

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

22 – 24 January 2019

Geneva, Switzerland

## Objectives of the 37<sup>th</sup> TERG Meeting

1. To finalize PCE annual and synthesis reports.
2. To discuss thematic reviews on RSSH and the partnership model.

## Day 1

---

### Opening session

**Chair: Jim Tulloch**

In his opening remarks, the TERG Chair noted how important this meeting was, considering it is the final year of the PCEs, and the high relevance of the four thematic reviews which the TERG is currently working on.

The TERG members were asked to disclose any conflict of interest. The Ethics Officer of the Global Fund greeted TERG members, and briefly explained the role of the Ethics Office. At the next TERG meeting, there will be a short training session for all TERG members and consultants.

Key strategic issues in reviewing PCE country reports: The Chair reminded the TERG to ensure findings are supported by strong evidence, particularly for their focal countries. The TERG discussed:

- The PCE should acknowledge what works well.
- The TERG would like to ensure that the reports are user-friendly and of appropriate length.
- The Resilient and Sustainable Systems for Health (RSSH), in view of TERG's ongoing thematic review on the same topic, will not be a central topic for the PCE in 2019. The TERG should articulate what the focus areas should be in 2019, in addition to impact.
- The PCE should utilize the results chain and the existing global Theory of Change.

### Session 1: PCE country work Bess Miller

**Chair:**

PCE team in each country presented its progress to date and plans for 2019, following introduction, PCE methodology, findings on the Global Fund business model analysis and specific thematic areas, overall conclusions, and next steps. Members of the relevant Global Fund Country Teams were invited to attend the presentations and make comments.

Discussion (Myanmar)

The TERG had organized additional analysis on the roll-out of new international guidelines on multi-drug resistant (MDR) TB and latent TB. The TERG focal point for Myanmar

commended the team for an impressive report with strong conclusions. Discussion points included:

- Results of TB prevalence survey will be released this year, which would be important to use.
- The TERG suggested to add a recommendation how to prevent the factors hampering RSSH.
- When the PCE develop recommendations, it would be good to add who each is addressed to, and what a solution would look like.
- The PCE proved its platform role and looked independently at the roll-out of new guidelines in a short time frame (in this case, on MDR TB); the TERG and the Secretariat welcomed this additional analysis.
- It is useful for the PCE to make a comment about the benchmark for transition.
- Some of the data which the PCE presented is rather striking, for example on MDR TB treatment success rates. Can the PCE tell how Myanmar achieved this?
- The TERG suggested the PCE to revisit the key and vulnerable populations evidence in order to ensure accuracy.

#### Discussion (Senegal)

The data strike, which had affected the PCE, was set to end this month. Discussion points included:

- 4.8% of the HIV budget was invested in human rights, but a benchmark is needed. The PCE may need to perform analysis on the modular tool in relation to community systems. The reasons behind low absorption on RSSH was discussed.
- One of the topics the Country Team would be interested to learn more about are delays with the Principal Recipient (PR) utilizing grant funds after the Global Fund had disbursed these.
- The PCE provided more details on RSSH finding and the related recommendation: at times, activities listed under RSSH were found to be very specific to particular programs, rather than health systems interventions.
- Challenges occurred when some PRs changed roles and became Sub-recipients (SRs). Contracts took long time to negotiate, and one-year renewable contracts were not perceived as effective for staff retention.

#### Discussion (Uganda)

The Global Fund's Regional Head and the Uganda Country Team responded to the PCE's findings and flagged that context is very important, while the PCE report does provide more detailed contexts. The TERG and the PCE appreciated the opportunity to discuss with the Country Team and intend to continue to share draft reports and to have clarification. The TERG also encouraged the PCE to contextualize, while noting Uganda's progress, for example on 90-90-90 targets. The PCE evaluators agreed that language can be reframed in response to comments.

The fund flow was discussed – the TERG inquired why the funds sit without being used at the district level. The PCE took the opportunity to reiterate that some of the findings still need to be validated at the sub-national level.

#### Discussion (Cambodia)

- In relation to domestic funding, the PCE confirmed that they are interested to also capture household expenditure.
- The PCE has shown only trends in impact but limited information on the Global Fund's contribution.
- The TERG encouraged the PCE to provide more details on successes which they mentioned for Cambodia, including recommendations on what to continue doing.
- The TERG also inquired about MDR TB situation. MDR TB is being discussed in country, so it is on the radar.
- The PCE can compare with what Gavi is doing (in relation to financial controls, for example) - this is one way to help enrich the PCE's descriptive analysis.
- Overall, the PCE agreed with the TERG's comments, and would like to take its additional suggestions into account as well, such as about the need to capture the impact of losing support of other donors on HIV.

#### Discussion (Democratic Republic of Congo, DRC)

The Country Team thanked the TERG and the PCE for good collaboration. It understands the need to consolidate findings across the eight PCE countries and would like the PCE's assistance on strategic investments for this grant cycle or the next one, such as through insights on gender, unit-cost comparison, co-financing, output-based financing, in addition to comments on the provincial approach which the Global Fund is taking in DRC. As such, the Country Team reiterated the need to have a better balance between an overview evaluation for cross-country comparison and in-depth analysis that can be used for strategic decisions in country. The PCE informed the audience that the team met with the Country Team already and discussed how it can better respond to the needs.

The TERG discussed with the PCE the provincial approach in DRC, which is new and was difficult to start. It will be important to identify which elements can be scaled up to other provinces. For this, there is a need to go down to the health zone level and identify bottlenecks and solutions. In each of the two provinces, there are PCE members evaluating.

#### Discussion (Mozambique)

The presentation focused on malaria, which is a serious concern in the country. The Country Team suggested that the PCE conduct better triangulation of data, and it was agreed that the PCE needs to work with the country team to validate data. The Country Team explained its hesitation about the PCE's recommendation to bring back process indicators.

The TERG and the Global Fund Secretariat appreciated that the PCE showed how despite best efforts, this has not resulted in proportional impact on malaria in the country, due to reasons such as climate change and demographics. The PCE could help assess epidemiologic drivers of malaria – it is appropriate for the PCE to identify areas requiring attention, action and investment. Additionally, the present timing is good to check the Theory of Change.

#### Discussion (Guatemala)

The TERG PCE focal points for Guatemala commended the Country Team for their efforts and time spent in country and collaborating with the PCE through a good working relationship. The Country Team thanked the TERG and clarified with the PCE regarding sources of data utilized. Other discussion points:

- The TERG noted some inconsistencies in the TB data presented and requested also information on the private sector's involvement on TB.
- The TERG inquired about outreach workers' role in advancing RSSH.
- TB in prisons: not only screening and treatment are important, but also understanding drivers and ways to reduce the transmission in prisons.
- This PCE has faced challenges in access to data. The PCE could benefit from discussing with other PCE countries how to address it and learn from their experiences and suggestions.
- Sustainability and transition: the country has planned to cover salaries and big portion of commodities.
- The TERG inquired about cross-usage of equipment, such as the GeneXpert. If not, the PCE should note lack of integration.

### Discussion (Sudan)

The Country Team explained many changes: Sudan is a core portfolio country now, and the composition of the Country Team has changed. The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) has conducted an audit, and certain findings are in line with the PCE's.

Some TERG members suggested to make a statement whether the weaknesses found are new, or previously existing, and to make comparisons to others, for example Gavi Full Country Evaluations in country.

The TERG understood that even taking into account the less positive program continuation findings, there is merit in this approach. The PCE evaluators added that, as the PCE Synthesis will show, there have been quite important implications that the program continuation has, for example in DRC, had impact on grant implementation (for ex. contracting new SRs).

### Plenary (conclusions from all country presentations)

TERG members focused on several questions in relation to the country reports:

- Are the findings in the country reports complete, well validated and triangulated?
- Is there a clear link in findings across the Theory of Change and/or the results chain?
- Are the solutions/recommendations proposed to resolve challenges feasible (both in country and the Global Fund contexts), prioritized, and addressed appropriately?
- Do the reports reflect both positive and challenging aspects, and the Global Fund's role?
- Is there evidence of the use of findings for future planning?

The TERG commented that the PCE can further strengthen analysis, and that having added value and credibility is very important. As such, the TERG reflected:

- The PCE reports provided comments on strength of evidence, in cases where weak evidence was noted, the TERG wondered if PCE can analyse the causes.
- Triangulating with the Country Teams' input is very important.
- There are too many recommendations in country reports, and it is better to prioritize, and include who, and by when, are responsible.

- The reports should have a concise executive summary.
- The TERG continues to hear about lack of countries' engagement on gender, or not understanding the issue enough, even though the Global Fund Secretariat is taking gender and human rights seriously. Thus, the PCE may need to look into this.
- It is the earlier investment in country which can result in impact now.
- The TERG welcomed recommendation workshops organized in some countries and urged the other PCEs to involve those to whom recommendations would be addressed.
- The PCE should be aware, and appropriately acknowledge, that some of the recommendations may already be addressed by the Global Fund Secretariat.

## Day 2

---

### Session 2: Thematic discussion

**Chair: Bess Miller**

#### Resilient and Sustainable Systems for Health (RSSH) Gotsadze

Moderator: George

Thematic review team on RSSH presented their findings, conclusions and recommendations to the TERG, followed by a PCE presentation on RSSH analyses. The PCE and RSSH thematic review's findings aligned in the following areas:

- The Global Fund's RSSH investments are largely short-term and gap filling;
- The evaluations found many examples where investments are servicing the Global Fund grants, rather than strengthening the broader health systems;
- There have been limited investments in community systems and responses;
- There is overall weak tracking of RSSH investments and their outcomes or impact;
- Absorption on RSSH is a continued challenge during early grant implementation phase.

The PCE noted also inconsistent categorization for RSSH interventions within grants.

#### Discussion

- The TERG reflected on the tension of fighting the three diseases while investing in RSSH and agreed that the primary order of business is to fight the three diseases. The Secretariat agreed that trade-offs and prioritization are important.
- A Theory of Change to help guide RSSH investments would be useful.
- While information systems are promising in terms of integration, there are ongoing missed opportunities in integration of other systems – procurement and supply management, for example. Service delivery is also an important opportunity for integration.
- Salary support was categorized as RSSH in grants, and this should be noted.
- It is important to coordinate with other development partners for cohesiveness.
- The TERG noted that while some of the review's recommendations are straightforward, others are not actionable in the current formulation.
- The Secretariat informed the audience that the modular framework will be revised for the next cycle, and it can certainly consider findings and recommendations from the review and PCE. However, it must be noted that some of the systemic issues will not be fixed through re-categorization, tracking, or revising the modular framework.

## Conclusions

- The TERG agreed with many of the points raised by the Secretariat, e.g., on trade-offs.
- There should be a good dialogue among partners to reduce fragmentation and work on health systems governance collaboratively.
- Most of the recommendations provided in the report need further work and should be addressed to specific stakeholders (who would be responsible to take them forward).
- The TERG and the Secretariat agreed that the report needs more contextualizing.

## Action points

- In drafting the final report, the review team will address the feedback received.
- The TERG focal points will develop a TERG position paper incorporating the key points.

## Partnerships

Moderator: Cindy Carlson

The thematic review team on partnership presented their findings, conclusions and recommendations to the TERG, followed by a PCE presentation on partnerships. The thematic review looked back at how partnerships have evolved at the Global Fund, identified different models of partnerships which the Global Fund currently engages in, and the strengths and weaknesses of these. It provided “spotlights” on initiatives such as regional malaria partnerships, and donors’ set-aside funding (i.e. French 5%). The review team acknowledged that the recommendations of the report need further work.

The PCE findings on partnerships have a degree of alignment with the thematic review, for example on topics such as tensions over the long-term vs short-term, or CCM capacity and effectiveness to mobilize partners. Added value of the PCE is the opportunity to adapt and apply in the PCE context the frameworks developed by the thematic review. The PCE presence in country also enables tracking of technical assistance. The PCE shared related plans for 2019.

## Discussion and conclusions

- The TERG advised the review team to have bolder and clearer recommendations in the report. The Secretariat also welcomed the consultants’ intention to address these in more details.
- The TERG and the reviewers agreed that mutual accountability is essential.
- Partners present at the TERG meeting (WHO, UNAIDS) had an opportunity to also share comments. The partners and the TERG agreed that the categories presented in the report are not mutually exclusive.
- The TERG instructed PCEs to integrate work on partnerships in 2019, while noting that the report struggled to answer its Objective 1, though there is some evidence presented.
- The TERG welcomed that the report has looked into Gavi’s approach, which is different and interesting. Report authors emphasized Gavi’s practice of holding annual joint appraisals.

## Action point



- Before finalizing the report, and to complement the TERG’s discussion, the review team will conduct a recommendations workshop with the Secretariat.
- The TERG focal points will develop a TERG position paper following the discussion above.

### Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing (STC) Evans

Moderator: Helen

The review has been launched, and the review team presented the objectives, limitations and methodology, including the countries selected for case studies. The next steps for this review are to conduct desk and country studies, a workshop with the Secretariat, and to deliver the draft and final reports.

This presentation was followed by a PCE presentation on STC. The PCE is guided by three questions in performing their analysis: Is it the right amount? Is it allocated to the right interventions? Is it the right level of accountability? One of the key findings on co-financing is that figures in the national plans do not always align with the Global Fund’s policy.

#### Discussion

The Secretariat reminded that STC considerations at the Global Fund existed well before the policy was put in place, while the results of the transition grants are not yet known, noting that data is a challenge. The TERG also noted that the related OIG report had an overall positive impression of the Secretariat’s work on transition, especially in regard to making improvements.

The TERG discussed with the reviewers:

- The complexity of definitions, which depends on stakeholders’ perceptions and context.
- What budget may be relevant and whether countries adhere to budgets.
- How principles through which the STC policy is implemented allow trade-offs to be implemented at country level.
- The TERG reiterated the need for inclusion of value for money and RSSH in the review.
- Continued service delivery: reviewers aim to confirm that governments are conscious of this. Maintaining and scaling service coverage may be complicated for key populations – in some cases it means sustaining the actual programs, such as for harm reduction.
- Procurement and supply chain are within the scope of the review, but a mid-term review of market shaping strategy will address further.

The TERG welcomed that the PCE are contributing to the TERG thematic reviews while improving the PCE’s own strength of evidence through these collaborations.

### **Session 3: PCE Synthesis** **Tulloch**

**Chair: Jim**

#### Business Model

The PCE found that many aspects of the Global Fund business model worked well and as intended at the country level. There was strong evidence that aspects of the business model positively enabled grant transition, maintained momentum and action and responded to emerging issues. However, some elements of business model also delayed grant

implementation in most PCE countries, due to: PR/SR selection and contracting processes; PR transitions in three PCE countries; multiple concurrent processes for the Global Fund; and misalignment of the Matching Fund processes. The PCE also shared possible study areas for 2019, for instance, to continue to deepen understanding and analysis around grant absorption.

## Discussion

The Global Fund Secretariat requested clarifications whether each delay was at the Geneva or country level and explained that various options related to more efficient timelines are being explored. For example, seeing whether countries going through the National Strategic Plan (NSP) funding option can have different timeframes. Having NSP applications may be the closest manner for the Global Fund's cycle to try and align with the national timelines and planning.

The TERG noted that its thematic reviews often look at the grant cycle and the business model, and this should be a consideration.

While the PCE Sudan and DRC have information on how the program continuation approach has worked, the Secretariat cautioned that it is only two countries, out of many going through this funding stream, and so the findings may not be generalizable.

## Conclusions

The Secretariat is thinking about different options related to the issues which the PCE noted above, and therefore consultations are crucial, especially with the Grant Management departments. Lack of such consultations would be a serious limitation.

## Value for Money (VfM)

The PCE considered current monitoring tools collect little data on the outputs of Global Fund support; do not systematically link data on investments and results; and do not collect information at the sub-national level. These limit VfM analysis to date.

The PCE presented available findings on the main elements of VfM (economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity), followed by recommendations. The PCE noted that there was a lack of statistical correlation between financial and programmatic data.

## Discussion

The Secretariat clarified that it is intentional that indicators use national targets, rather than Global Fund specific targets. Lack of monitoring tools have been a result of debates, with an aim to avoid excessive monitoring. The Secretariat agreed that output measures are a gap.

The TERG considers VfM rather important and as such welcomed that the PCE were now able to produce more analysis despite limitation. The PCE's impact evaluation is expected to advance better understanding and data on Global Fund's contributions.

One of the largest sources of poor VfM may be lack of integration between disease programs, for example, the use of GeneXpert machines for TB as well as HIV cases. This would make a good case study, since the Global Fund supports their purchases in many of its grants.



## Conclusions

- Some statements on inputs-outcome during the presentation were unclear, and the TERG encouraged the PCE to obtain and show the 2018 absorption figures. The PCE agreed but cautioned that access to this data is not the same in all PCE countries.
- The TERG decided it needs to further reflect on the level of VfM analysis in the PCE, and a way forward.

## Human rights and gender

The PCE team presented summary of findings, including:

- Stakeholders considered budget allocations for human rights, gender, key and vulnerable populations insufficient.
- The Global Fund and countries' definitions of which are the key and vulnerable populations (per disease) were at times misaligned.
- TB and malaria programs were less gender responsive than HIV.
- Guidance from the Global Fund exists, and the PCE continues to identify reasons why it is not explicitly and effectively translated to the country level.
- There have been partnerships which strengthened interventions.
- Overall, implementation delays were observed.

The PCE also shared their plans for 2019:

- To further unpack the challenges to operationalizing guidance at country level;
- To compare existing human rights-related interventions with barriers identified in human rights baseline reports; and
- To track the extent to which gender responsive programming is being addressed during implementation.

## Discussion

The Global Fund Secretariat agreed that overall, many statements made by the PCE are striking a chord (for example, on how gender and human rights are not entirely understood by stakeholders). The Secretariat is interested to see how to move forward the recommendations made by the PCE. Some of what the PCE mentioned in plans for 2019 coincides also with the plans of the Secretariat.

## Overall discussion session and conclusions

1. The PCE consortia presented the TERG with a proposal: to retain the observation of business model as continuous, as well as the analysis of impact, while focusing on thematic areas on quarterly basis. The PCE also assured the TERG that the prospective nature will not be lost.

The TERG's initial reaction was that there are pros and cons to the proposed approach. This approach should work within the framework of the theory of change which the PCEs have previously articulated. In principle, the TERG is supportive of having in-depth thematic

focus, rather than a broad-brush approach, but would need more information to decide. Therefore, the consortia will prepare and share a more detailed proposal.

2. The PCE consortia updated the TERG on impact evaluation planning; it intends to measure the rate at which inputs translate into outputs, by intervention.

The TERG encouraged the PCE to a) build in the dynamics of the other thematic areas that the PCE looks at, and b) define all non-modelled impact indicators to use for the three diseases – how available they are, and to more explicitly define what success would look like. The PCE assured the TERG that the various PCE teams conducting impact analysis will use a similar approach.

The TERG discussed challenges of the reporting timeline; at times there is a gap between country and global data. The TERG would also like to see validation with the Secretariat and partners, otherwise the validity of results may be undermined. The TERG urged the PCE to ensure consultation with the relevant departments at the Secretariat and with partners.

### **Executive session Tulloch**

**Chair: Jim**

Synthesis report: To prepare its guidance to the PCE, the TERG discussed:

- Allowing a certain level of independence (for example in choosing focus areas) to the PCE.
- The value of having policy briefs accompany the synthesis and country reports.
- The administrative reporting requirements, TERG meeting requirements for the PCE.
- The results chain, including balancing it with tracking of the business model.
- The PCE interaction with the Secretariat, including relationship with Country Teams, and consultations to keep aware of relevant initiatives (i.e. CCM Evolution).
- The PCE should revisit the analysis and update it with the latest data.

### **Day 3**

---

#### **Executive session: cont'd**

**Chair: Jim Tulloch**

The TERG discussed its 2019 evaluations, focusing on the PCE and the upcoming thematic reviews.

PCE results chain: The TERG is conscious that part of the PCE's unique appeal is the results chain with impact work. The full spectrum of the results chain has not been elaborated, and the TERG expects it in the next meeting. The TERG reiterated both the quantitative and the qualitative data components, and the need to look at what is between the boxes, and the links between the chains.

The PCE country annual reports: The TERG discussed how to make these reports more user-friendly and effective.

### **Closing Session Tulloch**

**Chair: Jim**

Impact analysis: The PCE consortia presented outcomes of their own discussions on impact analysis, proposing to have either full response models, results chain narratives only, or country-specific analysis.

#### Discussion

- The TERG noted that the full dose model should still have a narrative. The PCE agreed.
- A question was raised if these numbers are real data or not. Programmatic data will be used where possible, especially for the first two-thirds of the results chain, but more survey and modelling estimates for the last parts.
- The PCEs are yet to fully discuss how the PCE will take into account impact results from earlier times.
- The TERG will need to know more concretely what will be delivered per country.

#### Action point

The TERG requested the PCE to provide more information at the next TERG meeting.

Thematic focus per country: The PCE presented a proposal on deeper dives into thematic areas, per country. Partnerships will be treated as inter-sectional and be addressed for each theme if there is something on partnerships. Consortia will work on sequencing and further operationalization.

The TERG noted that the proposal is to have deep dives on gender in only two countries and wondered whether it would be worthwhile to look into other countries. Hence, the TERG suggested to consult with the relevant stakeholders. The PCE agreed.

#### Action point

The PCE requested the TERG to provide an opinion on timing, based on the TERG's needs.

### **TERG Guidance to the PCE**

The following were the key TERG guidance areas:

- To intensify connections with the Global Fund Secretariat;
- To make adjustments to the 2019 methodology (following further PCE-TERG discussion);
- To regularly communicate with country stakeholders;
- To collaborate with the TERG's thematic reviews;
- To co-create recommendations with stakeholders at the global and country levels;
- To treat the results chain as an integral part of analysis.

On outcome/impact assessments, the TERG answered affirmatively to the PCE's questions if the PCE should collect output data; model potential 2019 impact; and include historical impact data.

Country annual reports and 2018 Synthesis: The TERG expects the country reports to be concise, decreasing reporting burden on the PCEs while improving readability. The PCEs are welcome to develop a template (e.g., bullet-formatted) for documenting findings with an increased focus on grant related outputs and outcomes. There should be a short report

and policy brief for clear and user-friendly communication of key findings, and a slide deck for dissemination of results at the country level. The 2018 PCE Synthesis will be in a form of a detailed slide deck.

The TERG Chair closed the meeting.

**Participants list 37<sup>th</sup> TERG Meeting  
Geneva / Switzerland  
22 – 24 January 2019**

**TERG**

James Tulloch  
Bess Miller  
Beatriz Ayala-Ostrom  
Cindy Carlson  
Dan Whitaker  
Elizabeth Moreira dos Santos  
George Gotsadze  
Godfrey Sikipa  
Helen Evans  
Kenneth Castro  
Mari Nagai  
Maria Laga  
Peter Barron  
Timothy Poletti  
Osamu Kunii  
Luisa Frescura  
Abdallah Bchir

**Resource persons/observer**

Michele Moloney-Kitts, TRP Vice-Chair  
Clarisse Mason (WHO)  
Vincent Bretin (Team Lead, Results, UNITAID)

**EHG**

Clare Dickinson  
Matthew Cooper  
Starley Shade  
Ian Ramage  
Aye Mar Lwin  
Samia Seif Elhassan

**IHME**

Katharine Shelley  
David Phillips  
Allison Osterman  
Salva Mulongo  
Shakilah Nakyanzi  
Sandra Saenz de Tejada

**Senegal / Mozambique**

Adama Faye  
Tidiane Ngoye  
Eduardo Gudo  
Tavares Madede

**Partnership Review**

Sam McPherson (Itad)  
Allison Beattie (Itad)

### **RSSH Review**

Kaveri Kumar (CEPA)  
Clare Strachan (CEPA)

### **STC Review**

Patricia Moser (HMST)  
Roberto Garcia (HMST)

### **Global Fund**

Strategy and Policy Hub - Harley Feldbaum

Grant Management - Michael Byrne, Maria Kirova, Linden Morrison, Urban Weber, Abigail Moreland, Matthew Macgregor, Cynthia Mwase, Dumitru Laticevschi, Kirsi Viisainen, Vanessa Rousselle, Nicolas Farcy, Noemie Restrepo, Marcos Patino Mayer, Saman Zamani, Sandra Kuzmanovska, Carmen Gonzales, Olivier Cavey, Carmen Gonzales, Yamil Silva Cabrera, Juan Ramos Peris

Technical Advice and Partnerships - Peter Hansen, Nathalie Zorzi, Viviana Mangiaterra, George Shakarishvili, Daisy Lekharu, Michelle Monroe, Estifanos Shargie, Suman Jain, Lize Aloo

Community, Rights and Gender - Kate Thomson, David Traynor, Gavin Reid, Ralf Jürgens

Office of Inspector General - Tracy Staines, Mark Woodthorpe-Smith, Nezar Al-Hadaii, Collins Acheampong, Saif Abbas, Omar Loukili, Theshika Kassen, Linna Palmqvist

Ethics Office - Petra Forsstrom De Leon, Nick Jackson

Office of Board Affairs - Nella Foley

### **Participants at Pre-TERG Meeting, 21 Jan 2019**

Access to Funding - Silvio Martinelli, Jacqueline Bataringaya, José Castillo, Svetlana Dupriez, Bianca Guarino

Health Products Management - Sophie Logez

Global Sourcing Pharmaceuticals - Martin Auton, Melisse Murray

CCM Hub - Grainne McDaid

Digital team - Genc Kastrati (Specialist, Digital Team)

Communications team - Kevin Keen