

# **Approval of revised definitions, metric adjustments, and targets for KPIs**

## Electronic Report to the Board

GF/B46/ER08

### **Board Decision**

Purpose of the paper: To set out proposed revisions to Key Performance Indicators:

- To approve the target for KPI 6e (RSSH – Data Disaggregation)

## Decision

Based on the rationale described below, the following decision point is recommended to the Board.

**Decision Point: GF/B46/EDP08: Approval of the Revision for KPI 6e**

- a) *Based on the recommendation of the Strategy Committee, the Board approves the revision for Key Performance Indicator 6e as presented in GF/B46/ER08.*

*This decision has no budgetary implications.*

A summary of relevant past decisions providing context to the proposed Decision Point can be found in Annex 1.

# KPI 6e – Results Disaggregation

## Context

1. The Global Fund's 2017-2022 Strategic Key Performance Indicator Framework (the "Framework") is consistent with the Global Fund's 2017-2022 Strategy, *Investing to End Epidemics*, incorporating significant inputs from Board constituencies and technical partners. The Framework was approved by the Board via electronic decision point following the 35<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting (GF/B35/EDP05).<sup>1</sup>
2. The 2017-2022 Strategic Key Performance Indicator Targets (the "Targets") were approved by the Board through electronic decision point following the 36<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting (GF/B36/EDP09).<sup>2</sup> This followed a four-month consultation process with Board-nominated technical experts to review the appropriateness and ambition of each KPI Target.
3. The 2017-2022 Strategic Key Performance Indicator Framework approved several RSSH indicators – among those was an interim indicator and target on results disaggregation ("KPI 6e"). As approved by the Board (GF/B45/EDP01)<sup>3</sup> at the 45th Board meeting – a new indicator was developed to replace the interim indicator used in the first 3 years of the Strategy cycle. Instead of measuring the capacity of countries to report disaggregated results, the new indicator focuses on measuring the usage of disaggregated data in High Impact countries for all 3 diseases on specific tracer indicators.
4. While the initial KPI 6e showed strong performance, the revised indicator now measures actual usage of disaggregated data instead of only "availability". Therefore, a new baseline analysis was conducted and the corresponding KPI target is now proposed.
5. An in-country survey was developed and deployed in Q1 of 2021 to gather the first set of data for the new version of KPI 6e. This constitutes the basis for the baseline analysis.

## Questions this paper addresses

6. What is the proposed target for the revised version of KPI 6e?

## Conclusions

7. A revised end 2022 target of 80% for KPI 6e is proposed for Board approval.

## Input Sought

8. Decision Point: GF/B46/EDP08: Approval of the Revision for KPI 6e.

## Input Received

9. The proposed revision to KPI 6e is recommended by the Strategy Committee for Board approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b35-edp05/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b36-edp09/>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b45-edp01/>

## What is the need or opportunity?

10. This paper outlines a new target setting approach and numerical target for KPI 6e. This target is proposed as is required for all active KPIs in the current Strategic Performance Framework.
11. This target will focus exclusively on the use of disaggregated data based on specific tracer indicators. In addition, data on whether required disaggregated data is available and analyzed will be collected to provide a complete cascade of – availability, analysis and use. Furthermore, information on opportunities for strengthening availability, analysis and use of disaggregated data will also be collected to inform initiatives aimed at strengthening these areas for planning and programmatic decision making.

## What is proposed and why?

12. The proposed target for KPI 6e is outlined below for Board approval. Further detail regarding methodology and assumptions is included in the Strategy Performance Report (GF/B46/15).

Strategic Objective	2: Build Resilient and Sustainable Systems for Health
KPI 6e	Results Disaggregation
	<i>Proposed revision</i>
Definition	Percentage of countries that have documented evidence of using disaggregated data to inform planning and/or programmatic decision making for priority populations in HIV, TB and malaria
Purpose	<p>A baseline for capacity to report disaggregated data has been established. The broader goal for this indicator is to determine whether supported countries are using disaggregated data to inform program design and management.</p> <p>The indicator measures whether countries have required disaggregated data facilitating identification of populations in need of health services (priority populations) and if available, whether disaggregated data is analyzed and used to inform planning and ongoing implementation.</p>
Baseline	68% of countries in the cohort meet the benchmark for use of disaggregated data in planning and/or programmatic decision making
Targets	80% of countries meeting benchmark (end – 2022 target); interim target of 72%
Cohort	All High Impact countries, excluding acute COEs
Data source	Targeted, country-based survey <b>conducted by an independent body</b> with data collected in country and independently reviewed

<b>Calculation methodology</b>	<p>Survey results include score for each tracer indicator for each disease:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HIV:</b> (1) <i>Percentage of people on ART among all people living with HIV at the end of the reporting period;</i> (2) <i>Percentage of people living with HIV and on ART who are virologically suppressed;</i> (3) <i>Percentage of respondents who say they used a condom the last time they had sex with non-marital, non-cohabiting partner of those who have had sex with such a partner in the last 12 months</i></li> <li>• <b>TB:</b> (1) <i>Number of notified cases of all forms of TB (i.e. bacteriologically confirmed + clinically diagnosed) ;</i> (2) <i>Number of cases with RR-TB and/or MDR-TB that began second-line treatment;</i> (3) <i>Percentage of all forms of TB cases (bacteriologically confirmed plus clinically diagnosed) successfully treated (cured plus treatment completed) among all forms of TB cases registered for treatment during a specified period</i></li> <li>• <b>Malaria:</b> (1) <i>Proportion of suspected malaria cases that receive a parasitological test;</i> (2) <i>Proportion of confirmed malaria cases that received first-line antimalarial treatment</i></li> </ul> <p>Scores on “use” of disaggregated data are broken down in the categories as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u><i>For use of disaggregated data in planning - check latest disease strategic plan or NSP for interventions and targets for priority populations/ required disaggregation</i></u></li> <li>• <u><i>For use of disaggregated data to inform ongoing programmatic decision making - check quarterly/annual program/performance review report if it includes priority populations/ required disaggregation</i></u></li> </ul> <p>For each country, a “use” score (percent) is available for each tracer indicator for both categories noted above. An average score is calculated for all disease specific tracer indicators for both categories. A disease score is then determined by taking the higher of the two use scores across the two categories. A given country will then have one use score for each relevant disease. Finally, a country is given an aggregate “use” score taking an average across the relevant diseases (no weighting).</p> <p>This aggregate score for each country is then compared to a benchmark of 50% (applicable across all countries). Countries surpassing the benchmark are counted towards the KPI result.</p>
<b>Reporting frequency</b>	Annually, Fall Reporting
<b>Level of disaggregation</b>	Region and Disease

13. KPI 6e measures the domain of results/data disaggregation and their use within the country planning and decision-making context. A baseline for capacity to report on disaggregated data was established in the first half of the Strategy period and now the KPI must effectively measure how well and where countries are using disaggregated data.
14. After designing the survey, it was determined that results could vary by small amounts from year to year. Furthermore, upon consultation with relevant Secretariat teams it was determined that an approach that sets a benchmark for countries to surpass was the most logical approach as it would allow the Global Fund to determine whether a country is meeting a relatively standard threshold for usage. The alternate approach would be solely using the average of all countries, but it was determined that this could be heavily skewed by outlier countries. Given the relatively small cohort, the fact that all countries are all High-Impact and the novelty of this type of analysis in the Global Fund context, it was determined that a standard threshold would be applied across all countries. Baseline results indeed confirmed that outside of a few outliers, there was not widespread variation in initial results or drastically different performance between countries meaning that a singular benchmark was logical. The benchmark was set at 50 percent to both reflect current performance of countries and provide an intuitive and substantive benchmark without being overly ambitious in an area that is not well understood.
15. As this KPI also seeks to recognize countries promoting use of disaggregated data where it exists, the Secretariat sought to take a more positive approach to scoring. In that light, it was determined that the best of the 2 use scores (planning and programmatic decision making) would be taken to contribute to the country score rather than taking an average score (or taking a lower score). It should be noted that, in the majority of cases, the scores between the 2 use categories were either identical or very close.
16. A single use score across diseases was then calculated for each country. This is done by taking the average across the use score for all relevant diseases. This serves to recognize efforts across the whole country rather than siloed efforts by disease and allows the Secretariat to determine whether the country as whole is deploying disaggregated data effectively versus in just the case of a single disease. It should be noted that results by disease will still be presented as contextual information.
17. After establishing the benchmark and determining the final use score for each country, a baseline analysis was conducted. This analysis showed 17 of the 25 countries meet the benchmark of 50% in their aggregate data use score. Based on this 68% was set as the baseline.
18. This is a relatively high baseline that reflects efforts by these countries, the Global Fund and technical partners to prioritize availability and use of disaggregated data. Even though significant effort will be made by the Global Fund, partners and countries in the years leading to the end of the current Strategy, a substantial incremental progress on the KPI may be challenging to achieve. Therefore, a KPI target of 80% of countries reaching the applicable Benchmark by end 2022 is proposed for KPI 6e (20 countries) with an interim end 2021 target of 72% (18 countries).
19. Also, it is noted that in future reporting score on availability and analysis as well as qualitative information reported in the survey will be synthesized and shared alongside results for KPI 6e as needed to provide further context on country progress.

## **Why is this the recommended option?**

20. An 80% target is ambitious yet realistic given current results. As only two years remain in the current Strategy cycle and it is the first-time reporting on this theme using a survey, a somewhat conservative approach to setting the target was taken. A great deal of additional insight on this topic as well as realistic progress that can be made by countries will be revealed in the next two years and rather than setting an overly ambitious target, it made greater sense to use these next two years to learn more and monitor how countries will progress in the use of disaggregated data and what challenges they will face. These learnings can then be adapted to modifying the methodology and taking a more robust approach to target setting in the next Strategic Performance Framework (assuming this topic and indicator continue to be used).
21. Furthermore, since availability of disaggregated data is the greatest determinant of use, enormous effort is required to ensure additional required disaggregated data in HMIS, and national population-based surveys is made available. This will be a major focus of the Data Strategic Initiative.

## **What is needed to progress?**

22. Board approval of the KPI 6e proposed target.

## **Recommendation**

23. The Board is requested to approve the Decision Point on page 2 of this paper.

# Annexes

The following items can be found in Annex:

- Annex 1: Relevant Past Board and Committee Decisions

## Annex 1 – Relevant Past Board and Committee Decisions

Relevant past Decision Point	Summary and Impact
<b>GF/SC17/16: KPI Adjustments</b>	The SC recommended the proposed target also presented in this decision point.
<b>GF/B45/EDP01: Approval of Revised Definitions, Metric Adjustments and Targets for KPIs</b> (June 2021) <sup>4</sup>	The Board approved a revised methodology for KPIs 2, 5c, 6e, 7a and 9c overall.
<b>GF/B44/EDP06: Revisions for Key Performance Indicators</b> (November 2020) <sup>5</sup>	The Board approved a revised methodology for KPI 5 overall, introducing three sub-indicators.
<b>GF/B43/EDP06: Indicator Revisions and Target Setting for Key Performance Indicators 6a: Resilient and Sustainable Systems for Health: - Procurement; 6f: Alignment with National Strategic Plans; 9C: Key populations and human rights domestic investments and 12b: Availability of affordable health technologies: Affordability</b> (May 2020) <sup>6</sup>	The Board approved an approach to measure KPI 9c.
<b>GF/B36/EDP09: Performance Targets for the 2017 – 2022 Strategic Key Performance Indicator Framework</b> (March 2017) <sup>7</sup>	The Board: (i) Approved the performance targets where proposals were complete; (ii) Approved the proposed interim indicator proposals for KPIs 5 and 9c; and (ii) Agreed to postpone its review and approval of performance targets for KPIs 6a, 6b and 6e until the final Board meeting of 2017
<b>GF/AFC02/EDP04: Recommendation on Performance Targets for the 2017-2022 Strategic Key Performance Indicator Framework</b> (March 2017)	The Audit and Finance Committee (AFC) agreed to recommend performance targets for KPIs 7, 10 and 12 to the Board for approval.
<b>GF/B36/DP09: Performance Targets for the 2017 – 2022 Strategic Key Performance Indicator Framework</b>	The Board requested a further opportunity to review the proposed performance targets. Board constituencies were requested to submit a final

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b45-edp01/>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b44-edp06/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b43-edp06/>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.theglobalfund.org/Board-Decisions/B36-EDP09/>



(November 2016) <sup>8</sup>	round of feedback to the Secretariat, and the leadership of the Audit and Finance Committee (AFC) and Strategy Committee (SC) were requested to: (i) determine the performance targets to be addressed by each committee based on their respective mandates; and (ii) establish an advisory group to work with the Secretariat to present revised performance targets to the AFC and SC for recommendation to the Board.
<b>GF/SC02/EDP03: Recommendation on Performance Targets for KPIs 1, 2 and 8 for the 2017 – 2022 Strategic Key Performance Indicator</b> (October 2016)	The Strategy Committee reviewed the Secretariat's proposed performance targets for the 2017 – 2022 Strategic Key Performance (KPI) Framework and agreed to recommend the performance targets for Strategic KPIs 1, 2 and 8 to the Board, expressed as point estimates together with uncertainty ranges. In doing so, the Strategy Committee acknowledged the approach for deriving the performance targets for Strategic KPIs 1, 2 and 8, including the modelling assumptions and key inputs.
<b>GF/AFC02/DP05 and GF/SC02/DP05: Recommendation on Performance Targets for the 2017 – 2022 Strategic Key Performance Indicator</b> (October 2016)	The Audit and Finance Committee and Strategy Committee reviewed the Secretariat's proposed performance targets for the 2017 – 2022 Strategic Key Performance (KPI) Framework and agreed to recommend the performance targets that were complete and presented at the Committees' October 2016 meetings, including interim proposals for Strategic KPI 5 and 9c. The Committees agreed that the Strategy Committee would then review the performance targets for Strategic KPIs 1, 2, 8 and 9b prior to the November 2016 Board meeting to discuss and issue a recommendation to the Board on these targets. The Committees also agreed to recommend deferring the performance targets for the measures associated with Strategic KPIs 6a, 6b and 6e until 2017.
<b>GF/B35/EDP05: 2017 – 2022 Strategic Key Performance Indicator Framework</b> (June 2016) <sup>9</sup>	The Board approved the Strategic KPI Framework for 2017 – 2022, as presented in Annex 1 to GF/B35/ER05. The Board directed the Secretariat to present the Board with the Strategic KPI Framework's performance targets for approval at the final Board meeting in 2016.
<b>GF/B34/EDP04: Approval of 2016 Targets for the 2014 – 2016 Corporate Key Performance Indicator Framework</b> (January 2016) <sup>10</sup>	The Board approved the 2016 performance targets, noting specific revisions to the performance targets for KPI 7 (Access to Funding) and KPI 10 (Value for Money). Having acknowledged the Secretariat's response to requests by the Board for additional analysis on certain indicators, the Board directed the Secretariat to implement proposed management actions to improve performance, and to continue towards identifying lessons that could inform the

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.theglobalfund.org/Board-Decisions/B36-DP09/>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.theglobalfund.org/Board-Decisions/B35-EDP05/>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.theglobalfund.org/Board-Decisions/B34-EDP04/>

	development of the next Corporate Key Performance Indicator Framework.
<b>GF/B33/DP07: Remaining Targets for the 2014 – 2016 Corporate Key Performance Indicator Framework</b> (March 2015) <sup>11</sup>	Under the 2014 – 2016 Corporate Key Performance Indicator Framework, the Board approved updated performance targets for Key Performance Indicators 6, 12 and 16 after additional analysis conducted by the Secretariat following the Board's approval of the updated 2014 – 2016 Corporate KPI Framework.
<b>GF/B32/DP10: Approval of the Global Fund Corporate KPI Framework 2014-2016</b> (November 2014) <sup>12</sup>	The Board approved the updated Corporate KPI Framework, acknowledging the methodological work required to finalize certain indicators as agreed. The Board also approved the available performance targets for 2015, as well as the plan to present the remaining 2015 performance targets for approval at the Thirty-Third Board Meeting, as set forth in GF/B32/24.a – Revision 2. The decision point to approve the updated performance targets contained in GF/B33/04B completed the remaining action item from GF/B32/DP10.
<b>GF/B30/DP7: The Global Fund Corporate Key Performance Indicator Framework for 2014-2016</b> (November 2013) <sup>13</sup>	The Board approved the KPI Framework for 2014-2016 as set forth in GF/B31/7 – Revision 1. The Board asked for annual reports on these indicators, and where available, for interim results to be made available through the information dashboard.

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.theglobalfund.org/Board-Decisions/B33-DP07/>

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.theglobalfund.org/Board-Decisions/B32-DP10/>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.theglobalfund.org/Board-Decisions/B30-DP07/>