

Summary Report of the
Technical Evaluation
Reference Group (TERG)
of the Global Fund

Seventh Meeting

Geneva, Switzerland 3-5 September, 2007

1.0 Introduction

This document reports on the Seventh TERG Meeting, which took place from 3-5 September 2007 in Geneva, Switzerland at the Global Fund premises. It provides a summary of key issues discussed and the TERG's recommendations. The agenda for the meeting and participant list are attached as Annex A. The TERG meeting focused principally on the draft report on Study Areas 1 and 2 of the Global Fund Five Year Evaluation, and progress to date on Study Area 3. The TERG also reviewed implementation plans for the balance of the Five-Year Evaluation and next steps for the integration of study areas. Overall meeting objectives were as follows:

1. Review draft report on Study Area 1: Global Fund Organizational Efficiency and Effectiveness
2. Review interim report on Study Area 2: Partnership Environment
3. Review progress update on Study Area 3: Health Impact
4. Review Five-Year Evaluation workplan, timeline and plans for integration of study areas
5. Review schedule for TERG engagement and plans for next TERG meeting

2.0 Study Area 1 – Global Fund Organizational Efficiency and Effectiveness

2.1 Background

Macro International leads the two consortia undertaking the Five-Year Evaluation. The consortium for Study Areas 1 & 2 delivered the preliminary report on Study Areas 1 and 2 on 27 August for the TERG's review and comment. Based on this report, the TERG will bring recommendations to the Board at its November 2007 meeting.

2.2 Discussion and Recommendations

The TERG acknowledged the timely receipt of the report and recognized the large amount of data and information collected. The TERG focused its discussions on whether the appropriate hypotheses were addressed, the prioritization of recommendations, the methodology and whether the conclusions are evidence-based and recommendations specific and actionable. The TERG also welcomed a representative from Booz Allen Hamilton as an observer to the meeting, to facilitate appropriate linkages between the findings from Study Area 1 and the Executive Director's Management Review. The TERG encouraged communication between the Macro and BAH study teams and requested that TERG members be informed of all such exchanges. The TERG provided recommendations on the Study Area 1 draft report as follows:

- ❖ **Achievements and global perspective:** The TERG emphasized that the demonstrable achievements of the Global Fund should be given adequate attention, such as success in mobilizing new funds, the leveraging of significant new funds through additional channels, effect on inclusion of civil society in development decision-making, etc. It is also critical that Macro consider the Global Fund from a broader perspective, for example, considering the effect of the Global Fund on the development cooperation landscape and the development financing architecture.
- ❖ **Structure of Report:** At present there is a disconnect between the body of the report and the executive summary. The structure of the executive summary should mirror that of the body of the report, giving the major recommendations and the evidence to support the recommendations. In each section it should be clearly stated what is working, what is not, and the level of evidence and confidence supporting each recommendation. The report should show the direction of change – whether issues are improving or worsening, and steps under way to address them. There is a need to clearly prioritize and synthesize recommendations at a more strategic level appropriate for presentation to the Board. The final report should be written in a style appropriate for public dissemination.
- ❖ **Previous Evaluations:** The TERG emphasized that Macro should take into account and make reference to the recommendations from relevant previous TERG evaluations that are considered incremental steps towards the Five-Year Evaluation, especially building on the findings of the recent LFA evaluation.

- ❖ **Benchmarking:** The TERG particularly emphasized the need for benchmarking against similar organizations and/or private sector in particularly on HR issues, time to disbursement, financial tracking and private sector resource mobilization, and requested that Macro incorporate a benchmarking analysis into the study. While benchmarking of the Global Fund as a whole may be difficult as there are few fully comparable organizations, major processes should nevertheless be benchmarked.

The TERG provided additional specific recommendations on each area of the study:

- ❖ **Strategy – Recommendations 1-2:**

- The TERG did not agree that the Global Fund ‘lacks’ a strategy. Instead the contractor should consider that there has been a continual evolution of the Fund’s strategy, in accordance with the key Global Fund principles. Macro should outline the past strategy, the modifications in the updated strategy proposed in the PSC document, and provide specific recommendations for further updating of the strategy. Macro may want to pursue its proposal to rearrange the principles of the Global Fund according to evolving development priorities.
- Considering one of the key messages is concerning the Global Fund’s lack of an appropriate long-term strategy, the TERG requested access to the 2007-2010 Global Fund strategy document.
- The TERG suggested that an initial section be added to the report containing recommendations on the appropriate role for the Global Fund in the context of the global development finance architecture, considering its scale and the role of other partners. In addition, the Global Fund should be benchmarked against other organizations carrying out similar functions.
- The report recommends that the Global Fund should have a more active role in managing the balance of the portfolio. Currently the balance of the portfolio is reasonable but needs continued monitoring. If undesirable deviations are observed, then the Fund should either modify criteria for funding and/or work with partners to ensure appropriate support for weaker countries. The Global Fund should actively work with partners in identifying the balance of funding and any gaps by disease, as well as to assess and respond to country capacity to scale up. The evaluation should also address the issue that grant selection criteria do not adequately recognize innovative approaches.
- In considering recommendations related to strategy, the evaluation should also address the fact that addressing such a diversity of country circumstances requires added flexibility, especially with regard to FPM and grant implementation.

- ❖ **Governance – Recommendations 3-11:**

- The TERG suggested that a clear definition of the areas of responsibility of the three different levels of the Global Fund: Board, Committees and Secretariat, would help the Board delegate more of its responsibilities to the Committees and to the Secretariat.
- TERG agreed with the finding that the level of delegation of responsibility from the Board to its Committees and Secretariat would reflect the Fund’s institutional maturity.
- TERG found a lack of evidence to support Recommendation #3 to align Board constituency country groupings with OPS groupings. Instead TERG emphasized the larger issue is ensuring that delegations who come can actively participate, receive documentation and have adequate time to consult with their constituencies.
- Regarding recommendation #4, TERG emphasized the need to be more specific about the type of assistance that could be provided to resource-constrained constituencies.
- TERG found that Recommendations #5-11 are extremely detailed and could be reduced or combined. The recommendations don’t directly address the underlying suggestion that

the governance structure is overly heavy. TERG emphasized that clear overarching recommendations are needed.

- The TERG suggested that the role of the Executive Director of the Global Fund's Board be more directly addressed and benchmarked against other institutions.
- The report should also estimate the cost of governance and amount of time the Secretariat spends serving the Board rather than serving the Global Fund's mission (opportunity cost).

❖ **Resource Mobilization – Recommendations 12-14:**

- TERG emphasized the need to broaden the Fund's definition of private sector donations to include various types of organizations and contributions (e.g. accepting various types of in-kind donations and tracking additionality).
- TERG suggested that Recommendation 14 be reconsidered as the proposed action may put undue burden on CCMs. Instead the primary responsibility for expanding private sector involvement may begin at global level.
- TERG suggested that the report include a recommendation to strengthen the Secretariat's resource mobilization function for both private and public sectors, recognizing the ongoing allocation of resources to this purpose.

❖ **Secretariat – Recommendations 15-20:**

- The TERG noted that the recommendations regarding HR are at an operational level and that they should also be captured by the BAH study; thus coordination between the two evaluations is critical. TERG emphasized that the SA1 report should raise the larger question of what HR model is now appropriate for the Fund considering its growth estimates and likelihood of discontinuing the current ASA. If Macro has new evidence to add to the discussion on the ASA, this should be provided.
- TERG noted that the evaluation does not specifically examine Secretariat structure. This is being addressed by the BAH study.
- TERG emphasized that the Global Fund needs a strong management structure for the future if it is to meet the growth expectations of the Board. Related aspects such as leadership, common understanding of vision/mission and staff development should be better addressed. TERG recognized that efficiency gains can be made by simplifying processes; however, this is not enough and structural changes to the organization will also need to be considered for maximal efficiency gains. Appropriate conclusions should be drawn from the apparently over-complex decision-making processes.
- The report suggested that the Global Fund is understaffed and suffers from an 'immature' management culture. More evidence and specific recommendations to address both should be provided.

❖ **Grant Management – Recommendations 21-36:**

- TERG noted that the report lacks clarity on the suggested benefits associated with shortening the RCC cycle to 5 years instead of 6 years, and the benefits of a mid-term grant review rather than the Phase 2 review.
- The TERG found that the TRP is not adequately addressed and emphasized the value of Macro observing some of the TRP sessions to better inform the findings. Macro should also re-consider TRP-related recommendations raised by the TERG in the Proposal Development and Review Process Assessment (2006) – especially the recommendation for development of a TRP self-assessment mechanism, as part of Quality Assurance processes.

- The TERG recommended that the report give greater consideration to the question of why the grant approval rate is only 40%. The TERG recommended that the trends in the approval rate over time be assessed in more depth. TERG suggested Macro should consider the risk of misunderstanding the underlying message behind the statement that the Fund should 'improve the grant approval rate'.
- In examining the time to disbursement, TERG emphasized that it is important to understand the nature of the delay and whether it might be instrumental in building PR capacity and structure or whether it is just 'lost time'.
- The TERG suggested that Recommendation #26 be re-considered to include a wider view of moving from project to country program grants. TERG recognized that handling numerous smaller grants is not the TGF's primary role in the donor landscape. The TERG recognized that it is not possible for the Global Fund to increase its scale with the current average grant size and number of grants, using the current structure and systems. TERG suggested that Macro include a recommendation regarding how the number/size/type of proposals should evolve to include national strategy submissions so as to reduce the number of fragmented, disease-based applications. TERG would welcome a tangible recommendation as to how to increase country capacity to develop these types of proposals.
- TERG recommended that Recommendations #28-30 be bundled as they all address procurement issues.
- The TERG previously raised concerns with the lack of expenditure tracking as described in the report; however the TERG recognized that the Board has already mandated the Secretariat to put in a new financial tracking system which will be in place in January 2008. TERG suggested grouping Recommendations #32-34 as they all address financial tracking and monitoring. These recommendations should focus on cost per unit of service provided.
- The TERG also requested that the report mention the TERG's previous efforts to measure unit costs and its recommendations to the Board on this subject. It is important to recognize that systems are in line with the original board intent.

❖ **Information System – Recommendations 37-38:**

- TERG found that the recommendations in this section are not weighty enough to be included as major recommendations. Macro should provide strategic recommendations as to the Secretariat's future needs in this area make the related stand-alone report on the current information systems being used in the Global Fund available to the Secretariat.

2.3 Next Steps

The TERG agreed on the following timeline for Macro's finalization of the Study Area 1 report:

4-7 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macro to follow up with Secretariat on data, TRP, etc. issues • Organize TERG Feedback to share with key study leaders
8-15 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of TERG Feedback with key study leaders • Organization of the draft revision process using agreed on headings and presentation • Commencement of the revision process • Consultations with TERG/Secretariat as needed to clarify feedback from TERG Meeting and/or fill in data gaps
16-23 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of the revision process • Review of past recommendations (including previous TERG recommendations) and inclusion of references in text/footnotes • Control of consistency/symmetry between Executive Summary and full text
Monday, 24 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Final Report submitted to TERG and Macro Editors/Formatters
Friday, 28 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TERG teleconference with Macro to provide feedback on final document

29 September – 8 October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Macro Team – Integration of TERG comments and review for formatting and editing issues
Monday, 8 October	Final Report on SA1 with SA2 Preliminary Findings submitted to TERG

3.0 Study Area 2 – Partnership Environment and Grant Performance

3.1 Background

The first seven Country Partnership Assessments have been completed under Study Area 2, and the preliminary findings were presented to the TERG. The TERG plans to provide an update to the Board on Study Area 2 at the Board's November 2007 meeting. The final report covering all 16 Study Area 2 countries will be completed in February 2008. The final Five-Year Evaluation Synthesis Report will be presented to the Board in November 2008 and in this final report Study Area 1 and 2 findings will be linked to those from Study Area 3.

3.2 Discussion and Recommendations

TERG members discussed the update given by Macro on progress under Study Area 2 covering the first seven countries that have completed CPAs. TERG recognized that the evaluation is currently at a 'descriptive' stage and that it is not yet possible to draw firm conclusions. TERG members re-stated the need to build systematically on the hypotheses contained in the Inception Report. In particular, TERG emphasized that this study should clearly tackle the core issue of technical assistance (TA), considering different potential models and providing recommendations for the Global Fund's role in ensuring effective TA as differentiated by region and key stages of the grant life cycle. Macro should also investigate what the hindering factors are for countries in accessing TA and should especially focus on countries with repeated failures. TERG members made the following additional recommendations:

- ❖ The TERG encouraged Macro to consider the full spectrum of technical assistance provided by partners, and the harmonization efforts of partners at both country and global level, e.g. the role of the Green Light Committee for MDRTB, the TB Coalition for Technical Assistance, PEPFAR, World Bank and others. Similarly the effects of SWAps and basket financing on performance based funding by the Global Fund should be explored.
- ❖ TERG re-emphasized the importance of building on the results of the previous TERG assessments such as the 360° Stakeholder Assessment and the CCM Assessment that gave stakeholder opinions at country level. The TERG expects Macro to go beyond the level of TERG evaluations completed in the last two years, and to make over-arching recommendations on the Global Fund partnership model, the parts that are working and those that are not.
- ❖ TERG emphasized the need to begin the grant performance analysis across the portfolio which will better inform the CPA findings. The analysis should disaggregate data by disease, and should distinguish those countries with SWAp environments or those that are fragile states.
- ❖ TERG reiterated the importance of benchmarking the Fund's efforts against other institutions and against the original intent and purpose behind the setting up of various mechanisms (i.e. CCMs, EARS). The partnership environment before the entry of the Global Fund should also be considered in benchmarking. The joint development of M&E guidelines deserves recognition.
- ❖ TERG particularly emphasized the need to structure the report around the hypotheses contained in the Inception Report. The TERG raised additional questions to help Macro in fine-tuning its hypotheses before getting into analysis of the data:

- What are the trends over time in the functioning of key partnership mechanisms. For example, has the functioning of CCMs improved or declined since the 2005 CCM Assessment?
- The Fund has a strong emphasis on alignment with country plans and existing efforts. Given the importance of this principle, why is the perception at country level so different?
- How will country ownership be assessed? How would Macro measure whether it has improved?
- The Global Fund's original intent was to re-define country ownership to include civil society and communities living with the diseases, along side the government. Has this happened? Is this model working? If not, why? What would be the recommendation to be derived from this?
- In proposals submitted, is the planning for technical assistance for grant implementation weak? Are there any links between TRP assessment, Phase 2 assessment and overall grant performance (later to be supplemented by SA 3 data)?
- Consider the M&E aspects of the Global Fund grants in countries – are monitoring efforts stronger than evaluation efforts?
- Overall, the partnership model may not be working ideally, but is it improving?
- Why is TA at country level not being used? Quality of TA? Fragmentation?
- Are ambitiousness of targets and achievement of targets predictors of grant performance?
- Is there evidence of Global Fund activities competing with other development objectives?
- Is there evidence of systems/sustainability strengthening/weakening?

3.3 Next Steps

TERG members extended an invitation to team leaders to initiate contact with TERG members individually by telephone or email to obtain ongoing TERG input informally and at key milestones. TERG and Macro agreed to the proposed steps below for finalizing Study Area 2:

1. Macro will focus on maximizing the utility of Phase 2 of Study Area 2, starting by re-focusing the CPA methodology for the remaining 5 CPAs, based on TERG feedback.
2. Macro will analyze existing hypotheses against TERG feedback and identify data gaps and areas for further enquiry based on TERG feedback.
3. To ensure data collection efforts are well-aligned with hypotheses, Macro will submit a revised SA2 Data Collection and Analysis Plan to TERG on 1 October, in lieu of the planned updated report of preliminary findings. The revised Data Collection and Analysis Plan will include:
 - Identification of hypotheses for which strong data exists that needs further analysis;
 - Identification of hypotheses for which weaker data exists that should be reinforced through further data collection;
 - Plan for adapting CPA process in remaining 5 countries to ensure that evidence is collected to examine key hypotheses;
 - Plan for follow up in already-completed CPA countries to strengthen existing data;
 - Plan for portfolio analysis and other potential analytical efforts.
4. Macro and TERG agreed to a revised timeline in which Macro will submit a Draft Study Area 2 report with recommendations in the first week of December 2007 for discussion and feedback from TERG members at a joint meeting in Washington in early December.
5. The final Study Area 2 report will be submitted to the TERG in the first week of February 2008 as currently specified in the contract.

4.0 Study Area 3 – Health Impact

4.1 Background

The Health Impact evaluation is an attempt to assess the reduction in the burden of HIV, TB and malaria associated with the collective scale-up of prevention and treatment activities by all partners. The contractor is engaged with 20 countries under this study, of which 8 are undergoing primary data collection activities and 12 will rely on secondary data analysis. The Macro-led consortium undertaking Study Area 3 presented a progress update to the TERG, including modeling and data interpretation issues, funding gaps and plans for the integration of the three study areas.

4.2 Discussion and Recommendations

The TERG commended Macro on the impressive progress made to date on the development of country plans and establishment of impact evaluation task forces in the primary data analysis countries and most of the secondary data analysis countries. The TERG encourages Macro to initiate ongoing informal dialogue with the TERG members to facilitate more informal exchanges and technical input from the TERG, in particular on the modeling and analysis plan. The TERG made the following specific recommendations:

Country Progress

- The TERG noted that funding gaps are present in four primary data analysis countries and encouraged the Secretariat to be proactive in facilitating the use of undisbursed M&E grant funds to fill the gaps. Macro requested that the final budgets be provided by 15 September so that they can proceed with setting up the subcontracts based on these budgets.
- TERG members were updated on the situation in the three countries that have not yet submitted workplans: South Africa, Nepal and Mozambique, and noted that work in Nepal and Mozambique is likely to proceed. TERG selected Lesotho as an alternate country to replace South Africa which has elected not to participate in the Five-Year Evaluation. The TERG saw value in including a HIV hyper-endemic country in the analysis. The TERG chose not to select any other alternate countries but encouraged the Secretariat and Macro to continue efforts to involve both Mozambique and Nepal.

Harmonization and partnership

- TERG members emphasized the importance of collaboration with TB and malaria partners such as Stop TB, PMI and RBM and also encouraged linkages with the World Bank as it is currently active in impact assessment in several countries. TERG noted that three of the eight primary data analysis countries are PMI focus countries, and that Macro should explore use of PMI tools – particularly for studies in Tanzania and Ethiopia which are undergoing PMI HIV/Malaria surveys over the next few months.
- Given the many studies ongoing in most countries, the TERG emphasized the importance of avoiding duplication of efforts not only to save money but also to prevent study fatigue.
- In order to build country capacity, the TERG emphasized the importance of collaborating with ongoing efforts and involving country institutions responsible for routine data collection. In particular, TERG emphasized the importance of specifically including the Ministry of Health throughout the planning and conduct of the evaluation in order to strengthen country ownership and to ensure sustainability of the tools and approaches. It is also key to share data analysis plans and other key Five Year Evaluation documents with country partners to stimulate country ownership and partners' buy-in.

- TERG members noted that the National Health Accounts exercise may in fact overlap with UNAIDS National AIDS Spending Assessments and suggested that Macro seek such opportunities to supplement the data to deal with cross-comparability.

District Comprehensive Assessments

- The TERG requested that Macro proposes possible solutions to issues related to confidentiality of the data (especially regarding consent for the DCA household surveys and GPS identification of households).
- The TERG emphasized that the DCA sampling design and analysis needs to be more clearly defined to assess different intensities of efforts to scale up interventions for all three diseases. TERG members also suggested it would be an advantage to use already existing data (i.e. DHS) to re-interview households. To the extent possible TERG asked that the same villages/towns be surveyed in order to allow for longitudinal analysis.
- A calendar of the planned DCAs is requested from the contractor to facilitate country visits by the TERG.

Attribution vs. Contribution

- TERG members emphasized the importance of understanding the Global Fund's contribution to disease control efforts and reconfirmed that the Five-Year Evaluation does not attempt to assess individual partner attribution.

Data ownership and availability

- In the spirit of ensuring country ownership of results, the TERG emphasized the importance of gaining full country agreement on the data and of having a data depository at country level. TERG re-emphasized that Macro should release evaluation data into the public domain as soon as it is verified.

4.3 Next Steps

The TERG reiterated that the main objective of the Five-Year Evaluation is to provide actionable recommendations that could improve the Global Fund's effectiveness towards the reduction of the burden of the three diseases. Improvements to the effectiveness will also be influenced by the results from Study Areas 1 and 2.

Data Analysis Strategy and Integration of Study Areas

- Study Area 3 data collection is starting soon in countries. However, the analysis strategy plan remains unclear for the TERG. If the analysis strategy is not well-articulated in advance, there is a risk that the right data may not be available to feed into the final Five-Year Evaluation report.
- The TERG requested that Macro prepare an analysis strategy by 30 September, which should include (a) main hypotheses which will drive Study Area 3 analysis (b) how the data collected will be used to reply to these hypotheses and (c) how this will help in strengthening or refining Study Area 1 & 2 recommendations. The hypotheses of this analysis strategy should be elaborated around general cross-cutting programmatic concepts, not only restricted to impact. Examples include: the effect of civil society involvement in the equality of access or quality of services; system effects according the type of partnerships; and the role of civil society in service provision according to scale-up level. This document should include a detailed schedule containing key milestones in the final refinement of this strategy. The paper should maintain scientific rigor while being accessible to general audiences. TERG notes it is therefore not necessary to enter into full technical detail of the analysis and models since these elements will be refined at the modeling workshop scheduled in April 2008.

5.0 Other Recommendations on the Five Year Evaluation and the three study areas:

- ❖ The TERG encouraged Macro to consider the time-trends of major findings of the study areas, for example, when and how key milestones in the Partnerships Assessment (Study Area 2), such as the creation of CCMs, influenced the control of the three diseases (Study Area 3). Macro could illustrate 'lessons learned'/'best practices' with such information coming from the different countries participating to the Five Year Evaluation.

- ❖ Quality of Services:

The TERG placed special emphasis on the importance of measuring the quality of services delivered. As specified in the Request for Proposals, two evaluation questions need to be considered:

- *To what extent do Global Fund policies and procedures ensure that quality services, based on recognized international and national standards, are supported and implemented through Global Fund grants?*
- *What is the quality of services supported through Global Fund grants?*

The TERG recognized the initial efforts of Macro to address partially these questions, mainly through the facility surveys (collecting information on provider training, supplies, adherence to guidelines). TERG requested that Macro: a) fully consider these two evaluation questions synergizing evaluation efforts across the three study areas and b) consider quality of services provided outside health facilities (community-based prevention efforts). The TERG requested that Macro share its plan to address these two evaluation questions detailing the evaluation framework and related data collection activities.

- ❖ The TERG received the Secretariat Progress Update. The TERG particularly emphasized and encouraged the Secretariat to pursue analyses of: 'value for money', quality of services and the possibility of creating incentives in countries for the acceleration of existing grants.

6.0 Next Meeting

The TERG Study Areas 1&2 Working Group agreed to meet in Washington, 10-11 December 2007 to review the draft Study Area 2 Final Report. The 8th TERG meeting was tentatively scheduled for 18-20 February in Geneva, Switzerland. Given the need for intensive input into development of the Five-Year Evaluation Synthesis Report, the TERG scheduled its subsequent meetings for 13-15 May 2008, and 3-5 September 2008 to review the major deliverables. The TERG will continue to review evaluation products between meetings, and will provide updates on findings to the PSC and Board as they become available.



Investing in our future

The Global Fund

To Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) Seventh Meeting
Geneva, Switzerland • 3-5 September, 2007

DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA

Meeting objectives:

6. Review of draft report on Study Area 1: Global Fund Organizational Efficiency and Effectiveness
7. Review interim report on Study Area 2: Partnership Environment
8. Review progress update on Study Area 3: Health Impact
9. Review Five-Year Evaluation workplan, timeline and plans for integration of study areas
10. Review schedule for TERG engagement and plans for next TERG meeting

Monday 3rd September

Venue: Hope Plaza, The Global Fund

	08.00 – 09.00	TERG retreat breakfast – venue: Hope Plaza	
1	09.00 – 10.30	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Review agenda, meeting objectives- High-level review of TERG reactions and initial comments on the Macro reports Chair for morning session: R. Korte	R. Korte TERG
2	10.30 – 12.30 Inclusive of coffee break	Review of Study Area 1 Draft Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Review major findings of the study- Presentation by study team- Questions, clarifications	R. Korte Macro International
	12.30 – 14.00	Lunch	
2 con't	14.00 – 17.30 Inclusive of coffee break	Review of Study Area 1 Draft Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Discussion of findings- TERG recommendations Chair for afternoon session: tbd	Chair Secretariat
3	17.30 – 18.30	Drafting of Day One recommendations	Secretariat

Tuesday 4th September
Venue: Hope Plaza, The Global Fund

4	09.00 – 10.30	Summary of Day One discussions and TERG recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finalize recommendations on Study Area 1 - Global Fund progress update (20 min) Chair for morning session: Rose Leke	Secretariat
5	10.30 – 13.00	Review of Study Area 2 Interim Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation from study team - Discussion of preliminary findings - TERG recommendation Inclusive of coffee break	Macro International Chair
	13.00 – 14.30	Lunch	
6	14.30 – 17.30	Review of Study Area 3 Progress Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation by study team - Discussion of country progress, modeling and data interpretation issues, funding gaps - TERG recommendations Chair for afternoon session: tbd	Macro International Chair
7	17.30 – 18.30	Drafting of Day Two recommendations	Secretariat
	19:30	Dinner – <i>Restaurant Le Creux de Genthod</i>	

Wednesday 5th September
Venue: Hope Plaza, The Global Fund

8	09.00 – 10.00	Summary of Day Two discussions and TERG recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finalize all recommendations Chair for morning session: Rolf Korte	Secretariat
9	10.00 – 11.30	Review of Five-Year Evaluation workplan & timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review plans for integration of study areas - Discussion and recommendations Inclusive of coffee break	Macro International Secretariat
10	11.30 – 12:30	TERG schedule and plans for next meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review opportunities for TERG observation of Study Area 2 & 3 in-country work - Review of TERG calendar 	
	12:30	Lunch and close of meeting	

List of Participants – 7th TERG Meeting, 3-5 September, 2007

TERG Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
BERTOZZI Stefano	Director, Health Economics & Evaluation, National Institute of Public Health, Mexico Visiting Professor, CIDE, Mexico City, University of California Berkeley	Instituto Nacional de Salud Publica Avenue Universidad 655 Cuernavaca, Morelos 62508 México	+52 777 311 37 83	bertozzi@alum.mit.edu
KORTE Rolf	Honorary Professor Faculty of Medicine Justus-Liebig University, Giessen, Germany Senior Health Policy Advisor, GTZ, Germany	Ziegelhuetten 30 61476 Kronberg Germany	+49 175 433 4018	rolf.korte@swiftkenya.com
LEKE Rose	Professor of Immunology and Parasitology	Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences P. O. Box 3851 University of Yaoundé Cameroon	+237 223 44 51	roleleke@yahoo.com
MASSIAH Ernest	Head of Health Social Transformation Programmes Division – Health Sector	Commonwealth Secretariat Marlborough House Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5HX United Kingdom	+44 20 7747 6290	e.massiah@commonwealth.int
Ex-officio Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
BROEKMANS Jaap F.	Former Executive Director Tuberculosis Foundation	KNCV Koningin Emmakade 174 2518 JN The Hague The Netherlands	+31 (0)70 3352696	broekmansj@tbconsult.nl
DE LAY Paul	Director, Monitoring & Evaluation UNAIDS	UNAIDS Secretariat 20, avenue Appia CH-1211 Geneva 27 Switzerland	+41 22 791 3666	delayp@unaids.org
HJELMÅKER Lennarth	Co-chair Global Task Team Ministry for Foreign Affairs	Gustav Adolfs torg 1 SE-103 30 Stockholm Sweden	+46 8 405 1701	Lennarth.hjelmaker@foreign.ministry.se
NAHLEN Bernard	Deputy Coordinator President's Malaria Initiative	USAID Room 3.6-18 RRB Washington, DC 20523	+1 202 712 5915	bnahlen@usaid.gov

Additional Participants	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
BACHRACH Peter	Study Area 1 Lead	Macro International Inc.	+1 202 625 0675	pbachrach@hotmail.com
DYE Tim	Team Leader Study Area 2	Axios Inc.	+33 144 860 760	Tim.dye@axiosint.com
GREENWELL Fern	Study Area 3	WHO - IER/MHI	+41 22 791 5081	greenwellk@who.int
RYAN Leo	Project Administrator	Macro International Inc.	+1 301 572 0219	Leo.j.ryan@orcmacro.com
SARRIOT Eric	Consultant	Macro International Inc. c/o ANERA PO Box 19982, Jerusalem Israel	+972 54 214 7389	mailto:EricSarriot@gmail.com
VAESSEN Martin	Sr. Vice President Project Director DHS	Macro International 11785 Beltsville Drive, Suite 300 Calverton MD 20705, U.S.A	+1 301 572 0899	Martin.T.Vaessen@orcmacro.com

GF Secretariat	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
SCHWARTLANDER Bernhard	Director Performance Evaluation & Policy	The Global Fund 8, Chemin de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	+41 22 791 17 80	Bernhard.Schwartlander@theglobalfund.org
LOW-BEER Daniel	Deputy Director Performance Evaluation & Policy		+41 22 791 19 29	Daniel.Low-Beer@theglobalfund.org
XUEREF Serge	Manager Evaluation, Quality & Learning		+41 22 791 8208	Serge.Xueref@theglobalfund.org
BENDIG Mary	Evaluation Manager Evaluation, Quality & Learning		+41 22 791 8296	Mary.Bendig@theglobalfund.org
MAHE Cedric	Evaluation Officer Evaluation, Quality & Learning		+41 22 791 1760	Cedric.Mahe@theglobalfund.org
LANG Alexandra	Evaluation Officer Evaluation, Quality & Learning		+41 22 791 5920	Alex.Lang@theglobalfund.org