

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

Fifteenth Meeting

Geneva, Switzerland

26 - 27 May 2010

1.0 Introduction

This document reports on the TERG Fifteenth Meeting which took place 26-27 May 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. Three TERG members (Jaap Broekmans, Maria Ines Nemes, and Kumaraswami Vasanthapuram) were unable to attend the meeting and sent their apologies. The meeting objectives were to (1) review the Secretariat's draft Global Fund Evaluation Agenda and provide feedback, (2) review updated TERG bridging workplan for 2010 and agree on priority activities and required actions, and (3) outline a draft TERG workplan for 2011 and an accompanying budget request that can be included in the Global Fund budget proposal for 2011.

2.0 Updates since last TERG meeting

2.1 Background

The TERG Chair (Lola Dare) presented updates on the TERG presentations and follow-up discussions at the Thirteenth Policy and Strategy Committee (PSC) meeting (16-17 March 2010) and the Twenty-first Board meeting (28-30 April 2010). The Strategy, Performance and Evaluation (SPE) Cluster Director (Rifat Atun) updated the TERG on the Third Replenishment for the Global Fund (2011-2013) and the first meeting held in The Hague on 24-25 March 2010.

2.2 Discussion & Recommendations

Key topics of discussion at the PSC and Board meetings were the independent evaluation of the Affordable Medicines Facility-malaria (AMFm) initiative and the future role of the TERG. These topics are addressed in more detail in later sections of the meeting.

A recent article in the *Lancet* (Vol 375, pg 865) reinforced the need for independent evaluations of the Global Fund. The TERG Chair responded to this article saying that the TERG is providing independent oversight of the evaluation process in the Global Fund (*Lancet*, Vol 375, pg 1694). The Board requested that the TERG oversee the independent evaluation of the Joint Health Systems Funding Platform (GF/B21/DP5). The TERG Chair presented the TERG 2010 workplan to the PSC and Board highlighting that the work load was very heavy for the TERG. In the future the PSC has recommended that the TERG workplan and budget be presented, through the appropriate committees, to the Board for approval.

The SPE Director presented the three resource scenarios being discussed for Global Fund funding and operations in 2011-2013. The two day meeting at The Hague went well and leads up to the Pledging Conference in New York in October. TERG asked about its role in the replenishment process. The replenishment is seen as a collective responsibility, with the TERG having a role in independent evaluation. The TERG discussed recent papers on the issue of fungibility. The Secretariat is preparing its own assessment of the data and the TERG may wish to review this.

TERG welcomed Florent Loiseau who has been recruited to join the TERG Support Team. He was expected to start in early June. TERG thanked Mary Bendig for her role in supporting the TERG and reviewed the vacancy notice for a person to take up her position. The TERG considered that the job description was acceptable but preferred that the job title be changed from Team Manager, Independent Evaluations to Team Manager, TERG Support. The SPE Cluster Director advised the TERG that this change could be made when preparing the employment contract. TERG thanked Stein-Erik Kruse for his participation in the recruitment process for Florent and requested that he also participate in the recruitment of the additional new member of the TERG support staff. Wim Van Damme agreed to act as a back-up in providing TERG input into the recruitment process should Stein-Erik not be available for the interviews.

TERG discussed the resignation of Ruth Levine from the TERG and possible actions to replace her. On 7 April 2010 Ruth explained that she had recently taken up a new role as Director of Evaluation, Policy Analysis and Learning in U.S. Agency for International Development and was no longer able to participate in the TERG. TERG briefly reviewed a paper from the Secretariat outlining the possibility of selecting a new TERG member from the previous list of nominees as reviewed during the selection of the six new TERG members appointed by the Board in November 2009. The TERG was generally not

in favour of using the previous list of Board nominees for the TERG. TERG considered that as the TERG Terms of Reference (TOR) are currently under review with the Board expected to reach a decision in December 2010 on the future role of the TERG, it was not urgent at this time to initiate a process for selecting a thirteenth member of the TERG.

Action points:

- TERG to prepare its 2011 workplan and budget request for review by the appropriate Board Committees in October 2010 and subsequent Board approval in December 2010.
- Secretariat to make the title of the new person being recruited to work on independent evaluations and to support the TERG to “Manager, Independent Evaluations/TERG Support”.
- TERG to participate in the recruitment of the Manager, Independent Evaluations/TERG Support with the Secretariat sending the CVs of shortlisted candidates to Stein-Erik Kruse and Wim Van Damme and inviting them to participate in the interviewing process.

3.0 Independent evaluation of the AMFm

3.1 Background

At its Nineteenth Meeting in May 2009, the Board requested that the TERG provide guidance with regard to the technical parameters of the design of the independent evaluation of AMFm, under the oversight of the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee (GF/B19/DP27). The TERG Chair and one TERG member (Dorothee Kinde-Gazrad) attended the first inception workshop for the independent evaluation of the AMFm Phase 1, held in Nairobi, 12-15 April 2010, and reported on the meeting discussions and the more detailed planning of the evaluation. The TERG Chair also reported on meetings with the Vice Chair of the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee held on 30 April 2010 during the recent Board meeting.

The TERG Chair reported that many Board members are concerned about the limited inclusion of elements of a “downstream” evaluation in the evaluation of Phase 1 of AMFm. A “downstream” evaluation would focus on the impact on service delivery by the AMFm program and look at changes in the access and utilization of artemisinin combination therapies (ACTs) by the general population and by vulnerable groups. The TERG Chair reported that some Board constituencies would like to see plans for a more comprehensive downstream evaluation, including the estimated timelines and the cost.

3.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG discussed the limited time available to complete the evaluation of AMFm Phase 1. End point data collection activities are expected to be completed by June or July 2011 to permit data cleaning and analysis leading to a report in January 2012 from the Independent Evaluator to the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee on the independent evaluation of Phase 1 of the AMFm. The Board is expected to make a decision on the future of the AMFm program at its meeting in May 2012. In the relatively short time available for data collection, the TERG considered that a full evaluation looking at issues such as access to ACTs by the poor is not possible. One TERG proposal was to do case studies in a few countries where the AMFm program is progressing well to establish what works. Another suggestion was to consider extending the evaluation in a few countries to include a more in-depth look at access, and possibly also to gather information on the use of diagnostics.

The AMFm Ad Hoc Committee is planning a meeting in London on 22-23 June 2010 to review the work of consultants on defining the success criteria for Phase 1 of the AMFm. The TERG will be invited to participate in this meeting. The TERG discussed the possibility of engaging the same consultants to do additional work to outline options for more in-depth downstream evaluation, to include timelines and costs. Three TERG members (Lola Dare, Bernard Nahlen, and Dorothee Kinde-Gazrad) agreed to act on behalf of the TERG to provide further input to the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee on the evaluation of AMFm.

Actions points:

- Representatives of the TERG to attend and participate in the meeting being organized by the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee to review the work of consultants to define success criteria for the independent evaluation of Phase 1 of the AMFm program (London, 22-23 June 2010).
- Designated TERG members (Lola Dare, Bernard Nahlen, and Dorothee Kinde-Gazard) to consider providing further input to the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee on the possibilities of an extended evaluation that includes more in-depth analysis of “downstream” issues such as access.

4.0 Reports from the Office of the Inspector General

4.1 Background

The Director of the Office of the Inspector General (John Parsons) sent his apologies that he was not able to attend this session of the meeting. Two representatives of the OIG (Vicky Harris and Andrew Kavuma) presented summaries of the following two recent OIG reports: “Review of the Global Fund Grant Application Process” and “Review of Oversight of Grant Procurement and Supply Chain Management Arrangements”. The draft reports had been made available to TERG members with the opportunity for TERG members to comment to the OIG. The final reports were made available to the TERG prior to the TERG meeting and are also available on the Global Fund website.

4.2 Discussion & Recommendations

TERG first commented on the content of the two reports. With respect to the grant review process, there was concern that TRP members were not able to judge grants based on need and that funding decisions should take need into account rather than rely on country-demand. More epidemiological data and M&E capacity information should be included on proposal forms. The TERG also raised the issue of the need for improved access to technical assistance to countries to develop quality proposals. The TERG was generally concerned about the rigor of the reports and that some sections looked more like commentary that led to conclusions that were not grounded on properly analyzed data.

Discussion on the procurement report included comments on the lack of a clear link between the data and findings, and the recommendations. The TERG saw the OIG in an inspector role looking at red flags, but that it was also necessary when identifying problems to try and learn why they were occurring. The TERG saw the timelines required for procurement as a problem area that needs to be better understood.

In follow-up discussions, the TERG expressed surprise and concern that many aspects of the OIG reports were more evaluations than audits. TERG members found that the evaluation work was not being done using established evaluation methodologies, as used in public health management. For example, the formulation of the recommendations was not correct in that they were not based on clear conclusions that led to a particular recommendation. The OIG has the mandate from the Board to do what it sees as necessary. In order to prevent duplication of efforts, the Global Fund needs to clarify the boundaries of the different bodies of the Global Fund involved in evaluation efforts. The TERG considered that the role of the OIG might best be focused on identifying and managing risks to the organization; whereas, other bodies of the Global Fund would focus on doing evaluations to learn.

Acton points:

- Secretariat to summarize TERG comments on the two OIG reports, for the TERG to review and then make available to the OIG.

5.0 Future role of the TERG

5.1 Background

In May 2009, the Board requested that a committee be set up to “further define the role of the TERG in relation to independent evaluations, the resources required and Board oversight of the process” (GF/B19/DP29). A PSC subcommittee chaired by Lennarth Hjelmåker was set up to do this and is expected to submit its final report to the PSC in October 2010, leading to a Board decision in December 2010. Two TERG members (Lola Dare and Bernard Nahlen) are members of the Subcommittee and attended the most recent meeting held on 28 April 2010 during the recent Board meetings. They reported to the TERG on discussions at that meeting. In addition, Todd Summers, PSC Vice Chair and the ex officio TERG member, reported on the discussions at the Thirteenth PSC meeting (16-17 March 2010) on the future role of the TERG.

5.2 Discussion & Recommendations

TERG discussed several key issues related to the future role of the TERG. TERG supported emphasizing its role in overseeing independent evaluations with the need for the Global Fund to link better into the work of partner organizations doing evaluations. TERG considered the suggestion that the TERG support team be located in the OIG and emphasized the need to distinguish between audits and evaluations, while noting that some OIG reports now look more like evaluations than audits. Although the PSC Subcommittee has not been strong on the Global Fund creating an independent evaluation office similar to that of the World Bank, several TERG members still favour this approach. TERG was in favour of changing the name of the body to better reflect its function and also to create a more attractive acronym.

A one day meeting to look at how other organizations handle evaluation, and in particular independent evaluations, and to brainstorm about possible ways forward for the Global Fund was proposed. Prior to this, TERG members could gather information from other organizations and individuals. The outcome of the extended discussions would be intended to be a further paper from the TERG to the PSC Subcommittee putting forward TERG’s recommendations on the future role of the TERG. The TERG was reminded that the timeline for further TERG input to the PSC Subcommittee is limited as the Subcommittee will soon be drafting its recommendations for a final paper to be sent to the PSC in September 2010. In order to meet this timeline, the TERG began reviewing a draft outline for a short paper to the PSC Subcommittee, as presented by the TERG Chair in a PowerPoint presentation. This draft outline sought to define the role for an “Independent Evaluation Advisory Group” and its relationship with the Board and its Committee, the OIG, the Secretariat, and external bodies.

Actions points:

- Based on input from the TERG members, TERG Chair to further develop the outline on the future role of the TERG and to circulate this to all TERG members.
- TERG to discuss the revised outline by teleconference.
- Based on input from all the TERG, the outline will be further developed and shared with the PSC Subcommittee reviewing the future role of the TERG.

6.0 TERG 2010 workplan

6.1 Background

The TERG reviewed the revised TERG bridging workplan for 2010 as presented in the PSC paper to the Board in April 2010.

6.2 Discussion & Recommendations

The TERG considered that the workplan as currently presented could not be accomplished within the remaining months of 2010 and sought to select and further define the activities for 2010, and to consider moving other activities to 2011.

Under Objective 1 on independent evaluations and reviews the TERG decided on two activities in 2010:

- Preparing for an evaluation of the Joint Health System Funding Platform, by developing a concept paper on how to evaluate this jointly funded programs
TERG lead: Win Van Damme
- Planning for a review of how funding for M&E in Global Fund grants is actually used, focusing on how well Global Fund funding is helping to strengthen in-country M&E systems
TERG lead: Deborah Rugg with support from the other two disease-specific ex officio TERG members (Bernard Nahlen and Jaap Broekmans).

Under Objective 2 on guidance to the Secretariat, the TERG decided to focus on three activities in 2010:

- Providing guidance to the Secretariat on the development of a Global Fund cross-Secretariat Evaluation Agenda
TERG lead: Lola Dare
- Providing guidance to the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee on technical aspects of the independent evaluation of the AMFm
TERG lead: Lola Dare and Dorothee Kinde-Gazard
- Providing guidance to the Secretariat team that prepares the reports to the PSC on Key Performance Indicators
TERG lead: Lixia Wang

Under Objective 3 on strengthening TERG working modalities, the TERG decided to continue providing its views to the PSC Subcommittee working on defining the future role of the TERG, and to continue efforts to strengthen communication channels between the TERG and Board, Secretariat, and external bodies.

Under Objective 4 on improving TERG operations, TERG will conduct its meetings, attend PSC and Board meetings, organize updates from the MERGs on the direction of disease-specific evaluations, help build a stronger TERG support team, conduct a TERG self assessment, and prepare its 2011 workplan and budget request.

Action point:

- TERG Chair, with support from the Secretariat, to update the TERG 2010 workplan to reflect the discussions and decisions of the TERG, and to include updated timelines and cost estimates.
- TERG leads on the two evaluations under Objective One, with support from the Secretariat, to develop draft TOR for consultants to carry out the work.

7.0 Global Fund Evaluation Strategy and Agenda

7.1 Background

The Secretariat is developing an Evaluation Strategy and Agenda. A draft document was shared with the TERG prior to the meeting. A presentation summarizing the work so far was made at the TERG meeting.

7.2 Discussion & Recommendations

TERG discussed the draft paper and provided comments to the Secretariat for further development. The TERG considered that it is not clear whether the current document is a strategy or an agenda and advised that the emphasis should be on providing an agenda or plan. In general, the TERG would like to see a simpler document focusing on evaluating a few key questions for the Global Fund and its donors such as the comparative advantage of the Global Fund business model and the efficiency of the Global Fund itself and its funded programs. The Evaluation Agenda should be oriented to learning what the Global Fund could do differently to improve. It should also pave the way for the next comprehensive evaluation of the Global Fund. In planning the future of evaluations in the Global Fund, there first needs to be a better mapping of current M&E activities by the Global Fund, and relevant activities by partners and countries. The paper should present background information that justifies the recommendations and decisions that it makes.

The TERG recognized the importance to donors of being able to see impact but cautioned that it is only possible to assess the contribution of Global Fund funding to achieving impact. Assessing impact should be a joint effort with partners. TERG considered that the majority of Global Fund evaluation activities should be focused at the operational and country level with a minority focusing on questions of overall impact.

The TERG sought to define its role within the proposed Evaluation Agenda, particularly with respect to independent evaluations. TERG saw its role in:

- Independent evaluation metrics, methodology and data used for routine performance evaluations
- Independent evaluation of the new initiatives
- Next major evaluation of the Global Fund

TERG requests that the Secretariat have a fully developed Global Fund cross-Secretariat Evaluation Agenda ready prior to the next TERG meeting in early September when the TERG will be developing its 2011 workplan. TERG will seek to align itself and add value to the Global Fund Evaluation Agenda. The Secretariat thanked the TERG for its guidance.

Action points:

- Secretariat to further develop the Global Fund Evaluation Agenda, taking the TERG comments and suggestions into account, and to send a final draft to the TERG in advance of the next TERG meeting.

8.0 Planning for TERG 2011 workplan

8.1 Background

The PSC recommended at its Thirteenth meeting in March 2010 that in future the TERG workplan and budget should be approved by the Board. The TERG will need to present its 2011 workplan to the PSC at the PSC meeting in October 2010 and its budget request to the FAC at the FAC meeting in October 2010. PSC and FAC recommendations will then go forward for Board decision at the Board meeting in December 2010.

8.2 Discussion & Recommendations

Given the timeline outlined above, the TERG began to discuss its 2011 workplan. Earlier in the meeting, TERG proposed to consider moving forward to 2011 some of the work originally planned for 2010. Although the TERG will be guided by the Global Fund Evaluation Agenda in developing the TERG 2011 workplan, most of the big issues that could or should be the subject of evaluation are known. The Secretariat provided a list of topics for TERG consideration. This included:

- New grant architecture
- National Strategy Applications (NSAs)
- Voluntary Pooled Procurement (VPP)
- Quality Assurance
- Value for money
- AMFm
- Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM) re-structuring
- Gender and Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) strategies
- Health Systems Strengthening (HSS)
- M&E Systems Strengthening
- Technical assistance (TA) strategy
- Partnership strategy
- Performance-based funding (PBF)
- Role of Fund Portfolio Managers (FPMs)
- Country team approach
- Private sector contributions

The TERG requested that, based of these topics, the Secretariat develops a matrix outlining key questions, who might be responsible for conducting the evaluations, and possible timings. It was considered that the time frame would certainly be longer than one year and that the objective should be a strategic multi-year plan. Not all of the evaluations would require TERG input but TERG would have a role in identifying any gaps and encouraging work in those areas.

TERG expressed concern that the TERG 2011 workplan would need to be developed before the new TERG TOR are finalized and approved at the Board meeting in December 2010. In practice a well-developed TERG 2011 workplan ready for review at the PSC meeting in October might help to define the future role of TERG.

Action points:

- Secretariat to develop a matrix outlining possible topics and timings for evaluations to guide further TERG discussion on its 2011 workplan.

9.0 Next meeting

The TERG discussed possible dates for its next meeting. As the TERG will now be submitting its workplan and budget for Board approval, the TERG 2011 workplan and accompanying budget request will need to be ready for review by the PSC and FAC at their meetings in October 2010. The 2011 budgets will be approved at the next Board meeting, in Sofia, Bulgaria on 13-15 December. The TERG proposed to meet in early September to prepare its 2011 workplan and budget.

Action points:

- Secretariat to contact TERG members to establish their availability for a meeting in early September.

ANNEX A MEETING AGENDA & PARTICIPANTS LIST

DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA

Meeting Objectives:

- Review the Secretariat's draft Global Fund Evaluation Agenda and provide feedback
- Review updated TERG bridging workplan for 2010 and agree on priority activities and required actions
- Outline a draft TERG workplan for 2011 and an accompanying budget request that can be included in the Global Fund budget proposal for 2011
-

TERG Meeting: Day 2			
Thursday, 27 May 2010			
Venue: The Global Fund - Partnership Room - 9th Floor			
<i>Chair for morning session: Lola Dare</i>			
	08:30 - 09:30	Follow-up to Day 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review ady One - Agreeing modalities for its implementation - Reviewing TERG leads for each of its streams 	For TERG discussion and decision
9	09:30 - 10:30	TERG bridging workplan for 2010: Review of draft Terms of Reference for four reviews as proposed in Objective 1 of the updated workplan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process for identifying consultants and reviewing products and deliverables from this stream of work - Topics for four reviews (as listed in Objective 1 of the updated workplan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1. The Global Fund in global health: A review of the demand approach and the business model (<i>TERG focal points: To be determined</i>) ○ 2. Health systems and the joint funding and programming platform (<i>TERG focal points: To be determined</i>) 	For TERG discussion and decision
	10:30 - 11:00	<i>Coffee</i>	
9	11.00 - 12.30	TERG bridging workplan for 2010: Review of draft Terms of Reference for four reviews as proposed in Objective 1 of the updated workplan (<i>continued</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Topics for four reviews (as listed in Objective 1 of the updated workplan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3. Harmonization and alignment of country systems: A review of M&E systems as a tracker 	For TERG discussion and decision

		<p>case study (<i>TERG focal points: To be determined</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 4. Key Performance Indicators (<i>TERG focal points: To be determined</i>) 	
	12:30 - 13:30	Lunch	
Chair for afternoon session: Lola Dare			
10	13:30 - 14:30	<p>TERG guidance to the Secretariat (Objective 2 of TERG 2010 workplan)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion on further streamlining - Areas of guidance (as listed in Objective 2 of the updated workplan): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1. Evaluation Agenda of the Global Fund ○ 2. Evaluations of the AMFm ○ 3. Performance Based Funding ○ 5. National Strategic Applications ○ 6. Technical Assistance ○ 7. Prioritization and Sustainability 	For TERG discussion and decision
7	16:30 - 18:00	<p>Global Fund Evaluation Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of the draft Evaluation Agenda (<i>Bill Bertrand or Eddie Addai</i>) - TERG questions for clarification - TERG discussion and guidance to the Secretariat in further developing the Agenda 	For TERG information and input
11	14:30 - 15:30	<p>Planning TERG workplan for 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Giving consideration to the draft Global Fund Evaluation Agenda, identification of the main areas of work and the key activities for the TERG in 2011 - In line with the PSC recommendation that the TERG workplan and budget be submitted for Board approval, via the PSC and FAC, review the timelines for Global Fund workplan and budget submissions for 2011 - Discuss the process that the TERG will adopt to develop a 2011 workplan given the strengthened role of the TERG 	For TERG discussion and decision
	15:30 - 16:00	Coffee	
11	16:00 - 17:00	Planning TERG workplan for 2011 (<i>continued</i>)	For TERG discussion and decision
12	17:00 - 17:30	Dates for next TERG meeting	For TERG discussion

			and decision
	17:30	Close of meeting	

Deliverables (Day 1):

- Next steps for the TERG on the AMFm evaluation
- TERG input/paper to the PSC Subcommittee working on defining the future role of the TERG
- TERG comments on the two OIG reports
- TERG decision on an independent review of the Global Fund's Key Performance Indicators
- TERG input into the draft Global Fund Evaluation Agenda

Deliverables (Day 2):

- Plans for implementation of the TERG workplan for 2010
- TERG-approved Terms of Reference for the 2010 TERG independent reviews
- Planning for the TERG workplan for 2011 and accompanying budget request for 2011

List of Participants – Fifteenth TERG Meeting: 26-27 May 2010

TERG Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
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
DARE Lola	Executive Secretary, African Council for Sustainable Health Development	29 Aare Avenue New Bodija Estate UIPO Box 21633 Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria	+234 803 305-1418 +234 2 752-9934 +44 7891 817 041	acoshed@gmail.com
KINDE-GAZARD Dorothee	Professor of Parasitology, Malaria Researcher	03 BP 1428 Cotonou Benin	+229 959 64084	kindegazard@gmail.com
KRUSE Stein-Erik	Research Consultant, Nordic Consulting Group	Revefaret 11 0491 Oslo Norway	+47 9 11 88096	stein.erik.kruse@ncg.no
VAN DAMME 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)	wvdamme@itg.be ibogaert@itg.be
WANG Lixia	Director National Center for Tuberculosis Control and Prevention	No. 27 Nanwei Road, Xuanwu District, Beijing, 100050 P.R. China	+86-10 83136116	wanglx@chinatb.org
Ex officio TERG Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
NAHLEN Bernard	Deputy Coordinator President's Malaria Initiative	USAID Room 3.6-18 RRB	+1 202 712 5915 (office) +1 703 627 0801 (mobile)	bnahlen@usaid.gov

		Washington, DC 20523 USA		
RUGG Deborah	Chief, Monitoring and Evaluation Division (EVA)	UNAIDS, Evidence, Monitoring and Policy Dept. 20 Avenue Appia 1211 Geneva 27 Switzerland	+41 22 791 4694	ruggd@unaids.org
SUMMERS Todd	Senior Program Officer Global Health Policy & Advocacy Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation		+1 202 662-8186	todd.summers@gatesfoundation.org
Additional participants	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
BERTRAND William	Consultant			webertrand@gmail.com
HARRIS Victoria			00 33 6 20 69 14 86	taylor@worldonline.fr vmharris@gmail.com
Global Fund Secretariat	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
ADDAI Edward	Unit Director, M&E		+41 58 791 1646	Edward.Addai@theglobalfund.org
ATUN Rifat	Cluster Director, Strategy, Performance and Evaluation	The Global Fund	+41 58 791 1780	Rifat.Atun@theglobalfund.org
BENDIG Mary	Senior Technical Officer, M&E Unit	8, Chemin de Blandonnet	+41 58 791 1296	Mary.Bendig@theglobalfund.org
KAVUMA Andrew	Audit Team Leader, Office of the Inspector General	1214 Vernier	+41 58 791 1422	Andrew.Kavuma@theglobalfund.org
LO Wilson	Senior Technical Officer, M&E Unit	Switzerland	+41 58 791 1831	Wilson.Lo@theglobalfund.org
LOW BEER Daniel	Unit Director, Performance, Impact and Effectiveness		+41 58 791 1929	Daniel.LowBeer@theglobalfund.org