|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2.Threshold Establishment** | | | | | |
| **Area of Responsibility** | **Question/Topic** | **Threshold** | **Level** | **Rationale for the rating** | **Summary** |
| Oversight | The oversight function is aligned with the Global Fund (GF) grant priorities and relevant national processes (e.g., national program reviews and national planning) | 3 - The oversight function is aligned with GF grant priorities and relevant national programs and the CCM is self-reliant on its implementation. The oversight committee (OC) has attracted (within the CCM and/or co-opted) all relevant set of skills aligned with grant as well as national program priorities (e.g. procurement and supply chain management, Health Systems Strengthening, gender, finance, community experts, etc.) and is aligned with national structures conducting oversight-like activities (e.g., national strategic information committees, national M&E systems, etc.). Program planning, implementation and reviews cycles are conducted jointly, with the aim to enhance synergies and efficiencies. Triangulated strategic information from multiple sources is at the core of decisions. The OC and PRs collaborate and interact systematically to collect and analyze information to address and resolve identified bottlenecks.  2 - The oversight function is fully aligned with GF grant priorities only. The oversight committee (OC) has attracted (within the CCM and/or co-opted) all relevant set of skills aligned with grant priorities (e.g. procurement and supply chain management, Health Systems Strengthening, gender, finance, community experts, etc.). The OC conducts regular oversight activities in alignment with its plan and provides recommendations to the CCM for decision making (based on the available grant strategic information). The CCM and PRs interact to identify bottlenecks, but there is an opportunity to enhance this collaboration.   1 –The oversight function does not fully align with GF grant priorities. The oversight committee (OC) has not attracted all relevant set of skills aligned with grant priorities. Oversight activities are conducted inconsistently, and OC recommendations are not always followed through. Interactions with PRs are not systematic.   0 -There is little-to-no consistency between the oversight function (plan, committee and cycle: data collection, analysis and follow up on recommendations) and GF grant priorities. The existing oversight structures and processes are not operational. | 2 | Regular oversight activities in alignment with the oversight plan are evidenced by the existence of the plan (valid for current period), the reports from Oversight Field Visits and the minutes of the Quarterly Oversight Committee Meetings.  Oversight Committee membership alignment is evidenced by the EPA (2019) outcomes and the membership list. 84% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey agreed or strongly agreed that Oversight Committee Membership is aligned with grant priorities.  Whilst 72% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that the Oversight Committee coordinates closely with the PR to address bottlenecks, it appears that, with regard to PR progress updates, meeting process at OC level is duplicative of meeting process at CCM level; the PR gives the same presentation to each committee. The critical/analytical distillation of grant performance information, and the development of proposed solutions for presentation to the CCM to decide on, is not really happening at OC level.  The threshold would appear to fall short of level 3 due to the lack of recommendations being made by the OC to the CCM for decision making. It is clear from meeting minutes that OC is giving technical guidance and advice to PR during OC meetings in the form of comments and feedback (See OC mtg minutes June 2019 for e.g.) So, there is documentary evidence of interactions of a technical nature between the OC and the PR. What is missing is evidence of follow through on the recommendations being made; whether the advice is taken and what it's effect was, and any formal referral up to CCM from OC for a higher level decision or action.  The implementation of Oversight field visits in accordance with the CCM's annual oversight plan is well-documented by site visit reports and minutes of these reports being presented into the OC/CCM.  The new grant (commencing in 2021) has been reconfigured into a joint investment in health with World Bank that is fully aligned with the country's Health Sector Reform Strategy. There are ongoing discussions about CCM realignment with this new HANSA project as evidenced by the OC Meeting minutes from Sept 2019 and the CCM meeting minutes from the same month and from February and March 2020. These discussions have not yet come to a conclusion but are anticipated to bring the CCM into closer alignment with the overall national programme. | Summary of Findings - Oversight  A current costed Oversight Plan is in place and is being implemented on schedule. OC committee membership is aligned with the grant. The committee has a TOR and updated membership list. Meetings are held regularly prior to CCM meetings and are well-documented. There is good sharing and presentation of key grant documents: reports, proposals, PU/DRs, Global Fund Guidance and so on. Significant and persistent attention is paid to the tracking of co-financing commitments.  A formal/regularized risk management approach/process has not been adopted into the oversight process. There does not appear to be a current grant risk and mitigation plan in place for the OC to regularly check in on. The OC has not been involved in any risk identification/prioritization exercises recently.  Whilst data sharing is exemplary there is not much evidence of performance data analysis, distillation of critical performance issues, bottleneck solution brainstorming or requests from OC to CCM for a decision or action to unblock a bottleneck. There are duplicative progress updates from PR into both OC and CCM. It was noted that site visits often find persistent recurring issues that remain unresolved. |
| Use of strategic information for action and decision-making throughout the Global Fund (GF) grant-life cycle | 3 - The CCM ensures the availability, quality and analysis of information for its discussions with PRs, CTs and other stakeholders. A data/information-driven culture has been embedded. Global Fund investments are proactively assessed against and adjusted to the overall national response based on triangulated strategic information coming from different sources.   2 - The CCM ensures the availability, quality and analysis of information for its discussions with PRs, CTs and other stakeholders. Regular CCM data-based discussions and decisions inform key GF processes (e.g., funding request preparation, program revisions, oversight of implementation, etc.) without systematic linkages with the overall health response.   1 - CCM discussions and decision-making are not always supported by strategic information and these do not always seek alignment of Global Fund investments with other programs. There is still a window of opportunity to improve grant-related data quality and analysis.  0 - CCM discussions and decision-making are not supported by strategic information. | 2 | As above, the threshold would appear to fall in the vicinity of threshold 2.   Usually, the PR reports on the grant’s performance to the CCM twice a year, e.g. Semi-annual report (Progress Update - PU) and Annual Report - Progress Update and Disbursement Request - PUDR). This has been disrupted this year due to FR development. The PU/DR format is used to present grant progress (no dashboards). OC & CCM Mtgs in June 2019 evidences Performance Letters being presented into OC/CCM but no decisions or actions are documented.  A review of 8 CCM mtg minutes and 5 OC meeting minutes from 2015 to 2020 shows data coming in from risk assessment reports, PU/DRs, oversight field visit reports, regional coordination proposals, draft funding requests, performance letters, Global Fund guidance, and an independent review of the RAI project. Most of this data would appear to be more grant-orientated than national programme orientated. However, an important link between the national programmes and the CCM/OC are the disease specific taskforces which typically meet before the CCM/OC meetings. A representative from the taskforces (which are concerned with the national programme as a whole) is invited to give an update to the CCM/OC as required.  78% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that OC uses strategic information from different sources. 68% agreed that the CCM uses dashboards or other tools to support evidence-based decisions. The Secretariat reported that dashboards are not used to present grant progress reports; the PU/DR format is used instead. |
| Adoption of a risk management approach to oversight | 3 - CCMs are leading country portfolio risk identification and are actively contributing in mitigation of national disease program strategic risks. CCMs also demonstrate an ability to provide reliable assurance to the Global Fund.  2 - CCMs are proactively managing grant-related risks and providing guidance to implementers to ensure that risk management activities (identification, prioritization and mitigation) are carried out for the portfolio. CCMs ensure that PRs are managing grant related risks on an ongoing basis. . In countries classified as High Impact or Core, CCMs participate in Risk and Assurance Workshops and identify 3-5 key portfolio risks for follow up by relevant CCM committees.   1 - CCMs have integrated certain aspects of risk identification, prioritization, mitigation in their oversight function.  0 - CCMs (particularly in High Impact and Core contexts) have been sensitized to Risk Management but have not integrated any aspects of risk identification, prioritization, mitigation, monitoring and assurance in their oversight strategy. | 0 | The results of an HSS grant risk assessment were presented into a CCM mtg in Sept 2015. The PR was tasked to share a risk mitigation action plan with the CCM. A risk assessment of HIV, TB and Malaria grants was presented into a CCM mtg in December 2016. A risk assessment stakeholder consultation workshop was held in December 2016 with a technical support provider (participant list has been provided.)  A PMU risk management table has been shared by the Secretariat. However, there does not appear to be any systematic oversight or risk mitigation implementation oversight in the OC or CCM (i.e. updates being regularly presented and discussed.) The Secretariat has reported (KI interview) that insofar as this does happen it would most likely be at Taskforce level or embedded into the PU/DR report which the PR presents into OC/CCM. Supporting documentation has been requested to evidence this.  In summary it would appear that there is little evidence of any on-going or systematized risk mitigation action tracking or assurance by OC or CCM. The oversight of grant risk management has not been formalized and has yet to become a regular part of the Oversight process. It should be noted that as a Focused Country Lao has not had any Key Risk Matrix shared with country stakeholders by the Country Team. |  |
| CCM supports the realization of co-financing commitments | 3 - CCMs proactively and successfully collect information in order to track, advocate for and support the realization of co-financing commitments. The status of co-financing commitments is discussed at least twice/year during oversight committee and CCM meetings. The CCM supports follow up and reporting of materialized commitments during grant implementation (as indicated in the Co-financing Operational Policy Note) using relevant data, tools and processes.   2 - Co-financing commitments are known and their status is discussed at least twice/year during oversight committee and CCM meetings. Information related to the materialization of co-financing commitments is actively sought by the CCM and tracked through available tools (where these exist).   1 - Co-financing commitments are known by the CCM but are sporadically discussed during oversight committee or CCM meetings. Information related to the materialization of co-financing commitments is not actively sought by the CCM.   0 - The CCM is not sufficiently aware of co-financing commitments, nor has it sought further information on their realization. | 2 | This indicator scores a high 2.  Meeting minutes evidence discussions of co-financing commitments in an OC meeting on 18th February 2020 and in CCM meetings in March, May and September 2020. The February 2020 OC mtg and May 2020 CCM mtg minutes evidence information relating to commitments being actively sought.   However, it should be noted that the last 12 months have been a FR development year so much of the co-financing commitment discussion has been in relation to proposal development.  KI interviews revealed active follow up on progress of implementation of co-financing commitments, e.g. during CCM meetings when PR reports on their performance they also have to report on co-financing implementation. During CCM meetings when PR reports on their performance they also have to report on co-financing implementation. The CCM Chair is very serious about this issue and repeatedly asks for a status update; not only in CCM meetings but also in internal meetings within the national programme. The problem is more to do with the availability of the information rather than with the CCM's efforts to obtain it. Repeated attempts are made but it is very difficult to get a summary report.   78% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that the CCM keeps track of co-financing commitments, 84% agreed that the CCM advocates for the country to meet co-financing commitments |  |
| Engagement | CCM constituencies selection/election processes abide by principles of good governance and ensure quality engagement | 3 - CCM members are selected/elected through ethical, well-documented and widely-published processes that are guided by and aligned to the nature of GF investments and national priorities. Civil Society (CS) constituencies conduct consultations and mobilization of relevant CS groups (PLWDs, Key affected and vulnerable populations, etc.) leading up to the elections.   2 – CCM members are selected/elected through documented processes that are partially aligned to GF grants and national priorities (i.e. involvement of key relevant ministries). CS sector members are elected through an open, transparent and documented process following comprehensive consultations and mobilization of relevant CS groups (PLWDs, Key affected and vulnerable populations, etc.) leading up to the elections. Member selection for other sectors is based on each constituency's self-governed documented processes.   1 - CCM members are selected/elected based on self-governed processes that are documented but not geared towards a CCM composition aligned to the grants and national priorities. Some level of consultations and mobilization of relevant CS groups (PLWDs, Key affected and vulnerable populations, etc.) leading to the elections has taken place.  0 - The CCM members are selected/elected through adhoc and non-documented processes. No evidence of appropriate (coverage and timeframe) consultations and mobilization of relevant CS groups (PLWDs, Key affected and vulnerable populations, etc.) leading to the elections. | 2 | CCM sub-sector elections have not taken place since 2016. At that time, they were documented processes and membership is aligned with the grants.   Renewal was due in 2019, but most sub-sector elections have been on hold pending the outcome of discussions about the future role of the CCM in relation to the HANSA project. CCM meeting minutes of Sept 2019 show that CCM membership selection was tabled but postponed whilst the MoH Steering Committee discusses the HANSA governance structure.  At the time of writing an election workshop for selection of the reps and alternates for the CSO, KP and PLWD constituencies has been scheduled for 26th-27th Nov 2020 and an agenda has been shared. Documentation detailing the results will also be shared when it becomes available.  95% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that (a) the CCM has an ideal mix of members that is consistent with the country context and epidemiology and (b) the current CCM composition ensures multi-sectoral representation.  Overall it would seem that processes are in place with the active involvement of constituency members; the recent pause has solely been due to the upcoming change in implementation arrangements. | Summary of Findings - Quality Engagement  Clear efforts are being made to realize the ideals around community engagement that are embodied by the CCM model. From a constitutional point of view this engagement is fully enshrined in the relevant CCM documentation and membership lists.   There is also good evidence that this engagement extends to processes that pertain to the national programmes as a whole such as NSP development and the disease-specific taskforces.  The main issue appears to be the struggle to realize systematic bi-directional consultations with constituencies. This was formalized with Red Cross resources and coordination support at one point but appears to have dropped off once that project closed out. Given the challenges with giving the community voice in CCM meetings (time constraints, cultural constraints, language barrier etc.) the role of the CSO coordinating committee becomes even more pertinent. |
| CCM constituencies engagement in GF processes | 3 - Members engage actively in CCM meetings and activities and voice their constituencies' positions. Efforts from the leadership to ensure a balanced participation of each constituency represented in CCM debates and decision-making processes is systematic. All sectors are actively engaged in all key committees (oversight and executive). CCM constituencies prepare thoroughly for every key GF processes in which they participate and define constituency-specific positions. Attendance surpasses the required quorum at every meeting.  2 - Members engage actively in CCM meetings and activities and voice their constituencies' positions. There are deliberate efforts from the leadership to ensure a balanced participation of each constituency represented in CCM debates and decision-making processes. All sectors are actively engaged at in all key committees (oversight and executive). CCM constituencies make some efforts to prepare for key GF and national processes in which they participate. Quorum is achieved at every meeting.  1 - Members participate in CCM meetings and activities. There are minor efforts from CCM leadership to ensure a balanced participation of each constituency represented in CCM debates and decision-making processes. All sectors are represented in all key committees (oversight and executive). Quorum is achieved at every meeting.  0 - Members attend in CCM meetings and quorum is achieved regularly. Not all sectors are represented in key committees (oversight and executive) and meeting minutes do not clearly demonstrate a balanced articulation of various constituencies' views. | 2 | There is preproperate sector representation in both the CCM and the Oversight Committee and the CCM Secretariat reports that achieving a quorum is not usually an issue.  An NPA-KAP-PLWDs Coordinating Committee was formally established in March 2016. It is comprised of 11 members and 11 alternates with representatives from SW, MSM, IDU, PLHIV. It was involved in CCM member elections in 2016 and participation in country dialogue for Funding Request development. French Red Cross funding support for the committee ended in 2017. Although it was set up to strengthen networking and consultations with KP/PLWDs communities there was a lack of community ownership, a dependency on French Red Cross, and a lack of coordination for regular pre-CCM meetings. This is evidenced by the review ppt submitted to support Indicator J of 2019 EPA.   After the support from French Red Cross ended the committee changed its name to the CSO Coordinating Committee. There is budget in the CCM funding for this committee to meet prior to CCM meetings to develop constituency positions. However, no meetings have taken place so far this year. The current Chair of the committee reports that communication and networking by WhatsApp group still happens. However, it does appear that the ideal of a formalised process of pre and post CCM mtg bi-directional consultation and feedback is not currently actively in place. The issue appears to be with CSO committee members being too busy with implementation activities. One key informant felt that community reps tended to be voicing their own views in meetings rather than established constituency positions based on consultation.  The key informant interviews gave mixed views on community representatives participation in CCM meetings. Some felt there was no particular issue whilst others commented that the CCM is not a space where community people feel comfortable about speaking up in. This has to do with cultural issues around authority and seniority with the CCM being perceived as a high-level meeting with very senior representation. One informant felt that community participation was much better in the disease-specific technical taskforce meetings that take place prior to CCMs which are hosted by the national programmes and seen as being not so high-level. Key issues that were mentioned by key informants as obstacles to community partipcation in CCM meetings were: -Time constraints -Language issues (there is simultaneous translation at the CCM meetings but most of the documentation is lengthy, in English and circulated not long before the meeting.) -Cultural issues of seniority/authority   There is clear documented evidence of key population/community/civil society providing inputs into the most recent Funding Request development process, e.g. the minutes for OC Mtg Sept 2019 document PLHIV rep making a proposal regarding the structure of the new HANSA project (p2). Participation of community representatives in oversight field visits is also documented (see Sept 2019).  For threshold it would be fairer to say that this indicator scores somewhere between 1 and 2. There were differences of opinions about this among KI interviewees and within the taskforce. A key deficit would be around the representation of agreed constituency positions and pre-meeting preparation (see comments on Engagement indicator 4 below.)  89% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that dialogue in the CCM meetings include participation from all sectors, and 83% agreed CS representatives always participated in CCM decision-making processes offering their technical expertise and inputs. |
| Representatives of CCM constituencies (particularly Civil Society members) engage in country processes pertaining to the national response (e.g., National Strategic Planning, National Program Reviews and Prioritization, Development Partner’s Country Operational Planning, etc.) | 3 - Voices of CCM constituencies’ representatives (particularly civil society and communities) are amplified in health and other relevant sectors’ governance, leadership and coordination spaces. This participation is documented, systematic, goes beyond attendance and involves information sharing with the CCM.  2 - Representatives of CCM constituencies prepare and actively participate in country processes supporting the national health response and this participation is documented and systematic.   1 - Representatives of CCM constituencies participate in country processes supporting the national health response, but this participation is not documented nor systematic.  0 - Representatives of CCM constituencies only participate in CCM meetings. | 2 | According to key informant interviews, many of the CSOs in GF programme are partners of national programme. So, they are also involved in national consultations. E.g. national programme mid-term review meetings, development of NSP. This was confirmed by at least 3 of the key informants interviewed. Some felt the threshold for this was between 2 and 3. The evidence for this indicator is largely through interviews (including voices representing the CS sector.) I have been unable to obtain much in the way of written documentation (membership/attendance lists, meeting minutes/reports.) I have been told that insofar as these do exist, they would likely be in Laotian.  One key informant felt that engagement/participation of civil society members was much more active in the disease-specific taskforces convened by the national programmes prior to CCM meetings. Please note that as far as evidence is concerned these activities are usually documented in the local language. The role of these taskforces are described in the CCM TOR (p16) where it is clear that they are orientated towards the national programmes as a whole rather than the Global Fund grants and they are designed around the concept of multisectoral collaboration. |  |
| CCM members (particularly CS members) carry out activities to solicit inputs from and provide feedback within their constituencies to contribute to sound decisions. | 3 - There are proactive and ongoing bi-directional consultations between CCM representatives of all sectors and their constituents. These consultations are done using structured and agreed mechanisms. Constituency meetings (particularly for CS) take place prior to key CCM processes to analyze information, develop positions and identify priorities.  2 - There are proactive and ongoing bi-directional consultations between CCM representatives of all sectors and their constituents. These consultations are done using structured and agreed mechanisms.   1 - CCM representatives share outcomes of CCM processes with their constituencies. Input prior to meetings is not necessarily sought in a consistent manner through consultations.   0 - Bi-directional consultations within constituencies are infrequent or non-existent. | 0 | Whilst there is a mechanism in place to conduct bi-directional consultations with community constituencies (the aforementioned CSO coordinating committee) it has not been able to meet on a regular basis prior to CCM meetings as planned. No meetings have happened in 2020. Key informants explained that this was due to the committee members being busy with programme implementation. This perhaps explains why the 360 survey results recorded the highest level of disagreement for the three questions around members preparedness for meetings, and the holding of pre- and post CCM meeting consultations with constituencies. 33% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) disagreed that pre and post CCM constituency meetings occur or that CCM members are well prepared for meetings. There were, however, still more people agreeing with these questions than disagreeing. Some interviewees pointed out that there are non-documented consultation mechanisms within KP networks such as via WhatsApp group. It is hard to judge to what extent these constitute formal bi-directional feedback loops. Perhaps this threshold is best described as falling between 0 and 1, but in the absence of better documentary evidence it has been ranked at the most basic level. There are efforts underway to revamp the CS consultation process; it is hoped that the elections held last week are a step towards this. |  |
| Positioning | The CCM proactively defines a “strategic positioning” vision to ensure alignment with and/or integration into national structures/coordinating bodies and formal links with donor partner platforms. | 3 - The CCM co-creates a vision for positioning, alignment and harmonization with all relevant in-country stakeholders.   2 - Stakeholders, processes, and systems' coordination opportunities have been identified and the CCM proactively defines a pathway towards an agreed strategic positioning option(s).   1 - The CCM has conducted a stakeholders’ mapping and strategic landscape scan to inform a responsive strategic positioning vision.  0 -The CCM has not undertaken the process of defining its positioning in relation to the national landscape and lacks visibility in-country. | 1 | The issue of positioning is currently critical for Lao CCM because of the new implementation arrangements that will be coming in with the new grant starting January 2021. In the Lao context the GF has opted to pool its resourcing into a Health and Nutrition Services Access (HANSA) project, led and co-financed by World Bank with further co-financing from DFAT. Improved alignment with national systems is an important part of the rationale for this funding modality. The issue of the role and position of the CCM in relation to this new project structure has not yet been resolved, but there is ample documentary evidence of it being discussed at both CCM and OC level dating back to September 2019. The HANSA project has a steering committee which is comprised of government members. A draft organigram developed for discussion purposes has the CCM linking into this committee but the details of how, and the respective roles of the two committees have not yet been spelt out.  The threshold for this indicator was selected based on the fact that the discussion (of CCM positioning in relation to HANSA) has started and the CCM and OC have had opportunities to input into the discussion. It is not obvious that a mapping activity would be appropriate in the context given the specificity of the new set up and the inputs from key informant interviews that suggest that the decision is for the ministry to make.  Evidence of the HANSA governance structure being discussed in CCM committees can be found in the mtg minutes for OC mtg, Sept 2019, CCM mtgs Sept 2019, Feb 2020, Mar 2020. There is currently a Joint virtual mission underway by GF and WB which will also discuss the issue culminating in a report into the CCM mtg upcoming on Dec 7th 2020.  It should be noted that whilst the positioning of the CCM (and its governance function) has yet to be resolved, there has been a broader ongoing process of alignment and harmonization of implementation structures for a number of years (as evidenced by key informant interview with Secretariat.) This has included merging of PMU staff positions into relevant functional departments (Finance, Coordination and M&E for example,) culminating in the upcoming merging of TB and HIV into a single grant embedded in the HANSA project.  In relation to this indicator the following results from the CCM Evolution 360 Survey are noteworthy:  95% (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that the CCM discusses alignment with and/or integration into relevant national structures during CCM meetings. This makes sense given the ongoing discussions about the HANSA governance arrangements. 78% (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that the CCM has sufficient links to donor partner investments. Alignment with these investments is a major part of rationale for pooling the grant into the HANSA project. 66% (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that the CCM regularly engages in discussions related to its sustainability and transition beyond the Global Fund, though interestingly 22% disagreed.  In the key informant interviews some concerns were expressed that the new arrangements risk possibly diminishing the CCMs role and with it the participation of civil society in the governance architecture. | Summary of Findings - Positioning  Positioning is a critical issue for Lao CCM as the country moves to new implementation arrangements that pool GF funding into the WB HANSA project. Alignment with national structures is a significant part of the rationale behind the GF's decision to pool the funds in this way. The questions of how the CCM links with the HANSA Steering Committee and what its respective role is in relation to the national HANSA project coordination office in the DPC have yet to be resolved. A possible organogram has been presented to CCM and OC and been discussed. The sense among CCM stakeholders is that the decision will be made by the Ministry (rather than by the CCM.) The as yet undetermined merged governance arrangements present potential risks for the CCM particularly in relation to the CCM's leverage and the extent to which a meaningful role in governance for communities can be preserved. |
| Ensuring buy-in and ownership of the vision by all relevant stakeholders (particularly national government) | 3 - All relevant stakeholders proactively engage around an agreed [re]positioning vision and there is formal consensus among all parties. Roles and responsibilities of each party are clearly defined and agreed on.   2 - All relevant stakeholders proactively engage around an agreed [re]positioning vision and there is formal consensus among all parties. Roles and responsibilities of each party have been partially defined and agreed upon.  1 - The strategic positioning vision has been communicated to certain relevant parties. Consensus building is still needed.   0 -The strategic positioning vision has not been defined or has not been communicated to any relevant parties and there is no consensus on the way forward. | 1 | See comments on previous indicator. This indicator is hard to score in the current context given that the role/position of the CCM in the new project structure has yet to be decided upon. There is some hope that the current joint virtual mission by GF and WB will help move the issue forward towards a decision. It is anticipated that this will be discussed at the upcoming CCM meeting on 7th December when the mission debriefs.  Key issues that will need to be decided in relation to the new governance are the respective roles of the national project coordination office in the DPC (which sits between the implementation of WB programme and its steering committee) and the CCM. It has not yet been determined how these two bodies work together in the reporting process prior to submission to the HANSA steering committee  As with the previous indicator there is ample documentary evidence of the HANSA governance arrangements being discussed in CCM and OC meetings. The general principles of the positioning; alignment, harmonization, integration and sustainability, seem well understood and especially appreciated by the government (as evidenced by KI interview with Secretariat.) |  |
| The CCM aligns its functions and structures with the national response for enhanced harmonization of systems, processes and decision-making for greater impact and efficiencies. | 3 - CCM operations (functions and structures) are purposefully structured and implemented to ensure alignment and efficiencies within the national health response, reducing duplication and working towards full integration.  2 - CCM operations (functions and structures) are organized and are efficiently implemented. In addition, they have been recently aligned with broader national processes.   1 - CCM operations (functions and structures) are organized. In addition to focusing on GF-related activities, they are partially aligned with broader national processes.  0 - CCM operations (functions and structures) are not fully organized and are only GF-focused. | 2 | This indicator has been scored with reference to the current set up. It probably falls somewhere between 1 and 2. The outcomes of the ongoing discussions about the HANSA governance arrangements may have implications for the scoring. The following has been noted with respect to the current arrangements:  CCM operations are well organized and very efficiently implemented. They are also aligned - evidence of this is in the national-programme-led disease-specific taskforces (with a focus on the national programmes as a whole and with civil society participation) which link into the CCM and the Oversight Committee. Also, the CCM being Chaired by the Vice Minister for Health. The disease-specific taskforces have representation on the OC and CCM and can present national programme updates to these committees.   With regard to this indicator, it should be noted that this type of alignment and its intended harmonies, efficiencies and impact are part of the whole rationale for the new pooled funding arrangements, and the government has been a key driver in trying to bring about improved alignment (evidenced by KI interview with Secretariat.) Furthermore, as noted in response to positioning Indicator 1 above, a general process of alignment and harmonization of GF implementation structures with national programmes has been underway for several years. The KI interviews revealed a strong government commitment to the alignment of donor funded programmes with national structures and suggested that the government has been proactive in persuading donors to align their contributions. |  |
| Civil society members and communities are proactively represented and engaged in coordination, governance and decision-making bodies and processes beyond the CCM | 3 - The national civil society (particularly communities) is engaged in all relevant coordination and decision-making bodies and their voice is amplified in health sector governance and leadership spaces. The CCM has made efforts to ensure that civil society representation persists even after the end of Global Fund investments.  2 - Civil society (particularly communities) actively engages in several national coordination and decision-making bodies. Additional efforts are needed to amplify their voices in these spaces.  1 - Civil society (particularly communities) representatives engage actively in GF processes. 0 -Engagement and participation of civil society (particularly communities) in GF processes is limited. | 1 | See rationale for the third Engagement indicator which covers similar ground.  This indicator falls somewhere between thresholds 1 and 2. As noted above civil society is represented in the national programme taskforces and one key informant felt that there were more opportunities to voice their views there than at CCM meetings. The documented missions of these taskforces include promotion of multi-sectoral collaboration in the national response, fostering policy dialogues and formulation of common positions (CCM TOR.) However, they are not decision-making or governance bodies and given that the second threshold level requires evidence of active engagement in "several" such bodies, this has been scored at 1.  72% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that there are opportunities in country to maintain the principles of civil-society participation, partnership and transparency beyond GF financing, though a notable 22% disagreed. |  |
| Operations | CCM ensures ethical decision-making processes are adopted and mainstreamed throughout its operations. | 3 - The CCM fosters a respectful and inclusive environment where active and effective contributions by all members are sought and considered. All decisions are made in a transparent and equitable manner according to the CCM’s clearly documented processes. Decisions are based on triangulated data (from multiple sources) and aim for maximum efficiencies of the GF investments as well as National Health Programmes. The CCM Code of Conduct has been adopted, CCM members have received training on it and consistently apply its provisions to their governance processes.    2 - The CCM fosters a respectful and inclusive environment where active and effective contributions by all members are sought and considered. Decisions are made in a transparent and equitable manner according to the CCM’s clearly documented processes. Decisions are based on information (not always triangulated) and aim for maximum efficiencies of the GF investments. The CCM Code of Conduct has been adopted, members have been sensitized about it and is frequently used as a guiding document.   1 - The CCM has clearly documented decision-making processes in place. The processes are observed and applied most of the time. Not all decisions take on board all member’s input. The CCM Code of Conduct has been adopted and members have been sensitized.   0 - The CCM does not have clearly documented decision-making processes. These processes focus on meeting compliance requirements rather than effectiveness of CCM operations and the application of governance principles. The CCM Code of Conduct has not been adopted and members have not been made aware of it. | 2 | The Code of Ethical Conduct was first introduced in an OC mtg in Feb 2020. It was further discussed in the OC mtg of Sept 2020 where an Ethics Focal point was nominated. The contents of the Code have been reviewed and presented at OC and CCM level. A CCM meeting on Sept 2020 endorsed the Code, appointed the Ethics focal point and actioned all members to complete the GF's e Learning course on the Code. CCM Secretariat has indicated that ensuring all members complete the course is a challenge. It should be noted this is a relatively new development so it is too early to talk about frequency of use and consistent application.  There is good evidence of individuals recusing themselves from discussions where there is COI; for e.g., CCM mtg Mar 2020 (p13) Chair recuses himself from FR endorsement vote, and CCM mtg May 2020 (p9) an involved organisation recuses itself from SR selection vote (RAI grant.)   100% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that conflicts of interest are managed in all CCM activities  78% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that CCM members have adopted the Global Fund's Code of Ethical Conduct and know how the provisions of the Code apply to the CCM's governance processes.  73% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that the CCM’s Ethics Committee/Focal point is effective in promoting ethical conduct and decision-making in all CCM activities and this is documented in CCM meeting minutes | Summary of Findings - Operations  On an administrative level the execution of the operational side of CCM functioning is exemplary. Operations are well documented, plans are in place and costed, meeting minutes are complete and efficiently turned around. Initiative is taken to ensure that new requirements from GF, such as the Ethics Code of Conduct, are put in place. A documented appraisal process of the Secretariat is in place and so on.  If there are any shortcomings this would be mainly on strategic support. Processes as they currently stand do not accommodate a significant role for the secretariat in strategic analysis/filtering of data that is presented into the CCM and the Oversight Committee. Part of the issue here is that, as with many CCMs, the progress reports are not being made available in sufficient time before meetings for there to be an pre-meeting analytic review and completeness check. If the Secretariat were to take up such a role there would need to be an assessment of any logistical and capacity constraints as well as contextual constraints around authority structures. A new role for the CCM in relation to HANSA would also have implications for the relative weighting given to administrative versus strategic support provided to the CCM by the Secretariat. |
| The CCM Secretariat provides strategic support to the CCM and its structures | 3 - The CCM Secretariat provides strategic support to the CCM leadership and other core committees to fulfil their functions, ensure the observance of governance and ethical principles and to civil society representatives for enhanced engagement. The CCM Secretariat supports data-driven dialogue and decision making amongst all stakeholders. The secretariat also contributes to identifying and harnessing opportunities for collaboration and alignment aimed at strategic positioning of the CCM. In addition, the CCM secretariat proactively leads and facilitates members’ skills building and induction activities whenever appropriate, throughout the grant life cycle.   2 - The CCM Secretariat provides administrative and strategic support to the CCM and its committees -particularly the oversight committee - and provides the necessary information and advice to members and CCM leadership for effective decision-making. The CCM secretariat leads and facilitates members’ skills building and induction activities on annual basis and after membership renewal.  1 - The CCM Secretariat mostly provides administrative support to the CCM and its committees and makes efforts to ensure that governance policies and procedures are followed. Communication with members is frequent. Members’ skills building and induction activities for members are partially structured and planned.    0 - The CCM Secretariat is not fully organized/in place. | 2 | The Secretariat provides a high level of support to the CCM and its structures. The quality of the administrative support is exemplary as can be seen from the CCM and committee meeting documentation. The Secretariat is also very proactive in ensuring adherence to policies and procedures. A good example of this is the follow through on the implementation of the Code of Conduct (see above.) For lengthier documents such as these the CCM Secretariat provides a summary for presentation into the committee (reported by CCM Secretariat in KI interview.)   Secretariat also asks taskforce to make ppt summary of PU/DR for presentation into OC/CCM (reported by CCM Secretariat in KI interview.)   The Secretariat develops solid workplans. The 360 survey results (see next paragraph) indicate a high level of appreciation for the work of the Secretariat as does the documented secretariat performance appraisal (see CCM mtg minutes February 2020.)  The secretariat leads on ensuring that new members are properly briefed about their role as a CCM member (as per notes on KI interview with Secretariat)  The main gap would be in support for strategic review/analysis of programmatic data coming into the Oversight Committee before it is presented to the committee. As with many CCM's the data is not coming into the Secretariat from the PR in sufficient time before the OC meeting for there to be any significant analysis and checks performed on it at Secretariat level.   61% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that CCM members receive an orientation on their role and CCM core functions at least once a year, but it was notable that 17% said they didn't know and 22% disagreed. 94% (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that the CCM Secretariat provides technical support to CCM committees to ensure core functions are implemented. It is possible that there is room for orientations to be more systematically implemented. |
| The CCM has appropriate and relevant structures in place, which operate optimally and efficiently | 3 - The CCM committees' mandate and operations are purposefully structured to ensure alignment with GF grants and the national context, reducing duplication and working towards full integration. Committees develop sound recommendations - based on thorough investigations and evidence - to facilitate decision-making. Implementation of recommendations is followed through.  2 - The CCM committees’ mandate is clearly defined and widely shared. The composition is aligned with and supports GF grant priorities. Committees develop sound recommendations - based on thorough investigations and evidence - to facilitate decision-making. Implementation of recommendations is not always followed through.  1 - The CCM committees’ mandate is clearly defined, but not shared with all members. The committees' composition is designed to respond to and support grant priorities. Committees develop recommendations, though not always based on triangulated data and evidence. Implementation of recommendations is very sporadic or not fully documented.  0 - The existing committees and their composition are not aligned with grant priorities and their mandate is not clearly defined by terms of reference. Committees rarely provide sound recommendations to the CCM. | 2 | To date the CCM structure has served well with the CCM itself and the Oversight Committee being the most regularized meeting structures. There are discussions underway about merging the Resource Mobilization Committee into the Oversight Committee to reduce meeting load for members and avoid duplication. The structure of the CCM and its committees, including their mandates/TORs is well described in the CCM TOR.  A Civil Society Coordination Committee (see Engagement indictors above) is not currently able to perform its key function (of agreeing constituency viewpoints for presentation into the CCM) because its members have been too busy with implementation work to meet.  Committee composition is well aligned with both the grant and the national programme and due consideration has been given to membership of affected communities.  Exco meets less frequently at the moment on an as-needs basis.  Threshold-wise this probably falls between 1 and 2. Committee roles are defined and shared, and composition is aligned. The weakness is more in the area of lack of documented recommendations coming into the CCM from its subcommittees and then documented decisions being made on these recommendations. It is clear from the documentation that the committees are giving guidance and advice to the implementers. It is less clear from the documentation whether these is any follow through on this. |  |
| The CCM’s operations are effectively managed | 3 - The leadership proactively fosters regular and pertinent interactions among all internal and external stakeholders. CCM members participate and contribute to debates and decision-making processes. CCM meetings are managed effectively, using standard protocols to manage time, ensure quorum, manage potential conflicts of interest, organize participation by members and lead to implementable and documented decisions. Membership (including leadership) renewal occurs in accordance with CCM governance documents and procedures. A robust performance management system (in line with Global Fund expectations) of the CCM secretariat is in place and regularly implemented.   2 - The leadership fosters regular and pertinent interactions amongst internal stakeholders. CCM members participate and contribute to debates and decision-making processes. CCM meetings are managed effectively, using standard protocols to manage time, ensure quorum, manage potential conflicts of interest, organize participation by members and lead to implementable and documented decisions. Membership (including leadership) renewal occurs in accordance with CCM governance documents and procedures. A performance management system of the CCM secretariat (in line with Global Fund expectations) is in place, but is not regularly implemented.  1 - The leadership endeavors to foster interactions amongst CCM stakeholders. Some members participate and actively contribute to discussions and decision-making processes. CCM meetings are managed well, following standard protocols included in governance documents. Membership (including leadership) renewal is infrequent and is not always aligned with the procedures included in governance documents. A performance management system of the CCM secretariat is not in place.   0 - Few members participate in CCM discussions and decision-making processes. CCM meetings do not follow basic standard protocols. Membership (including leadership) renewal happens on an adhoc basis. The CCM secretariat does not have specific objectives and is not managed by the CCM leadership. | 3 | CCM operations are extremely well documented. Meetings are properly minuted and decisions documented. The documents submitted in the 2019 EPA are evidence of this. Strong efforts are made to mobilize participation and engagement in meetings.  Workplans are updated and there is a new workplan for oversight for the current year with budget.  There is good evidence of a formalized CCM Secretariat appraisal process; see CCM Meeting Minutes February 2020 and Sept 2018 for example, which document the CCM members ranking of Secretariat performance against agreed indicators.  Membership renewal occurs on a three year basis as per CCM TOR but note the 2019 renewal was put on hold due to the need to reconfigure the CCM to align with the HANSA project governance structure. This decision is documented in the CCM meeting minutes (Sept 2019) For more on this see the comments on the first Engagement indicator above.  100% of individuals completing the CCM Evolution 360 Survey (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that CCM members receive information in a timely manner to make informed decisions |  |