

22ST TERG MEETING OUTCOMES

Date :	10-11 September 2013
Venue :	Perle du Lac, Rue de Lausanne 128, Geneva 1201, Switzerland.
Chair :	Mickey Chopra
Vice-Chairs :	Wim Van Damme, Viroj Tangcharoensathien
Focal Point :	Daniel Low-Beer

Objectives of the 22nd TERG Meeting

1. To review progress on evaluations and data quality investments;
2. To review the findings and provide guidance on thematic reviews, including the transition phase of the New Funding Model;
3. To provide guidance on the outline of the Mid-term Review of the Global Fund Strategy.

Outcomes

- Guidance and input from Global Fund Executive Director and Board Vice-Chair:
 - a. Re-affirmation of current evaluation approach building upon rigorous country program reviews and need to agree upon methodology for impact assessment estimations;
 - b. Proposed Board information session on Mid-Term Review.
- TERG review of country program review reports and guidance on improvements:
 - a) Urgent need to further strengthen review process and establish independent objective peer review process;
 - b) Request to partners to finalize program review guidance by end of year.
- TERG review of thematic reviews and guidance on improvements:
 - a) Reviewed evidence of initial countries participating in NFM and endorsed report. Develop a learning framework on NFM and report back to TERG;
 - b) Sustainability report accepted with guidance. TERG focal point to prepare a position paper and key recommendations;
- Guidance on data quality assessments and investment in to country data systems:
 - a) Re-affirmed the need to validate the investment frameworks and prioritize information requirements;
 - b) TERG endorsed additional request for funds for investment in to country information systems.
- Agreed overarching contents and guidance on Mid-term Review of the Global Fund Strategy 2012-2016:
 - a) Establish a broad participatory framework to facilitate widespread stakeholder consultations, including Board information session, and prepare an analytical plan for the Mid-term Review.

Executive Session

- Reviewed OIG audit and confirmed that TERG satisfied with current institutional arrangements and actions.

Opening Session

- Mickey Chopra welcomed the TERG members and described the objectives of the 22nd TERG meeting.
- Mark Dybul highlighted that program reviews have been beneficial for countries and for a wider investment approach. Concept notes need to start with data, preferably district by district, and should be “much more strategic to achieve impact”. He also discussed:
 - The need to think of the role of Global Fund in Fragile States;
 - Expanded view of impact: infections averted; orphans; and even economic benefits”.

The Executive Director reiterated that the TERG was an essential part of the Fund.

- Mme Mireille Guigaz, the vice-chair of the Board, indicated the interest of the Board to have greater country input on impact to guide strategies. She stressed that the Mid-term Review was of fundamental importance to the Board leadership and suggested a Board information session on Mid-Term Review for “fluid and vivid discussion on impact, key to our strategy on investing for impact”. She also discussed the importance of impact at country and implementer level; and requested that “TERG will help us have a strategic discussion on impact and thematic options”
- Osamu Kunii, the SIID Head, noted that the Global Fund was moving towards maximizing impact and efficiencies with the New Funding Model. He stressed the importance of measuring impact, targeting hotspots and key populations. Dr. Kunii identified the importance of the TERG in providing quality assurance.
- Daniel Low-Beer provided an update on work progress and presented the current work on impact evaluations, thematic reviews and data quality. He also requested key guidance from the TERG on:
 - Guidance and quality assurance on impact reviews and investments in to country information systems;
 - Maximizing learning from thematic reviews;
 - Contents of the Mid-term Review of the Global Fund Strategy.

Session 1 – Country Program Reviews

- TERG welcomed major progress on areas of the work plan. They confirmed that the TERG review process and standardized format of program reviews were valuable to facilitate systematic synthesis / analysis for the GF mid-term reviews and requested that it should be formalized with feedback provided to partners.
- Following in-depth assessment and discussions on the various program reviews and their peer reviews, TERG provided the following recommendations:
 1. There continues to be a wide variability in the quality of country programme reviews. A more robust quality assurance process needs to be implemented;
 2. Deep concerns that the program reviews guides have still not been completed by partners. This is urgently required;
 3. Include more explicit sections on data quality assessments and investments, showing the strengths and weaknesses of each data system;
 4. Impact statements should be qualified by quality of data they are based on;
 5. Recommendations reduced to 5-7 priorities;
 6. Include a financial contribution table where data are available;
 7. Global Fund together with partners to prepare a contribution/attribution statement together with partners for TERG review;
 8. Clearer formats for analysis, e.g. use of baselines and use of data sources, particularly for cross-country comparison.
 9. Partners are requested to finalize program review guidance by end of the year. Where possible this should include best practice examples and formats for analysis and reporting.

Outcome: TERG recommended: (a) TERG review process and standardized format to be formalized with feedback provided to partners; (b) Finalization of program specific guides (for three diseases) before end of the year; (c) Global Fund with partners to prepare a contribution/attribution statement for TERG review.

Session 2 – Thematic Reviews

- TERG welcomed the progress on thematic reviews and provided guidance on the next steps. Plenary discussions were held on the Review of the Transition Phase of the New Funding Model; the sustainability study; and HIV infections averted. The members then discussed three other on-going reviews in break-out sessions.

Plenary Session

a. New Funding Model

The TERG reviewed the evidence from three accelerated early applicant countries, feedback from stakeholders and endorsed the report. They noted that the New Funding Model was welcomed by the majority of participants, particularly in improved predictability of finance, enhanced inclusiveness and partnership in countries, active engagement of the Secretariat and TRP and well implemented Country Dialogue, leading to successful concept note development. They identified areas to further strengthen the success of the model, and develop a learning framework to ensure progress, on which the Secretariat should report back to prepare the rollout of the New Funding Model. The identified areas were:

1. **Definition of key New Funding Model concepts** wherever possible, so it is more clearly communicated and understood by all stakeholders;
2. Balance speed with **improved alignment** to country planning cycles;
3. Further **enhance representation** of civil society and key affected populations in the process;
4. Improve **guidance on cross-cutting components** and improved **modular tools**;
5. Continue **country dialogues as a continuous process** beyond the development of the concept note so they are fully part of grant-making;
6. Review **roles and responsibilities of the Global Fund core structures** to align with effective implementation of the new funding model.

A preliminary discussion was held on the potential role of the TERG in evaluating the New Funding Model.

Key Recommendation: Establish a large scale electronic survey to elicit feedback on NFM from a wide range of stakeholders in implementing countries for learning and improvement

b. Sustainability study

TERG accepted the report and advised the TERG focal points to prepare a position statement based on recommendations, as follows:

- Wider view (including programmatic and other aspects) than fiscal sustainability, and apply to all countries;
- Need for investment in data and disease sub-accounts as platform for monitoring spending by Government and others;
- Sustainability planning requirements should include country advocacy and go beyond a plan to be checked off;

- Global Fund needs to formalize sustainability planning with countries and partners;
- There should be an element of ensuring successful transition from a recipient to a donor status for countries graduating from the Global Fund support;
- The issue of fungibility should be addressed and included in the sustainability study.

c. HIV Infection Averted

TERG recognized the value of the Asian Epidemic Model (AEM) approach to estimate the lives saved and new infections averted in countries with concentrated and low HIV epidemics, and present different policy and finance scenarios. They advised that AEM should be expanded to estimate orphans averted, and linked to data quality investments, e.g., IBBS, and country reviews. They also advised that conservative non-intervention (counter-factual) scenarios should be considered in country contexts.

Break-out sessions

D. Fragile States

TERG reviewed the work conducted on the thematic review on fragile states, including summaries of the 9 case studies, and the draft report with their annexes. TERG acknowledges the progress on this thematic review and commented on the in-depth study and rich set of materials. However, TERG had some specific comments:

- Need to conceptualize the many practices that have been identified in the case studies;
- Some of the key results need better clarity;
- Specific lessons learnt in terms of service delivery by Global Fund and other actors.

The TERG requested that the report be revised based on the guidance provided by TERG.

E. Human rights indicators

The initial work on this thematic review was discussed. Four key areas of intervention needing to have indicators were identified:

- a. Law and policy reform indicators;
- b. Training and capacity building indicators;
- c. Access to justice indicators;
- d. Human rights monitoring indicators

TERG advised that these should be positioned where possible as program interventions linked closely to HIV, TB and malaria. They should also include guidance on strategic information and program reviews. Additional suggestions from the TERG include:

- Re-scoping of groups: it was suggested that other groups such as migrant workers, ethnic minorities and physically disabled should be included;
- Indicators to be revised to be practically linked to the three diseases;
- Mainstreaming of human rights indicators in routine reporting and reviews;
- Focus on feasible and quick to measure indicators;
- Include indicators on background vigilance done to prevent prohibitive laws from passing.

The steps in implementing the next phase of the review were also discussed:

- revised draft indicators based on feedback from GF secretariat;
- draft report with re-drafted indicators;
- four country case studies on practical application of the new indicators;
- case study interviews and discussion with civil society groups;
- Project final report drafted on findings, inclusive of methodology and recommendations.

F. MDG 4&5:

TERG discussed the draft report and noted the work in progress. Comments provided need to be incorporated including use of UN/WHO data and suggestions for further analysis:

- Consider interrupted time-series models;
- Tie all work streams to have a coherent story-line;
- Come up with practical recommendations;
- Consider other control variables such as disease burdens and type of PRs in the model;
- Consider different time lags.

G. Health Systems Strengthening

TERG discussed the draft TOR for the HSS review on three specific questions, which are as follows:

- Measuring impact of HSS investments: should we include measurement of HSS impact on health outcomes, or should we focus only on health *system* outcomes (e.g. PSM, HMIS, human resources, service availability...)?
- Should we focus on GF portfolio or include other HSS investments?
- If we are building on the existing USAID framework tested in Sudan, would TERG agree to sole source the consultant, to avoid issuing a new RFP for tender, which will take time?

TERG discussed the nature of the HSS review and members provided guidance and input:

1. It was noted that it would perhaps be more useful looking at HSS in a more holistic manner than conducting a standalone HSS review, including it within health sector and disease program reviews, and assessing system-specific issues within the context of disease programs and health sector reviews. TERG requested the secretariat to explore opportunities of linking systems-related outcomes with broader health outcomes and to propose an approach. Feasibility of the approach will be discussed and decided during the review of the proposal/s. In that sense, TERG members saw the benefit of developing the HSS review tool within program reviews and adequately assessing the spill-over effects;
2. A primary focus on the GF portfolio was suggested, including disease and HSS grants;
3. TERG agreed that the framework be built on the previous HSS evaluation framework developed in collaboration with USAID and be applied / integrated into the country program reviews.

The monitoring role of the review to assess cross-cutting issues and develop guidance where needed during the roll out of the New Funding Model was accepted. This should incorporate and operationalize issues from the other studies. The extent to which it should also look at HSS impact will be further discussed.

Outcome: TERG review and guidance on individual thematic reviews. (a) NFM: Secretariat to develop a learning framework on New Funding Model and report back to TERG; (b) Sustainability study: Report accepted and TERG to prepare a position paper on the sustainability study; (c) Guidance provided on next steps for other reviews.

Executive Session

An Executive Session of the TERG was held on the 11th September from 8.45 – 9.45 am. The Session was conducted with the participation of TERG members. Secretariat staff and invited partners did not participate in this session. A summary of the proceedings as provided by the TERG chair is as follows:

- Reviewed OIG audit and confirmed that TERG pleased with current institutional arrangements and actions;
- TERG to prepare position statements and recommendations for each report, institute review process and executive sessions;
- Secretariat to investigate increase time and numbers for TERG members.

Session 3: A. Progress on Data Quality Assessments and Investments;
B. Planning for Mid-term review of Global Fund Strategy

A. Progress on Data Quality Assessments and Investments

- TERG reviewed an update on data quality assessments, mapping of country data quality and on the development of investment plans:
 - data availability mapped for all countries for the three disease components;
 - As of present, funds released to three countries, and eight more are in the pipeline.
- TERG reviewed the investment in Zimbabwe under the title “Partnering for Impact: Bringing back HMIS on track in Zimbabwe”, presented by Perry Mwangala, FPM for Zimbabwe.
- TERG reviewed the SARA tool and data quality verification presented by Katherine O’Neill (WHO).
- She identified mechanisms to institutionalize SARA and data verification in countries:
 - Joint multi-country approach
 - implement annual monitoring mechanism
 - strengthen country institutional capacity
- TERG then provided specific guidance on data quality assessments and investment in to country data systems, as follows:
 - a) Re-affirmed the need to validate the investment frameworks and prioritize information requirements to compile rigorous data driven conclusions for the mid and end term reviews. Where possible seek to establish some impact measures;
 - b) Prioritize the scale up of ‘real time’ monitoring systems such as stock out monitoring as outlined at previous TERG meeting. SARA has a role to play but cannot replace the need to establish higher quality routine systems.
 - c) TERG concerns over the inadequacy of hospital mortality statistics to demonstrate the impact of GF investment, as large proportion of mortality took place at home. Efforts should be given to establish national vital registration systems with good coverage of vital events and quality data on causes of death
 - d) TERG endorsed an additional request for funds totaling USD 30 million for investment in to country information systems from 2014 through 2016.

Outcome: TERG review and guidance on data quality assessments and investments: (a) Re-affirmed the need to validate the investment frameworks and prioritize information requirements; (b) Prioritize the scale up of ‘real time’ monitoring systems; (c) Establish national vital registration systems with good coverage of vital events; (d) Endorsed an additional request for funds totaling USD 30 million for investment in to country information systems.

B. Mid-term Review of the Global Fund Strategy 2012-2016

- The Secretariat presented the initial work towards the planning for the Mid-term Review of the Global Fund Strategy 2012-2016, which will take place in 2014/15. Some of the main areas of the presentation included:
 - Positioning of the evaluations toward to the Mid-term Review of the Strategy;
 - Objectives and scope;
 - Evaluation plan to cover all key areas of the Strategy:
 - progress by 2014 on 10 million lives saved and 140-180 million infections prevented,
 - progress on impact: national strategies and national systems,

- mapping of data and quality assessments linked to impact assessments.
- Outline of the MTR of GF strategy
- Process: Towards a framework document
- The TERG requested:
 - Contents to be structured according to key questions on Impact, Partnerships and Operational Reviews;
 - Combination of a Mid-term Review of the Global Fund Strategy and the 10-year evaluation;
 - Key gaps be considered in terms of a stakeholder review linked to the evaluation of the NFM, financing and additionality (extending the sustainability work) and any areas of operational efficiency not covered by the OIG;
 - Conduct consultations with Board and stakeholders and prepare a framework document for the Mid-term Review;
 - Pursue a Board Information session at the Board Meeting in early 2014.

Outcome: Agreed overarching contents and guidance on Mid-term Review of the Global Fund Strategy 2012-2016: (a) conduct consultations with Board and stakeholders and prepare a framework document for the Mid-term Review; (b) pursue Board information session on Mid-Term Review in early 2014.

Next TERG Meeting: 5-7 March 2014

List of Attendees

Name of attendee	Organization	Role	E-mail
1. Mireille GUIGAZ	Global Fund	Board Vice-Chair	GFBoardViceChair@gmail.com
2. Marijke WIJNROKS	Global Fund	Chief of Staff, OED.	Marijke.Wijnroks@theglobalfund.org
3. Osamu KUNII	Global Fund	Head, SIID	Osamu.kunii@theglobalfund.org
4. Mickey CHOPRA	UNICEF	TERG Chair	mchopra@unicef.org
5. Viroj TANGCHAROENSATHIEN	International Health Policy Program, Thailand	TERG Vice-Chair	viroj@ihpp.thaigov.net
6. Wim VAN DAMME	Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp	TERG Vice-Chair	wvdamme@itg.be ibogaert@itg.be
7. Atsuko AOYOMA	Nagoya University School of Medicine, Nagoya.	Member	atsukoa@med.nagoya-u-ac.jp
8. Stein-Erik KRUSE	Nordic Consulting Group	Member	stein.erik.kruse@ncg.no
9. Assefa Yibeltal ALEMU	Federal HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control Office, Ethiopia.	Member	Yibeltalassefa343@gmail.com
10. Jaap BROEKMANS	WHO Global Task Force on TB Impact Measurement	Ex-officio member	broekmansj@tbconsult.nl
11. Bernard NAHLEN	President's Malaria Initiative	Ex-officio member	bnahlen@usaid.gov
12. Peter HANSEN	GAVI	Ex-officio member	phansen@gavialliance.org
12. Ali Safarnejad	UNAIDS	Representing TERG member	SafarnejadA@unaids.org
13. Katherine FLOYD	WHO – Stop TB	Partner	Floyd.k@who.int
14. Mazuwa BANDA	WHO – HIV Dept.	Partner	bandam@who.int
15. Kathryn O'NEILL	WHO - Public Health Information and GIS Department	Partner	oneillk@who.int