

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

Eighth Meeting

**Geneva, Switzerland 18-20 February, 2008**

## 1.0 Introduction

The 8<sup>th</sup> TERG Meeting took place from 18-20 February, 2008 in Geneva, Switzerland at the Global Fund premises. This report 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 final report on Study Area 2 of the Global Fund Five-Year Evaluation, progress to date on Study Area 3 and plans for the Synthesis Report. The TERG also reviewed implementation plans for the remainder of the Five-Year Evaluation. Overall meeting objectives were as follows:

1. Review Five-Year Evaluation Final Report on Study Area 2, Partnership Environment
2. Review progress on Five-Year Evaluation Study Area 3, Health Impact Assessment
3. Review Secretariat progress on implementation of Study Area 1 recommendations
4. Review progress to date for the Five-Year Evaluation Final Synthesis Report

## 2.0 Study Area 2 – Partnership Environment & Grant Performance

### 2.1 Background

Macro International delivered the draft final report on Study Area 2 on 4 February for the TERG's review and comment.

In preparation for finalizing the Study Area 2 draft final report, the TERG provided comments to Macro at the TERG Working Group meeting held on 10-11 December 2007. Macro also received comments from the TERG at a special meeting held in their offices on 22 January 2008. Detailed minutes from both meetings were provided to Macro and the issues raised were expected to be addressed in this draft final report.

Macro has received a comprehensive set of comments on this draft final report from Chair TERG, TERG and consultants, plus the Global Fund Secretariat. The TERG requested that Macro also take these comments into consideration in finalizing the SA2 report.

### 2.2 Discussion and Recommendations

Despite the comments provided earlier, **the TERG found that the Study Area 2 Draft Final Report is still at a preliminary stage**, and will require substantial additional analysis and re-working. The TERG reminded Macro of the Board's expectations that some of the basic, long-standing questions about the Global Fund model need to be addressed and answered by Study Area 2. In particular the TERG encouraged the full input from all members of the Macro consortium in the revision of the report, and immediate actions to strengthen the project team.

**The TERG also expressed to Macro the need to consider all previous TERG comments on Study Area 2 emphasizing the presentation of evidence-based conclusions and specific and actionable recommendations.** Given that the report is incomplete, the TERG was unable to accept the report in its current form. The TERG requested that Macro present as an interim deliverable, a matrix outlining the initial high-level recommendations that can be drawn from the evidence to date, for consideration by the PSC and Board at their upcoming meetings in March-April 2008. The final Study Area 2 report will be discussed by the Board during the Partnership retreat, to be held possibly in October 2008.

The TERG urgently requested that Macro submit a revised timeline for finalization of a high quality Study Area 2 Final Report based on all TERG guidance received to date.

The TERG provided the following specific recommendations to the contractors on the Study Area 2 draft:

## **General Comments**

- ❖ **Data Analysis:** Although all coding of country data has now been completed, the results of a full analysis of all the data are not reflected in the report. The next draft of the report should reflect a full analysis of all available data at both country and global levels. The TERG recommended more in-depth analysis to probe beyond the initial questions and responses into the underlying issues, to probe, verify, triangulate, cross-check findings.
- ❖ **Report structure:** The introductory sections should define clearly how the Global Fund system works, who is involved and what their current roles are. **It should provide a sound analysis of the current global development architecture, addressing, for example, whether the global community has collectively failed to define appropriate systems for Technical Assistance and capacity building due to competitive rather than collaborative efforts.** Macro also needs to reflect the positive accomplishments of the Global Fund and provide a substantive analysis of the achievements.

**The report should provide a review of the evidence, then profile aspects of the Global Fund 'model' that are working, aspects that are not working, and present the key recommendations for improvement by the key actors (Secretariat, Board, partners at global and country-level) in: policies, systems and/or behaviors.**

Benchmarks or comparisons should be drawn from peer organizations including GAVI, PEPFAR or Gates Foundation or models from other sectors e.g. Fast-Track Initiative in Education, Global Environmental Facility. The TERG re-emphasized the need to present clear, quantitative evidence wherever possible.

## **Specific Comments**

- ❖ **Partnership System:** In general, TERG expects Macro to have a sound analysis of the current partnership environment, highlighting the division of labor with its existing gaps. This analysis shall identify what has changed in the last five years at global and country level (also addressing how Partnerships are managed by the Secretariat), and propose how to improve Partnerships at all levels.

Specifically in relation to CCMs, it is important to keep in mind the original vision of the founders of the Global Fund, in that the Global Fund was not prescriptive in designing CCMs in order to respect the principle of country ownership. The findings should focus on how CCMs have evolved from this original vision. Strong evaluative statements are needed to guide each area. The report should suggest whether Global Fund policies and guidelines for CCMs are still valid and the evidence for this. Recommendations should also suggest whether there is a need to revise CCM guidelines at Secretariat and Board levels. The report should also explore how CCMs could become part of country infrastructure (possibly by merging with other coordinating bodies). Case studies or examples of different successful methods of coordination should be presented, e.g. Tanzania or Mozambique. Good examples of partner coordination at global level should also be provided, e.g. between WHO, UNAIDS and the Global Fund on the 'three by five' initiative. If the study finds that some partners have been 'alienated' at country level since the inception of the Global Fund, then recommendations should specify what improvements (by specific groups) could be made.

Finally, the TERG stressed that the report should assess the potential differences between the partnership arrangements in the three disease areas, and should also identify how the financing of Partnerships will be ensured.

- ❖ **Technical Assistance:** In general, Macro should consider technical assistance (TA) with more perspective and depth, using a system approach. The report should clearly recognize the fact that the TA system currently in place is significantly under-developed. Given the expectation that countries undertake massive scale-up of disease interventions with already-stretched health systems, TA should be directed to improve absorption

capacity, by building on existing capacity and strengthening health systems. The report should examine existing models, e.g. STB, USG, GTZ, and propose options for a model that could be appropriate for the Global Fund. M&E TA is critical; however, the report does not recognize efforts to date to address it, e.g. the M&E Toolkit or M&E Systems Strengthening Tool. The report should explore why these tools are not more widely used. Additionally, many key TA providers are not mentioned in the report. The report should present examples of successful partnerships for TA provision. It is important to analyze TA going into capacity building and look beyond global and country-level TA to include regional possibilities for providing and coordinating TA. The report should address the need for the Global Fund Board to come to a decision on the financing of technical assistance, particularly at the global level. Questions that should be addressed include: Why TA is not used when funds are available? What TA is needed and what TA management structures are in place? What options exist to fund technical assistance? How is its quality ensured? Who is available to provide different types of TA in countries? What is the cost of TA?

- ❖ **Country Ownership & Alignment:** The TERG found that many recommendations in this section were overly general and should be more specific. The report could suggest that the rhythm of reporting to the Global Fund be aligned with country national planning cycles, specific to each country, and could examine successful case studies, e.g. Tanzania. The TERG did not advise delinking financial and program reporting. The report should also examine whether Global Fund grants and funding are changing national health priorities.
- ❖ **Performance Based Funding:** Evidence is needed to support assertions of negative consequences of the PBF system, especially with regard to any compromise of quality of services due to an overemphasis on meeting quantitative targets. The TERG found a lack of balance between results and contextual factors. The TERG emphasized that recommendations on data quality should recognize existing efforts; in particular the DQA tool recently developed by the Global Fund. The report could suggest that the original PBF concept was to examine outcomes rather than inputs/outputs, but that it may have evolved into an overly detailed process. The report should also emphasize that reporting requirements are inherent to performance-based funding.
- ❖ **Grant Performance:** Modelling of grant performance is incomplete. Macro should consider whether proxy measures for the portfolio might be available to understand aspects such as 'commitment' or civil society involvement. The study should consider similar evaluations done by partners, e.g. the fragile states analysis by the Global Fund itself and by GAVI. Partnerships appear not to be linked to the clear needs of grants along the grant lifecycle. Effort is needed to characterize countries by various typologies (e.g. weak government, development scores). The analysis could consider that the reported finding that there was no variation in performance by country typology may indicate that performance-based funding 'works', as no country is disadvantaged by type.
- ❖ **Health Systems Strengthening & System-Wide Effects:** The TERG found an appropriate emphasis on HR issues, but suggested that the report should also consider the management culture and quality management issues in health systems. The report could also emphasize lack of clarity and consensus even at Board level as to the definition of HSS and the need for further discussion at this level. The discussion should take into consideration that Health Systems in at least some countries are now able to deal more effectively with case loads, for example due to the reduction of cases on malaria, and that this in itself is an example of HSS.

## **Recommendations**

TERG emphasized the need to significantly elevate the conceptual level of recommendations. Recommendations should specify which partners need to act, and at what level (global, regional or country level). In particular Macro should consider the positioning of the Global Fund within the global development architecture and examine how the Global Fund has benefitted other partners and its major contributions (e.g. effects of PBF, contributions to international policy arena) and recognized shortcomings, with options to address these. The report should also address trends and changes in the global development architecture, inputs of other donors and the effect that this has had on implementation. Recommendations should be framed in the context of the future vision of the Global Fund's role over the next five years and progress towards the MDGs. Options for action could be associated with some recommendations. **Findings should distinguish between whether aspects of the system are weak or whether it is the implementation that is weak.** The report needs to show a clear flow from evidence to recommendations and possible options for action.

The TERG suggested the following questions as inputs for consideration in formulating actionable recommendations:

- i. What has changed since the founding of the Global Fund?
- ii. What has limited optimal functioning of partnerships (e.g. division of labor or resources) and how can the key actors work together in a new and improved way on discrete areas including TA and HSS to achieve the MDGs?
- iii. Which parts of the global development architecture are working well? Which are not? Consider the spirit of partnership within the Secretariat, and at country level, and technical support. Consider sharing draft recommendations with key partners for input.
- iv. How does the Global Fund performance-based funding model benefit partners, strengthen systems and how can it be improved? What is the added value?
- v. How does Global Fund mobilize financing for, and as, a partnership? What are the inherent expectations of each institution to best raise and use funds and, in particular, to provide technical support? After 5 years, and US\$10 billion, a new discussion with partners is needed to squarely face the question of an 'unfunded mandate'.
- vi. The Global Fund country interface currently often depends on individual relationships and should be guided by an institutional approach and system that would provide clear suggested guidance on FPM roles, financial and programmatic oversight, interaction with partners, and roles of country-level key actors: CCM, PR, SR and focal points for TA.
- vii. An individual country approach to provision of technical assistance has serious shortcomings and requires clearly-defined, agreed and established mechanisms by disease (provide options).
- viii. Recommendations should be made for measures that would significantly accelerate the alignment and simplification of the Global Fund system, e.g. defining oversight of the disbursement process and providing options to match annual country cycles.
- ix. Consider options for CCMs to shift from being a stand-alone body to one integrated with similar existing or new oversight mechanisms.
- x. Procurement: some immediate actions need to be taken to ensure high standards of oversight, at the level in the system where procurement occurs.
- xi. The locus of implementation for the Global Fund is at the sub-recipient level. Options should be considered to ensure appropriate oversight, partnership and capacity building at that level (PR model, TA on CCM, direct model of Secretariat, etc.).

## 2.3 Next Steps

The TERG agreed on the following immediate timeline for Study Area 2 report:

Date	Action
5 March 2008	Macro to deliver a matrix of 5-10 high-level, priority recommendations
12 March 2008	TERG to consider a presentation of preliminary SA2 recommendations to the PSC
28 April 2008	TERG to consider a presentation of preliminary SA2 recommendations to the Board

## 3.0 Study Area 3 – Health Impact Evaluation

### 3.1 Background

Macro reported on the Health Impact Evaluation progress to date in the 20 Study Area 3 countries. The TERG discussed progress, timelines, budgets, collaborative efforts with partners and the need to ensure sustainability.

### 3.2 Discussion and Recommendations

The TERG encouraged Macro to continue to work to address the issues in the three countries that are behind schedule: Nepal, Lesotho and India. The TERG was pleased to learn that various data analysis and modeling workshops are planned in April-June (designed to also include a capacity building element), and data dissemination workshops in July-August. TERG emphasized the need to include TB in the modeling workshops. The TERG were concerned that the Study Area 3 methodology relied too heavily on standard DHS methodology rather than being designed to meet the objectives of Study Area 3. TERG also discussed the importance of data quality and Macro offered to provide a document explaining specifically how data quality will be ensured for primary data collection countries.

The TERG was concerned to learn that the main challenge for Study Area 3 will be to meet the target dates as specified in the contract. Macro does not anticipate that the draft Study Area 3 report will be ready by the originally-agreed date of 30 April 2008. However, given that the final Study Area 3 Report is due in June 2008, Macro proposed to submit a partial Final Report on 30 June with placeholders for missing country data. The TERG did not agree to revised due dates, however remained open to the possibility of presenting the final report with placeholders for missing data. The TERG requested that each country report be made available for TERG review as soon as they become available, but committed to formally review only the Study Area 3 draft and final reports.

Macro also presented some preliminary plans for ensuring sustainability of the work in Study Area 3 including planning for a Model Impact Platform. The TERG emphasized that the Model Impact Platform needs to be proposed as a development tool. This tool will assist countries to obtain impact data on a regular basis, and will also help countries to strengthen their information systems. The TERG discussed the multiple initiatives underway looking at impact and health systems and considered the role of the International Health Partnership Plus (IHP+).

The Secretariat updated the TERG on Study Area 3 progress including:

- (a) A review of country budgets and timelines;
- (b) The identification of sources of secondary data emphasizing data for high risk groups;
- (c) Progress towards agreeing on the use of the PEPFAR contribution to Study Area 3; and
- (d) Plans for the upcoming Partners' Forum on Health Impact.

The TERG emphasized the need to find and use data from all possible past and on-going studies at country-level (at both national and sub-national levels) in order to best inform the Health Impact Evaluation. Special reference was made to HMN reports and WHO databases. The TERG also

discussed how the PEPFAR additional funds could be used for 2-3 additional studies to collect data where serious gaps had been identified and specifically emphasized the need for additional data on high risk groups. The TERG agreed that the emphasis of the Partners' Forum should be on sharing information on the Health Impact Evaluation, learning what similar partner efforts are under way and considering options for future evaluations. This meeting will be held in March prior to completion of data collection; however, it is considered a first step in a longer term collaborative process with partners.

The TERG further discussed sustainability, particularly with respect to the Implementation Evaluation Task Forces (IETFs). The TERG recommended that it would be best if IETFs are eventually merged into existing M&E bodies in-country such as national M&E groups or existing institutes. However, options for sustainability will need to be considered on a country-by-country basis. The TERG suggested that the IETFs might evolve to include other diseases thus enhancing their sustainability.

### 3.3 Next Steps

Date	Action
19-20 March	Partners' Forum for Health Impact - Geneva
1-4 April	Secondary data analysis workshop (all countries)
23-28 April	Modeling workshop (HIV, malaria)
30 April	Draft Report on Health Impact Evaluation due
5-6 May	Modeling workshop (concentrated epidemics)
early June	Primary data analysis workshop (8 primary data analysis countries)
30 June	Final Report on Health Impact Evaluation due

## 4.0 Five-Year Evaluation Synthesis Report

### 4.1 Background

The TERG discussed the draft outline of the Five-Year Evaluation Synthesis Report that was submitted by Macro to the TERG on 8 February 2008.

### 4.2 Discussion and Recommendations

Macro presented the hypotheses under consideration as the basis for the Final Synthesis Report. The TERG was not in favor of structuring the Final Report around hypotheses but emphasized the need to find linkages among the findings from the three study areas. The TERG emphasized that the Macro Study Area 3 team should increase its linkages and communications with the Study Area 1 and 2 teams and in particular to begin considering how Study Area 3 results could be used to inform the results from Study Areas 1 and 2. **The TERG did not endorse the proposed outline for the Final Synthesis Report** and advised Macro to put a strong team together first to conceptualize the Final Report and then to actually draft the report.

### 4.3 Next Steps

Macro proposed the following timeline. The TERG advised that the writing of the Final Report would need to commence at an earlier date and asked Macro to provide feedback on this.

Date	Action
March 2008	Draft and submit analysis plan for Synthesis Report
April-May 2008	Address identified gaps in Study Area 1 & 2 findings
May-June 2008	Begin synthesis with Study Area 3 findings
July-August 2008	Write Final Evaluation Report
August-September 2008	Integrate TERG feedback received at August meeting
15 September 2008	Final Five-Year Evaluation Synthesis Report due

## 5.0 Next Steps

The TERG agreed to meet in Geneva from 13-15 May 2008 to review the final draft of the Study Area 2 report, progress on the draft report on Study Area 3 and plans for the Five-Year Evaluation Synthesis Report. The 10<sup>th</sup> TERG meeting is scheduled for late August 2008 to review the Final Report on Study Area 3 and the draft Synthesis Report. Given the need for regular input into development of the Five-Year Evaluation deliverables, the TERG agreed to meet electronically and by teleconference more frequently to review the major deliverables, and will provide updates to the PSC and Board as the reports become available.

**The key actions and deliverables expected prior to the next TERG meeting in May are:**

### **Study Area 2:**

- Macro to provide a letter to Contracts explaining how they will **strengthen the Study Area 2 team** and proposing a date when the newly-strengthened team will be able to deliver a **high quality final report on Study Area 2** to the TERG. The final SA2 report is expected to present **actionable recommendations**.
- Macro will deliver to the TERG by 5 March, a matrix that presents preliminary high-level actionable recommendations and the evidence/findings on which they are based.

### **Study Area 3:**

- Macro will deliver the final progress report to the TERG by 28 February 2008.
- The contract calls for Macro to deliver a draft report to the TERG by 30 April 2008. Macro said at this meeting that the draft report is unlikely to be ready by this date and expects to deliver the final draft report by 30 June 2009. However, Macro will share from May 2008 the country reports as soon as they become available.





Investing in our future

**The Global Fund**

To Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

---

## ANNEX A - AGENDA & PARTICIPANTS LIST

### AGENDA

#### Meeting Objectives:

1. Review Five-Year Evaluation Final Report on Study Area 2, Global Fund Partnership Environment
2. Review progress on Five-Year Evaluation Study Area 3, Health Impact Assessment
3. Review Secretariat progress on implementation of Study Area 1 recommendations
4. Review progress to date for the Five-Year Evaluation Final Synthesis Report

**Monday 18 February**

**Venue: Hope Plaza, The Global Fund**

	<b>08.00 – 09.00</b>	<b>TERG Retreat Breakfast</b>	TERG
<b>1</b>	<b>09.00 – 09.15</b>	<b>Introductions &amp; review of agenda</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Review agenda, meeting objectives</li></ul> Chair for morning session: R. Korte	R. Korte
<b>2</b>	<b>09.15 – 11.00</b> <i>Inclusive of coffee</i>	<b>Presentation of Study Area 2 Final Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Macro presentation of overview of the SA2 report focusing on methodology and priority recommendations</li></ul>	R. Korte Macro
<b>3</b>	<b>11.00 – 12.30</b>	<b>Study Area 2 Focused Discussion: Partnership System &amp; Technical Assistance</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Macro presentation of key findings &amp; recommendations on Partnership System &amp; Technical Assistance</li><li>- TERG discussion and recommendations</li></ul>	R. Korte Macro
	<b>12.30 – 13.30</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
<b>4</b>	<b>13.30 – 14.30</b>	<b>Study Area 2 Focused Discussion: Country Ownership, Alignment and Performance Based Funding</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Macro presentation of key findings &amp; recommendations on country ownership, alignment and PBF</li><li>- TERG discussion and recommendations</li></ul> Chair for afternoon session: B. UI-Haq	B. UI-Haq Macro
<b>5</b>	<b>14.30 – 16.00</b> <i>Inclusive of coffee</i>	<b>Study Area 2 Focused Discussion: Grant Performance and Health Systems Strengthening</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Macro presentation of key findings &amp; recommendations on grant performance and health systems strengthening</li><li>- TERG discussion and recommendations</li></ul>	B. UI-Haq Macro
<b>6</b>	<b>16.00 – 17.30</b>	<b>Steps to finalize Study Area 2 Final Report for TGF Board</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- SA2 team presentation on plans for further refinement</li><li>- TERG discussion and recommendations in preparation for the TERG report to the Board</li></ul>	B. UI-Haq Macro
	<b>18.00</b>	<b>Departure for TERG Dinner – venue: Thai Phuket</b>	

**Tuesday 19 February**  
**Venue: Hope Plaza, The Global Fund**

7	09.00 – 10.30	<b>Summary of Day One discussions and TERG recommendations on Study Area 2 Final Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify items requiring further clarification</li> </ul> Chair for morning session: R. Leke	R. Leke Secretariat
	10.30 – 10.45	<b>Coffee</b>	
8	10.45 – 12.30	<b>Study Area 3 - Data Collection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation by SA3 team on progress against timelines globally and in each country, to include brief descriptions of the data collection tools used</li> <li>- TERG discussion and recommendations</li> </ul>	R. Leke Macro Secretariat
	12.30 – 13.30	<b>Lunch</b> Chair for afternoon session: P. De Lay	
8 <i>con't</i>	13.30 – 15.30	<b>Study Area 3 - Analysis Strategy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation by Ties Boerma on data analysis and modeling including strategies to incorporate past studies, workshops planned, and the development of an impact model platform</li> <li>- TERG discussion and recommendations including action points and next steps</li> </ul>	P. De Lay Macro
	15.30 – 15.45	<b>Coffee</b>	
9	15.45 – 17.30	<b>Preparation for Five-Year Evaluation Synthesis Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation by Macro on integration of 3 study areas</li> <li>- TERG discussion and recommendations including action points and next steps</li> </ul>	P. De Lay Secretariat

**Wednesday 20 February**  
**Venue: Hope Plaza, The Global Fund**

10	08.30 – 09.30	<b>Summary of Day Two discussions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify items requiring further clarification</li> </ul> Chair for morning session: R. Korte	R. Korte Secretariat
11	09.30 – 11.00	<b>Implementation of Study Area 1 Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation of progress on implementation of TERG recommendations on SA1 &amp; LFA Assessment</li> <li>- TERG discussion and recommendations</li> </ul>	R. Korte Secretariat
		<i>Inclusive of coffee</i>	
12	11.00 – 12.30	<b>Review of Five-Year Evaluation workplan, deliverables and TERG meeting dates</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Short presentation from Secretariat</li> <li>- TERG discussion and recommendations</li> </ul>	R. Korte Secretariat
	12.30	<b>Closing and Lunch</b>	

## List of Participants – 8<sup>th</sup> TERG Meeting: 18-20 February 2008

TERG Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
<b>KORTE</b> Rolf	Honorary Professor, Faculty of Medicine Justus-Liebig University, Giessen, Germany Senior Health Policy Advisor, GTZ	Ziegelhuetten 30 61476 Kronberg Germany	+49 175 433 4018	<a href="mailto:rolf.korte@swiftkenya.com">rolf.korte@swiftkenya.com</a>
<b>LEKE</b> Rose	Professor of Immunology and Parasitology, Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences	P. O. Box 3851 University of Yaoundé 1 Cameroon	+237 223 44 51	<a href="mailto:roleleke@yahoo.com">roleleke@yahoo.com</a>
<b>AOYAMA</b> Atsuko	Professor, Department of International Health, Nagoya University School of Medicine	65 Tsurumai-cho, Showa-ku, Nagoya 466-8550	+81 52 744 2108	<a href="mailto:atsukoa@med.nagoya-u.ac.jp">atsukoa@med.nagoya-u.ac.jp</a>
<b>BARR</b> David (by teleconf)	Senior Philanthropic Advisor Tides Foundation	193, Second Avenue No. 5 New York, N.Y. 10003 USA	+1 646 602 0027	<a href="mailto:d.barr@earthlink.net">d.barr@earthlink.net</a>
<b>BERTOZZI</b> Stefano (by teleconf)	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	<a href="mailto:bertozzi@alum.mit.edu">bertozzi@alum.mit.edu</a>
<b>HAQ</b> Bashirul	Director, Technical SoSec Consulting Services	House 67, Street 96-Sector 9-8/4 Islamabad	+92 51 484 7573	<a href="mailto:Buh02@hotmail.com">Buh02@hotmail.com</a>
Ex-officio Members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
<b>BROEKMANS</b> Jaap F.	Former Executive Director KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation	Koningin Emmakade 174 2518 JN The Hague The Netherlands	+31 (0)70 3352696	<a href="mailto:broekmansj@tbconsult.nl">broekmansj@tbconsult.nl</a>
<b>DE LAY</b> Paul	Director, Monitoring & Evaluation UNAIDS	UNAIDS Secretariat 20, avenue Appia CH-1211 Geneva 27 Switzerland	+41 22 791 3666	<a href="mailto:delayp@unaids.org">delayp@unaids.org</a>
<b>NAHLEN</b> Bernard	Deputy Coordinator President's Malaria Initiative	USAID Room 3.6-18 RRB Washington, DC 20523	+1 202 712 5915	<a href="mailto:bnahlen@usaid.gov">bnahlen@usaid.gov</a>
<b>TEIXEIRA</b> Paulo	Adviser, Ministry of Health	R. Bela Cintra, 1450 apto. 44 CEP 01415-001 – Jardim Paulista Sao Paulo, Brazil	+55 11 3066 8771	<a href="mailto:pteixeira@saude.sp.gov.br">pteixeira@saude.sp.gov.br</a>

<b>Additional Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>
<b>Schwartländer</b> Bernhard	UNAIDS Country Coordinator	UNAIDS/Beijing China	+86-10-8532 2226	<a href="mailto:schwartlanderb@unadis.org">schwartlanderb@unadis.org</a>
<b>BRANDRUP</b> Assia	Adviser to the Health Metrics Network	Strandvej 100 2900 Hellerup Denmark	+45 27 17 23 31	<a href="mailto:assiabrandrup@yahoo.de">assiabrandrup@yahoo.de</a>
<b>MOOKERJI</b> Sangeeta	Study Area 2 Coordinator	JHSPH	+1 301 572 0922	<a href="mailto:smookher@jhsph.edu">smookher@jhsph.edu</a>
<b>RYAN</b> Leo	Project Administrator	Macro International Inc. 11785 Beltsville Drive, Suite 300 Calverton MD 20705, U.S.A	+1 301 572 0219	<a href="mailto:Leo.j.ryan@orcmacro.com">Leo.j.ryan@orcmacro.com</a>
<b>VAESSEN</b> Martin	Sr. Vice President Project Director DHS	Macro International 11785 Beltsville Drive, Suite 300 Calverton MD 20705, U.S.A	+1 301 572 0899	<a href="mailto:Martin.T.Vaessen@orcmacro.com">Martin.T.Vaessen@orcmacro.com</a>
<b>BOERMA</b> Ties	Director Measurement & Health Information Systems/WHO	World Health Organization	+41 22 791 1481	<a href="mailto:boermat@who.int">boermat@who.int</a>
<b>GF Secretariat</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>
<b>BENDIG</b> Mary	Evaluation Manager Evaluation, Quality & Learning	The Global Fund 8, Chemin de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	+41 22 791 8296	<a href="mailto:Mary.Bendig@theglobalfund.org">Mary.Bendig@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>LANG</b> Alexandra	Evaluation Officer Evaluation, Quality & Learning		+41 22 791 5920	<a href="mailto:Alex.Lang@theglobalfund.org">Alex.Lang@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>LOW-BEER</b> Daniel	Director, Performance Evaluation & Policy		+41 22 791 19 29	<a href="mailto:Daniel.Low-Beer@theglobalfund.org">Daniel.Low-Beer@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>MAHE</b> Cedric	Evaluation Officer Evaluation, Quality & Learning		+41 22 791 1760	<a href="mailto:Cedric.Mahe@theglobalfund.org">Cedric.Mahe@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>SHAKARISHVILI</b> George	Senior Evaluation Officer Evaluation, Quality & Learning		+41 22 791 8218	<a href="mailto:George.Shakarishvili@theglobalfund.org">George.Shakarishvili@theglobalfund.org</a>
<b>XUEREF</b> Serge	Manager/ Evaluation, Quality & Learning		+41 22 791 8208	<a href="mailto:Serge.Xueref@theglobalfund.org">Serge.Xueref@theglobalfund.org</a>