

## **20<sup>TH</sup> TERG MEETING OUTCOMES**

**3-4 SEPTEMBER, 2012**

<b>Date :</b>	3-4 September 2012
<b>Venue :</b>	Chateau de Penthes, Geneva.
<b>Chair :</b>	Mickey Chopra
<b>Vice-Chairs :</b>	Wim Van Damme, Viroj Tangcharoensathien
<b>Focal Point :</b>	Daniel Low-Beer

### **Objectives of the 20<sup>th</sup> TERG Meeting**

1. To review progress and consolidate the evaluation work plan towards the ten-year evaluation in 2014;
2. To finalize TERG's recommendations on the AMFm evaluation;
3. To review the application of the M&E checklist, and to develop components of an M&E Investment Plan across priority countries.

### **Outcomes**

1. Agreed TERG position paper on the AMFm evaluation (*Annex 1*)
2. Agreed components of the M&E investment plan and financial allocation
3. Agreed TERG work plan 2013-14 to be submitted to SIIC (*Annex 2*)
4. Reviewed country evaluation components and suggested additional elements
  - a. Standardise guidance and protocols
  - b. Quality assurance with TERG involvement and review
5. Reviewed M&E checklist country application and suggested improvements
  - a. Include additional components, for example commodity tracking
  - b. Include column on grant investments over medium term
  - c. Include checklist in grant M&E standards
6. Agreed for period of implementation of reviews and capacity assessment for further review by TERG in February 2013 (*Annex 3 – updated schedule*)

### **Next Steps**

1. TERG position paper on AMFm to be finalised and used to guide deliberations of Global Fund Secretariat and Board
2. TERG work plan 2013-2014 to be submitted to the SIIC together with M&E investment plan
3. Secretariat to make adaptations to the tool and develop protocols for reviews for the next TERG meeting
4. Secretariat to present progress on grant M&E standards at the next TERG
5. Secretariat to provide update on checklist, program evaluation and thematic review progress according to work plan at the next TERG meeting
6. Date of next TERG agreed for 19 – 20 February, 2013

## Introduction Session

- The **Global Fund Management** expressed support of the evaluation approach and committed to learn from both positive and negative findings on impact
- **Grant management** stressed the relevance of both program reviews and data quality assessments for improving grants and welcomed an M&E investment plan (“**US\$1 on M&E tends to be seen as US\$1 away from the program until we assess program results and then there is a crisis. The checklist and menu of investment is invaluable, before we reach a crisis**”)
- **SIIC described the status of the new funding model** and the M&E investment plan requested at its last meeting. They stated that it seemed to be a good example of the new funding model: an agreed partner strategic investment framework, a country review and dialogue, and required allocation of funding
- The discussion stressed the need for country reviews to be country led in their timing, and for recommendations to be fed back to improve grant management
- **OIG also presented on the growing collaboration** with evaluations, including quarterly updates and joint missions

## Session 1. Evaluation Progress and Partner Planning

- Progress on key components of the work were presented, together with comments by Grant Management and the OIG
- The TERG welcomed the progress and suggested additional elements to be prepared for the next TERG meeting
  - Standardize guidance and protocols
  - Introduce TERG involvement and review
  - Work towards systematic planning with countries and partners
- The TERG also stressed that
  - Different types of reviews may be needed in different situations, depending on key partners in a country, in fragile states, and that the approach should be flexible in this respect
  - The reviews should be led by the country, and that a key partner may be identified in particular situations
  - The need to highlight negative and positive findings, so we could learn and identify major risks. These should be prominent in the reports and fed back to grant management
- OIG presented its summary findings, with risks in relation to reaching MARPS, non-adherence to national protocols, and data quality
- The TERG also noted that
  - In some reviews, additional evaluation studies may need to be commissioned, to strengthen the reviews and involve local institutions.
  - The need to assess the full M&E chain alongside impact and outcome
- The TERG work plan 2013-14 was presented and reviewed for presentation to the SIIC. It was supported with the following suggestions:
  - Further define the role of the independent synthesis
  - Add to the aims the strengthening of M&E capacity in priority countries
  - Assess whether there is significant financial support for the above activities as this is taken forward. This can be reviewed in 2013.
  - TERG members to be involved in key activities in 2013-14.

**Outcome:** Agreed TERG work plan 2013-14 to be submitted to SIIC (Annex 2). Reviewed evaluation components and suggested additional elements: (a). Standardize guidance and protocols (b). Introduce quality assurance of TERG involvement and review & (c). Work towards systematic planning with countries.

## Session 2. AMFm Evaluation

- The TERG AMFm sub-group presented their position paper which was reviewed by the TERG members
- The Secretariat requested that the recommendations be made as specific as possible to guide discussions. They welcomed the TERG work.
- The TERG stressed the importance of the general learnings from the evaluation for the Global fund in terms of private sector subsidies, negotiation of prices and procurement bottlenecks in the public and private sectors
- The TERG stressed the following elements in the review:
  - They welcomed the evaluation and progress shown
  - They highlighted the limitations to the findings and that these need to be made explicit
  - They highlighted the extra information that would be beneficial going forward
  - They discussed at length recommendations going forward and how to maximise the learnings from the evaluation for the Global Fund
- The sub-group distributed a modified version of the paper for comments to be finalised by the end of the week (final version Annex 1)

**Outcome:** Agreed TERG position paper on the AMFm evaluation (*Annex 1*)

## Session 3. Progress on Assessing M&E systems and M&E Investment Plan

- Progress on the Data Quality Assessment approach was reviewed and the country application for HIV, TB and malaria in Kenya
- The TERG welcomed the progress and made the following recommendations:
  - Include additional components, for example commodity tracking
  - Include column on grant investments over the medium term
- In addition the TERG stressed this approach should be linked closely to grant M&E standards and should catalyze improvements in M&E spending
- The TERG suggested that the approach is presented alongside the M&E thematic review to the SIIC to show the improvements required
- The TERG recommended that this was an important part of the new funding model and was based on (1) Strategic investment framework with partners (2) Country dialogue and review process (3) Financial allocation for countries
- The TERG decided to recommend an average of US\$500,000 per country to invest in the top 20-25 countries. In addition, they recommended that co-financing with WHO and PEPFAR be pursued and presented.

**Outcome:** Reviewed M&E checklist country application and suggested improvements (a) Include additional components, for example commodity tracking (b) Include column on grant investments over medium term (c) Include in grant M&E standards  
TERG recommended that the M&E investment plan be presented with an average of US\$500,000 per country. This should also be used to improve existing grant M&E funding and presented with the M&E evaluation

## Session 4. Thematic Reviews

- TERG members split into groups and reviewed and provided input in to specific thematic reviews which had been identified by TERG.
  - (A). Fragile states: TERG will work to further refine the TOR and commission the review. It was agreed to bring together various stakeholders working in this area to share difficulties, challenges, strategies and possible ways forward. Specific focus will be on a selection from DRC, CAR, South Sudan, Chad, Afghanistan & Haiti.
  - (B). Phasing-out from GF support: The TERG reviewed the terms of reference and proposal from the consultant. An additional country study for Thailand was agreed. The latter is closely associated with Viroj, who presented his conflict of interest. This will be declared in the contract process.
  - (C). Artemisinin resistance: TERG reviewed the draft TOR and decided to summarize previous work on the topic, which was undertaken by Jim Tulloch. Bernard Nahlen will provide an update from PMI on 19 African countries. Based on these inputs, a thematic review will be provided so TERG can provide advice to the Board. Work is currently in progress.
  - (D). GF investments in to M&E systems: The draft thematic review report was discussed. TERG members agreed to send in further comments on the report. These findings will be incorporated and the report disseminated for action.
  - (E). Human Rights: Initial discussions were held on conducting a thematic review on Human Rights within the Global Fund portfolio, with invited partners.
- TERG members will continue their engagement to start thematic reviews and review them at the next meeting.

**Outcome:** TERG review and adaptation of individual thematic reviews. (a). Fragile states: further develop TOR and commission the review; (b). Phasing-out: Commission review including country case studies; (c). Artemisinin resistance: Further input from TERG members and advice to the Board; (d). GF investments in to M&E: Findings to be presented together with the M&E investment plan; (e) Human Rights: develop evaluation questions and define scope of review, to be discussed at next TERG meeting.

## List of Attendees

Name of attendee	Organization	Role	E-mail
1. Mickey CHOPRA	UNICEF	TERG Chair	<a href="mailto:mchopra@unicef.org">mchopra@unicef.org</a>
2. Viroj TANGCHAROENSATHIEN	International Health Policy Program, Thailand	TERG Vice-Chair	<a href="mailto:viroj@ihpp.thaigov.net">viroj@ihpp.thaigov.net</a>
3. Wim VAN DAMME	Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp	TERG Vice-Chair	<a href="mailto:wvdamme@itg.be">wvdamme@itg.be</a> <a href="mailto:ibogaert@itg.be">ibogaert@itg.be</a>
4. Paulin BASINGA	National University of Rwanda	Member	<a href="mailto:paulinbasinga@gmail.com">paulinbasinga@gmail.com</a>
5. Stein-Erik KRUSE	Nordic Consulting Group	Member	<a href="mailto:stein.erik.kruse@ncg.no">stein.erik.kruse@ncg.no</a>
6. James TULLOCH,	Independent consultant in Health and Development	Member	<a href="mailto:jimtullocho9@gmail.com">jimtullocho9@gmail.com</a>
7. Assefa Yibeltal ALEMU	Federal HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control Office, Ethiopia.	Member	<a href="mailto:Yibeltalassefa343@gmail.com">Yibeltalassefa343@gmail.com</a>
8. Don De Savigny	Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Basel.	Member	<a href="mailto:d.desavigny@unibas.ch">d.desavigny@unibas.ch</a>
9. Jaap BROEKMANS	WHO Global Task Force on TB Impact Measurement	Ex-officio member	<a href="mailto:broekmansj@tbconsult.nl">broekmansj@tbconsult.nl</a>
10. Bernard NAHLEN	President's Malaria Initiative	Ex-officio member	<a href="mailto:bnahlen@usaid.gov">bnahlen@usaid.gov</a>
11. Salil PANAKADAN	UNAIDS	Ex-officio member	<a href="mailto:PanakadanS@unaids.org">PanakadanS@unaids.org</a>
12. Peter HANSEN	GAVI	Ex-officio member	<a href="mailto:phansen@gavialliance.org">phansen@gavialliance.org</a>
13. Shaun Mellors		SIIC Co-Chair	<a href="mailto:mellorsshaun@gmail.com">mellorsshaun@gmail.com</a>
14. Ties BOERMA	WHO- EIP/MHI	Partner	<a href="mailto:Boerma.t@who.int">Boerma.t@who.int</a>
15. Yves SOUTEYRAND	WHO - HIV	Partner	<a href="mailto:souteyrandy@who.int">souteyrandy@who.int</a>
16. Richard CIBULSKIS	WHO - GMP	Partner	<a href="mailto:cibulskir@who.int">cibulskir@who.int</a>
17. Katherine FLOYD	WHO – Stop TB	Partner	<a href="mailto:Floyd.k@who.int">Floyd.k@who.int</a>
18. Paul BOUEY	PEPFAR	Partner	<a href="mailto:BoueyPD@state.gov">BoueyPD@state.gov</a>
19. Valentina BUJ	UNICEF	Partner	<a href="mailto:vbuj@unicef.org">vbuj@unicef.org</a>