

32nd TERG Meeting: Summary Report

6-8 June 2017¹
Versoix, Switzerland

Objectives of the 32nd TERG Meeting

1. Review PCE inception reports and their progress, agree on cross-consortia coordination and collaboration, and identify ways forward for the eight PCEs.
2. Discuss and finalize Strategic Review 2017.
3. Provide final guidance on the thematic review on gender and discuss additional thematic

Day 1

Executive Session

Chair: Jim Tulloch

Discussion

The meeting began with an Executive Session on the Prospective Country Evaluations (PCE). All participants in the executive session were asked to declare any conflicts of interest.

Certain major themes emerged. Among these were the importance of assessing country ownership throughout the PCE process, the need to examine the quality of country data systems (also drawing from the SR2015 findings) and the Theory of Change (ToC). The framework of ToC should help countries address bottlenecks and could be tailored at the country level, to take into account concrete contextual aspects.

Discussions around process evaluation, capacity development, value for money and impact assessments were further elaborated in the subsequent days of the meeting.

Opening

Chair: Jim Tulloch

TERG received updates from the Global Fund Secretariat on Impact through Partnership and implementation of the 2017-2022 Strategy.

A draft report of the TERG Strategic Review 2017 (SR2017) with its findings and recommendations was presented. The Review generally concluded that the Global Fund had taken action in response to most of the SR2015 recommendations and is well placed to implement the new strategy. There are areas to monitor and course correct, and urgent ones to act upon now (e.g. ensuring that the AIM project delivers). SR2017 also highlighted country ownership, and its multi-dimensional nature: collaboration, coordination and follow-up by country were discussed.

Conclusions

¹ At this meeting, the TERG agreed to henceforward amend the usual format of meeting reports to a more concise document, which clearly states agreed upon action points and conclusions.

- ToC should be kept simple, yet its usefulness depends on adaptation in each country context and the underlying assumptions and conditions being unpacked.
- TERG could explore becoming involved in assessment of the supply chain initiative.
- The TERG will aim to clarify the issue of country ownership in the Global Fund's interactions with countries.

Action points

- TERG to ask global consortia to reflect further before taking the ToC to country level.
- TERG Chair requested members to think further about SR2017 themes which are relevant to PCE.

Day 2

Guidance on PCE

Chair: Bess Miller

Discussion

Day 2 was dedicated to the Prospective Country Evaluations: TERG shared with the consortia its guidance on ToC, draft inception and key themes where coordination is necessary, including: Value for Money (VfM); process evaluation; impact assessment; and capacity development.

On the ToC, the TERG requested the consortia to spend more time on the “drivers of change” and “assumptions” portions, which can maximize ToC's potential as a powerful explanatory tool.

In designing capacity development to implement the PCE, TERG advised to be aware of other efforts on the ground; mapping the gaps; effort and resources spent; and not being overambitious.

The VfM topic has potentially broad application, and primary and secondary focus suggestions were developed and the rationale for these choices discussed. Suggested topics for primary focus for VfM topics are: choice of interventions and modalities of implementation; stakeholder interactions; and a placeholder for issues that emerge during the course of PCE. Secondary VfM topics are: procurement and distribution of commodities; grant processes; capacity development (with a focus on data systems); and special initiatives, where relevant. Methodology for VfM analysis is not yet developed: while the TERG is open to formal economic analysis, qualitative measures will also need to be taken.

For impact assessment, it is expected that the PCEs will estimate effective coverage of the key interventions for each disease for prevention and treatment. Data (or estimates) on effective coverage depend on the country, but it is considered likely to be possible in most. It is accepted that modelling will be used to extrapolate morbidity and mortality impact but wherever possible this should be supplemented by direct measurement. It is expected that the PCE can make a more robust assessment of impact than that made at the time of the SR2015, in line with consortia's expertise. TERG discussed that it may be needed to look at impact in other areas, like reduction of stigma.

TERG and the consortia discussed the first synthesis report. Given the timing, grant-making processes will be a focus, without necessarily being the only one. Other areas with findings of interest across countries should also be included. The consortia do not need to tailor the report for the Strategy Committee meetings, as the TERG will update the SC as appropriate.

Country evaluation partners advised against being too prescriptive. TERG agreed that flexibility is necessary: unanticipated issues and new ideas are likely to emerge.

Conclusions:

- Generally, PCE should use a “country lens” to look at Global Fund processes and policies, and examine the business model from this perspective.

- The synthesis report is expected to cover all eight countries. The first such report should include information on the funding access process and differentiation.
- Priority for process evaluation should be on observing how well new funding access processes are working (including full vs tailored application).
- Emphasis in capacity development should be placed on data analysis and use. PCE should also consider how to promote a data use culture in countries.
- As data quality and analysis issues in countries persist, TERG identified data system strengthening as a key priority for the PCE, and especially important at the beginning. This includes validation, if not yet done, of quality of routine data systems (to better assess coverage of services) and systems to track financial information (in order to meaningfully look into value for money).
- Proven interventions are key for impact and should be viewed as a priority.
- TERG advised the country evaluation partners to pay close attention to: country ownership, including involvement of the Ministry of Health, evaluators' participatory observation, a high level advisory group on PCE (preferably an existing structure) and the long-term sustainability of PCE input.

Action points:

- At the next TERG meeting, a more polished ToC product will be presented to the TERG. The Global level ToC will be translated to country level.

Day 3

Guidance on PCE (continued from day 2)

Chair: Bess Miller

Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) are under development for the PCE. TERG discussed some principles for the SOP, as well the as the annual country reports.

Conclusions:

- Clear guidelines for communication at different levels (global, in country) are necessary.
- Involvement of TERG focal points for PCE countries extends to visiting these countries and acting as a sounding board for CEP (and then feedback to TERG colleagues)
- PCE work should employ the following principles: transparency, no surprise and no harm.
- Countries to define their own priorities, and own conclusions, including written reports.
- Annual country reports should include short- and long-term recommendations, both at the country level and some which can be scaled up to the global level.
- Annual country reports should be useful for the country and include actual use of findings if available.
- Overall, there is no reason to wait until platforms are fully set up, in order to move forward.

Guidance on Thematic Reviews

Chair: Wuleta Lemma

Thematic Review of the Implementation of Gender-Responsive Programming at Country Level

Conclusions

- TERG and the review consultants agreed that more time is necessary to refine and improve the present draft.
- TERG provided a number of comments, requesting to focus the report and ensure findings and recommendations are actionable as Global Fund activities, and feasible within constraints.

Action point:

TERG is expected to endorse the completed review and finalize its position before the Strategy Committee meeting in October.

Thematic Reviews to be conducted in 2017 and 2018 – Global Fund Secretariat teams informed the TERG of evaluation needs and plans, which are also being captured by a new inventory developed by the Policy Hub.

Conclusions:

There is strong rationale to potentially pursue the following reviews:

- Effectiveness and efficiency of Local Fund Agents (LFAs), in reference to and beyond the review conducted by the Office of Inspector General; and
- Impact through catalytic partnerships (to achieve effective coverage).

And further areas to consider include:

- Governance, leadership and management, in context of decentralization;
- Human resources for health in decentralized systems; and
- Additional proposed priorities: value for money (to complement the PCE); standalone RSSH grants; absorptive capacity; procurement and supply chain.

Action point:

TERG, in consultation with the Global Fund Secretariat, will consider approaches and usefulness of the suggestions above and other areas, and start launching a few reviews.

TERG Executive Session

Chair: Jim Tulloch

Discussion:

TERG shared feedback on the 32nd meeting, the interaction with consortia and ideas on 33rd meeting. TERG recognized that the consortia are still in the initial stages of the PCE, and may need some time to develop fully their methodologies, yet comprehensive data mapping should remain a priority.

TERG Chair informed the members on progress of the proposed procedure to increase transparency of TERG reports and position papers. At the end of June, the Strategy Committee will endorse an overall direction. The TERG, together with the Global Fund Secretariat, will then work on a concrete procedure document.

TERG agreed on a new format for meeting reports, which should be concise and action-oriented in around 4-5 pages.

Conclusions:

- Data mapping for PCE can begin, and more detailed methodologies from the consortia are expected over time.
- 33rd TERG meeting will take place in September 2017 in a PCE country. The TERG Chair will determine specifics in consultation with key stakeholders.

Action point:

- TERG Secretariat to draft a formal proposal for the 33rd meeting.

Following the 32nd meeting, TERG hosted two workshops at the Global Fund Secretariat on June 9, to disseminate and discuss the Strategic Review 2017 and the Gender Review, respectively.

Annex: List of Participants and observers

I. TERG members

Jim Tulloch (Chair)
Bess Miller (Vice-chair)
Wuleta Lemma (Vice-chair)
Abdallah Bchir
Anna Thorson
Cindy Carlson
Dan Whitaker
Don De Savigny
Erin Eckert
Elizabeth Moreira dos Santos
George Gotsadze
Godfrey Sikipa
Helen Evans
Jeanine Condo
Marie Laga
Osamu Kunii
Salil Panakadan
Vinand Nantulya

II. Resource persons

Arlette Campbell White (Euro Health Group)
Eduardo Samo Gudo (PCE lead, Mozambique)
Emily Carnahan (PATH)
Gilbert Asiimwe (PCE lead, Uganda)
Ian Ramage (PCE lead, Cambodia)
Kate Macintyre (Euro Health Group)
Melissa Hewett- Marx (Johns Hopkins University)
Michele Gross (Euro Health Group)
Nwe Nwe Aye (PCE lead, Myanmar)
Paul Balogun (ITAD/Euro Health Group)
Rose Gawayia (Euro Health Group)
Salva Mulongo (PCE lead, DRC)
Samira Abdelrahman (PCE lead, Sudan)
Sam McPherson (ITAD)
Sanja Matovic (Euro Health Group)
Sara Bennett (Johns Hopkins University)
Steve Lim (IHME)

III. Observers

Elil Renganathan (WHO)

Julia Martin (Strategy Committee)

IV. The Global Fund

Marijke Wijnroks (Chief of Staff)

Harley Feldbaum (Policy Hub)

Peter Hansen (Technical Advice and Partnership)

Kate Thomson (Community, Rights and Gender)

Ralf Jurgens (Community, Rights and Gender)

Nathalie Zorzi (Monitoring Evaluation and Country Analysis)

Estifanos Shargie (Monitoring Evaluation and County Analysis)

Suman Jain (Monitoring Evaluation and County Analysis)

Kirsi Viisainen (Grant Management)

Bertha Simwaka (Grant Management)

Saman Zamani (Grant Management)

Viviane Hughes-Lanier (Grant Management)

Noémie Restrepo (Grant Management)

Raissa Magnin (Strategy, Investment and Impact Division)

V. TERG Secretariat

Ryuichi Komatsu

John Puvimanasinghe

Sylvie Olifson

Sara La Tour

Felicetta Catanzaro

Seda Kojoyan

Jutta Hornig