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TERG Update Overview

1. Update on the preparation for Five Year Evaluation

2. CCM Assessment: Results and recommendations
TERG Recommendations: Timing of the Evaluation

- Board approved M&E Strategy calls for 5-Year Evaluation
- First grants will reach 5 years in 2007/2008
- For early learning: shift from a one-off evaluation to a phased incremental approach
- Inform operational decisions and the strategy discussion
TERG Recommendations: Evaluation Sequence & Focus

First Phase (2006):
- Operational and
- Grant performance

Second Phase (2008):
- Systems effects and
- Impact
First Phase of the 5-Year Evaluation: Planning Timeline

November-December 2005
- International tender on scale and scope (inception report)
- Decision on top-ranked proposal, negotiations under way
- Board workshop to identify priority questions/issues

February 2006
- TERG review of draft inception report

March-April 2006
- PSC to review inception report including design, timeline & budget options for decision at 13th Board meeting
Positive feedback on the approach which should have practical relevance for implementation

- Image of the GF and its position in the “development village”
- Explore effects on systems. Creation of parallel systems? Harmonization?
- Country ownership and sustainability, involvement of and support to Civil Society, inclusiveness of CCMs
- Balanced approach (prevention - care – support, to those most in need)
- Causes of disbursement delays, role of LFAs
- Qualitative analysis of “failures” (Phase 2), EARS, TA
- Performance Based Funding punishing countries most in need?
- Implementation of the Principle of Public Private Partnership
TERG Update Overview

1. Update on the preparation for Five Year Evaluation

2. CCM Assessment: Results and recommendations
CCM Assessment: Approach & Timing

- Field work March - July 2005
- “Snapshot” of CCM status before implementation of the Revised CCM Guidelines and Round 5 submissions
- Two parts:
  - “Performance Checklist” (document-verified)
  - Satisfaction survey for CCM members/constituencies
- Sample
  - 107 CCMs surveyed
  - 82 (77%) compliant
### CCM Assessment Results: Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCM Eligibility Requirements</th>
<th>CCMs meeting requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership of people affected by the diseases</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent proposal and oversight process:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Solicit and review submissions for proposals</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Ensure broad based stakeholder input</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent NGO membership selection</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent process to nominate PR</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest plan</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CCM Assessment results

### Other Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCM recommended criteria</th>
<th>CCMs meeting criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 40% of members from non-gov sector</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall proportion of women</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 3 or more times/year</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written TORs, bylaws or operating procedures</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership lists publicly accessible</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCM Assessment results: Member Satisfaction

Most satisfied with:
✓ Clear objectives of CCM meetings
✓ Comfort in presenting constituency opinions in meetings

Least satisfied with:
✗ Involvement in evaluating CCM strategy & implementation
✗ Participation in oversight of grant implementation

By constituency:
✓ Most satisfied: public/government sector,
✗ Least satisfied: religious/faith-based organizations and NGOs/CBOs.
CCM Assessment: Conclusions

- Baseline assessment shows serious gaps
- But: many CCMs begin to use the Performance Checklist tool to identify and correct problems
- Round 5 proposals showed that many CCMs have already taken action to improve compliance
- Need for improvement and follow-up
CCM Assessment: TERG Recommendations

TERG advises that the Secretariat:

1. Incorporate CCM self-assessment into routine grant management processes

2. Develop tools and methods for more in-depth sample audits to complement self-assessment methods

3. Work actively with civil society networks to explore means to more systematically assess civil society involvement