

Mid Term Review of Pacific Regional HIV and STI Response Fund Program

1. Purpose

The purpose of this TOR is to initiate discussion on, and define the Pacific Response Fund Committee (PRFC) prerequisites regarding a comprehensive Mid Term Review (MTR) of the Pacific Regional HIV and STI Response Fund Program (RF) which will provide sufficient information to the PRFC to make an informed judgement about the performance of the RF (it's effectiveness and efficiency assessed against the Goal, Purpose and Outcomes) and to make subsequent decisions about the required changes to the RF.

Discussion: What do we, members of the PRFC want to see reviewed?

Once these prerequisites have been agreed upon and defined the PRFC will be able to compare their TOR with the approach taken by the AUSAID Health Resource Facility Independent Progress Review of the Pacific Regional HIV and STI Response Fund. Comparing both approaches will provide the PRFC with a GAP analyses which will invite either approval of the Independent Report as the MTR of the RF or initiation of another MTR by the PRFC as budgeted in the PRFC 2011 budget.

Discussion: Has the AUSAID independent review provided us with what we think is necessary or are there gaps that we still want to get someone to look into?

2. Background

The Fund Committee is established with the responsibility for setting policy for the HIV/ STI Response Fund. It is responsible for overseeing the effectiveness of implementation financed from the Fund and the effectiveness of Fund mechanisms. One of its main roles is developing a framework for independent evaluation. AUSAIDS design document indicates that all Monitoring and Evaluation of the Fund to be led by the Fund Committee rather than constructing separate processes.

AUSAID commissioned an independent progress review (IPR) of the Regional HIV and STI Response Fund Program. The donor representative presented the set-up of this independent progress review during the 5th annual meeting and the members decided to look into the TOR in order to decide whether or not a separate additional review is necessary.

During the 6th annual meeting AUSAID agreed to share the applicable findings and recommendations of the IPR with the PRFC members post-meeting so that they can review and assess whether it meets their requirements for an independent Mid Term Review of the Response Fund. The members asked the Secretariat to draw up a TOR for an MTR in order to define what their requirements of an independent MTR are. Once this has been clarified the members will be able to compare these requirements with the IPR as initiated by AUSAID and make an informed decision about whether or not to go ahead with an additional review.

This document is a starting point for PRFC members to use in defining their requirements.

3. Objectives

3.1 Evaluate the current effectiveness and efficiency of RFs Goal, Purpose, Objectives and Outcomes both in performance and management (*Discussion: are we doing what we set out to do?*):

-Goal: To reduce the spread and impact of HIV and other STI's, while embracing people infected and affected by HIV in the Pacific Communities.

-Purpose: To support the scale up of the response to HIV and STIs in the Pacific through an efficient, responsive multi-donor fund that supports effective implementation of regional and national HIV and STI plans, including the capacity building needs identified in those plans.

-Outcomes and Objectives:

Objective 1: To establish an efficient mechanism to finance regional and national HIV and STI strategies including the capacity building needs identified in these strategies.

Outcome 1.1: Transaction costs for government and civil society organisations are minimized.

Outcome 1.2: National organizations capacity for quality implementation, planning and monitoring improve.

Outcome 1.3: Implementation responses by national government and civil society increase.

Objective 2: To establish cost effective fund governance arrangements which: promote Pacific ownership; ensure accountability and appropriate risk management; promote evidence based actions and multi-sectoral approaches; and encourage participation by multiple donors.

Outcome 2.1: Quality evaluation and research, including on gender issues, guides funding to evidence based responses and adoption of best practice implementation.

Outcome 2.2: Responses to HIV, other STIs and reproductive health needs are well integrated.

Outcome 2.3: International funding and technical agencies remain engaged or increase their engagement, in the response.

3.2 Provide a gap analyses on effectiveness and efficiency of RFs Goal, Purpose, Objectives and Outcomes both in performance and management (*Discussion: What aren't we doing that we said we would?*).

3.3 Provide short term, midterm and long term recommendations on how the gaps can be bridged and the bridges strengthened (*Discussion: How can we make sure that we do what we said we would now, later and after? Or should we change what we said we should do now, later and after?*).

4. Scope of Work

The key questions the review seeks to answer are:

Performance

- To what extent have the goal, purpose, objectives and outcomes of the RF been met (*Discussion: are national and regional approaches financed and strengthened? etc?*)?
- To what extent has the relevance and appropriateness of the goal, purpose, objectives and outcomes changed (*Discussion: what do we know now that we didn't know then?*)?
- To what extent is the approach sustainable at regional and national level (*Discussion: Can we keep this up? What happens after 2013? Etc?*)?
- What are the positive or negative long term effects which can be demonstrated or might be expected to emerge as a result of performance and management (*Discussion: are we aware of the impact of the RF on the longer term? Should we keep going or work on combating the risks?*)?

Management

- How effective and efficient has the PRFC been in its role and responsibility as the governing body of the RF (*what are we doing well and do we want to keep up, where do we need capacity building? Have appropriate and timely decisions been made? Etc?*)?
- How effective and efficient has SPC been as the principal recipient in negotiating and managing the Response Fund Grants (*what are they doing well and need to keep up and what should we be weary of, ask them to improve? Etc?*)?
- How effective and efficient have the donors been in their role of sole contributors to the grants (*Do we need more donors? Should donors be members? What are they doing that works and what are they doing that doesn't work? What can they take from this for future projects? Is this the way forward? What after 2013? Ect.*)?
- To what extent are gender, ethnic and social minority issues taken into account in both management and performance?
- What is the level of local ownership (*Do people feel like this is their Fund? Are people involved? Etc?*)?

For Current Independent review large focus of scope of work was on NZAID and AUSAID as donors. Would that have been incorporated in this TOR to the same extent? Why yes? Why no? What focus in this TOR is missing in independent review TOR?

5. Method

The approach aims to provide an environment of inclusion and participation. This setting will create support for and understanding of the necessary changes. It will involve all stakeholders in the larger strategic process, encouraging a wide perspective and facilitation of future collaboration. The review method will involve:

-Literature reviews: A limited amount of documents as provided by all relevant stakeholders.

-Interviews: MTR team members should receive a thorough briefing from the PRFC, which will be followed by questions posed by the MTR team. During preparation the head of the MTR team will negotiate who will be interviewed. Members will decide the interviews according to their particular skills and expertise. Beneficiaries of the RF should also be interviewed (both organisations as people receiving support).

-Site visits for fact-finding: These visits are essential to ensure verification of what is written in reports.

6. Stakeholder consultation

-PRFC

-Donors

-SPC

-Grant recipients

-Local responsible officer (Government)

-Local responsible officer (non Government)

-Representatives of the regional, international or multilateral relevant organisations

Discussion: Is this everybody? Who else?

7. Duration and timing

N/A for now

8. Team

The review team should be made up of up to a certain amount of members:

-Member with knowledge of Pacific funding/ donor context knowledge

-Member with M&E experience in a health context

-Member with HIV/ STI technical expertise

-Member with specific Pacific health systems knowledge

Discussion: Who else? Should there be a PRFC rep? As there was an AUSAID donor rep in the independent review?

9. Responsibilities of the parties

PRFC supported by Joint Secretariat – facilitate the consultancy, assist in logistics and support of site visits, cover costs of consultancy, and provide access to programme reports and other documentation.

SPC – Facilitate contract consultancy, provide input in review and comments and feedback.

Donors, sub recipients, beneficiaries, multilateral organisations and other stakeholders – provide input in review and comments and feedback on draft report.

The Consultant – Lead the conduct of the review, facilitate the interviews etc, draft reports and summary notes, review the documents, meet with all stakeholders, show independency, provide final report and recommendations.

Discussion: How does the PRFC feel about donors having taken on role of what PRFC would do in this TOR? What have been the benefits and what the risks?

Note that the AUSAID Design documents states that ‘AUSAID should rely on the Fund Committee Evaluation and review processes for monitoring and evaluation of the operation of the Fund and the Fund Committee rather than set up separate systems.’ Talk about what the rational was behind this.

10. Reporting

Expected documents to be delivered at the end of the review:

1. TOR for the MTR
2. Detailed evaluation plan for the conduct of the review
3. A draft report of the review covering background, method, findings, recommendations etc.
4. Final report of the review
5. Activity report of the activities undertaken to complete the MTR.

Discussion: Does PRFC feel that they have been able to submit their input, comments and feedback on the draft document in a sufficient way? If not what was missing? Currently AUSAID and SPC are drafting their management input. Where does the PRFC come into play? Would PRFC be able to provide more input if MTR was initiated by PRFC?

11. Budget

Independent midterm review of the Response Fund

Expenditure category	Description / assumptions	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total	
Consulting						
Consultant	Independent consultant daily fee	Days	20	USD 600	USD	12,000
Total consulting fee					USD	12,000
Out of pocket expenses						
Communication	Telephone, internet etc	Lump	1	USD 500	USD	500
Report preparation	Printing, stationary etc	Lump	1	USD 500	USD	500
Air travel	Home base to Fiji return economy airfare	Lump	1	USD 2,000	USD	2,000
Per diem	Accommodation and meal expenses	Day	10	USD 153	USD	1,529
Total out of pocket expenses					USD	4,529
ESTIMATED TOTAL OF MID TERM REVIEW					USD	16,529

DRAFT