

**Thirteenth Board Meeting
Geneva, 27-28 April 2006**

**GF/B13/7
Attachment 5**

**Draft Summary Report of the
Technical Evaluation
Reference Group (TERG) of
the Global Fund
Fourth Meeting**

Glion, Switzerland 27 February - 1 March, 2006

Introduction

This document reports on the fourth TERG meeting, which took place from 27 February-1 March 2006 in Glion, Switzerland. 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. Consistent with the TERG's mandate, the objective of the meeting was to make concrete recommendations to the Global Fund on evaluation approaches and practices, independence, reporting procedures and other technical and managerial aspects of monitoring and evaluation at all levels. Specifically, the TERG:

- reviewed findings and Advisory Panel recommendations emerging from the Evaluation of the Global Fund Proposal Process and developed final recommendations for PSC and Board consideration;
- advised on prioritized data and information gaps for the Global Fund five-year evaluation and assessments needed in the short term;
- revised the method of work and time line for the Global Fund five-year evaluation; and
- reviewed and discussed key issues identified by the TERG at its third meeting.

1.0 Progress update

1.1 Background

The Global Fund Secretariat reported on grant targets vs. results for 2005, the acceleration in numbers of people being reached by services, and progress towards implementation of the evaluation framework. The Secretariat also introduced the revised version of the Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit. Progress updates were provided on plans for impact measurement and specifically the commitment that all Phase 2 grants will include impact measures.

1.2 Recommendations

Building on the target setting study, the TERG recommended that the Secretariat undertake a study to be presented at the next TERG meeting, analyzing the determinants of grant performance, including such factors as the presence of support from technical partners and the burden of disease, and the relationship between grant performance and ambitiousness of targets set.

2.0 Evaluation of the proposal development and review process

2.1 Background

The TERG reviewed the findings of the Euro Health Group (EHG) final report on the evaluation of the Global Fund proposal development and review process and the Advisory Panel recommendations emerging from this evaluation. The final report will be submitted to the PSC and finally to the Board for consideration in April 2006 and will be posted on the TERG website.^a

^a http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/terg/announcements/evaluation_of/default.asp

2.2 Recommendations

The TERG recommended that the Global Fund should:

- recognize that there is an urgent need to improve the common understanding of Global Fund policies and principles among partners, which has sometimes been impaired by lack of consistent communication from the Global Fund. The TERG recommends that the Global Fund invest particularly in improving communications related to proposal development and technical review.
- recognize that the EHG report recommendations related to improving information on country capacity and strengthening monitoring and evaluation reflect well-known problems and should be the subject of further analysis so as to develop solutions.
- reinforce existing processes and tools to better ensure that Global Fund investments strengthen routine health information systems (including survey implementation) and in particular strengthen the focus on data quality, in order to improve measurement of country capacity.
- emphasize the alignment of proposals with national strategic plans that are inclusive of all sectors of society and that include appropriate gender perspective as needed. The TERG recommends that the Secretariat further refine tools, in particular proposal forms and guidelines, to link proposals with country disease strategies, budgets and monitoring frameworks.
- encourage adherence to appropriate and relevant international and national standards during proposal development. Those cases in which country standards deviate from international norms and standards should be explicitly explained in the proposal form.
- emphasize the inclusion of technical assistance in proposals and budgets, in particular, taking into consideration issues of continuity. The TERG highlighted the need for further information on technical assistance in terms of partners' capacity to provide assistance, the main technical assistance gaps and assessing the quality and effectiveness of services provided.

3.0 Five-year evaluation of the Global Fund

3.1 Background

The TERG welcomed the continuing dialogue and coordination with PSC and confirmed the importance of close links between the five-year evaluation and the strategy development process of the Global Fund. The TERG noted the evaluation is anticipated to help inform both the options development phase and the implementation of strategic decisions. The TERG reviewed the revised plan for initiation of the five-year evaluation, priorities for data collection and the timetable for appropriate studies to fill information gaps. During the meeting the TERG utilized three working groups to refine the three overarching questions guiding the evaluation and to consider relevant sub-areas to be addressed in the evaluation. The proposed overarching questions and revised timeline are attached as Annex B. The TERG noted that execution of the five-year evaluation will require funding support and that appropriate budgetary allocations should be made during the mid-year and 2006 year-end budget reviews.

3.2 Recommendations

The TERG reviewed the priority evaluation questions in the context of both the Global Fund evaluation framework and the strategy development process, and recommended that the Global Fund Secretariat should:

- collaborate with a sub-group of the TERG to refine the evaluation questions and terms of reference for the development of priority studies. This working group will meet in early June 2006 to provide recommendations on the integrated package of studies to be developed as part of the larger five-year evaluation effort, in preparation for the PSC meeting scheduled for July 2006.
- develop and disseminate a timeline for the end outputs of all aspects of the five-year evaluation effort.

In addition the TERG recommended:

- the unique elements of the Global Fund should be highlighted as a primary focus the five-year evaluation.
- final terms of reference for priority studies should be inclusive of the discussion points developed during the TERG meeting by the three working groups, and should explicitly show how studies lead to appropriate measurement of impact and systems effects. The scope and design of these studies are to be addressed at the next TERG meeting.

4.0 Target setting analysis

4.1 Background

At the request of the TERG, the Global Fund Secretariat assessed grant performance targets for 82 grants from Rounds 1 through 4, with the objective of describing the ambitiousness of performance targets across grants and the unit cost of service delivered associated with performance targets. The TERG welcomed the study and initial findings, and recognized the limitations of this preliminary analysis. The TERG acknowledged that the paper was developed for internal discussion and made the following recommendations.

4.2 Recommendations

Currently-available financial data cannot be sufficiently disaggregated to enable explanation of the large differences in service costs across grants. In addition, current budgeting guidelines limit the ability of the TRP and the Global Fund to assess the appropriateness of budget in relation to targets. The TERG therefore specifically recommends the Global Fund should:

- modify budgeting guidelines to show unit costs of the primary services delivered;
- strengthen the financial monitoring system to enable comparison of the efficiency of grants in achieving targets. These data are critical to the Phase 2 assessments as countries with very generous funding per service delivery should be held to higher expectations in terms of performance;
- recognize that beyond comparison of results against targets, it is vital that contextual issues also be considered as the basis for performance-based funding decisions;
- prioritize measures of services delivered and outcomes in relation to the goals of the proposal in performance-based funding decisions; and
- further investigate costs and target slippage during grant implementation in light of the finding that overall targets appeared relatively ambitious.

5.0 Data quality assessment

5.1 Background

The Secretariat has worked with WHO, Health Metrics Network (HMN), PEPFAR and Measure Evaluation to develop and pilot a set of quality assessment tools for data reported from countries. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Self Assessment Checklist, Data Quality Audit Tool and Indicator-based Data Quality Guidelines are now at various stages of development and testing. The TERG recognized progress in the development and piloting of these assessment tools and raised some key issues in its recommendations.

5.2 Recommendations

The TERG reviewed progress and recommended that the Global Fund should:

- encourage country ownership of the M&E checklist by ensuring it is completed or reviewed as part of a national stakeholder meeting. This process should evolve under the oversight of the CCM including civil society members;
- avoid parallel efforts by ensuring that the M&E checklist is completed (where feasible) by disease area rather than by each PR or for each grant;
- employ the M&E checklist at regular intervals to monitor progress and capacity strengthening; and
- encourage strengthening of national health information systems in proposals, avoid parallel investments and set incentives to achieve this.

The TERG also welcomed links with Health Metrics Network and recommended that the new Executive Secretary be present at the next TERG meeting to discuss how HMN efforts relate to disease specific performance reporting and global initiatives in particular. HMN is also invited to discuss how its efforts can be used to efficiently leverage Global Fund investments to strengthen performance reporting and strengthen health information systems.

6.0 Additional recommendations

Based on a past TERG recommendation, a member of the TERG presented a detailed proposal for a community-driven approach to monitoring and evaluation of CCM performance. After review and further discussion within the TERG, the following additional recommendation emerged:

- The TERG requests that the Secretariat develop terms of reference for a Request for Proposals (RFP) to develop a pilot project for CCM monitoring by civil society, based on the proposal presented on this subject at the TERG meeting.

7.0 Next meeting

An interim working group meeting will be held the week of 12 June 2006 to address key aspects of the Global Fund five-year evaluation. The fifth TERG meeting will be held the week of 28 August 2006. Specific dates and venue details will be submitted in due course.

ANNEX A

MEETING AGENDA & PARTICIPANTS LIST

Meeting objectives:

1. Review findings and Advisory Panel recommendations emerging from the evaluation of the Global Fund proposal processes and develop final recommendations for PSC and Board consideration;
2. Advise on prioritized data and information gaps for the five year evaluation of the Global Fund and assessments needed in the short-term;
3. Revise method of work and time line for five-year evaluation; and
4. Follow-up review and discussion on key issues identified by the TERG;

Venue: **Hotel Victoria, Glion, Switzerland**

Monday February 27th

19:00 Reception and Working Dinner

Tuesday February 28th

1	9.00 – 9.30	Opening, introduction, agenda and expected outcomes of the meeting; including update of Secretariat progress	R. Korte Secretariat
		Chair for morning session: Professor Korte	
2	9.30 – 11.00	Evaluation of the proposal development and review process: review of final report	R. Korte, Advisory Panel Chair
		- Presentation of methodology and findings, Advisory Panel recommendations and Secretariat response; - Discussion and TERG recommendations	Secretariat
3	11.00-11.45	Technical approaches for the five-year evaluation of the Global Fund	R. Korte Secretariat
		- Update and review of timeline; - Review of ToR for TERG sub-group	
		Inclusive of coffee	

3 con't	11.45 – 13.00	Technical approaches for the five-year evaluation of the Global Fund (continued)	Secretariat
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of Secretariat paper, 'Inventory of Information Availability and Data Gaps'; - Update on key evaluation questions and issues; - Discussion and recommendations 	
	13.00 – 14.00	Lunch	
4	14:00-15:15	Five-year evaluation priorities to inform strategy development process	Chair TBD
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priorities for interaction between strategy development and evaluation work - Discussion and recommendations Chair for afternoon session: TBD	Secretariat
	15.15 – 15.30	Coffee	
4 con't	15.30 – 17.00	Five-year evaluation priorities (continued)	R. Korte
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prioritization of data gaps and identification of studies required in the short-term; - Discussion and recommendations 	Secretariat
	19.00	Dinner (Hotel Victoria)	

Wednesday March 1 st			
5	9.00 – 10.00	Summary of Day One discussion and recommendations	Morning Chair TBD
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify items requiring further clarification - Discussion of context of five-year evaluation as it relates to other efforts (IOM panel for PEPFAR, coordination with other initiatives). 	S. Bertozzi, T. Boerma
6	10.00 – 13.00	Update on TERG-recommended activities	
		Target Setting Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of Secretariat 'Target Setting' paper - Discussion and recommendations 	J. Cutler
		Data Quality Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Status of tool development - Available findings from pilot of M&E checklist - Health Metrics Network (HMN) activities 	R. Tran-Ba-Huy T. Boerma
		CCM audit and civil society monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion of proposal - Response and recommendations 	D. Barr
		Inclusive of coffee	
	13.00 – 14.30	Lunch	
7	14.30 – 15.15	TERG methods of work	R. Korte
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timing of TERG meetings and products via-a-vis Board committees; - Opportunities for TERG members to participate in GF activities in coming months 	
		Chair for afternoon session: Professor Korte	
8	15.15 – 16.00	Summary of meeting	R. Korte
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TERG recommendations and conclusions 	Secretariat
9	16.00	Closing	

List of Participants to TERG Meeting February / March 2006

TERG members	Title	Address	Telephone	E-Mail
BARR, David	Senior Philanthropic Advisor Tides Foundation	193, Second Avenue No. 5 New York, N.Y. 10003 USA	001 646 602 00 27	d.barr@earthlink.net
BERTOZZI Stefano	Director of Health Economics & Policy. Visiting Professor for Economics Research and Education (CIDE) Mexico City	Instituto Nacional de Salud Publica Avenue Universidad 655 Cuernavaca, Morelos 62508 Mexico	0052 777 311 37 83	bertozzi@alum.mit.edu
BOERMA, Ties	Director Measurement and Health Information Systems	World Health Organization MHI Avenue Appia 20 CH – 1211 Geneva	0041 22 791 14 81	boermat@who.int
UL HAQ, Bashir	Director Technical, SoSec Consulting Services, Islamabad, Pakistan	House 67, Street 96, Sector 9–8/4 Islamabad Pakistan	0092 300 552 73 52 (mobile)	BUH02@hotmail.com
KITA, Etsuko	Professor Center for International Health & Humanitarian Studies The Japanese Red Cross Kyushu International University of Nursing	1–1, Asty Munakata Fukuoka 811–4157 Japan	0081 940 35 7036	e-kita@rckicn.ac.jp
KORTE, Rolf	Honorary Professor Faculty of Medicine Justus-Liebig University, Giessen, Germany Senior Health Policy Advisor, GTZ, Germany	Ziegelhuetten 30 61476 Kronberg Germany	0049 175 433 4018	rolf.korte@swifkenya.com
MASSIAH, Ernest	Senior Social Development Specialist	Inter. American Development Bank 1300 New York Avenue NW Washington, DC 20057 USA	001 202 623 3816	ernestm@iadb.org
PEDRAZA, Jairo	Vice-Chair Policy and Strategy Committee	505 Eight Avenue, Suite 1600, New York, NY 10018 USA	001 – 212 594 7741	jpfna@aol.com
PESCHI, Loretta	Senior Consultant INTERSOS for Monitoring and Evaluation, Co-ordinator of the Italian NGOs Network for the Global Action against AIDS	Via Pegasus 1 I – 00060 Castelnuovo di Porto (Roma) Italy	0039 347 703 41 55	peschilo@tin.it

Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) 4th Meeting, Glion, Switzerland

Page 9/11

Ex-officio Members		Address	Telephone	E-Mail
BROEKMANS, Jaap F.	Executive Director	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation Royal Netherlands TB Ass. P.O.Box 146, Riouwstraat 7 NL – 2501 CC The Hague Netherlands	0031 70 416 72 27 (secre.) 0031 70 416 72 22 (general)	broekmans.J@KNCVTBC.nl Copy to: bisela@KNCVTBC.NL
DE LAY, Paul	Director, Monitoring and Evaluation Executive Office UNAIDS	UNAIDS Monitoring and Evaluation 20, Avenue Appia CH – 1211 Geneva	0041 22 791 45 34	delayo@UNAIDS.org
NAHLEN, Bernard	Senior Advisor M&E	GFATM 8, ch. de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	0041 791 5983	Bernard.Nahlen@theglobalfund.org
Global Fund Secretariat		Address	Telephone	E-Mail
SCHWARTLANDER, Bernhard	Director Strategic Information and Evaluation	GFATM 8, ch. de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	0041 22 791 17 80	Bernhard.Schwartlander@TheGlobalFund.org
LOW-BEER, Daniel	Senior Manager Strategic Information and Evaluation	GFATM 8, ch. de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	0041 22 791 19 29	Daniel.Low-Beer@TheGlobalFund.org
PLOWMAN, Beth Anne	Senior Evaluation Officer M&E strategy and Policy	GFATM 8, ch. de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	0041 – 22 791 1747	Beth.plowman@theglobalfund.org
LANG, Alexandra	Evaluation Officer	GFATM 8, ch. de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	0041 – 22 – 791 5920	Alex.Lang@theglobalfund.org
TRAN-BA-HUY, Ronald	Technical Officer	GFATM 8, ch. de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	0041 – 22 – 791 5953	Ronald.Tran-Ba-Huy@theglobalfund.org
CUTLER, John	Manager SI	GFATM 8, ch. de Blandonnet 1214 Vernier	0041 – 22 – 791 5928	John.cutler@theglobalfund.org

Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) 4th Meeting, Glion, Switzerland

Page 10/11

Annex B

Proposed Overarching Questions and Anticipated Timeline for the Five-Year Evaluation of the Global Fund

Proposed Overarching Questions
<p>Question #1: Does the Global Fund as an organization (Board, Secretariat, TRP, LFAs) through both its policies and operations, reflect the two critical, core principles of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Acting as a financial instrument rather than implementation agency; and (b) Furthering country ownership? <p>In fulfilling these principles, does the Global Fund as an organization perform in an efficient and effective manner?</p>
<p>Question #2: How effective and efficient is the Global Fund partnership system* in supporting HIV, Malaria, and TB programs at country level?</p> <p>* Partnership system includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) CCM, PR, SR, civil society; (2) Providers of technical assistance, e.g. UN, WB, bilateral donors, contractors; (3) Implementers of programs: PEPFAR, UNICEF, MAP; (4) Other donors: bilaterals, foundations, private sector.
<p>Question #3: What is the Global Fund's contribution to reducing the burden of the three diseases? What has been the overall reduction on the burden of the three diseases?</p>

Anticipated Timeline 2006

Month	Activity / Deliverable
Feb.	Inventory of available information and identification of priority data gaps
	TERG 4 th meeting: Development of proposed overarching evaluation questions
Mar.	Key stakeholder consultation to develop consensus around priority evaluation questions
	Outcome presented to PSC
Apr.	Priority questions presented to Board
	Begin development of integrated package of studies addressing priority questions
Jun.	TERG working group to provide recommendations on package of studies
Jul.	Presentation of package of studies to PSC
	Begin roll-out of short-term studies
Aug.	Mid-term budget review, seek budget support for initiation of medium-term studies
	TERG 5 th meeting: Discuss scope and design of specific medium-term studies
Sep.	Update presented to PSC
Nov.	Present recommended package of medium-term studies to Board for approval