

## 26TH TERG MEETING: OUTCOMES

<b>Date</b>	2-4 June 2015
<b>Venue</b>	La Perle du Lac (2-3 June) and the Global Fund (4 June) Geneva, Switzerland
<b>Chair</b>	Mickey Chopra
<b>Vice-Chairs</b>	Viroj Tangcharoensathien, Bess Miller

### Objectives of the 26th TERG Meeting

1. To examine the accuracy and quality of findings and weigh evidence from the Strategic Review and other thematic reviews;
2. To develop, and finalize to the extent possible, conclusions from the Strategic Review and recommendations from other thematic reviews; and
3. To discuss further work to be done for the SIIC, the TERG meeting, and the rest of the year.

### Day 1

#### Session 1: Thematic review and discussion

**Chair: Mickey Chopra**

#### **Thematic Discussion 1: Sustainability**

The consultant Herman Fuenzalida-Puelma and Ilana Kirsztajn presented the thematic review on sustainability and transition. The presentation included an overview of the review methodology, country case studies on Croatia and Mexico, and preliminary findings that would inform the draft sustainability synthesis report.

Sustainability was defined as the ability of a health program to reach, maintain, and increase service coverage at a level that will provide continuing control of a health problem even after the removal of external funding. Transition was defined as the mechanism by which a country gradually moves towards fully funding and implementing its health programs independent of donor support (financial or otherwise). As yet, the Global Fund has not adequately addressed sustainability and transition in a systematic way. Although the previous thematic review identified needs and made recommendations, and the Technical Review Panel (TRP) had requested sustainability plans in some cases, there was no guidance in place to support the activity.

The thematic review emphasised that the issue of sustainability needed to be considered in three ways, namely, 1: institutional (e.g., use of CCMs as a platform for engagement, Ministry of Health: MOH and Ministry of Finance: MOF, local authorities in federal states and Civil Society Organizations: CSOs), 2: financial (fiscal space for health, innovative mechanisms for domestic financing, etc.) and 3: programmatic (e.g. integrated systems and processes, role of CSOs) sustainability. Experience from some of the case study countries showed that CSOs have a good leverage among target populations and hence the need for continuity post-Global Fund. Discontinued or weak CCMs after transition were seen to affect the work of CSOs with detriment to advocacy, reach and communication roles. CCMs based within the MOH had a greater likelihood of being institutionalized. Both political will and political commitment were seen as indispensable to sustain the three disease programs. The need for the MOF to be involved in the design of

Sustainability and Transition plans were identified as was the need to align processes with national cycles.

Cindy Carlson, from the Strategic Review consultant team, then presented the relevant findings on sustainability from the Strategic Review 2015 and raised the issue of the lack of the Secretariat's capacity to implement recommendations on sustainability issues, which stemmed from resource constraints. There was limited transition and sustainability planning taking place within the portfolio, although there are emergent plans in some countries that will be transitioning within the next years. On programmatic sustainability, she stressed the possible impact of transition on funding for CSOs, especially in HIV prevention among MARPs, human rights advocacy and investments in HSS. She mentioned the necessity of a new approach in order to institutionalise the concept of sustainability throughout concepts notes and grant management processes.

In general, the TERG agreed with the preliminary findings, but requested that the synthesis work should be substantially strengthened with conclusions and recommendations clearly based on evidence from the case studies; further operationalize the recommendations to the context of the Global Fund and the country; explore any good practices of partners; and also review any innovative mechanisms of countries in advancing domestic financing and in achieving sustainability on program components. The TERG noted that the case studies on Croatia and Mexico (which have higher fiscal capacities as their GNI per capita was higher than the average of Upper Middle Income country group) were interesting and had important findings. They acknowledged that the studies were done well. However, they stressed that the conclusions and recommendations needed to be supported by the findings, and requested the TERG Support Team to identify an approach to facilitate this. The TERG directed that the review should be positioned within the broader conversation on sustainability and the broader discussion around eligibility, while expressing concerns about the lack of planning for countries going through transition to sustainability.

In order to facilitate transition and sustainability of programs, the TERG suggested further collaboration with the Ministries of Finance (MOF), and the need for incorporating sustainability and transition planning in funding applications to the Global Fund, in other words, from the beginning of the grant process. The TERG also stressed the importance of Global Fund's engagement with civil society organisations (CSOs). The members considered that CSOs had great potential to supplement the lack of the government's capacity, therefore, further efforts should be made to enhance their role in HIV and TB, but even in malaria, building on lessons learnt from the HIV experiences.

The TERG suggested the need to have discussions on resourcing of the Secretariat to implement recommendations based on findings from this thematic review and from the SR 2015, given the need for differentiation of resources for grant management. Recommendations from 2013 were not necessarily implemented, partly because of the resource constraints. The TERG suggested the Global Fund should acknowledge and respond to lessons learned and recommendations from the reviews in order to further move this key issue forward.

## **Thematic Discussion 2: Health Systems Strengthening**

Wendy Abramson, the lead consultant for the HSS thematic review explained the context of the review and presented its findings. The review focused on operational modalities and examples of best practices in the implementation of HSS. The findings showed that there was a wide range of country platforms to coordinate, align and harmonise Global Fund's HSS investments in-country. The level of political commitment and ownership also widely varied. Large variations were noted in mechanisms to access and use TA, as well as focus and understanding of TA providers' on HSS, which undermined the concept and operationalization of cross-cutting HSS. Pooled funding mechanisms were identified as a mechanism to improve coordination of HSS investments, and reduce fragmentation and duplication of services. As strengthening health systems is complex, it

was stressed that the government's role in monitoring and evaluation of HSS is highly important to ensure the alignment and harmonisation of development programmes.

Cindy Carlson presented findings from SR2015 on the implementation, progress and key challenges related to HSS. She mentioned the lack of common understanding about intended results of HSS investments, among the Secretariat. Insufficient emphasis is given to cross-cutting HSS within the Global Fund, while current ways of funding HSS may be doing more harm than good (e.g., focus on disease specific approaches or non-governmental PR systems.) She stressed that there were missed opportunities in most countries to use Global Fund financing to address broader health system constraints – with implications for sustainability.

The TERG shared concerns that the problem of HSS was more than analytical limitations, but the lack of a clear operational definition of and a common approach to “HSS” within the Secretariat. The effectiveness of the Global Fund's approach to HSS was debated and specifically whether it should focus on one or a couple of HSS building blocks or encourage synergies by looking across the various building blocks. The TERG also discussed the possibility of recommending to the Board to consider focussing investments in HSS to three specific aspects: the strengthening of information systems and data; procurement & supply management (PSM); and capacity and human resources. The quality of the data was of concern and hence the importance of investing in national health management information systems. The TERG also acknowledged the need for stronger and improved capacity of governance, stewardship and monitoring and evaluation.

The TERG chair provided feedback on the modification to the HSS review report, especially the need to summarize the main findings and messages from the country case studies and partner experiences and making these more visible; and to strengthen the conclusions and recommendations based on evidence from the case studies. A request was made to the consultants to outline a clearer link between the Global Fund's HSS investment and outcomes/impact; to make a more explicit message of what works and what does not work by utilising evidence and findings; and to illustrate the comparative advantage of the Global Fund in this field. The consultant responded that the current review looked specifically at implementation modalities in-country (the ‘middle’), while the link between investments and outcome will be assessed through reviews of ‘the right’.

### **Thematic discussion 3: National Strategic Plan (NSP)**

The TERG reaffirmed its intention to monitor the evolution of NSPs, and also considered the possibility of a larger review on NSPs to inform the development of the next Global Fund Strategy. They requested the TERG Support Team to further explore and include perspectives of IHP+, and report back to the TERG at the September meeting. The TERG strongly supported the idea of using the NSPs/operational plans as a basis for funding decisions and evaluations of implementation in future, instead of Global Fund specific processes and forms. There was a general agreement that technical partners plus IHP+ should be considered as the main mechanism to ensure developing robust NSP and reviewing NSP quality to support the process of funding applications.

### **Thematic discussion 4: Market Shaping**

Due to the poor internet connection and the tight schedule, the presentation and discussion on market shaping was postponed and conducted by a phone conference on 10<sup>th</sup> June. From the TERG, the three focal persons, namely, Viroj Tangcharoensathien, Don De Savigny, and Salil Panakadan, participated. After the presentation of findings, the TERG members requested the need to conduct telephone interviews with some selected countries to understand perspectives of implementing countries in terms of procurement practice, regulatory/treatment guidelines, and PR capacity. The TERG instructed the consultants to ensure a clear understanding and interpretation of data before the final report. In order to secure the quality of the report, the TERG allowed the

consultants to extend the deadline of the first draft to 30<sup>th</sup> July and clarified that the finalised report should be delivered before 20<sup>th</sup> August.

## **Session 2: Main Objective 2: Impact**

**Chair: Bess Miller**

George Rutherford and Hilary Spindler, from the Strategic Review consultant team, presented their analytical findings of impact against the three diseases. Their analysis represented a triangulation of cross-national trends of outcomes linked to investments; analysis of impact profiles; analysis of program reviews; and a review and conduct of plausibility impact assessments in selected countries. Overall, the preliminary results found adequate and plausible evidence of a temporal association between funding and disease impact.

The TERG appreciated the contribution of MO2 in providing an independent validation of impact, which they had not had before. The TERG agreed that key messages should be shared with SIIC. However, the TERG cautioned that MO2 needs to provide more detailed and clear explanation of the methodology, analysis and recommendations and less technical / modelling jargon in the final report. Specifically, the TERG identified the need for clarity and interpretation of the various analysis and figures presented; a clear interpretation of the ARIMA model results; the current progress towards the 2012-2016 Strategy Goal of 10 million lives saved based on an accurate understanding of the models used by the secretariat; and recommendations on how the secretariat should proceed in assessing the progress towards the other Strategy Goal of 140-180 million infections averted. They also requested the consultants to provide analysis on whether investing money in the Global Fund makes any difference, comparing to other institutions. They stressed that additional analysis should include assessing impact against domestic funding and total funding, as opposed to singling out Global Fund-specific funding, in order to prevent any misinterpretation of attributing impact to the Global Fund. Although globally available data have been improving over the last years and can show the association between funding and impact, the TERG was concerned about the quality and availability of validated programmatic and financial data and stressed the need for further investments for strengthening national data systems.

## **Day 2**

---

### **Session 2: Strategic Review (cont.)**

**Chair: Viroj Tangcharoensathien**

#### **Main Objective 1: Progress on the Strategy**

The TERG welcomed Mark Dybul, the Executive Director of Global Fund, who participated in morning session. Mark Dybul sought the advice of the TERG regarding the further implementation of the Strategy and in the development of the new Strategy. Firstly, he expressed his frustration against the slow change in outcome and impact trends of the three disease over the past 15 years, and requested recommendations to identify missing components in the strategy which could accelerate the progress. Secondly, he addressed the issue of the scope and the focus of the Global Fund's programmes. As the programmes' focuses were expanding beyond the initial mandate of the Fund, he raised the question of how far the Fund should support issues relevant to public health control, such as education opportunity and data management. Mark Dybul stressed the need for resilient and sustainable systems for health; early planning for transition & sustainability; and issues related to gender and adolescence girls. He further discussed the consideration been given to working with other major partners on a large initiative to improve health information systems. The TERG members appreciated his insightful direction to the focus of the TERG reviews.

Cindy Carlson presented on Main Objective 1 of the SR2015, entailing a review of progress on the implementation of the Global Fund Strategy 2012-2016. She provided an overview of the methodology as a formative review, which used a Theory-based approach (due to the preliminary

nature of strategy implementation). The TERG evaluation questions were grouped around the relevant Theory of Change conditions.

The review acknowledged major changes to Secretariat structures and increased Secretariat resources dedicated to engaging with countries. However, a great focus on systems and forms created a large amount of work in countries, but with little evidence that these were leading to intended improvements in organisational efficiency and effectiveness at country level. In resource generation, there was a 30% increase in pledges between 3rd (2011-13) and 4th (2014-16) replenishment, while private sector pledges had nearly doubled (mainly due to BMGF). 97% of countries/grants had met counterpart financing requirements. However, the findings highlighted that sustainability dimensions were not institutionalized within concept notes/grant management processes. The allocation formula had increased funding predictability (*“Now when we go fishing we know we will catch fish”* – Country Stakeholder) while the iterations with the Secretariat did help to improve concept note quality and was appreciated by countries.

Commitment to predictable and sustained financing for the three diseases was assessed. USD 3.9 billion additional domestic resources were committed to the 3 diseases for next phase, which was a 51% increase overall, while it was 78% in LMICs. Counterpart financing thresholds were set low so easy to meet. NSPs were used as basis for concept note development in many of the case study countries but only a very few NSPs had gone through some form of independent quality assessment before final government endorsement.

On the thematic areas: regarding HSS, the consultants stressed the lack of clear consensus in the Global Fund on what HSS should cover. Most of HSS interventions proposed in concepts notes were disease specific programmes, and did not entail the cross-cutting points of view. On human rights and gender, the review noted the guidance developed and disseminated by the secretariat and the feedback provided on concept notes. Only 25% of the concept notes reviewed in the case study countries proposed human rights and gender interventions aligned with Global Fund guidance. Findings on the Partnership Agreement between the Global Fund and WHO showed it was given high priority by partners and improved the accountability both in formal and informal ways.

Mark Dybul welcomed the preliminary findings and recommendations as they were very helpful in formulating the next strategy. The TERG acknowledged the progresses in the strategic focus on generating resources and sustaining responses, and improved efficiency and effectiveness in the investments. Findings highlighted significant weaknesses of the alignment of the human rights and gender intervention with the Global Fund’s strategy. The TERG members noted that partnerships were ad hoc, and more systematic investment should be made available in order to make it sustainable. The TERG members agreed that transition and sustainability had to be incorporated in the concept notes and institutionalised.

While the Theory of Change was presented by the consultants to provide a framework for the review, TERG members reiterated that it was not necessarily a good way to communicate with the audiences in the Strategic Review final report, so required the consultants to provide the data sources and to highlight the most important findings with less technical terms. The TERG agreed that findings indicate good progress but highlight various concerns, but noted that some of the statements of the review appeared subjective and required the consultants to elaborate the findings and refer to data sources or evidence obtained, while clearly acknowledging limitations and qualification. The TERG also requested a prioritized set of recommendations in the final report.

TERG considered that the review indicated that there were advantages with the new funding model but that its required forms and processes are still too complex. It would be important to determine which aspects of complexity add value and which do not. Simplification and differentiation are still required.



**SR2015 Mo 1-2 linkage**

Paul Balogun consolidated the findings from Mo1 and Mo2, stating that the trend of the three diseases has been positive across the 27 TERG countries overall and it was plausible to believe that national responses made a significant contribution to impacts.

The TERG initially requested to have a cohesive linkage from the strategy to disease impact, but after intensive discussion, there was a general sense among the TERG that linking MO1 and MO2 may not be a good way to present the results. TERG noted that Mo1 and Mo2 did not have compatible timelines, and linking them may become misleading. TERG also commented on the statement that data quality was enough for evaluating impact for global level but needs improvement for country level could be easily misinterpreted, and therefore requested the consultants not to use it.

**Day 3**

---

**Conclusions and next steps****Chair: Mickey Chopra****Discussion with the Secretariat Working Group on Evaluation**

The Chair appreciated the efforts of TERG members for the intense discussions over two days. Indeed, the objects of this meeting was to interrogate the data and to give strategic and operational directions to the SR2015 consultant team, which were largely achieved. Moreover, the TERG acknowledged their confidence in the robust evidence-based findings. The members also discussed how to organise initial conclusions along with initial key findings, and the overall framework was agreed.

Regarding the Main Objective 2, the TERG reaffirmed the appropriateness of the models used and encouraged the Global Fund Secretariat to continue and refine the current approach and methodology, working on recommendations by the external expert group. The TERG also noted that the causal relationship between the increased resources and the results merits further investigation, even though the findings showed the correlation between the two. From the findings of the Main Objective 1, the TERG mentioned that the complexity of the process has not been improved, and recommended the Secretariat to encourage more country ownership and enhance the national capacity.

Marijke Wijnroks, Chief of Staff and Chair of the Secretariat Working Group on Evaluation, expressed her general agreement with the preliminary findings presented, but asked for clarification regarding the need for more country ownership. She requested more detailed information from the TERG and requested to elaborate the finding with evidence obtained. The TERG also stressed that the Global Fund needed further commitment on the issues of gender and human rights, especially at the national level. The Secretariat fully agreed upon this point, while expressing their struggle to improve these points, and asked for more precise and specific recommendations from the TERG. The TERG also pointed out that differentiation of approaches has not been institutionalised enough in the Secretariat. The Secretariat responded that it was not overtly expressed in the last Strategy but it would definitely be incorporated in the next Strategy.

The TERG outlined the next steps as follows:

- The contents discussed in this meeting will be summarised in a set of slides and presented at the SIIC meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> June, covering framework and key messages;
- Consultants will reframe the findings and submit the first draft report by 9<sup>th</sup> July. It will consist of a 20 page summary and two technical annexes;

- The TERG and Secretariats will review the documents and consolidate the comments;
- By third week of August, the final reports will be ready and be discussed at the 27<sup>th</sup> TERG meeting, which will be held from 1 to 3 September. TERG will finalise the Strategic Review 2015 report, and have a one-day retreat to consider future areas of focus in response to needs from the Secretariat and the SIIC and the new strategy under development;
- It was agreed to prioritise recommendations, rather than listing numerous recommendations;
- The Strategic Review will be then reported to the Board in November, through SIIC.

## **Secretariat updates**

### **Challenging Operating Environments**

Emmanuele Capobianco, from Policy Hub, thanked the TERG for an excellent thematic review on fragile states (COEs) and presented the implementation progress on the TERG recommendations from the thematic review and TERG Position Paper. He acknowledged that the Secretariat has been trying to provide more flexibility in order to respond to complex situations such as humanitarian crisis. The TERG members complimented the systematic changes in the Secretariat which clearly demonstrated a differentiated approach to certain challenging environments, especially in terms of flexibility of processes, and appreciated the progress and updates. The TERG requested the Secretariat to provide an update on implementation in one year.

### **Reproductive, Maternal, New born, Child Health (RMNCH)**

The presentation by Viviana Mangiaterra highlighted the progress on these issues. The TERG acknowledged this progress but suggested that this required more integration with other systems and organisations in order to create synergistic effects. The members also noted that greater focus should be put on the gender perspective, especially adolescent girls.

### **Technical Cooperation**

The TERG was reassured to hear progress on quality assurance of technical cooperation. The members also encouraged the Secretariat to include regional consultants in technical cooperation in order to enhance their capacity. The TERG will hear further update and consider its role in overseeing the end evaluation of Technical Cooperation in the next meeting.

### **Impact data update: country data system and investment and modelling**

The TERG acknowledged the changes and progress made over the last three years in the Global Fund approach to national data systems and strategic investment in this area following the guidance and recommendations by the TERG. The TERG appreciated the progress on modeling and mapping of needs for strengthening data systems in-country, and advised on the need to invest further in national data systems. The members reiterated that attribution of results and impact is problematic and even reopening the discussion should be avoided. The TERG requested that quality of data and investments into data systems, and the progress made on plausibility impact assessments through program reviews should be discussed at the next TERG meeting in September.

## **Annex: List of Participants**

### **I. TERG**

Mickey Chopra (TERG Chair)  
Viroj Tangcharoensathien (TERG Vice-chair)  
Bess Miller (TERG Vice-chair)  
Paulin Basinga  
Kenneth Castro  
Jeanine Condo  
Don De Savigny  
Peter Hansen  
Osamu Kunii  
Wuleta Lemma  
Bernard Nahlen  
Jan Paehler  
Salil Panakadan  
Anna Thorson  
Jim Tulloch

### **II. Resource persons**

Paul Balogun (Itad)  
Cindy Carlson (EHG)  
Clare Dickinson (EHG)  
George Gotsadze (TRP)  
Louisiana Lush (EHG)  
George Rutherford (UCSF)  
Hilary Spindler (UCSF)  
Hernan Fuenzalida (World Progress Center)  
Wendy Abramson (EHG)  
Jennifer Lissfelt (EHG) (by a separate call)

### **III. Partners**

WHO focal points

### **IV. Global Fund**

Mark Dybul (Executive Director)

#### *Secretariat Working Group on Evaluation*

Marijke Wijnroks (Chief of Staff)  
Cees Klumper (Chief Risk Officer)  
Michael Byrne (for the Grant Management Division)  
Harley Feldbaum (Policy Hub)  
Osamu Kunii (Strategy, Investment, and Impact Division)

#### *Resource person and observer*

Lee Abdelfadil (Technical Cooperation Hub)  
Nicolas Cantau (Eastern Europe and Central Asia)  
Emmanuele Capobianco (Policy Hub)  
Mehran Hosseini (Strategic Information)  
Johannes Hunger (Strategic Information)  
Michael Johnson (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)  
Ilana Kirsztajn (Policy Hub)  
Viviana Mangiaterra (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)  
Igor Oliynyk (Technical Cooperation Hub)  
George Shakarishvili (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)  
Estifanos Shargie (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)  
Rebecca Solow (Sourcing)



Aditi Srinivasan (Policy Hub)  
Kate Thomson (Community Rights and Gender)  
Alex Winch (Policy Hub)  
Nathalie Zorzi (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)

*TERG Support team*  
Ryuichi Komatsu  
John Puvimanasinghe  
Jutta Hornig  
Eriko Maruyama