

8. Fair Share Info Gathering Process

Increasingly, global health advocates have sought to publicize the “fair share” contribution each donor government should provide toward financing a response to a particular disease. In doing so, they have required four sets of information:

1. What is the current baseline spending by each donor?
2. What is the annual total resource need globally?
3. What is the most reasonable equation for dividing this need among donors?
4. What is the resource gap for each donor?

The first calculation – establishing current baseline spending by donors – has proven to be the most problematic to obtain, yet the most essential. If advocates are unable to establish a baseline, their calls for “doubling” it may as well be shouts into the wind.

Typically, many donor agencies lump health spending together into general categories, making it difficult to disaggregate expenditures by specific diseases or interventions. For example, the UK does not publicly disaggregate its funding for TB, as it is mostly given as country budget support and left for the recipient country to decide how it is to be spent.

The ACTION project has come to view the hard work of obtaining baseline figures as an opportunity rather than as a constraint for several reasons. It has discovered that the **process** of securing these numbers can be just as useful of an advocacy tool as ultimately establishing credible fair share numbers.

- By investigating the process of how funding is allocated and approved, one can learn more about who ultimately makes decisions within a donor agency and how to better strategize to leverage more resources.

- Merely asking for the data about TB results in donor governments taking note of the disease.

- In the US, ACTION engaged Members of Congress to make formal requests for TB spending data. Getting Members to take this action helped turn them into allies/champions on the issue and informed them of the often non-transparent and unaccountable nature of development funding.

Tips & Suggestions

1. Don't be deterred by challenges faced in obtaining data. Make use of new opportunities that continue to arise that highlight the importance of obtaining the requested information.
2. Be aware of new laws that may make retrieving information easier (e.g. the new UK Freedom of Information Act).
3. When working on fair shares, share methodologies with other health advocates in your country and try to build a country-wide consensus. This will help build greater support for advocacy tools when they are produced.
4. Make the exact calculations used for determining fair shares publicly available, either on the report card or accompanying document itself, or via a link to your website.

Example of Calculations of "Fair Share" Numbers

Donor Countries Fair Share of the Global TB Need (all amounts are in US\$ millions)

Country	Funding Baseline (FY03/04)	Fair Share of Global need (%)	Annual Funding Target (FY06 thru FY07)		
			R&D	DOTS Expansion, DOTS-Plus, TB/HIV	Total Annual Funding Target
Canada	34.34	2.82	28.2	42.3	71
Japan	26.56	14.81	148	222	370
UK	30.37	6.29	63	94	157
US	163.73	37.90	379	569	948
Total	255.00	61.82	618	927	1546



The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria

DONOR REPORT CARD

Meeting the MDG for AIDS, TB and Malaria

The Global Fund (GF) estimates that in order to reach universal access to HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care by 2010 and achieve the MDG for AIDS, TB and malaria by 2015, it will need up to US\$11 billion per year by 2010 - over a five-fold increase from current spending. This assumes a steady scaling up of resources starting with US\$3 billion in 2006, US\$5 billion in 2007 and US\$7, 9 and 11 billion for 2008, 2009 and 2010 respectively. US\$ 11 billion is the GF's share of the total annual resource needs of US\$23 billion for HIV/AIDS, US\$4.5 billion for TB and US\$3.7 billion for malaria by 2010. Significant scale-up in GF resources will need to be financed primarily by donor countries. This report card grades major donor countries based on their current pledges for 2006 and 2007 compared to their corresponding fair shares.

Although the G8 has pledged its full support for the Global Fund in recent years, G8 countries continue to short-change this critically important funding mechanism, threatening the lives of millions who depend on it.

	2006	2007	
 CANADA	A	C	Canada's move to frontload its full 2006 and 2007 pledge in 2006 is helping to fill critical gaps for the GF; however, to reach its fair share and earn an A grade in 2007, Canada will need to pledge an additional CDN\$60 million (~US\$53 million).
 FRANCE	A+	A+	France is the only G8 country to pledge more than its fair share for both 2006 and 2007.
 GERMANY	F	F	Germany receives failing grades for pledging a mere 46% of its fair share for 2006 and 37% for 2007.
 ITALY	N	N	Despite pledging more than its fair share for 2006 and almost 100% for 2007, Italy earns an N for its distinction as the only G8 country to default on its 2005 pledge. Italy has yet to contribute US\$25 million to fulfill its pledge for 2005.
 JAPAN	F	F	Although Japan is the world's second largest economy, it has failed to demonstrate leadership concerning the GF. Japan pledged only 39% of its fair share for 2006 and 0% so far for 2007, and has yet to fulfill its US\$500 million pledge made in 2005.
 UK	C	C	While the UK took a key leadership role in 2005 by moving US\$70 million from its 2006 pledge to cover the gap for Round 5, this leaves the UK's pledges for 2006 and 2007 approximately 25% below its fair share.
 US	C	F	The Bush Administration has earned a failing grade for its 2007 pledge, but Congress deserves high marks for pushing up funding for 2006 and for potentially increasing funding for 2007.
 EC	D	F	The EC has yet to prove itself as a key contributor to the GF fulfilling just over 50% of its 2006 fair share and failing to pledge a single euro for 2007.

This report card was funded by RESULTS Educational Fund and supported by:
 RESULTS International • Health GAP • Global AIDS Alliance • Global Health Advocates •
 Advocates for Youth • Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance • Project RING • Japan AIDS & Society Association