

27TH TERG MEETING: OUTCOMES

Date	1-3 September 2015
Venue	The Global Fund, and off-site retreat at Salève, Geneva, Switzerland
Chair	Mickey Chopra
Vice-Chairs	Viroj Tangcharoensathien, Bess Miller

Objectives of the 27th TERG Meeting

1. Discuss and finalize the strategic review and other reviews and TERG papers
2. Provide guidance on on-going reviews
3. Develop the TERG work plan for 2016 including self-assessment and identification of priority areas.

Day 1

Session 1: Ongoing Reviews

Chair: Mickey Chopra

Breakout session (1)

Chair: Viroj Tangcharoensathien

- **HSS**

Discussant: Wuleta Lemma

Consultant Michele Gross presented the HSS thematic review, the objectives, its methodology and limitations. The findings and conclusions were presented under four thematic areas agreed with TERG: 1) coordination, alignment and harmonization; 2) technical assistance (TA) and support; 3) funding mechanisms; and 4) monitoring, evaluation and use of data.

Findings on coordination, alignment and harmonization were supported with examples from Sudan and Vietnam. The harmonized concept note in Sudan was facilitated by strong leadership and coordination efforts, although time-consuming. Overall conclusions identified the need for clear national vision and flexibility in coordinating process and requirements. The HSS grant application process can catalyse health system reform as seen in Kazakhstan. Second, TA models showed wide variations and were of varying quality. The consultant discussed Kazakhstan, Nigeria and Mozambique examples. There appeared to be a lack of systematic mechanisms for TA provision while well-coordinated TA was a powerful catalyst for successful HSS investments. Third, pooled funding mechanisms in DRC showed good potential, while matching funds tying payments to performance in Benin was beneficial. Lastly, findings on M&E indicated the importance of the government's role in harmonisation of M&E of HSS programs while the concept note development process was identified as an early entry point. The consultant then listed a number of short-term and medium-term recommendations.

The TERG then presented their reflections on the HSS Thematic Review with a view to developing a position paper. Confusions on the ground due to a lack of coordination and the importance of capacity building in-country were stressed. The review did not mention capacity building sufficiently, which is important to boost HSS intervention. A dashboard to describe the status of the six HSS components may be needed. The TERG discussed which components the Global Fund should focus on. The TERG highlighted HSS is the key in achieving health-related SDGs. The TERG discussed how the recommendations should be packaged, and agreed to work on the TERG position paper in later sessions, based on these discussions.

- **Market Shaping Strategy**

Discussant: Salil Panakadan

Consultant Leif-Erik Stabell presented the final report on market shaping. The topics of the presentation were: objectives and methodology, key evaluation questions, findings on LLINs,

ARVs, paediatric ARVs, ACTs, AMFm and other products. Additionally, comments received from PRs, partner organizations and suppliers were highlighted.

The TERG appreciated the excellent work, noting that sustainability and innovation perhaps cannot be fully developed at this time and there is a difference in understanding between the methods of calculating savings by the Global Fund sourcing department and the authors of the review. The TERG shared agreement on the recommendations suggested by the consultant, except on the recommendation for changing the procurement structure. TERG members queried as to whether changing the structure had a cost-benefit to the Global Fund and whether there was a conflict of interest between the recommendation for having Global Fund procurement versus an e-market place. The members stressed that the study requires a formal response from the Global Fund management. More technical questions were posed by TERG on savings, suppliers, losses in procurement, alignment with PEPFAR and other partners to maximize gains, the link between HSS and market shaping, and the lack of link between this topic, HSS and sustainability. The TERG further highlighted the sustainability of the ACT market and the distortion of the market by AMFm; the undermining of country ownership due to pooled procurement; and the role of the e-marketplace.

- **Sustainability**

Discussant: Peter Hansen

In the absence of the consultants who authored the report, TERG member Peter Hansen presented the Thematic Review on Sustainability. He acknowledged the work that had been initiated by the Secretariat and discussed the relevance and usefulness of the report and of the TERG position paper on sustainability. He suggested that the Secretariat should build on this work to identify drivers of transition and sustainability and take concrete steps based on the report's findings and recommendations.

In the discussion, the TERG stressed the need for involving the Ministries of Finance in sustainability discussions while expressing concerns about mixing transition and sustainability. Other comments included: the need to communicate at high political levels on decreasing levels of global funding and national responsibility; the need to identify early program elements that can be sequentially transitioned; and an analysis of the availability of preventive and community services that had been transitioned. The members suggested incorporating relevant recommendations from the thematic review on the market shaping into the sustainability recommendations. There was also general agreement that the focus should be put on the comparative advantages of the Global Fund. Finally it was suggested to summarise the report and the discussion into a TERG position paper on sustainability.

Breakout Session (2)

Chair: Bess Miller

- **Strategic Review 2015**

Discussant: Jim Tulloch

Paul Balogun, the consultant, presented the progress of the Strategic Review 2015 and reported that factual errors were corrected, based on the comments from the Secretariat and the TERG. The TERG congratulated on their efforts and showed appreciation for the interactive works between the consultant, the TERG and the Secretariat. The consultant raised the issue and sought advice from the TERG members on the confidentiality of the evidence presented in the reports. Since most of this review is based on secondary data and information provided by the Secretariat, some of them are confidential in nature. Evidence needs to be shown in order to justify arguments made in the report but it can be difficult to include evidence based on confidential materials in the report. The consultant team tried to avoid direct specification of sources as much as possible. While the TERG understand the sensitivity

among the Secretariat, they favour the transparency of this report over the confidentiality of this type of information; one option may be to decide not to put the annex in the public domain.

The TERG requested the consultant to strengthen the argument on the partnership issue at the county level, rather than between international organisations, and to bring it forward in the report. It was also discussed that the TERG needs to highlight the operationalisation and to clearly state the definition of “differentiation” and how the Secretariat should do it. The members decided to discuss on Day 3 how to align this Strategic Review and other thematic reviews in order to make sure there is consistency and coherence in the TERG’s position. Lastly, the consultant encouraged the TERG to design any future Strategic Review with a more explicit theory driven approach, and to clarify this intention on the use of the report in the RFP.

- **Quality Assurance Mechanisms in Funding Access**

Discussant: Anna Thorson

Paul Balogun next presented on the progress of the review on mechanisms for review and decision-making of concept notes in the funding model. This work aims to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the technical quality assurance mechanisms of the funding access process. The preliminary finding confirmed that there seemed to be an overlap between the function of the TRP and the Country Teams, in terms of the technical support. It was pointed out that Country Teams tend to intervene in the development of the concept notes possibly to an excess, which may conflict with the role of the TRP; on the other hand the TRP has limited contact and in some cases limited understanding of the local context. The consultant also shared concerns on the methods of study concerning cost effectiveness, as there are few corresponding comparative mechanism in other organisations. The TERG advised him to utilise experience and lessons from other organisations, rather than seeking quantitative benchmarking, in order to understand organisational issues. The TERG supported the proposed approach overall and expressed great expectation for this review.

- **Evolution of NSP**

Discussant: Jeanine Condo

Ryuichi Komatsu, from the TERG Support Team, presented the key issues and challenges of National Strategic Plans (NSPs) in the Global Fund’s application. The members shared the concerns on the 3 issues; budget, timing and the coordination mechanism. If a country has a technically sound NSP with realistic budget, the Concept Notes may not be needed. One bottleneck would be budgets across various donors and partners for multiple years, including disease specific ones and general administrative costs. This will require further coordination among donors. Secondly, since disease and health sector strategies may have different timing, it may be difficult to consolidate programmes and integrate into a single NSP. It was also pointed out that an NSP is more for technical strategies and parameters but is not necessarily for direct implementation. One challenge is how to update NSPs to incorporate lessons learnt from implementation without having to rewrite them. Some countries have an integrated approach for the entire health sector, whereas in others this is less developed. Therefore, it was noted that we may need a differentiated approach for each country. The members shared the sense that the further discussion is needed on how the Global Fund should incentivise the development of robust NSPs. The Global Fund should facilitate the adaptation and use of existing tools, such as JANS to assess the quality of NSPs.

- **Effect of the Allocation Methodology**

Discussant: Jim Tulloch

Robert Greener, the consultant, presented preliminary findings of the thematic review on the effects of allocation methodology. The findings revealed that the funding model and the

current allocation has improved the predictability of funding, whereas the problem of the complexity still remained. The Minimum Required Level (MRL) had the largest reallocation effects after the application of the formula, which leaves the problem of some continued inequity. In order to address this issue, the consultants will seek other options such as the contents of the programme. He commented that the process was at an early stage, characterising the transition to the NFM, and no position has been taken so far. Nonetheless, the TERG members appreciated the excellent work, especially the aggregated stories of each country. The TERG requested the consultant to consider the Equitable Access Initiative and to incorporate sustainability and HSS perspectives, e.g., how governments respond to the reduction in the funding. The TERG agreed to present preliminary findings in the SIIC meeting in October.

Session 2: Secretariat updates and potential areas for TERG engagement

Chair: Bess Miller

Programme Reviews

Estifanos Shargie, from the Secretariat, made a presentation on program reviews, covering historical backgrounds, lessons from analysis of past program reviews, challenges and proposed mitigation measures, joint partner initiated evaluations, and quality of services-focused evaluation of community health care services. It was mentioned that the roles and responsibilities of partners need to be clearer in order to take the programme review further. The importance of the institutionalisation of programme reviews into the development of the National Strategic Plans (NSP) was emphasised. The TERG members agreed on this and reiterated the necessity to use robust NSP as basis for Global Fund funding. Overall, the members appreciated the progress. They raised the challenge of how the Global Fund can leverage to better implement programme reviews. The limited capacity at the country level is the key challenge because the importance of the data is not well understood. There is a gap in the recognition between the local and the international community, hence the TERG requested the team to take a look at the lessons from Uganda to develop a strategy to solve this issue.

Saman Zamani from the Uganda Country Team presented on the progress of impact assessment in Uganda, which was supported by the TERG. The Global Fund supported the review of the NSP and of the comprehensive condom programming. This was part of a broader assessment of condom programming and analysis of HIV prevention in Uganda. Main recommendations focused on: engaging political, cultural and religious leaders; customising HIV prevention services; strengthening prevention among key populations and young people; and ensuring that there is an alignment between budgeted and spent resources. The TERG recommended to start linking the outcomes of the programme reviews into the concept note development in order to make the recommendations accountable and implementable. The TERG considered that the programme review is important, and it has been proposed to have a session on this topic in the next TERG meeting to review the objectives of the programme reviews with regard to the new directions of the Global Fund.

Data systems

Bertha Simwaka updated the TERG on progress of the Global Fund's investment in data systems in Zimbabwe. The strategic investment for data initiated by the TERG invested US\$2.7 million into the scale up of the District Health Information Software (DHIS) and the integration of the information systems. The TERG appreciated to see significant improvement of DHIS. However, they also expressed concerns on the stagnated expansion of the DHIS. They suggested two points to enhance the availability and sustainability of the system: the capacity building in the local health facilities; and further strengthening the engagement and

coordination with other organisations, for example, by doing collaborative facility assessment. The TERG also encouraged the team to check the review of 2009-2014 TB surveys done by the Gates Foundation in order to link with the Global Fund's activities. In the end, the TERG agreed on the common understanding that the TERG should continue to play a key role to strengthen the data quality to measure impact.

Break out Session (1)

Chair: Bess Miller

- **Results Based Financing (RBF)**

Harinder Janjua and Matias Gomez from the Secretariat presented an update on results-based financing (RBF). Since 2013, the Global Fund has been exploring the possibility of using RBF. Potential benefits are faster impacts and value for money and efficiency, as well as countries that are more prepared for self-sufficiency. In late 2014, the process of systematizing the approach to RBF began with broad-based internal and external engagement (i.e., CHAI, Gates Foundation and the Centre for Global Development). An RBF framework is targeted for rollout in 2017, with several pilots currently underway (in Rwanda, Benin, EMMIE and Solomon Islands). There is an evaluation process for the pilots and lessons have already been learned from the EMMIE pilot. The presenters also discussed future steps.

A questions and discussion session was held following the presentation. TERG inquired as to the reasons for interest by countries in RBF. Presenters clarified that through RBF, countries are able to tap into more funds and they have greater autonomy in deciding on how to manage them. Discussions on level of evaluation of these pilots and the design of the evaluations in general took place. It was noted by the presenters that these are still at a very early stage. The TERG urged to keep in mind that who the grants are going to could make a big difference and to look for lessons and learning that is already available from other partners.

- **Technical Cooperation/Partnership**

Igor Oliynyk from the Secretariat presented an update on technical cooperation and partnership. Around 87 concept notes have received support through the agreement for funding of joint activities where gaps exist. Negotiations are on-going with partners (mainly WHO) to extend this agreement, due to country slippage and need for further funding into the first months of 2016. He stressed that TERG's ideas on the agreement and partnerships would be highly appreciated, and concluded that technical assistance has come a long way, even when conducted at the "last minute".

A discussion session was held following the presentation. TERG inquired what its role is or what it can be in regards to evaluation of these projects. The Technical Cooperation Hub is open and would like to work with the TERG from the very beginning on an evaluation, starting with the TORs. TERG member stated that the Board's expectations from this should be considered.

Break out Session (2)

Chair: Viroj Tangcharoensathien

- **HSS and RMNCAH**

Viviana Mangiaterra from the Secretariat presented the new strategy, overview of the HSS/RMNCAH, and the new opportunities for collaboration with the TERG on this topic. She emphasised that there is a gradual shift from HSS to the "Resilient and sustainable system for health (RSSH)" in order to address more the needs of local communities. The TERG acknowledged that there should be stronger focus on this issue, and noted that the definition of "HSS" should be clarified. She also pointed out that only 8.6% of the total allocation in

windows 1 to 4 in the funding application process was disbursed for the RMNCH-focused activities. Therefore, it was requested for the TERG to facilitate more evaluation work in order to support the HSS investment by evidence. Although the difficulty to assess the impact of HSS interventions is understandable, this is useful and necessary, and could perhaps be achieved by utilising more epidemiological data. A question was raised on a significant imbalance between the building blocks in the HSS grant making. While HMIS and M&E occupies 58% of the funds, the figure for the service delivery is only 2% and for policy/governance a mere 1%. The TERG agreed that the team needed to guide countries to strengthen gaps in HSS. As the TERG was keen to see the new HSS strategy under development, the TERG support team would share it with the members.

- **Human Rights and Gender**

Motoko Seko from the Secretariat updated the TERG on the progress of the reviews conducted in 2014-2015 and shared a list of 4 reviews planned for the next year: portfolio analysis on community responses; effect of Global Fund transitioning on programmes targeting key and vulnerable populations; and external evaluation of the CRG special initiatives. The TERG members expressed their concerns about the ongoing/planned evaluations beyond the TERG's oversight, the need for quality assurance and the risk of conclusions conflicting with the TERG's position. Hence, the members showed their willingness to support these reviews, and the Division expressed appreciation and enthusiasm to collaborate with the TERG. It was also discussed that there was a lack of age/sex disaggregated data at the national level, even though they do exist at the facility level. The TERG members considered there is a coordination and communication issue and there was a general sense on the need to investigate this issue and take stock.

Management Response on GLC

Eliud Wandwalo, from the Secretariat, presented the outcome and key changes brought by the Green Light Committee (GLC) agreement. He highlighted the recommendations made by the independent reviewers, focusing on 3 possible scenarios: to modify the GLC agreement; to continue with the current agreement; and to discontinue GLC support. He reported that the importance and usefulness of the review in reaching an decision to revise the GLC agreement and extend its term till December 2016. The TERG members discussed the question whether the GLC mechanism is still needed or not. Nonetheless, the TERG appreciated the update.

Day 2

Retreat on TERG business matters

Chair: Mickey Chopra

The Chair suggested the agenda of the day and the members agreed as following; review of the current TOR and SOP, the election of the new Chair, discussion on the work plan and the budget in 2016, discussion on HSS and differentiation in the morning and self-assessment in the afternoon.

Review of the current TOR and SOP and the selection of the new Chair

As the amendment of TOR and SOP was related to the selection of the new Chair, the TERG Chair designated the SIIC focal person to the TERG and the Secretariat focal person as co-Chairs for the session and the members agreed on this. The members decided to add the "time availability" to the selection criteria in the TOR. The length of the duty as the Chair and Vice-Chair was also discussed. After careful consideration of advantages and disadvantages of options of the period of service as the Chair and Vice-Chair, it was decided to keep the current statement, which indicates that the members shall serve for a period of three years, and be

eligible to service not more than two consecutive terms or six years. It was commonly understood that the same rule would be applied to the Chair and Vice-Chair, meaning that they will serve to the end of their terms as a member of the TERG. In addition, the consensus was achieved that the appointment of the Chair will be automatically renewed if he/she is renewed as a member for the second. This will be specified in the SOP. The TERG support team will revise the SOP and the members of the TERG will endorse it.

After having made the consensus on TOR and SOP, the discussion was moved to the selection of the new Chair. Jim Tulloch nominated himself, as he would have available time. Other members of the TERG supported him and appreciated for his voluntary nomination. The session co-Chair Jan proposed to vote and 7 voting members (all current voting members except Jim himself and Don De Savigny in absence) thereby officially appointed Jim as the new Chair. It was clarified that Mickey Chopra would continue his responsibility as Chair until the next SIIC meeting in October. The new chair appreciated supports from the members. Bess Miller and Viroj Tangcharoensathien were re-confirmed as Vice-Chairs.

The Work Plan and the Budget in 2016

Sam Kunii, the Secretariat focal person to the TERG, presented the draft 2017-2021 Strategy framework currently under development. The draft of the Strategic Objectives was also share with the TERG to give sense to the TERG's work plan. The SIIC focal point to TERG shared some estimation of the maximum budget of next year, which will be a decrease compared to the previous years. The TERG discussed priorities and level of budgets, and agreed on a work plan proposal.

An update from Day 1 triggered an active debate on the systematisation of the internal evaluations conducted by the Secretariat. The TERG shared a concern about this issue, as the current situation may undermine the quality and the coordination of the evaluation work in the Global Fund. The TERG discussed a potential necessity to establish a new mechanism for coordination of the internal and external evaluations and decided to raise this issue to the Executive Director on Day 3.

It was also discussed how the TERG will be involved in the quality assurance of the programme reviews. The members argued whether the TERG needed to act as a guardian of the data quality and data collection. There was a general agreement on adding this point in the possible topic for the next year evaluation works.

Self-Assessment and peer review

Chair: Viroj Tangcharoensathien

As recommended by the OIG review of the TERG, the TERG decided to conduct the TERG self-assessment and peer review during the 4th quarter 2015/1st quarter 2016. The members decided to include the following documents, developed during 2014/2015, as part of the peer review of the TERG's work: the Strategic Review 2015; the thematic reviews on HSS; sustainability; fragile states (COEs); market-shaping; the effect of the allocation methodology; and the guidance for plausibility impact assessments. This assessment will aim to identify the gaps between the respective TORs and the actual deliverables, for the improvement in the future and to judge the usefulness of the TERG products. It was requested to incorporate quantitative evidence, where possible. The TERG Support Team was requested to develop a questionnaire and methodology and share with the TERG for approval. The final TERG self-assessment report will be shared with the SIIC, possible also the Board, and the Secretariat. It was also decided that, as a best practice, the TERG will provide all consultants with review forms at the end of their assignments.

Day 3

Working Session

Chair: Mickey Chopra

Mickey Chopra opened the session with the summary of the two days and shared the agenda of the day: finalisation of the TERG position paper on sustainability, HSS, and market shaping and the TERG's work plan in 2016.

The Chair briefly mentioned the history of the TERG's evaluation work, for reference of the next year's work plan. Although the first Five-year Evaluation of the Global Fund had brought insightful lessons, it was not well reflected in the work of the Secretariat and countries as expected. This lesson changed the approaches of the TERG to the evaluation work. First, it made the TERG shift to focus on the notion of "Five years of evaluation" from "a Five Year Evaluation", and to develop country evaluation capacities and country-level evidence following national cycles, to generate more practical recommendations and learning. Second, the TERG decided to invest in the data and information systems in the countries, with a Special Initiative approved by the Board, in order to facilitate the plausibility impact assessment, which made a significant improvement in the information system as well as building capacity in countries. It was also noted that the TERG needs to keep an optimal distance from the Secretariat in order to provide independent evaluation but at the same time support ongoing implementation. The Chair reaffirmed that the TERG has been promoting programme reviews well, and the members shared the consensus that the TERG should continue the support for programme reviews and their utilisation, with the ownership of the countries and coordination with partners. It was also agreed that the TERG website should be more open to the public.

The TERG discussed whether the Strategic Review 2015 was satisfactory to deliver as the TERG's position to the SIIC and the Board. The TERG acknowledged the overall quality of the Review, but there was a general concern on the lack of the clarity in the recommendations. In addition, there was a consensus that "differentiation" needs clarification and possibly definition. The TERG decided to add further edits on the synthesis report. The TERG also agreed to submit the ongoing thematic reviews and TERG position papers along with Strategic Review 2015 findings, and various on-going work, to the SIIC. The preliminary finding of the review on the effect of the allocation methodology will also be presented. Then, the TERG members were split into smaller groups in order to work on these tasks and assigned lead members: Wuleta Lemma for HSS; Peter Hansen for sustainability; Viroj Tangcharoensathien for market shaping; Jan Paehler for the differentiation; and Jim Tulloch the recommendations of the synthesis report.

The Work Plan in 2016

Chair: Mickey Chopra

The Chair led a discussion on the work plan for the next year. From the list of the potential items prepared by the TERG Support Team and the discussions in previous sessions, the TERG decided to propose thematic reviews on the following topics, with lead focal people:

- Review of investments in data quality, information systems and data platforms: Wuleta Lemma
- Global Fund's Emergency Fund: Bess Miller
- Role of civil society in countries transitioning from Global Fund support: Viroj Tangcharoensathien
- Global Fund's Regional Grants: Jim Tulloch
- Gender and adolescents related policy: Anna Thorson

It was noted that the timing of each review is important, in order to timely reflect them into the new strategy. The TERG Support Team will draft TORs in consultation for these reviews by the next TERG meeting, advancing some of the reviews with focal person. It was also discussed whether TERG should investigate the internal evaluations by the Secretariat, and it was decided to ask the opinion of the Executive Director in a later session.

Data System

Nathalie Zorzi from the Secretariat presented findings on the residual funding gap for M&E systems. A preliminary estimation showed there would be \$153 million funding gaps between 2015 and 2017 to measure impact in priority countries. It was emphasised that the efforts are needed in the following areas to address these unfunded needs: further harmonisation of the data collection and data use; introduction of new technologies; funding arrangement with other partners; and strengthened partnership to reorganise M&E resources in country. She sought advice from the TERG on the approach to this issue.

Jinkou Zhao from the Secretariat also presented estimated funding needs for M&E systems between 2018 and 2020. According to the estimation, there will be \$500 million demand for M&E systems for High Impact and TERG focus countries. He proposed to use District Health Planning and Reporting Tool (DiHPART) to re-allocate resources and to effectively address the needs at the district levels. He also asked guidance from the TERG on the differentiated approach and the next steps for a special initiative for country data systems. The TERG pointed out the inefficient use of money in the country and advised to work closer with the partners. It was also suggested to encourage the country to use the data system and to help them find interest in the system, by linking with the Concept Notes.

Hannah Grant from the Secretariat gave an update on the modelling exercise, including: resource scenarios for needs assessment; strategic investments and priorities. First results are expected within the next few days and will be summarized at the SIIC meeting.

The TERG requested the Secretariat to provide more details and analysis of their plans and also to present an update of previous investments into country data systems through Special Initiatives. The TERG queried as to why the required funds could not be secured through existing grant funds. There was no endorsement by the TERG on any further funding through the Special Initiatives.

Conclusions and Next Steps

Chair: Mickey Chopra

- **Market Shaping**

The TERG discussed the thematic review on the market shaping, whether to finalise the work. The members acknowledged that its findings and recommendations were clear, but its signed was suspended as it was considered that the recommendation regarding the restructuring of the procurement structure in the Global Fund was questionable. The TERG will require a management response on this issue and decide the next move.

- **The Next TERG Meeting**

It was decided to hold the next TERG meeting in Geneva, from 2nd to 4th February, ahead of the SIIC meeting, which is scheduled between 23rd and 25th. The members also discussed the possibility of the different venue in the future.

- **Plenary Discussion with Mark Dybul**

The TERG welcomed Mark Dybul, the Executive Director of the Global Fund, and the Chair updated the outcome of this three-day meeting to him. The TERG concluded that the new strategy has been on the right track, but informed that the challenge would be the prioritisation within the strategies and issues around the sustainability. The TERG also highlighted five points to be noted. Firstly, it is necessary to have clear definition on the “differentiation”, and the TERG attempted to define it and figure out how to measure it. Second, the discussion on HSS should be shifted from “what” to “how”. Thirdly, the TERG will emphasize the recommendations on sustainability from the Strategic Review and the thematic review. Fourth, the market shaping should bring in PSA function and support eMarket place. Lastly, the ongoing thematic review on the allocation methodology was mentioned and it was reaffirmed that the TERG will continue to provide recommendations to the Secretariat.

The Chair also outlined that the TERG will prioritise the information system and programme reviews and conduct five thematic reviews next year. He posed the question on internal evaluations by the Secretariat beyond the TERG’s management and asked the Executive Director’s thought on this.

Mark Dybul expressed his appreciation for the TERG’s outstanding work and excellent working relationship with the Secretariat. Regarding the question raised by the Chair, he agreed that there was no integrated and systematic approach to internal evaluation. However, he mentioned two initiatives relevant to this matter: a new position in the Executive Director’s Office to regularly monitor projects and evaluations and report to the Executive Director and the Chief of Staff; and a mechanism for the quality assurance of project management. He also mentioned that the Human Resource Department was aiming to enhance the project management skills of the staffs. He emphasised that the TERG is absolutely necessary to provide more deep and cross-cutting evaluations to the Secretariat. On the transitioning issue, he noted that the Global Fund is working with the World Bank to ensure programmatic and financial sustainability, stressing now is the time for accelerating this issue with partners. He also mentioned thoughts under development on the different incentive funding and regional grants, and requested guidance from the TERG.

The Chair expressed appreciation to the Executive Director and closed the meeting thanking all the participants for the great engagement during the three days.

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
Peter Hansen
Osamu Kunii
Wuleta Lemma
Bernard Nahlen
Jan Paehler
Salil Panakadan
Anna Thorson
Jim Tulloch

II. Resource persons

Paul Balogun (Itad)
Michele Gross (Euro Health Group)
Leif-Erik Stabell (Euro Health Group)
Tama Gotsadze (Curatio international Foundation, by telephone)
Robert Greener (Oxford Policy Management)

III. Partners

WHO focal points

IV. The Global Fund

Mark Dybul (Executive Director)

Secretariat Working Group on Evaluation

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

Resource person and observer

Robert Brinckman (Access to Funding)
Matias Gomez (Grant Management Division)
Hannah Grant (Strategic Information)
Harinder Janjua (Policy Hub)
Ralf Jurgens (Community Rights and Gender)
Himanshu Kateja (Access to Funding)
Viviana Mangiaterra (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)
Igor Oliynyk (Technical Cooperation Hub)
Motoko Seko (Community Rights and Gender)
George Shakarishvili (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)
Estifanos Shargie (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)
Bertha Simwaka (Grant Management Division)
Rebecca Solow (Sourcing)
Aditi Srinivasan (Policy Hub)
Mohammed Yassin (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)
Nathalie Zorzi (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)
Jinkou Zhao (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)
Saman Zamani (Grant Management Division)

Eliud Wandwalo (Technical Advisory and Partnerships)

TERG Support team

Ryuichi Komatsu

John Puvimanasinghe

Jutta Hornig

Seda Kojoyan

Eriko Maruyama