

Summary Report of the Global
Fund Technical Evaluation
Reference Group (TERG)

12th Meeting

Frankfurt, Germany 14-16 July 2009

1.0 Introduction

This document reports on the TERG 12th Meeting which took place 14-16 July 2009 in Frankfurt, Germany. It provides a summary of key issues discussed and the TERG's recommendations. The agenda for the meeting and participant list are attached as Annex A. The TERG meeting focused principally on the follow up to the Five-Year Evaluation, the TERG Assessment, the independent evaluation of the Affordable Medicines Facility – malaria, and the TERG activities, budget and workplan for 2009-2010.

2.0 Five-Year Evaluation Follow-up Activities

2.1 Background

The TERG presented the final Five-Year Evaluation reports to the Board at its Nineteenth Meeting in May 2009. The overall reception of the Board to the evaluation was positive and constructive. The following Board decision captures the full Board response (GF/B19/DP29):

'Recognizing the continued role of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) in the follow-up to the Five Year Evaluation (5YE), as part of the TERG mandate to provide independent advice, assessment and oversight for the Global Fund's work on monitoring and evaluation (M&E), the Board:

1. Welcomes the findings and recommendations included in the Study Area (SA) 3 Report and in the Synthesis Report of the 5YE, as summarized in the TERG Report (GF/B19/10);
2. Endorses the TERG's call for action for the Global Fund to work with partners to strengthen country monitoring and evaluation, and information systems for performance and impact, to build analytical capacity in countries and to support development of country-owned impact evaluation platforms;
3. Requests the Secretariat to articulate a process and timeline for responding to and implementing the recommendations set out in SA3 and the Synthesis Report by 15 June 2009...'

The Secretariat response has been shared with the Chair of the PSC for input and will be submitted to the PSC and then to the Board. To support its continued role in the follow up of the 5YE the TERG requests to receive the Global Fund's response to the Five-Year Evaluation.

2.2 Discussions and Recommendations

The TERG discussed various aspects of the planned evaluation follow-up activities including in-country data dissemination workshops and the dissemination of the Model Evaluation Platform used for impact assessment. The Director of the Strategy, Performance and Evaluation Cluster and TERG focal point (Dr Rifat Atun) described the various impact evaluation platforms currently evolving, in addition to the Five-Year Evaluation (5YE) Model Evaluation Platform. These include the global initiative to strengthen Country Health Systems Surveillance (CHESS); and the IHP+ monitoring framework. Dr Atun announced the Global Fund would convene a meeting in September to include WHO, UNAIDS, GAVI, WB, and UNICEF to discuss indicators, tools and platforms, and invited the TERG to participate. TERG reminded the Secretariat of the need to be cognizant of partners' roles and recommended that the Global Fund should not only try to support and facilitate but try to mobilize partners individually to fulfill their own mandates. The TERG will ensure its participation in these processes. The TERG emphasized that the 5YE platform is to be made available to partners and countries, but is not in any way prescriptive. Harmonization of this tool with others is most welcome.

TERG highlighted the most important issues for future study, including: prevention activities, sexual minority issues, gender, most at-risk populations and health system strengthening – especially to address lack of guidelines, lack of essential drugs, etc. TERG emphasized the need to address issues of quality and coverage of non-facility based services (prevention activities and community based services). Especially in the area of TB, TERG highlighted the need to strengthen surveillance in countries using a uniform approach. The Global Fund should be proactive in this field as its performance-based funding processes derive directly from these indicators.

TERG recommended the Global Fund should move towards a more prospective, periodic evaluation process, focusing on high-quality data while endeavoring not to overburden weak country systems. TERG also highlighted the need for simpler, less expensive impact evaluation methodology including financial tracking data.

Based on TERG previous guidance and a conference call organized between the TERG support team, Martin Vaessen and Ties Boerma, a detailed workplan from Macro on the roll-out of the dissemination activities after the Five-Year Evaluation will be finalized and submitted to TERG for review. This workplan will be mostly funded by PEPFAR contributions to the Five-Year Evaluation. TERG members welcomed the opportunity to participate in country dissemination workshops.

TERG recommended that the Five-Year Evaluation final reports on Study Area 3 (SA3) and the Synthesis Report be formally published as books. TERG will develop a preface to be included in the published final reports. TERG also requested that the TERG Summary Reports on the Synthesis Report and Study Area 3 be translated into French. TERG requested the development of a publications strategy with appropriate distribution network.

Action points:

- Detailed workplan on the roll-out of the dissemination activities after the 5YE to be submitted to TERG for review
- Five-Year Evaluation SA3 final reports to be formally published as a book. TERG to develop a preface
- TERG Summary Reports on the Synthesis Report and Study Area 3 to be translated into French.

3.0 Strategic directions of the Global Fund M&E Agenda

3.1 Background

Dr Atun presented a broad overview of the three components that comprise the Secretariat's evaluation agenda, and indicated a detailed evaluation agenda will be developed with the TERG to include the following subjects:

1. Country evaluations
 - Program evaluations e.g. grant evaluations led by countries
 - Disease impact evaluations with partners
 - Health systems effects evaluation with partners
2. Regional and global level synthesis
3. Business model or policy evaluations including PBF, Phase 2, NSA, AMFm, PMTCT policy

3.2 Discussion & Recommendations

TERG emphasized the need to define the priority evaluation questions for each area of evaluation, and to ensure these are reflected in the 2009-2010 workplan.

With regard to the proposed evaluation of Performance-Based Funding (PBF), TERG reiterated the Five-Year Evaluation finding that questioned the Global Fund's implementation of PBF and highlighted the need to prioritize this evaluation. TERG also reiterated a request for an update on recent changes to the PBF system. TERG pointed out that PBF funding rewards short term results rather than long term results which can create unintentional incentives.

With regard to evaluating the Global Fund's effect on health systems, while no evidence of negative impact were identified by the 5YE, TERG recognize that many articles suggest that Global Fund

investments are distorting health systems and having unintended negative effects. TERG emphasized the need for a comparative analysis in this area.

TERG also highlighted the need to prioritize a methodologically-rigorous evaluation of the new National Strategy Application process given that the first learning wave is already well under way. TERG enquired as to how NSAs reconcile with dual track financing and expressed the need to secure civil society involvement in the design and implementation of national strategies. The Cluster Director committed to share the draft evaluation proposal with the TERG.

Regarding the evaluation of the change in PMTCT policy, the Cluster Director clarified that this review would be a combined effort with UNAIDS and WHO. TERG underlined that this is extremely important to recognize that to conduct this kind of technical policies (or guidance reviews) is a WHO mandate and responsibility. Partners such as the Global Fund should support WHO in this process rather than taking the lead.

The role of TERG in finalizing the evaluation agenda was discussed at length. TERG requested that the Secretariat urgently share the full draft evaluation program of work, including the set of research questions, methodologies to be used and plan for how the work will be done. TERG reiterated its role in helping define evaluation methodology and terms of reference as well as reviewing proposals and plans and making recommendations. Dr Atun committed to sharing a draft agenda in the next 2 weeks for TERG discussion by teleconference. Dr Atun emphasized that the main pieces of work in 2009-2010 would include impact evaluation, PBF review and NSA review.

TERG reiterates the need for the promotion of the principles of quality management and self-assessment at country level since it is impossible to evaluate the full Global Fund portfolio on a continuous basis. Therefore, in line with the call for action from Global Fund Board for the strengthening of country M&E capacity, TERG recommends the strengthening of quality management systems supplemented by systematic voluntary or externally driven evaluations and audits.

Action points:

- Secretariat to share the draft evaluation agenda by end July for TERG discussion by teleconference

4.0 TERG Activities 2009-2010

4.1 Background

At the conclusion of the Five-Year Evaluation in May 2009 (as budget had only been made available for 5YE-related TERG activities) the TERG Chair presented the TERG's budget and resource requirements to the Secretariat TERG focal point for the balance of 2009.

4.2 Discussion & Recommendations

Before the Five-Year Evaluation, TERG operated primarily as an advisory group, giving feedback on the monitoring and evaluation activities of the Secretariat. The Secretariat presented its activities, evaluations, results, and TERG provided guidance during all stages of the Secretariat's activities. In undertaking the oversight of the Five-Year Evaluation, TERG's role evolved to include oversight of external rather than internal activities. TERG emphasized the lessons to be learned from its past relationship with the Secretariat. TERG has traditionally been involved with all stages of evaluation preparation and execution, including reviewing terms of reference, selecting contractors, reviewing methodologies and interim and final products.

TERG expressed a desire to move from the extraordinary relationship created by the 5YE (with a TERG Support Team separated from the Secretariat) to the original model of working which was based on more frequent, informal communication and exchange with the Secretariat. TERG

emphasized the need for the Secretariat to take the lead in setting an evaluation agenda for the TERG's review and input. TERG will contribute to identifying the needs and gaps and will bring these to the attention of the Secretariat. Dr Atun emphasized the Secretariat welcomes a strong working relationship with TERG.

The TERG recommended the main areas for Secretariat evaluation focus in 2010 include: performance-based funding, national strategies application process, Phase 2, M&E System Strengthening and the TRP review process. TERG offers its guidance through reviewing the Secretariat's M&E agenda, strategy and workplan as well as reviewing evaluation protocols, RFPs and interim deliverables and providing recommendations.

TERG emphasized the need for a coordinated approach to developing an evaluation agenda with the Secretariat and reiterated its need for a support team of 2 people at minimum to continue TERG's basic operations. TERG recommended that the TERG Chair should participate in hiring of TERG support staff and should be involved in at least 1 annual performance review of TERG support staff. TERG recommended that the Secretariat should review the original terms of reference of the TERG to improve understanding of TERG role and mandate. The TERG Chair reiterated the need to make financial and human resources available to the TERG and the need for the Secretariat to facilitate the TERG's work in these areas. Dr Atun explained that due to 2009 budget cuts it may not be possible to commit budget support for the TERG in 2009 beyond funding TERG meetings. The budget for 2010 will need to be submitted to the Dr Atun by July 22 and finalized by 14 August at which point the proposed budget will be shared with FAC.

Action points:

- TERG support team to submit the 2010 budget needs to Dr Atun on 20 July

5.0 TERG Self-Assessment

5.1 Background

The TERG decided in October 2008 to undergo a self-assessment, and requested the TERG support team to develop a TERG self assessment methodology. A draft framework for the assessment of the TERG was prepared for review by the TERG in early 2009. The TERG self-assessment paper is under preparation with the assistance of an external consultant, Stein-Erik Kruse, who conducted a survey of all TERG members and conducted telephone interviews with various external stakeholders to obtain external assessment input. The preliminary findings and proposed recommendations were presented to the TERG for discussion. Based on the initial feedback received from TERG, the paper will be finalized by the external consultant and the TERG support team.

The TERG Assessment report will be shared with the Policy and Strategy Committee and will form a key background document for the Board Ad-Hoc Committee in charge of further defining the role of the TERG in relation to independent evaluations, the resources required and Board oversight of the process (as described in the Board's decision point: GF/B19/DP29).

5.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG provided the following summary comments as guidance to the consultant in framing the main issues identified in the report:

- Given the magnitude of the Five-Year Evaluation, TERG has become primarily identified with this study, especially among new staff members of the Global Fund who were not aware of the TERG's normal modus operandi. The TERG's mandate has not changed, but has been interpreted differently by new management at the Global Fund. It is important to uphold the original mandate of the TERG, while keeping in mind that the mandate may require clarification as a result of the findings of this assessment.

- The report identifies communication with Secretariat as a serious issue requiring attention. TERG is willing to take every opportunity to improve communication and to forge a closer relationship with the Secretariat. The 5YE period was extraordinarily challenging for all parties. The M&E Unit management deliberately chose to be isolated from TERG communications, to avoid a real or perceived conflict of interest. The Secretariat underwent major management changes during this time, which directly affected TERG functioning. The relationship with the TERG was not properly managed as part of this transition. The report should include recommendations as to how the TERG's working model should be refined, especially with regard to its relationship with the Secretariat.
- During the Five-Year Evaluation the TERG Support Team was intended to be entirely dedicated to TERG support (without taking on additional M&E Unit activities), but should not have been isolated from regular M&E Unit communications. The report should recognize the challenge the Secretariat must address in ensuring the TERG Support staff play a dual role in their responsibilities to both the Secretariat and the TERG. Conflict of interest issues should be examined carefully.
- In considering issues of independence, the report should distinguish between independence and bias. TERG members volunteer their time and are highly committed to strengthening the Global Fund. This may introduce a bias, but is not an issue of independence.
- With regard to the format of the report, the views of different groups of interviewees should be clearly differentiated e.g. contractors, TERG members, or Secretariat. Conflicting opinions should be attributed to the appropriate group. Findings should be illustrated with quantitative information to the extent possible.
- The interviews conducted by the external consultant did not include implementers' delegates at the GF Board. Such interview should be conducted before finalizing the text.

The TERG discussed the proposed recommendations and provided the following specific guidance:

- The report should provide detailed recommendations to formalize and institutionalize working methodologies, ensuring operating arrangements are robust and less dependent on personalities. Recommendations should support a degree of 'statutory accountability' between TERG and Secretariat. The report should also recognize that a healthy degree of tension should exist between an independent evaluation group and the senior management of an organization being evaluated, and should be appropriately managed.
- TERG discussed and agreed with the proposed option to include the Secretariat TERG Focal Point as an ex-officio member of the TERG as a means to improve efficiency and communication. It was stressed that the Focal Point would require strong support from the Executive Director to appropriately engage in such a role.
- In considering the relationship of the TERG with the PSC, TERG emphasized the need to maintain close contact with the Chair of PSC and to explicitly manage the transition when a new PSC Chair is appointed.
- TERG acknowledged the Chair's extraordinary efforts in terms of commitment to the Global Fund and time spent in and between meetings - a level of effort which will be most likely impossible to sustain in the future. TERG recommends that compensation for such efforts should be considered.
- TERG discussed communication mechanisms and recommended the Secretariat should provide annual feedback to the TERG on areas needing TERG contribution during the year. TERG should provide technical feedback on the annual evaluation agenda and should provide a clear indication of its planned contribution.
- TERG clarified that Secretariat evaluation work should be regularly co-designed and shaped by the TERG, but not managed or implemented by TERG. TERG should review the detailed evaluation agenda, budget and workplan and in line with its terms of reference propose to the Board independent evaluations as needed.

- Because the remit of TERG is beyond M&E unit, TERG agreed with the recommendation to locate the support function at a higher level to protect its independence. A degree of separation from M&E Unit and appropriate access to the Secretariat Focal Point should be guaranteed.

5.3 Next Steps

The external consultant will continue development of the assessment report, incorporating all feedback. Additional stakeholder interviews will be conducted with the M&E Unit Director, SPE Cluster Director and PSC Chair, and a southern constituency Board representative. The TERG support team will provide supporting factual data and support the editing. The draft report will be circulated to TERG for comment on 31 July and the final report will be sent to PSC by the end of August.

Action points:

- Revised draft of the TERG self-assessment report to be submitted to TERG by 31 July for review

6.0 TERG Renewal

6.1 Background

The following TERG members have served at least one full term and are now eligible to rotate out: Rolf Korte, Rose Leke, David Barr, Stefano Bertozzi, Bashirul Haq, Loretta Peschi. TERG decided before the end of 2008 that to ensure continuity, existing members will be encouraged to remain active until the new members are confirmed by the Board. The TERG requested the Secretariat to begin soliciting Board nominations in January 2009 to fill these seats.

A comprehensive TERG recruitment process was conducted January - March 2009. In total, 22 nominations were received from 13 constituencies. External consultancy HSLP was contracted for the initial screening of nominees based on previous experience with TRP & TERG. TERG Selection Committee met 16 March 2009 to develop options for PSC discussion. The TERG Selection Committee felt additional information was required from candidates to ensure a fair and complete selection process, and requested that HSLP pursue a second phase of data collection and reference checking, contacting candidates as needed to fill information gaps. TERG Selection Committee will reconvene to review the candidates once background information is complete. To accommodate this approach, the terms of these six members of the TERG were extended by the Board until the conclusion of the Twentieth Board Meeting

6.2 Discussion & Recommendations

In considering the selection of new potential TERG members, TERG emphasized the need for strong evaluation expertise, in particular in impact evaluation and qualitative evaluation. TERG also emphasized the importance of ensuring at least one TERG member is selected with strong NGO experience. In the future, TERG members suggested the TERG ToR could be amended to include a need for experts in organizational development and program management experience (particularly in Global Fund-managed programs). The TERG anticipates the TERG Selection Committee will next convene in September 2009 to make a final proposal to the PSC.

For the next TERG meeting, TERG members proposed to hold a joint meeting with departing members and new members to allow a better induction to new members and ensure a better continuity of the activities.

Action points:

- TERG support team to coordinate, in close relation with the TERG Selection Committee, the second phase of data collection and reference checking by HSLP for TERG member selection.

7.0 Affordable Medicines Facility – Malaria

6.1 Background

At its nineteenth meeting the Global Fund Board decided that the TERG 'will provide guidance with regard to the technical parameters of the design of the independent evaluation of the AMFm, under the oversight of the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee. Consistent with its previous decisions, the Board confirms that the Secretariat will continue to have responsibility for commissioning of the independent evaluation, under the oversight of the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee' (DP GF/B19/DP27). TERG has expressed its willingness to work together with the Ad Hoc Committee to translate the Board decision in the most expeditious manner. In May 2009 the TERG proposed to the Ad Hoc Committee two main areas for TERG contribution, limited to the provision of guidance on the technical parameters of the evaluation:

- (i) A technical review of key protocols and documents related to the independent evaluation of AMFm;
- (ii) Observational country visits to a small sample of countries to assess the technical soundness of the implementation of the evaluation.

At the invitation of the Ad Hoc Committee Chair, the TERG has provided feedback to the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee on both the second and third drafts of the AMFm Independent Evaluation M&E Framework, highlighting various methodological challenges. However TERG regrets that to date, the TERG has not been given an opportunity for direct communication with the Ad Hoc Committee, and the modalities for working together in this joint effort have not been further elucidated.

6.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG discussed its method of working with the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee and determined that the TERG's specific mandate from the Board as per the TERG's formal Terms of Reference provide adequate scope and direction to guide the TERG's work on AMFm.

In particular, the terms of reference specify that 'The TERG shall provide independent assessment and advice to the Board of The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis & Malaria on issues which it determines require board attention...The TERG shall provide advice to the Global Fund Secretariat on evaluation approaches and practices, independence, reporting procedures and other technical and managerial aspects of monitoring and evaluation at all levels.' As such, TERG has a clear role in contributing to the evaluation and ensuring its technical merit, soundness and relevance. Any guidance received from the Ad Hoc Committee will allow a better contribution of the TERG to this committee activities but will not supersede the TERG's primary mandate and terms of reference. TERG considers it important to accompany its evaluation work in all areas by field visits to ensure comprehensive insight into country activities as a basis for its reports to the Board.

TERG emphasized the need for open, regular communication directly with the Ad Hoc Committee and the Secretariat unit responsible for AMFm.

Action points:

- AMFm Ad-Hoc committee, with support from the AMFm Unit, to send to the TERG the modality of contribution, working modalities and timeline of activities proposed by the Ad-Hoc committee members

7.0 Next meeting

TERG agreed to schedule the 13th TERG meeting in November 2009 to coincide with the Twentieth Board Meeting to be held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The TERG will meet via teleconference and videoconference and will continue to review evaluation products between meetings, and will report on these to the PSC and the Board as they become available.

ANNEX A
MEETING AGENDA & PARTICIPANTS LIST
AGENDA

Meeting Objectives:

- Review of the follow up to the Five-Year Evaluation
- Review of progress on the Affordable Medicines Facility - Malaria Independent Evaluation
- Review and Discuss TERG Self Assessment
- Discuss TERG workplan, budget and working modalities 2009-2010

Tuesday 14 July

Venue: Westin Grand Hotel - Dublin Room

- | | | |
|----------|----------------------|--|
| 1 | 09.00 - 9.45 | Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Review of agenda, feedback from 19th Board Meeting, Extension of TERG terms & TERG renewal <p><i>Chair for morning session: R. Korte</i></p> |
| 2 | 9.45 - 10.30 | Five-Year Evaluation Follow-up Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Presentation on status of 5YE follow-up activities implemented by Macro - C. Mahe- TERG discussion and recommendations |
| | 10.30 - 10.45 | <i>Coffee</i> |
| 3 | 10.45 - 12.30 | Strategic directions of the Global Fund M&E Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Presentation - R. Atun- TERG Discussion and recommendations |
| | 12.30 - 14.00 | <i>Lunch</i> |
| 3 | 14.00 - 15.30 | Strategic directions of the Global Fund M&E Agenda (con't) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Discussion of TERG potential contribution <p><i>Chair for afternoon session: R. Leke</i></p> |
| | 15.30 - 15:45 | <i>Coffee</i> |
| 4 | 15.45 - 17.30 | TERG 2009-2010 working modalities and activities <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Round table discussion |
| | 19.00 | <i>Dinner - Zum Schwarzen Stern</i> |

Wednesday 15 July

Venue: Westin Grand Hotel - Dublin Room

- 5 9.00 - 10.15 Introduction of TERG Assessment**
- Overview of the TERG assessment framework and planned agenda for the day - S.E. Kruse
 - TERG recommendations on the structure of the report
- Facilitator: Stein-Erik Kruse*
- 10.15 - 10.30 Coffee**
- 6 10.30 - 12.30 Discussion of main findings**
- Presentation of draft TERG Assessment findings - S.E. Kruse
 - TERG comments and clarifications
- 12.30 - 14.00 Lunch**
- 7 14.00 - 17.30 Discussion of future scenarii**
- Presentation of proposed scenarii - S.E. Kruse
 - TERG discussion and recommendations
- 19.00 Dinner - venue tbd**

Thursday 16 July

Venue: Westin Grand Hotel – Dublin Room

- 8** **9.00 - 10.30** **Update on AMFm Independent Evaluation**
- Status Update - R. Korte
 - TERG discussion and recommendations
- Chair for morning session: tbd*
- 10.30 - 10.45** **Coffee**
-
- 9** **10.45 - 12.15** **Discussion of the TERG workplan for 2009-2010**
- Presentation of first day meeting outcome - A. Lang
 - TERG discussion and recommendations
-
- 10** **12.15 - 12.30** **Meeting Wrap Up**
- Chair's summary - R. Korte
-
- 12.30 - 14.00** **Lunch & Close of Meeting**

List of Participants - TERG 12th Meeting: 14-16 July, 2009

TERG Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
KORTE Rolf	Honorary Professor, Faculty of Medicine, Justus-Liebig University, Giessen, Germany Senior Health Policy Advisor, GTZ	Ziegelhuetten 30 61476 Kronberg Germany	+49 175 433 4018	rolf.korte@swiftkenya.com
LEKE Rose	Professor of Immunology and Parasitology, Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences	P. O. Box 3851 University of Yaoundé 1 Cameroon	+237 223 44 51	roleleke@yahoo.com
AOYAMA Atsuko	Professor, Department of International Health, Nagoya University School of Medicine	65 Tsurumai-cho, Showa-ku, Nagoya 466-8550	+81 52 744 2108	atsukoa@med.nagoya-u.ac.jp
BERTOZZI Stefano	Director, Health Economics & Evaluation, National Institute of Public Health, Mexico Visiting Professor, CIDE, Mexico City, University of California Berkeley	Instituto Nacional de Salud Publica Avenue Universidad 655 Cuernavaca, Morelos 62508 México	+52 777 311 37 83	bertozzi@alum.mit.edu
DARE Lola	Executive Secretary, African Council for Sustainable Health Development	29 Aare Avenue New Bodija Estate UIPO Box 21633 Ibadan, Oyo State	+234 2 810 2401	acoshed@gmail.com
HAQ Bashirul	Director, Technical SoSec Consulting Services	House 67, Street 96-Sector 9-8/4 Islamabad	+92 51 484 7573	bashir.haq@sosec.org
PESCHI Loretta	Co-ordinator of the Italian NGOs Network for Global Action against AIDS	Via Pegasus 1 00060 Castelnuovo di Porto Roma, Italia	+39 06 90 78 124 +39 347 70 34 155	peschilo@alice.it
Ex-officio Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
BROEKMANS Jaap F.	Former Executive Director KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation	Koningin Emmakade 174 2518 JN The Hague The Netherlands	+31 (0)70 3352696	broekmansj@tbconsult.nl
DE LAY Paul	Deputy Executive Director, Programme Branch, UNAIDS	UNAIDS Secretariat 20, avenue Appia CH-1211 Geneva 27 Switzerland	+41 22 791 3666	delayp@unaids.org
NAHLEN Bernard	Deputy Coordinator President's Malaria Initiative	USAID Room 3.6-18 RRB Washington, DC 20523	+1 202 712 5915	bnahlen@usaid.gov
TEIXEIRA Paulo	Adviser, Ministry of Health	R. Bela Cintra, 1450 apto. 44 CEP 01415-001 – Jardim Paulista Sao Paulo, Brazil	+55 11 3066 8771	pteixeira@saude.sp.gov.br

TERG Advisors	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
SCHWARTLÄNDER Bernhard	UNAIDS Country Coordinator, Advisor to TERG Chair	UNAIDS Beijing, China	+86 10 8532 2226	schwartlanderb@unadis.org
Consultants	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
KRUSE Stein-Erik	Senior Consultant	Center for Health and Social Development (HeSo) Revefaret 11a Oslo, 0491	+47 91 18 80 96	stein.erik.kruse@heso.no
GF Secretariat	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
ATUN Rifat	Director Strategy, Performance & Evaluation	The Global Fund 8, Chemin de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	+41 58 791 1780	Rifat.Atun@theglobalfund.org
MAHE Cedric	Senior Evaluation Officer TERG Support Team		+41 58 791 1760	Cedric.Mahe@theglobalfund.org
LANG Alexandra	Evaluation Officer TERG Support Team		+41 58 791 1020	Alex.Lang@theglobalfund.org