

# **Approval of Adjustments to the 2023-2028 KPI Framework**

## **49<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting**

GF/B49/03

10 – 11 May 2023, Ha Noi, Viet Nam

### **Board Decision**

Purpose of the paper: This paper describes the proposed adjustments to 2023-2028 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and a proposal for the Secretariat, in consultation with the relevant Committee leadership, to be delegated the authority to make non-material adjustment to KPIs

## Decision

**Decision point: GF/B49/DPXX: 2023-2028 KPI Framework adjustments**

**The Board notes the recommendations of the Audit and Finance Committee (“AFC”) as set forth in GF/AFC21/EDP02, and the Strategy Committee (“SC”) as set forth in GF/SC21A/DP01, and:**

- i. Approves the adjustments to the 2023-2028 Key Performance Indicator (“KPI”) Framework (including each KPI) as set forth in GF/B49/03 Annex 2;***
- ii. Notes that proposed material changes to a KPI (refer to GF/B49/03 Annex 1 for the approach to assessing materiality) will continue to be recommended by the AFC or SC, within their respective allocated responsibilities (each a “Relevant Committee”) (as set forth in Annex 2 section 2.2 of GF/AFC20/09 and Annex 2 section 2.1 of GF/SC20/05 revision 2), for Board approval; and***
- iii. Delegates authority to the Secretariat, in consultation with the Relevant Committee Chair and Vice Chair, to make non-material KPI adjustments, in line with GF/B49/03 Annex 1, and report back to the Relevant Committees and Board on all such changes.***

**Budgetary implications (included in, or additional to, OPEX budget)**

***This decision has no budgetary implications.***

A summary of relevant past decisions providing context to the proposed Decision Point can be found in [Annex 4](#).

# Executive Summary

## Context

- The Global Fund's 2023-2028 Key Performance Indicator Framework (including each Key Performance Indicator ("KPI")) (the "KPI Framework") was developed as part of an overarching Monitoring & Evaluation Framework ("M&E Framework") through extensive work across the Global Fund Partnership to monitor progress towards achieving Strategy objectives outlined in the Global Fund's 2023-2028 Strategy ("Strategy"). The Strategy Committee ("SC") and the Audit and Finance Committee ("AFC") have each been allocated responsibility for recommending different KPIs according to their respective committee mandates<sup>1</sup>. Based on the SC and AFC recommendations, the KPI Framework<sup>2</sup> was approved by the Board at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting held in November 2022.
- Targets for KPI I1 (Mortality rate), KPI I2 (Incidence rate) and KPI E1 (Scale up of programs to address Human Rights-related barriers) were not presented at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting for approval as the target setting for these KPIs was contingent on the confirmation of sources of funds for Allocation and Catalytic Investment at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting<sup>3</sup>.
- Baselines for KPI R1b (Mitigation actions for countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments) and KPI R2 (Timeliness and quality of external audit process performed by SAIs) were recently confirmed, and thus needed to be included in the KPI definition.
- Additionally, some material and non-material adjustments were required to the KPIs, such as:
  - Material: updated cohort for KPI H5 (AGYW reached with prevention programs) to reflect reduced Catalytic Investment for AGYW;
  - Material: fix typographical error in the threshold of KPI R2 (Timeliness and quality of external audit process performed by SAIs); and
  - Non-material: correction and simplification of some KPI definitions to better articulate the intent of the KPIs.
- As per current practice, all material and non-material adjustments to the definition of all KPIs subsequent to their initial approval are presented to the relevant Committee for recommendation to the Board for approval<sup>4</sup>. While the review and approval of all KPI adjustments by the relevant Committee and the Board provide assurance that the revisions are appropriate for the continued robustness and relevance of the KPIs and the KPI Framework, this process can impose significant demands on the limited time available to the Committees and the Board which should be prioritized towards strategic decision making and steer. Thus, the Secretariat would like to put forth a proposal to streamline the KPI adjustment process.

## Questions this paper addresses

- What is the proposed target for KPI I1 (Mortality rate) and KPI I2 (Incidence rate)?
- What is the proposed target for KPI E1 (Scale up of programs to address Human Rights-related barriers)?
- What is the baseline for KPI R1b (Mitigation actions for countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments)?
- What is the baseline for KPI R2 (Timeliness and quality of external audit process performed by SAIs)?
- What are the proposed adjustments to the KPI definitions?

---

<sup>2</sup> [GF/B48/DP06](#)

<sup>3</sup> [GF/B48/DP04](#)

<sup>4</sup> [Charter of the Strategy Committee](#) (May 2022) and [Charter of the Audit and Finance Committee](#) (May 2022)

- What is the Secretariat’s proposal to streamline the process of making adjustments to KPI definitions subsequent to their initial approval by the Board?

## Conclusions

- For KPI I1, the proposed targets are [35% - 54% - 70%] for **projected reduction in combined mortality rate** across the three diseases **from 2021 baseline to end 2028**.
- For KPI I2, the proposed targets are [30% - 42% - 60%] for **projected reduction in combined incidence rate** across the three diseases **from 2021 baseline to end 2028**.
- For KPI E1 (Scale up of programs to address Human Rights-related barriers), the proposed target is that **50% countries in cohort show increase in scale of programming from baseline** for a comprehensive response to human rights barriers to HIV, TB, malaria services respectively, for the 2023-2025 Allocation Period.
- For KPI R1b (Mitigation actions for countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments), as it is a new KPI with no existing available data, there is **no baseline available**.
- For KPI R2 (Timeliness and quality of external audit process performed by SAIs), the calculated **baseline is 45%, (i.e., 5/11) countries met threshold for timeliness and quality** as per 2022 External Audit Tracking (EAT) annual review process.
- The list of material KPI adjustments is noted in [Table 1](#) and list of non-material KPI adjustments is noted in [Table 2](#).
- The Secretariat proposes that to optimize the use of the Committees’ and the Board’s limited time:
  - a. All material adjustments (refer to [Annex 1](#) for examples) to KPIs will continue to be presented by the Secretariat to the relevant Committees for review and recommendation to the Board for approval;
  - b. The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the relevant Committee, will be delegated authority by the Board to make non-material adjustments (refer to [Annex 1](#) for examples) to KPIs. In cases when the non-materiality of a KPI adjustment is uncertain, the adjustment will be presented to the relevant Committee for review and recommendation to the Board for approval; and
  - c. To ensure continued transparency and oversight of the KPI Framework, the Secretariat will inform the AFC, SC and the Board of all non-material adjustments to KPIs.
- The list of all KPIs part of the 2023-2028 KPI Framework with adjustments noted as track changes are detailed in [Annex 2](#) of this document.

## Input Sought

- The Board is requested to approve the Decision Point on page 2.

## Input received

- The proposals have been reviewed and endorsed by the Secretariat’s Management Executive Committee and include inputs received from the Strategy Committee during its 21<sup>st</sup> meeting as well as during additional calls on 23 March 2023 and 17 April 2023, as well as and further bilateral discussions.
- The SC and the AFC both recommended to the Board for approval the decision presented in this paper.

# Report

**Question 1:** What is the proposed target for KPI I1 (Mortality rate) and KPI I2 (Incidence rate)?

## What is the need or the opportunity?

1. KPI I1 and KPI I2 are critical impact indicators approved at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting for inclusion in the 2023-2028 KPI Framework. The approval of KPI I1 and KPI I2 targets will allow the Secretariat to monitor achievement of the Global Fund Partnership’s goal of ending AIDS, TB and malaria as noted in the 2023-2028 Strategy.

## What do we propose?

2. The target setting required, as a key data input, the amount of country allocation funds available for the 2023-2025 Allocation Period, as well as the 2021 baseline data for all diseases. The 2023-2025 country allocation funds were confirmed following the approval of the sources of funds for allocation at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. The complete 2021 baseline dataset for all diseases was also available from technical partners towards the end of 2022. Thus, it was not feasible to complete the exercise in time for submission of the targets at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting when the KPI Framework was approved.
3. Following the completion of the target setting exercise, the table below notes the proposed targets for KPI I1 and KPI I2 and information on baseline for Board approval:

<b>KPI I1: Mortality rate</b>		
<b>Definition</b>	Reduction in Mortality rate	
<b>Formula</b>	Projected reduction in combined mortality rate across the three diseases from 2021 baseline to end 2028	
	<b>As currently approved</b>	<b>Proposed target and baseline</b>
<b>Target</b>	None	Combined mortality rate reduction of <b>[35% - 54% - 70%]</b> (low/intermediate/high targets) across the three diseases from 2021 to end 2028
<b>Baseline</b>	None	Due to potential retrospective revisions of burden estimates as more recent and reliable data becomes available, the baseline will be presented at the time of reporting using WHO/UNAIDS latest estimates of burden of the three diseases published in their annual reports
<b>KPI I2: Incidence rate</b>		
<b>Definition</b>	Reduction in Incidence rate	
<b>Formula</b>	Projected reduction in combined incidence rate across the three diseases from 2021 baseline to end 2028	
	<b>As currently approved</b>	<b>Proposed target and baseline</b>
<b>Target</b>	None	Combined incidence rate reduction of <b>[30% - 42% - 60%]</b> (low/intermediate/high targets) across the three diseases from 2021 to end 2028
<b>Baseline</b>	None	Due to potential retrospective revisions of burden estimates as more recent and reliable data becomes

		available, the baseline will be presented at the time of reporting using WHO/UNAIDS latest estimates of burden of the three diseases published in their annual reports
--	--	--

4. The target setting exercise required some assumptions (e.g., level of funding, best use of resources, introduction of innovations etc.) to be made in order to determine a target that would be both realistic and ambitious. However, given the current geopolitical and economic context that is not overtly optimistic and the corresponding uncertainties around future developments, the following three scenarios were taken into consideration when determining the target for Impact KPIs.

- Scenario A:** based on continuation of pre-COVID-19 (2014-2019) historical trends. Projections were obtained by standard forecasting (extrapolation) methods, i.e., following an exponential decay in the progression of the reduction of the burden of the three diseases. The scenario thus implicitly assumes a rapid return to a situation that is broadly consistent with pre-COVID-19 context in terms of Global Fund, domestic and other external funding (~60% of total funding need covered), use of available resources and tools, existing innovations, and absence of any major climate, pandemic or insecurity crises that would significantly impact implementation. Outcomes (rounded up to account for ambition) based on the Scenario A projection show **35%** combined reduction in mortality rate between 2021 and end-2028, and **30%** combined reduction in incidence rate between 2021 and end-2028. This base scenario provides a realistic yet ambitious performance benchmark for the Global Fund Partnership to rapidly return to the same pace of performance as pre-COVID-19.
- Scenario B1:** based on modeling exercise. Projections were obtained based on optimistic assumptions such as: growth in Global Fund funding at the 8<sup>th</sup> Replenishment to cover ~14% share of total need, conservative increase in domestic funding, external funding maintained at current level (these three assumptions together correspond to ~70% of total funding need covered); best use of available resources and tools in countries; no new significant innovations introduced; and absence of any major climate, pandemic or insecurity crises that would significantly impact implementation. Outcomes based on Scenario B1 projections show a **54%** combined reduction in mortality rate between 2021 and end-2028, and **42%** combined reduction in incidence rate between 2021 and end-2028. This scenario is setting a very ambitious target for the Global Fund Partnership to move forward in the fight against the three diseases.
- Scenario B2:** based on modeling exercise. Projections were obtained based on even more optimistic assumptions for the Global Fund Partnership such as: growth in funding at both Global Fund funding at the 8<sup>th</sup> Replenishment to cover ~14% share of total need, high growth in domestic funding, external funding maintained at current level (these three assumptions together correspond to ~80% of total funding need covered); best use of available resources and tools in countries; new innovations introduced in time and at scale; and absence of any major climate, pandemic or insecurity crises that would significantly impact implementation. Even if each of these assumptions has a realistic chance to materialize independently, realization of all assumptions at the same time appears extremely optimistic and many of them are also outside of the control of the Global Fund. Outcomes based on Scenario B2 projections (rounded down for realism) show **70%** combined reduction in mortality rate between 2021 and end-2028, and **60%** combined reduction in incidence rate between 2021 and end-2028. This scenario thus provides an aspirational goal for the Global Fund Partnership to end the three epidemics.

5. Achieving Impact requires changing social conditions, which is only possible with sustained efforts across the Global Fund Partnership. Furthermore, achieving impact and setting a single SMART<sup>5</sup> target becomes even more challenging when there is no certainty of the available resources and the operating environment. Despite this reality facing us, the Secretariat would like to remain cautiously optimistic in achieving impact with the support of the Global Fund Partnership, and thus considers that there is merit in not losing sight of our aspirations, whilst at the same time being pragmatic on what should be acceptable progress towards ending the three epidemics especially given that several factors are beyond the control of the Global Fund and its Partnership.
6. Given these considerations, the Secretariat proposes that, rather than a singular target that will rely on a set of assumptions that may or may not hold true, the **target for Impact KPIs is expressed on a scale, with low, intermediate, and high points based on the three scenarios described above**. The three-point target can be interpreted as follows:
- **Low target:** based on Scenario A, is suited as benchmark for performance management as, by considering historical information, it allows for the detection of deviations from the expected trajectory and the implementation of quick and targeted course correction.
  - **Intermediate target:** based on Scenario B1, is an ambitious objective that provides an aim for the Global Fund Partnership to strive towards accelerating in the fight against the three diseases.
  - **High target:** based on Scenario B2, this aspirational goal is useful as a guiding light for advocacy and mobilization of efforts across the whole Global Fund Partnership to end the three epidemics.
7. The Impact targets thus proposed by the Secretariat as noted in the table above are:
- **KPI I1 (Mortality rate):** Combined mortality rate reduction of **[35% - 54% - 70%]** across the three diseases from 2021 to end-2028, with:  
High target: 70%  
Intermediate target: 54%  
Low target: 35%
  - **KPI I2 (Incidence rate):** Combined incidence rate reduction of **[30% - 42% - 60%]** across the three diseases from 2021 to end-2028, with:  
High target: 60%  
Intermediate target: 42%  
Low target: 30%
8. Please note that the target setting exercise for Impact KPIs has been developed under the steer of the Global Fund Modelling Guidance Group (MGG) which consists of technical partners and other experts and is supported by Imperial College London as the Global Fund Modeling Secretariat. The target has been defined as an aggregate across the three diseases using a simple average (as in past KPI Frameworks). To enable proper understanding and oversight of performance, KPI results will be reported not only at the aggregate level but also disaggregated by disease.
9. Finally, it is noted that as scenarios for KPI I1 and KPI I2 are calculated based on most recent epidemiological data and projections of available funding including Global Fund allocations, the targets will be recalibrated if needed, following the 8<sup>th</sup> Replenishment Conference in 2025. If there

---

<sup>5</sup> SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Timebound

is an impact on the numerical value of the Impact targets, the revised KPI I1 and/or KPI I2 targets will be presented for Strategy Committee recommendation to the Board for approval.

**Question 2:** What is the proposed target for KPI E1 (Scale up of programs to address Human Rights-related barriers)?

**What is the need or the opportunity?**

10. KPI E1 was approved at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting and tracks the progress of the scale up of comprehensive programs to remove Human Rights related barriers. The approval of the KPI E1 target will allow the Secretariat to monitor the progress being made in the key strategic area of reducing Human Rights barriers to achieve our Strategy goal of ending AIDS, TB and malaria.

**What do we propose?**

11. This table below notes the target for KPI E1 for Board approval:

<b>KPI E1: Scale up of programs to address Human Rights-related barriers</b>		
<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with increases in scale of programs to reduce Human Rights-related barriers for a) HIV; b) TB; c) Malaria respectively	
<b>Formula</b>	<b>Numerator:</b> # countries showing an increase in scale of programs from baseline for HIV, TB, malaria respectively <b>Denominator:</b> Total countries in reporting period for HIV, TB, malaria respectively	
	<b>As currently approved</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>
<b>Target</b>	None	<b>50%</b> of countries in cohort <sup>6</sup> show increase in scale of programming from baseline for a comprehensive response to human rights barriers to HIV, TB, malaria services respectively, for 2023-2025 Allocation Period

12. Three factors are critical to establish a meaningful target for KPI E1, namely: a) cohort of countries eligible for Matching funds; b) amount of Matching Funds that the countries are eligible for; and c) amount of allocation funds available to countries. Given that the sources of funds for allocation and for catalytic investments were only approved at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, it was not feasible to calculate and present the KPI E1 target at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting when the 2023-2028 KPI Framework was approved.

13. Following the confirmation of the source of funds and conditions to access Matching Funds, the target setting was undertaken considering the following contextual factors:

- Matching Funds amounts decreased very significantly for the 20 countries in the original Breaking Down Barriers (BDB) country cohort<sup>7</sup> (with the exception of Ukraine), often by 50%, and was lower than expected for the four<sup>8</sup> new countries in the cohort;
- HIV allocations decreased in 5 of 24 countries and flatlined in 3 countries, while TB allocations have mostly remained static, and the malaria allocation decreased in one of the 2 countries in the cohort;

<sup>6</sup> Based on the funding available to countries for Human Rights Matching funds, and available funds in the Human Rights SI to fund annual KPI E1 assessments by TA providers, the 2023-2025 Allocation Period cohort includes 24 countries for; 12 countries for TB; and 2 countries for Malaria

<sup>7</sup> BDB countries for 2020-2022 Allocation Period: Ukraine, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Kyrgyzstan, Senegal, Cote d'Ivoire, Botswana, Mozambique, Jamaica, Cameroon, Benin, South Africa, Tunisia, Indonesia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Nepal, Ghana, Honduras, Uganda and Kenya.

<sup>8</sup> Additional 4 BDB countries for 2023-2025 Allocation Period: Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Nigeria and Thailand.



- Current global economic landscape puts significant pressures on allocations even if they have increased slightly or remained stable.
14. The proposed target (as noted in the table above) is considered both realistic and ambitious, as it accounts for:
- reduced human rights Matching Funds;
  - increased pressures on country allocation funds;
  - lesson learnt from the current BDB initiative that suggests that the trajectory of performance is not linear, as it is observed that the largest scale up is associated with increased investments in a new grant cycle, and progress generally stabilizes after the first year of the grant cycle. Also, progress becomes slower, the closer a country is to implementing comprehensive programs to remove human rights-related barriers.

Furthermore, it is expected that a greater number of countries will show progress in the scale of the human rights “program essentials” (i.e., subset of programmatic areas related to: stigma & discrimination; efforts to remove harmful laws & policies, including those led by communities; integration of programs to reduce human rights barriers into KP programs; and legal literacy & access to justice activities). The Secretariat will provide updates as relevant, on progress in these key programs to complement the KPI E1 results.

15. The target and cohort for KPI E1 for the 2026-2028 Allocation Period will be determined in 2026 based on the outcome of the 8<sup>th</sup> Replenishment Conference which will have an impact on the amount of allocation and Matching Funds available to countries. Any updates made to the conditions to access Matching Funds in the 2026-2028 Allocation Period will also impact the cohort of countries eligible for Matching Funds and will be factored in setting the KPI E1 target for 2026-2028 Allocation Period.

**Question 3:** What is the baseline for KPI R1b (Mitigation actions for countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments)?

**What is the need or the opportunity?**

16. KPI R1b approved at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting is a useful indicator that has value in projecting risks to realization of domestic co-financing commitments, and therefore appropriately complements KPI R1a, which contains a significant lag between outcomes and reporting. The Board approved KPI R1b target is to monitor whether 80% of mitigation actions are implemented by countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments. As the processes and systems for calculating the KPI were being finalized at end of 2022, the baseline could not be provided at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. The processes are now established and it can be confirmed that no baseline will be available, which needs to be reflected in the KPI definition.

**What do we propose?**

17. The table below notes the baseline for KPI R1b for Board approval:

<b>KPI R1b: Mitigation actions for countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of milestones achieved for implementation of mitigating actions by countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments
<b>Formula</b>	Average score for the % of milestones reached across portfolio

	As currently approved	Proposed baseline
Baseline	None	Not available, new KPI

18. KPI R1b monitors the new approach to co-financing risk management established through the Integrated Risk Management system 2.0. As part of this new approach being operationalized in the 2023-2025 Allocation Period, the Secretariat will appraise the risk of countries not meeting their co-financing commitments towards scale-up or sustaining progress of HIV, TB and malaria programs, following which mitigating actions, including milestones, will be defined to manage those risks. Progress against those milestones will be tracked and results provided through KPI R1b.
19. Countries will provide their co-financing commitments as part of the 2023-2025 Funding Request submissions commencing in March 2023. Thus, the risk assessment and subsequent data on mitigating actions including milestones will only be available from Q2 2023 onwards. In the early days of defining these milestones, the KPI will score 0%, since milestones will have been established, but not achieved. The earliest milestones to be achieved will most likely be towards the end of 2023 which will be around the time the first results for KPI R1b will also be due for the Spring 2024 Committee and Board meetings. Therefore, given that:
- KPI R1b is monitoring a new approach being implemented from 2023-2025 Allocation Period onwards, for which there is no existing comparable data; and
  - first results for this KPI will be available only around the time of first report due for Spring 2024 Committee and Board meetings;

The Secretariat proposes that the baseline be noted as “Not available” for KPI R1b. As this KPI is tracking an average score (rather than progress compared to baseline), absence of a baseline has no impact on future tracking and performance for this KPI. This proposal is also in line with other new KPIs (e.g., Equity KPI E2a, Gender KPI E3b) for which no baseline was available.

**Question 4:** What is the baseline for KPI R2 (Timeliness and quality of external audit process performed by SAIs)?

**What is the need or the opportunity?**

20. KPI R2 approved at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, provides the highest level of assurance on the use of grant funds managed by governmental Principal Recipients. Whilst the Board-approved KPI R2 target is to monitor whether 80% countries in cohort meet criteria for timeliness and quality of audit deliverables, confirmation of the baseline will provide an understanding of progress made since the start of the 2023-2028 Strategy.

**What do we propose?**

21. The table below notes the baseline for KPI R2 for Board approval:

KPI R2: Timeliness and quality of external audit process performed by SAIs	
Definition	Percentage of countries meeting criteria of timeliness and quality for audit deliverables
Formula	<p><u>Numerator</u>: # countries for which SAIs audit of grants meet threshold for timeliness &amp; quality</p> <p><u>Denominator</u>: # countries using SAIs for the audit of grants for the relevant financial year</p>

	As currently approved	Proposed baseline
Baseline	None	45% (5/11) countries met threshold for timeliness & quality as per 2022 External Audit Tracking (EAT) annual review process

22. Data for calculating baseline and results for KPI R2 comes from the Global Fund’s External Audit Tracking (“EAT”) tool. The 2022 EAT annual review exercise of latest available audit reports of countries was underway at the time of the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, and thus the baseline analysis could not be presented at the same time as 2023-2028 KPI Framework approval.
23. Following the finalization of the 2022 annual EAT review process, the analysis shows that 45% (5 of 11) countries had met the criteria of timeliness and quality for audit deliverables.

**Question 5:** What are the proposed adjustments to the KPI definitions?

**What is the need or the opportunity?**

24. Following the confirmation of available sources of funds for 2023-2025 Allocation Period and specifically the AGYW catalytic funding, the number of AGYW priority countries was reduced from 13 to 12 countries. This update to the AGYW priority country cohort needed to be reflected in the cohort definition for KPI H5 (“AGYW reached with prevention programs”).
25. A typographical error was noted in the threshold value of KPI R2 (“Timeliness and quality of external audit process performed by SAIs”) which could potentially impact KPI performance and thus needed to be corrected.
26. Based on feedback received by the Secretariat, it was noted that some KPI definitions could be better articulated to communicate the intent of the KPIs more correctly and clearly to our stakeholders. As the Secretariat is starting to operationalize and socialize the 2023-2028 KPI Framework, it was considered timely and appropriate to adjust the KPI definitions to not only reflect the updates to KPIs, but also to clarify the KPI definitions to build a common understanding of the KPIs and avoid misinterpretations.
27. For administrative ease, the Secretariat proposes material and non-material adjustments to some KPIs for Board approval at the same time as the submission of remaining targets and baselines.

**What do we propose?**

28. The table (Table 1) below notes the material adjustments to the KPI definitions for Board approval.

KPI	Change to	As currently approved	Proposed revision	Rationale
KPI H5: AGYW reached with prevention programs	Cohort	13 AGYW priority countries	12 AGYW priority countries	Following the confirmation of AGYW catalytic funding for 2023-2025 Allocation Period, the cohort of AGYW priority countries was reduced from 13 to 12

				countries. The adjustment reflects this update to cohort of countries for KPI H5
<b>KPI R2:</b> Timeliness and quality of external audit process performed by SAIs	Threshold	Grant audit report score <b>&gt; 2.3</b>	Grant audit report score <b>is 2.3 or more</b>	A grant audit report that has a score of 2.3 or more is considered to meet expectations. Due to a typographical error, the currently approved threshold reads as “Grant audit report score should be “>” (greater than) 2.3”, which is incorrect and needs to be corrected

29. The table (Table 2) below notes the non-material adjustments to the KPI definitions for Board approval.

<b>Table 2: List of non-material clarifications to elements of KPI definitions</b>				
<b>KPI</b>	<b>Change to</b>	<b>As currently approved</b>	<b>Proposed revision</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
<b>KPI H4:</b> KP reached with prevention programs	Long title	Portfolio performance for coverage of prevention <b>services</b> among specific Key Populations	Portfolio performance for coverage of prevention <b>programs</b> among specific Key Populations	Ensure language consistency with underlying modular framework (“MF”) indicator (% of <i>Key Populations reached with HIV prevention programs – defined package of services</i> ) noted in approved formula and KPI short title ( <i>KP reached with prevention programs</i> )
<b>KPI H5:</b> AGYW reached with prevention programs	Long title	Portfolio performance for coverage of prevention <b>services</b> among high-risk adolescent girls and young women	Portfolio performance for coverage of prevention <b>programs</b> among high-risk adolescent girls and young women	Ensure language consistency with underlying MF indicator (% of <i>high-risk adolescent girls and young women reached with HIV prevention programs- defined package of services</i> ) noted in approved formula and KPI short title ( <i>AGYW reached with prevention programs</i> )
<b>KPI T4:</b> DR-TB treatment success rate	Long title	Portfolio performance for Treatment Success Rate of RR/MDR	Portfolio performance for Treatment Success Rate of RR/MDR- <b>TB</b>	Clarify that KPI relates to “TB”, and thus include reference to “TB” in KPI title.
<b>KPI S1:</b> Provision of integrated, people-centered, high-quality services	Numerator	# of countries that showed significant improvement in scores compared to latest baseline	# of countries that showed <b>statistically</b> significant improvement in scores compared to latest baseline	Ensure consistency with illustrative example of KPI S1 that correctly articulates that improvements in KPI result must be “statistically” significant. Also ensures consistency with related KPIs – KPIs S2, S3, S5
<b>KPI S4:</b> Community systems for service delivery	Baseline	18% (19 countries) met <b>75%</b> criteria in 2020-2022 Allocation Period	18% (19 countries) met <b>3/4</b> criteria in 2020-2022 Allocation Period	Clarify that 18% countries met 3/4 criteria as part of baseline analysis which is not apparent when using percentage (i.e., 75%)
<b>KPI P1:</b> Progress in laboratory testing modalities	Cohort	all countries investing Global Fund funds related to the specified technical domain	all countries investing Global Fund funds <b>in interventions</b> related to the specified technical domain	Clarify language by fixing the omission of the phrase “in interventions”

<b>KPI P2:</b> Progress in early warning surveillance function	Cohort	all countries investing Global Fund funds related to the specified technical domain	all countries investing Global Fund funds <b>in interventions</b> related to the specified technical domain	Clarify language by fixing the omission of the phrase “in interventions”
<b>KPI P3:</b> Progress in human resources for implementation of IHR	Cohort	all countries investing Global Fund funds related to the specified technical domain	all countries investing Global Fund funds <b>in interventions</b> related to the specified technical domain	Clarify language by fixing the omission of the phrase “in interventions”
<b>KPI R1a:</b> Realization of domestic co-financing commitments	Cohort	all country-components, excluding, components (a) exempted or granted waiver from co-financing requirements; (b) given extension for reporting co-financing, beyond KPI deadline; and/or (c) that did not access funding in previous Allocation Period	all country-components <b>with an allocation in current Allocation Period</b> , excluding, components (a) exempted or granted waiver from co-financing requirements; (b) given extension for reporting co-financing, beyond KPI deadline; and/or (c) that did not access funding in previous Allocation Period	For consistency with the illustrative example, the revision clarifies that cohort includes all country components with an allocation in the current Allocation Period prior to applying the exclusion criteria.
<b>KPI S9:</b> Supply continuity	Numerator	# of products <b>with active suppliers above</b> threshold that meet Quality Assurance requirements	# of products <b>achieving threshold for number of</b> active suppliers that meet Quality Assurance requirements	The approved threshold is 4 or more suppliers for high volume products, and 2 or more suppliers for low volume products. The rewording of the numerator correctly reflects the KPI intent
	Threshold	<b>&gt;=</b> 4 suppliers for high volume products; <b>&gt;=2</b> suppliers for low volume products	<b>4 or more</b> suppliers for high volume products; <b>2 or more</b> suppliers for low volume products	Simplify language to avoid using mathematical symbols to improve readability and better communicate the intent
<b>KPI E2a:</b> Reaching marginalized sub-populations	Long title	Percentage of countries with at least half of the custom equity indicators performing <b>at minimum acceptable level</b>	Percentage of countries with at least half of the custom equity indicators <b>having performance of 90% or more</b>	The approved threshold is “at least half of the custom equity indicators have performance of 90% or more”. The rewording of the long title fully reflects the threshold and thus clarifies better the KPI intent.
	Numerator	# countries <b>with at least half of the custom equity indicators performing at or above</b> the threshold	# countries <b>achieving</b> the threshold	The approved threshold is “at least half of the custom equity indicators have performance of 90% or more”. Updating Numerator to reference the threshold simplifies language
	Threshold	At least <b>50%</b> custom equity indicators have	At least <b>half of the</b> custom equity indicators	Simplify language to use fewer numerical values (to avoid confusion with numerical target value) and

		performance $\geq 90\%$	have performance of 90% or more	removing mathematical symbols to improve readability and better communicate the intent
	Target	70% countries have at least half of the custom equity indicators performing at minimum acceptable level, assessed annually	70% countries have at least half of the custom equity indicators with a performance of 90% or more, assessed annually	The approved threshold is “at least half of the custom equity indicators have performance of 90% or more”. The approved target is for 70% countries to achieve this threshold. Rewording the target to fully reflect the threshold better clarifies the target.
<b>KPI E3b:</b> Performance of gender-specific indicators	Long title	Percentage of countries with at least half of the gender indicators performing at minimum acceptable level	Percentage of countries with at least half of the gender indicators having performance of 90% or more	The approved threshold is “at least half of the gender indicators have performance of 90% or more”. The rewording of the long title fully reflects the threshold and thus clarifies better the KPI intent.
	Numerator	# countries with at least half of gender indicators performing above threshold	# countries achieving the threshold	The approved threshold is “at least half of the gender indicators have performance of 90% or more”. Revising Numerator to just reference the threshold simplifies language
	Threshold	At least half of gender indicators have performance $\geq 90\%$	At least half of the gender indicators have performance of 90% or more	Simplify language to avoid using mathematical symbols to improve readability and better communicate the intent
	Target	70% countries have at least half of the gender indicators performing at minimum acceptable level, assessed annually	70% countries have at least half of the gender indicators with a performance of 90% or more, assessed annually	The approved threshold is “at least half of the gender indicators have performance of 90% or more”. The approved target is for 70% countries to achieve this threshold. Rewording the target to fully reflect the threshold better clarifies the target.
<b>KPI E2b:</b> Reducing inequities in HTM	Numerator	# countries with at least half of the custom equity indicators showing a faster progression compared to standard indicator	# countries achieving the threshold	The approved threshold is “at least half of the custom equity indicators show change in result greater than standard indicator”. Revising Numerator to just reference the threshold simplifies language
	Threshold	At least 50% custom equity indicators show change in result greater than standard indicator	At least half of the custom equity indicators show change in result greater than standard indicator	Simplify language to use fewer numerical values to avoid confusion with target value
<b>KPI E3a:</b> Advancing gender equality	Long title	Satisfaction of women and gender-diverse communities with	Satisfaction of women and gender-diverse communities with engagement across the	The approved threshold or acceptable level of performance is 75% minimum satisfaction score. The current title suggests

– engagement in grant cycle		engagement in grant cycle consistently above minimum acceptable level	grant cycle consistently at acceptable level	satisfaction should be above the acceptable level which is incorrect. Revision fixes this semantic error and also aligns the wording with related KPI C1
	Numerator	# grant cycle stages with scores above threshold	# grant cycle stages with scores achieving the threshold	The approved threshold or acceptable level of performance is 75% minimum satisfaction score, and thereby all stages of grant cycle that achieve this threshold should count towards the KPI result. Revision fixes this semantic error.
<b>KPI C1:</b> Community engagement across Global Fund grant cycle	Long title	Satisfaction of communities with engagement across the grant cycle consistently above minimum acceptable level	Satisfaction of communities with engagement across the grant cycle consistently at acceptable level	The approved threshold or acceptable level of performance is 75% minimum satisfaction score. The current title suggests satisfaction should be above the acceptable level which is incorrect. Revision fixes this semantic error.
	Numerator	# grant cycle stages with scores above threshold	# grant cycle stages with scores achieving the threshold	The approved threshold or acceptable level of performance is 75% minimum satisfaction score, and thereby all stages of grant cycle that achieve this threshold should count towards the KPI result. Revision fixes this semantic error.

30. Please note that, in [Table 2](#), the Secretariat is not recommending any change to the KPI calculation methodology, numerical target or cohort as approved by the Board at the 48<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. The proposed revisions in [Table 2](#) would therefore not result in any material change to KPI calculation, performance or reporting, but would allow the Secretariat to better communicate the KPI definitions to all relevant stakeholders.

**Question 6 :** What is the Secretariat’s proposal to streamline the process of making adjustments to KPI definitions subsequent to their initial approval?

**What is the need or the opportunity?**

31. The current practice followed by the Secretariat is to present every (material and non-material) KPI definition adjustment to the relevant Committee for recommendation to the Board for approval. The review and approval of all KPI definition adjustments through the relevant Committee and the Board provides assurance that the adjustments are appropriate for the continued robustness and relevance of the KPI Framework. However, the Secretariat is also conscious that requiring the Committees and Board to review and approve every KPI definition adjustment may not be the most productive use of the limited time available, which should be prioritized towards strategic decision making and oversight.

32. An example from the 2017-2022 KPI Framework of when a significant demand on relevant Committee and Board time was made for a non-material change relates to the Board’s approval of changes to the KPI 4 (investment efficiency) target definition<sup>9</sup>. This adjustment, allowed for

<sup>9</sup> [GF/B47/EDP14](#)



continued monitoring of the KPI beyond the 2017-2019 Allocation Period into the 2020-2022 Allocation Period. As KPI 4 performance is measured over a specific Allocation Period and not across Allocation Periods, this change did not have any impact on the past or future performance of KPI 4 but was needed to enable the Secretariat to continue monitoring the KPI with the same target and methodology for the 2020-2022 Allocation Period as well. This document also outlines in [Table 2](#) several examples of non-material KPI adjustment to the 2023-2028 KPI Framework that are being presented to the Board for approval in May 2023.

33. In an effort to optimize the best use of the time of the relevant Committees and the Board, the Secretariat presents the proposal outlined below.

### **What do we propose?**

34. The Secretariat's proposal is as follows:

- a. All material adjustments (refer [Annex 1](#) for examples) to KPIs will continue to be presented by the Secretariat to the relevant Committees for review and recommendation to the Board for approval;
- b. The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the relevant Committee, will be delegated authority by the Board to make non-material adjustments (refer [Annex 1](#) for examples) to KPIs. In cases when the non-materiality of a KPI adjustment is uncertain, the adjustment will be presented to the relevant Committee for review and recommendation to the Board for approval; and
- c. To ensure continued transparency and oversight of the KPI Framework, the Secretariat will inform the AFC, SC and the Board of all non-material KPI adjustments.

35. A KPI monitors three key aspects of the achievement of an outcome (i.e., change in conditions). These aspects are:

- a. **Quality** or the expected outcome being monitored by the KPI.
- b. **Quantity** or the extent to which the outcome is expected to be achieved, and
- c. **Time** by when the outcome should be achieved.

36. The Secretariat proposes that an adjustment to a KPI definition that directly impacts KPI performance due to a change to one or more of the above three aspects of a KPI should be categorised as a "material" adjustment, and any other KPI adjustment should be categorised as a "non-material" KPI adjustment. For example, the change of KPI target value would be considered a material adjustment requiring relevant Committee recommendation and Board approval, whilst an update to a KPI data source or correction of typographical errors would be considered a non-material adjustment and could be directly implemented by the Secretariat.

37. Please refer to [Annex 1](#) for further details on the approach to assessing the materiality of a proposed KPI adjustment and examples of material and non-material adjustments.

### **Recommendation**

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



# Annexes

## Annex 1 – Approach to assess materiality of KPI adjustment

- The elements of a KPI definition approved by the Board as part of the 2023-2028 KPI Framework are as follows:
  - KPI ID
  - KPI short title
  - KPI long title
  - Formula (or Numerator and Denominator)
  - Threshold (if any)
  - Target
  - Cohort
  - Baseline
  - Data source

A change to any of these elements of the KPI definition is a “KPI adjustment”.

- A “material” KPI adjustment means an adjustment that has a direct impact on KPI performance due to a change in any one or more of the following aspects of a KPI:
  - **Quality** or the expected outcome being monitored by the KPI;
  - **Quantity** or the extent to which the outcome is expected to be achieved; and
  - **Time** by when the outcome should be achieved.

Please refer to table below for non-exhaustive examples of “material” KPI adjustments.

Aspect monitored by KPI	Adjustment to	Example
Quality	nature of the numerator and/or denominator	<p><b>Current Denominator:</b> <i>Adjusted pledges expected to be received for the Replenishment Period</i></p> <p><b>Revised Denominator:</b> <i>Announced pledges expected to be received for the Replenishment Period</i></p>
Quality	indicators from other M&E frameworks (eg. Modular Framework, WHO SPAR etc.) underlying the KPI	<p><u>Example 1</u> KPI P1 (<i>Progress in laboratory testing modalities</i>) is based on SPAR indicator C4.4. This underlying SPAR C4.4 indicator assesses the performance of a country on a scale of 1-5. <b>If the scale of performance for C4.4 is changed from 1-5 to 1-4</b>, it will have an impact on the expected outcome and will require change to KPI P1 formula.</p> <p><u>Example 2</u> Change in nature of a Modular Framework (MF) indicator underlying a KPI that alters the expected outcome.</p>

		<p><b>Current MF indicator:</b> % of patients with all forms of TB, bacteriologically confirmed plus clinically diagnosed, successfully treated (cured plus treatment completed) among all TB patients notified during a specified period; *includes only those with new and relapse TB</p> <p><b>Revised MF indicator:</b> % of patients with all forms of TB, bacteriologically confirmed plus clinically diagnosed, successfully treated (cured plus treatment completed) among all TB patients registered during a specified period; *includes only those with new and relapse TB</p>
Quality	level of the threshold	<p><b>Current threshold:</b> 75% minimum satisfaction score</p> <p><b>Revised threshold:</b> 80% minimum satisfaction score</p>
Quantity	numerical value of the target	<p><b>Current target:</b> 85% co-financing commitment realized</p> <p><b>Revised target:</b> 90% co-financing commitment realized</p>
Quantity	size of the cohort	<p><b>Current cohort:</b> High Impact countries</p> <p><b>Revised cohort:</b> High Impact and Core countries</p>
Time	time period by when the target is expected to be achieved	<p><b>Current target:</b> 95-98% corporate asset utilization, assessed annually</p> <p><b>Revised target:</b> 95-98% corporate asset utilization, by end Strategy (2028)</p>

3. The following non-exhaustive examples are “non-material” KPI adjustments that do not directly impact KPI performance:

Adjustment to	Example
Baseline	<p>All adjustments to baseline are non-material as taken on their own they do not have a direct impact on KPI performance.</p> <p>If a change in baseline impacts other elements (e.g. KPI target) that affect KPI performance (i.e. if the change in baseline indirectly leads to a material change), then the impacted element will be presented to the relevant Committee for recommendation to the Board for approval.</p> <p><u>Example 1:</u> Inclusion of a baseline</p> <p><b>Current baseline:</b> not available</p> <p><b>Revised baseline:</b> 96% portfolio performance for year 2021</p> <p><u>Example 2:</u> Change to baseline for a KPI that has no impact on KPI target</p> <p><b>Current baseline:</b> 101% portfolio performance for year 2021</p> <p><b>Revised baseline:</b> 100% portfolio performance for year 2021</p>
Data source	<p>All adjustments to data sources are non-material as taken on their own they do not have a direct impact on KPI performance.</p> <p>If a change in data source impacts other elements (e.g. KPI formula) that affects KPI performance (i.e. if the change in data source indirectly leads to a material change), then the impacted element will be presented to the relevant Committee for recommendation to the Board for approval.</p>

	<p><u>Example:</u></p> <p><b>Current data source:</b> WHO IHR Electronic State Parties Self-Assessment Annual Reporting (e-SPAR)</p> <p><b>Revised data source:</b> Global Fund grant reporting</p>
Indicators from other M&E frameworks (eg. Modular Framework, WHO SPAR etc.) underlying the KPI	<p>Updates that do not alter the Formula, Numerator or Denominator of the KPI.</p> <p><u>Example 1:</u> KPI P1 (<i>Progress in laboratory testing modalities</i>) is based on SPAR indicator C4.4. This underlying SPAR C4.4 indicator assesses the performance of a country on a scale of 1-5. If the description of a scale of performance for C4.4 is revised, it does not impact the KPI calculation methodology</p> <p><u>Example 2:</u> <b>Current MF indicator:</b> # of patients with all forms of TB notified (i.e., bacteriologically confirmed + clinically diagnosed); *includes only those with new and relapse TB</p> <p><b>Revised MF indicator:</b> # of all forms of TB cases notified (i.e., bacteriologically confirmed + clinically diagnosed); *includes only those with new and relapse TB</p>
Revision to KPI ID	<p>Revisions to the originally approved KPI identifier code.</p> <p><u>Example:</u></p> <p><b>Current KPI ID:</b> KPI R3</p> <p><b>Revised KPI ID:</b> KPI R2b</p>
Other elements of KPI definition	<p>Editorial edit to an element of the KPI definition to correct typographical and semantic errors that improve the clarity of the KPI or articulation of the KPI intent, or both.</p> <p><u>Example:</u></p> <p><b>Current Threshold:</b> At least 50% of the custom equity indicators have performance <math>\geq 90\%</math></p> <p><b>Revised Threshold:</b> At least half of the custom equity indicators have performance of 90% or more</p>

## Annex 2 – 2023-2028 Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Framework with revisions

### Section 2.1: Impact and Strategy KPIs

<b>KPI H1: People living with HIV who know their status</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for percentage of people living with HIV who know their HIV status
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of people living with HIV who know their HIV status at the end of the reporting period” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting and UNAIDS
<b>Baseline</b>	101% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI H2: ART coverage</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for percentage of people living with HIV who are on ART
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of people on ART among all people living with HIV at the end of the reporting period” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting and UNAIDS
<b>Baseline</b>	95% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI H3: Viral load suppression</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for percentage of people living with HIV and on ART who are virologically suppressed
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of people living with HIV and on ART who are virologically suppressed” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting and UNAIDS
<b>Baseline</b>	105% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI H4: KP reached with prevention programs</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for coverage of prevention <a href="#">services programs</a> among specific Key Populations
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of Key Populations reached with HIV prevention programs-- defined package of services” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s). Key Populations include Men who have sex with men (MSM), Transgender (TG), Sex workers (SW), People who inject drugs (PWID)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	91% portfolio performance for year 2021

<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually
---------------	---

#### KPI H5: AGYW reached with prevention programs

<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for coverage of prevention <a href="#">services-programs</a> among high-risk adolescent girls and young women
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of high-risk adolescent girls and young women reached with HIV prevention programs- defined package of services” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	<a href="#">43-12</a> AGYW priority countries
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	29% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

#### KPI H6: Elimination of vertical transmission

<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for percentage of pregnant women living with HIV who received antiretroviral medicine
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of pregnant women living with HIV who received antiretroviral medicine to reduce the risk of vertical transmission of HIV” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting and UNAIDS
<b>Baseline</b>	90% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

#### KPI H7: PLHIV on ART who initiated TPT

<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for percentage of people living with HIV on ART who initiated TB preventive therapy
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of people living with HIV currently enrolled on antiretroviral therapy who started TB preventive treatment (TPT) during the reporting period” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	88% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

#### KPI T1: TB notifications, all forms

<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for number of patients with all forms of TB notified
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “# of patients with all forms of TB notified (i.e., bacteriologically confirmed + clinically diagnosed); *includes only those with new and relapse TB” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (#)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (#)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	78% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI T2: TB treatment success rate, all forms</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for TB Treatment Success Rate (all forms)
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of patients with all forms of TB, bacteriologically confirmed plus clinically diagnosed, successfully treated (cured plus treatment completed) among all TB patients notified during a specified period; *includes only those with new and relapse TB” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	96% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI T3: People with confirmed DR-TB on treatment</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for percentage of people with confirmed RR-TB and/or MDR-TB on treatment
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of people with confirmed RR-TB and/or MDR-TB that began second-line treatment” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	97% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI T4: DR-TB treatment success rate</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for Treatment Success Rate of RR/MDR-TB
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of patients with RR and/or MDR-TB successfully treated” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	85% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI T5: TB contacts on preventive therapy</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for number of TB contacts on preventive therapy
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “# of people in contact with TB patients who began preventive therapy” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (#)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (#)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	29% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI T6: ART coverage for HIV-positive TB patients</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for percentage of HIV-positive registered TB patients on ART
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “% of HIV-positive new and relapse TB patients on ART during TB treatment” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerator = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• Denominator = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	92% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI M1: LLINs distributed</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for number of LLINs distributed through mass campaign and continuous distribution
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “#LLINs distributed through mass campaign and continuous distribution” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerator = Aggregate portfolio result (#)</li> <li>• Denominator = Aggregate portfolio target (#)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	76% portfolio performance over 2019-2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI M2: Malaria testing, public facilities</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for proportion of suspected malaria cases that receive a parasitological test at public sector health facilities
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “Proportion of suspected malaria cases that receive a parasitological test at public sector health facilities” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerator = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• Denominator = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	99% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI M3: Malaria cases treated, public facilities</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for proportion of confirmed malaria cases that received first-line antimalarial treatment at public sector health facilities
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “Proportion of confirmed malaria cases that received first-line antimalarial treatment at public sector health facilities” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerator = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• Denominator = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	96% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI M4: IPTp3 coverage</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for proportion of pregnant women attending antenatal clinics who received three or more doses of intermittent preventive treatment for malaria
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “ <i>Proportion of pregnant women attending antenatal clinics who received three or more doses of intermittent preventive treatment for malaria</i> ” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target (%)</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	85% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI M5: Children receiving full course of SMC</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Portfolio performance for percentage of children who received the full number of courses of seasonal malaria chemoprevention (SMC) per transmission season in the targeted areas
<b>Formula</b>	Portfolio performance for “ <i>Percentage of children who received the full number of courses of seasonal malaria chemoprevention (SMC) per transmission season in the targeted areas</i> ” with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u> = Aggregate portfolio result (%)</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u> = Aggregate portfolio target %</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries monitoring progress of indicator through grant(s)
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	107% portfolio performance for year 2021
<b>Target</b>	Achieve or sustain Global Fund grant portfolio performance at or above 90%, assessed annually

<b>KPI S1: Provision of integrated, people-centered, high-quality services</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with improvement in scores for provision of integrated, people-centered, high quality service delivery from latest baseline
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u>: # of countries that showed <a href="#">statistically</a> significant improvement in scores compared to latest baseline</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u>: Total # countries in cohort</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	Select cohort of 10-20 priority countries for focused RSSH measurement.
<b>Data source</b>	Targeted health facility assessment (HFA)
<b>Baseline</b>	2023 results used as baseline for 2024 and 2025 results. 2025 results used as baseline for 2026-2028 results
<b>Target</b>	100% countries improved scores compared to latest baseline (2023,2025) by mid Strategy (2025) and end of Strategy (2028)

<b>KPI S2: Provision of integrated supportive supervision</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with improvement in scores for provision of integrated supportive supervision at health facilities from latest baseline
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Numerator</u>: # of countries that showed statistically significant improvement in scores compared to latest baseline</li> <li>• <u>Denominator</u>: Total # countries in cohort</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	Select cohort of 10-20 priority countries for focused RSSH measurement.
<b>Data source</b>	Targeted health facility assessment (HFA)
<b>Baseline</b>	2023 results used as baseline for 2024 and 2025 results. 2025 results used as baseline for 2026-2028 results
<b>Target</b>	100% countries improved scores compared to latest baseline (2023,2025) by mid Strategy (2025) and end of Strategy (2028)



**KPI S3: HTM integrated services offered to pregnant women**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with improvement in scores for provision of HTM integrated services to pregnant women from latest baseline
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # of countries that showed statistically significant improvement in scores compared to latest baseline</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	Select cohort of 10-20 priority countries for focused RSSH measurement.
<b>Data source</b>	Targeted health facility assessment (HFA)
<b>Baseline</b>	2023 results used as baseline for 2024 and 2025 results. 2025 results used as baseline for 2026-2028 results
<b>Target</b>	100% countries improved scores compared to latest baseline (2023,2025) by mid Strategy (2025) and end of Strategy (2028)

**KPI S4: Community systems for service delivery**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with systems in place for community health service delivery
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # of countries that have maturing or strong systems in place for community health service delivery (i.e., met at least 3 of 4 criteria)</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort</li> <li>• <b>Threshold:</b> 75% (3/4) of criteria met for having community health service delivery</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries receiving Global Fund allocation in the relevant Allocation Period
<b>Data source</b>	1. National Commitments and Policy Instrument; 2. Global Fund Funding Request; 3. Global Fund PR ratings & capacity assessments; 4. WHO Global Tuberculosis Report
<b>Baseline</b>	18% (19 countries) met <del>75%</del> <u>3/4</u> criteria in 2020-2022 Allocation Period
<b>Target</b>	38% (40 countries) meet at least 3 /4 criteria by end of Strategy (2028)

**KPI S5: Systems readiness for CHWs**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with improvement in scores for system readiness for community health workers from latest baseline
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # of countries that showed statistically significant improvement in scores compared to latest baseline</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	Select cohort of 10-20 priority countries for focused RSSH measurement.
<b>Data source</b>	Targeted health facility assessment (HFA)
<b>Baseline</b>	2023 results used as baseline for 2024 and 2025 results. 2025 results used as baseline for 2026-2028 results
<b>Target</b>	100% countries improved scores compared to latest baseline (2023,2025) by mid Strategy (2025) and end of Strategy (2028)

**KPI S6a: Secure, maintained, and interoperable HMIS**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with digital HMIS functionality baseline maturity score of 3 or less that increased by at least one maturity level
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # countries that increased maturity score by one or more</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries that scored <=3 at baseline, limited to High Impact and Core countries, excluding acute emergency countries
<b>Data source</b>	Global Fund M&E systems country profile, master digital HMIS maturity model
<b>Baseline</b>	To be confirmed in <a href="#">Spring-Fall</a> 2023, based on year 2022
<b>Target</b>	100% of countries increase by at least one maturity level by end of Strategy (2028)

**KPI S6b: Data driven decision making**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with data use maturity score of 3 or less that increased by at least one maturity level in terms of leveraging programmatic monitoring for data driven decision making
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # countries that increased maturity score by one or more</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries that scored <=3 at baseline, limited to High Impact and Core countries, excluding acute emergency countries
<b>Data source</b>	Annual LFA review, Global Fund M&E systems country profile
<b>Baseline</b>	To be confirmed in <a href="#">Spring-Fall 2023</a> , based on year 2022
<b>Target</b>	90% of countries increase by at least one maturity level by end of Strategy (2028)

**KPI S7: Use of disaggregated data for planning or decision making**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries that have documented evidence of using required disaggregated data to inform planning or programmatic decision making for priority populations in HIV, TB and malaria
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # countries at or above threshold country score for “use” of disaggregated data</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in the cohort</li> <li>• <b>Threshold:</b> 50% score at country level</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All High Impact and Core countries, excluding acute emergency countries
<b>Data source</b>	Targeted country-based survey
<b>Baseline</b>	68%, based on year 2021 and for High Impact countries only
<b>Target</b>	80% countries meeting threshold for use of disaggregated data by end of Strategy (2028)

**KPI S8: On Shelf Availability (OSA)**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of health facilities with tracer health products available on the day of visit for HIV, TB & malaria respectively
<b>Formula</b>	On-Shelf Availability (OSA) for each product category is the ratio of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # of health facilities with tracer products available on the day of the visit</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total health facilities where tracer products are expected to be available</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	<u>Countries:</u> High Impact & Core countries based on the following criteria: (1) highest burden and levels of investment for HIV, TB & Malaria; (2) In-Country Supply Chain Risk Rating, (3) level of PSM investment; <u>12 Product groups:</u> HIV (Dx, Adult FLD, Pediatric FLD, Adult SLD, Pediatric SLD, VLD); TB (Dx, Adult FLD, Adult SLD); Malaria (Dx, FLD, SLD)
<b>Data source</b>	Supply Chain and Health Services Spot Checks
<b>Baseline</b>	OSA for HIV= 83%; TB= 81%, Malaria=84%, based on Round 2 spot checks conducted in 2022.
<b>Target</b>	Achieve OSA of at least 90% by 2025 and maintain annual 90% result till end Strategy (2028) for HIV, TB, Malaria respectively

**KPI S9: Supply continuity**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of priority products with the desired number of suppliers that meet Quality Assurance requirements
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # of products <a href="#">achieving threshold for number of</a> <del>with</del> active* suppliers <a href="#">above threshold</a> that meet Quality Assurance requirements</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # products</li> <li>• <b>Threshold:</b> <math>\geq 4</math> <a href="#">or more</a> suppliers for high volume products; <math>\geq 2</math> <a href="#">or more</a> suppliers for low volume products</li> </ul> <p><i>* Suppliers are considered active if they produce the respective product or are committed to making production capacity available as per supplier performance reviews.</i></p>
<b>Cohort</b>	WHO-recommended 1st & 2nd line ARVs, ACTs, LLINs, TB products agreed with Stop TB. List of products revised annually
<b>Data source</b>	Quality Assurance list, Supplier performance reviews, StopTB database
<b>Baseline</b>	96% for the year 2021 (this does not include TB products)
<b>Target</b>	90% of priority products have desired number of suppliers that meet quality assurance requirements, assessed annually

**KPI S10: Introduction of new products**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of new products introduced, from an agreed list of new products
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # products that have become eligible and available for country procurement</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total new products to be introduced in the year</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	Agreed set of new products recommended for introduction – Revised annually in alignment with external partners
<b>Data source</b>	KPI specific database
<b>Baseline</b>	Not available (new KPI)
<b>Target</b>	80% of new products available for country procurement, assessed annually

**KPI E1: Scale up of programs to address Human Rights-related barriers**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with increases in scale of programs to reduce Human Rights-related barriers for a) HIV; b) TB; c) Malaria respectively
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # countries showing an increase in scale of programs from baseline for HIV, TB, Malaria respectively</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total countries in reporting period for HIV, TB, Malaria respectively</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	For HIV: receiving Human Rights Matching Funds in relevant Allocation Period; for TB: all TB SI countries among those receiving Matching Funds in relevant Allocation Period; for malaria: Kenya, Uganda
<b>Data source</b>	Funding Request, annual reports from TA providers
<b>Baseline</b>	Staggered baseline data provided by countries at time of Funding Request submission for 2023-2025 Allocation Period. 2025 results serve as baseline for 2026-2028 Allocation Period
<b>Target</b>	<a href="#">To be confirmed in Spring 2023 50% of countries in cohort show increase in scale of programming from baseline for a comprehensive response to human rights barriers to HIV, TB, malaria services respectively</a> , for 2023-2025 Allocation Period. TBC in Spring 2026 for 2026-2028 Allocation Period

**KPI E2a: Reaching marginalized sub-populations**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with at least half of the custom equity indicators <a href="#">having performance of 90% or more performing at minimum acceptable level</a>
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # countries <a href="#">with at least half of the custom equity indicators performing at or above- achieving</a> the threshold</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort for the reporting period</li> <li>• <b>Threshold:</b> At least <a href="#">50% half of the</a> custom equity indicators have performance <a href="#">&gt;= of 90% or more</a></li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All High Impact and Core countries and priority Focused countries
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	Not available (new KPI)
<b>Target</b>	70% countries have at least half of the custom equity indicators <a href="#">with a performance of 90% or more performing at minimum acceptable level</a> , assessed annually

**KPI E2b: Reducing inequities in HTM**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with at least half of the custom equity indicators showing a faster progression compared to the standard indicator
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # countries <a href="#">achieving the threshold with at least half of the custom equity indicators showing a faster progression compared to standard indicator</a></li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort for the reporting period</li> <li>• <b>Threshold:</b> At least <a href="#">50% half of the</a> custom equity indicators show change in result greater than standard indicator</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All High Impact and Core countries and priority Focused countries
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	Not available (new KPI)
<b>Target</b>	70% countries have at least half of the custom equity indicators showing faster progression compared to standard indicator, assessed annually

**KPI E3a: Advancing gender equality – engagement in grant cycle**

<b>Definition</b>	Satisfaction of women and gender-diverse communities with engagement <del>in</del> <a href="#">across the</a> grant cycle consistently <a href="#">above minimum-at</a> acceptable level
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # grant cycle stages with scores <a href="#">above achieving the</a> threshold</li> <li>• <b>Threshold:</b> 75% minimum satisfaction score</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	all countries receiving Global Fund allocation in relevant Allocation Period
<b>Data source</b>	Standardized survey conducted at different stages across grant cycle
<b>Baseline</b>	Not available (new KPI)
<b>Target</b>	3 stages (out of 3), i.e., each stage of the grant cycle has at least 75% satisfaction level, assessed annually

**KPI E3b: Performance of gender-specific indicators**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with at least half of the gender indicators <a href="#">having performance of 90% or more performing at minimum acceptable level</a>
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # countries <a href="#">achieving the with at least half of gender indicators performing above</a> threshold</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort for the reporting period</li> <li>• <b>Threshold:</b> At least <a href="#">50% half of the</a> gender indicators have performance <a href="#">&gt;= of 90% or more</a></li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All High Impact and Core countries and priority Focused countries
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	Not available (new KPI)
<b>Target</b>	70% countries have at least half of the gender indicators <a href="#">with a performance of 90% or more performing at minimum acceptable level</a> , assessed annually

**KPI C1: Community engagement across Global Fund grant cycle**

<b>Definition</b>	Satisfaction of communities with engagement across the grant cycle consistently <a href="#">at above minimum</a> acceptable level
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator</b> # grant cycle stages with scores <a href="#">above achieving the</a> threshold</li> <li>• <b>Threshold:</b> 75% minimum satisfaction score</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	all countries receiving Global Fund allocation in relevant Allocation Period
<b>Data source</b>	Standardized survey conducted at different stages across the grant cycle
<b>Baseline</b>	Not available (new KPI)
<b>Target</b>	3 stages (out of 3), i.e., each stage of the grant cycle has at least 75% satisfaction level, assessed annually

**KPI R1a: Realization of domestic co-financing commitments**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage realization of domestic co-financing commitments to health across the whole portfolio
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> Total Co-financing amount realized in the Allocation Period under review</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total Co-financing commitments for the Allocation Period under review</li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	All country-components <a href="#">with an allocation in current Allocation Period</a> , excluding, components: (a) exempted or granted waiver from co-financing requirements; (b) given extension for reporting co-financing, beyond KPI deadline; and/or (c) that did not access funding in previous Allocation Period
<b>Data source</b>	Global Fund Health Financing co-financing monitoring database
<b>Baseline</b>	85% commitments realized in 2017-2019 Allocation Period by eligible 2020-2022 components
<b>Target</b>	85% co-financing commitment realized for each Allocation Period, assessed annually

**KPI R1b: Mitigation actions for countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments**

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of milestones achieved for implementation of mitigating actions by countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments
<b>Formula</b>	Average score for the % of milestones reached across portfolio
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries identified as having material risks for co-financing with mitigation actions specified in grant agreements that were due in the year for which KPI results are reported. Exclusion: Milestones of mitigation actions that were extended beyond the KPI reporting period
<b>Data source</b>	Global Fund Health Financing co-financing monitoring database

<b>Baseline</b>	<a href="#">Not available (new KPI)</a>
<b>Target</b>	80% mitigation actions implemented by countries at risk of not meeting co-financing commitments, assessed annually

### KPI R2: Timeliness and quality of external audit process performed by SAIs

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries meeting criteria of timeliness and quality for audit deliverables
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # countries for which SAIs audit of grants meet threshold for timeliness &amp; quality</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> # countries using SAIs for the audit of grants for the relevant financial year</li> <li>• <b>Threshold:</b> grant audit reports score <math>\geq</math> <a href="#">is 2.3 or more</a></li> </ul>
<b>Cohort</b>	High Impact/Core countries using Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs) for the audit of Global Fund grants (with Govt. PRs) for the relevant financial year
<b>Data source</b>	Global Fund External Audit Tracking (EAT) tool
<b>Baseline</b>	<a href="#">45% (5/11) countries met threshold for timeliness &amp; quality as per 2022 External Audit Tracking (EAT) annual review process</a>
<b>Target</b>	80% countries meet criteria for timeliness and quality of audit deliverables, assessed annually

### KPI R3: Announced pledges

<b>Definition</b>	Announced pledges as ratio of Replenishment target
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> total pledges secured at Replenishment Conference and throughout the Replenishment Period</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> target set out in the Investment Case for the 3-year Replenishment Period</li> </ul> <p><i>*all amounts in USD, calculated using the respective Replenishment Period exchange rates</i></p>
<b>Cohort</b>	All pledges to Global Fund for the given 3-year Replenishment Period (whether announced prior to, during or after the Pledging Conference). Excludes co-financing/co-investment and any other fundraising initiatives not factored in during initial target-setting (e.g., C19RM in 2020-2022)
<b>Data source</b>	Global Fund pledges and contributions database
<b>Baseline</b>	100% for 6 <sup>th</sup> Replenishment Period
<b>Target</b>	100% of Replenishment Target for 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> Replenishment respectively, assessed annually

### KPI P1: Progress in laboratory testing modalities

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with improved or sustained high performance in laboratory testing capacity modalities
<b>Formula</b>	<p>Performance measured using SPAR C4.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Numerator:</b> # of countries that show significant improvement, or maintain high performance* compared to baseline</li> <li>• <b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort</li> </ul> <p><i>* Country is considered as meeting the KPI if it has progressed its score from 0 to 40; from 20 to 60; from 40 to 80; from 60 to 80 or if it maintained its score if it was already at 80 or at 100 in 2022</i></p>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries investing Global Fund funds in <a href="#">interventions</a> related to the specified technical domain
<b>Data source</b>	WHO IHR Electronic State Parties Self-Assessment Annual Reporting (e-SPAR)
<b>Baseline</b>	To be confirmed in Fall 2023. Baseline year 2022.

<b>Target</b>	90% of countries show significant improvement, or have maintained high performance by end of Strategy (2028)
---------------	--

### KPI P2: Progress in early warning surveillance function

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with improved or sustained high performance in early warning surveillance function
<b>Formula</b>	Performance measured using SPAR C5.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Numerator:</b> # of countries that show significant improvement, or maintain high performance* compared to baseline</li> <li><b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort</li> </ul> <p>* Country is considered as meeting the KPI if it has progressed its score from 0 to 40; from 20 to 60; from 40 to 80; from 60 to 80 or if it maintained its score if it was already at 80 or at 100 in 2022</p>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries investing Global Fund funds in <a href="#">interventions</a> - related to the specified technical domain
<b>Data source</b>	WHO IHR Electronic State Parties Self-Assessment Annual Reporting (e-SPAR)
<b>Baseline</b>	To be confirmed in Fall 2023. Baseline year 2022.
<b>Target</b>	90% of countries show significant improvement, or have maintained high performance by end of Strategy (2028)

### KPI P3: Progress in human resources for implementation of IHR

<b>Definition</b>	Percentage of countries with improved or sustained high performance in human resources for implementation of IHR
<b>Formula</b>	Performance measured using SPAR C6.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Numerator:</b> # of countries that show significant improvement, or maintain high performance* compared to baseline</li> <li><b>Denominator:</b> Total # countries in cohort</li> </ul> <p>* Country is considered as meeting the KPI if it has progressed its score from 0 to 40; from 20 to 60; from 40 to 80; from 60 to 80 or if it maintained its score if it was already at 80 or at 100 in 2022</p>
<b>Cohort</b>	All countries investing Global Fund funds in <a href="#">interventions</a> related to the specified technical domain
<b>Data source</b>	WHO IHR Electronic State Parties Self-Assessment Annual Reporting (e-SPAR)
<b>Baseline</b>	To be confirmed in Fall 2023. Baseline year 2022.
<b>Target</b>	90% of countries show significant improvement, or have maintained high performance by end of Strategy (2028)

### KPI I1: Mortality rate

<b>Definition</b>	Reduction in Mortality rate
<b>Formula</b>	Projected reduction in combined mortality rate across the three diseases from 2021 baseline to end 2028
<b>Cohort</b>	Fixed cohort of countries eligible for funding in 2023-2025 Allocation Period that have a modeled projection
<b>Data source</b>	<u>Baseline and results:</u> UNAIDS (for HIV) and WHO (for TB and malaria) <u>Projections:</u> GOALS model (HIV), TIME model (TB) and Imperial College London, <a href="#">malaria simulation model</a> (malaria)
<b>Baseline</b>	<del>To be confirmed in Spring 2023. Baseline year 2024. Due to potential retrospective revisions of burden estimates as more recent and reliable data becomes available, the baseline will be presented at the time of reporting using WHO/UNAIDS latest estimates of burden of the three diseases published in their annual reports</del>
<b>Target</b>	<del>To be confirmed in Spring 2023 for end Strategy (2028). Combined mortality rate reduction of [35% - 54% - 70%] across the three diseases from 2021 to end 2028</del>

<b>KPI I2: Incidence rate</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Reduction in Incidence rate
<b>Formula</b>	Projected reduction in combined incidence rate across the three diseases from 2021 baseline to end 2028
<b>Cohort</b>	Fixed cohort of countries eligible for funding in 2023-2025 Allocation Period that have a modeled projection
<b>Data source</b>	Baseline <a href="#">and results</a> : UNAIDS (for HIV) and WHO (for TB and malaria) Projections: <a href="#">Goals GOALS</a> model (HIV), TIME model (TB) and Imperial College London, <a href="#">malaria simulation</a> model (malaria)
<b>Baseline</b>	<del>To be confirmed in Spring 2023. Baseline year 2021</del> Due to potential retrospective revisions of burden estimates as more recent and reliable data becomes available, the baseline will be presented at the time of reporting using WHO/UNAIDS latest estimates of burden of the three diseases published in their annual reports
<b>Target</b>	<del>To be confirmed in Spring 2023 for end Strategy (2028)</del> Combined incidence rate reduction of [30% - 42% - 60%] across the three diseases from 2021 to end 2028



## Section 2.2: Financial KPIs

KPI F1: Pledge conversion	
<b>Definition</b>	Pledge conversion rate
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Numerator:</b> Absolute cash receipts received (cumulative year on year)</li> <li><b>Denominator:</b> Adjusted pledges expected to be received for the Replenishment Period</li> </ul> <i>*all amounts in USD, calculated using the respective Replenishment Period exchange rates</i>
<b>Cohort</b>	All contributions from pledges linked to a given Replenishment Period. Excludes Special Purpose Resource Mobilizations such as C19RM
<b>Data source</b>	Global Fund Financial database
<b>Baseline</b>	Y1: 24%; Y2: 54%; Y3: 86%; Y4: 100%. Baseline from 5 <sup>th</sup> Replenishment
<b>Target</b>	For 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> Replenishment respectively: Pledge conversion rate by end Y1:30%; Y2:60%; Y3:90%; Y4:100%, assessed annually
KPI F2a: Corporate asset utilization	
<b>Definition</b>	Utilization of corporate assets across approved uses of funds (e.g., Grants, SI, and OPEX) in the Replenishment Period
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Numerator:</b> Total asset utilization (actual + forecast) in the Replenishment Period</li> <li><b>Denominator:</b> Total corporate assets in the Replenishment Period</li> </ul> <i>*all amounts in USD, calculated using the respective Replenishment Period exchange rates</i>
<b>Cohort</b>	All corporate assets
<b>Data source</b>	Global Fund Financial database
<b>Baseline</b>	95% as of October 2022 AFC report
<b>Target</b>	95%-98% corporate asset utilization, assessed annually
KPI F2b: Allocation utilization	
<b>Definition</b>	Portion of allocated grant funds that are disbursed or forecast to be disbursed
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Numerator:</b> Total disbursements (actual + forecast) for the Allocation Period</li> <li><b>Denominator:</b> Total allocated grant funds for the Allocation Period</li> </ul> <i>*all amounts in USD, calculated using the respective Replenishment Period exchange rates</i>
<b>Cohort</b>	All grant uses of funds. Excluding Special Purpose Resource Mobilization funds such as C19RM
<b>Data source</b>	Global Fund Financial database
<b>Baseline</b>	>93% as of October 2022 AFC report
<b>Target</b>	95% allocation utilization, assessed annually
KPI F3: In-country absorption	
<b>Definition</b>	Portion of grant budgets that have been reported by country programs as spent on services delivered
<b>Formula</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Numerator:</b> Cumulative in-country expenditure during Grant Implementation Period for relevant Allocation Period</li> <li><b>Denominator:</b> Cumulative grant budget during Grant Implementation Period for relevant Allocation Period</li> </ul> <i>*all amounts in USD, calculated using the respective Replenishment Period exchange rates</i>
<b>Cohort</b>	All Global Fund active grants for the relevant Allocation Period, excluding Special Purpose Resource Mobilization such as C19RM
<b>Data source</b>	Routine grant reporting
<b>Baseline</b>	Y1: 62%; Y2: 70%; Y3: 89% for 2017-2019 Allocation Period
<b>Target</b>	For each Allocation Period, in-country absorption by end Y1: 75%, Y2: 80%, Y3: 85%, assessed annually

## Annex 4 – Relevant Past Board Decisions

Relevant past Decision Point	Summary and Impact
<p><a href="#">GF/B48/DP06</a>: 2023-2028 M&amp;E Framework, KPI Framework and Multi-Year Evaluation Calendar (November 2022)</p>	<p>The Board noted the recommendations of the Strategy Committee and Audit and Finance Committee, as set forth in GF/B48/04 and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorses the components of the M&amp;E Framework as described in GF/B48/04 Annex 1;</li> <li>• Approves the KPI Framework (including each Key Performance Indicator), as set forth in GF/B48/04 Annex 2;</li> <li>• Approves the topics for the Multi-Year Evaluation Calendar 2023-2028 as set forth in GF/B48/04 Annex 3; and Delegates authority to the SC to approve changes to the Multi-Year Evaluation Calendar in 2023, following a request by the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer and advice from the Independent Evaluation Panel.</li> </ul>
<p><a href="#">GF/B47/DP08</a>: Leveraging the work of the Standing Committees (May 2022)</p>	<p>Based on the recommendation of EGC, as set forth in GF/B47/06 – Revision 1, the Board amended the Charters of the Standing Committees of the Board.</p>