

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

Eighteenth Meeting

Geneva, Switzerland

12 – 13 September 2011

Introduction

This document reports on the TERG eighteenth meeting which took place 12-13 September 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 is attached as Annex A^a.

Attendance

Were present	Were excused
Elected members	
Atsuko Aoyama Paulin Basinga Mickey Chopra (Chair) Dorothee Kinde-Gazard Stein-Erik Kruse Viroj Tangcharoensathien (Vice-Chair) Wim Van Damme (Vice-Chair)	Kumaraswami Vansanthapuram Lixia Wang
Ex-officio members	
Jaap Broekmans Bernard Nahlen Anja Nitzsche-Bell (replacing Bernhard Schwartlander, in her capacity of UNAIDS focal point for the Global Fund) Todd Summers	

1. Opening session

1.1 Welcome

The TERG Chair, Mickey Chopra, welcomed the participants and set out the main objectives of this meeting: to finalize TERG's input to the Global Evaluation Strategy and TERG 2011 activity report to the PSC and to the Board.

1.2 Approval of the minutes of TERG 17th meeting

The minutes were approved with no change required.

Action point 1: The TERG support team to publish the report of the 17th meeting on the internet

1.3 Review of the Agenda

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

^a It should be noted that the discussions did not always respect the agenda.

2. Report on ongoing evaluations

2.1 Evaluation of the Health System Funding Platform

Wim Van Damme (TERG Vice-Chair and TERG focal point for this evaluation) informed the TERG that the consultant commissioned to conduct that work was expected to submit a draft report before the end of the month. The report will be focused on the Global Fund's perspective on a joint evaluation. It should be used as a basis for consultations with partners on how to design a multiagency evaluation.

The following remarks were made during the discussions following the presentation:

- The Global Fund and GAVI have similar funding mechanisms and follow the IHP+ guidelines. The World Bank's situation is different. That may create tensions and difficulties in harmonizing processes.
- Seen from the viewpoint of countries applying for grants, the situation is complex and confusing: as of Round 11, they can apply for funds for a specific disease, but also on HSS for which there is a joint process Global Fund - GAVI and also apply on the basis of NSAs.
- Those complexities may delay the implementation of certain programs or may have negative effects on the applications. The TERG should consider informing the Board of this risk.

Action point 2: Once the report on the evaluation framework finalized, the TERG Chair should inform the Board and its relevant committee of the TERG reactions to the findings and recommendations of the report.

2.2 Evaluation of the Affordable Medicines Facility – malaria (AMFm)

Wim Van Damme summarized the documents circulated in preparation of the meeting. During the discussion, one TERG member informed participants that, according to certain reports, the AMFm program was responsible of shortages of non-subsidized ACTs, as well as of raw materials, the prices of which were rising.

It was recalled that the evaluation was expected to address those issues.

It was agreed that Wim Van Damme would attend the next AMFm Ad Hoc Committee meeting, the 13 October, in the Global Fund premises.

Action point 3: Wim van Damme to represent TERG at the AMFM HAC meeting and to inform the TERG on the most important points and outcomes of the meeting.

2.3 Evaluation of the Key Performance Indicators

Jaap Broekmans introduced the point, because he had been interviewed by the consultants in charge of the evaluation and had read the report. He found the report to be unsurprising and the overall evaluation of summarising the complexity of the Global Fund's operations into a short list of KPIs to be very difficult.

The following remarks were made during the discussions that followed:

- There is no certainty that the report, which is rather "light", may respond to the doubt expressed by Board Committees on the quality and relevance of the KPIs.
- Although KPIs have limitations (notably on representing the quality of operations or covering the entire scope of the work done), the very good presentations made to TERG show that KPIs are a valuable tool for measuring and monitoring progress over time. Not all organizations have such systems in place. There is however a risk that the attention of the organization be focused on the indicators rather than on the mandate, missions and objectives.

3. TERG's input to the evaluation strategy

In his introduction, the TERG Chair thanked the Secretariat for its support with the work done over summer to revise the document. The Chair also reminded TERG members that in his work on the document he made special efforts to ensure:

- the presence of framework to specify how the different types of M&E activities fit together; for this the Framework developed for the Five Year Evaluation was used;
- the management of evaluations;
- the independence of evaluations.

During the exchanges that followed, TERG members expressed the following viewpoints:

- The document might be too long;
- The new priority given to evaluation was seen as the sign of a positive evolution;
- The role of recipients in the evaluations, and the added value of evaluations for them was seen as unclear;
- The role of TERG in the new strategy, and its capacity to deliver what is expected from it were questioned;
- The articulation between the evaluation strategy and the Global Fund 2012-2016 strategy (currently being drafted) was seen as necessary;
- The role of TERG in giving assurance to the Board that the evaluation work is done in a fair and high-quality professional manner (also described as the TERG "governance function") appeared to be critically important;
- A second role for the TERG was seen as being a technical advisor for the evaluations undertaken by the Secretariat.

A six-step evaluation process was presented:

1. Define the evaluation agenda
2. Define specific evaluation questions
3. Select consultants for conducting the evaluation
4. Supervise the evaluation process
5. Review the evaluation report(s)
6. Report the evaluation conclusions and recommendations to the Board.

It was agreed that TERG should concentrate on steps 1-2 and 5-6.

It was proposed that an independent review panel be in charge of the oversight of steps 3-4 for evaluations commissioned by the Secretariat, with TERG being represented on the panel.

With reference to step 1, it was proposed that a small working group be set up for identifying items for evaluations, notably items identified in OIG reports, with the view that, after discussion by the TERG, those items could be placed on the TERG work plan.

Action point 4: SPE Director to set up a working group in charge of identifying evaluation topics to be part of the TERG work plan and of the 12 Year evaluation of the Global Fund.

4. Exchanges with SPE cluster Director on SPE /TERG cooperation and 2012 TERG work plan and budget

Rifat Atun, Director of SPE, presented the directions taken by the Cluster in the context of important reforms initiated by the Global Fund.

He started by detailing the actions taken in application of the Five Year Evaluation findings and recommendations, notably:

- The priority put on increasing the quality of data used for assessing proposals and monitoring grants, which resulted in:
 - o The development of Data Quality Analyses (DQAs), On-Site Data Verifications (OSDV), Rapid Data Quality Assessments (RDQA);
 - o The importance given to strengthening M&E systems in recipient countries;
 - o The development of an M&E toolkit;
- Actions in favour of strengthening health systems.

Thanks to all those activities, SPE and the Global Fund have better knowledge of the field, which allows for better funding and management decisions consistent with the performance-based funding (PBF) principles.

Rifat Atun also explained that the Global Fund was now implementing three fundamental changes still in line with PBF, reflected in the 2012-2016 Strategy:

- From proposal lottery approach to informed demands: fund requirements now have to be based on evidence and information. This should improve the quality of funds requests and expedite the grant negotiation process;
- From a culture of disbursement to one of investments. More attention is put on value for money, more work is also needed on the relation between investments and impacts;
- From phase-2 review of grants to Program periodic review, which is also the occasion to have a better view of the complementarity between programs (or absence thereof).

During the discussion that followed, TERG members highlighted:

- The need to know more about the relevance of having one same Global Fund model applied to different countries and settings;
- The call, in the Paris Declaration, for having one M&E plan per country, or at least, one per country and per disease;
- The need to take into account the countries' perspectives on the development of M&E systems, and on the program reviews.

The TERG Chair then invited TERG members to focus their inputs on where TERG resources could be useful to the Secretariat. He identified three themes:

- Continuous performance monitoring
- Key shifts in the Global Fund model (those mentioned by R. Atun)
- The Global Fund business model (CCMs, PBF, PRs and LFAs,...) and its adaptation to different countries.

Those three themes could be further developed and investigated in the framework of the next multi-year evaluation.

The discussion then went on to the development of program evaluations commissioned by SPE and conducted by external consultants. TERG members and SPE Director exchanged views on different possible arrangements that could ensure good quality evaluations with unquestioned independence. The role of TERG as regards ensuring the methodological quality and the independence of those evaluations was also debated, as was the possibility to set up in SPE a team that would work only on evaluation with no implementation or monitoring task, and the expert support TERG could provide to such a team.

5. Report on ongoing evaluations (continued)

5.1 Evaluation of the Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) Strategies

The support team reminded TERG members that the TERG had refused to contribute to the budget of this evaluation commissioned by the Secretariat. The TERG was invited to comment on the final report, and to convey to the Board its assessment of the evaluation.

Several TERG members commented on:

- The importance of the SOGI issues on the political agenda;
- The main finding of the report, which is that SOGI issues are not yet a strong priority for the Global Fund;
- Methodological weaknesses of the report.

Action point 5: TERG members to send detailed comments to the TERG support team, for inclusion in the TERG report to the Board.

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

Paulin Basinga, TERG member focal point for this evaluation introduced the point by highlighting the importance of this theme for the M&E strategy, as well as for the 12 Year evaluation. He communicated to the TERG that the inception report that he had reviewed was of very good quality.

Viroj Tangcharoensathien expressed his availability to become the second focal point for this evaluation.

A brief discussion followed during which TERG members insisted that since the topic of the evaluation is wide, focal points should invite consultants to remain focused on a limited number of themes of specific interest for the Global Fund.

A brief telephone call with one of the consultants (Greet Peersman) followed, during which TERG members expressed their satisfaction with the work done so far, and requested to be kept informed of all developments of the evaluation.

6. Information of TERG members on the development of the Global Fund strategy (2012-2016) and on governance reform

Todd Summers, in his capacity of member of a working group drafting the Global Fund strategy for 2012-2016 that will be submitted to the Board in November for approval, briefed TERG members on the salient points of the draft strategy, and on governance reforms that the Board might want to adopt before the end of the year.

He listed the following points as being of specific importance for TERG:

- The strategy will be based on objectives of number of lives saved and infections prevented;
- The Global Fund is expected to become more proactive in investing for impact;
- The round-based funding model will be replaced by a continuing approach to funding;
- If the new Global Fund strategy is approved by the Board, the evaluation strategy will have to be revised to ensure that both documents are aligned;
- Major governance reforms are being envisaged, notably as regards the number and roles of Committees;

- There is a feeling that more knowledge is needed on certain items, to guide the funding decisions, notably on transversal interventions that go beyond the three diseases (e.g. MNCH and HSS);
- The TERG will have an important role to play in measuring what works and what doesn't, and for so doing in establishing monitoring and evaluation criteria.

In the discussion, the following points were made:

- The Global Fund is used to working with governments, but it can improve and increase its work with other partners, sub-national public authorities (at the regional or local levels), Civil Society Organizations, etc...
- The question of the number of countries in which the Global Fund is investing is being debated, with the view to intervene only where there is a need and a capacity for delivering results, with the Global Fund remaining global;
- The TERG has a role to play in evaluating the Fund's performance from the countries' perspective and in establishing which types of interventions work and which do not, in which type of country;
- The TERG could contribute to define baseline data and evaluation plans; it could notably work with TRP on defining criteria (in the M&E domain) for grant approval.

Summarizing the exchanges, the TERG Chair proposed that, in its future work the TERG focus on:

- Working on the evaluation of systems in which the Global Fund has been investing (e.g. M&S systems, HSS, capacity building);
- Evaluating program delivery in critical areas;
- Looking at specific aspects of the business model;
- Investigating specific issues (such as the causes and mechanisms leading to stock outs).

7. Exchanges with the Deputy Executive Director (Debrework Zewdie)

The TERG Chair presented to the Deputy Executive Director the summary of previous discussions on the possible role of TERG in the context of the Global Fund reform and the preparation of the 2012-2016 strategy.

The Deputy Executive Director:

- Emphasized the importance and depth of the reforms through which the organization was currently going, and would be going through the next months;
- Welcomed the idea that the TERG investigate systemic questions (e.g. M&E systems, capacity building, geographical coverage, etc...) but advised that it be done as part of impact evaluations, without losing sight of the effects on the diseases;
- Encouraged the TERG to build on the findings presented in OIG reports when defining its work plan, and recommended that it be complemented with perspectives and information gathered from recipient countries and from the Country Program Cluster;
- Expressed her support to the fact that each and every paper dealing with evaluations should be submitted to the TERG before it can reach the PSC or the Board;
- Reaffirmed her readiness to take the measures the TERG would request, as regards the size and role of the TERG support team.

Several participants intervened on this last topic.

Todd Summers reminded to TERG members that the current institutional arrangements

(TERG budget approved by FAC separately from the Secretariat budget, TERG support staff being in close contact with SPE, but administratively under OED) were adopted by the Board with the view to ensure a certain independence from SPE while maintaining good cooperation between SPE and the TERG.

Stein Erik Kruse and Anja Nitzsche-Bell invited the TERG to reflect on the evaluation function in the Fund within the changing environment. If an independent evaluation function were to be developed in SPE, staff dedicated to this (and not involved in program implementation) could also work for TERG support. If an internal audit function were developed outside the OIG, this could also change the landscape.

When concluding this session, Todd Summers and the TERG Chair highlighted that the TERG should certainly work closely with both SPE and OIG and that, when defining its needs for support, it should keep in mind that the Board needs to know the quality, the independence and the reliability of anything that is produced as part of evaluation work. In addition to that, the TERG should have the resources and the freedom to decide on other evaluations it might want to undertake.

8. Working session on the Evaluation strategy

TERG members worked with John Puvimanasinghe (SPE evaluation manager) on specific parts of the draft evaluation strategy. This working session was aimed at defining guidelines for working on next iterations of the evaluation strategy, before it is submitted to the PSC and then to the Board.

It was agreed that the work would continue after the meeting, via electronic exchanges.

Action point 6: The SPE evaluation manager to work closely with TERG Chair and to obtain his approval of the Evaluation strategy, before it is submitted to the PSC and then to the Board.

9. TERG administration

The TERG went through relevant supporting documents and decided on the following action points:

Action point 7: TERG support to prepare the 19th TERG meeting to take place the 9 and 10 February 2012a.

Action point 8: The draft TERG 2012 work plan and budget as presented in supporting document to be submitted for approval to the FAC, and to be reviewed by the TERG during its 19th meeting.

Action point 9: The TERG Chair to update the vacancy notice with minimal changes for a Grade 6 position of Team leader, TERG support, and to request the Deputy Executive Director to launch/unfreeze the recruitment.

Action point 10: The TERG Chair to request the Board, via the PSC, to extend the terms of office of Dorothee Kinde Gazard, Wim Van Damme, Stein-Erik Kruse, Kumaraswami Vasanthapuram, and Lixia Wang until the spring 2012 session of the Board.

^a This decision was recalled in January 2012. The 19th TERG meeting was rescheduled to 1-2 March 2012.

Action point 11: The TERG Chair, with help from the TERG support team, to draft a short TERG annual report to the Board, to be shared with TERG members electronically before it is submitted to the PSC.

ANNEX 1: AGENDA OF THE MEETING

TERG Meeting: Day 1 Monday, 12 September 2011 Venue: The Global Fund - Room to be specified		
	08:30 - 08:45	Welcome Coffee
<i>Chair for the first sessions: Wim Van Damme</i>		
1	08:45 - 09:15	Opening session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome - Approval of the minutes of TERG 17th meeting - Review of the Agenda - Overview of documents in meeting binder
2	09:15 - 10:30	Report on ongoing evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation of the Health System Funding Platform (Wim van Damme, Bernhard Schwartländer) - Evaluation of the Affordable Medicines Facility - malaria (AMFm) To be Confirmed - Evaluation of the Key Performance Indicators (presenter to be specified)
	10:30 - 11:00	<i>Coffee</i>
<i>Chair for the following sessions: Mickey Chopra</i>		
3	11:00 - 12:00	Discussion on TERG's input to the evaluation strategy
4	12.00 - 13.00	First discussion on the 2012 TERG work plan and budget
	13:00 - 14:00	<i>Lunch</i>
5	14:00 - 16:00	Finalization of TERG's input to the Global Fund evaluation strategy
	16:00 - 16:30	<i>Coffee</i>
6	16:30-18:00	Report on ongoing evaluations (continued) Evaluation of the Gender Equality Strategy and Evaluation of the Sexual orientation and Gender identity Strategy (Mickey Chopra)

		<p>Evaluation of The Global Fund’s funding of in-country M&E systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress report on the implementation of the evaluation (Paulin Basinga, Florent Loiseau) - Choice of a second TERG focal point for following up on this file (in addition to Paulin Basinga) - Conference call with the 2 external consultants (Greet Peersman and Beth Plowman)
7	18:00-18:15	Wrap up of day 1

TERG Dinner, from 7.30 pm

Brasserie Restaurant de l’Hôtel de ville

39, Grand Rue 1204 Geneva

Tel : +41(0) 22 311 70 30

By bus Line 3 or 5, Tram line 12 : Stop : Place de Neuve

TERG Meeting: Day 2
Tuesday, 13 September 2011
Venue: The Global Fund - Room to be specified

8	9:00 - 10:30	<p>Introduction to Day 2 (Mikey Chopra)</p> <p>Information of the TERG on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reform of the Global Fund's governance structures • The Board's and PSC's expectations vis-à-vis the TERG • The Global Fund Strategy (Todd Summers)
	10:30 - 10:45	<i>Coffee</i>
9	10:45 - 12:15	<p>Exchanges with the Deputy Executive Director (Debrework Zewdie)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DED's expectations vis-à-vis the TERG's role and work plan, - Information of TERG members on the reforms implemented in the Secretariat - Questions and answers
	12:15 - 13:15	Lunch
10	13:15 - 14:15	Finalization of TERG 2012 Work plan and budget
11	14:15 - 15:00	<p>Preparation of the TERG 2011 Report to the Board (content, process, etc...)</p> <p>TERG's views on the Global Fund 12 Year evaluation (2014)</p>
	14:45 - 15:00	<i>Coffee</i>
12	15:00 - 16:00	<p>Any other business</p> <p>Dates for the next TERG meeting</p>
	16:00	Closure of the meeting