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Background

• Key principle: Global Fund funds programs that reflect country ownership and respect country-led formulation and implementation processes

• Funding is based on demonstrated progress (Performance-based approach)
GF M&E Data Quality Framework

Implementation of M&E Plan/Action Plan

M&E Self-Assessment (recommended every 2 years)
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M&E Requirements- 1. Grant signing

• National M&E Plan
  – Purpose: to ensure that systems are in place to report indicators included in the grant agreement

• National M&E assessment resulting in a costed action plan
  – Purpose: to identify bottlenecks and plan strengthening measures in advance
  – TB M&E assessment conducted in 59 (60%) countries with GF support (HIV: 72, Malaria: 56)
  – Top 3 M&E challenges (based on 21 country reports):
    • Inadequate M&E technical capacity (skills)
    • Poor or no Quality Assurance (QA) mechanism
    • Inadequate data collection & recording
M&E requirements- 1. Grant signing

- LFA M&E assessment
  - Purpose: to verify whether the systems and capacities of the nominated PR meet the minimum required
  - to identify critical gaps that need to be addressed

- Performance Framework
  - Purpose: to demonstrate performance and consequently, ensure continued funding
  - a legal document
  - the recipient and the Global Fund agree the indicators and the targets
On-site data verification (OSDV)

- Purpose: to ensure the quality of results reported
- Conducted by Local Fund Agents (LFAs) during program implementation period, at least once a year for each grant
- Involves
  - performing on-site data verifications at the service delivery points
  - for key service delivery indicators (cases detected and successfully treated)
  - re-aggregating data from primary records
  - and comparing re-counted numbers with results contained in summary reports up to the national level.
On-site Data Verification - Some findings

Results from 19 countries (2006 & early 2007)

- A: less than 10% error margin
- B1: between 10%-20% error margin;
- B2: above 20% error margin
- C: no systems in place

Bar chart showing:
- # new smear positive cases successfully treated
- # of new smear positive cases detected
Data Quality Audit

• Purpose: to assess data management systems and in-depth verification of the quality of reported results
  • Focuses on two or three output level indicators
  • At 8 to 12 service delivery points (for each indicator)

• implemented independently from the routine grant management and Local Fund Agent (LFA).
• Conducted for 3 to 5 grants per quarter (up to 20 p.a)
• DQA Planned in 2008- TB:
  • Wave 1: Philippines (report expected by 1st week of Oct.)
    – By KNCV - Dutch Tuberculosis Foundation
  • Wave 2: Yemen & China (field work to start in Oct.)
M&E Country Profile

• Summary of findings from various sources such as-
  – M&E plan, M&E assessment, on-site data verification, DQA, work plan & budget, progress reports and information from partners

• Purpose: For information sharing on the current status and changes over time in M&E systems at country level

• Ready to use by Q1 2009

• Will be shared with countries to validate the information and follow-up on M&E issues

• Will also be shared with partners to provide support strengthening M&E systems in country

• Could be used during proposal preparation phase by the country and during the review process by the TRP
M&E Country Profile

Three broad areas assessed through the Country Profile:

• **1) Is there an M&E system in place?**
  – National M&E plan and/or indicator measurement framework?
  – Outline of data collection system and data management mechanism?
  – M&E resources needed estimated?
  – Outline of information products and dissemination mechanisms?
  – Capacity-building strategy?

• **2) Availability of M&E resources**
  – Adequate M&E personnel?
  – Adequate infrastructure (computers, Internet, databases…)?
  – M&E budget available?

• **3) Functionality of the M&E system**
  – Capacity for timely reporting (to the Global Fund as a proxy for the overall capacity on reporting)?
  – How are information products disseminated and used?
  – Data quality issues (based on On-site Data Verification and/or DQA)?
  – M&E expenditures?
Challenges/Lessons learned

• Incomplete (not comprehensive) M&E Plan and Work Plan
  – Period covered is very short
  – activities not specified
  – most plans are not fully costed
  – role of partners for financial and technical support not included

• Lack of mechanisms to demonstrate improvements in M&E system vis-à-vis investments being made
Areas of Support/collaboration with Technical partners

1. Technical support in assessment processes, implementation and follow-up of M&E Plan/action plan

2. Information exchange: specifically on data quality assessment reports, M&E Plans, and National Strategic Plans

3. Promote Task Force recommendations
### Areas of support/collaboration with Technical partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force recommendations</th>
<th>Areas of collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measuring TB incidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening routine TB surveillance</td>
<td>GF recommends 5-10% of grant for M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized assessment of TB incidence: reliability and coverage of notification data</td>
<td>Tools for assessing M&amp;E systems and ensuring data quality. Further refine tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification of TB notification data</td>
<td>Benefits programme evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measuring TB prevalence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing through new grants and reprogramming in existing grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measuring TB mortality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Vital Registration systems in countries (HSS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluating impact of TB control</strong></td>
<td>Building analytical capacity Key performance indicator for GF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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