Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s influenced the policy agenda (n=114), provided useful advice (n=61), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=36). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Nigeria (7%, 1527.6)
2. Tanzania (6%, 1323.5)
3. India (5%, 1072)
4. Rwanda (5%, 964.4)
5. Ethiopia (4%, 869.5)
6. DRC (3%, 717.6)
7. China (3%, 664.8)
8. Zambia (3%, 640.7)
9. South Africa (3%, 552.3)
10. Zimbabwe (2%, 529)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria's Development Finance, 2004-2013

(millions of USD)

In which countries is the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria performing the best?

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.7 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s agenda-setting influence, 0.7 above the average country.

**Provides useful advice***

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.9 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

**Helpful in implementation**

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.7 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The Global Fund to Fight AIDs, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

**Policy Domain**
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

**Agenda-setting influence**
- 0 = no influence at all
- 5 = maximum influence

**Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

*The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
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