

25th TERG MEETING: OUTCOMES

Date	14 - 16 January 2015
Venue	Starling hotel, Geneva, Switzerland
Chair	Mickey Chopra
Vice-Chair	Viroj Tangcharoensathien

Objectives of the 25th TERG Meeting

1. To discuss the Strategic Review 2015 and agree on a final version of the inception report.
2. To discuss scopes, progresses, and possibilities for thematic reviews & links with the SR 2015 process.
3. To discuss and agree on how the TERG will work in 2015, including confirmation of leadership, timing, self-assessment and peer review.

Day 1

Opening session

Chair: Mickey Chopra

- The **TERG Chair** welcomed the meeting participants and thanked the out-going and incoming TERG members. The Chair emphasized the importance of the TERG's independence and of evaluating on-going efforts through formative evaluations, while closely cooperating with the Secretariat to ensure the relevance of the work.
- The **Chief of Staff** commended the TERG upon the quality of its membership and its recent work. The Chief of Staff also stressed the usefulness of recent and future TERG deliverables, in particular the main deliverable for this year, Strategic Review 2015 (SR 2015), which will provide critical inputs for the new strategy.
- The **Head of Strategy and Policy** described Board thinking and the roadmap of the Strategy development and the next replenishment, and added that the TERG fragile states and financial sustainability reports have already been very helpful.
- The **SR2015 consultant team leader** re-affirmed his commitment to the SR 2015 timeline, in order for the SR 2015 findings to inform the new strategy. The team leader also emphasized that keeping to the timeline will require active engagement with the Secretariat, the TERG and possibly the SIIC and Board. A final product will be packaged in a way to be helpful for people to use: a) actionable and accessible and b) credible, systematic and transparent.

Session 1: 2015 Strategic Review – Main Objective 1

Chair: Jim Tulloch

- The **Director of External Relations** opened session 1 by encouraging the TERG and the review consultant team and reminding the participants that the SR 2015 is not only crucial for the new strategy, but also for the next replenishment cycle.

Presentation and discussion of the Theory of Change

- **SR2015 consultant team** presented their proposed Theory of Change (ToC) to evaluate the questions related to Main Objective (MO) 1, and explained that the ToC will serve as:
 - An approach to ensure a transparent, credible and holistic evaluation;
 - A framework to guide the evaluation questions and judgment; and
 - A tool to depict the interactions and implicit assumptions in the current strategy to examine how it works in the evolving real world setting.
 - Lastly, she stressed that the ToC needs to be good enough to make judgment and be helpful for the next Strategy, rather than a comprehensive and academic construct.
- **TERG members and Secretariat representatives** overall considered the ToC as a good enough working draft to proceed with the work, but pointed out some areas that could benefit from further thinking:
 - Consider clarifying or to adjust why the Board is seen as a remote condition. -> Response: it is shown as a remote condition as ToR for review specify not to look at enabling factors – so the Board is remote to the focus of SR 2015;
 - Consider clarifying how the ToC will be used. -> Response: it will be used as the organizing principle for the evaluation, in order to clarify the teams' approach to the SR 2015;
 - Use of the ToC could be misleading as all Board members may not be familiar with the approach; retroactive fitting of the ToC into 2012-2016 Strategy may be misleading. -> Response: the ToC is intended to be used by evaluators, will not figure prominently in SR 2015 report;
 - Effective grant management processes should be a proximate condition. -> Response: noted;
 - Concern around data availability to evaluate the ToC. -> Response: sufficient data for proximate conditions, and use more qualitative data elsewhere;
 - The iterative approach of the NFM could be better reflected by including an arrow between 'increasingly efficient and effective investment of existing and future Global Fund resources' and 'prioritized, relevant and effective program design and budgeting'. -> Response: agreed;
 - There is a large gap between intermediate and country outcome conditions, particularly, effective and equitable interventions leading to impact. -> Response: agreed, further unpacking is needed, potentially in a discussion chapter in the report;
 - Consider moving remote condition on partnerships more towards the right side as partnerships central to Global Fund model. -> Response: noted;
 - Consider adding 'appropriate regulatory and legal frameworks' to the bottom last country outcome condition. -> Response: agreed;
 - Consider clarifying how the allocation model fits into the ToC. -> Response: noted;

- ToC may be difficult for Board members or Secretariat staff to understand or agree as they may also have their own versions of “theory”. -> Response: the purpose is not to develop a perfect version but to develop a good enough working draft; the team will incorporate comments into the ToC, and the final report will be two parts, the first for communication focused material and technical annex that includes the approach taken to SR 2015;
- Ensure that MO1 provides answers on implementation of Strategic Objective (SO) 1 and SO2, even if not a priority area. -> Response: noted;
- Consider priority areas of work identified at the recent Board meeting, such as HSS; sustainability; partnership; and human rights and gender. Some questions were also raised such as how to consider operational processes, e.g., business plan, KPIs etc. in the ToC, and how to address HSS in the ToC. -> Response: provide further thought in incorporating these areas more explicitly within the ToC framework; and
- Consider how to link the SR2015 and its ToC framework and the individual thematic reviews. -> Response: the ToC provides an organizing framework which will enable the setting up of case studies/reviews and evaluation questions. The output can be converted to respond to the specific evaluation questions. The SR2015 will provide a more high-level view while the thematic reviews will go deeper when required.

Presentation and discussion of the overall approach to Main Objective (MO) 1

- **SR2015 consultant team** presented the overall approach. In particular, it was stressed that the approach and methods will be adapted to the type of condition:
 - For example for the remote conditions, the team will extract data from external documents looking at global prosperity and sustained growth;
 - For the proximate conditions, the team will use sources such as document review, TRP surveys, key informant interviews and country case studies; and
 - In addition, the consultant team proposed to delete question 3.5 on market-shaping and to refer to the findings of the thematic review instead.
- **TERG members** agreed in general and made the following comments for consideration:
 - While the SR2015 will cost a small proportion of the cost and take less time compared with the Five-Year Evaluation, it is based on various on-going work, including country level program reviews and therefore is drawing on evidence from the country level;
 - While not very evident in the current inception report, there is a need to link MO1 and MO2 and to comment on plausibility;
 - It is crucial to identify key individuals for interviews and to guarantee their anonymity;
 - Human rights and gender are currently not very visible in the MO1 approach, need to emphasize focus on human rights and gender issues;
 - Data from country-level donors, for example PEPFAR, should also be taken into account to create a more accurate picture of country realities; and
 - Lastly, the TERG agreed to deleting question 3.5 on market-shaping.
- Following the presentation of the overall approach to MO1, the TERG with the SR2015 consultant team discussed in three parallel breakout sessions issues how health-system

strengthening, sustainability and partnerships may be addressed in the context of the Theory of Change in the proposed main themes of the SR 2015 report.

Selection of countries for case studies for MO1

- The **consultant team** explained the proposed approach to case studies and country visits.
 - Proposed are sixteen case studies, including visits to four countries.
 - The proposed countries were primarily selected among the twenty-seven TERG priority countries.
 - Factors in consideration for a potential country visit included upcoming transition out of Global Fund financing, HIV/TB concept notes, participation in wave 1 or 2; and/or Challenging Operating Environments.
 - All case studies will be used to provide answers to all evaluation questions; and
 - Concluding, the team stressed that country visits will not be ‘intrusive’, but will serve to identify real life stories in order to strengthen communication messages.
- Criteria and suggested countries for case studies were discussed:
 - Clear ToRs are needed to prepare Secretariat staff and in-country partners;
 - Potential risks to country visits should be considered, e.g., political situations; and
 - Coordination with the OIG is needed.
- In addition, the **TERG suggested** to consider the following factors in the country selection:
 - Equal opportunities and distribution of diseases;
 - Cover majority of Global Fund investments; and
 - A balanced approach to Global Fund regions.
- The **TERG recommended** the consultant team refine the list of country case studies with inputs from the Secretariat. The TERG agreed not to include regional grants, but emphasized the importance of evaluation components built into grants.
- Data limitations and analysis were also discussed.

Outcomes session 1:

1. The consultant team **agreed to follow the proposed timeline** for the SR 2015 review.
2. While the TERG approved the presented **Theory of Change**, the consultant team will incorporate comments in the revised inception report.
3. Similarly, the TERG approved the presented **approach to Main Objective 1**, including the case study approach.
4. The TERG recommended that the consultant team collaborates with the Secretariat to finalize the **list of countries for the case studies**.
5. The TERG agreed that the SR 2015 report will feature **health-system strengthening, sustainability and partnerships**.
6. The TERG agreed to delete the question 3.5 on **market-shaping** from the SR2015 and to rely on the planned thematic review on market shaping as the main source to answer the question.
7. The TERG and the consultant team agreed that the **SR 2015 report will have two parts**: Part 1: a concise report for actionable recommendations and accessible communication; and Part 2: an annex to document the systematic processes used to ensure credibility and transparency.

Day 2

Session 2

Chair: Viroj Tangcharoensathien

At the 24th TERG meeting, the TERG identified the following five thematic reviews as priority work in 2015.

Break-out session 1

Facilitator: Bess Miller

Thematic review on HSS

- The Secretariat presented an overview of the current work related to the assessment of HSS and how this work would feed in to the development of the new Strategy. The assessment approach includes three work streams: 1) the “left” – a review of NFM instruments and processes related to HSS (incorporated as part of SR2015); 2) the “middle” – review of operational modalities and best practices of Global Fund and partners (the HSS thematic review) and 3) a review of output and outcomes of HSS investments (as part of national program reviews).
- For thematic review on HSS “the middle”, a consultant team has been selected. The scope of work for the review had been revised as per guidance from TERG and was discussed in the session. The revision entailed transferring some NFM process-related questions to the SR2015 review; placing more emphasis on analysis and presentation of innovative or new approaches in design and implementation of HSS; and examination of partner’s strategic and operational modalities; four broad themes identified to assess partner experiences. The broad themes are 1) funding mechanisms; 2) alignment, collaboration and coordination; 3) technical assistance; and 4) evaluation of HSS;
- Country selection criteria were discussed. It was agreed that the HSS thematic review will comprise four case studies in countries and 6 to 10 desk reviews;
- The final synthesis report is expected in June 2015.

Thematic review on program sustainability

- The Chief Economist of the Global Fund provided an overview of the work currently being undertaken by the Secretariat on fiscal and program sustainability, including the TERG thematic review on program sustainability;
- The scope of work of the TERG thematic review was discussed and agreed. The work includes ascertaining the extent countries are sustaining programs following transition and mechanisms that were initiated by these countries and by the Global Fund to facilitate transition;
- The country selection was agreed upon;
 - The Secretariat team will develop the synthesis report, possibly with an additional person, supported by TERG.
 - The synthesis report and country case studies are expected by June 2015.

Break-out session 2

Facilitator: Bernard Nahlen

Thematic review on market-shaping

- RFP was issued in November, but did not attract suitable candidates -> RFP is to be re-issued
 - **TERG approved** the revised ToR but recommended to include diagnostic equipment (focus initially HIV) as well as sustained accessibility based on document reviews.

Thematic review on the effect of the allocation model

- The Secretariat presented a draft scope of work for TERG's consideration. **TERG agreed** to the draft ToR, but recommended:
 - To consider exploring if the deciding factor for the allocation was indeed the formula or rather past funding;
 - To consider looking at the workload implication of incentive funding;
 - To consider including a band 4 country as a case study instead of a low-income country and to assess if a different methodology for band 4 countries was useful;
 - To coordinate country visits with SR 2015 other reviews, if there is an overlap; and
 - To present the final draft ToR to the Secretariat Working Group prior to publication;
- Next steps:
 - TERG to send additional comments by 22 January;
 - RFP to be finalized for 26 January; and
 - TERG members Anne, Jan, and Jim volunteered as focal points.

Thematic review on the evolution of national strategic plans

- Least advanced; a 'food for thought' presentation was shared with the TERG to focus the discussion and scope for the thematic review.
- TERG generally re-affirmed its commitment to this thematic review, but noted that it may be useful to conduct the review in several steps, with first findings to potentially be presented to the June SIIC in order to influence the strategy;
- Therefore, **TERG agreed** to conduct a light desk-review ('landscaping current findings') of disease-specific national strategic plans, for example, looking at how they are costed and funded, while also taking into account the analysis carried out by the consultant team on the alignment of concept notes with national strategic disease plans;
- Jim, Salil, and Viroj agreed to propose how to conduct the desk review in collaboration with the disease partners;
- Based on the outcomes of the light desk review, TERG may commission a larger thematic review at a later point. One potential topic could be to examine the linkage of disease-specific national strategic plans to health-sector strategic plans.

Secretariat updates

Results-based financing

- Backgrounds and updates of results-based financing were presented, including three classes:
 - Provider payment system, which is payment based on output in an incentive manner;
 - Payment for a good NSP, linking disbursement schedule to results; and

- Payment based on verifiable results, moving from input to output or impact based. As this approach has never been evaluated, TERG's involvement would be welcomed.
- TERG agreed to consider supporting the roll-out of the results-based financing model by conducting a thematic review at a later point in time.

Technical cooperation

- An update on technical cooperation was presented and discussed:
 - Shift in thinking -> increasing focus on facilitating long-term technical assistance;
 - WHO partnership agreements -> around 30% of submitted concept notes have benefitted from WHO partnership agreement; issues around country-level coordination exist.
 - Quality assurance of technical assistance -> mid-term assessment of partnership agreement was described and the end-year evaluation was discussed (current project end date: December 2015); some discussion on end term evaluation was held, which does not intend to include the quality of NSP in scope.
- TERG requested that reports be brought through TERG.

Human rights and gender

- Community, Rights, and Gender (CRG) department presented its work on human rights and gender, with some focus on areas that benefit TERG inputs:
 - Review of concept notes -> urgent need for gender- and sex-disaggregated data;
 - Implementation of the CRG Special Initiative for concept note development -> evaluation of this initiative is planned, RFP to be published in coming months.
- TERG agreed that SR2015 will benefit from CRG's review on gender, and to
 - Request that the SR 2015 consultant team report how many of the 16 case study countries are able to provide gender- and sex-disaggregated data; and
 - Consider to conduct, at a later point in time, forward-looking studies on human rights and gender, for example how to include key affected populations (such as adolescent girls) in programming.

Outcomes session 2:

8. TERG approved the approach to the **thematic review on health-system strengthening**; findings from the three parts will be discussed in June.
9. TERG approved the terms of reference for the **thematic review on sustainability** as well as the country selection.
10. TERG approved the revised terms of reference for the **thematic review on market-shaping**, but also requested minor additions to the scope.
11. TERG welcomed the draft scope of work for the **thematic review on the allocation methodology**, but will submit written comments in the week following the TERG meeting.
12. TERG agreed to conduct a **light desk-review** on disease-specific **national strategic plans**, in the expectation to present an issues paper to the June SIIC meeting.
13. TERG agreed to be the interlocutor when thematic reviews have interim findings.
14. TERG welcomed the Secretariat updates received and agreed to, at a later stage, explore commissioning or advising on evaluations on **results-based financing, partnerships human rights and gender**.

Session 3: 2015 Strategic Review – Main Objective (MO) 2

Chair - Viroj Tangcharoensathien

Analysis of program review reports & updates on country data systems and impact

- The consultant presented the scope and preliminary findings of an analysis of program review reports; ‘trend availability’ was defined based on at least two data points.
- The Secretariat presented an update of their work, and requested on behalf of the Impact Taskforce regular communications and guidance from TERG.
- The **TERG made the following comments/decisions:**
 - Expressed concerns and disappointments of the limited availability of quality impact data, especially in key documents such as program review reports, despite large investments over the past decade and TERG’s effort to improve guidance with Secretariat and partners in the recent years;
 - Requested that the Secretariat shares with the TERG for review a report on data availability in African high-impact countries; and
 - Agreed to decide on a focal point(s) for the Impact Taskforce.

SR2015 MO2: Approach to assessing progress in impact against the three diseases

- The **SR2015 consultant team** presented the proposed impact assessment approach, stressing and/or clarifying that the MO2 team
 - Is aware of data limitations, e.g., changing definition over time, availability, and quality, but will review existing data, documents and evidence and comment and recommend for Global Fund, including effective coverage and effective ART adherence rate;
 - Use ALL available data and triangulate. Stratify by gender and age where possible.
 - Aims to be consistent with partner-approaches and to possibly tag on to other processes and will use the existing lives saved model and comment on them; and
 - Will triangulate existing data; field visits are not planned due to the tight timeline.
- The SR2015 consultants raised a risk that a Secretariat’s results report could contradict the results of the SR2015 and hence there was a need to manage this possibility.
- **TERG agreed with the overall approach** on MO2 with the following comments:
 - Suggested considering additional indicators such as MDR-TB, TB detection rates, TB treatment completion and bed net coverage;
 - Requested to address plausibility considering external factors as much as feasible;
 - Recommended the following countries for review of plausibility assessments:
 - Malaria: To review Zambia and Bangladesh and to conduct Ghana;
 - Tuberculosis: To review Zambia and Tanzania; and conduct Indonesia; and
 - HIV/AIDS: To review Nigeria and Ukraine and to conduct Zambia.

Outcomes session 3:

15. The TERG welcomed the update on program review reports and investments in country data systems, but requested that additional analysis is being carried and shared with the TERG.
16. The TERG agreed with the overall approach on MO2 and agreed with the consultant team on the list of countries for plausibility assessments.

Day 3

Executive Session

Chair: Mickey Chopra

- **TERG confirmed** Chair Mickey Chopra and Vice-Chair Viroj Tangcharoensathien; Bess Miller was elected second Vice-Chair.
- **TERG discussed** the importance of having a risk framework for the SR 2015 in place; TERG Support team to share the draft framework that has been put together in collaboration with the Chief Risk Officer and his team.
- **TERG discussed** the need for sound communication to stakeholders and made the following comments/recommendations – There is a need to
 - Emphasize that the SR2015 is a synthetic overview of available data, including from field studies/reports, not new data collection.
 - Develop more specific messages, for example, around MO2 using the best evidence available, verifying existing models and working on plausibility assessments.
 - Include general message in usual stakeholder communication as much as possible, for example, through interviews with TERG members or editorials.
 - Develop specific communication for case study countries based on ToR.
 - Post on the web the Board slides and the timeline with strategy development;
 - Assess how SR 2015 messaging can be brought to partnership forum;
 - Develop communication materials for focal points such as the SIIC and disease partners;
 - Mention to countries that they have an additional channel for inputs through the Secretariat surveys on concept note development and grant making.

Session 4: 2015 Strategic Review – Next Steps

Chair: Mickey Chopra

- Key points: The TERG summarized the outcomes of days 1 and 2, which can be found under the respective sessions in this meeting report.
- Agreed timeline: There is an agreement on a high-level timeline for the SR 2015 report:

Date, 2015	Action
End January	Consultant team to submit a revised inception report including a revised ToC, further details on the SR 2015 outline, analytical framework, planning, data sources (especially for MO2) and collection tools/dummy tables for data analysis. The data quality should be commented on throughout; including to what extent program reviews are useful. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The consultant team should clarify points raised and discussed<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ How MO1 and MO2 will be linked given that they cover a different time period;▪ How answers to specific evaluation questions will be worked into the broader narrative; and▪ How much can be said about effective coverage of interventions and determining factors.
Beginning	TERG will provide quick feedback on the updated inception report and the

February	revised ToC. A call between the TERG and the consultant will be arranged in early February. Further calls will be arranged as needed; for example, to discuss the link between MO1 and MO2.
21 May	Consultant team to submit a power-point presentation of preliminary findings for MO1 and MO2, which will be shared with the Secretariat for factual correction (also missing data, misstatements, etc.).
2-4 June	TERG to hold its 26 th meeting in order a) to discuss methods, the quality of findings, and limitations, together with other thematic review findings then b) to discuss draft recommendations, and c) to engage with the Secretariat on recommendations and implications.
SIIC meeting June	TERG to present the preliminary findings and recommendations to the SIIC. The SR2015 consultant team leader may be asked to be present, pending the SIIC chair's permission.
July	Consultant team to submit a draft synthesis report, taking into account SIIC comments. TERG and Secretariat to review and comment on the report.
End August	The consultant team will submit a final draft report ahead of the September TERG meeting.
1-3 September	TERG to hold its 27 th TERG meeting, including a one day retreat.

Closure

- The Chief of Staff closed the meeting by thanking the TERG members for their efforts. She expressed her appreciation that the TERG also considered the communications aspect of the SR 2015, as the review is a difficult topic with many moving parts and targets. The Chief of Staff was furthermore pleased about the close collaboration to align thinking with the Strategic Information department, though not to undermine independence, and confirmed that relevant results from the Secretariat and on-going work of the development continuum working group would be shared with the TERG. Lastly, she emphasized that, although there is high expectation on the review, SR 2015 report should be realistic and practical, and not attempt to provide full answer to all questions.
- The TERG chair also thanked the TERG and Secretariat members for participating. In particular, the fact that many Secretariat members invested their time during the TERG meeting is a real indication how serious this process is being taken. Lastly, the Chair thanked again all new and outgoing TERG members for their very valuable contributions.

Outcomes executive session:

17. TERG confirmed Chair and Vice-Chair and elected **Bess Miller as second Vice-Chair**.
18. TERG recommended developing a **risk framework** for the SR 2015 as well as a **communication plan**.

Outcomes session 4:

19. TERG repeated the **key points** and **agreed with the consultant team on a high-level timeline** between now and September 2015.

Annex

List of Attendees

Name of attendee	Role
Mickey Chopra	TERG Chair
Viroj Tangcharoensathien	TERG Vice-Chair
Jim Tulloch	TERG Member
Stein-Erik Kruse	TERG Member (out-going)
Bess Miller	TERG Member
Anna Thorson	TERG Member (in-coming)
Wuleta Lemma	TERG Member (in-coming)
Jeanine Condo	TERG Member (in-coming)
Jaap Broekmans	TERG Ex-officio member, Stop TB Partnership (out-going)
Kenneth Castro	TERG Ex-officio member, Stop TB Partnership (in-coming)
Salil Panakadan	TERG Ex-officio member, UNAIDS
Bernard Nahlen	TERG Ex-officio member, RBM MERG
Peter Hansen	TERG Ex-officio member, GAVI
Jan Paehler	TERG Ex-officio member, SIIC

Resource persons	Role
Paul Balogun	Strategic Review 2015 Consultant Team Leader
Cindy Carlson	Strategic Review 2015 Consultant Main Objective 1 lead
Clare Dickinson	Strategic Review 2015 Consultant
Louisiana Lush	Strategic Review 2015 Consultant

George Rutherford	Strategic Review 2015 Consultant Main Objective 2 lead (via skype)
Hilary Spindler	Strategic Review 2015 Consultant (via skype)
Karen White	Strategic Review 2015 Consultant (via skype)
Michelle Gross	HSS thematic review consultant
Wendy Abramson	HSS thematic review consultant
Xavier Bosch	Program review analysis consultant
Txema Calleja	HIV Department, WHO
Lucie Blok	TRP Chair (written comments on the Inception report)

Global Fund Secretariat	Role
Secretariat Working Group on Evaluation	
Marijke Wijnroks	Chief of Staff, OED
Cees Klumper	Chief Risk Officer
Harley Feldbaum	Head, Strategy and Policy
Michael Byrne	Head, High Impact Africa 1 department, for Grant Management Division
Johannes Hunger	Head, Strategic Information, for Strategy, Investment and Impact Division
Office of Inspector General	
Elmar Vinh-Thomas	Audit Director, Office of Inspector General
Others	
Christoph Benn	Director, External Relations Division
Michael Borowitz	Chief Health Economist
Christopher Game	Chief Procurement Officer
Abigail Moreland	Head, Access to Funding

Michael Johnson	Head, Technical Advisory and Partnerships
Kate Thomson	Head, Community Rights and Gender department
Nicolas Cantau	Regional Manager, Eastern Europe and Central Asia
Nathalie Zorzi	Senior Manager, Monitoring & Evaluation
Viviana Mangiaterra	Senior Technical Coordinator MNCH & HSS
Lee Abdelfadil	Manager, Technical Assistance hub
Estifanos Shargie	Senior Specialist Evaluation & Impact
George Shakarishvili	Senior Technical Advisor HSS
David Traynor	Advisor, Community Rights and Gender department
Mehran Hosseini	Senior Specialist, Disease Impact and Modelling
Shufang Zhang	Strategic Information department
TERG Support Team	
Ryuichi Komatsu	Senior Advisor, TERG Support team
John Puvimanasinghe	Senior Specialist, TERG Support team
Nina Ingenkamp	Associate Specialist, TERG Support team
Jutta Hornig	Assistant, TERG Support team