
46
47 primary sources: the Open Society Institute and the Global Fund. Global Fund HIV/AIDS
48
49 grants have provided direct financial support for CSO advocacy as follows: Georgia,
50
51 received \$195,000 for advocacy activities through its Round 2 grant (14% of the total grant),
52
53 plus \$312,000 from single a funding stream a year later. Kyrgyzstan, received \$716,580 from
54
55 the first phase of its Round 7 grant (6.5% of the total grant) specifically for advocacy work,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 while Ukraine received around \$630,000 for advocacy from Rounds 1 (2% of the total grant)
4 and 6 (0.1% of total) (Table 1). Activities supported through this direct advocacy funding are
5 described below (see Box 2). We chose to focus our study on the Global Fund due to high
6 levels of CSO financing to deliver HIV/AIDS services, direct financial support for CSO
7 advocacy and the introduction of new models of working including Country Coordination
8 Mechanisms. Additionally a body of data and analysis on Global Fund country HIV/AIDS
9 programmes exist that are relatively accessible.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Box 1: about here**

24
25
26
27 In spite of the Global Fund's financial support, the vast majority of CSO, government and
28 development partner interviewees agreed that CSO advocacy had had limited impact on both
29 national policies and their implementation nationally and locally, which, in turn, constitute a
30 major barrier to implementing Global Fund-supported HIV/AIDS programmes. Capturing
31 this sentiment, a CSO interviewee said about the drug laws in Georgia: '*When such*
32 *legislation is in force the activities of the Global Fund are in vain*'. In the following sections
33 we ask whether Global Fund financed programmes have strengthened CSO advocacy efforts.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 ***To what extent has Global Fund financing supported civil society advocacy?***

46
47 Global Fund HIV/AIDS direct grant support for advocacy in the three focus countries
48 primarily took the form of funding for conferences and meetings where CSO grantees
49 contributed to the exchange of information and policy discourse with government agencies,
50 as well as press conferences, communications and materials, advocacy training at 'Summer
51 Schools' and multi-sectoral working groups established for the development of policy
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 proposals. While some interviewees welcomed this, others were critical of the quality of the
4
5 training which consisted of one-off sessions rather than ongoing, systematic support, and
6
7 tended to focus on a limited number of topics that reflected the priorities of the Global Fund
8
9 country HIV/AIDS grant and its implementation rather than being grounded in vulnerable
10
11 groups' needs and wishes and/or locally determined priorities by smaller CSOs. 'A lot of
12
13 jabber about nothing' as one Ukrainian interviewee described it. Examples of Global Fund
14
15 financing directly allocated for advocacy activities are summarised in Box 2.
16
17
18
19

20 **Box 2 about here**

21
22
23
24
25 There was a relatively buoyant CSO advocacy environment in Ukraine, which interviewees
26
27 described as stemming from the fact that two large CSOs – the *International HIV/AIDS*
28
29 *Alliance* and the *Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS* – acted as the country's Principal
30
31 Recipients (PRs) for the Round Six HIV/AIDS grant. Their status as PRs raised the national
32
33 profile of both CSOs in Ukraine and made them a powerful voice among the CSO
34
35 community resulting in a number of successful national advocacy campaigns (Box 1).
36
37 However, the relationship between the two Ukrainian CSO PRs and their CSO sub-grantees
38
39 was widely described as 'top-down' and weakly aligned with sub-grantees' priorities. Much
40
41 advocacy work funded under the 'supportive environment' component of Ukraine's Round
42
43 Six HIV/AIDS grant took the form of issuing competitive tenders for mostly local level
44
45 advocacy projects defined by the PRs for which CSO sub-grantees could bid. Some
46
47 interviewees were positive about this, though were consistent in their criticism that the
48
49 amount of funding available was insufficient to support local advocacy that was essential for
50
51 the smooth running of CSO-run HIV/AIDS services, such as working to change attitudes of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 local militia (police) commanders and officers on the street, or negotiating cooperation with
4
5 local government and health officials.
6
7

8
9
10 A common observation across the three countries was that most Global Fund support to
11 improve CSO sub-grantees' capacity was only *indirectly* associated with advocacy
12 strengthening. Thus, Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants supported participation in international
13 exchanges and conferences, and Global Fund-financed training strengthened the managerial
14 and administrative capacity of numerous CSOs through increasing the professionalism,
15 experience and qualifications of employees, as well as providing financial resources to hire
16 new CSO employees including frontline service providers, managerial and administrative
17 staff. This support strengthened CSOs to both deliver services more effectively, and as a
18 beneficial side-effect, to conduct advocacy either at national or local level: '*it gave us*
19 '*possibilities to show the community's needs and start advocacy*' but '*there is no targeted*
20 '*activity towards us*' (Kyrgyz CSO). In Georgia, the experience was similar, with
21 interviewees noting that while Global Fund grants did not support CSOs to do advocacy
22 directly '*...advocacy activities are an indirect result of Global Fund funding*' (development
23 partner, Georgia).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 ***Has dependency on Global Fund financing influenced civil society advocacy?***

44
45 Interviewees suggested that many CSOs were financially dependent on Global Fund grants.
46
47 A Ukrainian government official described Global Fund grants as: '*...a crutch, and without*
48 '*this crutch they won't be able to walk. And I would like them to be taught how to walk by*
49 '*themselves*'. Several CSO sub-grantees in Ukraine felt that financial dependence on short
50 term Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants undermined their ability to criticise either PR for fear of
51 losing further funding. This lack of space to input into decision making: '*turned the civil*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *society sector into robots that are just implementing donors' ideas'* (Ukrainian CSO).
4
5 Economic dependence also had the effect of repositioning some CSOs as commercial entities,
6
7 as the following CSO interviewee from Ukraine noted: *'...the Global Fund has turned civil*
8
9 *society into a public business - it means that there is an interest in subsequent and bigger*
10
11 *grants'*.
12
13

14
15
16 CSO advocacy in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia – where government agencies acted as the PRs –
17
18 was even more subdued at both at national and local levels. A key problem described by
19
20 several CSOs in these countries was the perception that challenging government policies
21
22 would prejudice their chances of receiving future Global Fund grants. Small CSOs receiving
23
24 single Global Fund grants in Kyrgyzstan, and to some extent Georgia, felt particularly
25
26 vulnerable, and were more cautious about embarking on advocacy activities, especially at the
27
28 national level, than those larger, more visible, CSOs that received funding from multiple
29
30 sources, although the subtle process of exclusion from future grants was not easy to prove. In
31
32 Kyrgyzstan, an additional problem stemmed from breaks in Global Fund financing to CSOs,
33
34 which created fragility and jeopardised both service delivery and staff retention. This
35
36 undermined advocacy efforts since CSOs were forced to concentrate on maintaining a
37
38 skeleton service with limited resources.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Global Fund country HIV/AIDS programmes attached limited value to CSO advocacy –
46
47 whether at national or local – because CSOs were widely regarded as service providers
48
49 rather than advocates. A development partner in Georgia commented: *'I cannot see that this*
50
51 *[advocacy] is a key focus of the Global Fund. On the contrary, it has been absolutely*
52
53 *abandoned'*. In Kyrgyzstan, CSOs had a similar experience: *'...little attention was paid to*
54
55 *advocacy measures...the Global Fund strategy did not have emphasis, goals and objectives*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *of development of the nongovernmental sector* (development partner, Kyrgyzstan).
4
5 Furthermore, as a Kyrgyz CSO interviewee maintained, the Global Fund PRs actively sought
6
7 to play down CSO advocacy: ‘...in general there is some feeling that the Global Fund tries
8
9 to keep silence...’. In Georgia, the expectation of the PR was clear: that CSOs’ should not
10
11 engage in advocacy activities: ‘If you are not a main contractor for the Global Fund grant,
12
13 your role is limited to implementation of project activities - and that’s it!’ (Georgian CSO).
14
15

16
17
18 ***Have Global Fund HIV/AIDS programmes affected relationships between civil society and***
19
20 ***government?***
21

22
23 An important effect of the Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants has been the increased
24
25 professionalisation of CSOs through both through insisting on CSO grantees adopting
26
27 adequate project management, accounting, grant and financial management and monitoring
28
29 and evaluation practices, and financing for hiring and training managerial and administrative
30
31 staff as well as office equipment (also reported in Kapilashrami and O’Brien 2012). This has
32
33 led to CSOs becoming more respected by government officials in the three countries, has
34
35 helped to build trust, and challenged government stereotypes of CSO organisational capacity.
36
37 In turn this has facilitated CSO engagement with and, ultimately, some influence on
38
39 government HIV/AIDS and drugs policies and programmes and their implementation at local
40
41 level. Moreover, in many cases, being encouraged to work with government officials under
42
43 Global Fund grant activities, such as joint membership of national policy working groups
44
45 and coordinated service delivery between CSO and government HIV services, promoted
46
47 contact between government and CSOs thereby fostering better relationships with
48
49 government, which interviewees saw as enhancing the influence of CSOs on government
50
51 policy. Indeed, adoption of Global Fund procedures by CSOs has had the effect of
52
53 encouraging government institutions to do the same.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 The introduction of Country Coordination Mechanisms (CCMs) was widely applauded by
6
7 interviewees as a major area in which the Global Fund had enabled CSOs to contribute to
8
9 shaping decisions relating to national HIV/AIDS programmes. Indeed, in each of the three
10
11 countries, the CCM was described by CSO members as a valuable platform for advocating
12
13 on national issues relating to HIV/AIDS including expressing the wishes and needs of
14
15 vulnerable groups including IDUs and CSWs. While this promoted increased interaction
16
17 between civil society and government the fact that CCMs were government dominated in
18
19 terms of numbers of members and control of the agenda meant that CSO voices were in
20
21 practice muted and had limited impact on collective decisions. A government interviewee in
22
23 Kyrgyzstan accepted this reality: *'The CCM is a country committee under the government...it*
24
25 *is interpreted as belonging to the government rather than society...based on that, they do not*
26
27 *want to give many places to the nongovernmental sector'*. Furthermore the status of CCMs in
28
29 the three countries as advisory rather than decision-making bodies further attenuated the
30
31 ability of CSOs to advocate on national decisions. In Georgia there was a sense that while
32
33 the CCM was respected by government, when it came to *'real conflict of interest between*
34
35 *what the state is interested in and what the CCM might support, then the government' does*
36
37 *not take [the CCM] into consideration...'* (Georgian CSO).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 ***Have Global Fund HIV/AIDS programmes affected relationships between civil society***
46
47 ***organisations?***
48

49 Interviewees widely accepted that collective action among CSOs strengthened advocacy,
50
51 while CSOs working individually had limited impact on government policy, particularly at
52
53 national level: *'...one organisation is only one vote. Many voices - that's the power'*
54
55 (Ukrainian CSO). In all three countries some CSOs were affiliated with networks or
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 coalitions that were reported as strengthening some national level advocacy attempts,
4 particularly when common interests and goals were agreed. A Georgian CSO interviewee
5 said: *'It is easier to influence political decisions when the organisation operates in a*
6 *network'*. Some CSOs indicated they were members of international networks or were
7 closely connected to international CSOs from which they derived resources and power,
8 strengthening their voice within their country. Further, knowledge exchange among CSOs
9 strengthened advocacy; in some cases it motivated their advocacy efforts: *'...when we meet*
10 *with others, new ideas come, in my opinion, strengthening is realised when we speak...it*
11 *gives a positive stimulus to keep on working'* (Kyrgyz CSO).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Nevertheless, few interviewees felt the Global Fund had fostered cooperation between CSOs.
26 A common observation was that CSOs were fragmented and that competition for scarce
27 resources was a key reason for this. Indeed, Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants were reported as
28 exaggerating competition among many local CSOs contending for financial resources, a
29 problem also reported in Peru where receipt of Global Fund financing fostered competition
30 and undermined original affiliations and patterns of CSO collaboration (Caceres et al 2009).
31 Interviewees in Kyrgyzstan suggested that Global Fund financing had increased the number
32 of CSOs but, in so doing, had effectively spread resources too thinly. For a Kyrgyz CSO
33 interviewee, the consequences were clear: *'Because of Global Fund money, those*
34 *interpersonal relationships between NGOs have worsened: they regularly get into conflict*
35 *with each another'*. In Ukraine, a similar experience emerged from the interviews:
36 *'...currently, cooperation among organisations is weak because there is incomprehensible*
37 *hidden competition, possibly for funding, possibly for [career advancement]'* (Ukrainian
38 CSO). In Georgia, whilst a lack of broad collective action was reported amongst CSOs, who
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 often delivered multiple and sometimes contradictory messages to national government, the
4
5 Global Fund was not identified as a principal or even contributing factor.
6
7
8

9 10 **Discussion**

11 ***The Global Fund and 'true' advocacy?***

12
13
14 The aim of our paper is to identify the effects of Global Fund financing on CSO advocacy.

15
16 Financing from external sources inevitably raises the spectre of co-option – how can CSOs

17
18 'truly' advocate for the rights of minority groups in society if they enjoy close political ties

19
20 with the very actors that enact policy limiting those rights, or are dependent on others for

21
22 funding? There is insufficient space here to engage fully with a long-standing but ultimately

23
24 unresolved debate about the appropriate role of civil society *vis a vis* the state (whether

25
26 strong relations between state and civil society are beneficial or inimical to democracy -

27
28 what Foley describes as the 'paradox of civil society' (Foley 1996)). Nevertheless, our study

29
30 raises two important points pertinent to this conundrum. First, our results suggest that CSO-

31
32 state relations were not so close as to warrant the charge of co-option. Second, we argue that

33
34 co-option is too crude an explanation of the subtle effects of economic dependence we found

35
36 in our study. The extent to which CSOs reconstructed both the meaning of advocacy and

37
38 their own functioning in society in response to the need to win Global Fund grants is a

39
40 striking, if under-reported, example of power-relations between grantor and grantee.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 ***Effects of different components of the Global Fund governance model***

48
49 Our study sheds light on what is inevitably a complex relationship between three principal

50
51 actors in IDU policy: the Global Fund, CSOs and governments. If, as many of the

52
53 respondents in our study attest, there is insufficient funding for advocacy, where does

54
55 responsibility lie within the Global Fund to increase its support? Should the CCM be more
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sensitive to advocacy needs and write them into proposals; should the PRs agree a greater
4
5 allocation of funding for advocacy with the Secretariat in the grant agreement; should the
6
7 Board instigate an advocacy 'window' in much the same way as it did for health systems
8
9 strengthening, and encourage CCMs to incorporate specific advocacy activities into grant
10
11 proposals?
12

13
14
15
16 The results of our research add a degree of nuance that helps to address this question. It is
17
18 clear that the category of PR is important: whether or not a PR is a CSO or government agent
19
20 appears to affect the level of priority afforded advocacy activities. In countries such as
21
22 Kyrgyzstan and Georgia, where the PRs are government agencies, international donors such
23
24 as OSI, UNAIDS and USAID are in a position – through the technical assistance they
25
26 provide in proposal writing – to encourage the PRs to be more supportive of advocacy
27
28 capacity building. However, this assumes that donors have a common stance towards the
29
30 rights of IDUs and reflect that position consistently. It is by no means clear that this is the
31
32 case.
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 Nevertheless, the general perception amongst our respondents was that Global Fund-
40
41 supported HIV/AIDS programmes attached limited value to civil society advocacy, with
42
43 CSO sub-grantees constructed primarily as service providers. Whether responsibility for the
44
45 low priority attached to advocacy lies at the door of an unresponsive CCM is difficult to
46
47 gauge: on the one hand, interviewees regarded the CCM as an important platform for
48
49 advocacy; on the other, many respondents still regarded the CCM as a government-
50
51 controlled institution, and thus inimical to CSO advocacy efforts. A close examination of
52
53 CCM proposals, comparing advocacy components within proposals accepted and rejected,
54
55 may usefully quantify CCM interest in advocacy.
56
57
58
59
60

Financial incentives reconstruct CSO identity

Others have identified clear financial incentives for maintaining a prohibitionist stance towards drug use leading to widespread police extortion and intimidation of IDUs and CSWs (Lewis 2010; SWAN 2009; Kupatadze 2009; Sarang et al 2010). Our study confirms these findings and suggests this is also a major factor undermining CSO attempts to change policy on drug use. Less well understood are the effects that financial dependence on external funding has had on CSO performance. The effects that we identify are not co-optive, in the sense that PRs sought to exert political control over sub-recipients of Global Fund grants (Rau 2006). Rather, they are reconstructive in the sense that CSOs, under pressure from competing CSOs, reconstructed their identities to appear more professional, corporate and business-focused organisations in an effort to attract grants.

Advocacy as an event or a process?

What also emerges from our data is that advocacy strengthening is perceived by the Global Fund to be an event rather than a *process*. Interviewees assert that advocacy is systematic work and yet the Global Funded-HIV/AIDS programmes appear to approach advocacy as a short-term, one-off training exercise rather than long-term support for CSOs. Part of this effect is that increased funding from Global Fund grants is changing the meaning that CSOs attach to advocacy. Where once advocacy had 'value', now the activity is regarded by some CSOs as 'just another project' that brings in money. Thus, while the aim of advocacy was to reform legislation, the motivation was often grant-focused rather than rights-based. Advocacy was seen as instrumental in order to fulfill CSO sub-grantees' obligations under the grant rather than necessarily supporting vulnerable groups by defending their rights. Caution is required in attributing responsibility for this shift in priorities to Global Fund

1
2
3 grants, as it may reflect a broader dissonance in country wide (that is, government)
4
5 understanding of advocacy and its importance for health systems strengthening.
6
7
8

9
10 ***Have Global Fund programmes fostered an ‘enabling environment’ for CSO advocacy?***

11
12 In common with previous studies (Nathan et. al. 2002, Court et. al. 2006, Pollard and Court
13
14 2005), we found that weak capacity of CSOs undermined their ability to influence
15
16 government policy. With the exception of a few high-profile CSOs, the vast majority of
17
18 CSOs in the field of HIV/AIDS in our focus countries are relatively small-scale
19
20 organisations whose advocacy needs are relatively inexpensive. A small amount of financial
21
22 support to strengthen CSO advocacy resources, evidence-gathering, knowledge (particularly
23
24 legal), and skills and leadership development, may help CSOs to advocate with local
25
26 officials to enable them to deliver services to vulnerable groups. The Global Fund is
27
28 beginning to recognise the importance of CSO capacity building. The Round 10 proposal
29
30 form, for example, now includes this as a specific – and major – service delivery area,
31
32 allowing countries to secure funding for specific advocacy training activities.
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 But we also found that an indirect effect of capacity building from Global Fund grants has
40
41 been to build an ‘enabling environment’ in which communities can advocate for reform of
42
43 government HIV/AIDS-related policies. Our study provides examples of strengthened
44
45 relations between CSOs and government officials that are beginning to erode stereotypes
46
47 each sector has of the other. Increased professionalism among CSOs increased the regard
48
49 many government officials had for them. Indeed, CSO grantees adopting Global Fund
50
51 procedures financial management, administration, and monitoring and evaluation had
52
53 encouraged government institutions to do the same.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CSOs competing for Global Fund grants

Another important consequence of CSO dependence on Global Fund grants in our three focus countries is the effect of CSOs competing as sub-recipients for funding. Despite the emergence of CSO networks and coalitions, broad collective action has been difficult to achieve. Indeed, this finding compares with other regions, such as South America, where on one hand HIV/AIDS galvanised a broad based civil society social movement that successfully lobbied for legal reform around HIV/AIDS in Brazil which did not have a Global Fund programme, while in Peru receipt of Global Fund financing undermined affiliations and collaborations among CSOs (Caceres et al 2009; Parker 2009; Kendall and Lopez-Uribe 2010). A comprehensive regional comparison of CSO experiences of Global Fund support is beyond the scope of this study, but warrants further exploration.

Study limitations

Our study has a number of limitations. Ongoing political and economic upheaval experienced in the three countries means it is difficult to generalise our findings across Eastern Europe and Central Asia and beyond. Additionally, sampling was restricted to the capitals, which created a selection bias although in Georgia this was less problematic than Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan since we interviewed representatives of Georgian 14/16 CSOs receiving Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants. The majority of interviewees represented CSOs, and while we interviewed key government informants in the field it was difficult to interview greater numbers due to problems of availability and in some cases lack of willingness to participate.

Conclusion

Despite concerted efforts by the international community to raise the profile of civil society

1
2
3 engagement in the health policy process, the Global Fund's financing of CSO advocacy – an
4 important way that CSOs might be supported to engage in this process – has been limited.
5
6 Partly, this is because relatively limited funding is being channeled *directly* towards
7
8 advocacy through country HIV/AIDS grants, which emphasise service delivery to achieve
9
10 targets rather than capacity building for advocacy. Obviously, given the Global Fund's
11
12 principle of country ownership, it is not in a position to positively discriminate against grants
13
14 with an explicit advocacy component. Nor should it. However, if the Global Fund is serious
15
16 about strengthening communities – as a way to strengthen health systems – it could
17
18 positively promote advocacy as an integral component of health systems strengthening in the
19
20 literature it commissions on CSS and in its R11 guidance notes for grantees.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 It is clear that the source of grant proposals, the CCM, is not working as well as it might to
28
29 raise the profile of advocacy. Here too there may be little the Global Fund can do, although it
30
31 does issue guidelines about CSO participation in decision-making within the CCM. Evidence
32
33 from our study suggests that CSO representation on CCMs is often little more than a 'box-
34
35 ticking' exercise by a government-dominated Board. Currently, additional tranches of
36
37 funding from the Global Fund are tied to grant performance. A way forward may be to
38
39 extend criteria for 'performance' to include broad-based inclusion of stakeholders in CCM
40
41 decision-making.
42
43
44
45
46

47 Funding is mostly short-term, making it impossible for CSOs to establish long-term
48
49 strategies. Short-term funding has also meant short-term training. Whilst it may be unfair to
50
51 describe the advocacy training provided as "jabber about nothing", it would appear to be of
52
53 variable quality. The responsibility of the Global Fund's Local Fund Agent (LFA) is to make
54
55 sure that money granted for advocacy is used effectively. It is important therefore for LFAs
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to be required by the Secretariat to monitor the performance of monies allocated to advocacy
4
5 activities. The Global Fund Secretariat should also reflect on and seek to mitigate the
6
7 negative effects of hierarchy and competition for its funding amongst CSOs. Whilst
8
9 advocacy may now be a higher priority for the Global Fund Secretariat, there is a sense
10
11 among CSOs that this has not yet permeated fully to the Fund's country level governance
12
13 mechanisms.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 References

22
23 Caceres C, Giron M, Sandoval C, Lopez R Pajuelo J Valverde R Vasquez P Silva-
24
25 Santisteban A Rosasco A. 2009. Preu: Effects of the implementation of Global Fund-
26
27 supported HIV/AIDS projects on health systems, civil society and affected communities,
28
29 2004-2007. In Maximizing Positive Synergies Academic Consortium *Interactions Between*
30
31 *Global Health Initiatives and Health Systems: Evidence from Countries*. Geneva: WHO.
32
33

34
35
36 Chkhatarashvili K, Gotsadze G, Rukhadze N. 2008. Effects of GFATM on Georgia's Health
37
38 System Development. Tbilisi: Curatio International Foundation.
39
40

41
42
43 Cohn J, Russel A, Baker B, Kayongo A, Wanjiku E et al. 2011. Using global health
44
45 initiatives to strengthen health systems: A civil society perspective, *Global Public Health*, 6
46
47 (7): 687-702
48
49

50
51
52 Court J, Mendizabal E, Osborne D, Young J. 2006. *Policy Engagement: How Civil Society*
53
54 *Can be More Effective*. London: ODI.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Doyle C, Patel P. 2008. Civil society organisations and global health initiatives: problems of
4 legitimacy. *Social Science and Medicine*, **66** (9), 1928-1938.
5
6
7

8
9
10 Edwards M, Hulme D. 1998. Too close for comfort? The impact of official aid on
11 nongovernmental organisations. *World Development*, **24**, 961-973.
12
13

14
15
16 Global Fund. 2010. Community Systems Strengthening Framework. The Global Fund, May
17
18 2010.
19

20
21
22
23 Global Fund 2011 <http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/>
24
25

26
27
28
29
30 Halmshaw C, Hawkins K. 2004. Capitalising on Global HIV/AIDS Funding: The challenge
31 for civil society and government. *Reproductive Health Matters* **12** (24):35-41.
32
33

34
35
36
37 Ibrahim S, Hulme, D. 2010. *Has Civil Society helped the Poor? A review of the Roles and*
38 *Contributions of Civil Society to Poverty Reduction*. Brookes World Poverty Institute
39
40 Working Paper 114.
41
42
43

44
45
46 Kapilashrami A., O'Brien O. 2012 The Global Fund and the re-configuration and re-
47 emergence of 'civil society': Widening or closing the democratic deficit? *Global Public*
48 *Health* DOI:10.1080/17441692.2011.649043
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kendall T, Lopez-Uribe E. 2010 Improving the HIV response for women in Latin America:
4 barriers to integrated advocacy for sexual and reproductive health and rights *Global Health*
5
6
7 *Governance* **4**(1): 1-18.
8
9

10
11 Latypov, A. 2009. Understanding post 9/11 drug control policy and politics in Central Asia.
12
13 *International Journal of Drug Policy*, **20**, 387-391.
14
15

16
17
18 Murzalieva G, Aleshkina J, Temirov A, Samiev A, Kartanbaeva N, et al. 2009. *Tracking*
19
20 *Global HIV/AIDS Initiatives and their Impact on the Health System: the Experience of the*
21
22 *Kyrgyz Republic Final Report*. Bishkek and London: Centre for Health System Development,
23
24 Kyrgyzstan and London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.
25
26

27
28
29 Nathan S, Rotem A, Ritchie, J. 2002. Closing the gap: building capacity of non-government
30
31 organisation as advocates for health inequality. *Health Promotion International*, **17**(1),69-78.
32
33

34
35
36 Open Society Institute. 2009. *Shining Light on the Hidden Epidemic*. New York: Open
37
38 Society Institute.
39
40

41
42
43 Parker R. 2009. Civil society, political mobilisation, and the impact of HIV scale-up on
44
45 health systems in Brazil. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome*, **52** (Supplement
46
47 1): S49-51.
48
49

50
51
52 Pollard A, Court J. 2005. *How Civil Society Organisations use Evidence to Influence Policy*
53
54 *Processes: a Literature Review*. London: ODI.
55
56

1
2
3 Pope C, Mays N. 2006. *Analyzing Qualitative Research in Health Care*. London: Wiley-
4
5 Blackwell.

6
7
8
9 Price R. 2003. Transnational civil society and advocacy in world politics. *World Politics*, **55**,
10
11 579-606.

12
13
14
15
16 Rau B. 2006. The politics of civil society in confronting HIV/AIDS. *International Affairs*, **82**
17
18 (2), 285-295.

19
20
21
22
23 Rhodes T, Singer M, Bourgois P, Friedman S, Strathdee S. 2005. The social structural
24
25 production of HIV risk among injecting drug users. *Social Science and Medicine*, **61**, 1026-
26
27 1044.

28
29
30
31
32 Sarang A, Rhodes T, Sheon N, Page K. 2010. Policing drug users in Russia: risk, fear, and
33
34 structural violence. *Substance Use and Misuse*, **45** (6), 813-64.

35
36
37
38 Seale C. 2004. Validity, reliability and the quality of research. In Seale, C. (ed) *Researching*
39
40 *Society and Culture*. London: Sage. 72-82.

41
42
43
44
45 Semigina, T. 2009. *Tracking Global HIV/AIDS Initiatives and their Impact on the Health*
46
47 *System in Ukraine*. Kyiv: Kyiv Mohyla Academy.

48
49
50
51
52 Spicer N., Harmer A, Aleshkina J, Bogdan D, Chkhatarashvili K, et al. 2011 Circus monkeys
53
54 or change agents? Civil society advocacy for HIV/AIDS in adverse policy environments.
55
56 *Social Science and Medicine* 73:1748-1755.

1
2
3
4
5 UNGASS *Georgia Country Progress Report 2010*
6
7
8

9
10 UNGASS *Kyrgyzstan Country Progress Report 2010*
11
12

13
14 UNGASS *Ukraine Country Progress Report 2010*
15
16
17

18 Vienna Declaration. 2010. <http://www.viennadeclaration.com/the-declaration.html>
19
20

21
22
23 Walt G, Gilson L. 1994. Reforming the health sector in developing countries: the central role
24 of policy analysis. *Health Policy and Planning*, **9**, 353-70
25
26
27

28
29 WHO. 2004. *Advocacy Guide: HIV/AIDS Prevention Among Injecting Drug Users*. Geneva:
30 World Health Organisation.
31
32

33
34
35
36 WHO Maximizing Positive Synergies Collaborative Group. 2009. An assessment of
37 interactions between global health initiatives and country health systems. *Lancet* **373**, 2137-
38 69.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Wolfe D, Malinowska-Sempruch K. 2004. *Illicit Drug Policies and the Global HIV*
46 *Epidemic: Effects of UN and National Government Approaches*. New York: Open Society
47 Institute.
48
49
50

51
52
53
54 World Bank 2011 *World Development Report: Conflict, Security and Development*
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Georgia, Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan: selected data on HIV/AIDS epidemic and Global Fund HIV/AIDS programmes

	Georgia	Ukraine	Kyrgyzstan
Population^e	4M (2009)	46M (2009)	5M (2009)
Gross national income per capita^e	\$2,530	\$2,800	\$870
Epidemic type	Low-level	Concentrated	Concentrated
Number of people living with HIV/AIDS^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,136 (2010) (registered) • 3,300 (2009) (estimated number) 	188,766 (April 2011)	3,288 (January 2011)
Percentage of adult population living with HIV/AIDS^b	0.03% (2010)	1.11% (2009)	0.13% (2007)
HIV prevalence among key MARPs^{fgh}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDUs upto 4.5% (2009) • CSWs upto 1.8% (2009) • MSM upto 3.7% (2009) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDUs 22.9% (2008-9) • CSWs 13.2% (2008-9) • MSM 8.6% (2009) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDUs 14.3% (2009) • CSWs 1.6% (2009) • MSM 3.8% (2007)
Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants^c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round Two (2003-2009) \$14,363,254 • Round Six (2007-2010) \$8,533,048 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round One (2004) \$23M • Round Six (2007) \$131.5M 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round Two (2003) \$17M • Round Seven (2008) \$11M
Principal Recipients	The <i>Georgia Health and Social Projects Implementation Center</i> (NB: in January 2011 a nongovernmental organization became PR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>International HIV/AIDS Alliance</i> (Rounds One and Six) • <i>Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS</i> (Round Six) 	<i>Republican AIDS Centre</i> (transferred to UNDP from July 2011)

Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants as % of total HIV/AIDS funding^c	55.3% (2008-9)	72.2% (2004-8)	47% (2007)
Numbers of civil society organisations funded by Global Fund HIV/AIDS grants^d	16 (2010)	156 (2010)	42 (2010)
Amount of money allocated for advocacy by Global Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$195,000 (Round 2, 2005) • \$312,000 (Single Stream Funding, 2006) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$464,000 (Round 1) • \$166,000 (Round 6) 	716,580 (Phase 1 Round 7)
Advocacy as % of total grant^d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.4% (Round 2, 2005) • 3.7% (Single Stream Funding, 2006) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.0% (Round 1) • 0.1% (Round 6) 	6.5% (Phase 1 Round 7)
Sources: (a) Georgia National Centre for Disease Control and Public Health; Ukraine Principal Recipient; Kyrgyzstan National AIDS Report, January 2011; (b) Global Fund grant portfolio index: http://portfolio.theglobalfund.org/en/Home/Index ; (c) Global Fund grant data: http://portfolio.theglobalfund.org/en/Route/DataDownloads ; (d) Georgia National Centre for Disease Control and Public Health; Global Fund PIU, Kyrgyzstan; Ukraine Principal Recipient (e) World Bank World Development Report 2011 (f) UNGASS Kyrgyzstan Country Progress Report 2010 (g) UNGASS Georgia Country Progress Report 2010 (h) UNGASS Ukraine Country Progress Report 2010			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2 CSOs sample description

	Georgia	Kyrgyzstan	Ukraine
Harm reduction including needle/syringe exchange and addiction therapy	•	•	•
Education/awareness building	•	•	•
Condom distribution	•	•	•
Prevention of mother to child transmission (PMTCT)	•		
Voluntary counseling and testing (VCT)	•		•
Rehabilitation of former prisoners		•	
Detoxification		•	
Care/support		•	•
Legal support		•	
STI testing			•
IDUs	•	•	•
PLWHA	•	•	•
Women	•		
Pregnant women	•		
Men having sex with men (MSM)	•		•
CSWs	•	•	•
Children, young people	•		•
Prisoners/former prisoners		•	•
Women IDUs		•	
General public			•

Box 1 CSO advocacy efforts in Georgia, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine*Examples of issues for which CSOs have advocated*

- Reduced price antiretroviral drug procurement by the state
- Drug users and sex workers' rights including entitlements and exposing corruption and discrimination
- Introduction of new commodities and approaches such as Methadone opiate substitution therapy (OST), needle/syringe exchange, pre- and post-counselling and express testing
- Decriminalisation of injecting drug use and/or reductions in penalties
- Adoption of new regulations/protocols for prevention, testing and treatment
- Advocacy with local law enforcement and health officials to accept CSO harm reduction services and for changes in militia training curricula
- Advocating with local government for the allocation of additional resources
- Advocating for individual clients' entitlements

Examples of successful CSO advocacy

- Ukrainian CSOs successfully advocated for the national HIV program to incorporate OST and needle/syringe exchange interventions; for a reduction in the price of antiretroviral drugs procured by government; and actively contributed to drafting Global Fund proposals
- Kyrgyz CSO advocacy precipitated the integration of CSO HIV services within government primary healthcare and the inclusion of social aspects of HIV in medical school curricula; also changes in the law on quantities of illicit drugs a person can carry; and to changes in militia training curricula
- Georgian CSO advocacy led to changes in drugs testing protocols in line with the EU Convention of Human Rights

Source: Spicer et al (2011)

Box 2 Global Fund HIV/AIDS grant support for civil society advocacy**Georgia**

- Supporting the drafting of a proposal document for drugs policy reform developed jointly by government agencies and select CSOs
- Financing conferences and meetings on harm reduction and other aspects of HIV/AIDS prevention

Ukraine

- Co-financing annual advocacy ‘summer schools’ and other training for civil society Global Fund grantees
- Principal Recipients providing direct technical assistance to sub-grantees on aspects of advocacy
- Providing Issuing competitive tenders for specific advocacy activities under the ‘Supportive Environment’ component of the Round Six HIV/AIDS grant
- Developing and distributing advocacy ‘toolkits’ to guide CSO grantees
- Funding Regional Coordinator posts for which part of the role includes contributing to local level advocacy in support of CSO grantees
- Financially supporting events including conferences, press conferences, workshops and interagency meetings

Kyrgyzstan

- Financially supporting ‘round table’ interagency meetings on harm reduction and other aspects of HIV/AIDS prevention
- Providing financial support for organizing Annual NGO Forum, where NGO representatives from different part of the country could jointly discuss advocacy issues