

Operational Policy Note

Revise Grants

Approved on

23 November 2023; Updated 31 January 2025

Approved by

Executive Grant Management Committee

Process Owner

Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support Department

Process Metrics for Revise Grants


Principal Recipients¹ and Country Teams are expected to meet the following key performance indicators:

- **End-date Revisions:** to be completed maximum **three** calendar months² and one month prior to the current implementation period end-date.
- **Additional Funding (or Funding Reduction / Transfer) and Programmatic Revisions:** to be completed maximum **three** calendar months³.
- **Administrative Revisions:**
 - *Administrative changes to the Performance Framework or Baseline Budget:* to be completed maximum **three** calendar months⁴;
 - *All other Administrative Revisions:* to be completed maximum **two** calendar months

Process Objectives

1. The goal of a grant revision (hereinafter referred to as “revision”) is to allow for planned Global Fund investments to be adjusted to changing context and requirements during grant implementation. This ensures continued effective and efficient use of Global Fund resources to achieve maximum impact in line with national strategic plans and the Global Fund’s Strategy.
2. There are five revision types which follow a hierarchy as presented in Figure 1: the higher-level revisions can include the lower-level ones, but not the contrary. For example, an End-date Revision can include additional funding, but an Additional Funding Revision does not change the duration of the Implementation Period.

Figure 1. Hierarchy of revision types



¹ Unless defined in this OPN or if the context otherwise requires, all capitalized terms used in this OPN shall have the same meaning set out in the [Global Fund Grant Regulations \(as amended from time to time\)](#).


² After initiation in the Global Fund systems

³ *ibid*

⁴ After initiation in the Global Fund systems or other applicable timelines if combined with other types of grant revision

Figure 2 below describes the phases and sub-processes of revisions. The sub-processes vary depending on the revision type.


Figure 2. Phases and subprocesses of revisions depending on the revision type



Operational Policy

3. This Operational Policy Note (OPN) defines the guiding principles and requirements on revisions. Specific best practice guidance is also captured in the document (see Annex 1).
4. The OPN applies to country and multicountry portfolios and grants unless otherwise specified in the dedicated multicountry section.
5. While the principles and general requirements defined in this OPN apply across all portfolios, the specific revision deliverables do not apply to Focused portfolios, unless explicitly stated. Annex 1 provides a summary of the grant-making deliverables and how they apply to each portfolio category.
6. The below decision tree assists in determining the type of revision to pursue. Depending on the type of revision planned, the reader can refer to specific sections of this OPN that defines the principles and requirements per revision type.

Figure 3. Decision tree to determine the grant revision type to pursue



Key considerations

7. **Combine revisions.** Overall, Principal Recipients (PRs) and Country Teams (CTs) are strongly encouraged to consolidate multiple changes to a grant into one revision. If multiple revisions are combined, CT and PRs will follow the process for the highest-level revision, while still complying with the specific requirements for each type of revision set out in this OPN. For example, if a Programmatic Revision and a Budget or Administrative Revision are processed together, the Programmatic Revision process and timelines apply. For questions, consult with the Operational Efficiency Team.
8. **Timeliness.** Revisions must be initiated as early as possible from when the need for a revision is identified and are expected to be completed within the timelines as defined in the process metric section above. Retroactive revisions (e.g., processing an End-date Revision past the Implementation Period (IP) end-date or a Programmatic Revision for a period that has passed) are not allowed unless approved by the Global Fund.
9. **Budget Changes.** The following terms/mechanisms are used in this OPN:

Baseline Budget	The original approved detailed budget for the IP, processed through grant-making and formalized at summary level through a Grant Confirmation. The Baseline Budget does not change except when administrative budget changes are processed through an Administrative Revision (see Section 5) which is formalized at summary level through an Implementation Letter (IL).
Incremental Budget	An additional approved detailed budget for budget increases or reductions, processed through an End-date and/or Additional Funding/Funding Reduction Revision (See Sections 1 and 2). Each increase or reduction is documented in a new Incremental Budget; once approved, such Incremental Budget does not change. The Incremental Budget is aggregated with the Baseline Budget and any prior approved Incremental Budgets to create the Total IP Budget
Total IP Budget	The sum of the Baseline Budget and any approved Incremental Budgets, aggregated in Global Fund systems and formalized at summary level through an IL.

Budget Adjustment Form	Captures budget changes at summary level resulting from a Programmatic or Budget Revision (see Sections 3 and 4), through an online form in the Global Fund Systems. Budget changes executed through the Budget Adjustment Form do not change the Baseline, Incremental or Total IP Budgets and are validated by the Global Fund.
-------------------------------	---

10. **Revisions to Matching Funds.** When processing any type of revision that involves changes to [Matching Funds](#), the PR and CT must ensure that Matching Funds continue to be invested in activities relating to the catalytic investment priority area⁵.

11. **Interdependencies with grant life cycle processes.** When planning and processing a revision, CTs and PRs consider the interdependencies with the other grant life cycle processes and plan accordingly:


A. Grant Implementation:

- i. **PR reporting:** Revisions that involve changes to the Performance Framework and/or Baseline and Total IP Budget and need to be reported in the next Progress Update/Disbursement Request (PU/DR) must be well-planned, so they start and are fully completed before the current reporting period end date. If a revision is completed *after* the reporting period end-date and/or *after* PU/DR configuration, the requested revision changes will be reflected for the *next* reporting period only. Changes to Performance Framework targets that have an impact on performance rating and results reporting can be initiated as soon as identified with prior written agreement between the PR and the CT and later formalized through an Implementation Letter. Refer to Section 3 for more details.
- ii. Revisions that require updates to the **grant purchase order** impact the following processes throughout grant implementation. Specifically, during a revision, from the moment the Grant Signing Calculator (GSC) is approved and whilst the grant purchase order is being revised until it is approved in the Global Fund systems:
 - a) **Annual funding decision (AFD)** and Supplementary AFD cannot be submitted or approved. Accordingly, CTs are responsible for ensuring that the AFD approvals are completed prior to GSC and grant purchase order approval.⁶
 - b) Only **disbursements** from an already approved AFD can still be processed.
 - c) **Pooled Procurement Mechanisms (PPM) purchase requisitions** can be submitted in wambo.org, however, the *procurement* purchase order cannot be released to the procurement agent until the *grant* purchase order is approved in Global Fund systems. Hence CTs need to ensure that wambo.org requisitions are fully approved and finalized before (a) the GSC is approved and (b) revising the *grant* purchase order, as needed.

Figure 4. Interdependencies between revision and AFD, disbursements and PPM/wambo.org

⁵ See the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#).

⁶ See [OPN on Annual Funding Decisions and Disbursements](#).



- B. Revision:** For End-date, Additional Funding, Programmatic or Administrative Revisions – a new revision cannot be initiated in the Global Fund systems if there is an ongoing revision being processed for the same IP in the Global Fund systems. A revision is considered complete in the Global Fund systems once (a) the updated grant purchase order is approved where applicable, and (b) the revised grant information is registered and becomes active content in the Global Fund systems.
- C. Closure:** Any open End-date, Additional Funding, Programmatic or Administrative Revision prevents the closure process from being finalized. CTs must complete any pending revision prior to closure of a grant/IP.⁷
- D. Grant Entity Data (GED):** GED required to process revisions (e.g., PR or Local Fund Agent (LFA) organization or contact information appearing in key revisions documents) must be updated early on to avoid delays in the revision finalization process and to ensure the correct GED is appropriately reflected in all revision documents.⁸
- E. Implementation Arrangements Map:** Revisions can result in modifications to the Implementation Arrangements Map approved during grant-making⁹. PRs are responsible for ensuring that this map is updated accordingly and re-submitted to the CT in line with revision changes.

A list of key concepts related to grant revisions (i.e. allocation utilization period (AUP)) can be found in Section 1 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#).

Section 1: End-date Revisions¹⁰

- 12. Definition.** An End-date Revision extends the IP end-date (extension) to allow for continued implementation and to avoid programmatic disruptions while addressing operational challenges or

⁷ See [OPN on IP Reconciliation and Grant Closure](#).

⁸ See [OPN on Grant Entity Data](#), specifically Annex on Grant Entity Data required throughout the grant life cycle, including for revisions

⁹ See [Implementation Arrangements Map Instructions](#) and the Make Approve and Sign Quality Grants OPN for requirements by portfolio category. When the modifications to the Implementation Arrangement Map relate to changes to the Sub-Recipients (SRs), the PR ensures to select new SRs in a transparent and well-documented manner based, among other criteria, on approved ToRs, capacity assessment and integrity due diligence (refer to the [Guidelines on Sub-recipient and Supplier Integrity Due Diligence for Principal Recipients](#), as well as The Global Fund Policy to [Combat Fraud and Corruption](#) and Policy on [Conflict of Interest](#)), and signs contracts.

¹⁰ This section operationalizes the policy related to extending grant IPs as approved by the Global Fund Board ([GF/31/DP12 – Extension Policy under the New Funding Model](#)).

completing grant-making. It also covers instances where an IP is shortened, such as to allow for joint programming.¹¹

13. **Triggers.** End-date revisions can only be sought based on strongly justified circumstances,¹² such as:
- To facilitate joint programming and the submission of single funding requests for multiple disease components (e.g., joint HIV and TB funding requests for high co-infection countries).
 - To address challenges in timely submission of funding requests and completion of grant-making due to circumstances that are beyond the control of the applicants and the PRs (e.g., natural or man-made disaster or specific in-country political or economic circumstances severely affecting applicant and PR operations, or matters related to the work of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG)).
 - To address longer review and processing of applications by the Global Fund, such as the Technical Review Panel's (TRP) or the Grant Approvals Committee's (GAC) review and approval processes, or when the Global Fund Board objects to relevant funding recommendations from the Secretariat.
 - To allow for successful and responsible transition from Global Fund funding to other sources of funding in cases where a country component received its last Global Fund allocation.
 - To address cases of early termination of a grant or change of PR during grant implementation¹³.

Prepare and submit End-date Revision

14. **Initiators.** An End-date Revision can be initiated by the PR or the CT. The Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM)¹⁴¹⁵ must be informed and endorse all End-date Revisions. CCM endorsement must be provided by: (i) the CCM Chair and (ii) the civil society representative if the CCM Chair is the representative of the Government, or the representative of the Government if the CCM Chair is the representative of civil society.¹⁶
15. **Timing.** End-date Revisions are expected to be completed three calendar months after initiation and one month prior to the current IP end-date.
16. **Key considerations for extending IPs.** When preparing an extension, PRs and CTs must adhere to the following principles:
- Source of funding.** Extensions to the IP do not extend the AUP¹⁷. Therefore, all extensions use time from the subsequent AUP and are funded from the subsequent allocation,¹⁸ reducing the amount of time and funds available for the next IP. In addition, the AUP in which goods and services are delivered determines the allocation from which it is funded; therefore, if goods and services were ordered before the original IP end date but delivered during the extension period, they are funded from the subsequent allocation.¹⁹

¹¹ Reducing the IP that result in grant closure also requires compliance with the [OPN and Operational Procedures on IP Reconciliation and Grant Closure](#)

¹² Operational policy on the possible use of extensions will be updated should there be amendments to the Board-approved [extension policy \(GF/B31/DP12\)](#)

¹³ Reducing the IP that result in grant closure also requires compliance with the [OPN and Operational Procedures on IP Reconciliation and Grant Closure](#).

¹⁴ Throughout this OPN, references to CCM include any Country Coordinating Mechanism (with or without CCM funding recipient), Regional Coordinating Mechanism (RCM), Regional Organization (RO) or other applicants, as applicable.

¹⁵ In the absence of a CCM or an alternative coordinating platform in the country, the CT must seek endorsement from the Regional Manager (or for High Impact departments, relevant Department Head), after consulting with the Manager of the Monitoring, Evaluation & Country Analysis (MECA) Team, the Head of the Technical Advice & Partnerships Team, and to the extent possible, in-country partners.

¹⁶ With respect to endorsement by the CCM Chair, in the absence of the CCM Chair, endorsement by the Vice Chair is acceptable if in line with the CCM's governing documents.

¹⁷ The allocation utilization period (AUP) is the period (usually three years) during which the country allocation per disease component can be utilized to implement a grant. See Guidelines on Grant Budgeting for further details.

¹⁸ Unless there is no subsequent allocation.

¹⁹ For more information, see Section 2 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#).

- ii. **Sustainability.** As all extensions are financed by the subsequent allocation (unless there is no subsequent allocation²⁰), CTs and PRs must carefully consider the programmatic and cost implications beyond the extension period, which includes ensuring that:
 - a. Sufficient funds exist to cover the entire three-year AUP;
 - b. The activities and budget for the extension period enable a proper transition to the next IP; and
 - c. The expected trajectory of future funding is sustainable.
- iii. This is to ensure that a disproportionate amount of the subsequent allocation is not consumed during the extension period (e.g., 50% of the subsequent allocation for a component is not consumed during a 6-month extension) and avoid leading the grant on an unsustainable spending trajectory or one that is not reflective of the epidemiological context.
- iv. **Targets and activities**²¹. CTs and PRs ensure that all programmatic activities and targets during the extension period maximize impact given the available resources, align with the core objectives of the Global Fund Strategy and allow for a seamless transition to the new IP if applicable.
 - a. The targets for the period of the extension must be at least the same as those specified in the last reporting period. Adjustments must be in line with the trajectory of the allocation for that country component going forward.²²
 - b. Programmatic adjustments can be undertaken as necessary to ensure Global Fund resources are strategically invested to achieve maximum impact during the extension period.²³ Programmatic adjustments for the extension period are reviewed and approved by the relevant approval authority as defined in Section 3 below.²⁴
- v. **Budget Changes.** PRs prepare and submit an Incremental Budget to cover the extension period only. The Incremental Budget is aggregated with the Baseline Budget and any previously approved Incremental Budgets in the Global Fund's systems to show the Total IP Budget. The Total IP Budget is formalized at summary level as part of the Implementation Letter.
- vi. **Length.** Unless approved by the Global Fund Board, an End-date Revision cannot extend the current IP of the grant for more than 12 months. This length of the extension is cumulative of all extensions approved for each grant (e.g., those extensions already approved and signed, as applicable, plus the extension request).²⁵

17. Key considerations for shortening IPs

- i. **Shortening the AUP.** Shortening the IP of a grant generally results in shortening the AUP. If the AUP is shorter than what is communicated in the Allocation Letter, the allocation funding for the grant is proportionately reduced.
- ii. **Budget Changes.** PRs prepare and submit an Incremental Budget related to the reduced implementation period only. The Incremental Budget is aggregated with the Baseline Budget and any

²⁰ In this case, the extension is financed through grant savings.

²¹ As defined in the Performance Framework and Detailed Budget.

²² For example, if the country component is facing a subsequent allocation that is significantly smaller than the current one, targets for certain interventions can be adjusted downward to reflect the new funding reality. Such decisions require a consultation with the CT and relevant Technical Advice and Partnership (TAP) disease advisor.

²³ This is particularly important when it is known that specific activities are unlikely to continue in the new IP due to the amount of the new allocation (e.g., if the amount is reduced).

²⁴ The CT may consult with TAP to determine whether a change in targets and activities during the extension period requires TRP review (for further information on the scenarios where TAP might be consulted, refer to the [Operational Procedures on Revise Grants](#)).

²⁵ For example, if a grant is approved by a Department Head for a six-month extension (assuming sufficient uncommitted funds from current IP are available to finance the extension budget) of the new allocation amount for the relevant disease component, and then the country requests an additional two month extension (assuming sufficient uncommitted funds, as well), the second extension is subject to an elevated approval authority and must be approved by the GAC as it will cumulatively be an eight-month extension.

previously approved Incremental Budgets in the Global Fund's systems to establish the Total IP Budget. The Total IP Budget is formalized at summary level as part of the Implementation Letter.

18. **Documents.** The table in Annex 1 provides the required documents for an End-date Revision.

Review and approve End-date Revision

19. **Review.** The CT reviews the End-date Revision request and documents with the support of the LFA and other Secretariat teams as necessary. The scope of the LFA review is to be agreed between the CT and the LFA, on a case-by-case basis.

20. For all extensions, the CT consults and informs the Access to Funding Department for tracking and reporting of extensions to the Board.

Approval Authority

21. **Extending the IP.** The amount of uncommitted funds from the current IP, and whether these are sufficient or not to cover the budget for the extension period, defines the two scenarios used to **determine the approval authority for extensions**. Annex 2 provides an illustration of the two scenarios. All extensions are funded from the next AUP.²⁶

i. **Scenario 1:** If the estimated uncommitted funds²⁷ as of the IP end-date are **sufficient** to fully cover the budget for the extension period,²⁸ the relevant approval authority is determined based on the duration of the extension period (e.g., how long the current IP end-date will be extended, on a cumulative basis)

Cumulative Extension Period	Approval Authority
Up to 3 months	Fund Portfolio Manager (FPM) ²⁹ (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>); and Finance Specialist (and Portfolio Services Team (PST) for Focused) (<i>changes to the Incremental Budget</i>)
More than 3 up to 6 months	Regional Manager or Department Head (for High Impact ³⁰) (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>); and Grant Finance Manager (<i>changes to the Incremental Budget</i>)
More than 6 up to 12 months	GAC
More than 12 months	Board (with GAC recommendation)

ii. **Scenario 2:** If the estimated uncommitted funds as of the IP end-date are **insufficient** to fully cover the budget for the extension period,³¹ the relevant approval authority is determined based on the cumulative duration of the extension period and the cumulative amount of additional funding³² needed for the extension period.

Cumulative Extension Period	Cumulative Amount of Additional Funding Needed for Extension Period	Approval Authority
-----------------------------	---	--------------------

²⁶ Unless there is not a subsequent allocation.

²⁷ Refers to any unutilized in-country cash, undisbursed funds from existing Annual Funding Decision (AFD), and "signed but not committed" funds.

²⁸ Formerly "non-costed extension". These criteria apply unless otherwise approved by the Board([GF/B31/DP12](#)).

²⁹ For portfolios with Disease Fund Managers (DFMs), the Senior FPM approves based on the recommendations of the DFM.

³⁰ This refers to portfolios/grants in High Impact Departments.

³¹ Formerly "costed extension".

³² According to Board-approved [extension policy \(GF/B31/DP12\)](#), the GAC is authorized to approve Scenario 2 Extensions as long as the amount of additional funding required (the funding required for the extension period minus the unutilized funds approved by the Board for the current IP) does not exceed USD 10 million and is not equivalent to more than 6 months of additional funding. Refer to Annex 3 on how to calculate the equivalent months of additional funding and to the calculator for further guidance on determining the approval authority for Scenario 2 extensions.

Up to 12 months	Up to US\$10 million and up to the equivalent of 6 months of additional funding.	GAC
	More than US\$10 million or more than the equivalent of 6 months of additional funding.	Board (with GAC recommendation)
More than 12 months	N/A	

iii. **Transitioning Grants.** Any End-date Revision processed for a grant transitioning from Global Fund financing must be approved by the GAC, regardless of the length of the extension period³³.

22. **Shortening the IP.** The approval authority for IP reductions is determined by the consequent impact on the AUP³⁴.

Scenario	Approval Authority
Shortening the IP without changing the AUP	Regional Manager / Department Head (for High-Impact) (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>); and Grant Finance Manager (<i>changes to the Incremental Budget</i>)
Shortening the IP with changes to the AUP	GAC recommendation and Board approval at time of Grant-making of the subsequent grant

Additionally, compliance with the relevant approval authorities set out in Section 3 below is also required if the End-date Revision to shorten the IP is accompanied by a Programmatic Revision that requires TRP review per the scenarios defined in Section 3.

Formalize End-date Revision

23. **Implementation Letter.** Once approved, the End-date Revision is reflected in the Grant Agreement through an Implementation Letter. The Implementation Letter is signed by the PR and the Global Fund (in accordance with the Delegations of Signature Authority). For IP reductions, the issuance of a Notification Letter from the Global Fund to the PR is sufficient if it is issued in accordance with the terms of the Grant Agreement. The CT consults with CT Legal Counsel to determine whether a Notification Letter can be issued instead of an Implementation Letter to formalize the IP reduction as well as timing of issuance of the Notification Letter if the funding is being transferred to another grant. Refer to Annex 1 to for the grant documents required to accompany the Implementation Letter.

24. For End-date Revisions that require Board approval, the Implementation Letter is signed by the first Global Fund signatory as per the Delegations of Signature Authority and can be sent to and signed by the PR after GAC recommendation, contingent on Board approval (unless otherwise specified by GAC), provided this is clearly communicated in the Implementation Letter ahead of time. The Implementation Letter does not take effect until after Board approval of the End-date Revision and countersignature of the Implementation Letter by the second Global Fund signatory as per the Delegations of Signature Authority.

25. **Registration.** An End-date Revision is considered complete once the updated grant purchase order is approved and the revision is registered in the Global Fund systems.

³³ Reducing the IP that result in grant closure also requires compliance with the [OPN and Operational Procedures on IP Reconciliation and Grant Closure](#).

³⁴ Reducing the IP also requires compliance with the [OPN and Operational Procedures on IP Reconciliation and Grant Closure](#).

26. Notification to the Board and GAC: The GAC and Board are notified of all approved extensions through GAC Reports to the Board.

Section 2: Additional Funding Revision (or Funding Reduction / Transfer)

27. Definition. An Additional Funding Revision increases the Grant Funds for the relevant IP to account for new³⁵ resources made available to the grant, without amending the duration of the IP. Other adjustments to grant funds, including reductions and transfers, without amending the duration of the IP are also captured under this revision type.

28. Triggers. Additional funds can be made available at the aggregate portfolio level because of:

- a. Permitted restricted financial contributions by private donors or Debt to Health.
- b. The Portfolio Optimization process.³⁶
- c. Global Fund emergency response facilities such as the Emergency Fund,³⁷ the COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM),³⁸ or any other mechanism to respond to an emerging pandemic.

29. Funding reductions or transfers can be triggered by various reasons such as:³⁹

- a. Non-compliance with co-financing commitments.⁴⁰
- b. Failure of a PR to refund recoverable amounts.⁴¹
- c. Shifting activities and respective budgets from one grant / PR to another grant / PR.⁴²

30. The requirements below apply to additional funding due to e.g., private sector contributions, Debt to Health, and Portfolio Optimization and funding reductions / transfer scenarios. They do not apply to mechanisms that have separate review and approval processes (e.g., C19RM, Emergency Fund or other Strategic Initiatives (unless Strategic Initiative funding is being integrated into a grant derived from allocation funding)).

Prepare and submit Additional Funding Revision (or Funding Reduction / Transfer)

31. Initiators. An Additional Funding Revision (or Funding Reduction / Transfer) can be initiated by the PR or by the Global Fund through the CT. Additional funding revisions (or Funding Reduction / Transfer) require endorsement from the CCM.^{43,44} Endorsement must be provided by (i) the CCM Chair and (ii) the civil society representative if the CCM Chair is the representative of the Government, or the representative of the Government if the CCM Chair is the representative of civil society.

³⁵ Resources made available to the grant/PR through the transfer of activities and budgets from another grant/PR are not considered additional funding in that these are existing, previously approved funds that eventually pertain to the grant. Such cases are treated under the Funding Reduction / Transfer revision.

³⁶ See the Prioritization Framework for funds that become available for Portfolio Optimization and Financing Unfunded Quality Demand.

³⁷ See [Guidelines on Emergency Fund](#).

³⁸ See [C19RM Guidelines](#).

³⁹ Reductions in funding related to an IP reconciliation or grant closure follows the IP Reconciliation and Grant Closure process.

⁴⁰ See [OPN on Co-financing](#).

⁴¹ See OPN on Recovery of Grant Funds.

⁴² During a reallocation of activities and accompanying budget between PRs from the same program, the CT must ensure that (i) the PR(s) to whom the activities are reallocated has achieved satisfactory past performance and has relevant capacity to perform the activities; (ii) the proposed reallocation is aligned with the grant goals and objectives; and (iii) the proposed reallocation is consistent with the TRP recommendations for the program.

⁴³ Additional Funding Revisions triggered by private sector contributions, Debt to Health and Portfolio Optimization do not require additional CCM endorsement as the activities in the Unfunded Quality Demand (UQD) register to be financed through these mechanisms have been previously endorsed by the CCM. If proposed activities for financing are not on the UQD register, then the Prioritized Above Allocation Request (PAAR) update process needs to be followed before initiating the revision (See [OPN and Operational Procedures on Design and Review Funding Requests](#)).

⁴⁴ In the absence of a CCM or an alternative coordinating platform in the country, the CT must seek endorsement from the Regional Manager (or for High Impact departments, relevant Department Head), after consulting with the Manager of the Monitoring, Evaluation & Country Analysis (MECA) Team, the Head of the Technical Advice & Partnerships Team, and to the extent possible, in-country partners.

32. **Timing.** An Additional Funding Revision (or Funding Reduction / Transfer) can be proposed at any time during grant implementation and is expected to be completed a maximum three calendar months after initiation in the Global Fund systems.

33. Key considerations.

- i. **Targets and activities:** The PR and CT work to determine how to adjust the key programmatic activities and targets for the IP.⁴⁵ Typically, targets are either adjusted upward as part of an Additional Funding Revision, considering the additional resources provided, or downward as part of a Funding Reduction / Transfer. If, however, the PR and CT determine that a change in funding does not affect targets, a justification is required which is considered by the relevant approval authority as defined below.
- ii. **Budget Changes.** PRs prepare and submit an Incremental Budget to cover the additional funding or funding reduction/transfer only. The Incremental Budget is aggregated with the Baseline Budget and any previously approved Incremental Budgets in the Global Fund's systems to establish the Total IP Budget. The Total IP Budget is formalized at summary level as part of the Implementation Letter.

34. **Documents.** The table in Annex 1 provides the required documents for an Additional Funding Revision (or Funding Reduction / Transfer).

Review and approve Additional Funding Revision (or Funding Reduction / Transfer)

35. **Review.** The CT reviews the additional funding (or Funding Reduction / Transfer) revision request with the support from the LFA, as necessary. The scope of the LFA review is to be agreed between the CT and the LFA, on a case-by-case basis.

Approval Authority

36. **Additional Funding.** Additional Funding Revisions due to e.g., private sector contributions, Debt to Health and Portfolio Optimization are approved by the Global Fund Board with GAC recommendation. If the Additional Funding Revision is accompanied by a Programmatic Revision triggering TRP review (as detailed in Section 3 below):

- A TRP recommendation is required;
- GAC reviews the programmatic changes as part of the Additional Funding Revision and recommends to the Board for approval.

37. Additional funding finance TRP recommended prioritized activities under the Unfunded Quality Demand (UQD) [register](#). As a result, the CTs update the UQD register in the Global Fund systems⁴⁶ to deduct funds invested against TRP recommended interventions. If proposed activities for financing are not on the UQD register, then the Prioritized Above Allocation Request (PAAR) update process needs to be followed.⁴⁷

38. Funding channels with defined and separate approval processes and requirements (e.g., C19RM, Emergency Fund and other Strategic Initiatives (unless Strategic Initiative funding is being integrated into a grant derived from allocation funding)) are not subject to the approval authorities outlined above.

39. Board approval is not required where funding is moving between grants within the same disease / resilient and sustainable systems for health (RSSH) component and allocation period which have already been approved by the Board. The approval authority for the transfer of such funds is outlined in the table below.

⁴⁵ The CT may consult with TAP to determine whether a change in funding with impacts on targets and activities requires TRP review (for further information on the scenarios where TAP might be consulted, refer to the [Operational Procedures on Revise Grants](#)).

⁴⁶ See the UQD register user guidance.

⁴⁷ See [OPN and Operational Procedures on Design and Review Funding Requests](#).

40. Funding Reduction/Transfer. The below table defines the approval authority for cases of funding reduction resulting from: the transfer of activities and budget from one grant to another. This approval authority applies to grants transferring or receiving funds.

For other potential cases of reduced funding, the approval authorities are defined in the relevant operational policies.⁴⁸

Transfer Scenarios	Approval Authority
Transfer of activities and respective budget from one Board-approved grant to another within the same disease / RSSH component and allocation period.	Regional Manager/Department Head (for High-Impact ⁴⁹) (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>); and Grant Finance Manager (<i>changes to the Incremental Budget</i>). GAC and TRP recommendation may also be required if redistribution constitutes a Programmatic Revision requiring TRP review.
Transfer of activities and respective budget from one Board-approved grant to another grant across disease / RSSH components within the same allocation period.	Board (with GAC recommendation). TRP recommendation may also be required if redistribution constitutes a Programmatic Revision requiring TRP review.

Formalize Additional Funding Revision (or Funding Reduction / Transfer)

- 41. Implementation Letter.** Once approved, the Additional Funding Revision, or Funding Reduction / Transfer not initiated by the Global Fund, is captured through an Implementation Letter. The Implementation Letter is signed by the PR and the Global Fund (in accordance with the Delegations of Signature Authority Procedures). Refer to Annex 1 for the grant documents required to accompany the Implementation Letter.
- 42.** For additional funding revisions that require Board approval, the Implementation Letter is signed by the first Global Fund signatory as per the Delegations of Signature Authority by the PR after GAC recommendation, contingent on Board approval (unless otherwise specified by the GAC), provided this is clearly communicated in the Implementation Letter ahead of time. The Implementation Letter does not take effect until after Board approval and countersignature of the Implementation Letter.
- 43.** For Funding Reduction / Transfer revisions that are initiated by the Global Fund, the CT consults with CT Legal Counsel to determine whether a Notification Letter can be issued instead of an Implementation Letter to formalize the funding reduction as well as timing of issuance of the Notification Letter if the funding is being transferred to another grant.
- 44. Registration.** An Additional Funding Revision (or Funding Reduction / Transfer) is considered complete once the updated grant purchase order is approved and the revision is registered in the Global Fund systems.

Section 3: Programmatic Revisions

- 45. Definition.** A Programmatic Revision (formerly referred to as a “reprogramming” or “Program Revision”) refers to changes to the scope and/or scale of a grant within the already approved funding ceiling and

⁴⁸ See [OPN on Co-financing](#) and OPN on Recovery of Grant Funds.

⁴⁹ This refers to portfolios/grants in High Impact Departments.

current IP resulting in changes to the modules, interventions and/or targets in the Performance Framework.

i. Changing the **scope of a grant** results in:

- a. One or more goals and/or objectives being changed; and/or
- b. Interventions⁵⁰ being added or deleted (including those related to RSSH, Human Rights, and Gender Equality), either at grant level or at the disease (or RSSH) program level supported by the Global Fund.

ii. Changing the **scale of a grant** results in changes in targets for one or more indicators – either increasing or decreasing.

46. Triggers. There are different potential scenarios which can trigger a Programmatic Revision. These include, but are not limited to:

- i. The need to invest more strategically, e.g., in case of changes in the National Strategic Plan (NSP), epidemiological trends, new data from national surveys, program evaluations, etc.
- ii. Emerging scientific evidence or normative guidance.
- iii. Changes in the national context that result in non-compliance with co-financing commitments.⁵¹
- iv. Changes in implementation arrangements.
- v. The scale-up of effective interventions and innovative approaches, introduction of new health products and removal of health products
- vi. Risk mitigation purposes.
- vii. The need to advance transition planning, particularly if a country is nearing the end of its funding relationship with the Global Fund.
- viii. The need to accelerate the adoption of revised partner technical guidance to ensure patient safety and program efficacy.

Prepare and submit Programmatic Revision

47. Initiators. A Programmatic Revision can be initiated by the CCM, PR, or the CT. Programmatic Revisions require endorsement from the CCM⁵². Endorsement must be provided by (i) the CCM Chair and (ii) the civil society representative if the CCM Chair is the representative of the Government, or the representative of the Government if the CCM Chair is the representative of civil society. If the Programmatic Revision only incorporates activities in the UQD register previously endorsed by the CCM, an additional CCM endorsement for the revision is not required⁵³. In this case, the PR informs the CCM before processing a Programmatic Revision.

48. Timing. A Programmatic Revision can be proposed anytime during grant implementation if warranted by the programmatic context and needs to be completed maximum three calendar months after initiation.

49. Budget Changes. PRs use the Budget Adjustment Form to capture budget changes that form part of a Programmatic Revision. The Baseline, Incremental and the Total IP Budgets do not change.

50. Documents. The table in Annex 1 provides the required documents for Programmatic Revisions.

Review and approve Programmatic Revision

⁵⁰ For example, interventions within a defined epidemiological context, as confirmed by the relevant TAP disease advisor include interventions that are not adequately funded at present and/or interventions that meet one or more of the following criteria: i) address emerging threats to disease control, ii) lift barriers to the broader disease response and/or create conditions for improved service delivery; and/or iii) enable the roll-out of new technologies that represent best practice. See [Modular Framework Handbook](#).

⁵¹ See [OPN on Co-financing](#).

⁵² In the absence of a CCM or an alternative coordinating platform in the country, the CT must seek endorsement from the Regional Manager (or for High Impact departments, relevant Department Head), after consulting with the Manager of the Monitoring, Evaluation & Country Analysis (MECA) Team, the Head of the Technical Advice & Partnerships Team, and to the extent possible, in-country partners.

⁵³ If proposed activities are not on the UQD register, then the Prioritized Above Allocation Request (PAAR) update process needs to be followed before initiating the revision (See [OPN and Operational Procedures on Design and Review Funding Requests](#)).

51. Review. The CT reviews the Programmatic Revision request and documents with support from the LFA, as necessary. The scope of the LFA review is to be agreed between the CT and the LFA, on a case-by-case basis. The CT is required to consult with TAP advisors⁵⁴ for the following cases:

- i. Adding or deleting modules or interventions in the Performance Framework;
- ii. Increasing or decreasing targets for existing indicators and adding missing targets in the Performance Framework; and/or
- iii. Including activities into the grant that are reviewed and prioritized in the UQD register ⁵⁵.

The CT is accountable to confirm if the Programmatic Revision requires TRP review or not, based on guidance provided below.

52. Approval Authority. The approval process for Programmatic Revisions is differentiated based on whether the revision requires TRP review or not.

Scenario	Portfolio category	Approval Authority
Programmatic Revisions that do not require TRP review		
(1) Adding new modules and interventions into the grant to incorporate activities in the UQD register	High Impact and Core	Regional Manager or Department Head (for High Impact ⁵⁶) (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>)
	Focused	FPM based on PHME recommendations and, if required, technical review by HPM Specialist (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>);
(2) Increasing or decreasing targets for existing indicators and adding missing targets ⁵⁷ in the PF ⁵⁸ provided it does not result in a significant redesign or shift of balance of the originally approved funding request, which would otherwise trigger a TRP review (scenario 6c below).	High Impact and Core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CT: increase of up to 100% or reduction of up to 20% to the targets and adding missing targets; Regional Manager or Department Head (for High Impact⁵⁹) (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>): increase of more than 100% or reduction of more than 20% to targets
	Focused	FPM based on PHME recommendations and, if required, technical review by HPM Specialist (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>)
(3) Scaling-up existing interventions and innovative approaches, introducing of new health products and removing health products to incorporate activities in the	High Impact and Core	Regional Manager or Department Head (for High Impact ⁶⁰) (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>)

⁵⁴ The CT is required to attach evidence of such consultation in GOS (e.g. email exchanges).

⁵⁵ See [OPN on Design and Approve Funding Requests](#).

⁵⁶ This refers to portfolios/grants in High Impact Departments.

⁵⁷ Such as left as "to be determined" at the time of Grant-making (e.g. when baselines are not yet defined to specify targets)

⁵⁸ PRI team should be consulted when grant targets with implications on Global Fund Strategy targets and reporting are being revised.

⁵⁹ This refers to portfolios/grants in High Impact Departments.

⁶⁰ This refers to portfolios/grants in High Impact Departments.

Scenario	Portfolio category	Approval Authority
UQD register, provided it does not add or remove existing modules and interventions in the PF.	Focused	FPM based on PHME recommendations and, if required, technical review by HPM Specialist (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>)
Programmatic Revisions that <u>require</u> TRP review		
(4) Adding changes that contradict or are not part of the TRP's original or modified review and recommendation on the funding request or the latest UQD register (as updated during implementation). For example: a) a module or intervention not in the UQD register is added to the PF; b) a module or intervention originally removed following TRP recommendation is re-introduced into the grant; c) there is a significant redesign or shift of balance of originally approved funding request, i.e. a prevention component is shifting to treatment; sub-national tailoring analysis leads to a significantly different intervention mix (e.g. Indoor Residual Spraying vs. Insecticide Treated Nets) d) a module or intervention is removed from the PF without alternative funding in the country	High Impact and Core	Scenarios a) and b): • Regional Manager or Department Head (for High Impact ⁶¹) (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>); and Scenario c), d) GAC ⁶² , based on TRP recommendation
	Focused	Regional Manager or Department Head (for High Impact) (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>) Regional Manager or Department Head to decide if TRP technical inputs are needed.
(5) Adding new interventions for which there is lack of or lag in release of evidence or development of normative guidance. For such scenarios, the overarching approach will be reviewed by the TRP with individual requests reviewed and approved by the Secretariat based on the TRP recommendation.	High Impact and Core	GAC ⁶³ , based on TRP recommendation
	Focused	Regional Manager or Department Head (for High Impact ⁶⁴) (<i>end-to-end revision scope and changes</i>) Regional Manager or Department Head to decide if TRP technical inputs are needed.

53. If the Programmatic Revision is triggered by foreign exchange gains (after providing for the required contingency reserve), in addition to the approval authority defined above, the process defined in section 2.4 of Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#) needs to be followed.

Formalize Programmatic Revision

54. **Implementation Letter.** Once approved, a Programmatic Revision is reflected in the Grant Agreement through an Implementation Letter. The Implementation Letter is signed by the PR and the Global Fund (in accordance with the Delegations of Signature Authority). Refer to Annex 1 to for the grant documents required to accompany the Implementation Letter.

⁶¹ This refers to portfolios/grants in High Impact Departments.

⁶² GAC review and recommendation is sufficient (GAC approval not required) if the Programmatic Revision is processed together with an Additional Funding Revision. Refer to paragraph 34 above.

⁶³ GAC review and recommendation is sufficient (GAC approval not required) if the Programmatic Revision is processed together with an Additional Funding Revision. Refer to paragraph 34 above.

⁶⁴ This refers to Focused portfolios/grants in High Impact Departments.

55. For Programmatic Revisions that involve time sensitive changes to the PF with implications to the performance rating and results rating (such as increasing or decreasing targets or adding missing targets), a Notification Email can be issued to capture PR and Global Fund agreement on the PF changes and enable PF updates in the Global Fund system. The PF changes are formalized with an Implementation Letter at a later stage (together with other revisions, as applicable). It is the CT's responsibility to track these notification emails and integrate them in upcoming Implementation Letters.
56. **Registration.** A Programmatic Revision process is considered complete once the Notification Email or Implementation Letter is issued and the revision is registered in the Global Fund systems.

Section 4: Budget Revisions

57. **Definition:** Budget Revisions are a type of grant revision and refer to the reallocation of approved Grant Funds across modules, interventions or cost categories. They do not involve changes to approved Grant funding ceiling, or the duration of the relevant IP, or the Performance Framework.

Types of Budget Revisions

58. A Budget Revision is categorized as **material or non-material** depending on the percentage increase or decrease for the module, intervention or discretionary cost category in the approved Grant Budget, as detailed in Section 2.5.2 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#).
59. **Triggers:** A Budget Revision can take place periodically in the normal course of grant implementation to respond to grant context and circumstances (e.g., to reflect changes in administrative or operational costs, changes in unit costs of items being purchased or to allow for assurance activities like Health Facility Assessments or Data Quality Reviews). It can also be triggered by:
- Foreign exchange** gains and/or losses.
 - Cases of **transfer and/or disposal of program assets** during the IP.⁶⁵

Prepare and submit Budget Revision

60. **Initiators:** A Budget Revision can be initiated by the PR or the CT. PRs need to inform the CCM of material Budget Revisions prior to submitting them for approval by the Global Fund.
61. **Timing.** A Budget Revision can be proposed any time during grant implementation.
62. **Budget Changes.** PRs use the Budget Adjustment Form to capture at the summary level material or non-material budget changes that form part of the Budget Revision. The budget adjustment can be done any time by the PR and/or CT as per mutual understanding and agreement. The Baseline, Incremental and the Total IP Budgets do not change.
63. **Documents.** The table in Annex 1 provides the required documents for material Budget Revisions.⁶⁶

Review and approve Budget Revision

64. The review and approval process for Budget Revisions depends on the materiality of the budget changes⁶⁷.
65. For further guidance, please refer to Sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#).

Approval Authority

⁶⁵ See the Interim Guidance on the Transfer and/or Disposal of Program Assets during the Implementation Period.

⁶⁶ For non-material Budget Revisions, no submission is required. See the Operational Procedures on Revise Grants.

⁶⁷ Refer to Section 2.5.2 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#).

66. Approval authorities for Budget Revisions are defined in Section 2.5.2 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#)⁶⁸ and Section 6 of the Guidelines for Grant Budgeting – Global Fund Approvals and Managing Exceptions.
67. There are specific circumstances where CT approval can be required even if the revision is deemed “non-material” (e.g., any increase in salary or incentives above those already planned in the budget to staff / agents working for the Global Fund). For further information, please refer to Section 2.5.3 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#) and Section 6 of the Guidelines for Grant Budgeting – Global Fund Approvals and Managing Exceptions.
68. If a Budget Revision is triggered by foreign exchange rate gains (after providing for the required contingency reserve), in addition to the approval authority defined in Section 2.5.2 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#), please follow the process defined in Section 2.4 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#) and Section 4 of the Guidelines for Grant Budgeting – Global Fund Approvals and Managing Exceptions.

Formalize Budget Revision

69. A Budget Revision does not require the issuance of an Implementation Letter.
70. The PR is responsible for properly documenting and maintaining their internal approval and the Global Fund written approval for audit purposes. It is required that the PR and other implementers consistently maintain and update their internal operational budget for internal budget management and monitoring of their programs.

Section 5: Administrative Revisions

71. **Definition.** An Administrative Revision captures changes to the grant that are purely of an administrative nature or require specific modifications to Grant Entity Data contained in a Grant Agreement and/or grant requirements.
72. **Triggers.** An Administrative Revision can take place periodically in the normal course of grant implementation and can be triggered by (among other reasons):
- i. **Changes to Grant Entity Data** contained in a Grant Agreement, specifically:
 - a) Change in PR organizational representative for notices⁶⁹.
 - b) Change in PR or LFA organization information, such as change in the organization’s official name, address, etc.⁷⁰
 - ii. **Administrative changes to the Performance Framework** which do not change the targets, such as to:
 - a) Revise the reporting schedule,
 - b) Update or add a missing source of data,
 - c) Correct/clarify custom indicator names, comments fields, cumulation type without any changes to targets,
 - d) Realign the targets according to the cumulation type, geographic coverage or scope of targets,
 - e) Align indicators and targets with measurement guidance and standard indicator definitions, and to ensure internal consistency across indicators.
 - iii. **Changes to existing grant requirements** or introduction of new ones in the Grant Agreement (i.e., for example conditions for transfer of program assets⁷¹).⁷²

⁶⁸ Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Global Fund and PR pursuant to section 2.5.3 of the Global Fund [Guidelines for Grant Budgeting](#).

⁶⁹ See the [OPN on Grant Entity Data](#).

⁷⁰ See the [OPN on Grant Entity Data](#).

⁷¹ See the Interim Guidance on the Transfer and/or Disposal of Program Assets during the Implementation Period.

⁷² See the [OPN on Oversee Implementation and Monitor Performance](#).

- iv. **Administrative adjustments to Grant Funds:**
 - a) Deduct for new IPs the final and validated in-country cash balance from the closing IP⁷³;
 - b) To carry over the cash from the previous IP extension disbursement⁷⁴; or
 - c) To deduct Grant Funds relating to Debt to Health, or other private sector contribution mechanisms, to allow for the transfer of such funds from one allocation period to the next⁷⁵.
- v. **Administrative changes to the Baseline Budget** such as:
 - a) To change the Sub-recipients (SRs) names in the Baseline Budget in cases where SRs were not identified during Grant-making or when there is a change in the official name of SRs during implementation.
 - b) To correct any error or omission in the descriptive information of the Baseline Budget.

Administrative changes to the Baseline Budget are allowed if:

- c) They do not change the Baseline Budget amounts at module, intervention, cost input and/or implementer level;
- d) They do not change the Baseline Budget by replacing budget amounts with actual expenditures from past periods; and
- e) They affect more than 10%⁷⁶ of the Total IP budget.

Prepare and submit Administrative Revision

73. Initiators. An Administrative Revision can be initiated by the PR, or the CT.

74. Timing. An Administrative Revision can be proposed at any time during grant implementation and is expected to be completed as follows:

- i. *Administrative changes to the Performance Framework or Baseline Budget:* within **three** calendar months after initiation in the Global Fund systems or other applicable timelines if combined with other types of grant revision;
- ii. *All other Administrative Revisions:* within **two** calendar months after initiation or other applicable timelines if combined with other types of grant revision.

75. Documents. The table in Annex 1 provides the required documents to be submitted for Administrative Revisions.

Review and approve Administrative Revision

76. Review. The CT reviews the Administrative Revision request and documents with support from the LFA, as necessary. The scope of the LFA review is to be agreed between the CT and the LFA, on a case-by-case basis.

Approval Authority:

Scenario	Approval Authority
----------	--------------------

⁷³ See [Operational Procedures on IP Reconciliation and Grant Closure](#).

⁷⁴ Cash from extension refers to cash that has been disbursed but not expensed during the extension period.

⁷⁵ During the transfer, the CT must ensure that the proposed reallocation of funds and activities is consistent with the TRP recommendations for the program provided during the funding request in the applicable allocation period and that funds are not being moved across any disease/RSSH components. If this is not the case, CTs are required to follow the Additional Funding and/or Funding Reduction/Transfer Revisions and/or Programmatic Revision process instead, CTs are required to consult with the Treasury & Financial Transactions Team (and Legal Counsel in the Legal Institutional Team where needed) regarding compliance with Global Fund policies, including the [Amended and Restated Comprehensive Funding Policy](#). Furthermore, the approval authority defined above applies to the grant transferring funds. The grant receiving funds through Debt to Health f, or private sector contribution mechanisms, follows the Additional Funding Revision process and approving authority described above.

⁷⁶ If less than 10% of the total IP budget is impacted (for example, errors relate to less than 10% of the budget, SR is implementing less than 10% of the budget), CTs and PRs wait until the >10% threshold is reached to initiate administrative changes to the Baseline Budget.

Administrative Revisions triggered by changes to existing grant requirements or introduction of new grant requirements in the Grant Agreement	Global Fund defined authority (FPM or Regional Manager/Department Head or Head, GMD) depending on scope of changes. See OPN on Oversee Implementation and Monitor Performance - Management of Exception section
Administrative changes to the Baseline Budget	Grant Finance Manager (based on recommendations from FPM and Finance /PST Specialist)
All other Administrative Revisions	FPM ⁷⁷ (based on recommendations from CT members)

Formalize Administrative Revision

77. **Implementation Letter.** Once approved, an Administrative Revision must be reflected in the Grant Agreement, by issuing an Implementation Letter. The Implementation Letter is signed by the PR and the Global Fund (in accordance with the Delegations of Signature Authority Procedures).
78. For most Administrative Revisions, the changes do not need to be reflected immediately in the Grant Agreement, and therefore do not require the immediate issuance of an Implementation Letter. Unless the proposed change must take effect within a particular timeframe (e.g., owing to PU/DR reporting and/or application of a particular grant requirement), it is recommended to wait until an Implementation Letter is required for another type of grant revision (e.g., a programmatic or Additional Funding Revision) when the Administrative Revision can be included in that Implementation Letter. This approach reduces the need for CTs to issue multiple Implementation Letters. It is the PR's and CT's responsibility to track any Administrative Revisions and ensure that those that do not require an immediate issuance of an Implementation Letter are included in the next Implementation Letter.⁷⁸
79. Administrative changes to the Performance Framework can be immediately captured in the Global Fund systems and become effective following issuance of a Notification Email and can be later formalized through an Implementation Letter.
80. **Registration.** An Administrative Revision is considered complete once the Notification Email or Implementation Letter is issued and the revision is registered in the Global Fund systems.

Specific Multicountry Considerations

81. Multicountry grants refer to:
- Grants financed through pooled country allocations (e.g., Multicountry Western Pacific and Multicountry Caribbean);
 - Regional grants financed solely through the Catalytic Investments – Multicountry Modality; and
 - Regional grants financed through a combination of pooled country allocations and Catalytic Investments.
82. Multicountry grants generally follow the same requirements set out in this OPN, with the following specific considerations:
- For multicountry grants, reference to the term CCM includes Regional Organizations (RO) Regional Coordinating Mechanisms (RCM) and CCM representatives of all countries included within the grant (in all cases, if applicable).
 - The legal and political considerations and logistics of cross-border implementation are considered when tailoring LFA-services.

⁷⁷ For portfolios with Disease Fund Managers (DFMs) the submission is done by the DFM and approved by the Senior FPM.

⁷⁸ The CT consults with the CT Legal Counsel regarding timing of issuance and contents of the Implementation Letter.

Annex 1. Requirements Levels by Revision Type and Portfolio Category

Grant Deliverable	End-date and Additional Funding & Funding Reduction / Transfer					Programmatic					Budget					Administrative				
	HI / Core	Focused				HI / Core	Focused				HI / Core	Focused				HI / Core	Focused			
		A	T	Li	Le		A	T	Li	Le		A	T	Li	Le		A	T	Li	Le
Prepare and Submit																				
CCM endorsement ⁷⁹	R ^{80, 81}					R ⁸²					- ⁸³					-				
Grant Revision Review Form ⁸⁴	R ⁸⁵					R					-					-				
Revised Performance Framework	R ⁸⁶					R					-					R ⁸⁷				
Updated Baseline Budget	-					-					-					R ⁸⁸				
Incremental Budget	R					-					-					-				
Budget Adjustment Form	-					R					R ⁸⁹					-				
Revised HPMT (if health products are being updated)	R	-				R	-				R	-				-				
Updated UQD register in Global Fund systems ⁹⁰	R ⁹¹					-					-					-				
Review and Approve																				
LFA review and recommendations	BP																			
CT review and recommendations	R																			
Review and approval by defined authorities	R																			

⁷⁹ Captured through a letter, email or other form of written documentation.

⁸⁰ Additional Funding Revisions triggered by Portfolio Optimization do not require CCM endorsement as the UQD has been previously endorsed by CCM.

⁸¹ Not required for Global Fund-initiated Funding Reduction / Transfer revisions.

⁸² If the Programmatic Revision only incorporates activities in the UQD Register previously endorsed by the CCM, an additional CCM endorsement for the revision is not required. In this case, the PR informs the CCM before processing a Programmatic Revision.

⁸³ PRs are expected to inform the CCM of material Budget Revisions prior to submitting them for approval by the Global Fund. This can be done through a letter, email or other form of written communication.

⁸⁴ Refer to the Grant Revision Review Form and Instructions

⁸⁵ Not required for Global Fund-initiated Funding Reduction / Transfer revisions.

⁸⁶ If targets are being updated.

⁸⁷ Only applicable to Administrative Revisions triggered by administrative changes to Performance Framework.

⁸⁸ Only applicable to Administrative Revisions triggered by administrative changes to Baseline Budget.

⁸⁹ Required for Material Budget Revisions, Best Practice for Non-material Budget Revisions.

⁹⁰ See the UQD register user guidance.

⁹¹ Only required for Additional Funding Revisions.

Grant Deliverable	End-date and Additional Funding & Funding Reduction / Transfer					Programmatic					Budget					Administrative				
	HI / Core	Focused				HI / Core	Focused				HI / Core	Focused				HI / Core	Focused			
		A	T	Li	Le		A	T	Li	Le		A	T	Li	Le		A	T	Li	Le
Grant Signing Calculator	R ⁹²					-					-					R ⁹³				
Formalize																				
Revised Grant Confirmation Table ⁹⁴	R					-					-					R ⁹⁵				
Implementation Letter (IL), including: -Amended Grant Confirmation Table, if applicable -Updated Total IP Budget or Baseline Budget , if applicable -Revised Performance Framework, if applicable	R ⁹⁶ , ⁹⁷					R					-					R				

Level of requirements:

R Required
BP Best Practice
- Not required

⁹² Not required if extensions are fully funded from uncommitted funds from the current IP.

⁹³ Only applicable to Administrative Revisions triggered by administrative changes to the Grant Funds.

⁹⁴ The amended Grant Confirmation Table must include the updated Grant Purchase Order amount, as validated by the Finance or PST Specialist (Focused).


⁹⁵ Only applicable to Administrative Revisions triggered by changes to Grant Entity Data that impact the contents of the Grant Confirmation Table.

⁹⁶ For IP shortenings, a Notification Letter from the Global Fund is sufficient if issued in accordance with the terms of the Grant Agreement. Please consult with CT Legal Counsel.


⁹⁷ For Global Fund-initiated Funding Reduction / Transfer revisions, the CT consults with CT Legal Counsel to determine whether a Notification Letter can be issued instead of an Implementation Letter.

Annex 2. Illustration of Extension Scenarios

Scenario 1: Uncommitted funds as of the IP end-date are sufficient to fully cover the extension period budget



Scenario 2: Uncommitted funds as of the IP end-date are insufficient to fully cover the extension period budget



Annex 3. Equivalent Months of Additional Funding – Calculation

