

# TERG RETREAT AND 29TH MEETING REPORT

## 1. TERG Retreat

<b>Date</b>	6-7 June 2016
<b>Venue</b>	Lake Geneva Hotel, Versoix, Switzerland

### **Objectives of the TERG Retreat**

1. To understand key areas and issues within the new Global Fund Strategy 2017-2022 and their implications, to identify key evaluation questions and determine their evaluability.
2. To discuss a draft M&E strategy for future input and iteration with the Secretariat, the TERG and Board committees, and to prepare other guidance needed for the Secretariat.
3. To facilitate communication and collaboration between the TERG and the key owners of M&E activities in the Secretariat.
4. To discuss a TERG multi-year evaluation approach in the context of the M&E Strategy.

Jim Tulloch, the TERG Chair, welcomed the participants and discussed that it is the best timing to be familiarized to the Global Fund strategy, contribute to shaping the M&E strategy, and discuss TERG's multi-year approach.

Mark Dybul, Executive Director, thanked TERG for its contributions, especially to the new strategy and allocation process, and for TERG Chair's engagement on key performance indicators (KPIs). Many TERG reviews have had critical impact, and its work is essential to the Global Fund. He shared his vision of a fundamental shift from "monitoring and evaluation" (M&E) to program quality, and use of data by the full range of stakeholders from community health workers to global institutions.

Mouhamadou Diagne, Inspector General, highlighted tremendous progress in risk management, but also challenges, e.g., program quality and the performance framework, and acknowledged that not enough focus has been placed on the programmatic side. He emphasized the importance of demonstrating progress on this and that the most important risk is not to achieve program impact. A holistic approach to assess progress is missing, and successful examples of this are needed, to be replicated and to ensure a robust independent quality assurance mechanism.

TERG Chair welcomed the orientation and shared TERG's new emphasis to more prospective and country level orientations to look at the whole results chain as there is serious lack of data, highlighted by the Strategic Review 2015 (SR2015). The TERG has obtained broad agreement from the Strategy Committee on conducting full country prospective evaluations (FCE). The ex-officio TERG member from GAVI, while declaring a potential conflict of interest, stated that prospective full country evaluations can leverage what already exists, e.g., planned health facility assessments and innovative technologies and at the same time to investment in specific and targeted areas. He pointed out that in conducting FCEs it is important to synthesize what is already available at the inception phase, and to drive costs of each FCE down while expanding the number of countries. Investing in collaboration with GAVI will improve value for money for both organizations.

In conclusion, the Secretariat, the OIG and the TERG are like three legs of a stool, and each has an important role. The TERG needs to implement a prospective full country approach,

potentially joining GAVI, in response to the needs that were discussed, which cannot be done without significant additional investment.

During the rest of Day 1 and first hours of Day 2, there were extensive discussion with relevant Secretariat teams on KPI, M&E strategy, M&E enablers, Strategic Objectives (SO) 1-4 including sub objectives and theory of changes.

The TERG reiterated its position that the Global Fund should focus on the ‘contribution model,’ and agreed therefore to avoid attempting to quantify achievement that could be attributed to the Global Fund, and acknowledged measurement of progress against national targets as a defensible position. The TERG engages in KPI discussion and target setting through disease-specific partnerships and through Committee discussions.

The TERG agreed that the Accelerated Integration Management project (AIM) is important to improved grant management and is on right track. The TERG continues to identify a clear approach to the internal evaluation as a key need.

The TERG appreciated the SO leads for leading discussion on objectives and theory of change in each SO. The key areas of TERG’s engagement in SO1 may include a) allocation, b) transition, c) Challenging Operating Environments (COE), and d) program quality evaluation. The TERG has reviewed the first three of these areas, and following through would be important. It is important to further refine some theories of changes (some explicit logic and assumptions) for SOs, and the TERG encourages, therefore, the Secretariat to further develop these and apply these in the development of implementation plans and implementation KPI, which are happening concurrently.

It was discussed and agreed that full country evaluations would provide rich evidence, and can be complemented by targeted thematic reviews. The TERG strongly advised the Secretariat to focus on “effective coverage” rather than just “coverage” and also identified needs for an appropriate definition of “stock out”. It was agreed that technical assistance (TA) is central and should be in a more strategic way.

The TERG was broadly supportive of the operational aspects of the draft M&E strategy. The TERG encouraged the Secretariat to improve routine monitoring. Secondly, the TERG continued to emphasize the importance of national program reviews conducted jointly with independent experts, although with limitations, e.g., these review may not provide details needed for the Global Fund. Thirdly, selective thematic reviews should not focus on specific country, but contrast success and failure in different countries. The TERG is still assessing if program evaluations outside national program reviews are necessary, but partner-led evaluation, e.g., President Malaria Initiative (PMI)’s impact evaluation, should be taken into consideration, and may allow the Global Fund to lower its M&E budget. More integrated scope of evaluations (with all SOs), rather than separate evaluations, should be encouraged, while topic specific reviews should be more of an exception. However, further thoughts on this would be necessary. The TERG also requested that some Secretariat evaluations would need to be removed if prospective TERG-led evaluations are implemented, to avoid overlap.

## **Executive sessions**

---

### **Draft TERG multi-year approach and discussion on full-country evaluation**

The TERG agreed that the TERG approach needs to be compatible to the overall M&E strategy and its implementation, and discussed the draft TERG multi-year approach to evaluation, which was developed with contributions from the TERG leadership and focal points. While broadly in agreement with the proposal, TERG members requested certain adjustments and changes to the text of the document.

## 2. 29th TERG Meeting

<b>Date</b>	8-9 June 2016
<b>Venue</b>	The Global Fund Secretariat, Geneva, Switzerland
<b>Chair</b>	Jim Tulloch
<b>Vice-Chairs</b>	Viroj Tangcharoensathien, Bess Miller

### Main objectives of the 29th TERG Meeting

1. To develop recommendations for Global Fund evaluation strategy and to provide guidance to the Secretariat on selected issues on M&E and data.
2. To agree on the draft TERG's multi-year plan including the scope of prospective country evaluation.
3. To discuss the on-going TERG reviews (regional, NSP, TA, data investment, transition, gender).

### Day 1

#### Opening Session

**Chair: Jim Tulloch**

The Chair gave welcome remarks, followed by an overview of the agenda items.

#### • Management Response to SR2015

**Presenter: Harley Feldbaum**

Harley Feldbaum, Head, Policy and Strategy Hub, presented to the TERG the state of the management response to TERG recommendations. Responses to some of the main recommendations have progressed substantially, e.g., differentiation, sustainability and RSSH. Moreover, the TERG reviews on allocation and regional and multi-country programs have provided key inputs. TERG's clear identification of the problems and independent voice have been very helpful. Moving forward, TERG full-country evaluations must happen.

The TERG appreciates teams in the Secretariat for diligent follow-up on the TERG recommendations and provided information to fill in the management response. However, some recommendations and response need to be unpacked and followed up.

Main issues around transition are known, yet there are likely no standard ways to tackle them. Success for transitioning countries is difficult and variable. The vision for the Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing (STC) policy is to ensure a focus on sustainability in the countries moving to transition soon, and for the Global Fund to do its best, with the limited resources.

The TERG discussed results-chain and data system strengthening. The Secretariat explained that there is an emphasis to work with other agencies on data strengthening to achieve good global data. A prioritization approach can be taken with data assessment – prioritizing and seeing where to bring partners together, etc.

The Chair concluded the session by reaffirming the impact of the TERG's reviews. Having reviews that follow a topic progressively is also rather important.

**On-going TERG thematic reviews**

- **Finalize review on the regional/multi-country programs**

**Presenters: Michele Gross, Sanja Matovic**

Two consultants from the review team presented the study objectives, key questions, methods, conclusions and recommendations, as well a selection of key findings.

At the request of the TERG, the consultants focused their presentation on the conclusions and recommendations. The overarching conclusion from the study is that regional and multi-country grants can provide significant benefits (e.g. encourage regional dialogue), and generally constitute a sound strategic investment. At the same time, there is a need for a more guided and strategic approach to these grants (i.e. to avoid overlap). The review notes certain well-functioning governance structures, which the Global Fund can use as a model.

The consultants recommend that the Global Fund proactively identify regional priorities and themes (with partners), encourage funding of innovative approaches to service delivery, retain the two-stage application process, and request the regional managers to make a strategic briefing to the Technical Review Panel (TRP). The review also provides recommendations for grants focusing on advocacy, and encourages transition plans, as sustainability is a major weakness. It is also considered important to utilize existing strong regional bodies. In addition, the Global Fund should consider revising the performance framework and the modular template, as well as certain other elements of the application process.

TERG members observed that the review has a limited sample, and therefore general conclusions may need to be qualified, especially since there are many differences between regions. TERG members inquired about innovation in service delivery, efficiency (especially in pooled procurement mechanisms), sustainability, and alignment of multiple regional grants per country. TERG members expressed reservations about the recommendations on the two-step application process and a strong regional body as sometimes this body may not be appropriate for a regional grant.

The consultants clarified that the review certainly has limitations. However, the two-step application process is justified by strong evidence, as far as the current model is concerned. Conclusions such as those on cost effectiveness were reached based on limited feedback, and therefore, further and more detailed analysis has been suggested.

The TERG agreed that its guidance on this review is quite important in the new allocation period, and will provide the consultants with detailed feedback on the review.

- **Update on review on data investment**

**Presenters: Nathalie Zorzi, Suman Jain**

Nathalie Zorzi, Senior Manager, Monitoring, Evaluation and Country Analysis (MECA), and Suman Jain, Senior Specialist, updated the proposed data investment review with the TERG. Discussions on this review were already underway at the 28<sup>th</sup> TERG meeting in February, but the situation had changed since then. Also, they updated the TERG on proposed M&E activities and needs, including budget information. The main goal of the proposed approach is to strengthen data collection, analysis and use for impact reporting, program quality and efficiency improvement, and reporting on CRG- and RSSH-related objectives.

The TERG would like to see identification of which information is provided for information only purposes and data on impact of the M&E investments in order to make more informed

decisions and recommendations. The TERG encourages increased spending within the allocated budget on M&E. The TERG agreed that mortality data collection is missing at the community level.

WHO representative shared their perspective that data quality and availability has improved very much, and that catalytic strategic funding has indeed brought improvement.

While giving examples of how they are addressing lack of mortality data, MECA team cautioned that it is the country choosing what investments to make.

In conclusion, the TERG should take a decision whether or not to advise that some defined portion of the Global Fund budget should be used for M&E.

- **Use of National Strategic Plans (NSP) Review for funding applications**

**Presenters: Sanja Matovic, Joost Hoppenbrouwer**

The review aims to understand to what extent NSPs can be used directly for funding application for the Global Fund rather than through Global Fund specific Concept Notes. Two consultants from the review team presented the review objectives, key evaluation questions and the methodology of this upcoming review. The team has developed a checklist for their data collection, key issues for stakeholder interviews and an online survey. They anticipated delay due to limited access to some of key documents, and invited the TERG to share their comments on the proposed approach and methodology.

The discussion concluded that it is difficult to say if NSPs were properly prioritized. The consultants think the checklist may be more widely used. They noted that NSP quality need not only be judged technically, but also from the point of view of usefulness in the country.

Silvio Martinelli, Head, Access to Funding, and other Secretariat representatives provided their inputs on the consultants' presentation. Using findings from the SR2015 was suggested among others.

Attendees agreed that utilizing NSPs as much as possible supports national ownership.

- **Gender**

**Presenter: Anna Thorson**

The work and discussion on the gender review has been on-going for some time now, and a draft TOR was developed already at the last TERG meeting. Meantime, due to the approval of the new strategy in April and associated work recently done, the TERG suggested aligning the new thinking on this review with the SO3 and the theory of change. Members recognised that timing is important; it would be especially useful to conduct a prospective evaluation (with baseline survey), with 4-6 country case studies.

Heather Doyle, Senior Technical Coordinator, the Community, Rights and Gender department, addressed her team's review on gender investments, and updated the TERG on current initiatives, including a working group with partners (coordinated by the Global Fund).

TERG Vice-Chair suggested a working group on the gender review, and requested a document with the latest updates from the Secretariat team. A working group was formed consisting of representatives from the Secretariat, the TERG and the TERG Secretariat to produce a short document (3-5 pp) in the next 2 months and to finish revising the TOR before the next meeting.

- **Transition**

**Presenter: Viroj Tangcharoensathien**

Similar to the work on gender review, with the STC policy recently endorsed, and TERG's potential engagement in full country evaluations, TERG members took this opportunity to realign the thinking around this review. There are 3-4 dimensions to be evaluated: policy aspects (governance, legal), financial sustainability and programmatic governance. The review should fit in the context of the full-country evaluations and select 1-2 countries approaching transition out of 8 full evaluation countries. Two methodological approaches are possible for data collection: either from a participatory observer or impartial non-participatory observer perspectives. Formulation of a "transition readiness index" may be envisioned, which can be quantitative and applicable on a wider scale.

TERG members interacted with relevant Secretariat members to understand soon-to-transition countries, the STC policy and the current modes of evaluating transition success. Similar to the gender review, the TERG agreed to form a working group. During the next 1-3 months, the working group and the TERG Secretariat will work to synchronize this review's TOR with the work-stream on SO3. By the next TERG meeting, the group should have a better idea which kinds of countries are to be chosen for the review, and other key points.

- **Partnership Agreement Review**

**Presenter: Peter Hansen**

Peter Hansen updated the TERG on the process for commissioning this up-coming review. After this, the session became only for the TERG members and select TERG Secretariat staff, as the selection process is still in progress.

## **Day 2**

---

### ***Executive session***

- **TERG TOR, recruitment strategy, SOP**

The Chair went over the changes in the TOR, as they have been recently revised upon request from the SIIC, and asked TERG members to share their opinions and/or any objections to the changes. TERG members discussed the Recruitment Strategy. Members agreed that evaluation experience would be essential, with expertise in HSS, health economics, health policy especially related to transition, challenging operating environment, human rights and gender, and/or evaluation methodology, as well as capacity for 'horizontal thinking' beyond one area of expertise. Someone who is/was a program implementer and/or with CCM experience would be also welcome. It is essential that potential members commit adequate time to the TERG. The idea to request letters of support from institutions for potential members was discussed to ensure their availability.

- **TERG position paper on the Review of the Emergency Fund**

The TERG position paper on the Review of the Emergency Fund had been developed by the TERG focal point and leadership based on the previous TERG meeting discussion, with input from the original review and the TERG Secretariat. The position paper had been submitted for the Strategy Committee and shared with the TERG members.

- **TERG key activities and points to be discussed at the SC**

The TERG discussed its proposed work priorities to be presented at the Strategy Committee meeting the following week. Furthermore, the TERG reviewed and discussed some material on more evidence of data investment impact; the TERG members agreed that they need a better understanding of what has been funded to date.

TERG members came up with the following key points from this discussion:

- Reiteration that the allotted budget for M&E should be fully used.
- Importance of having quantifiably measurable ways to assess data strengthening.
- A need for some part of catalytic funding to be utilized for M&E activities.
- Support of full country evaluations, which is currently an unfunded gap.
- Other specific needs (i.e. mortality measurements), which are not yet prioritized.

- **Added to the agenda: Session on HSS**

**Presenters: Viviana Mangiaterra, George Shakarishvili**

The TERG has agreed to have Viviana Mangiaterra, Senior Technical Coordinator, MNCH and HSS, and George Shakarishvili, Senior Technical Advisor, present some topics on HSS, to inform the TERG members. Topics included: sources of technical support for concept note development, priority areas for catalytic investment (as suggested by technical partners), discussion of fostering improvement and innovation in integrated health services, systems and networks for RSSH. Presenters also touched upon the topic of aiding countries to achieve integrated concept note delivery, similar to the Sudan experience.

Following this, a brief discussion took place.

- **Full country evaluations**

The TERG discussed conduct of multi-year full-country evaluations, which will be prospective and across the four SOs of the strategy. TERG agreed that it could be very useful to partner with GAVI at least in part on these evaluations. A working group was formed. One of the goals is to have a very clear description of the context prior to the next TERG meeting. TERG could potentially conduct a site visit to one of the countries in future.

- **Next TERG meeting**

The TERG decided to plan its 30th meeting during the week beginning 12 September 2016, ahead of the SC meeting in mid-October.

## **Closing session**

- **Communication and discussion of TERG decisions and guidance**

During this session, the Chair shared with Secretariat members the key conclusions from the TERG retreat and meeting.

### Global Fund M&E strategy

The Chair congratulated the Secretariat on the commendable progress with the M&E strategy, and its linkage to the overall Global Fund strategy. The TERG finds it useful to have a more explicit theory of change approach (a key weakness identified in the SR2015 and other external

review, e.g., MOPAN review). The theory of change should inform implementation planning and development of KPIs. The TERG expresses its support to focus on contribution (rather than attribution), including through the idea for KPIs to use national targets. While the TERG promotes integrated evaluations, it also recognizes that in certain cases focused evaluations are necessary. National programme reviews are critical, therefore, there is a need to be more explicit about the expectation for the quality of these reviews. Finally, the TERG endorses the idea of fully utilizing partners' evaluations wherever they are conducted.

As part of the M&E strategy, the TERG proposes to conduct full-country evaluation in a set of countries to understand the pathway from investment to impact for all four SOs. In the event that this approach goes forward, there will be a need to take a stock of what other evaluations are happening in a given country, in order to save costs and avoid overlap.

The TERG welcomes the management response and plans to follow up the Secretariat's responses. This is because certain recommendations still require looking into details and following through, and the TERG must perform its due diligence.

#### TERG multi-year evaluation approach

The key aspect of the approach is to conduct full country evaluations, and to focus on the four SOs and program quality improvement. The full country evaluations cannot proceed without agreement and cooperation from the selected countries. An additional goal is to improve programming in those countries, but also to identify and apply wider lessons learned and a methodology that could be utilized in other countries. The TERG's approach also requires periodic synthesis reviews of the strategy.

On improving country data systems, some good work has been done to date, but there is truly a need to learn more. Country grant budget allocations to M&E has increased to about 5%, but only about half is being spent. The TERG notes the need to identify what exactly funds are spent on, what the other partners are financing and doing, and other pertinent topics to help in solving bottleneck.

Improving mortality measurement is a priority. While the TERG welcomes investments in DHIS2 and catalyzing a partnership approach and investments in common country data systems, a major priority is the mortality measurement. The TERG would like to see an "implementation KPI" focusing particularly on the issue of quality of efforts in mortality measurement.

#### TERG thematic reviews

The Chair updated the Secretariat on the state of current thematic reviews:

- Gender: the TERG focal point, in conjunction with the Secretariat and the TERG Secretariat focal points, will work on situation analysis to develop the focus on the review.
- Transition/STC review: Similar to the gender review, this review will take place within the context of full country evaluations. The TERG sees the prospective review as informative to the assessment and evolution of STC policy. The programmatic evaluation will focus on topics of sustainability, finance and governance in transitioning countries.
- Multi-country and regional grants: the consultants completed the review and presented it to the TERG. The TERG suggested to the consultants to look more in depth at the conclusions and recommendations, and qualify them appropriately. The TERG will develop a position paper on this review.
- National Strategic Plans: the aim of this up-coming review is to see if the Global Fund application processes can be made easier for the countries through direct utilization of NSPs including other supporting national documents. The Chair requested Secretariat's assistance in providing documents to the team of consultants and facilitating interviews.
- Partnership Agreement Review: a tender had been issued to which groups sent their



bidding. Selection process is in progress.

- Data system investments: the TERG considered it important to understand reasons for underutilization of the M&E budgets and solve the bottlenecks to improve the use of M&E budgets. Additionally, the TERG encourages the Secretariat to include in data systems such as DHIS2 causes-of-death module and sample vital registrations with cause of death (incl. verbal autopsy). This is particularly relevant since the SDGs include over 15 mortality indicators.

Members of the Secretariat welcomed the conclusions and posed a few questions to the TERG. The Secretariat requested TERG's opinion on what should be changed or refined in the current strategy architecture, in regards to the results chain. The Secretariat is keen to see and support the full country evaluations. The TERG Chair continued the discussion on these, including the value of learning from, and potentially efficiencies if joining with, GAVI's full country evaluations.

The TERG clarified that an implementation KPI may be important to put in place seeing how well countries are doing in providing good mortality measurements.

*TERG leadership and several members remained an additional day to have a follow-up discussion on the TERG HSS review with the HSS team.*

*As part of its mandate to promote a "learning" environment, the TERG sponsored a brown bag seminar on 10 June at the Global Fund on the topic of the Emergency Fund review. Dr. Nigel Pearson, who was the lead consultant on this review, was the featured speaker. The seminar was very well attended with significant interest in the findings and implications of this review for future efforts by the Global Fund in Emergency situations.*

## Annex: List of Participants and Observers

### **I. TERC<sup>1</sup>**

James Tulloch (Chair)  
Bess Miller (Vice-chair)  
Viroj Tangcharoensathien (Vice-chair)  
Kenneth Castro  
Don De Savigny  
Peter Hansen  
Osamu Kunii  
Wuleta Lemma  
Bernard Nahlen  
Salil Panakadan  
Anna Thorson

Regrets: Paulin Basinga, Mickey Chopra, Jeanine Condo.

### **II. Resource persons**

Michele Grosse, Sanja Matovic, Joost Hoppenbrouwer (Euro Health Group)  
Cindy Carlson (independent consultant)  
Steve Lim (IHME) by phone

### **III. Partners**

Babis Sismanidis (WHO)  
Daniel Low-Beer (WHO)

### **IV. The Global Fund**

Mark Dybul (Executive Director)  
Mouhamadou Diagne (Inspector General)

#### *Secretariat Working Group on Evaluation*

Harley Feldbaum (Policy Hub)  
Rahul Singhal (Chief Risk Officer)  
Michael Byrne (Grant Management Division)

#### *Resource persons and observers*

Lee Abdelfadil (Technical Advice and Partnerships)  
Olga Bornemisza (Technical Advice and Partnerships)  
Emanuele Capobianco (Policy Hub)  
Lindsey Cole (Access to Funding)  
Heather Doyle (Community Rights and Gender)  
Carol D'Souza (Strategic Information)  
Chris Game (Sourcing Department)  
Mauro Guarinieri (Community Rights and Gender)  
Johannes Hunger (Strategic Information)  
Suman Jain (Technical Advice and Partnerships)  
Ralf Jurgens (Community Rights and Gender)  
Andrew Kennedy (Finance Division)  
Viviana Mangiaterra (Technical Advice and Partnerships)  
Silvio Martinelli (Access to Funding)  
Abigail Moreland (Grant Management Division)  
Linden Morrison (Grant Management Division)

---

<sup>1</sup> As of this meeting, the appointment of an ex-officio member from the Strategy Committee was pending.

Michael Olszak-Olszewski (Grant Management Division)  
Estifanos Shargie (Technical Advice and Partnerships)  
Patrik Silborn (External Relations Division)  
George Shakarishvili (Technical Advice and Partnerships)  
Ronald Tran-Ba-Huy (Grant Management Division)  
Jinkou Zhao (Technical Advice and Partnerships)  
Nathalie Zorzi (Technical Advice and Partnerships)

TERG Support Team

Ryuichi Komatsu  
John Puvimanasinghe  
Jutta Hornig  
Seda Kojoyan  
Eriko Maruyama