

28TH TERG MEETING REPORT

Date	2-4 February 2016
Venue	The Global Fund
Chair	Jim Tulloch
Vice-Chairs	Viroj Tangcharoensathien, Bess Miller

Main objectives of the 28th TERG Meeting

1. To finalize the on-going thematic reviews and TERG position papers and to develop the new thematic reviews and other items for 2016 work plan;
2. To discuss TERG self-assessment and consider how to improve the TERG.

Day 1

Opening Session

Chair: Jim Tulloch

The Chair gave welcome remarks, along with the Chief of Staff Marijke Wijnroks, who emphasized value and importance of the SR2015 and other TERG guidance. The topics to be discussed are very important and the Secretariat is looking forward to the discussions.

- **New strategy framework**

Presenter: Harley Feldbaum

Harley Feldbaum, Head of Policy Hub, presented the Strategy Framework 2017-2022 and its four Strategic Objectives, noting that the TERG reviews, in particular the ones on Fragile States and Transition and Sustainability, have been vital.

The TERG emphasized the importance of domestic funding opportunities, increased fiscal space for health, and quality data systems. The TERG plans to contribute to the evaluation of the Strategy Framework 2017-2022 through, e.g., independent strategic reviews, thematic reviews and support to Secretariat program reviews.

Session 1

Chair: Viroj Tangcharoensathien

Finalize the on-going thematic reviews

- **Review on the effect of the allocation methodology**

The slides by the Oxford Policy Management, who could not join, was shown by Hannah Grant, Manager Allocation Model. The review focused on a careful examination of the allocation methodology and of the impact of allocation steps, and provided many recommendations, e.g., abolish country bands; base the ability-to-pay factor upon general government expenditure per capita, rather than gross national income per capita; and simplify the overall model.

- **Secretariat update on allocation**

Presenter: Hannah Grant

Hannah Grant continued to update the TERG on an overview of the proposed revision of the allocation model and the current approach and work conducted on proposing holistic refinements (to be presented at the 17th SIIC and 35th Board meetings).

The TERG review on allocation model provided key inputs to refinements to the allocation model. The TERG review will feed into SIIC and Board discussions; the team will update the TERG at its next meeting on SIIC and Board-determined refinements to allocation approach, and will prospectively identify aspects that could benefit from an active review.

TERG members posed several questions, including on testing the model and the quality of data used for this exercise. The TERG also inquired whether it could do anything more for the allocation model. TERG members also discussed with the Secretariat whether the impact of TERG's work on the current model could be better. The Secretariat mentioned it is very useful to be able to state TERG's recommendations to their constituencies. The TERG effort has been excellent, and decisions rest with the SIIC and the Board.

- **Secretariat update on differentiation**

Presenter: Silvio Martinelli

Silvio Martinelli, Head of Access to Funding department, updated the TERG on implemented and envisioned differentiation initiatives. Various initiatives have been put in place since 2015. Among them are light CCM eligibility screening, optimized TRP and GAC review processes, and differentiated funding application process (simplified or reprogramming applications for certain cases). TRP is supportive of a tailored review approach.

More ideas on differentiation and simplification are being explored for the next allocation period, some of which are in line with the recommendations of the TERG review. The ideas include country classification into focused, core and high impact categories; flexibilities for COEs and countries in transition; simplified approach for impactful programs with no or minor changes; making concept note sections optional if addressed in National Strategic Plans (NSP); single concept note for all components (starting with HSS); and others. The 2016 work plan on differentiation include: A2F operational policies, TORs for TRP/GAC review modalities, application materials, data systems, communication and training material, and allocation, where the TERG report will play a significant role.

TERG members posed questions, which were clarified. Categorization is made mostly on context-basis (i.e. COEs, transitioning..), by country, not disease components, as operationally it would be difficult to differentiate on these basis. It was discussed if the Global Fund should play a role in ensuring the costing elements of NSP during the NSP development, but in some countries Global Fund investment may be so small to be influential or insist NSPs. Another challenge is validating whether or not NSP is robust and who should validate. In conclusion, Chair of this session noted with satisfaction good progress on differentiation.

- **Review and decision making process in funding access**

Presenter: Paul Balogun

Representing Itad-EHG, Paul Balogun briefly presented the review of the present review and decision making processes in funding access. It concluded that it is an effective process for evidence-based financing, which is the TRP's current task. Costed, technically qualified plans are the result, and efficient as compared to other organizations. Weaknesses of the approach are the high transaction cost to the Secretariat, TRP, countries themselves, as well as potentially perverse incentives to spend money quickly. The main recommendation of the review is to institute a system in which oversight remains, but to work out when exactly to conduct that process in cases where contexts would not change in the next couple of years.

During the discussion, TERG members wondered how review's recommendations could be carried out, given the purpose of the TRP, as stipulated in the framework document. The organization might need to turn to its legal department. A detailed discussion on the NSP took place: whether is it challenging to see if all which needs to be covered in concept note is covered in a NSP. There are two views on this: either NSP is inadequate or the Global Fund demands are too detail (especially in cases where contribution in comparison is small).

In conclusion, the session Chair noted the progress made on simplification, strengthening NSPs and other efforts. Moreover, TERG believes TRP is performing its due diligence. All of these processes are meant to empower the country, and should strengthen the NSP.

Self-assessment and peer review**• Reflection and discussion on strategic direction Presenter: Werasit Sittitrai**

For the self-assessment and peer review exercise, a team of three consultants had reviewed TERG's previous thematic reviews and Strategic Review 2015, and had conducted surveys and interviews with TERG members, Secretariat leadership and partners. The lead consultant, Werasit Sittitrai, presented the results to the TERG, which had been mostly positive: TERG's work and its engagement, including the thematic reviews and Strategic Review 2015, have been judged to be of very good quality. To build upon the strengths, and to address some gaps which were identified, the lead consultant suggested 8 recommendations. These are:

1. Develop TERG's long-term roadmap to support the Global Fund Strategy 2017-2022.
2. The TERG should have more emphasis on country-relevant and country-focused deliverables.
3. Improve process of development and review of the TERG's own deliverables.
4. Actively review and advise on the Secretariat's evaluation function.
5. Ensure management responses from the Secretariat on all TERG's recommendations and seriously track and report on the implementation of recommendations.
6. Strengthen "positive relationship" and active engagement with the Secretariat in TERG's functions and enhance implementation of TERG's recommendations.
7. Improve the TORs of the TERG and the TERG SOPs and SOPs for the Secretariat.
8. Increase the capacity of the TERG especially the number and expertise of TERG members, as well as the capacity of the TERG Support Team.

The TERG discussed these recommendation. On recommendation 1, once the M&E component of the strategy is developed, the TERG can see the TERG responsibilities for 2017-2022. Program quality has also emerged as a priority from discussions with the Secretariat leadership. The TERG endorsed the recommendations 1 and 2 and found they can merge. On recommendation 3, an improvement would be to not have variability in quality of the deliverables, and can be tied to recommendation 6. On recommendation 4, the Secretariat leadership suggested speaking to the particular individuals and returning to this item by the next TERG meeting. So this item could be put on hold. Recommendation 5 implies knowing and owning TERG products deeply, and then following up. On recommendation 6, members felt that more intimate knowledge of the Secretariat would be helpful, including functions. There has been a close relationship and should be continued in this manner.

Recommendation 7 probably were considered as beneficial, but need to be approved either at next SIIC meeting, or subsequent committee meeting. Action on recommendation 8 would also have to be approved by the SIIC, as it has budgetary implications. The TERG discussed other approaches for increased engagement: 3 meetings a year, teleconferences, etc.

TERG members discussed its learning function. One way is as "lessons learned," which can include both TERG learning and conveying that learning. One idea is to have a workshop with the Secretariat following every TERG product, and to facilitate learning. The independent consultant expressed his appreciation for the discussion and agreed to revise some of the order and content of the recommendations, and merged recommendations 1 and 2 together

following the TERG's discussion. The Chair concluded that, during this TERG meeting, it would be best to focus on the 2017-2022 plans. It was decided to discuss concrete actions on this topic on Day 2 of TERG meeting.

Day 2

Review of day 1

The TERG Chair shared key points from previous day's content on TERG's future work:

- More forward-looking evaluation for the new strategy, in order to equip the Board to have more effective evaluation (more data and clearer structure early on);
- Focus on what needs to be put in place over the next several years to ensure the data is available (mid-strategy, end of strategy and impact assessment);
- Thematic reviews at the right time in 2017-2022 implies a multi-year plan (some likely areas: differentiation of access to funding programs; assessment of gender-focused efforts, longer-term transition processes, strategic use of potentially reduced funding);
- More engagement in data quality, and closer involvement in MECA efforts;
- Improve quality and consistency of TERG products (greater involvement of TERG members throughout the whole process - including increased focal point involvement in the position paper, workshop of the results, follow up on the recommendations);
- Look proactively at other evaluation efforts (i.e. the GAVI evaluation, 3ie and others);
- Maintain the capacity of the TERG to respond quickly to new requests, be flexible;
- Aim for an in-principle agreement for a modest expansion of the TERG and TST.

While the TERG focused on wrapping up session 2 of day 1 (the self- and peer- assessment), Jan Paehler joined by the phone. Jan commented on, in particular, needs for an argument as to why the TERG and not the Secretariat should get more resources on evaluation. Consideration is needed for engagement from a voluntary advisory group. A joint evaluation with GAVI and others would be good to integrate into an existing program evaluation, rather than as standalone. TERG members discussed how the TERG's requests to the SIIC would be handled, given that the SIIC is transitioning. The TERG may need to present options: TERG either becomes more ambitious and thus expands, or keeps the current level of work.

Session 3: Develop new thematic reviews

Chair: Bess Miller

- **Secretariat update on sustainability and transition**

- **Presenter: Michael Borowitz**

- Michael Borowitz, Chief Health Economist, presented, among other updates, the draft Sustainability, Transition and Counterpart Financing Policy. The purpose is to set the criteria and processes to support countries as they transition along the development continuum to the point where they are no longer eligible for Global Fund support. Some new approaches include a standard transition grant after eligibility ends and possibly impact bonds. Additionally, in his opinion, future of CCMs would be the most useful topic for the TERG's proposed review.

During the discussion, it was noted that CCM may be too narrow of a focus, particularly for cases where transition starts early. Since many countries start transitioning processes, this could mean either waiting for about a year for the implementation of the new transition and sustainability policy, or doing the review right now. The value for a holistic approach (taking into account human rights, etc.) in a prospective evaluation was noted.

- **Regional and multi-country programs inception**

Presenters: David Wilkinson and Sanja Matovic

Consultants for this work, David Wilkinson and Sanja Matovic, shared with the TERG their initial ideas on the review. The main aim of the review is to gain systematic and critical evidence and lessons learned from regional/multi-country grants, and to further inform discussions within the Global Fund Secretariat and Board on future regional and multi-country grants. The final report is due in May. They shared issues for TERG's consideration and guidance: what needs to be prioritized; criteria for selection of grants to be reviewed; regional and country visits - criteria and feasibility, and other questions.

The TERG provided guidance to the consultants, including a suggestion to look at what is the benefit of regional grants vs. national ones, and on areas of implementation. Further, it seems the underlying assumption is that regional grants are a good idea. Consultants could start with this rationale and perform an assessment of whether it was justified.

- **Secretariat update on the Emergency Fund Presenter: Catherine Hernandez**

Catherine Hernandez, Manager for Operational Policy Support, presented the Emergency Fund, including the review and approval process for grants and the list of grants. The mechanism is quick and efficient, and feedback has been positive.

Breakout Sessions

1. TOR on transition

Discussant: Viroj Tangcharoensathien

The initial draft TOR was discussed and judged too narrow. The group agreed with the following two-step approach. First step would consist of:

- a) Brief review of previous TERG and Secretariat work to avoid duplication;
- b) Review of the Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing policy;
- c) Drawing lessons from other Global Health Initiatives transition experiences, e.g., GAVI, PEPFAR, family planning assistance by USAID in Latin America.

Second step would consist of case studies and retrospective learning on e.g.:

- a) Political and policy dynamics and role of different stakeholders in response to transition from the Global Fund;
- b) Source of financing for the three diseases, and whether the government budget can be used to contract non-state actors. Identify legal and administrative barriers to financing. Additionally, if the goal is that co-financing and government programs cover the key populations, which legal and administrative bottlenecks should be addressed during the pre- and actual transition period?
- c) Programmatic sustainability, especially coverage for the key populations;
- d) The emerging construct of the governance on resource allocation to the three diseases, role of non-state actors in the governance mechanisms;
- e) Enabling factors and barriers for successful vs. unsuccessful transition.

2. Emergency Fund

Discussant: Nigel Pearson

The consultant, Nigel Pearson, provided an update on the thematic review on the Global Fund's Emergency Fund (EF). The EF was proposed by the TERG thematic review on Challenging Operating Environments (COEs) to fill an unmet need. The review assessed the overall EF facility and the experience in the five grants implemented to date. The review identified the successful roll-out of the EF facility, the appreciation by partner agencies and those living with the disease, and the various ripple effects that resulted from the facility.

Some of the challenges identified included the delays in disbursement and implementation; inadequate verification of implementation; and inadequate emphasis on sustainability. Among the recommendations were: maintaining a 'light-touch' application process; promoting options for longer-term exit strategies, closer verification of results and a recommendation to expand the facility to USD 50 million for the period 2017-2019.

- **Plenary discussion on TORs on transition and the emergency fund**

The preliminary results of the thematic review on the Emergency Fund were shared. Overall the findings are very positive, and the recommendation is that the Emergency Fund does not need to be transformed, but rather have the capacity to grow and respond to new emergencies. In future, it would be also good to keep log of requests and decisions as well as better M&E and verification for further accountability. A Secretariat member noted the high value of the review and appreciated the TERG and its support team for fast tracking this.

The outcomes from discussion on transition were shared. Discussion focused on the current draft TOR, which may be too narrow, and it was agreed to broaden it. Taking into account the new proposed policy, the TERG supported a two-step process for conducting the review.

- **Secretariat update on gender work**

Presenter: Heather Doyle

Heather Doyle, Senior Technical Coordinator, the Community, Rights and Gender department (CRG), presented considerable achievements in advancing gender equality and addressing the needs of women and girls, but also key areas to improve policies and processes to realize the collective mission of ending the three epidemics. Women and Girls Project is one such initiative. 12-15 countries will be selected for scale-up of programs to address the increased risk to HIV and TB amongst adolescent girls and young women, including gender inequalities. Key potential inquiry questions were raised for the upcoming TERG thematic review.

TERG members discussed sources of data on this project – countries need to report sex disaggregated data. The Secretariat is developing corporate KPI on investment targeted at 15-24 year old girls. On the TERG thematic review, TERG member debated key outcomes from certain questions for the review. This review would be conducted in parallel to a review on key populations and there is an overlap in terms of data sources. With this review, the Secretariat team would like to know insight on the achievements of the gender equality strategy. The associated challenge is to understand what that means for individual countries.

- **Secretariat update on data system investment**

Presenter: Natalie Zorzi

Natalie Zorzi, Senior Manager, Monitoring, Evaluation and Country Analysis (MECA), presented the special initiative on data and M&E investment needs in the next cycle. The needs would be \$500M in priority countries but possible to fill, if harmonizing well with partners.

TERG members raised some issues and concerns, including how to identify top priorities to have the system functional (enabled routine monitoring on three diseases and HSS at country-level), and noted there may be a need for data audit and certain absent indicators (community involvement, private sector health facilities...). The session concluded that the TERG would need and welcome close interaction with MECA; including a joint retreat.

Breakout Sessions

1. **TOR on gender**

Discussant: Anna Thorson

The plan for a phased-approach and draft TOR for the gender review were presented by the TERG focal point Anna Thorson. The draft was developed in close collaboration with the CRG and Southern Africa teams, taking into account the internal assessment on gender.

The phased approach to the review was welcomed, in line with the current thinking for more prospective evaluations. Some opinions supported the focus on implementation, coverage and epidemiological impact of gender initiatives, rather than on process issues. The feasibility of directly measuring changes in incidence by the TERG was discussed. The TERG concluded that the draft TOR was a good starting point but needed to be further discussed. It was decided that the focal point, TST and Secretariat teams further discuss the TOR, taking into account the TERG's long-term evaluation approach, SAGE initiative and relevant partner evaluations. The updated scope and TOR will be finalized at the TERG meeting in June 2016.

2. TOR on data system investment

Discussant: Wuleta Lemma

The high level objectives were discussed. It was agreed that thematic issues such as gender, etc. as well as look into output, outcome, and impact were important, eventually feeding into Strategic Review. A challenge is how to bring the data available at facility to the national level.

Also, a draft TOR for the review on data system investment was discussed. The group agreed on the following steps:

1. The MECA team may conduct on its own the first part of the draft TOR, with consideration to the number and kinds of countries (e.g., core, transition and COE) and data sources (bilateral and other). The TERG continues advising where needed.
2. The second part of the draft TOR requires further understanding of the feasibility and implications. For example, cost implication could be serious. It will be important to develop an advanced draft TOR before the next TERG meeting.

Day 3

Review of day 2

Chair: Bess Miller

The progress on the day 2 was reviewed.

Session 4

Chair: Viroj Tangcharoensathien

Discuss other key areas

- **Update on “Projects and Business Development”** **Presenter: Adda Faye**
Adda Faye, Head of Projects and Business Development, presented this newly launched initiative, to enhance Global Fund's project management capacity and address weaknesses in interdependence and accountability. Ten key projects have been identified.

Following the presentation, the TERG discussed its role in regards to this initiative. The TERG has interest in nearly all of the 10 projects. While it is possible for the TERG to review if the initiative has improved project management in the organization, which is an internal function, the TERG considered it would add more value to look at specific areas (projects) and impact at the country level. Another suggestion was that the TERG could perform an independent review of one or a few of the projects, and this could be forwarded to the Board.

- **RBF pilots** **Presenter: Matias Gomez**
Matias Gomez, Senior Manager Operational Support, presented work conducted on results-based financing (RBF), which has now been known as “payment for results”. After a period of learning by doing, the Global Fund is now defining its strategic approach to paying for results and collecting lessons learned from various sources. It will also see if payment for results can add value (i.e. addressing KPs, supporting malaria elimination, supporting UHC, differentiation in COEs, support sustainability and transition via pre-financing).

The discussion between the TERG and members of the Secretariat focused on possibility of rigorous and independent evaluation for the RBF initiative. The Chair concluded that it appears rigorous evaluation of the initiative is critical and it should be conducted earlier rather than later, due to the involved complexity. The TERG would discuss with the SIIC and Board if there should be an independent evaluation.

- **Technical cooperation**

The session was cancelled due to the unavailability of the presenter.

- **Program review and HSS impact guidance Presenters: Nathalie Zorzi and Viviana Mangiaterra**

Jointly, Nathalie Zorzi, Senior Manager, MECA, and Viviana Mangiaterra, Senior Technical Coordinator, MNCH and HSS, made a presentation on program review, evaluation and impact assessment, including the HSS tool for program reviews and lessons learned. The evaluation agenda is built around program reviews, with on-going effort to institutionalize program reviews and impact assessments in countries. The team analyzed NSPs and M&E plans and saw positive results. Additionally, all priority countries carried out program reviews for at least one disease. The presenters also shared 2016-2017 plans on these topics.

Needs for one day retreat on evaluation and impact assessment were raised. Due to time constraints, the TERG decided to continue internal discussion on this later in the day. Regarding program reviews, TERG members felt there is limited scrutiny of Global Fund processes and how they relate to results, and room to improve evaluation component. The Secretariat agreed but also clarified that the Global Fund has a limited leverage to improve quality because program reviews occur between the national program and the WHO office.

- **Documents policy Presenter: Joseph Chiu**

Joseph Chiu, Manager, the Legal Institutional team, discussed various requests for TERG reports and his responses within the current documents policy, which he also clarified.

In this TERG meeting, the TERG decided to improve the way its views are conveyed. For this reason, the TERG could focus on TERG position papers and not the whole report. Several TERG members felt that transparency should be the default, unless there is specific rationale. Some practical considerations were discussed, and it was decided that certain safeguards shall be put in place, including informing consultants and interviewees that reports would be in public domain. In conclusion, TERG is in favor to make reports publicly available, but it will further consider details of a mechanism for doing so.

- **GAVI's prospective TA evaluation Presenter: Peter Hansen**

Peter Hansen, TERG ex-officio member represent GAVI, gave an overview of the GAVI's results framework and the M&E framework and strategy, and an introduction to the full country evaluations. The prospective studies take place 2013-2016, with the goal to examine and quantify barriers to and drivers of immunization program improvement. Key characteristics include real time data, country-driven approach, capacity strengthening, harmonization, efficiency and flexibility. GAVI's upcoming evaluation of its technical assistance (TA) is a lighter, independent, multi-year evaluation aiming to assess relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of TA at country-level, with periodic assessments and continuous assessment of TA through a web-based system.

TERG members found these initiatives very useful and welcomed the possibility to join this type of evaluation for the Global Fund. Osamu Kunii, the TERG ex-officio member representing the Secretariat confirmed agreed that the Global Fund would be interested in collaboration. It was agreed that understanding the landscape is important, which may take some time and cost. The TERG will consider the applicability to the TERG.

Closing session

Chair: Jim Tulloch

Discussion with Secretariat management

During this session, the Chair presented items which, according to discussions to date, can be included in TERG's long-term planning:

- Definitions of data across the full results chain, with focus on quality implementation, needed for countries to improve program management, but also for the Global Fund.
- Understanding of what needs to be put in place for data collection over the next years.
- Effectiveness of the revised allocation model.
- Impact of efforts for differentiation (not only in funding access, but also program implementation and data requirements).
- Effectiveness of efforts to focus attention on women and girls.
- Longer-term transition processes.
- Guidance on strategic evaluation of reduced global funding.

Equally important is greater engagement with the Secretariat:

- Greater engagement with MECA.
- Potentially, 4-5 projects to focus on (e.g., differentiation for impact, data for impact, program quality and ITP, women and girls).
- Improving the quality and consistency of TERG products. This includes: 1. Clarity between TERG view and consultants' work; 2. workshop with relevant Secretariat teams on the review, which may inform also TERG's position paper; 3. Ensuring management response from Secretariat to TERG recommendations; and 4. Follow-up of the response, without being overburdening.
- Collaborating with other partners, i.e. GAVI.
- Increase capacity to respond rapidly to assessment of new topics as they come up.

The TERG also requested the Secretariat to inform the TERG at its next meeting how work is advancing in regard to internal evaluation, and how is the Secretariat structured in order to manage it, including a budget.

The TERG decided to plan its 29th meeting from 8-9 June, while its retreat on M&E with MECA team is planned for 6-7 June.

The Chief of Staff helped conclude the 28th meeting, noting that priorities discussed appear in line with Secretariat priorities, and relevant, as well as requesting possible contribution from the TERG on the developed corporate KPIs.

Working session: finalize TORs and other work

The TERG discussed practical considerations around its work. Some guidance was shared on meetings and the amount of commitment expected from TERG members.

The TERG agreed that it would be beneficial to have a modest expansion (several new members, including regional representation and filling needed areas of expertise) and to have 3 meetings year: the first one with various Secretariat updates and subsequent ones with more focus. TERG also agreed that at the moment there is no serious issue with the TORs.

Next, Chair requested the discussant for the data breakout group to give a summary of the session. Action points are to break down the TOR into two streams, and to make the TOR more specific. Key area of concern is to identify the data gaps. Two important areas are roadmap on data, goals, milestones; and better understanding of what is going on at the Global Fund.

TERG leadership and several members remained an additional day after the meeting to further discuss some key areas and agree on points for the TERG position papers. On this day, TERG members had preliminary discussion on KPIs with Andrew Kennedy, Manager, Strategic Controlling, and a discussion on the TERG report on review and decision making processes in funding access with Silvio Martinelli, Head of Access to Funding department.

Annex: List of Participants

I. TERG

James Tulloch (Chair)
Viroj Tangcharoensathien (Vice-chair)
Bess Miller (Vice-chair)
Kenneth Castro
Jeanine Condo
Peter Hansen
Osamu Kunii
Wuleta Lemma
Jan Paehler (joined by telephone on day 2)
Salil Panakadan
Anna Thorson

Regrets: Bernard Nahlen, Don De Savigny, Mickey Chopra, Paulin Basinga.

II. Resource persons

Paul Balogun (Itad)
Werasit Sittitrai (independent consultant)
David Wilkinson, Sanja Matovic (Euro Health Group)
Nigel Pearson (independent consultant)
Todd Summers

III. Partners

Katherine Floyd, WHO
Alba Vilajeliu, GAVI

IV. The Global Fund

Secretariat Working Group on Evaluation

Marijke Wijnroks (Chief of Staff)
Harley Feldbaum (Policy Hub)
Osamu Kunii (Strategy, Investment, and Impact Division)
Rahul Singhal (Acting Chief Risk Officer)

Resource persons and observers

Aline Abou Atme (Operational Policy)
Michael Borowitz (Policy Hub)
Joseph Chiu (Legal Institutional)
Heather Doyle (Community Rights and Gender)
Adda Faye (Projects and Business Development)
Matias Gomez (Grant Management Division)
Hannah Grant (Policy Hub)
Emanuele Capobianco (Policy Hub)
Catherine Hernandez (Operational Policy)
Ilana Kirsztajn (Policy Hub)
Viviana Mangiaterra (Technical Advice and Partnerships)
Silvio Martinelli (Access to Funding)
Vanessa Rousselle (Access to Funding)
Motoko Seko (Community Rights and Gender)
Estifanos Shargie (Technical Advice and Partnerships)
Alexandra Shields (Policy Hub)

Ezra Tessera (Technical Advice and Partnerships)
Alexander Winch (Policy Hub)
Nathalie Zorzi (Technical Advice and Partnerships)

TERG Support team

Ryuichi Komatsu
John Puvimanasinghe
Jutta Hornig
Seda Kojoyan