

24TH TERG MEETING: OUTCOMES

Date	3-5 September 2014
Venue	3rd floor TCS Building, Chemin de Blandonnet 6, 1214 Vernier, Geneva, Switzerland
Chair/s	Viroj Tangcharoensathien, Jim Tulloch
Focal Point	Osamu Kunii

Objectives of the 24th TERG Meeting

1. To strengthen and finalize the plan for the Strategic Review 2015;
2. To finalize the SR 2015 evaluation matrix; and
3. To discuss the TERG self-assessment and TERG work plan for 2015.

Day 1

Opening Session

Chair: Jim Tulloch

- The Chair welcomed the participants to the meeting, in particular the new TERG members Bess Miller and Jan Paehler (SIIC focal point), who participated via telephone.
- The Chair identified the Strategic Review 2015 (SR 2015) as the current key focus of the TERG, and described the main objective of the meeting:
 - *To finalize the plan and evaluation matrix for the Strategic Review 2015 and move beyond conceptualization of Strategic Review 2015*
- Marijke Wijnroks, the Chief of Staff, highlighted that the Strategic Review 2015 is a key priority for the Global Fund and takes place at a crucial moment, as the results of the review will
 - allow mid- course correction of the 2012-2016 Strategy;
 - provide input into the development continuum thinking;
 - help prepare the next Global Fund Strategy; and
 - contribute to the next replenishment.
- The Chief of Staff also stressed the importance of keeping the TERG's independence to ensure that the SR2015 is credible, while obtaining additional inputs from the Secretariat Working Group on Evaluation in order to ensure relevance to the Global Fund.
- Osamu Kunii, Head of SIID, presented the major components and milestones of the Strategic Review process and stressed in particular the importance of data availability and data quality in countries. He also provided an update on TERG processes, especially the extension and recruitment of TERG members.

Session 1: Strategic Review Plan and Evaluation Matrix (plenary)

Chair: Jim Tulloch

- Beth Plowman and Philip Setel presented the detailed Strategic Review plan incorporating some of the decisions made by the TERG Task Team on the comments from the SIIC, which was well received by the TERG. The presentation included an update on the process; an overview of the contents of the plan; and the management strategy.
- The TERG reaffirmed that the SR 2015 would be mostly a synthesis of available data and evidence and identified the need to manage expectations. The TERG also recommended that the Strategic Review plan includes a **communication strategy to countries**, which should explain that the aim of the review is to use existing country data and processes as much as possible, a synthesis of which would answer higher-level review questions.

2.1. Lives saved and modelling: update from the expert meeting

- Mehran Hosseini presented an update on the Global Fund’s efforts to develop models for lives saved and infections averted. His presentation included an update on the Expert Meeting held in July 2014 to address limitations of current methods and the need for capturing wider impact of Global Fund investments. He discussed the current modeling methods, their limitations and recommendations from the expert group going forward. He mentioned that the presented changes to the modelling efforts are still under development and do not yet represent the Global Fund’s new corporate position.
- The TERG acknowledged the efforts and resources that were going in to disease modelling and welcomed the update, stressing the importance for the Global Fund to continue to work with partners. The TERG:
 - Identified the limitations in the data used in models and stressed the critical need to enable better data generation at the country level;
 - Recommended moving from measuring intervention 'coverage' to 'effective coverage', noting that important aspects of coverage included the measurement of stock-outs, adherence to treatment and coverage of Key Populations;
 - Reiterated that it considers “contribution” more appropriate than “attribution” when assessing impact and that the Global Fund’s share of input should not be extrapolated to impact such as lives saved/infections averted.;
 - In addition, the TERG recommended highlighting the Global Fund’s contribution to malaria elimination in low-burden countries, for example Sri Lanka, where the Global Fund is the only international donor for malaria.

2.2. Progress made against corporate Key Performance Indicators

- Andrew Kennedy presented on the corporate KPIs relevant to the SR 2015, mapped the KPIs to the evaluation questions and provided a data availability schedule. He specifically mentioned that:
 - Around 24 KPIs have been identified as relevant for the Strategic Review 2015. However, the majority of KPIs will only have data in Q4/2014 or early 2015 as the new KPI framework has only been in place since the beginning of the year, and most of the data related to the NFM’s implementation will not be available until 2015 since most Concept Notes submitted in 2014 will not be signed into grants until next year. Most KPIs are new and will not allow comparison with past measures.
- The TERG recommended:
 - **To identify which KPIs can be retrospectively applied** to obtain or estimate data prior to Q4/2014 in order expand the available data for the 2015 Strategic Review, in particular in regard to lives saved.
 - **To introduce an additional KPI on ‘effective coverage’**. This would take into account the effectiveness of supply-chain management in countries and whether intended end-users were correctly using a commodity.

2.3 Country impact assessment: Guidance document and examples

- Philip Setel presented the epi stage analysis guidelines, which Global Fund implementing countries are now encouraged to use. Epi stage analysis aims to establish whether changes in impact are plausibly due to national program input and activities, or are likely due to some other cause. It is about further assessing contribution and causation along the results chain taking in to account other competing explanations or hypotheses. He explained that the team was “learning on the job” with the conduct of impact plausibility assessments and reiterated that plausibility assessments required sophisticated facilitation including assessment of alternative pathways that could explain impact. He warned that the need for adequate TA could be an issue.
- The TERG recommended
 - Noting that ‘adequacy’ and ‘plausibility’ impact assessment were recognized terminology, to rename the epi stage analysis, which was Global Fund specific, as ‘adequacy’ and ‘plausibility impact analyses’.
 - To ensure quality, to include a facilitation guide in the analysis guidelines and to build a cadre of qualified external consultants to support adequacy and plausibility impact analysis in countries.

2.4 Update on program reviews / impact assessments

- Estifanos Shargie presented an update on program reviews conducted in countries, which will constitute a key data source for the Strategic Review 2015. Since 2013, 39 program reviews are available so far. He added that about 15 epi stage analysis will be available in time for the Strategic Review 2015.
- The TERG positively acknowledged the number of program reviews available, but
 - noted that the level of rigor and explanatory power of the program reviews will be critical for the Strategic Review 2015; and
 - offered to provide guidance on retrospective strengthening of impact assessment for already conducted program reviews;
 - proposed that, if possible, cost and cost-effectiveness should be assessed together with impact during program reviews.

2.5 Progress on investment in country data systems

- Nathalie Zorzi presented on progress made in investments in country data systems. The majority of the work in this area is carried out through the M&E officers as part of the country teams. Additional special initiatives exist, albeit with a relatively modest financial volume compared to grants' investments.
- The TERG encouraged the Secretariat **to continue to ensure that appropriate levels of funding** are allocated from grants to strengthen country data systems as part of a long term development process.
 - In addition, the Secretariat should continue to pursue time-limited strategic investments to fill data gaps.
- The TERG discussed a **review of Special Initiative funds to support data systems**.

2.6 Guidance on mortality analysis

- Daniel Low-Beer presented a resource guide on how to assess and strengthen in-country mortality data systems.
- The TERG welcomed the guide and
 - noted **lack of investment in civil registration and vital statistics (CRVS)**; and
 - recommended **tracking quality mortality data**, possibly including cause of death as it is of vital importance.

Summary: In session 2, the TERG reviewed the data sources for the objective 2 of the SR 2015 (progress made against saving lives and averting infections). The TERG recommended minor course corrections to broaden the evidence base for this question, such as (i) to identify KPIs that can be retrospectively applied prior to 2014; (2) to retroactively strengthen the quality of program reviews; and (3) to actively support the roll-out of plausibility impact assessments in countries.

Session 3 on Strategic Objective 4 & 5

Chair: Viroj Tangcharoensathien

SO4: Promote and protect human rights

- In break-out session 1, a sub-group of TERG members discussed the questions related to SO4 with Secretariat teams, including the Community, Rights and Gender (CRG) team.
- The TERG agrees that **there is sufficient data** to provide some (partial) answers to human rights questions in SR 2015, in particular with respect to elements related to the Concept Notes.
 - The CRG team has a plan to conduct a review of the Concept Notes, in addition to the TRP review. SR2015 consultant may look further at gaps in what will be undertaken by the TRP and the Secretariat.
 - In addition, the **TERG recommended for the CRG team and the TERG Support Team to further discuss data sources**.

- The TERG does not see the need to expand on or to introduce separate human rights questions into SR 2015 as was already decided not to focus on SO4 on its own, partly because it is still early in the NFM process.
- The TERG also discussed the possibility of a separate thematic review on human rights & gender at a later point in time.

SO5: Sustain the gains, mobilize the resources

- In break-out session 2, a sub-group of TERG members discussed selected questions related to SO5.¹
- The TERG agreed that there is sufficient data to answer SO5, and **recommended to split question 5.2 on increases in domestic financing in two parts:**
 - Part 1 will look at expenditure data over a longer time frame; and
 - Part 2 will look at commitments over the timeframe expressed in Concept Notes.
- The TERG agreed with the SIIC that there is a need to evaluate sustainability from a programmatic as well as financial perspective. In order to do so, the **TERG encourages the Secretariat to develop a definition and unpack the components of programmatic sustainability in addition to the conventional focus on financial sustainability**, on which the TERG is keen to work jointly.
- The TERG identified key issues to be considered:
 - Financial and programmatic sustainability preparation by countries for graduating from Global Fund support;
 - Required capacities of a program to sustain or accelerate achievements after the end of Global Fund grants;
 - Global goods that could be developed with Global Fund support and still available to countries when no longer using Global Fund support;
 - Changes in commodity prices as results of market responses over time and variations between Global Fund and transitioned programs;
 - Gaps and harmonization between Global Fund-supported and transitioned programs; and
 - Benefit package covered by Universal Health Coverage.
- **Possible data sources** include NHA (with investment in quality, rigor, disaggregation over the longer term), counterpart financing, case studies that have already commissioned, the sustainability thematic review previously commissioned by the TERG, programmatic data and estimates from standard reference agencies on burden, coverage and so on.

Summary

- Under SR 2015, the TERG recommended further clarification between CRG and TERG Support teams on the data sources for the Strategic Objective 4 and discussed the possibility of a separate thematic review on human rights & gender at a later point in time.
- For Strategic Objective 5, the TERG recommended to split question 5.2 in two parts. The possibility of an additional thematic review on programmatic sustainability was also discussed and the TERG Support Team was requested to follow-up.

Day 2

Session 4 on Strategic Objective 1 & 3

Chair: Bernard Nahlen

SO 1: Invest more strategically

- In break-out session 3, the TERG discussed the questions under the SO1 with the Secretariat focal points. Specific issues related to some of the questions were as follows:

¹ The question on resource mobilization was not discussed as no one from the External Relations division was able to attend the meeting.

- *Current question 1.1 & 1.2: To what extent have investments focused on the highest-impact countries, interventions and populations? To what extent have Key Affected Populations been addressed?*
 - The global context of funding in the country should be considered (reflected in TRP forms);
 - Thought should be given how to identify key interventions in each country;
 - The A2F database, which will be brought on-line after data entry, will be a key data source;
 - TERG recommends that Concept Notes (CNs), grant agreements, TRP reports, and TRP reviews should be available as data sources as needed throughout SR 2015, to answer specific questions;
 - Given the TRP assessment, the TERG does not see a need for an additional independent review of CNs. However, as mentioned previously, the SR2015 consultant may conduct a review of concept notes focusing on gaps building on what will have been undertaken by the TRP/the Secretariat. The TERG will give thought to the selection criteria of CNs for such in-depth review.
- The online survey is a good source of data for many of the questions, especially regarding CCM member views. However, currently the overall response rate is very low (<20%). The A2F team should consider targeting these surveys and ensure at least a 40% response rate;
- Question 1.4: *‘To what extent do Concept Notes plan for the use of national systems and structures (e.g. budgeting, monitoring)?’* There is a need to clarify the term ‘national system’ to use, which ones, which situations in line with risk assessment;
- *‘How does the quality of the national strategy affect the development of the Concept Note?’* - The TERG commented that the Global Fund had not adequately used its leverage to ensure that national strategies were strengthened and used as the base for the CNs. TRP takes the quality of national strategies as a given and does not comment on them. TRP assumes that national health strategies are of adequate quality as they have gone through the Joint Assessment of National Strategy (JANS) process. Hence, the TRP review forms will not provide details on this area. The TERG therefore suggests omitting the question on the quality of national strategies. The TERG will consider future work on the evolution of National Strategic Plans;
- Question 1.5: *To what extent has Strategy implementation facilitated a more strategic focus on health systems strengthening?* - The TERG will follow up on HSS review tool – short term and long term how it looks. It may also consider how to further facilitate use of OneHealth tool. Independent evaluation of Global Fund HSS investments in countries may provide a data source: and
- Question 1.6: *To what extent have Concept Notes for focus countries incorporated MNCH content as per agreements with partners (i.e. UNICEF MOU)? Do Global Fund funding/grant-making processes facilitate the intended incorporation of MNCH content per those agreements?* - Agreements may need to be considered more comprehensively, i.e., UNICEF, UNFPA, WB, IERG as another data source. Key informant interviews with partners need to be conducted.

SO 3: Support grant implementation success

- In break-out session 4, the TERG discussed the questions under SO3 with the Secretariat focal points.
- Current question 3.1: *Risk differentiation in grant management*
 - The TERG positively acknowledged the vast amount of data sources available and did not recommend any further changes.
- Question 3.3: *Incorporating value for money considerations in grant management*
 - The TERG acknowledged the Value for Money and Unit Cost benchmarking initiatives as viable data sources but recommended to cross-reference in the SR 2015 review plan to other areas where Value for Money also surfaces (such as in question 3.5 and 3.6), and add additional data sources such as case studies.
- Question 3.4: *Supporting program evaluations or assessments that focus on service quality*
 - In the discussion it was clarified that this question should focus on the evaluation of service quality as part of program reviews.
 - The TERG noted that data availability and quality of program reviews should be assessed more generally; and recommended to add the OIG’s audit on quality assessments as a data source.
- Question 3.5: *Enhanced investments in national pharmaceutical and health product management*
 - In the discussion it was clarified that investments in pharmaceutical and health product management are in early stages and the only country pilot at the moment is Nigeria.
 - The TERG recommended replacing the term ‘pharmaceutical and health product management’ with a more standard term, such as ‘procurement and supply management’ or ‘supply chain

management'; and that the Global Fund collaborates with partners to define international standard indicators for procurement and supply management.

- Question 3.6: *More advantageous pricing of health commodities*
 - The TERG congratulated the Global Fund on the impressive progress made in this area and did not recommend any changes to the question or the sources.
 - However, in order to fully capture the progress made, the TERG recommended a separate, long-term thematic review on how the Global Fund has shaped the health commodity market, covering the early initiatives such as AMFM until today, including a transparent analysis of health commodity prices over time.
 - The TERG also felt that KPI 10 was not a useful data sources for this indicator.
- Question 3.7: *Are partnership agreements operating as expected*
 - The TERG acknowledged that there is a sufficient process and data to assess the implementation of the existing partnership agreements with WHO.
 - The TERG recommended that this question goes beyond partnerships for Concept Note development and also makes mention of the additional partnership efforts in grant management.

Session 5 on Strategic Objective 2 & HSS review framework

Chair: Viroj Tangcharoensathien

5.1 SO 2: Evolve the Funding Model

- In break-out session 5, the TERG discussed the questions under the SO2 with the Secretariat focal points. Many of the questions were reframed and specific issues related to some questions were discussed, as follows:
- Current question 2.1: *'To what extent has the timelines for accessing funding been shortened compared to the Rounds-based system?'* - The question was updated. This relates to the time from submission of CN to grant-making. Possibility of comparing with the Rounds-based system but needs clear definition of equivalent start and end points. KPI 7 can be used as a data source while the A2F (timelines) database contains data for each CN;
- Question 2.2: *'Has the predictability of Global Fund resources improved? Both in terms of timing when funds can be accessed and in terms of the expected overall amount of resources?'* - Additional data sources were suggested (allocation letters given to country). Key Informant Interviews would be another valuable data source. The TERG recommended that the Key Informant Survey should contain a list of questions relevant to answering the various questions, possible across all of the SOs being considered;
- Question 2.3: *'To what extent is the allocation model working as intended to re-align resources?'* - Country Allocation database (data on outcomes of allocation model) available with A2F which identifies funds allocated to countries;
- Question 2.4: *'To what extent is the in-country program split process working?'* The question was reframed and data sources identified (program split decision database, survey of respondents; TRP review forms);
- Question 2.6: Part a) will remain as is. Part b) was altered. *Is there evidence to date that joint HIV-TB Concept Notes allow better targeting of resources and plans for scaling-up of services?'* Data sources identified included CNs, grant agreements, program reviews, TRP review forms and reports. However, the number and method of sampling CNs for assessment needs to be determined. The TERG identified program reviews possibly also for answering other questions in addition to impact;
- Question 2.7: *'To what extent has the quality and inclusiveness of Country Dialogue, access to funding and grant-making processes improved over time?'* - This question was reframed including a component of the previous question 2.1 a). It would include in-country and country-Global Fund dialogue and perceptions. The TERG suggested carefully identifying key informant stakeholders for this purpose. The TERG would also examine how this could be linked to the existing A2F surveys;
- Question 2.8: The previous question 2.8 has been altered and combined with the previous 2.13. It currently reads as (a). What effect has improved knowledge of funding levels had on Concept Note content and on work-load? (b). What effect has access to incentive funding had on Concept Note content? To what extent does it satisfy Board decisions?

- Question 2.9: *Does the Concept Note review process reinforce reflection of SO1 and SO4? What has been the effect of the process of different iterations of Concept Notes?* A sample of CNs, selected as per guidance from TERG, will be followed through the process;
- Question 2.10: The previous question 2.10 was ‘rolled’ in to previous 2.11. *‘What factors have been conducive (including the minimum standards for implementation) for developing disbursement ready grants?’* QUART assessments and Implementation Map is included as data sources. The TERG noted the OIG tools for assessing implementation arrangements.

5.2 HSS review framework

- In break-out session 6, Ricardo Bitran updated the TERG on the framework and guide for assessing HSS investments. The HSS guide assesses the role of HSS investments in the strengthening of priority health system components (P&SCM, HHRR, HIS, SD, FM); examines the role of HSS investments in achieving health impact and the level of integration of disease-specific programs into national health systems. The consultancy was also required to propose operational guidance for using the HSS review guide in conjunction with national disease program reviews. The framework has been proposed to be applied in a number of countries and to serve as a data source for the Strategic Review 2015.
- The TERG recommended that the current draft of the framework should be updated, in order to
 - Reflect the non-linearity of the health system;
 - Include healthcare financing, governance & policy as additional HSS areas;
 - Simplify the draft, as it is currently too heavily focused on a defined methodology, not leaving enough room for flexibility.
- The TERG also recommended conducting an additional independent thematic review on HSS. While the Strategic Review 2015 features how HSS support has been integrated as a component of the New Funding Model (the "left side" of the result chain), and the above HSS evaluation framework can help examine HSS impact (the "right side"), this additional thematic review would assess country-level processes and country experiences (the "middle") in utilizing HSS support under NFM, including whether countries were adequately prepared to take full advantage of available cross-cutting funding provided by the Global Fund to strengthen their health systems.

5.3 Evaluation efforts post-2015 Strategic Review (plenary)

- The TERG reaffirmed its commitment to a continuous evaluation effort that should continue beyond the 2015 Strategic Review. As it is based on the principle of ‘five years of evaluation’ with different elements starting at different times, it is likely that some questions will continue beyond the 2015 Strategic Review.
- The TERG discussed the possibility of an annual or bi-annual TERG summary report/update, as a means to facilitate learning and managing knowledge.
- The TERG also recommended that the Secretariat strengthen its internal evaluation function, in order to be able to continuously commission and manage a variety of evaluations, as needed.

5.4 Addressing SIIC’s comments on the 2015 Strategic Review (plenary)

- The TERG discussed the draft responses to the comments by the SIIC put forward by the TERG Task Team. By this session, the comments and questions that were well addressed in the Strategic Review 2015 included: the issue of contribution or attribution to results – contribution is recommended; HIV/TB – an evaluation question was added; M&E system and mortality – addressed in SO2; SO1 is unpacked as commented, although cost effectiveness is not answerable at this stage – TERG plans to discuss in future; HSS – this is addressed in SO1; Key Population – this is addressed in SO2; partnership – this is covered; quality of NSP – this should be considered in the next strategy, although the TERG may conduct a thematic review of efforts to improve NSPs; sustainability – a thematic review should be conducted.
- The TERG focused their discussion on allocation model – question will be kept but scope needs to be precisely defined; combined question may be added on allocated funding and incentive funding

Day 3

Executive Session of the TERG

An Executive Session of the TERG was held on the 5 September from 8.30 – 10.00 am. The Session was conducted with the participation of TERG members.

Session 5: Tying up the ends (plenary)

Chair: Jim Tulloch

5.1 Update on GLC review

- Kathy Fiekert presented the draft review of the Green Light Committee agreement between the Global Fund and WHO. Overall, the Green Light Committee **should be further supported**, but a modification of the MoU is proposed to clarify roles and responsibilities.
- The TERG thanked the consultants for the draft and commended them on the effort made within the short time frame. In addition, the TERG recommend to address four issues in more detail:
 - The **dysfunctional nature** of the regional GLC in Afro;
 - The **communication issues**, in which the GLC should have broader role;
 - The **technical issues around providing MDR TB treatment** -> what mechanism should the GLC and WHO develop to bridge the gap between diagnosis and treatment of MDR-TB; and
 - The **role of the GLC Secretariat**.
- An updated, final version of the report is expected at the end of this month.

5.2 Finalization of SR 2015 plan and preparation for launch

Preparation for launch

- The TERG recommends:
 - Developing an **RFP that allows for innovation** (by avoiding unnecessary specifications in the RFP);
 - Providing an **indicative budget figure** in the RFP to avoid receiving bids that are beyond the budget;
 - In time for the consultants' arrival, writing out the **intent and a definition** for each question in the evaluation matrix; and that
 - **TERG leadership is present** in the final face-to-face interviews
- In regard to the TERG's involvement in the selection process, the TERG offered to **provide input to the RFP** before it is published and to participate in the selection process.
- The TERG requests the Secretariat to take responsibility for developing a **country-focused communication strategy** for the Strategic Review 2015.

Possible topics for future work

- Evolution of National strategic Plans: The TERG recommended to focus on a descriptive assessment of **how countries and partners work together** in developing / strengthening National Strategic Plans (which encompass diseases and realistic cost and budget) and how this has evolved over the years, but not to evaluate the **quality** of these strategies.
- Investments in improving data: The TERG recommended to identify data gaps in high-impact countries, as shown by modelling efforts, and to recommend medium-term fixes.
- Market shaping: While acknowledging the question included in the Strategic Review, the TERG felt a need to conduct a descriptive assessment of the recent changes and a more **long-term evaluation of how the Global Fund has shaped the market and how market responded accordingly**, as it would help to generate evidence for market-shaping. The TERG recommended that the evaluation should **also cover the outcomes and consequences of the pooled procurement mechanism**.
- Health System Strengthening: The TERG recommends **to more broadly cover the 'missing and dynamics in middle'** of the results chain at country level in a thematic review. The 'start' and 'end' of the results chain were covered by Strategic Review 2015 with emphasis on the new funding model and impact, as well as the HSS guideline and its implementation through program reviews, but there was a gap in knowledge in the 'middle' part of the results chain.
- Sustainability: The TERG suggested a broader view of sustainability than purely financial sustainability. The TERG encouraged the Secretariat to develop a definition and unpack the components of

programmatic in addition to financial sustainability. The TERG identified the need for identifying financial and programmatic sustainability preparation by countries graduating from or reducing their dependence from Global Fund support; aspects of capacity needed by a program to sustain or accelerate achievements; and to investigate changes in commodity prices over time and variations between Global Fund and transitioned programs respectively (see discussion under SO5 above).

- Human rights & Gender: The TERG did not recommend a thematic review on human rights & gender at this point in time as it is too early to evaluate progress made. A thematic review should however be conducted at a later stage.

5.3 TERG workplan & budget

- The TERG reviewed the draft 2015 budget, which was proposed at the same level as in 2014 and felt that it may possibly be too low for this critical year to conduct the Strategic Review 2015 and additional thematic reviews. The TERG therefore **recommends increasing the budget** for the Strategic Review to around USD 1 million, and to USD 1.2 million for thematic reviews;
- The Executive Director clarified that
 - The TERG budget needs to be submitted in October to the SIIC;
 - While there is room for adjustment, the final figure should be fairly close to the 2014 figure;
 - Some activities related to the Strategic Review may also be funded from other teams' budgets; and that
 - The TERG should focus its 2015 workplan & budgets on outputs.

5.4 Closure

- The Executive Director closed the meeting by thanking the TERG members for their work. He added that he was pleased to hear that the relationship between the TERG and the Secretariat had never been better.
- The Executive Director encouraged the TERG to talk with its oversight role, to identify necessary evaluations and to inform the Secretariat of what has gone well and what has gone not so well.
- The Executive Director also gave an update on the development continuum work, in which the Global Fund is looking at how it is supporting countries in different development stages.
- The development continuum work also requires classifying countries' economies, which the TERG may want to discuss as a possible evaluation topic at its next meeting.

- The TERG recommended (i) minor modification to the draft GLC report; (ii) launch of an RFP that allows applying companies to take innovative approaches to conducting the Strategic Review 2015; (iii) topics for five possible thematic reviews; and (iv) the 2015 budget increased by USD 0.5 million for the Strategic Review.

Annexes

List of Attendees

	Name of attendee	Organization	Role
1	Mickey Chopra (by phone)	UNICEF	TERG Chair
2	Viroj Tangcharoensathien	International Health Policy Program, Thailand	TERG Vice-Chair
3	Jim Tulloch	Independent consultant	TERG Member
4	Stein-Erik Kruse	Nordic Consulting Group	TERG Member
5	Assefa Yibeltal Alemu	Federal HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control Office, Ethiopia.	TERG Member
6	Don De Savigny	Swiss Tropical Institute	TERG Member
7	Bess Miller	Independent consultant	TERG Member
8	Jaap Broekmans	WHO Global Task Force on TB Impact Measurement	TERG Ex-officio member
9	Salil Panakadan	UNAIDS	TERG Ex-officio member
10	Bernard Nahlen	President's Malaria Initiative	TERG Ex-officio member
11	Peter Hansen	GAVI	TERG Ex-officio member
12	Jan Paehler (by phone)	European Commission	TERG Ex-officio member
13	Osamu Kunii	Global Fund	TERG Ex-officio member/ Head, SIID

Resource persons

1	George Gotsadze	Curatio International Foundation	TRP Vice-Chair
2	Katherine Floyd	WHO/ Global TB Department	Partner
3	Catherine Palmier	Representing SIIC chair	Observer
4	Kathy Katengwa	Representing SIIC vice-chair	Observer
5	Kathy Fiekert	KNCV	Resource person
6	Beth Plowman	Independent	Resource person
7	Philip Setel	Independent	Resource person
8	Daniel Low-Beer	Graduate Institute of Geneva	Resource person
9	Ricardo Bitran (via skype)	Independent	Resource person

Global Fund Secretariat

1	Mark Dybul	Global Fund	Executive Director, OED
2	Marijke Wijnroks	Global Fund	Chief of Staff, OED
3	Anne Rwego	Global Fund	Audit Manager, Office of Inspector General
4	Abigail Moreland	Global Fund	Head, Access to Funding
5	Andrew Kennedy	Global Fund	Manager, Strategic Controlling
6	Carol D'Souza	Global Fund	Specialist Health Economics, Strategic Information
7	Catherine Hernandez	Global Fund	Specialist Operational Policies, Grant Management
8	Cees Klumper	Global Fund	Chief Risk Officer
9	Christopher Game	Global Fund	Chief Procurement Officer
10	Eliud Wandwalo	Global Fund	Senior Disease Coordinator, TB
11	Estifanos Shargie	Global Fund	Senior Specialist Evaluation & Impact
12	George Shakarishvili	Global Fund	Senior Technical Advisor HSS
13	Harley Feldbaum	Global Fund	Head, Strategy and Policy
14	Jinkou Zhao	Global Fund	Senior Specialist Monitoring & Evaluation
15	Kanako Ishida	Global Fund	Specialist Epidemiology & Performance Analysis
16	Kate Thomson	Global Fund	Head, Community Rights and Gender department
17	Korah George	Global Fund	Senior Specialist Health Financing
18	Lee Abdelfadil	Global Fund	Manager, Technical Assistance hub
19	Matias Gomez	Global Fund	Senior Manager, Operational Support
20	Meg Davis	Global Fund	Senior Advisor, Community Rights and Gender
21	Mehran Hosseini	Global Fund	Senior Specialist, Disease Impact and Modelling
22	Michael Borowitz	Global Fund	Chief Health Economist
23	Michael Byrne	Global Fund	Head, High Impact Africa 1 department
24	Michael Johnson	Global Fund	Head, Technical Advisory and Partnerships
25	Mohammed Yassin	Global Fund	Senior Disease Advisor TB
26	Nathalie Zorzi	Global Fund	Senior Manager, Monitoring & Evaluation

27	Nicolas Cantau	Global Fund	Regional Manager, Eastern Europe and Central Asia
28	Rajesh Divakaran	Global Fund	Specialist, Risk Management
29	Sai Pothapregada	Global Fund	Senior Fund Portfolio Manager
30	Viviana Mangiaterra	Global Fund	Senior Technical Coordinator MNCH & HSS
31	Ryuichi Komatsu	Global Fund	Senior Advisor, TERG Support team
32	John Puvimanasinghe	Global Fund	Senior Specialist, TERG Support team
33	Nina Ingenkamp	Global Fund	Associate Specialist, TERG Support team
34	Jutta Hornig	Global Fund	Assistant, TERG Support team
35	Jillian Roos	Global Fund	Intern, TERG Support team