

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

Seventeenth Meeting

Geneva, Switzerland

4 – 5 July 2011

Introduction

This document reports on the TERG Seventeenth Meeting which took place 13-14 January 2011 in Geneva, Switzerland at the Global Fund premises. This report provides a summary of key issues discussed and of the action points agreed upon. The agenda for the meeting and participants list are attached as Annex A^a.

Attendance

Were present	Were excused
Elected members	
Atsuko Aoyama Paulin Basinga Mickey Chopra Dorothee Kinde-Gazard Stein-Erik Kruse Wim Van Damme	Viroj Tangcharoensathien Kumaraswami Vansanthapuram Lixia Wang
Ex-officio members	
Jaap Broekmans Bernhard Schwartzlander	Bernard Nahlen Todd Summers

1. Opening session

1.1 Welcome

The TERG Vice-Chair and acting Chair (Wim Van Damme) welcomed the participants and expressed the view that this session was expected to be the first step of a new period in the history of TERG. A new Chair - and new Vice-Chairs- would be and guide the work of the Group under the new Terms of Reference.

1.2 Approval of the minutes of TERG 16th meeting

The minutes were approved with no change required.

1.3 Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with no change required and is annexed to this report.

2. Questions and answers with the Deputy Executive Director (Debrework Zewdie)

The Deputy Executive Director expressed that there were high expectations from Secretariat regarding TERG and underlined the following:

- TERG's input in the finalization of the evaluation strategy is seen as crucial;
- TERG should clarify how the evaluative work undertaken by the TERG and Secretariat can be fruitfully articulated with the work done and planned by the Inspector General;

^a It should be noted that the discussions did not always respect the agenda. For the sake of clarity, the present report follows the broad lines of the agenda rather than the order of debates.

- The Secretariat is ready to take action to strengthen the support given to the TERG, as soon as the TERG's needs are specified and communicated.

The Deputy Director General (DED) explained that the Global Fund is undergoing a series of reforms that are urgently needed for several reasons:

- Because the Organisation has grown immensely during those last years with processes and procedures not always updated at the same speed and which became heavy and cumbersome;
- Because the absence of in-country presence has been compensated by efforts required from partners which have now reached a limit in many instances;
- Because there is a need to fight fraud and to communicate more effectively on this fight;
- Because the Global Fund is now focusing, among other reforms, on aid effectiveness and value for money.

During the exchange that followed her presentation, TERG members expressed that TERG's capacity to respond to the expectations listed by the DED would depend from the outcome of their reflections on:

- The articulation between TERG's two roles of: advisor to the Board and advisor to the Secretariat;
- The articulation between its role of supporting, encouraging or commissioning independent evaluations and its role of giving technical recommendations on each M&E-related topic;
- The complementarity between the OIG, SPE and the TERG.

In conclusion, the DED and TERG members expressed their agreement on the fact that the TERG 2012 work plan should be drafted with the view to ensure that TERG's expertise contributes to: The Global fund strategy, its Evaluation strategy, the Reform Agenda and the SPE work plan.

3. TERG administration -1

3.1 Report on the 23rd session of the Board (Wim)

Wim van Damme gave a short presentation of TERG-related discussions that had taken place during the last Board. He reminded participants that those points had already been presented earlier this year.

Annex 1: List of 23 Board Session decisions highly relevant to the TERG

3.2 Election of TERG Chair and Vice-Chair(s)

In application of the paragraph 9 of its Terms of Reference, TERG appointed members elected: Mickey Chopra as Chair and Viroj Tangcharoensathien as well as Wim Van Damme as Vice-Chairs.

It was agreed among TERG members that, as a matter of principle, the TERG Chair and Vice-Chair were elected for 3 years, or until they reach the end of their term of office.

3.3 Update on the TERG members Terms of office and next replenishment

Dorothee Kinde-Gazard, Stein-Erik Kruse, and Wim Van Damme whose term of office as appointed members is in September 2011 have expressed their availability for a second term.

Mickey Chopra, the new Chair, expressed that he would work with the DED, the PSC and the support team to organize the replenishment, with the view to ensure that the TERG benefit from expertise that go beyond epidemiology and public health, which are two

domains already very well represented in the TERG, as well as in the Secretariat. His view was that among the five TERG members to be appointed or reappointed during the next session of the Board, it would be desirable that expertise in financial management, in pharmaceutical procurement or in organization management be added to the TERG.

Action point 1

TERG support team to facilitate the TERG replenishment process.

3.3 Review of TERG 2011 work plan and budget

Florent Loiseau, for the TERG support team, presented the documents on the 2011 approved work plan and budget and on the execution of the 2011 budget.

4. Update on the evaluation of the Affordable Medicines Facility – malaria (AMFm) –

The point was briefly introduced by Wim van Damme, chairing the meeting, who gave background elements.

It was followed by a presentation by Olusoji Adeyi, Director of the AMFm Unit.

After the presentation, TERG members asked several questions on the preliminary results of the AMFm program. O.Adeyi replied that certain results were already visible, and even spectacular (e.g. as regards price reductions in certain areas), but that his action to this regard was to protect and promote the evaluation which would establish firmly the results of the program.

TERG members underlined that one issue they find particularly interesting and that the evaluation should address was whether the program benefit only to the middle class living in urban areas or if it also has an impact on equity.

It was agreed that:

- TERG members who are focal points for AMFm would continue to be regularly informed of and to follow-up on the work of the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee, and notably to attend AMFm AHC meetings;
- As soon as a draft evaluation report is submitted to the AHC, it would be shared with the TERG for input. The draft report should be received by the AMFm unit during summer 2012.

Action point 2

TERG support team to facilitate cooperation between TERG, AMFM AHC and the AMFm Unit in the secretariat.

5. Key Performance Indicators

Wim Van Damme, Chair, introduced this item by reminding TERG members that three of them had been interviewed in the framework of the independent review of the KPIs.

Daniel Low Beer, Director of the Performance, Impact and Effectiveness Unit, and Ryuichi Komatsu, Manager of the Strategic Information team, updated the TERG on the performance of the organisation as measured by the KPIs, and on the process of revising those.

During the exchange that followed, TERG members asked several questions, notably as regards gender issues, or the speed of disbursement (which can have negative

consequences). In the responses given, it was mentioned that data are being disaggregated by gender and that an indicator should not be taken alone (e.g. speed) but was part of a set of indicators.

It was also noted that, despite the good quality of the KPIs and their rigorous management, this system was unable to announce that an overall reform of the Organisation (like the one appearing in the Reform Agenda, or the one recommended in the “light review”) would appear necessary, because the KPIs as a tool are more adapted for capturing incremental changes than crises.

It was agreed that the draft report on the revision of KPIs would be shared with TERG focal points (Lixia, Bernard and Jaap) who would provide comments to be included in the document submitted to the Board.

Action point 3:

TERG support team to facilitate involvement of TERG focal points in the process of revising the KPIs.

TERG focal points to comment on the draft report on the revision of KPIs.

6. Lessons Learnt from audits, Office of the Inspector General (OIG)

John Parsons, the Inspector General, introduced his office, his work and the documents he had sent in advance of the meeting.

He explained that the field work done by his staff led to similar findings and recommendations in different settings and that those were captured in the “Lessons learnt” report. He clarified the differences between audits and investigations and explained audit findings could call for more work to be done, or for investigations to be launched.

The Cluster Director for Country Programs, Mark Eddington, commented on the fact that the problems revealed in OIG reports are linked to the business model of the Global Fund. He noted that several changes suggested in the report would be radical (e.g. on country presence) but that there were other topics on which progress is possible (e.g. in the way relations with procurement partners are managed).

TERG members underlined the very good quality of the reports presented and asked several questions, including:

- The extent of the problems noted in OIG reports;
- about the fact that those problems, which are well-known, have not been addressed or corrected yet;
- and about the benchmark used to assess the performance of people or organisations.

The Inspector General responded that similar problems were often noted, which shows that they are prevalent; that corrective measures suggested to address and solve identified problems are not taken and that the benchmarks were taken from the good practices observed in well-performing countries (e.g. Rwanda).

The TERG Chair asked the Inspector General what were the issues on which he should TERG work could complement the work of OIG.

The OIG responded that:

- He would like to see TERG’s input to the evaluation strategy;
- Through field audits, his Office could address questions that the TERG may have;

- Additionality and capacity-building were certainly two themes that TERG could breakdown into several evaluations;
- The voluntary Pooled Procurement, which might become mandatory, would also be an item worth being evaluated.

In conclusion, TERG members welcomed the idea of working in cooperation with the OIG and expressed that evaluations could explain in a rigorous way the cause-effects relationships identified by audits. It was decided that the TERG would appoint a focal point for interacting with the OIG.

Action point 4:
TERG to appoint a focal point to interact with the OIG.

7. Reports on ongoing evaluations

7.1 Evaluation of The Global Fund's funding of in-country M&E systems

Florent informed the TERG that the contracts have been signed with the two consultants, after significant revisions made to the original TORs (notably, the scope was extended after consultations with TERG focal points). They have started the document review. There was some concern expressed regarding the allocation of effort for the specific outputs.

It is decided that Bernard, Paulin, and Bernhard would be the new focal points for this evaluation.

Action point 5:
TERG support team to initiate and facilitate contacts between the two consultants and the TERG focal points and to review the outputs.

7.2 Evaluation of the Partnership Forum

Stein-Erik presented the work done by the Partnership forum, which he described as a very important arena to reaffirm the specific nature of the Global Fund's governing arrangements. He noted that questions submitted to the Forum were broad and time to address them very limited. He added that "human rights" was a theme that came out strongly from the discussions.

The report to be produced as an output of the forum will certainly help to identify possible themes for future evaluations.

8. Evaluation of the Gender Equality and Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities Strategies' (SOGI)

In the absence of a TERG focal point for this evaluation, this item was replaced by an exchange with the Director of the SPE Cluster.

Action point 6:
TERG to appoint a focal for following up on the Evaluation of the Gender Equality and Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities Strategies' (SOGI)

9. Global Fund Evaluation Strategy, Rifat Atun, Director of the SPE Cluster

Rifat Atun in his introductory remarks gave background elements on the relations between the TERG and the Secretariat, particularly the SPE cluster. Those relations were shaped by

the Five Year Evaluation (5YE) and were not always easy. However, there is a clear need for independent evaluation, notably of impact, and for technical evaluation input to the Evaluation Strategy. This is where the TERG could bring a lot.

The table below summarizes the questions and answers that followed this introduction

Questions from TERG members	Responses from R. Atun
Taking into account the relations between the Global Fund, the World Bank and GAVI, what are the evolutions in the evaluation landscape	The Health System Funding Platform is being pushed forward, although it was expected to be experimental only. We want to set a joint M&E framework. We also try to have joint M&E practices and tools in different countries.
TERG's mandate is wide and not limited to impact evaluations. Which are the areas that TERG could explore, to complement the work of SPE?	We need to know more about what works or not at the program level. We need to evaluate certain business models and service delivery models (if we change the business model, what is the effect on the impact?). There is a need for cross-sectoral, thematic evaluations and for impact evaluations.
Why is independent evaluation important in the framework of evaluation as it exists in the Global fund,	When commissioning independent evaluations, you can hire the best evaluators, and choose some who are not those who are intervening everywhere.
In the draft evaluation strategy, you propose the creation of an evaluation working group. How would this differ from TERG?	This group is meant to ensure cooperation within the entire Secretariat around evaluations. It is a working group of the Secretariat.
Which, from your viewpoint, are the most important areas for evaluation?	PMTCT, harm reduction are themes on which the Global Fund tends to think and say it has been decisive. This should be demonstrated.
A serious problem of data quality was noted in the 5YE. What is the current situation to this regard?	This is an area on which we have concentrated our efforts by conducting a serious effort of data cleaning and by developing Data Quality Audits, On Site Data Verifications, etc... Good data are the basis for M&E. We can now build on this.

DAY 2

10. Discussions on day 1 and on TERG 2012 work plan and budget

The TERG Chair introduced the agenda item, before the exchange of views took place. There was a common perception of the following points:

- The TERG needs to find a balance between (i) remaining a reference group on evaluation methods and findings, especially by commissioning external independent

evaluations and (ii) providing the Secretariat with support and adding value to several items that are being addressed;

- The place where this balance can be described is the evaluation strategy;
- TERG has not been involved in the drafting of the evaluation strategy so far, which is unsatisfactory, since there is a risk that TERG will be marginalized and the added value it can bring to the GF will be wasted;
- The TERG should now engage vigorously in the development of the evaluation strategy and reaffirm its oversight role as regards M&E matters.

Action point 7: TERG Chair to engage SPE to keep TERG informed of the progress made in the drafting of the strategy.

TERG Chair to engage TERG members to work commenting on and contributing to the strategy.

2012 Work plan

It was decided that the development of the 2012 work plan would continue. In addition to the two independent evaluations already commissioned, it could make sense to launch some sort of scoping study (e.g. on whether the Global Fund's business model and modalities of intervention are adapted to fragile states).

For the time being, the level of budget requested for 2012 should remain the same as the one for 2011. The work plan will be further developed during the next TERG meeting, but possible issues to be addressed in TERG-commissioned work could also be: GF business model in fragile state settings with a focus on capacity building, procurement, additionality.

2012 TERG report to the Board

The TERG chair will work with the support team to draft a short report to the Board summarizing the highlights of the year. A significant part of the report will be dedicated to TERG's involvement in and input to the Evaluation strategy.

11. Legal matters

11.1 Declarations of absence of conflicts of interest

Richard Cunliffe, legal officer, presented the declaration of possible conflicts of interest (to be filled out, signed and returned by each TERG member, once a year).

11.2 Draft TERG policy on conflicts of interest

He also presented a draft TERG policy on Conflict of Interest. The TERG decided that this would become its temporary policy, which would then be further discussed via exchanges with the Ethics Committee.

11.3 Honoraria for TERG members

It was proposed that, in application of article 20 of the 2010 Terms of Reference of the TERG, the FAC committee be invited to review and adopt the following new scheme for aligning TERG members' honoraria with those of TRP members.

Honoraria for TERG members:

TERG meetings: USD 700 / day,

TERG meetings are 2 day meetings but require 3 days of work

Presence to the meeting is required to receive the honorarium

There should be 2 to 3 TERG meetings per year

In addition to the honorarium for attendance to meeting, it is estimated that the effort for following up on several TERG files outside meeting days should be acknowledged by a symbolic honorarium corresponding to 3 days of work, i.e. USD 2100 per year.

Honoraria for TERG Chair and Vice-Chair

It is proposed that, in addition to the honoraria described above, the TERG Vice-Chairs receive USD 3500 per year and the Chair USD 6000 per year.

Action point 7:

TERG Chair, with support from the TERG support team and the legal officer, to submit this proposal to FAC for approval.

12 Conclusions of the 17th TERG meeting

The TERG Chair listed the following points as those he would convey to the Global Executive management:

- TERG appreciates the strong expressions of support by the senior management of Global Fund and reiterates its commitment to contribute to a strengthened and more effective organisation
- TERG welcomed the development and sharing of the draft Evaluation strategy and wanted to minimise the risk that the TERG be marginalized, notably in the drafting of the evaluation strategy, in which the TERG wants to play a central role;
- Now that the text has been shared, TERG members will actively contribute to it and are ready to dedicate time and efforts;
- TERG welcomed the commitment expressed by the Executive management as regards the resources that would be dedicated to TERG, notably the recruitment of a second member in the TERG support team.

Special Session of the 17th TERG meeting: Conference call on the way towards a joint evaluation of the Joint Health Systems funding Platform

Summary of discussions

Participants to the call

Wim Van Damme (TERG Vice-Chair)	Bernhard Shwartzländer (TERG member, Director of Evidence, Monitoring and Policy Dept., UNAIDS)
Dorothee Kinde Gazard (TERG member)	Peter Hansen (GAVI)
Paulin Basinga (TERG member)	Wim Van Lerberghe (Director, Department for Health System Governance and Service Delivery (HDS), World Health Organisation)
Peter Hill (consultant for the TERG)	Jan Ties Boerma (WHO)
Rifat Atun (Cluster Director, Strategy Policy and Evaluation, The Global Fund)	Finn Schleimann, Senior Health Specialist, (the World Bank)
Johannes Hunger (SPE, The Global Fund)	
Olga Bornemisza (Knowledge Management Unit, The Global Fund)	
Florent Loiseau (TERG support team, The Global Fund)	

Purpose of the call

The Global Fund Board required the TERG to commission an evaluation of the Joint Health Systems Funding Platform (JHSFP). Taking into account several elements, the TERG decided that launching an evaluation would be too complex and premature. Therefore, it contracted an external consultant to write an Evaluation framework, which would then be used to move towards the evaluation itself.

The purpose of the call was to gather representatives of all partners involved in the JHSFP, in order to ensure shared understanding of how to move together towards a joint evaluation of the Platform.

Points clarified during the call

Clarifications were given on the differences between JHSFP and the IHP+ Monitoring and Evaluation Platform, which is a common effort to ensure the strengthening of M&E systems.

It was specified that, in parallel to making steps towards the evaluation of the JHSFP, the TERG has also commissioned an evaluation of the Global Fund' funding of in-country M&E system. The results of this evaluation will fit in the IHP+ M&E Platform

The following questions were raised, as possible evaluation questions to be addressed at some point:

- How could the Partners involved in the JHSFP and in other collaborative efforts better work together?
- How successful is the cooperation around the JHSFP (at country level, and between headquarters)?
- What is the impact of Health Systems Strengthening?
- How to address the issue of harmonization between organizations, at the global level? And what is the cost of this harmonization?
- How to address the issue of alignment of procedures at the country level?
- What are the effects of harmonization and alignment on populations at the country level?
- Does the JHSFP create a strong enough incentive to use National Strategies and Plans to encourage the alignment of funding? If so, is the round-based funding model still relevant?

- Do the efforts of harmonization succeed in transferring the transaction costs from countries to organizations?

Outcome of the call

Participants shared the view that a multi-partner evaluation of the JHSFP would be an innovative learning exercise and that their respective Boards would certainly support this approach.

Therefore, the following next steps were agreed:

- Peter Hill would work on how to approach a common evaluation and how this evaluation should be conducted over several years, addressing the questions identified above.
- Participants would give to Peter Hill access to relevant documents and sources of information
- The Terms of Reference of Peter Hill, endorsed by the TERG, would be shared with all participants who would be given the opportunity to revise them.

ANNEX 1: AGENDA OF THE MEETING

TERG Meeting: Day 1 Monday, 4 July 2011 Venue: The Global Fund -Robert Koch 3B Room - 3rd Floor		
	08:30 - 08:45	Welcome Coffee
<i>Chair for morning session: Wim Van Damme</i>		
1	08:45 - 09:15	Opening session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome - Approval of the minutes of TERG 16th meeting - Review of the Agenda - Overview of documents in meeting binder
2	09:15 - 10:30	Questions and answers with the Deputy Executive Director (Debrework Zewdie) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update on the Reform and strategy of the Global Fund - Expectations vis-à-vis the TERG
	10:30 - 11:00	<i>Coffee</i>
3	11:00 - 12:00	TERG administration -1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report on the 23rd session of the Board (Wim) - Election of TERG Chair and Vice-Chair(s) - Update on the TERG members Terms of office and next replenishment - Review of TERG 2011 work plan and budget - Elements for establishing the TERG 2012 work plan and budget
4	12.00 - 13.00	Update on the evaluation of the Affordable Medicines Facility - malaria (AMFm) - (Dorothee) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation by Secretariat (Olusoji Adeyi, Director of the AMFm Unit) - TERG questions for clarification
	13:00 - 13:45	<i>Lunch</i>
<i>Chair for afternoon session: TERG Chair</i>		
5	13:45 - 14:30	Key Performance Indicators (time to be confirmed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation by Secretariat (Daniel Low Beer, Director of the

		<p>Performance, Impact and Effectiveness Unit, TBC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TERG questions for clarification
6	14.30 - 16:00	<p>Cooperation with the Office of the Inspector General (OIG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation by the Inspector General (John Parsons) of two OIG reports of interest to TERG - Exchange of views on the distribution of work and relations with the Office of the Inspector General
	16:00 - 16:30	<i>Coffee</i>
7	16:30-17:15	<p>Reports on ongoing evaluations</p> <p>Evaluation of The Global Fund's funding of in-country M&E systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Choice of a TERG focal point for following up on this file (replacing Deborah Rugg) - Conference call with the 2 external consultants (Greet Peersman and Beth Plowman) <p>Evaluation of the Partnership Forum (Stein Erik)</p>
8	17:15-17:45	<p>Joint Evaluation of the Gender Equality and Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities Strategies' (SOGI)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation by Secretariat (Presenter: Andy Seale) - TERG questions for clarification
9	17:45 - 18:15	Wrap up of day 1

TERG Dinner, from 7.30 pm
Café du Soleil
Place du Petit Saconnex 6 - 1209 Geneva
Tel : +41(0) 22 733 34 17
By bus : line #3, Stop : Petit Saconnex

TERG Meeting: Day 2
Tuesday, 5 July 2011
Venue: The Global Fund -Robert Koch 3B Room - 3rd Floor

10	9:00 - 9:15	Introduction to Day 2
11	9:15 - 10:00	<p>TERG administration - 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A TERG policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest (draft policy to be proposed by the Legal Unit of the Secretariat). - Proposals on New policy for the honorarium of TERG members <p>Supporting documents introduced by the Secretariat (Richard Cunliffe, Legal Officer, Legal team)</p>
12	10:00 - 10:30	Development of TERG 2012 Work plan and budget
	10:30 - 11:00	<i>Coffee</i>
13	11:00 - 12:30	<p>Development of TERG 2012 Work plan and budget (continued)</p> <p>TERG's views on the Global Fund 10 Year evaluation (2013)</p>
	12:30 - 13:15	Lunch
14	13:15 - 14:00	Exchange of views on the preparation of the TERG 2011 Report to the Board (content, process, etc...)
15	14:00 - 14:45	<p>Second meeting with the Deputy Executive Director</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staffing and administrative hosting of the TERG support team - Any Other Business
	14:45 - 15:00	<i>Coffee</i>
16	15:00- 16:30	<p>Exchange of views on TERG's input to the Global Fund Evaluation strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction by Secretariat (Rifat Atun, Director of the Strategy, Performance and Evaluation Cluster) - TERG questions and input
17	16:30 - 17:00	<p>Dates for the next TERG meeting</p> <p>Any other business</p>
18	17:00 - 18:00	<p>Special session on moving towards a joint evaluation of the Joint Health Systems Funding Platform</p> <p>Exchange of views via video conference with participants from: UNAIDS, WHO, the World Bank, the Global fund Secretariat.</p>

	18:00	Closure of the meeting
--	--------------	-------------------------------

ANNEX 2: DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE GLOBAL FUND BOARD DURING ITS 23RD SESSION WITH SPECIFIC RELEVANCE TO TERG.

Decision point	Relevance to TERG
GF/B23/DP6 Extension to the Board Committee Membership and Leadership Terms	Todd Summer's term as PSC Vice-Chair and PSC TERG focal point extended (?)
Decision Point GF/B23/DP7 to Decision Point GF/B23/DP13: All those decisions relate to the Report of the Comprehensive Reform Working Group	<p>TERG members may wish to stay abreast of all Reforms happening in the Global Fund. The following ones seems to be particularly relevant:</p> <p>Decision Point GF/B23/DP9: Plan for Comprehensive Reform: Value for Money</p> <p>Decision Point GF/B23/DP10: Plan for Comprehensive Reform: Partnerships</p> <p>Decision Point GF/B23/DP11: Plan for Comprehensive Reform: Business Model</p> <p>Decision Point GF/B23/DP12: Plan for Comprehensive Reform: Governance</p> <p>Decision Point GF/B23/DP13: Plan for Comprehensive Reform: Implementation of Reforms, Monitoring and Learning</p>
Decision Point GF/B23/DP14: Global Fund Strategy Framework 2012-2016	<p>TERG members may wish to stay abreast of the strategic reflections currently conducted.</p> <p>Special mention is made in the decision of the strategic importance of the upcoming Partnership Forum, which several TERG members will attend.</p>
Decision Point GF/B23/DP15: Replenishment of TERG Members	Appointment of new TERG members.
Decision Point GF/B23/DP20: Revisions to the Ethics and Conflict of Interest Policy's Declaration of Interest Form	TERG members will be required to fill in those forms and have committed to work on a TERG policy on conflict of interest.