

## 21<sup>ST</sup> TERG MEETING OUTCOMES

<b>Date :</b>	19-20 February, 2013
<b>Venue :</b>	Perle du Lac, Rue de Lausanne 128, Geneva 1201, Switzerland.
<b>Chair :</b>	Mickey Chopra
<b>Vice-Chairs :</b>	Wim Van Damme, Viroj Tangcharoensathien
<b>Focal Point :</b>	Daniel Low-Ber

### **Objectives of the 21<sup>st</sup> TERG Meeting**

1. To finalize the protocol for the process evaluation of the transition phase of the New Funding Model;
2. To obtain TERG guidance on thematic reviews to finalize TORs;
3. To review progress on evaluations and data quality assessments and obtain guidance on the principles for the 10-Year Evaluation (10-YE).

### **Outcomes**

1. Agreed protocol for the learning process of the transition phase of the New Funding Model (*Annex 1*). Focus on country dialogue and concept note;
2. Agreed collaboration and joint position with OIG on assurance on evaluation;
3. Agreed co-ordination with TRP, including their role in the NFM. TRP agreed that national strategies and program reviews should be seen as a package and to include TERG guidance on data systems in their reviews so they are implemented;
4. TERG guidance on individual thematic reviews to launch TORs in 2013;
5. TERG guidance on selected data quality assessments and investment plans to:
  - a. Ensure they capture grant and partner funding to support catalytic role of strategic investments;
  - b. Conduct mapping of data quality across TERG countries to segment investments into short, medium and longer term;
  - c. Prioritize investments in data quality to strengthen assessment of disease impact and trends in order to support the ten-year evaluation;
  - d. Prioritize investments in 1). Analysis and analytical capacity 2). HMIS, including DHIS and mobile reporting. Review co-investments with partners;
6. TERG guidance on selected impact reviews to:
  - a. Provide the full package of documents, for a few countries, for TERG review;
  - b. Ensure they incorporate clear assessment of quality of data;
  - c. Introduce additional quality assessment of reviews.
7. TERG guidance on 10-year evaluation framework to prepare outline for consultation with Board members.

### **Next Steps**

1. Protocol for the learning process of the transition phase of the NFM to be implemented with results reported in December;
2. Assurance mechanisms to be developed with OIG and any gaps in business reviews identified to be commissioned for ten-year evaluation
3. Finalize ToRs and commission thematic reviews for 2013;
4. Conduct mapping of data quality across TERG countries to prioritize investments and segment into short, medium and longer term;
5. Develop a package of data quality assessment; national program review report; and summary impact review report, for selected countries, to be sent to TERG for review;
6. Develop framework and outline of 10-year evaluation for consultation with Board;
7. Date of next TERG meeting agreed for 10-11 September, 2013.

### **Opening Session**

- Mickey Chopra welcomed the TERG members and described the objectives of the 21<sup>st</sup> TERG meeting.
- Daniel Low-Beer provided introductory remarks and requested key guidance from the TERG on:
  - The New Funding Model and its learning process;
  - Maximizing learning from thematic reviews;
  - Guidance and quality assurance on impact reviews and data quality assessments;
  - Principles for the 10-year evaluation.

### **Session 1 – New Funding Model/Collaboration with OIG**

#### **New Funding Model (NFM)**

- An update on the New Funding Model, especially its transition and key components of the NFM was presented by Abigail Moreland, Head of Transition Team & Johannes Hunger, Senior Manager of the Strategy and Policy Team. Comments were made by Mark Edington, Todd Summers and George Gotsadze (TRP Vice-Chair), which was followed by a discussion with TERG members.
- The TERG stressed:
  - Need to focus with TRP on quality of Concept Note and Country Dialogue, which are critical.
  - The Concept Note to be based on National Strategic Plans, epidemiological data and program reviews. These should be seen as one package.
  - Need to identify in which countries this would work: cover all countries but focus efforts dependent on context.
  - Assess check and balances in key stages, including of TRP.
- The draft protocol for the learning process of the Transition Phase of the NFM was presented;
- The SIIC chair informed the meeting that the Board is expecting a report on strengths, weaknesses and learning by December, and that this should be seen as a basis for the phase-2 evaluation of the full roll-out of the new funding model;
- Mark Edington commented that “we are in the middle of an express train. It is about continuous learning”.
- The TERG stressed the following:
  - This is a learning process. Need to have a learning framework which supports the on-going process. The Transition Phase learning would lead to a full evaluation platform;
  - Need to simplify questions and focus on Concept Note, Country Dialogue and evidence base (epidemiological data, program reviews);
  - Define key components of NFM and what it takes to make them work;
  - Look at all countries but dis-aggregate and link to thematic reviews (Fragile States, Human Rights);
  - Country visits and observation is critical to get independent and frank responses;
  - Need to look at the similar process which GAVI went through;
- Secretarial staff, with guidance from Jim Tulloch, simplified the assessment questions and included additions (Annex 1);
- The OIG indicated that it was too early to audit the NFM in 2013. The OIG commented that the “TERG role of process evaluation makes more sense than an audit”.

### Collaboration with OIG

- The OIG presented the Audit Work Plan 2013-2015.
  - Overall assurance on the secretariat processes:
    - Secretariat business process - this will be fully developed in 2013;
    - Thematic audits – at country level;
    - Audit of country processes;
    - Review of other assurance providers - evaluates the quality of other potential providers of assurance.
  - Annual statement on the Global Fund assurance process to the Board
  - Audit engagement in 2013
    - Audits of specific business processes
    - Thematic audits of assurance processes in selected countries
    - Country audits in selected low/medium-risk countries
- The OIG and TERG collaboration was welcomed and the following discussed and agreed:
  - Agreed wording of coordination on evaluations and assurance;
  - TERG and OIG to collaborate to develop assurance process;
  - OIG interface defined as focusing on business processes; and TERG on impact. However as the OIG charter is developed this should be checked;
  - TERG and OIG to map reviews of business processes to identify any key gaps that need commissioning, and to use findings to complete the business process level of the ten-year evaluation;
  - Jointly assess independence and checks and balances in NFM.
- TERG collaboration with TRP was also discussed and agreed:
  - Concept Note process of NFM: TERG to provide feedback from country learning and TRP to provide key lessons from their review of Concept Notes;
  - TRP to include TRP recommendations on data quality and program reviews in its review of Concept Note to ensure these are implemented.

“TRP and OIG can do some work for us in filling key areas, and we can reciprocate through our review of country dialogue, program reviews and feedback”

**Outcomes:** (1). Agreed protocol for the learning process of the transition phase of the NFM (Annex 1); (2). Agreed areas for collaboration between TERG, TRP and OIG. TRP agreement to include TERG guidance on data quality in its reviews.

### Session 2 – Thematic Reviews

- TERG welcomed the progress on thematic reviews and provided guidance to finalize the TORs for the three reviews planned for 2013. The TERG members discussed the three thematic reviews in break-away groups.
- **Fragile States:** The draft Framing Document and ToR for the thematic review were presented. The following areas were further discussed.
  - Defining Fragile States: there are many different definitions and lists; and adding our own Global Fund definition was not seen as a productive contribution to the debate. There are a set of core-countries that are found on any list of Fragile States (such as DRC, Chad, CAR, Somalia, Afghanistan, South Sudan, &c). GAVI also commissioned a study on this topic, and makes a clear distinction between countries experiencing a chronic crisis (list above) and countries experiencing acute humanitarian emergencies (Syria, Mali, etc). GAVI’s central conclusion is that “case-by-case” approaches have to be worked out. Other studies and reviews have been commissioned (such as a 6-country study on “health in fragile states” commissioned by DANIDA) and

Global Fund should build on these. From the Global Fund's perspective, the focus should be on countries where there is a significant AIDS, TB and/or malaria burden, additional on being fragile. It is also thought that distinguishing between the Fragile States that get a lot of attention (such as South Sudan, DRC & Haiti) and the "neglected Fragile States" (such as CAR & Chad) is useful.

- Key guidance provided on approach to the thematic review:
  - Focus on a limited set of case studies; preferably clear-cut cases, on which everybody agrees that they are fragile and with a significant AIDS, TB and/or malaria problem (e.g. CAR, DRC, Chad, South Sudan) would be a good starting point, but acknowledge wider set of countries;
  - Review and benchmark other organizations' strategies for working in such states and identify lessons to be drawn for the Global Fund; focus on organizations that have significant experience in such countries (e.g. UNICEF, GAVI, ICRC, MSF, ...);
  - Assess Global Fund processes in light of what happens within countries – what has been working well and why, what hasn't worked well and why. What aspects of the New Funding Model might need adapting/tailoring to ensure that fragile states are not disadvantaged and how this should be done;
  - Provide guidance on fragile states for country teams, and use findings in countries to engage partners on how to tackle issues.
  
- **Human Rights**
  - The draft ToR was presented and discussed:
    1. What others are doing in terms of human rights;
    2. Baseline of Global Fund investment in human rights;
    3. M&E tools;
    4. Human rights and the NFM;
    5. Global Fund human rights investment for addressing issues that impinge effective interventions;
    6. Risks for the Global Fund to support human rights infringements.
  - Guidance provided on two stage approach to the thematic evaluation:
    - Guidance to first undertake research questions 1-3 in 2013 and produce report; and 4-6 subsequently (focusing on grant-making process mostly in 2013);
    - While the first phase may focus on "mapping", evidence-based strategic guidance (in guidelines or other tools) should be produced through this review;
    - The review could refer to UNHCHR's human right indicators, composed of structural, process and outcome indicators, and including various health indicators, for an example of M&E tool;
    - The following issues should be taken into account during the review: a) doing no harm; and b) risks of not doing anything, which might unintentionally permit present injustice;
    - Draft recommendations required by November 2013.
  
- **MDG 4 and 5**
  - Guidance provided on the objectives and approach to this thematic review:
    - Document the Global Fund contribution to the progress toward MDGs 4 and 5 in the past decade;
    - Conduct case studies to identify exemplary, synergetic key interventions (using disease-specific or HSS funding);

- Identify strategic options to strengthen MNCH services and maximize the number of mothers' and children's lives saved to inform grant management, countries, and Global Fund donors;
- Finalize ToR for this work by June, covering the overall assessment and countries specific assessments.

**Outcome:** TERG review and adaptation of individual thematic reviews. (a). Fragile States: To commission thematic review including country case- studies; (b). Human Rights: Update evaluation questions and scope and to commission review. (c). MDG 4 & 5: Go ahead to further update evaluation questions and finalize TORs to implement in June.

### **Session 3: Progress on Data Quality Assessments, Impact Reviews and discussion on the 10-YE**

#### Data Quality Assessments

- An update was provided on data quality assessments and development of investment plans:
  - Based on partner assessment check-list with priority investments;
  - Five data system areas explored and gaps identified;
  - Updated guidance from SIIC and Board on allocating 5-10% to M&E to country data systems, including 7% to strengthen national data systems of reporting, surveys and program reviews.
  - The Tanzania example was presented.
- The following guidance was provided by the TERG with a view to strengthening the quality and consistency of data quality assessments and investment plans:
  - Map data quality across TERG countries to prioritize and segment investments into short, medium and longer term;
  - Ensure the investment plans capture grant and partner funding to support catalytic role of strategic investments. Catalytic role is critical.
  - Recommendations and investments should also be linked to the assessment of disease-specific section of check-list;
  - The check-list section titled “additional details for HIV, malaria, TB” to be rephrased;
  - Assess additional components, e.g. use of systems for stock-outs; ;
  - Tailor approach to specific countries, e.g. in some countries strengthening in a few districts may be feasible. Focus on priority investments which could strengthen assessment of disease impact and trends;
- Partner comment: “The assessments in countries, including COIA/CAF assessments, are translating to investment plans. FPMs are taking on these assessments and reprogramming their resources to support information and data systems”.

**Outcome:** Reviewed selected data quality assessments and investment plans and suggested additional improvements (a). Conduct mapping of data quality across TERG countries to prioritize and segment investments as short-term, mid-term and long-term; (b). Ensure investment plans capture grant and partner funding; (c). Prioritize investments in 1). Analysis and analytical capacity; 2). HMIS, including DHIS and mobile reporting, to support assessments for the 10-year evaluation of the Global Fund; (d) Additional components to be included. Review co-investments with partners before their release to ensure they are catalytic.



### Impact Reviews

- An update was provided on impact reviews:
  - A number of completed program impact reviews were presented, including the Cambodia review and grant recommendations based on it;
  - It was stressed that the reviews are providing evidence of documented impact, no impact and situations where data quality issues are severe.
  
- The following comments were provided by the TERG with a view to strengthening the quality and consistency of the impact review summaries:
  - Develop a package consisting of data quality assessment; national program review report; and summary impact review, for selected countries, to be sent to individual TERG members for review;
  - A more in-depth analysis of the data is required together with independent graphs and testing of hypotheses. Additional evaluation activities may need to be funded in the country to build up to these reviews. Steps should be taken to build capacity at country level for analysis;
  - Provide a more detailed assessment of the quality of data used for the evaluations. The summary reports need to fully reflect the gravity of data issues in the country;
  - Should ensure internal consistency of the impact review summaries. Stock-outs are a threat to impact and should be included.
  
- The use of program reviews to inform grant making and grant management at the secretariat was commended and that it had helped these reach a new level.
  
- The TRP member while congratulating the IRE on this work, mentioned that programmatic reviews need to be part of the package of submissions to the TRP and be budgeted for in on-going grants. "We need to develop this platform approach, it is the right one for the TRP to play its role and the basis of an application".

**Outcome:** Reviewed selected impact reviews and suggested additional improvements (a). Provide the full package of documents for review by individual TERG members (b). Provide a more detailed assessment of the quality of data used for the evaluations. (c) Fund additional analysis activities (e.g. by disease including evaluations) which build into the reviews.

### 10-Year Evaluation (10-YE) of the Global Fund

- The secretariat requested the TERG on key guidance on the following areas related to the 10-year evaluation:
  - Maximize ongoing learning and management responses (2013-14)
  - Improve quality of key components (2013)
  - Initiate independent review of key components (2014)
  - Mid-term review of Global Fund strategy (2015)
    - How to feedback to the Board (disease discussion, key themes)
    - Decisions to the Strategy, Investment and Impact Committee
  
- The following decisions were made by the TERG:
  - To identify what can be expected to be delivered in 2 years. TERG will drive that discussion and use the mapping to identify countries with potential for good quality data, those where baselines can be provided, and those which require medium term investments;
  - To improve approaches for lives saved as part of the final report;
  - To develop a framework and outline for the 10-year evaluation;
  - To seek consultation at the June Board Meeting with individual stakeholders on their views.

**List of Attendees**

<b>Name of attendee</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
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. Atsuko AOYOMA	Nagoya University School of Medicine, Nagoya.	Member	<a href="mailto:atsukoa@med.nagoya-u-ac.jp">atsukoa@med.nagoya-u-ac.jp</a>
5. Paulin BASINGA	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle.	Member	<a href="mailto:paulinbasinga@gmail.com">paulinbasinga@gmail.com</a>
6. Stein-Erik KRUSE	Nordic Consulting Group	Member	<a href="mailto:stein.erik.kruse@ncg.no">stein.erik.kruse@ncg.no</a>
7. James TULLOCH,	Independent consultant in Health and Development	Member	<a href="mailto:jimtullocho9@gmail.com">jimtullocho9@gmail.com</a>
8. Assefa Yibeltal ALEMU	Federal HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control Office, Ethiopia.	Member	<a href="mailto:Yibeltalassefa343@gmail.com">Yibeltalassefa343@gmail.com</a>
9. Don De Savigny	Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Basel.	Member	<a href="mailto:d.desavigny@unibas.ch">d.desavigny@unibas.ch</a>
10. Jaap BROEKMANS	WHO Global Task Force on TB Impact Measurement	Ex-officio member	<a href="mailto:broekmansj@tbconsult.nl">broekmansj@tbconsult.nl</a>
11. Bernard NAHLEN	President's Malaria Initiative	Ex-officio member	<a href="mailto:bnahlen@usaid.gov">bnahlen@usaid.gov</a>
12. Salil PANAKADAN	UNAIDS	Ex-officio member	<a href="mailto:PanakadanS@unaids.org">PanakadanS@unaids.org</a>
13. Peter HANSEN	GAVI	Ex-officio member	<a href="mailto:phansen@gavialliance.org">phansen@gavialliance.org</a>
14. Shaun Mellors	Board Member, Communities Living with HIV, TB and affected by Malaria	SIIC Co-Chair	<a href="mailto:mellorsshaun@gmail.com">mellorsshaun@gmail.com</a>
15. Katherine FLOYD	WHO – Stop TB	Partner	<a href="mailto:Floyd.k@who.int">Floyd.k@who.int</a>
16. Mazuwa BANDA	WHO – HIV Dept.	Partner	<a href="mailto:bandam@who.int">bandam@who.int</a>
17. Kathryn O'NEILL	WHO - Public Health Information and GIS Department	Partner	<a href="mailto:oneillk@who.int">oneillk@who.int</a>
18. Malgorzata GRZEMSKA	WHO – Stop TB	Partner	<a href="mailto:grzemska@who.int">grzemska@who.int</a>
19. Michael Lynch	WHO - GMP	Partner	<a href="mailto:lynchm@who.int">lynchm@who.int</a>