

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

Fourteenth Meeting

**Geneva, Switzerland**

**8-9 February 2010**

## 1.0 Introduction

This document reports on the TERG Fourteenth Meeting which took place 8-9 February 2010 in Geneva, Switzerland at the Global Fund premises. This report provides a summary of key issues discussed and the TERG's recommendations. The agenda for the meeting and participants list are attached as Annex A. The meeting objectives were to review planning for the evaluation of the AMFm and define the role of the TERG, to advise on the planning for a Global Fund Evaluation Strategy and Agenda, to prepare a memo to the Board Ad Hoc Committee reviewing the role of the TERG, and to agree a TERG work plan and working modalities.

## 2.0 Updates since last TERG meeting

### 2.1 Background

Updates were presented on three key areas. The TERG Chair briefed the TERG on discussions at the recent Board retreat (1-3 February 2010). The Secretariat reviewed the new grant architecture and the on-going move to single-stream funding with periodic reviews. The Secretariat also updated the TERG on the Joint Health System Strengthening Funding Platform (JHSP).

### 2.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG Chair reported to the TERG on the recent Board retreat. The Board identified the following priorities for discussion: efficiency and value for money, meeting the needs of those most in need, sustainability of the Global Fund and contributions from countries, sustainability at the country-level, harmonization and alignment with country systems, country demand, and communication. Board members indicated that the TERG had the potential to add value to Board discussions by bringing in the findings from continuous and independent evaluations. The TERG could add value by validating information from the Secretariat, by providing information on the progress of performance-based funding especially at country level, and possibly by scanning the global landscape to provide external evaluative intelligence that could inform Board decisions and Secretariat actions. In discussion, TERG members were not sure that validating reports from the Secretariat was the mandate of the TERG or within their limited capacity as voluntary, part-time advisors.

The TERG welcomed the participation of the Global Fund Deputy Executive Director in the discussions on the new grant architecture. The TERG viewed the introduction of the new grant architecture as being a good example of the Global Fund being in a learning mode and fulfilling its ambition to be a learning organization. The TERG emphasized the need for good communication with partners, particularly those at country-level, on the value of this approach and the details of the transition. The TERG were particularly interested and supportive of the move to periodic reviews that will allow for better harmonization and alignment as well as provide a more holistic assessment of program performance and impact.

Following the presentation on the JHSP, the TERG was interested to know how other efforts such as the International Health Partnership plus (IHP+), and the monitoring and evaluation reference groups for the three diseases, interacted with this new effort. TERG recommended that the Global Fund seek wider input and consider how the JHSP fits into the global architecture.

#### Action points:

- In developing its workplan, TERG to address the priority areas identified by the Board. For example, the TERG to consider as it develops its workplan if/how the effects of the implementation of the new grant architecture could/should be evaluated.
- The Secretariat to send a follow-up document to the TERG proposing what value it sees that the TERG could bring to the JHSP.

## 3.0 Discussion with the World Bank team planning a Global Program Review of the Global Fund

### 3.1 Background

The Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank is planning a Global Program Review (GPR) of the Global Fund for completion in the second quarter of 2011. Prior to the TERG meeting, the IEG circulated an Approach Paper to the TERG seeking its comments. As the team conducting the review planned to be in Geneva conducting interviews during the week of the TERG meeting, a session of the TERG meeting was set aside for the TERG to meet with two of consultants (Edward Elmendorf and Chris Gerrard) working on this GPR. The IEG team explained that they were still identifying the focus areas for the GPR and seeking input. Evaluating partnership and the experience of global partnership programs is the overarching aim of GPRs, with the additional objective for this GPR to advise the World Bank on how it could engage more effectively with the Global Fund.

### 3.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG members were asked for their lessons from overseeing the Five-Year Evaluation. In addition to the comments presented in the TERG Self Assessment as presented to the PSC in September 2009, TERG members recommended that the IEG team consult the TERG Summary Reports that accompanied each of the main four reports of the Five-Year Evaluation. The TERG found that overseeing the Five-Year Evaluation was an enormous task that left them exhausted. The TERG conveyed the difficulties encountered in Study Area 3 where the dual objectives of conducting a quality impact assessment in a limited amount of time while also providing capacity building was difficult. It would have been better not to try to do both at the same time. The TERG said that Study Area 3 was pre-mature in that it was too early to do an impact assessment, and that this was recognized at the time. The TERG considered that important lessons from the Five-Year Evaluation were the difficulties in managing an evaluation while maintaining its independence and the difficulties in achieving the right balance between looking at attribution and contribution. The TERG commented that in any evaluation, the quality of the contractor is critical.

#### Action points:

- TERG Chair with the support of the Secretariat to provide a 1-3 page document to the IEG team summarizing the discussions.
- TERG to continue to assist the IEG team as requested to do so.

## 4.0 Independent evaluation of the AMFm

### 4.1 Background

The Secretariat made a two-part presentation to the TERG on the AMFm, which included an overview and a more detailed section on the proposed independent evaluation. The TERG welcomed the participation of the Vice-Chair of the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee in this session.

### 4.2 Discussion & Recommendations

TERG members discussed key aspects of the AMFm, including but not limited to: the objectives, design, expected achievements, the timeline, the roles of TERG in relation to the Board, the Secretariat, the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee and the Expert Advisory Group. The TERG also considered some aspects of the political economy of AMFm and the fact that discussions around it have been controversial.

The TERG noted the disconnect among the relatively short timeline for AMFm Phase 1, the number and diversity of contexts in which AMFm Phase 1 is being implemented, and the aspirations for the evaluation. The TERG concluded that because of the short time period between the program inception and the proposed measurement of effect on access to, and use of, different types of anti-malarial treatments, particularly within poor households, it is highly unlikely that conclusive evaluation results will be obtained. The TERG also noted that keeping the current evaluation design will merely raise expectations without being conclusive. In addition, while the TERG noted the value of being able to compare the effectiveness of different approaches to increasing access to ACTs, the technical limitations of measuring the cost-effectiveness of the AMFm relative to other strategies are significant and are unlikely to be overcome with the time and financial resources available. Therefore, the current

design of the evaluation will likely not yield the information demanded for policy decisions, and may not be a wise use of scarce resources.

The TERG noted that based on the Secretariat's information that there is no realistic prospect of additional funds to guarantee an extension of the implementation period. The Secretariat reported that contributors to the AMFm Co-payment Fund have made it clear that there are no further funds for AMFm Phase 1.

The TERG further noted that AMFm could be usefully examined in two parts:

- a. **The upstream part, with emphasis on the operational aspects, or "business model," of AMFm as a financing platform:** The new element of the AMFm is the introduction of a factory-gate subsidy at the global level to reduce prices to the consumer. The process-related features of this approach can be studied with respect to how closely the actual implementation conforms to plans.
- b. **The downstream part, with emphasis on service delivery to increase access to and use of ACTs, including by the poor.** This part is expected to benefit from lower prices that result from the upstream part. The TERG noted that the downstream part is neither new nor unique to the AMFm.

TERG members reached a consensus that it would be sensible to examine and document the **extent to which the operational aspects, or business models, are working within the duration of Phase 1**, by concentrating on the following aspects of the independent evaluation:

- a. Changes in the price of co-paid ACTs
- b. Changes in the availability of co-paid ACTs
- c. Changes in the market share of ACTs compared to undesirable monotherapies

The TERG's position is that an evaluation of the AMFm using these three parameters should form the core of the independent evaluation.

The TERG noted information from the Secretariat that the Global Fund will pay for outlet surveys, but not for household surveys, as part of data collection for the independent evaluation. The TERG further noted that it is possible to examine the three parameters of price, availability and market share without household surveys, thus avoiding a major increase in the costs of data collection.

The TERG further noted the usefulness of examining how and how fast the lower-priced ACTs will reach the most remote locations and the poor. It is very doubtful that this can be expected or usefully evaluated in all locations in a relatively short period. However, it is worthwhile, as soon as possible, to measure changes in uptake of co-paid ACTs at outlets and by people in remote locations. The feasibility of this will depend on country situations. For countries that start and move forward quickly, such changes may be measurable within the duration of AMFm Phase 1. For others, where medicines are relatively slow to arrive in the country, conducting end-point outlet surveys will not yield meaningful results.

Operations research could help to draw lessons from smaller-scale, but detailed, studies of what works better in different contexts.

### ***Comparator financing mechanisms***

As part of the assessment of AMFm as a new business model, the independent evaluation should include direct comparisons with other financing mechanisms that aim to achieve the same three objectives as those outlined above. The need is to compare and contrast how each financing model performs, not to compare AMFm (a financing model) with specific approaches to service delivery. For the reasons described above, it is likely that the focus will have to be on the speed and coverage of the comparator financing mechanisms, rather than on poor people's access, which is not measurable in the time period allotted.

### ***Greater emphasis on country case study approach***

The current design, which emphasizes inter-country comparisons, will not best inform decisions about whether to extend and/or terminate the ACT subsidy at the end of Phase 1. The TERG concluded that the evaluation should instead be approached as a collection of country case studies. This will provide opportunities to assess and learn, in addition to quantitative measures of what has changed, how and

why the new model unfolds in a variety of contexts while drawing lessons that can help future operations.

### ***Special attention to the AMFm logo and branding***

The TERG took the position that the evaluation should include an assessment of the effects of the AMFm logo on the market dynamics of co-paid ACTs and other quality-assured ACTs.

### ***What is “success”?***

Considering the predictable limitations of the evaluation and the need for realism, the TERG recommended against seeing any single element of the evaluation as a definitive criterion for “go” or “no go” from Phase 1 to a global phase. At the same time, the TERG noted that the Board requires as much evidence as possible for its decision on the future of AMFm. One approach would be to develop a composite scorecard with multiple criteria that would permit examination of a set of complex information about the operational effectiveness and, where information can be obtained, the effects on access. However, even with the device of a scorecard there will be the need for many judgment calls, and the TERG advised the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee to be aware that the independent evaluation alone will not yield unambiguous findings to guide decision making.

#### **Action points:**

- The TERG, under the leadership of Ruth Levine, to submit a paper to the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee summarizing the TERG position on the AMFm independent evaluation.
- AMFm Ad Hoc Committee to review the role and contribution of the TERG to the AMFm evaluation.
- Representatives of the TERG to be invited to participate in the upcoming meeting with the selected contractors (tentative dates 11-12 March) to plan the implementation of the evaluation.

## **5.0 Meeting with the Executive Director**

### **5.1 Background**

The TERG invited the Executive Director to meet with the TERG and to share his vision of the Global Fund, his expectations for the TERG, as well as his suggestions for improving communication and building a good working relationship between the TERG and the Secretariat. The Executive Director thanked the TERG for its commitment to the Global Fund. He advised the TERG that the Board at its recent retreat again re-affirmed its support for the five founding principles of the Global Fund. He identified three areas that he thought were immediately relevant to the TERG: the effects that Global Fund (vertical) funding is having on health systems, the relationship between demand (rather than estimated needs) and availability of resources, and the impact on MDG 5. He saw the role of the TERG as a sort of scientific advisory body whose work was important to ensure the credibility of evaluations. In considering the future role of the TERG, he advised against institutionalizing the evaluation function by creating a new office or institution. The founding principles emphasize the importance of working in partnership and he considered that for many evaluations, particularly those related to impact, the Global Fund should rely on partners to take the lead. He welcomed the opportunity for continued and sustained interaction with the TERG and requested that his participation be included in the second day of consequent TERG meetings.

### **5.2 Discussion & Recommendations**

The TERG discussed with the Executive Director the difficulties of evaluating fast moving organizations such as the Global Fund and the need to make trade-offs between the ideal evaluation and one that will produce results that meet the needs of policy makers. The Executive Director confirmed that he supported the move from attribution to contribution and encouraged the work to align and harmonize evaluations by different organizations. The TERG asked about the role of the TERG in evaluations that are conducted for learning purpose and those conducted for accountability purposes. The Executive Director considered that the TERG needed to advise on its role but generally the Global Fund has the capacity to conduct internal evaluations for learning purposes. For accountability purposes, the Global Fund should rely on external evaluations conducted in partnership with technical agencies and academic institutions.

## 6.0 Role of the TERG

### 6.1 Background

The TERG Chair and other members of the TERG prepared a draft memo to the Ad Hoc Committee set up by the Board to review the role of the TERG. This Committee is expected to report to the Policy and Strategy Committee (PSC) at its meeting on 15-16 March. The TERG would like to have its views and recommendations taken into account by the Ad Hoc Committee as the Committee prepares its recommendations to the PSC and then to Board on the future role of the TERG.

### 6.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG discussed the learning versus accountability functions of evaluations and how independent the TERG needed to be. The TERG was concerned that it would become an out-dated body merely asked for advice and with no authority to carry out evaluations. The TERG considered that the TERG was founded in 2003 when the Global Fund was a much smaller and different organization with little technical expertise in-house. As the Global Fund has evolved, the role of the TERG needs to evolve. In conducting interviews for the TERG Self Assessment in mid-2009, the feedback from Board members was that they supported an independent TERG but were resistant to setting up an external evaluation body. TERG members perceived that at the moment the Global Fund Management and Board do not have the desire for an independent evaluation unit similar to that at the World Bank. The message is rather that partners need to do more evaluation work. Some TERG members voiced the view that the Global Fund now has the capacity to do internal, learning evaluations and that the TERG can now best add value by focusing on external, independent evaluations. Other TERG members were comfortable with advising the Secretariat on its evaluation agenda while carrying out a few focused evaluations on topics that the TERG identified as supporting informed decision making by the Board. As part of this work, the TERG should also strengthen its links to the work of the monitoring and evaluation reference groups for the three diseases.

The TERG considered that role of the TERG memo to the Ad Hoc Committee should be to push the Committee to seriously consider the role of the TERG and come to some recommendations for the Board to consider. The TERG generally agreed that the memo should propose a range of options to the Ad Hoc Committee that could range from sharpening the current terms of reference to creating an independent external evaluation body.

#### **Actions:**

- TERG Chair (Lola Dare) to work with Stein-Erik Kruse to revise the draft memo.

## 7.0 UNAIDS MERG

### 7.1 Background

As part of its efforts to link the work of the TERG to that of other organizations carrying out evaluations, the TERG invited Deborah Rugg, the TERG ex officio member from the UNAIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group (MERG), to make a presentation on the UNAIDS MERG and its workplan for 2010.

### 7.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG thanked Deborah for her presentation and asked questions for clarification. There is now a good effort among the key funders of HIV working at the global level to harmonize indicators and tools but this takes time to “trickle down” to country level work. One proposal for how the TERG might wish to work with the UNAIDS MERG was on an evaluation of how M&E budgets in Global Fund grants are actually used.

**Action point:**

- The TERG to invite presentations from the monitoring and evaluation reference groups for tuberculosis and for malaria at future TERG meetings.

## 8.0 Global Fund Evaluation Strategy and Agenda

### 8.1 Background

The Secretariat presented a paper to the TERG outlining its plans to develop a Global Fund-wide evaluation strategy and agenda. The plan is to submit a well-developed draft to the TERG for review at the next TERG meeting.

### 8.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG confirmed that it wanted to build its workplan based on the Secretariat's evaluation plans and that it needed to have a well developed Global Fund Evaluation Strategy and Agenda as a starting point. The TERG recommended that the focus of the Global Fund Evaluation Strategy and Agenda be on an agenda. The TERG recommended that any sections on strategy be focused and limited and that the document start with a situation analysis followed by a corporate evaluation plan. The plan should include a mapping of functions and roles, to include the role of the TERG, and the identification of priorities. The TERG advised that in developing the Evaluation Strategy and Agenda, the Secretariat should be the principle developers of the strategy and agenda as this work requires an in-depth knowledge of the Global Fund. Consultants could be employed to facilitate the work of the Secretariat.

**Action points:**

- Secretariat to develop a draft Global Fund Evaluation Strategy and Agenda and share it with the TERG by the time of the next TERG meeting (anticipated in May 2010).

## 9.0 TERG workplan and working modalities

### 9.1 Background

As the Global Fund Evaluation Strategy and Agenda is under development and not yet available to the TERG to help guide the TERG workplan, the TERG decided to develop a workplan that will bridge the time until the Secretariat has defined its evaluation plans more concretely. Based on discussions at the previous TERG meeting and follow-up discussion with the TERG Chair, a draft TERG bridging workplan and background paper on TERG working modalities were presented for discussion.

### 9.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG members expressed varying levels of concern over the amount of time required to carry out the proposed work. TERG considered that as many of the tasks are based on reviewing documents and giving advice, the workload could be accommodated by selecting focal points from within the TERG to take the lead in reviewing and providing feedback.

The TERG discussed possible areas where a TERG-initiated review could be of value. Although the evaluation of new business lines was considered important (e.g. National Strategy Applications, new grant architecture, joint funding for health system strengthening), the TERG considered that it was too early to review these. The TERG identified three possible topics for a TERG-led focused review:

- M&E system strengthening (TERG focal points: Three disease-specific ex officio members; Deborah Rugg, Jaap Broekmans, Bernard Nahlen)
- Health system strengthening (Wim Van Damme and Stein-Erik Kruse)
- Global Fund contribution to MDG 5 (Lola Dare to identify a TERG focal point)

Specific evaluation questions around these topics would require further development. Generally, one might look for examples of what has worked and what has not, and why. There also might be efforts to track resources, for example, the use of M&E budgets within Global Fund grants. The TERG asked the Secretariat to develop three short papers on these topics for review by the TERG at its next

meeting, with the intention that the TERG select one of these topics to do a focused TERG-led review. The TERG identified TERG members to ask as focal points for each of the three topics.

The TERG discussed how it could better coordinate its work between formal TERG meetings. It was proposed that the Secretariat update the TERG on a monthly basis taking into account that much of the information on the Global Fund is already available on the Global Fund website. Following the briefing note, a TERG teleconference could be organized. Based on the precedent used for the UNAIDS MERG, a fixed date each month could be agreed for a teleconference call, at 4 PM Geneva time.

TERG further discussed Secretariat support for the TERG and the lines of communication between the TERG and the Secretariat. The focal point for the TERG within the Secretariat is Rifat Atun. With regard to TERG support, the Secretariat is planning to have two staff members working full-time to support the TERG. One is in place (Mary Bendig) and recruitment is underway for the second person. The TERG asked to see the terms of reference for this second person and said that it would nominate a TERG member to participate in the final selection. The TERG considered that it did not want to have all its communications going through the Secretariat. The TERG Chair proposed that the TERG flag communication as a topic for discussion at its next meeting.

**Action points:**

- Secretariat, in consultation with the designated TERG focal points, to develop three short papers on the three proposed topics for a TERG-led review summarizing recent or on-going work in evaluating these topics and proposing terms of reference for a TERG-led review.
- Secretariat to explore the interest level within the TERG to have monthly teleconference calls among TERG members.
- Secretariat to circulate the terms of reference for the TERG support position and invite one TERG member (as nominated by the TERG) to participate in the selection process.

## 10.0 Next meeting

The TERG discussed possible dates for its next meeting. Three sets of dates were proposed (10-11 May, 26-27 May, and 7-8 June). A TERG meeting in May or early June was considered to be important in order for the TERG to review the Global Fund's Evaluation Agenda prior to the submission of the budgets for 2011. The TERG meeting might be linked to a possible cross-Secretariat review of the Evaluation Agenda. If the Board has decided on a revised Terms of Reference (TOR) for the TERG at its meeting in April, the TERG will also review these at its next meeting. Based on the Secretariat's Evaluation Agenda and the possibly revised TERG TOR, the TERG would further develop its workplan and budget requests for 2011.



# ANNEX A MEETING AGENDA & PARTICIPANTS LIST

## AGENDA

### Meeting Objectives:

- Review planning for the evaluation of the AMFm and define the role of the TERG
- Advise on the planning for a Global Fund Evaluation Strategy and Agenda
- Prepare a memo to the PSC subcommittee reviewing the role of the TERG
- Agree TERG work plan and working modalities

**TERG Meeting: Day 1**  
**Monday, 8 February 2010**  
**Venue: The Global Fund - Hope Plaza**

08.30 - 09.00	Welcome Coffee	
1 09.00 - 09.15	<i>Chair for morning session: Lola Dare</i> <b>Introduction</b> Welcome Review of agenda, documents in meeting binder	
2 09.15 - 10.30	<b>Updates since the last TERG meeting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update from TERG Chair's meeting with the Secretariat <i>(15 min)</i></li> <li>- Update from the Board Retreat <i>(15 min)</i></li> <li>- Update from the Secretariat:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint Health System Funding Platform <i>(20 min)</i></li> <li>New grant architecture <i>(20 min)</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>- Important dates <i>(5 min)</i></li> </ul>	For TERG information
10.30 - 11.00	<i>Coffee</i>	
3 11.00 - 12.00	<b>Meeting with World Bank team planning a Global Program Review of the Global Fund</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of the Approach Paper <i>(Edward Elmendorf)</i></li> <li>- Discussion <i>(TERG)</i></li> </ul>	For TERG information and input
12.00 - 13.00	<i>Lunch</i>	
4 13.00 - 15.00	<i>Chair for afternoon session: Ruth Levine</i> <b>Independent evaluation of the AMFm</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction <i>(TERG Chair/Vice Chairs; AMFm Ad Hoc Committee Chair/Vice Chair; 15 min)</i></li> </ul>	For TERG information and input

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key aims and features of AMFm (<i>Secretariat, 20 min; Q&amp;A, 10 mi</i>)</li> <li>- Elements of the AMFm Independent Evaluation (<i>Secretariat, 30 min</i>)</li> <li>- Overview of key issues (<i>Session Chair, 20 min</i>)</li> <li>- Discussion (<i>TERG, 25 min</i>)</li> </ul>	
	15.00 - 15.30	<i>Coffee</i>	
4	15.30 - 17.30	<b>Independent evaluation of the AMFm (con't)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advisability/feasibility of assessing during 12 month observation period the attributable effectiveness of business model vs. effects on access by poorest and/or change in use of mono-therapies (<i>TERG, 40 min</i>)</li> <li>- Comparator financing mechanisms (<i>TERG, 30 min</i>)</li> <li>- Summary of findings from the technical discussions (<i>TERG, 15 min</i>)</li> <li>- Potential implications of technical findings for the design and timeline (<i>TERG with Ad Hoc Committee Chair and Vice Chair, 20 min</i>)</li> <li>- Conclusions and next steps (<i>TERG with Ad Hoc Committee Chair and Vice Chair, 15min</i>)</li> </ul>	For TERG information and input
4	17:30 - 18:00	<b>TERG position on AMFm</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TERG to decide on its position (<i>TERG only</i>)</li> </ul>	For TERG decision

**Deliverables (Day 1):**

- Response to World Bank on its Global Program Review of the Global Fund (one-page summary of the discussions)
- TERG position on the AMFm

**TERG Meeting: Day 2**  
**Tuesday, 9 February 2010**  
**Venue: The Global Fund - Hope Plaza**

5	8.30 - 9.30	<i>Chair for morning session: Lola Dare</i>  Meeting with the Executive Director ( <i>Michel Kazatchkine, TERG</i> )	For TERG information
6	9.30 - 10.30	Memo to the PSC subcommittee - Discussion and finalization of a memo from the TERG to the PSC subcommittee reviewing the role of the TERG	For TERG discussion and decision
	10:30 - 11:00	<i>Coffee</i>	
7	11:00 - 11:30	Presentation from UNAIDS MERG - Presentation ( <i>Deborah Rugg</i> )	For TERG information
8	11:30 - 13:00	Global Fund Evaluation Strategy and Agenda - Approach paper for the development of the Global Fund strategy and agenda ( <i>Secretariat</i> ) - Discussion ( <i>TERG</i> )	For TERG information and input
	13.00 - 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>	
9	14.00 - 15.30	<i>Chair for afternoon session: Lola Dare</i> TERG bridging workplan 2010 - Planning TERG 2010 workplan taking into consideration information from earlier sessions	For TERG discussion and decision
	15.30 - 14.00	<i>Coffee</i>	
10	14.00 - 17.00	TERG working modalities and relationships - TERG discussions - Next meeting date(s)	For TERG discussion and decision
	17.00	Close of Meeting	

**Deliverables (Day 2):**

- Memo from the TERG to the PSC Subcommittee
- TERG position on the Approach Paper on the Global Fund’s Evaluation Strategy and Agenda
- TERG bridging workplan
- TERG working modalities and relationships

## List of Participants – Fourteenth TERG Meeting: 8-9 February 2010

TERG Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
<b>DARE</b> Lola	Executive Secretary, African Council for Sustainable Health Development	29 Aare Avenue	+234 803 305-1418	<a href="mailto:acoshed@gmail.com">acoshed@gmail.com</a>
		New Bodija Estate	+234 2 752-9934	
		UIPO Box 21633 Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria	+44 7891 817 041	
<b>KINDE-GAZARD</b> Dorothee	Professor of Parasitology, Malaria Researcher	03 BP 1428 Cotonou Benin	+229 959 64084	<a href="mailto:kindegazard@gmail.com">kindegazard@gmail.com</a>
<b>KRUSE</b> Stein-Erik	Research Consultant, Nordic Consulting Group	Revefaret 11 0491 Oslo Norway	+47 9 11 88096	<a href="mailto:stein.erik.kruse@ncg.no">stein.erik.kruse@ncg.no</a>
<b>LEVINE</b> Ruth	Vice President for Programs and Operations and Senior Fellow, Center for Global Development (Washington DC)	Centre for Global Development 1800 Massachusetts Ave. NW Washington, DC 20009 USA	+1 202 416 4007	<a href="mailto:rlevine@cgdev.org">rlevine@cgdev.org</a> <a href="mailto:ruthlevine@yahoo.com">ruthlevine@yahoo.com</a>
<b>VAN DAMME</b> Wim	Professor, Public Health and Health Policy, Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp	Department of Public Health Institute of Tropical Medicine Nationalestraat 155 2000 Antwerp Belgium	+32 3 247 6286 (office) +32 486 883203 (mobile)	<a href="mailto:wvdamme@itg.be">wvdamme@itg.be</a> <a href="mailto:ibogaert@itg.be">ibogaert@itg.be</a>
<b>VASANTHAPURAM</b> Kumaraswami	Scientific Director, Tuberculosis Research Centre	Tuberculosis Research Centre Mayor VR Ramanathan Road Chennai, 600031 India	+91 44 28369682	<a href="mailto:kumaraswami@gmail.com">kumaraswami@gmail.com</a>
Ex officio TERG Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail

<b>BROEKMANS</b> Jaap	Chair, WHO Global Task Force on TB Impact Measurement	Koningin Emmakade 174 2518 JN The Hague The Netherlands	+31 (0)70 335 2696 (home) +31 (0)6 5390 6054 (mobile)	<a href="mailto:broekmansj@tbconsult.nl">broekmansj@tbconsult.nl</a>
<b>NAHLEN</b> Bernard	Deputy Coordinator President's Malaria Initiative	USAID Room 3.6-18 RRB Washington, DC 20523 USA	+1 202 712 5915 (office) +1 703 627 0801 (mobile)	<a href="mailto:bnahlen@usaid.gov">bnahlen@usaid.gov</a>
<b>RUGG</b> Deborah	Chief, Monitoring and Evaluation Division (EVA)	UNAIDS, Evidence, Monitoring and Policy Dept. 20 Avenue Appia 1211 Geneva 27 Switzerland	+41 22 791 4694	<a href="mailto:ruggd@unaids.org">ruggd@unaids.org</a>

<b>Additional participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>
<b>MYHR</b> Kirsten	Head, RELIS Medicines Information and Pharmacovigilance Centre, [Vice Chair of AMFm Ad Hoc Committee]	RELIS Øst Medicines Information and Pharmacovigilance Centre Oslo University Hospital, Ullevål 0407 Oslo Norway	+47 23 016 411 (office) +47 41 638 747 (mobile)	<a href="mailto:myhr@online.no">myhr@online.no</a>

<b>Global Fund Secretariat</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>
<b>ADDAI</b> Edward	Unit Director, M&E	The Global Fund	+41 58 791 1646	<a href="mailto:Edward.Addai@theglobalfund.org">Edward.Addai@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>ADEYI</b> Olusoji	Unit Director, AMFm	8, Chemin de Blandonnet	+41 59 791 1441	<a href="mailto:Olusoji.Adeji@theglobalfund.org">Olusoji.Adeji@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>BENDIG</b> Mary	Senior Technical Officer, M&E Unit	1214 Vernier	+41 58 791 1296	<a href="mailto:Mary.Bendig@theglobalfund.org">Mary.Bendig@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>KAZATCHKINE</b> Michel	Executive Director	Switzerland	+41 58 791 1788	<a href="mailto:Michel.Kazatchkine@theglobalfund.org">Michel.Kazatchkine@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>KIM</b> David	Senior Strategy and Policy Officer		+41 58 791-1789	<a href="mailto:David.Kim@theglobalfund.org">David.Kim@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>LO</b> Wilson	Senior Technical Officer, M&E Unit		+41 58 791 1831	<a href="mailto:Wilson.Lo@theglobalfund.org">Wilson.Lo@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>MATOWE</b> Lloyd	Senior Technical Officer, AMFm Unit		+41 58 791 1896	<a href="mailto:Lloyd.Matowe@theglobalfund.org">Lloyd.Matowe@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>MENDLULA</b> Fortunate	Assistant, Office of the Cluster Director, SPE		+41 58 791-1027	<a href="mailto:Fortunate.Mendlula@theglobalfund.org">Fortunate.Mendlula@theglobalfund.org</a>

<b>MURRAY</b> Melisse	Senior Technical Officer, AMFm Unit	+41 59 791 1664	<a href="mailto:Melisse.Murray@theglobalfund.org">Melisse.Murray@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>NFOR</b> Emmanuel	Senior Advisor, AMFm Unit	+41 59 791 1879	<a href="mailto:Emmanuel.Nfor@theglobalfund.org">Emmanuel.Nfor@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>SHAKARISHVILI</b> George	Senior Advisor, HSS	+41 58 791-1218	<a href="mailto:George.Shakarishvili@theglobalfund.org">George.Shakarishvili@theglobalfund.org</a>