

# 34<sup>th</sup> TERG Meeting: Summary Report

6- 9 February 2018

Geneva, Switzerland

## Objectives of the 34<sup>th</sup> TERG Meeting

1. To review and finalize Prospective Country Evaluations (PCE) annual country reports and synthesis report and provide further guidance on PCEs;
2. To further the dialogue between Global Evaluation Partners (GEPs), Country Evaluation Partners (CEPs), country teams, and TERG regarding PCE implementation and expectations/approaches for 2018;
3. To provide guidance on new and on-going thematic reviews and finalize ones that are ending;
4. To understand status of Impact through Partnership (ITP) and M&E related work at the Global Fund Secretariat.

## Day 1

### Opening session: PCE progress, translation of Global Fund model and strategy, and capacity development

**Chair: Jim Tulloch**

#### Announcements

- As per the procedure, Chair requested TERG members to declare any conflicts of interest.

#### Discussion

The Head of the Global Fund's Policy Hub expressed appreciation for the PCE work, expected to generate large amounts of evidence-based data. The TERG discussed the draft PCE synthesis report, including methodology and dissemination, and heard eight country presentations. The first PCE synthesis report focused on funding request and grant-making stages. For the process evaluation, the unit of analysis was the funding request and the consortia analyzed twelve such requests. Key findings:

- All case study grants for Window 1 and 2 were promptly approved, which should enable grants to begin on time.
- "Tailored" and "program continuation" applications were comparatively simpler and lighter for countries. However, as these requests moved through the next stages, some of these gains were offset. The Global Fund Secretariat noted that this was anticipated, with the objective to avoid duplication of efforts at later grant-making stages.
- Inclusive and largely transparent country dialogue took place in countries undergoing a "full review" of their funding requests. However, quality of the country dialogue was mixed, and the lack of dialogue processes in "program continuation" countries may be of concern.

- Countries experienced confusion on when and how to apply for Matching Funds, along with a perception that the Matching Funds process was repetitive and transaction costs were high.
- It has been a mixed picture on budget allocations for addressing human rights and gender-related barriers, with some of the case studies demonstrating an increase and others a decrease. These issues proved difficult to conceptualize and translate into operational interventions in several cases.
- Countries were familiarized with the Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing Policy (STC) policy. While there was a stronger focus on sustainability measures, transition planning was nascent.
- Mixed attention was paid to resilient and sustainable systems for health (RSSH) and there was some confusion regarding how the Global Fund prefers to see RSSH allocations managed.

Most PCE countries have identified and started to use high-level advisory panels for the PCE evaluations. An exception is Cambodia, which will test this approach in 2018. TERG noted that different terms are used to refer to such panels. One consortia is also employing an in-country “technical task team”.

The Secretariat noted it welcomes TERG’s current and future guidance on timelines for matching funds, as well as comments and direction for addressing heavy transaction costs.

#### Conclusions/actions

- With the guidance and feedback from the TERG, the consortia should finalize the synthesis report by 1 March.
- Given the STC policy’s objectives, and the fact that Guatemala is the only PCE country approaching transition, for other PCE countries, evaluators agreed to comment on sustainability potential, rather than transition readiness.
- Strengthening the PCE Country Evaluation Partner teams: the TERG suggested utilizing local professionals with strong expertise and knowledge where available.

## **Day 2**

### **Session 1: Outcome/impact/resource tracking and recommendations, and next steps** **Chair: Bess Miller**

#### Discussion

For each of the session’s themes, the TERG discussed with the consortia the common areas for assessment in 2018-19, heard an overview of the planned methodologies, and suggested ways to harmonize approaches and synthesize findings. All consortia proposed triangulation of findings and capacity building on the ground.

PCEs’ first year was dedicated to setting up the activities and developing evaluation approaches. Generally, next steps for the consortia are to refine these approaches (i.e. agree on results chains with CEPs, fine-tune evaluation questions, data sources and analytic strategies), before the core data collection stages.

Outcome and impact – The consortia presented their respective results chains. Comments received following the presentations touched upon the need for process modelling at the country level and emphasizing the grant level. The Global Fund Secretariat noted the importance of appropriately designed indicators.

Resource tracking – Objective is to understand plans and flows of Global Fund investment. The consortia proposed a hierarchical model, to be able to unpack different stages (higher/lower resolution). Consortia noted also the advantage of comparable data sources, with the next step to assess how to fit them together. Analysis will encompass funds allocation, absorption, co-financing, reprogramming, and combination analysis.

Value for money (VfM) – The consortia’s approach is two-fold, a) to assess whether and how the Global Fund and partners are approaching and managing for VfM, and the results of these efforts; and b) to utilize the other analytical methods being employed as part of the PCE to provide insight into the economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity.

At the end of the session, given that country-level documents used for dissemination of findings should necessarily feed into the synthesis report, the TERG discussed with the CEPs their propositions for the most useful format.

#### Conclusions/actions

- Consortia should conclude the synthesis report on time; the TERG does not expect recommendations from the consortia at this first stage of the PCE. At TERG’s request, most CEPs concluded that a country-level executive summary document would be an appropriate complementary output.
- The Global Fund Secretariat will share more details on the impact model and calculations for key performance indicators (KPIs) with the three consortia for further consideration.
- Whenever possible, consortia should use the same indicators and approach.

### **TERG executive session to discuss PCE guidance<sup>1</sup>**

**Chair: Jim Tulloch**

#### Discussion

TERG members discussed the significance of rigorous evaluation for the PCE. Of importance to the TERG is that the evaluators follow grant implementation, see how it connects to national strategic plans (NSPs), and conduct process mapping in the eight countries.

PCE guidance was communicated and discussed with the consortia on day 3 (see below).

#### Conclusions/actions

The TERG requested the PCE consortia to conclude the first synthesis report and move to data collection. The consortia requested TERG members who are disease focal points to assist, when possible, with the PCE global models.

The TERG emphasized that the Board, the Strategy Committee, the Global Fund Secretariat and the PCE countries themselves have high expectations from the findings and recommendations of the PCE and its synthesis reports. Timing is critical, because results may be able to feed into the 2019 replenishment strategy.

- Generally, PCE consortia and the TERG have to manage operating the evaluations under tight timelines, due to dates and procedure related to the Strategy Committee meetings.
- Guidance on synthesis report: reference should be made to all eight PCEs where possible. Financial data would require further understanding and contextual data. Additional data may need to be gathered where appropriate, and clear explanation on robustness of data is expected.
- Country reports should be available if and when requested, and follow the guidelines (i.e. on length).

---

<sup>1</sup> Concurrently, the PCE consortia ran a parallel session to share experiences between the GEPs and the CEPs.

- The TERG requested the consortia to provide more details on results chains (using one for each disease) with what is in the boxes and the assumptions about how they are linked, as well as the data gaps. Consortia should go more in-depth into the country context and look at hypotheses on the facilitating factors and obstacles. The consortia should report to the TERG by the next meeting with details about data to be measured.
- TERG suggested to use outcome mapping where appropriate, and provide an RSSH analysis even when no RSSH component is included in the grant.

## Day 3

---

### Session 2: Thematic reviews and M&E/ITP discussion

Chair: Wuleta Lemma

#### Discussion

The Technical Advice and Partnerships department updated the TERG on M&E and the Impact through Partnerships (ITP) at the Global Fund. A framework, with five components, has been developed on data use for action and improvement.

The Strategic Information department shared the Global Fund's approach to tracking KPIs, and requested the TERG to consider the PCE addressing country-level data availability, quality, and use of certain KPIs in country.

The TERG discussed its upcoming thematic review of the broader partnership model. A forward-looking approach is proposed: evaluating relationships with key global partners, including Gavi, while focusing on the country level. The Secretariat agreed that it would be useful if the TERG looks at the existing model of the Global Fund partnerships.

Thematic review on in-country assurance for programmatic risk: The Review aimed to analyze the organization's assurance model and mechanisms in relation to programmatic risk, as well as to identify potential ways of strengthening in-country programmatic assurance. The Review found that the Global Fund has made good initial progress, while some issues merit further verification and debate. It made draft recommendations in relation to the risk framework, concept and systems, providers, stakeholder accountability, tools and activities, partnerships, in-country systems, and coordination and organization at the Global Fund Secretariat.

A point stressed during the discussion was the definition and scope of programmatic assurance and the extent to which the Global Fund focuses on assurance only in relation to grants or whether this also includes a shared responsibility for assurance of impact in relation to the national programs that it supports. The TERG considered that grants are the pathway to impact. Therefore, to focus on assurance for grants or national programs is not a binary choice.

Country ownership: TERG Secretariat presented the results of its work on country ownership, including an analysis across the Global Fund's grant cycle. While the Global Fund is in a unique position to foster country ownership, definition and scope regarding country ownership remain ambiguous, and there were mixed findings as to the adoption of country ownership across the grant cycle. As country ownership is one of the areas for PCE assessment, the PCE is expected to take this work further.

#### Conclusions/actions

- The TERG decided, in agreement with the Secretariat, to pursue the review on partnerships, and it will refine details in future.

- The thematic review on in-country assurance discussion merits more time and inputs. The report will need to incorporate clarification by the Secretariat, and the TERG will develop its position further.

## **TERG executive session on thematic reviews<sup>2</sup>**

**Chair: Wuleta Lemma**

TERG continued discussion on country ownership and the thematic review on programmatic risk.

Another planned thematic review is on RSSH. This is an area where the Global Fund depends also on other partners, and so the TERG appreciated to potentially conduct this review jointly with a partner organization.

The TERG also discussed the results of an anonymous survey, sent to evaluation contractors who worked with the TERG in 2017, intended to lead to improvements in the thematic review processes.

Lastly, TERG discussed some additional matters on guidance to the PCE.

Following the session, the TERG requested PCE consortia to indicate proposed focus areas. It was agreed that to achieve capacity building the majority of evaluation work has to be done in-country. Also PCE teams must be aware of the work facilitated by the Secretariat's MECA team, especially at the country level in PCE countries. The TERG expects PCE timelines in 2018 to ensure that activities and other important milestones in the process happen earlier.

## **Day 4**

---

### **Session 2 (continued): Thematic Reviews**

Review on malaria elimination in southern Africa: The Global Fund Secretariat requested the TERG to conduct an independent evaluation of the current situation. Two regional grants are currently in place, the E8 and MOSASWA. The review's findings pointed to the need to:

- Further foster improved data collection and regional data sharing and analysis;
- Analysis of available data to develop and cost interventions for specific areas;
- A strong E8 regional governance structure, anchored in SADC.

The TERG, while considering that a proposed two step planning process should not take a long time, endorsed overall the review team's recommendations on how to continue the E8 initiative, including adjustment of its governance process. It agreed with the recommendation to continue the MOSASWA grant.

Review on in-country gender programming: TERG members discussed drafting of the TERG position paper for this review – which findings to lift forward, and what additional TERG recommendations to incorporate.

A designated PCE lead explained to the TERG the current status of findings related to gender within the PCE, as well as how the evaluators plan on utilizing this TERG review. Previously, the consortia agreed to look at the grants with a gender lens, as well as to develop a gender evaluation framework.

### Conclusions/actions:

- To accurately reflect the focus of the thematic review to assess the design and implementation of gender-responsive programming of adolescent girls and young women (AGYW), the TERG decided to rename this thematic review "Review on AGYW and HIV". In its position paper, the TERG can further encourage the Global Fund to take an active role enhancing AGYW and HIV programming, by highlighting the need for evidence-based interventions with sufficient reach and coverage.

---

<sup>2</sup> Concurrently, the PCE consortia ran a parallel session to discuss emphasis for process evaluation for 2018.

## Closing session

Chair: Jim Tulloch

### Thematic reviews:

- The TERG needs additional reflection on linking its thematic review results with the PCE.
- There has been enough discussion generated for the drafts of position paper for the thematic review on a) AGYW and HIV, and b) malaria elimination.
- Regarding the latter, the Access to Funding department expressed appreciation for the TERG's upcoming guidance via a position paper, and informed the TERG that it will be part of the basis for suggesting to the regional applicants how to adjust their programs.

### Conclusions/actions:

- Position papers for the thematic reviews on a) AGYW and HIV, and b) malaria elimination, will be shared with relevant TERG members for feedback and finalization.
- The 35<sup>th</sup> TERG meeting will take place the week of May 14 2018.
- The 36<sup>th</sup> TERG meeting will take place in September 2018 in one of the PCE countries (to be determined).

*Following the 34<sup>th</sup> meeting, TERG hosted two workshops at the Global Fund Secretariat on February 9 2018, to disseminate and discuss the thematic reviews on "Malaria elimination in southern Africa" and "Programmatic risk assurance", 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  
Elizabeth Moreira dos Santos  
Erin Eckert  
George Gotsadze  
Godfrey Sikipa  
Helen Evans  
Jeanine Condo  
Kenneth Castro  
Luisa Frescura  
Marie Laga  
Osamu Kunii  
Vinand Nantulya

### **II. Resource persons**

Herbie Duber (PCE/IHME)  
Katharine Shelley (PCE/PATH)  
Edgar Kestler (PCE Guatemala)  
Gilbert Asiimwe (PCE Uganda)  
Salva Mulongo (PCE DRC)  
Melissa Hewett-Marx (PCE/Johns Hopkins University)  
Steve Harvey (PCE/Johns Hopkins University)  
Sozinho Ndimba (PCE Mozambique)  
Michele Gross (Euro Health Group)  
Clare Dickinson (PCE/Euro Health Group)  
Sam McPherson (Itad)  
Kate Macintyre (PCE/Euro Health Group)  
Matthew Cooper (Consulting for Development)  
Nwe Nwe Aye (PCE Myanmar)  
Samira Abdelrahman (PCE Sudan)  
Ian Ramage (PCE Cambodia)  
Roberto Garcia (HMST/Health Focus)  
Tim Clary (Itad)  
Jon Cooper (Itad)

### **III. Observers**

Elil Renganathan and Kimberly Ann Lindblade (WHO)

Michele Moloney-Kitts (Technical Review Panel)

Melody Daly (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation)

### **IV. Global Fund**

Access to Funding - Silvio Martinelli

Grant Management - Kirsi Viisainen, Bertha Simwaka, Saman Zamani, Qi Cui, Noemie Restrepo, Carmen Gonzales, Juan Ramos Peris, Yira Tavares Villaman, Nicolas Farcy

Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support - Abigail Moreland, Olena Tokar, Susanne Reichelt

Monitoring Evaluation and Country Analysis - Nathalie Zorzi, Estifanos Shargie, Suman Jain, Lize Aloo

Policy Hub - Harley Feldbaum, Aditi Srinivasan

Risk Management - Caty Fall, Rajesh Divakaran, Sebastien Lenelle

Strategic Information - Mehran Hosseini, Shufang Zhang, Lisa Regis, Breshna Orya, Carol D'Souza Richard Grahn

Technical Advice and Partnerships - Peter Hansen, Scott Filler

Office of the Inspector General - Daniel Petrescu, Omar Loukili, Andrew Hammond, Augustine Agyeman-Duah, Agustinus Mangampa

### **V. TERG Secretariat**

Ryuichi Komatsu

John Puvimanasinghe

Sylvie Olifson

Sara La Tour

Seda Kojoyan

Felicetta Catanzaro

Jutta Hornig