

45th TERG Meeting Report

September 2021 (2, 3, & 14)

Objectives of the 45th TERG Meeting

1. To review and discuss current status of the Strategy Framework, M&E Framework and KPI developments;
2. To discuss and agree on the TERG position on the PCE evaluation and the TERG view on country-based evaluation platforms;
3. To discuss and finalize the joint TERG position paper Strategic Initiatives (SIs) and Multi-Country Grants (MCGs) and a viewpoint paper on partnership;
4. To agree on the TERG comments on global health security (GHS) review;
5. To provide an update on progress with the other 2021 TERG evaluations; and
6. To discuss and agree on the TERG 2022 work plan and second phase of TERG request for funding for 2022-2023 under the Strategic Initiative allocation for independent evaluation.

Meeting Outcomes

- The TERG requested that critical areas raised on the independent evaluation function to be further clarified and addressed.
- The TERG agreed on the preliminary TERG workplan for 2022 and to scope out the modality of country-based evaluation platforms for developing the Phase 2 Independent Evaluation Strategic Initiative Investment Proposal.
- The TERG provided guidance on areas that needed to be further strengthened on the GHS review noting that the evidence from this evaluation feeds into implementation considerations for the next Global Fund strategy.
- The TERG agreed on the use of a joint position paper for the Strategic Initiatives (SIs) and Multi-Country Grants (MCGs) evaluations.
- The TERG evaluations on Covid-19 response mechanism (C19RM), TB prevention and wambo.org pilot were discussed and TERG members were satisfied with progress to date.
- TERG members were satisfied with the insights and analysis on the Partnership model viewpoint, although some areas in the “review” needed to be improved.

Next steps

- Preparation and submission of the documents for the Strategy Committee (SC) to the Governance and Legal department on the week of September 13.
- Finalization of the Resilient and Sustainable System for Health (RSSH) compilation and TERG viewpoint on partnership model.
- Submission of first draft report on the Wambo.org pilot review in early October as well as launch of the RFP on the TB prevention evaluation in October 2021.
- Development of the Phase 2 Independent Evaluation Strategic Initiative Investment proposal for comment by the TERG in October and for submission to the SC in November 2021.

Session 1: Introductory remarks and declaration of conflicts of interests

Cindy Carlson

The TERG Chair welcomed everyone to the 45th TERG meeting and thanked participants for their preparations in advance of the meeting. Before introducing key objectives of the meeting and adoption of the agenda, a potential conflict of interest issue from the Gavi ex-officio was disclosed and clarified.

Update on Strategy Framework

The Head of the Strategy and Policy Hub (SPH) provided an update on the strategy framework agreed by the Board's Strategy Committee (SC), highlighting changes in the framework as well as continuity from the last strategy. The new strategy framework drew on the TERG's Strategic review (SR) 2020. Continuity in the new strategy includes the primary objective of ending HIV, TB and Malaria epidemics, and ways of working, i.e., the business model although with some improvements. The main areas of change in the new strategy include:

- Intensified focus on prevention;
- People centered and integrated services;
- Systematic approach to communities;
- Continued focus on human rights and gender (HRG) expanded to equity;
- Accelerated pace of implementation;
- Fast and equitable deployment of innovation;
- Better data-based decision making;
- Explicit role of pandemic preparedness and response (PPR) (evolving objective); and
- Increased clarity on partnership enablers (roles and accountability).

The next steps include further refinement and finalization of the strategy narrative and implementation planning.

In the discussions, TERG members noted the need for better delineation of RSSH and community, rights and gender (CRG) objectives, absence or little discussion of sustainability which was such a strong focus for the current Strategy, no mention of developing theories of change (TOC) for RSSH or other areas and CRG performance measurement. Other points included practicality of integrating key and vulnerable populations (KVP) into services, as well as where PPR fits in the strategy framework. In response the head of SPH highlighted the following;

- PPR was in the strategy framework as an evolving objective, and it should be integrated into the primary goal of the Global Fund though requiring additional funds;
- Countries will need to decide how to integrate KVP into services;
- The Secretariat is working on the TOC as part of the M&E Framework;
- Sustainability is in the framework and hinges on the need to mobilize more domestic resources.

Update on Performance Measures

The manager, Key performance indicator (KPI) reporting at the Global Fund secretariat updated the TERG on the upcoming technical consultations to develop a comprehensive approach to measuring performance for the next Global Fund strategy. It was emphasized that these consultations would include a review of existing KPIs, and potentially develop new KPIs for the new strategy as well as

other types of performance measures. The approach to the consultation process, the number, range of participants (subject/core experts), and the timeframe for them ending mid-2022 were discussed.

The Secretariat highlighted the following points:

- The role of the TERG will be to validate the process, i.e., to give assurance to the Board that every step in the process was followed. This would involve consultation role in the actual substance of the process where the summary, findings and decisions from the workshops will be provided on a regular basis to the TERG as well as getting feedback from the TERG on the process. Also, the TERG should be able to provide their expert opinion on the final framework to the SC/Board, and independent view in parallel to the Board/SC.
- The experts were identified from a diverse group with a two-step process, i.e., from the Board constituencies, global and regional organizations, internal Global Fund staff, and situation rooms. Additionally, external experts' suggestions of other experts as well as implementers, CSOs, donor and field experts to ensure consistency and adequate coverage.

Updates on Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework and independent evaluation function

The Chief of Staff gave an update on the independent evaluation function from the 16th SC meeting in July 2021 and acknowledged guidance from the SC M&E working group on the proposed model for independent evaluation. The key pain points from the 2019 TERG review and rationale for the independent evaluation function were outlined. An overview was presented of the proposed structure with the roles and responsibilities of the Independent Evaluation Panel and the Evaluation Unit (particularly of the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer (CELO)). The Evaluation Unit will be situated within the Office of the Executive Director, with technical oversight and quality assurance provided by an Independent Evaluation Panel (the “new TERG”). Also summarized was how the model will ensure safeguards to protect and promote evaluation independence and strengthen learning across the organization.

There were points of clarification raised on how the joint oversight of the Evaluation Unit will work in practice and on the IEPs role in the management and monitoring of recommendations as well as writing of position papers. Clarifications were requested on the interface and engagement of the MECA team with the Evaluation Unit. The TERG noted the necessity for more elaboration on the processes of hiring, reporting line and performance report of the CELO and the way hybrid evaluations will be managed.

In conclusion, the Secretariat noted these concerns and questions and will address them in advance of the SC meeting in October.

Executive Session (1)

Chair: Cindy Carlson and Helen Evans

TERG position on the external evaluation of PCE, focus on country level evaluation

The TERG discussed the draft position paper on the external evaluation of the PCE drafted by the PCE working group. Members provided some specific comments to strengthen one of the recommendations to the Secretariat regarding optimization of the use of operational research through grant funding. They also refined the position regarding the Evaluations' consideration for design of the future independent country evaluation, highlighting the importance of having an approach that allows understanding of how the Global Fund business model works at country level.

Day 2, Friday September 3

Session 2: Update on C19RM, Wambo.org, and GHS Review/Evaluations.
Ansah

Chair: Evelyn

Update on C19RM evaluation

Peter Barron

The C19RM Secretariat delivered an overview of C19RM approach, areas and size of support, process and timelines, priority areas and key pillars. The C19RM Secretariat indicated one of its roles is to review trends in procurement within the Global Drug Facility (GDF) to analyze laboratory diagnostic capacity. The C19RM Secretariat clarified there is considerable diversity across countries in relation to degree and kind of coordination and alignment between CCMs and COVID-19 response coordination mechanisms at country-level and described mechanisms and approaches deployed to promote better coordination and incentivize alignment. The C19RM Secretariat acknowledged some proposals have not been approved by the C19RM Investment Committee, because they are more appropriate for partner organizations (such as Gavi) and have been referred to partners. In discussion, the importance of coordinating the TERG evaluation with Gavi in relation to facilitating access to COVID-19 vaccines was emphasized.

The TERG Focal Point for the C19RM evaluation presented an update on the status and plans for the evaluation, including the key milestones, deliverables and deadlines for the evaluation process. This evaluation will be sequenced into three separate rounds, with separate bidding, contracting and implementation phases. In discussion, there was agreement that, given a significant component of the C19RM activities related to procurement of commodities, there should be more emphasis in evaluation questions on procurement activities, policies and approaches. It was agreed that this evaluation provides an opportunity to explore how different procurement approaches have contributed to improvements in efficiency and responsiveness. It was also observed that the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) is doing a parallel process of audit and analysis and given the importance of procurement for the OIG audit, it would be vital for evaluation suppliers to engage with the OIG. It was emphasized to leverage insights and ensure alignment across C19RM and global health security (GHS) evaluations. There was agreement that it is critical to map and coordinate across an assortment of COVID-19 related evaluations that are planned and ongoing within the broader ecosystem.

Update on evaluation of Wambo.org pilot

Beatriz Ayala-Ostrom

The TERG focal points for the wambo.org pilot evaluation described the evaluation process and deadlines. It was reiterated that the evaluation is focused on the pilot part of wambo.org and not the wambo.org platform: i.e., transactions permitted to PRs to access the wambo.org platform to purchase health products from the PPM portfolio using non-Global Fund grant funding and or domestic funding, up to a maximum of ten transactions as approved by the Board. Twelve countries were selected as evaluation case studies covering all geographical areas using specific criteria and methodological approach.

Update on Global Health Security (GHS) Review

The Session chair summarized the evolving context and high-level objectives of the GHS review. This review includes incorporating the evolving objective of pandemic preparedness and response (PPR) in the next strategy. The review consultant provided highlights of the pre-recorded presentation on the review, vis-a-vis the context, main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The TERG focal point re-emphasized the evolution of the review focus acknowledging the original intention had been for the review to inform the Board deliberations on its role in GHS in the next strategy. The review was conducted in parallel with the SC and Board deliberations, and eventually decisions regarding the new Strategic Framework. As a result, the review has been refocused on informing the strategy narrative and implementation considerations.

The TERG requested evidence on the strategic options for extend and extend plus, clarity on tradeoffs between PPR and HTM priorities, comparative analysis of major actors involved in PPR financing space, as well as the implications of the Global Fund playing a significant role in PPR considering mixed results in RSSH implementation. In response, the consultant clarified the drivers and context of the potential tradeoffs between PPR and HTM priorities and mitigation strategies. The reviewer noted that maturing RSSH capabilities were critical in achieving PPR objectives. It was clarified that a comparative analysis of major actors involved in PPR financing space was out of scope.

Executive session (2)

Chair: Helen Evans

GHS commentaries and TERG view on hybrid approach

In the discussions, an update on the evolution of work for the GHS review was provided in addition to the strengths, opportunities, implications and limitations of Global Fund's role in the PPR space. Further, pros and cons of the hybrid model as well as clarity on TERG's role in the hybrid model of evaluation were discussed. The next steps for timing for the report for the SC meeting in October were discussed.

Joint TERG position paper on SIs and MCGs evaluations

TERG members deliberated on this position paper and re-emphasized the merits of consolidating both position papers. Also discussed in detail was the TERG position on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of both final reports.

Feedback on evaluation of Wambo.org pilot inception report.

Concerns about consultants drawing too much from wambo.org platform were raised, and TERG focal points should steer the focus on the pilot part. An analysis of the “**why**” **adopted or not** by countries of wambo.org pilot, or alternative available procurement platforms, is key. Challenges of limited country/user uptake of the pilot are to be elucidated. Highlighting the missed opportunity of continued use of wambo.org for transitioning/transitioned countries and answering the *why not* is important. The limited uptake, limited transactions, and scope of the wambo.org pilot means that there may not be enough data points for a full evaluation, while a counterfactual analysis should provide enough respondents to answer the why of non-utilization of wambo.org pilot. The consultants are doing country case studies with non wambo.org pilot users to evaluate the existing barriers to the platform and preferences for other platforms. It was suggested that OIG advise stakeholders for the evaluation.

The need to assess the marketing efforts for the pilot was highlighted, including whether countries considered using wambo.org pilot to procure quality assured products at reasonable prices bearing in mind corruption challenges in many country procurement systems.

There were concerns on value for money (VFM) analysis and key and vulnerable populations (KVP) inclusion in this evaluation, which have been addressed by the addition of an evaluator with a health economics background to the team.

DAY 3, Tuesday September 14

Session 3: Update on TERG viewpoint on the Partnership model

Chair: George Gotsadze

After a brief introduction, the consultants listed the key takeaways from the partnership “viewpoint” on the technical partnerships, which consolidated findings from past TERG, the OIG, TRP, TAP and Secretariat reviews, audits, and evaluations, with limited interviews and benchmarking against Gavi and Global Financing Facility (GFF). Extracted learnings from the various documents showed that previous findings are still valid. Changes in context were factored in due to COVID-19 and its significant impact on the trajectory of the three diseases and the type of technical support required, i.e., highlighting the heightened need for RSSH, which has repeatedly been the weakest link for technical support.

Ten signposts (as opposed to recommendations) were drawn up for technical partnerships. The two key signposts are:

- Signpost 1: **Overarching imperative for resetting global technical support (TS) roles and responsibilities.** This signpost impacts many of the others. TS will be requested, designed, delivered, and monitored at country level, with improvements at country level being supported by actions at central level by key global partners via round table discussions on technical support. The aim is greater clarity on who funds what and who is best placed to deliver.
- Signpost 2: **Encourage better upfront coordination of technical support through a landscaping of needs, funders, and service providers.** This is considered as foundational signpost for the other 8 operational signposts in this partnership viewpoint. The consultative ‘**country dialogues**’ are a forum to shape funding requests including technical support, and to scope country technical support needs matching them to providers. The reviewers emphasized that country dialogues need to be country led for technical assistance. There were limited deliberate needs assessments of TS done by countries and partners. Landscape assessment of TS needs can come from roundtable discussions and during country dialogue thus encouraging transparency particularly for set asides in technical support provision.

Various details were discussed, e.g., the type of TS under discussion and the proposed frequency of possible technical support supplier roundtables. Concerns raised regarding signpost 2 included whether a CCM is an ideal forum for assessing TS needs for pandemic preparedness as well as for RSSH. This expansion may further complicate the provision and coordination of TS. Ministry of Health (MOH) and United Nations (UN) agencies are better able to articulate strategic TS needs especially in these areas whilst this might not be the case for CCMs. The TERG also discussed the necessity of linking/mapping the ten signposts of the viewpoint with the partnership engagement workplan by the Secretariat, which was considered a good initiative.

Executive session (3)

TERG discussion on partnership viewpoint

The TERG agreed that the Partnership Viewpoint was valuable despite the tight time frame that inhibited further analysis and validation of the consultant's viewpoints. This does not undermine the findings, which could benefit from more time with additional review of other partnership evaluations.

The movement towards greater use of local consultants, who thus know the contexts, for TS is highly appreciated, with the caveat that some degree of capacity development in technical support is needed in some countries. The Global Fund needs to have a six-year plan with set targets for performance measurement regarding institutional capacity building at regional and country level. Theory of Change (TOC) of outcomes from TS, as well as evaluations, would also be helpful, including for technical support funded by donors' set-asides funds. Additionally, suggestions on addressing structural problems in the flow of funding in contracting TS providers were discussed.

Executive session (4)

Cindy Carlson

Other 2021 evaluation calendar activities and the TERG Work Plan 2022, the Independent Evaluation Strategic Initiative phase 2 proposal for evaluation structures (including country-level evaluation).

The TERG discussed its Work Plan 2022 and proposed evaluation topics for the rest of 2021 and 2022. It was decided that a brief narrative of proposed reviews/evaluations be developed with justification, context, objectives and main questions, to be ready for the 17th SC meeting in October. The rationale for management of some of the reviews, i.e., using a TERG-led or hybrid approach, was also discussed.

The TERG discussed the design of the independent country-level evaluation, and concluded that, given the importance of this element, a scoping exercise was necessary in 2022. The idea will be to identify cross-country evaluation questions that will be of relevance to both global and more local audiences, and questions that are needed for understanding how the Global Fund business model is performing and affecting country institutions. A scoping exercise will also explore the different models on the table as to how this CLE work will be best managed. The TERG emphasized that this design should allow good ownership of the evaluation questions at country level and by the Secretariat. These points will be used to update the TERG investment case for the Independent Evaluation Strategic Initiatives (phase 2), for SC decision in December.

The TERG Chair closed the meeting with appreciation to everyone for their participation, particularly to the outgoing TRP vice chair, Billy Pick. The 46th and 47th TERG meetings were tentatively scheduled for the week of February 7th and third week of May or early June 2022, respectively.

Annex

45th TERG meeting participants TERG (September 2,3 & 14 2021)

TERG

Cindy Carlson
Helen Evans
Beatriz Ayala-Ostrom
Erin Eckert
Esther Saville
Daniel Whitaker
Evelyn Ansah
George Gotsadze
Godfrey Sikipa
Kenneth Castro
Kieran Daly
Luisa Frescura
Mari Nagai
Marie Laga
Peter Barron
Osamu Kunii

TERG Secretariat

Ryuichi Komatsu
John Puvimanasinghe
Jutta Hornig
Betty Brady
Sara La Tour
Sylvie Olifson
Marc Theuss
Uchenna Anderson Amaechi

Resource persons

Todd Summers
Joseph Chiu
Nina Schwalbe
Kate Macintyre

TRP

Billy Pick
Robin Gorna

Global Fund Secretariat

Marijke Wijnroks
Harley Feldbaum
Johannes Hunger
Abigail Moreland
Rhiannon James

Michael Olszak-Olszewski
Cynthia Mwase
Urban Weber
Estifanos Shargie
Kate Thomson
Geeda Haddad-Gregoire

Sandra Kuzmanovska
Lindsay Smith
Nathalie Zorzi
Cynthia Urusaro Imhof
David Lowrance
Jacqueline Bataringaya
Ketevan Bejanishvili
Marcela Rojo
Nicole Bustamante
Aude Arduini
Martin Auton
Chirag Rajpuria
Matthieu Courtois
Melisse Murray
Hui Yang
Lin Li
Matthew MacGregor
Bhushan Shrestha
Christine Perrier
Michael Njuguna
John Fairhurst

WHO

Clarisse Mason
Christophe Schmachtel

Review Consultants

Anthony Garai
Gill C Sivyer
Robert Hecht
Aishwarya Bhattacharya
Alexa Straus
Ruwan de Mel
Patrik Silborn
Juliann Moodley