

DOC 2.06-4.1

# External Evaluation of the Stop TB Partnership, including GDF Note for the Coordinating Board

# I. Objectives

The objectives of the external evaluation are to determine whether the Stop TB Partnership continues to:

- deliver impact and added value;
- have the appropriate strategic focus; and
- have the adequate structure, governance and managerial processes to continue functioning optimally in an accountable manner over the foreseeable future.

The evaluation will satisfy the requirements of the Coordinating Board, DFID, the World Bank Development Grant Facility and other key stakeholders for an independent review.

### II. Scope

The proposed evaluation will cover the structure and functioning of all systemic elements of the Partnership, all the processes within and between the elements, and the Global Drug Facility (GDF) of the Partnership. Though the evaluation will cover the period from 2001, it will specifically focus on the period Jan 2004 to December 2006.

The evaluation will cover an assessment of Partnership engagement with a wide range of partners and stakeholders through critical review of work and activities in a selection of countries in which Partnership activities are undertaken and a group of countries that receive GDF support. It will be conducted by a team of persons with the necessary expertise from a consulting firm selected for the work on the basis of competitive bidding as per WHO procedures. Criteria for selection of the firm for awarding the contract will be agreed by the Steering Group set up by the Coordinating Board. The Steering Group will guide the evaluation process.

## II. Evaluation Variables

In conducting the evaluation the critical issues are:

- 1. **Relevance:** To determine whether the Stop TB Partnership is addressing mainly high priority problems as viewed by actual and potential stakeholders, particularly the wider TB community and beneficiaries.
- 2. **Effectiveness:** To assess whether the Partnership, as a loose coalition of partners, has been able to give the expected impetus to the TB control movement and has had an impact on TB control. To determine the adequacy of its existing roles and functions and the capacity for new roles.
- 3. **Efficiency:** To assess the outputs of the Partnership and their quality in relation to the resources, funds and human efforts invested.
- 4. **Sustainability:** To determine the suitability of the Partnership structure and assessing the processes used for maintaining or augmenting the positive achievements induced by the initiatives and projects of the Partnership.

# III. Evaluation Budget

Approximately US\$800,000 for both the GDF and the Stop TB Partnership. It should be noted that the 2003 external evaluation cost the partnership and GDF US\$882,305. Of the total budget needed, US\$700,000 has already been pledged by DFID. The balance can be will be completed by funds already available with the Stop TB Partnership Trust Fund.

#### **IV. Evaluation Process:**

- Establishment by the Coordinating Board of a small steering group comprising five persons representing different constituencies (incl. WHO). This group will guide the evaluation work, and will receive all the reports with comments from the Stop TB Partnership Secretariat. It will review these documents and give feedback to the evaluation team through the Secretariat on the issues set out in the report.
- Final Approval by the Coordinating Board of the budget range indicated (in work plan).
- Finalisation of the Terms Of Reference (TOR) for the external evaluation. TORs developed will cover both the Partnership and GDF.
- Preparation and circulation of the Request For Proposals (RFP), based on the technical note, to at least 10 potential service providers. Evaluation of these based on an initial list of 15 service providers having received an invitation for registering an expression of interest in the evaluation of the Stop TB Partnership. The RFP will also be placed on the Stop TB Partnership website for transparency purposes.
- Setting up a selection committee and establishing criteria for selecting the firm that will conduct the evaluation and clearance thereof by the Steering Group.
- Analysis of valid bids, scoring of bids, and selection of the winner.
- Activation of the Contract Review Committee (CRC) process of WHO to award the contract for the evaluation.
- Finalisation of the work plan with the selected organization.
- Commencement of work in Geneva, in selected countries and with partners.
- Receipt of first draft report on findings of the evaluation team by the Secretariat.
  Discussions of the report within the Secretariat and among the Steering Group and/or Executive Committee members.
- Feedback on the first draft report to the evaluation team.
- Remaining work completed and 2<sup>nd</sup> draft report received by the Secretariat, and circulated to the Steering Group.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> draft report reviewed by the Secretariat, management response prepared and sent to the Coordinating Board.
- Both the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft report and the management response presented to the Board in Autumn 2007 for discussions on evaluation recommendations.

 Acceptance of the final report by the Board and circulation of the final report to donors and other stakeholders on request. It will also be posted on the Stop TB partnership web site.

#### V. Time line

For work by evaluators and the Secretariat after the launch of the process formally in November 2006:

- March 2007 Finalization of working arrangements and country visits (interviews with key stakeholders and partners);
- End July 2007 1<sup>st</sup> Draft Report circulation and comments;
- End Sept 2007 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Report received;
- Mid-October 2007 Management response prepared;
- November 2007 Circulation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft report and the associated management report to the Coordinating Board; Coordinating Board discussions and comments.
- Early December 2007 Receipt and circulation of the Final Evaluation Report and approval thereof (Board by electronic means).
- December 2007 Wide dissemination of the Evaluation Report.