

Report of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG)

46th Board Meeting

GF/B46/10

8-10 November 2021, *Virtual*

Board Information

Purpose of the paper: This paper provides a summary of the recent work of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group.

Executive Summary

Context

- The Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) has submitted the reports on the Evaluations of the Strategic Initiatives (SI) and Multi Country Grants (MCG), the extension period of Prospective Country Evaluation (PCE), and the External Evaluation of the PCE to the Strategy Committee (SC). The SC discussed these together with the Secretariat's initial management responses to the TERG recommendations. The TERG has also submitted, for information, a synthesis of TERG, TRP, OIG and Global Fund partnership model related reports and a compilation of recent reports and evaluations carried out by the TRP, OIG and TERG on specific aspect of RSSH. These have been prepared to inform deliberations on the implementation of the new strategy

Input Sought

The Board is requested to consider the TERG positions on aspects of the operationalization of the next Global Fund Strategy, as well as the new M&E framework.

Conclusions

- A. The TERG commissioned and managed the SI and MCG Evaluations, as well as the PCEs extension report and the external evaluation of the PCE and provided its position on each. It provided oversight to the Global Health Security review managed by the Secretariat and provided input to the M&E Framework and the KPI work. The TERG also commission the synthesis of the partnership model reports which contains 10 signposts for consideration and the compilation of reports on specific aspects of RSSH.
- B. The TERG proposed prioritized recommendations, while the Secretariat developed its initial management responses.

Input Received

- The Strategy Committee (SC) discussed and thanked the TERG for these evaluations and the Secretariat for their initial responses to the TERG recommendations, noting the importance and implications from the evaluations' findings, conclusions and recommendations for the next strategy, including how it can build on the good practices and address the challenges identified in these evaluations and reports.
- Timely availability of the Secretariat's initial management response to those evaluations has been valuable. This highlights the importance of continuing to ensure an agreed evaluation calendar and agreed timelines for reporting.
- The Secretariat welcomed those evaluations and largely agreed on the recommendations, already reflected in Strategy-related work such as the allocation methodology and management of the SIs as well as in developing a Strategy implementation plan.

What is the topic of this update?

1. The Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) commissioned and discussed several evaluations with the Strategy Committee (SC). Finalized evaluations were summarized below.

Strategic Initiatives (SIs) and Multi Country Grants (MCGs) Evaluations – joint conclusions and recommendations

2. The main conclusions and TERG’s prioritized recommendations on the evaluations of SIs and MCGs and are summarized as below table.

| TERG position | Review recommendations mapped to conclusions for SI | Review recommendations mapped to conclusions for MCG |
|--|---|--|
| Continuation of catalytic investments: The TERG agrees with the explicit recommendation in the MCG evaluation “Strategic Recommendation 1: Maintain MCGs as a priority investment area for activities that demonstrably add value over and above what country grants can deliver to meet the Global Fund’s Strategic Objectives” and implied conclusion in the SI evaluation that both types of investments should be continued. Both are adding value in their own ways. | N/A ^[1] | R1, C1.1/ C2.2 |
| Contribution to SOs: The TERG is concerned with the conclusion (C.1.1) that the MCG’s have made a limited contribution to SO’s other than SO1. For SI and MCG’s there is a particular comparative advantage over country grants associated with key populations and human rights and gender (HRG). | N/A | C1.1 |
| Define better what catalytic means: Tthe SC should facilitate a consensus on the definition of catalytic expected impacts from these modalities, including the risk if they are not implemented; and high-level principles to guide the selection of topics that would most likely achieve that impact. | R1, C 2 | C1.1 |
| Selection and prioritization criteria: A more proactive approach to determining what catalytic investments should cover would help lessen the chances that key areas that <i>should</i> be covered by catalytic investments are neglected. | R1&2 | R 2, C1.2/ C2.2/ C3.1/ C3.2 |
| Strengthening performance measurement and management: the TERG agrees with both evaluations’ recommendation that each SI and MCG needs to have an associated Theory of Change that indicates how processes, outputs and outcomes from each investment will produce a catalytic effect. Both types of funding should then ensure that SIs and MCGs have a robust performance framework and evaluation plan according to the Theory of Change. | R3, C3b | R3, C2.1/ C2.3/ C3.1/ C3.3 |
| Ensuring greater coherence: The TERG agrees that the Secretariat needs to provide a more holistic mapping of which types of catalytic investment would provide the most appropriate means of implementing SC/Board determined priorities for transformational change | R4, C 4 | C1 |
| Designing for higher relevance and sustainability: the TERG agrees with the SI Conclusion 3 on some of the design challenges that strategic initiatives have faced. SR2017 noted early in the 2017-2019 funding cycle that “...there are...some | R3, C3 | N/A |

| | | |
|---|--------|-----|
| concerns that catalytic funding may undermine country ownership and skew programming and resourcing toward a set of issues defined by the Secretariat; and that country teams may spend a disproportionate amount of time programming relatively small amounts of catalytic funding to the detriment of the overall grant implementation process.” In particular, the Secretariat and implementing partners for each MCG/SI need to take on responsibility for ensuring that stakeholders at country-level are consulted in the design, country selection, and implementation timeframe and arrangements. The proposed implementing partner/s will also need to ensure an exit strategy or sustainability plan in place | | |
| Implementation and risk management: Part of the design of the new cycle of Catalytic Investments will need to consider the areas discussed above with addressing other challenges mentioned in the SI and MCG evaluation reports. These include who implements the work financed under SI and MCG funds; how they are contracted; and how they are implemented. | R5, C5 | N/A |
| Merit in merging SIs and MCGs into a single fund: Given the success of establishing the SI Program Management Office there may be some merit in merging the SIs and MCGs into a single pool of funds and bringing MCG management into the same management office to ensure these grants receive sufficient attention. | N/A | N/A |

 Not applicable

The Prospective Country Evaluations

3. The PCEs were extended for three months from April to June 2021, to undertake additional investigation and final analysis in relation to key issues presented in the PCE 2021 Synthesis Report. The PCE Extension Synthesis Report, based on the individual country reports, examined grant revisions, resilient and sustainable systems for health (RSSH) investments and grant making issues in more depth. The PCEs have now concluded. The TERG and the Global Fund Secretariat intend to publish the extension period report as an annex to the PCE 2021 Synthesis Report, along with the related TERG Position Paper and its Secretariat Management Response.
4. As agreed in the TERG’s 2021 work plan, in April 2021 an external evaluation of PCE was commissioned to draw out the lessons learned from the PCEs experience and inform the future of independent country level evaluation. An evaluation steering committee was set up that was independently chaired by a member of the Gavi Evaluation Advisory Committee. The key conclusion of the evaluation was that the PCEs were innovative but too ambitious and complex, with multiple audiences and expectations. Appreciation of usefulness varied by audience. The TERG acknowledged the findings and conclusions with some qualifiers including the fact that the PCEs, through their independence and by providing the country level perspectives, were critical for capturing what was not available (for example business model analysis, independent assurance, country perspectives) via other mechanisms. The evaluators provided ten recommendations that were endorsed by the TERG

| Recommendations (Report) | TERG’s recommendations (Position Paper) |
|--|---|
| 1.The annual synthesis reports drawing on independent country level evaluation reports to present a more comprehensive assessment of the Global Fund business model are useful and should continue. This function is not available | 1. The recommendations section starts with a recognition of the importance of the objectives around independent country level evaluation that the PCEs sought to address even though they were not able to achieve all those objectives. The report stresses the importance of safeguarding independence while ensuring quality and utility of evaluations. The TERG strongly |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>through other existing Global Fund M&E mechanisms.</p> <p>2. The mode of implementation of independent country evaluation – and the synthesis which is the outcome of this - needs considerable design modifications to address current deficiencies and deliver better value for money.</p> <p>3. Much better arrangements for learning from independent country evaluation are needed and the TERG and Global Fund senior management should jointly give this attention, working with other stakeholders to understand what will help learning. The issues to address which would help support learning include:</p> <p>(Recommendations 4-8 are aimed at addressing this).</p> <p>4. There should be sufficient time allotted by the SC for in-depth discussion of the synthesis findings at SC and Board level, to ensure ownership and follow through from the highest level.</p> <p>5. More effective accountability mechanisms at both global and country levels are required to ensure action on the recommendations.</p> <p>6. More timely and effective dissemination of the country and synthesis reports is required, including public access, so that all stakeholders can access the findings.</p> <p>7. Greater space should be built into the approach for tailoring evaluation at country level to ensure ownership, utility and learning.</p> <p>8. The Global Fund should explore what existing or new funding source could enable operational or implementation research, driven by the CCM and FPM's priorities, and separately from independent evaluation.</p> <p>9. The objective of capacity building around M&E, while important, cannot be delivered directly by the PCE or its successor and should be addressed through other routes as is already the case. To the extent that strengthened country-level analytical capacity is a secondary</p> | <p>agrees with this position and recognizes that to achieve these objectives requires a rethinking on the design of country level evaluations.</p> <p>2. The TERG draws the Committee's attention to Recommendation 3 which stresses the need for much better arrangements for learning from independent country evaluations and the fact that this is an issue that requires joint attention from both the TERG and Global Fund senior management working with other stakeholders. One of the clear findings from the PCE work is that it cannot be achieved by the TERG alone. The TERG agrees with this recommendation and Recommendations 4-7 which are specifically aimed at addressing this.</p> <p>3. Recommendation 8 relates to the importance of operational research (OR) driven by country priorities, which it sees as separate from independent evaluation, and the need to explore how this can and should be funded. The TERG agrees this is a gap in many countries and suggests that it is an area that could be more clearly identified as something that can and should be funded within a country's allocation. During the grant making TERG suggests that the role of the CCM or MoH overseeing the OR is laid out clearly. This also applies to Recommendation 9 that refers to capacity building in-country around M&E.</p> <p>4. The TERG encourages OR to be integrated as a component of the overall M&E framework. To inform how this is best done, the TERG encourages the Secretariat to identify lessons learned from the past and current operational research experiences funded through grants and several SIs. Lessons learned could focus on the reasons why countries chose to do some OR or chose not to, how were topics selected, examples of good practice and to what extent they led to better programing in countries.</p> <p>5. To ensure that OR informs program implementation the TERG requests that the Secretariat consider putting in the allocation letter specific guidance to countries about including M&E as an integral part of grant requirements with a suggested figure of 5% of the total grant. In this way it must be reported and can be tracked. The TERG agrees that operational research, is separate from the independent reviews/research which is commissioned by the TERG. These independent country level evaluations are covering specific areas across countries or in a specific country to learn lessons that would contribute to the improvement of the Global Fund business model processes in country leading to greater impact.</p> <p>6. Recommendation 10 states that improvement in data quality is an important objective but that it should be addressed through other routes such as RSSH grants, not independent</p> |
|---|---|

result of independent evaluation, that capacity can be leveraged to support other country or regional monitoring, evaluation, and research needs.

10. Improving data quality, which is also an important objective, also cannot be delivered directly by independent evaluation and should be addressed through other routes such as the Global Fund's grants for RSSH.

evaluation. The TERG agrees with that position. However, linking to Recommendation 9, we note that skills in analyzing data and how to use data in a policy context was a key M&E capacity weakness that was identified by both GEPs and CEPs. The TERG also sees merit in seeing how the Strategic Initiative Evaluation could build on and benefit from the capacity building done by the Data Strategic Initiative.

5. At TERG's request the evaluators provided possible design considerations for future independent evaluation at the country level. The evaluators recommended a simpler/more focused approach with fewer layers, which also allows for an annual synthesis. The TERG sees the options put forward as a very useful starting point that will require more detailed work on consultation with key stakeholders. As an initial position, prior to any consultation TERG supports the evaluators' option 2, to develop a rolling program of independent country level evaluations (CLEs) commissioned separately by the TERG. The CLE's would cover agreed global/business model questions and a number of country specific questions agreed ahead of time with the relevant stakeholders.
6. TERG position papers and Secretariat initial responses were discussed at the 17th SC meeting. The Secretariat's initial responses are in broad agreement with the findings and conclusions of these evaluations and conclusions from the TERG position papers, considering findings and recommendations as part of the on-going oversight and improvements and as part of the preparation for the new Strategy and the 2023-25 allocation cycle. SC members thanked the TERG for the three evaluations and the Secretariat for their initial responses. Many SC members highlighted the need to understand the implications of the evaluations' findings for the next strategy, including how the next strategy can build on the good practices and address the challenges identified in the evaluations.
7. With respect to the SI and MCG evaluations, SC members agreed with concerns that were raised about the lack of clarity on the definition of catalytic investments and ability to measure catalytic impact and success and supported the need for a theory of change (TOC) for SIs. This would ensure clearer objectives and better measurement of impact. SC members also discussed the rationale and implication for the recommendation in the TERG position paper to merge the governance of SI and MCG catalytic investments, which was rejected in the Secretariat management response. The committee requested that the next design phase of these investments reflect the learnings identified.
8. Regarding the evaluation of the PCEs, the Secretariat response showed that "(it) broadly endorses the overall findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Secretariat agrees that the ambition of PCEs was very broad in scope and therefore unable to meet all objectives, however the value of the syntheses reports and learning across countries to improve greater impact is recognized." Needs for scoping of country-led evaluations were raised and discussed.
9. In addition to these evaluations the TERG has provided oversight and inputs to the Global Health Security review, the M&E framework development and strategy performance/KPI measurement, and availed information resources on RSSH and partnership perspectives to the SC to help understand the available evidence.
10. The TERG work plan for 2022 as a transition year to the new independent evaluation function in the Global Fund was approved, with flexibility to respond to additional evaluation items.

- Evaluation of wambo.org pilot (underway, to be finalized early 2022)
- C19RM evaluation (report on end-2021 to the SC in mid-2022)
- TB prevention review (TOR/ RFP currently being drafted)
- An evaluation of the Global Fund's support to community engagement and community led responses
- An evaluation of Global Fund support to decentralized governments
- An evaluation of the implementation of the Challenging Operating Environments policy
- 2022 C19RM evaluation to cover implementation of 2021 C19RM grants
- An evaluation of the Market Shaping Strategy
- Initiation of the Strategic Review 2022 to evaluate the current strategy at its end point.

What is the proposed response and what are the next steps?

11. The TERG will develop an investment case for Phase 2 of the Independent Evaluation Strategic Initiative, which will include a) a proposal on independent country-led evaluation, b) a mapping of RSSH grants to health sector strategies in a sample of countries, as well as further thoughts on evaluation items for SC feedback.
12. The Secretariat will finalize their management responses, with the aim that they are published along with the TERG position papers and consultant reports.
13. The Board is requested to consider key evaluation conclusions and TERG's prioritized recommendations as part of their deliberations on the implementation of the next Strategy and M&E framework.

Annexes

The following items can be found in Annex:

- Annex 1: Summary of previous Committee Input
- Annex 2: Relevant Past Board Decisions
- Annex 3: Relevant Past Documents & Reference Materials

Annex 1 – Summary of Committee Input

Extract from the Draft Report of the 17 Committee Meeting

TERG Matters

1. The TERG Chair provided a brief overview on 2022 TERG budget and workplan, highlighting proposed evaluations¹ scheduled for 2022, which is a transition year to the new independent evaluation function. An update of the ongoing work, e.g., wambo.org pilot and C19RM evaluations, was provided as well as a summary of the TERG positions on the recent evaluations, including the joint TERG position paper on Evaluations on Strategic Initiative (SI) and Multi Country Catalytic Investment Grants (MCG) and an independent external evaluation of Prospective Country Evaluation (PCE). Regarding the TERG workplan and proposed evaluations for 2022, a brief overview on the scope, objectives, timelines and status was provided.
2. Regarding the external evaluation of PCE, the TERG Chair highlighted the purpose and utility of this external evaluation for informing ongoing work on the new M&E Framework, particularly the country level evaluations. The evaluation noted that the PCE was ambitious and complex but very innovative and captured essential information at the country level that is not readily available through other mechanisms used by the Global Fund. The TERG overall endorsed the evaluation noting the value add of having a country-led approaches to selected evaluations. The TERG Chair proposed a scoping study of independent country-led evaluation, i.e., identifying cross-country/cross cutting questions that stakeholders would like answered, and the model for implementation that would work best at country-level.
3. Regarding the SI and MCGs evaluations, the TERG Chair noted the TERG's broad endorsement of the key findings and conclusions and that both add value and contribute to achieving the Global Funds' strategic objectives. The TERG broadly agreed with the suggested recommendations in the reports emphasizing the continuation of these investment modalities and proposed five areas for prioritized action vis-à-vis *i) clearer definition of what catalytic means, ii) strengthen harmonisation and coherence of catalytic investment design with country grants, iii) further strengthen design, implementation, governance and performance management arrangements, iv) better risk identification and management as well as v) merging of catalytic investments (SIs and MCGs)*. The TERG Chair requested SC input on whether the definition of "catalytic" as provided in SR2020² and the two evaluations is still valid.

¹ Page 9 of [GF/SC17/06_Rev1](#)

² [Strategic Review 2020 Final Report](#)

SC Discussion

TERG 2022 Workplan

4. There was broad support from SC for the TERG workplan and budget. The following questions and comments were raised:
- Need for flexibility on evaluation topics, noting the need to look at the strategic shifts in the new Strategy narrative, preparations required for setting up the Independent Evaluation Panel and information gaps in the current topics, e.g., data driven decision making and accelerating equitable access to new innovations and their sustainability.
 - Details requested on how the proposed evaluations fit into the broader M&E Framework work (OIG and MECA proposed workplans), and why the proposed evaluations are best situated with the TERG.
 - Questions were raised on how the workplan fits within the transition to the new independent evaluation model and what would happen in the event the TERG starts some reviews that won't be completed by the end 2022.
 - Regarding an end-term evaluation of the Market Shaping Strategy (MSS) it was noted that an independent follow-up to the findings and recommendations of the 2019 evaluation may be more useful. SC members also asked rationales on the potential merging with the SR2022.
 - Regarding the budget, clarification was sought on the timeline for the SC decision and what is covered by the OPEX budget and when would the SC be deciding on the use of Phase 2 of the SI.
 - There is a need to ensure adequate follow up and uptake of TERG recommendations and consideration of the learnings, acknowledging the importance of this responsibility within the role of the new Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer.
 - One constituency requested, in light of the findings from the PCEs, that the mapping of in-country RSSH investments and how they are linked to the National Health Strategic Plans (NHSP) be considered for this or future workplans. Its omission from any specific work was noted stressing its consideration in the Phase 2 SI funding investment proposal.
5. PCE External Evaluation
- a. SC members agreed that the initial scope of the PCEs was overly ambitious but acknowledged the need for country-level evaluations. It was noted that building country-level evaluation capacity is not the role of the TERG or the new IEP and that efforts should be made to ensure that the findings from evaluations feed into discussions on adaptations or changes needed in implementing the Global Fund strategy.
 - b. There is a need to ensure some level independent country-level evaluation and that this should be considered in the context of the new M&E framework, noting that 2022 provides an opportunity to look at how country-level evaluations are carried out.
 - c. Clarity was requested on what is meant by 'scoping' and concerns were raised regarding the potential burden on grant implementers if too many requests for information are made. SC members noted the need to consider country stakeholder capacity, particularly in the

first semester of 2022 due to the current context and that requests need to be targeted and coordinated with other stakeholders.

- d. A concern was raised regarding the cost-benefit of these reports and the need to consider the trade-offs in investments in evaluations versus investing in country programs.

6. SI and MCG evaluations

- a. Further clarification was requested on the rationale for the TERG recommendation to merge the SI and MCG catalytic investments.
- b. SC members highlighted the importance of ensuring a clear definition of catalytic and ability to measure catalytic impact and success, supported by a theory of change (TOC) for all catalytic investments to ensure clear objectives, expected outcomes and impact measurement in the next cycle and request was made for a more holistic discussion around catalytic funding.
- c. The role of MCGs in addressing Key and Vulnerable Populations and Human Rights and Gender issues and their contribution to Strategic Objective 3 (SO3) was highlighted and it was noted the evaluation ideally would have explored this further.

TERG Response

7. The TERG Chair noted that the 2022 Evaluation Calendar was discussed and proposed in October 2020 at the 14th SC meeting. The proposed evaluation topics are aligned with the timing of key points in the Global Fund strategy implementation. The TERG Chair indicated that there can be reasonable flexibility in the workplan as long as there is sufficient funding to address new and emerging areas.
8. On MSS, it was noted that the Secretariat was concerned that there may be overlap with other evaluations (such as C19RM) and as such there is a need to further discuss the objectives and scope of the review and that due to timing it will likely fall under the oversight of the new independent evaluation entities being set up in 2022.
9. Regarding prioritization of topics, the TERG Chair noted that the reprioritization of the payment for results evaluation was made in response to comments from SC members on the pre-call.
10. On RSSH mapping, this is currently not foreseen under the funds available under OPEX and that this may be considered as part of the Phase 2 of the SI funds. Clarification was also provided that the OPEX budget will cover 2-3 evaluations and the remaining evaluations would require funding from the Independent Evaluation SI. A more detailed investment case proposal will be submitted to the SC for decision before the end of 2021.
11. On the transition, the TERG Chair noted the need to further develop the details together with the Secretariat to ensure a clear hand-over to the new evaluation unit and Independent Evaluation Panel
12. Regarding the PCE External Evaluation findings, the TERG Chair agreed that the intent of the PCEs to build country capacity was not appropriate and that Phase 2 of the SI provides an opportunity to look and see how country-led evaluation could be more effective. Clarification around the intent of what is meant by “scoping” was provided, which was not to do actual country-level evaluations, but rather use key informants to help inform how the Global Fund can support country-led evaluation to ensure that these are useful and informative to both countries and the Global Fund.

13. On the SI & MCG reviews, noted and commended the progress in the design of 2020-22 SIs using lessons learned from the 2017-2019 period, and the proposed 2023-2025 design features using the results of the SI evaluation. The TERG Chair also detailed the rationale behind recommendation to merge the management of SI and MCG in response to the findings that there is a need to ensure more management attention is given to both these funds.

Secretariat Response

14. The Secretariat elaborated on greater visibility permitted by the evaluation calendar. The evaluation calendar has considered input and feedback from the different entities undertaking evaluation. Regarding the transition, discussions with the TERG will begin following the SC decision on the recommendation on the new independent evaluation model to the Board. The Secretariat also clarified the role of the MECA which is primarily focused on monitoring and that evaluation component will transition to the new unit.
15. On the suggested RSSH mapping and gap analysis evaluation, the Secretariat highlighted the political sensitivities and requested assistance from WHO and World Bank.
16. The Secretariat concurred with the SC on the importance of the learning function citing utility in the development of guidance and strategy operationalization resulting from learning from all the evaluations.
17. Regarding the comments around the PCE external evaluation, the Secretariat noted that 2022 is a transition year and provides an opportunity to work with the CELO and the IEP to explore the best way to capture country voices in evaluation.
18. The Secretariat provided a joint response based on the TERG joint position paper of the SI and MCG, outlining timeliness of the evaluations in informing the design of the next catalytic investments and aligning of SIs with grants, building on the definition of catalytic investments proposed in the report and broadly agreed with the TERG position except on the merging of the SI and MCG modalities in SIPMO. The Secretariat response highlighted the lessons learnt from the evaluations and the concrete steps to strengthen the implementation of SIs in the current cycle, as well as the prioritization and design of SI in the next cycle.
19. Noted the need to look at catalytic investments in their totality (including matching funds) and that the findings are very timely and are influencing how the Secretariat manages current investments and the design of the next cycle, given that a number of the evaluation recommendations have been implemented for SI's in the current cycle.

Action Points

20. The SC approved the Technical Evaluation Reference Group's (the "TERG") Annual Work Plan 2022, as presented in GF/SC17/06, Revision 1 which included revisions to acknowledge the need to flexible in deciding the 2022 evaluation topics.
21. Regarding Global Health Security (GHS), written interventions on the report were requested from SC members.
22. Next phase SI and MCG design should reflect learnings from these evaluations and TERG request on the next SC discussion of the catalytic investments.

Annex 2 – Relevant Past Board Decisions

See attached Guidance Note for completion of this section.

The table below should be completed with the most recent relevant Decision Point at the top.

| Relevant past Decision Point | Summary and Impact |
|---|--|
| GF/B42/DP03: 2020 – 2022 Allocation: Sources and Uses of Funds (November 2019). ³ | Approved the use of an additional USD 0.09 billion for the 2020-2022 allocation period's catalytic investments, to be made available for the priorities and associated costs set forth in Annex 1 of GF/B42/02, in the link . This table includes TERG Independent Evaluation at US\$ 22 million. |
| GF/SC14/EDP01: Independent Evaluation Strategic Initiative: Technical Evaluation Reference Group Investment Plan (Phase 1). ⁴ | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Strategy Committee approves the use of a maximum amount of USD 5.5 million from the funds set aside for the TERG Independent Evaluation Strategic Initiative (GF/B41/DP04) to implement the activities described in Phase 1 of the TERG's Investment Case Proposal, as presented in GF/SC14/ER01. 2. The TERG will present a final investment case proposal for the use of the remaining funds before the end of 2021 taking into account the discussions around monitoring and evaluation, including the independent evaluation function, and any other input provided by the SC. |
| GF/B42/DP05: Evolving the wambo.org pilot for non-Global Fund-financed orders (November 2019). ⁵ | <p>Based on the recommendation of the Strategy Committee as presented in GF/B42/04 – Revision 1, the Board instructs to undertake consultations early in 2020, an evaluation of the wambo.org pilot in 2022 and bi-annual reporting on progress of the wambo.org pilot.</p> <p>The Board requests the Secretariat to include the results of the evaluation referred to in Section 1(iii) in the development of a strategy for future advancement of wambo.org to be presented for Board approval at the</p> |

³ <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b42-dp03/>

⁴ https://tgf.sharepoint.com/sites/ESOB/ESOB/StrategyCommittee/SC/SC%20Meetings/Electronic%20Reports/GF_SC14_ER01_TERG%20Investment%20Plan_%20Independent%20Evaluation%20Strategic%20Initiative.pdf

⁵ <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b42-dp05/>

| Relevant past Decision Point | Summary and Impact |
|---|---|
| | conclusion of the wambo.org pilot for non-Global Fund-financed orders no later than November 2022. |
| GF/SC02/DP03: Technical Evaluation Reference Group Evaluation Plan 2017-2022 and Work Plan 2017 (October 2016)⁶ | The SC approved the TERG Evaluation Plan 2017-2022, as presented in Annex 1 to GF/SC02/09, and the TERG's work plan for 2017, as presented in GF/SC02/09. |
| GF/SC01/DP02: Terms of Reference for the Technical Evaluation Reference Group (June 2016)⁷ | The SC approved the revised TERG Terms of Reference (TORs), as set forth in Annex 1 to GF/SC01/08 – Revision 2. The revised TORs noted that independent evaluations to be conducted by the TERG may include country evaluations with respect to impact and progress towards the goals of the Global Fund strategy, recognizing the nature and scope of such evaluations shall be in accord with annual or multiyear evaluations approaches by the SC. |

Annex 3 – Relevant Past Documents & Reference Materials

[GF SC17 02A TERG position paper on SI and MCG Evaluations](#)

[GF SC17 02B Secretariat Management Response SI and MCG](#)

[GF SC17 03A TERG Position Paper on External Evaluation of the PCE 15Sept2021 FINAL](#)

[GF SC17 03B Secretariat Management Response External Evaluation of the PCE-final](#)

[GF SC17 04A Annex PCE Extension Synthesis Report Final](#)

[GF SC17 04B Secretariat Management Response PCE Extension](#)

[GF SC17 06 Rev1 TERG Work Plan 2022 \(tracked\)](#)

⁶ https://tgf.sharepoint.com/sites/ESOBAA1/GFBC/StrategyCommitteeSC/SC%20Meetings/02%20SC%20Meeting%2013-14%20October%202016/GF%20SC02%2026%20Chair%20and%20Vice-Chair's%20Summary%20Notes_sent.pdf

⁷ <https://tgf.sharepoint.com/sites/ESOBAA1/GFBC/StrategyCommitteeSC/SC%20Meetings/01%20SC%20Meeting%2014-15%20June%202016/Working%20Documents/GF%20SC01%2020%20Chair's%20Summary%20Notes.pdf>