

## **TB MAC 3 Evaluation: 2017 Interim Report**

**V1.0 December 2017**

**Author:** David Collier

**Reviewer:** Client for data check only

### **Document History**

V0.1	November 2017	Working draft
V0.2	December 2017	Client for comment
V1.0	December 2017	Issued

### **Authorised for Release**

David Collier  
Principal Consultant

White Ox Evaluation & Review Group

www.whiteox.co.uk

T: +44 (0)7973 683850

E: [david@whiteox.co.uk](mailto:david@whiteox.co.uk)

113 York Road, Bristol, BS6 5QG, UK

## Executive Summary

### Context

1. The TB Modelling and Analysis Consortium (TB MAC) is funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Its purpose is to improve the interaction between quantitative researchers, policy makers, TB programmes and donors to improve global TB control. Its secretariat is based at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.
2. Phase 1 TB MAC funding (TBMAC 1) covered the initial 18-month development of the network, from June 2012 to November 2013. TB MAC 2 covered 2014/15 and funding was requested for 2016-2018. However, this start date could not be met so TB MAC 3 will now cover 2017-2019.
3. The main objectives are set out in the Grant Proposal Narrative and its Theory of Action:
  - Strengthening networks: improved co-ordination, knowledge sharing and management within the TB community (~17% of the budget):
  - Creating solutions: new high-quality modelling guidelines and resources (~57% of the budget):
  - Empowering decision-makers: better informed TA/decision making communities and modellers (~15% of the budget):
  - The remaining 11% was allocated to 'governance and evaluation'.

### Evaluation

4. We delivered a post-hoc evaluation of TB MAC 1 and have now been commissioned to deliver an independent, formative, evaluation of TB MAC 3 programme and associated sub-grant process. This is our first interim report, covering 2017.
5. The main evaluation activities in 2017 were:
  - Review of the draft Grant Proposal Narrative and 2016 stakeholder meeting.
  - Baseline interviews with the Secretariat and a sample of Committee members, other modellers, and external stakeholders.
  - Governance reviews of: the Request for Applications process and use; the role of the Advisory Panel<sup>1</sup>; and the appointment of a 'rotating member' to the Committee.
  - Desktop review of TB MAC 's 8<sup>th</sup> international workshop and a progress review with the Secretariat.
  - Analytical work towards a map of TB MAC's networks as a benchmark for future application of a network improvement utility metric.
  - Ad hoc discussions with PIs/ Secretariat and participation in Committee meetings as appropriate.
6. We did not do any benchmarking in 2017.

## Conclusions

7. Irrespective of issues they might have raised, everyone we interviewed was very supportive of TB MAC and its continuation and recognised the work of the TB MAC team, which augers well for its continuation.
8. Although plans have evolved response to circumstances, TB MAC is making meaningful progress and generally met its main objectives for 2017. The Guidance and the Catalogue are almost ready for issue, the separation between the Modelling Research Group and country-level modelling strands seems successful, and the Annual Meeting went well.
9. The potential for conflicts of interest was by far the most common potential problem our interviewees suggested TB MAC would need to manage. Our experience in 2017 is that the Committee and Secretariat are very committed to managing conflicts of interest and have put some quite elaborate procedures in place to avoid bias, but we recommend below further transparency measures.
10. The MRG network has been successfully consolidated during 2017 but the Committee now needs a clear strategy for further broadening engagement. Other strategic issues that will need some thought during 2018 include future funding and managing the workload on key team members, so that the programme is sustainable and so that they can meet their contractual requirements under the grant agreement.

## Recommendations

11. Generally, we think TB MAC's existing programme will deliver what is required but we have made some recommendation to support engagement objectives.
  - A documented strategy should be developed to guide the expansion of TB MAC's network within high burden countries and academic teams from a wider range of regions and countries. We will support this with our analytics data on request.
  - In line with objectives, the next Annual Meeting should increase participation from high burden countries and younger researchers. The 2019 Annual Meeting could be held in a location convenient for modellers and NTPs from high burden countries.
  - Conflict of interest statements should be added to website Committee and AP member's individual profiles.
12. We also made some recommendations related to administration and communications.
  - TB MAC should set out a plan for using the modelling ambassador role to expand engagement, with a strategy for deciding who to connect with which event.
  - All terms of reference and formal procedures be consistently formatted with no overlap, placed on the controlled documents list, and published on the website.
  - A systematically review of website navigation and content is needed, so the update can be completed. Site analytics will support this and help understand patterns of use.
  - Consideration should be given to actively promoting the training materials now online.
  - The Secretariat project management training should be completed.

## **Contents**

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Programme Assessment .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Governance Themes .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4 Conclusions &amp; Recommendations .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix A: Detailed Assessments .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix B: TB MAC Evaluation Terms of Reference.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix C: Advisory Panel Terms of Reference.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix D: TB MAC's Network.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Endnotes.....</b>	<b>27</b>



# 1 Introduction

## Background

1. The TB Modelling and Analysis Consortium (TB MAC) is funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation ('the Foundation'). Its purpose is to improve the interaction between quantitative researchers, policy makers, TB programmes and donors to improve global TB control. Its secretariat is based at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM).
2. Phase 1 TB MAC funding (TBMAC 1) covered the initial 18-month development of the network, from June 2012 to November 2013. TB MAC 2 covered 2014/5 and funding was requested for 2016-2018. However, this start date could not be met so TB MAC 3 will now cover 2017-2019. Some of the TB MAC 2 budget remains unspent due to £/\$ currency movements, so a no-cost extension has been agreed in parallel to use it during 2018 on some tasks moved from TB MAC 3. The proposed tasks are under review with the TB MAC Stakeholders.
3. We delivered a post-hoc evaluation of TB MAC 1 and have now been commissioned to deliver an independent, formative, evaluation of the TB MAC 3 programme and associated sub-grant process. This is our first interim report, covering 2017.

## Report Structure

4. The project objectives and our evaluation activities are briefly described below. The main text of this report considers whether TB MAC 3's goals and objectives have been met, with supporting detail in Appendix A. Technical evaluation of the quality of TB MAC's outputs is, however, outside our remit and generally also our competence. We then comment on some key governance themes that we paid particular attention to over the course of the year.
5. Our Terms of Reference (ToRs) and conflict of interest statement are in Appendix B. Appendix C is the Advisory Panel ToRs and Appendix D contains some initial analysis of TB MAC's network. Document references are generally collated after the appendices as endnotes.

## Project Objectives

6. The main objectives are set out in the Grant Proposal Narrative and its Theory of Action. The Investment Results Framework (IRF) then defines milestones, target dates and indicators.
  - Strengthening networks: improved co-ordination, knowledge sharing and management within the TB community (~17% of the budget):
  - Facilitation and linkage of decision makers and modelling groups.
  - Creating solutions: new high-quality modelling guidelines and resources (~57% of the budget):
  - Modelling to inform policy guidance, including model details sharing.
  - Knowledge-sharing on key data and methodological advances to support decision making.
  - GFATM concept note and WHO modelling evidence submission guidelines.
  - Co-ordinate WHO Task Force modelling stream.
  - Review of and recommendation for data and models for allocative efficiency.
  - Create framework for measurement of coverage and change in epi indicators.
  - (If GFATM funded) co-ordinate modelling in regional WHO/GF workshops.

- Empowering decision-makers: better informed TA/decision making communities and modellers (~15% of the budget):
  - Training of TA in use of models for policy making (model generic).
  - Case studies of best practices in TB modelling and model sharing.
7. The remaining 11% was allocated to 'governance and evaluation' which includes committee and PI salary and expenses and some (but not all) of the project management. Our evaluation fee component is around 1%.

## Evaluation

8. The main evaluation activities in 2017 were:
- Review of the draft TB MAC 3 Grant Proposal Narrative (focussing on ToRs)<sup>2</sup> and of the outputs from the February 2016 stakeholder meeting.
  - Baseline interviews with the Secretariat and a sample of Committee members, other modellers, and external stakeholders (the Foundation, WHO)\*. These focussed on hopes for outcomes and impacts and cautions regarding potential pitfalls and challenges.
  - Governance reviews, including: the proposed Modelling Research Group (MRG) 'Request for Applications' (RFA) process<sup>3</sup> and an audit of its use for the first RFA round; the role of the Advisory Panel<sup>4</sup>; and the appointment of a 'rotating member' to the Committee.
  - A desktop review of the plans for, and outputs from, TB MAC 's 8<sup>th</sup> international workshop (TB MAC 8) in Glion, and a progress review with the Secretariat in November 2017.
  - Analytical work towards a map of TB MAC's networks as a benchmark for future application of a network improvement utility metric.
  - Ad hoc discussions with PIs/ Secretariat and participation in Committee meetings as appropriate.
9. The main audit trail documents mentioned in this report are listed below. Full references are given in the endnotes and they are all available from the Secretariat.
- The 2016 Grant Proposal Narrative Application<sup>5</sup>, Investment Results Framework<sup>6</sup> and Budget<sup>7</sup>.
  - Internal project management and budgetary control spreadsheets.
  - TB MAC's mailing list and all the public and internal website material ( <http://tb-mac.org> ).

## Acknowledgments and Caveats

10. We are grateful for the help of our interviewees, who were unfailingly open and generous with their time. No one refused an interview request. However, the conclusions and comments in this report are ours alone and may not accord with those of any other party. We do not claim to be speaking for everyone and this report needs to be considered alongside team members' and stakeholders' direct feedback. All interviews relating to this project evaluation were non-attributable but direct quotes may be included anonymously as appropriate.
11. A previous draft of this report has been reviewed by project team members for factual accuracy and the implications have also been discussed at some length. However, no changes have been made because of comments relating to our interpretation or judgements on adequacy.

---

\* 19 to date, mainly August- September 2017, plus some additional interviews following in December/January 2017.



## 2 Programme Assessment

12. For convenience, only assessment summary tables are included below, and tasks intended for future years are not shown. Appendix A provides the detail and cross-references the supporting evidence that we checked.
13. Achieving specific grant objectives is not the only measure of 'value added' and we also sought comments from stakeholders on progress towards broader improvement of communication and collaboration within the TB modelling community. External interviewee expectations of TB MAC's achievement in this area were typically cautiously positive.

### Objective 1: Strengthening networks

14. The current status of the outputs identified on the IRF for this objective in 2017 is shown below.

Ref.	Result	Status	Comment
1.1.1	Stakeholder needs managed.	Ongoing	Positive progress.
1.1.2	Needs identified, TORs defined.	Closed	Process TORs now complete.
1.1.3	TOR delivered in practice.	Ongoing	WHO TF oversight, incl. via AP.
1.1.4	List of modellers tools on website.	Delayed	Catalogue in draft, publish 2018.
1.1.5	List of WHO TF 'asks'.	Ongoing	TF meets 2018.
1.1.8	Major website upgrade.	Delayed	Deferred, maybe dropped.
1.1.10	Update modelling literature review.	Closed	Brought forward from 2018. Updated review now on website.
1.1.12	Add jobs, RFAs etc. to website.	Ongoing	Added as available, progress OK.
1.1.14	Refresh website annually.	Ongoing	Updated at start TB MAC 3.

#### Commentary

15. These tasks cover setting up the mechanisms for linking TB MAC and WHO and improving the website. Progress has generally been as expected, except that:
- The WHO TF meeting due in 2017 has been deferred until at least April 2018 so TB MAC actions that require direction or sign-off there cannot yet be completed.
  - Good progress has been made but some key ToRs are still in draft or not on the website. This needs to be resolved.
  - The major website revamp has been deferred. Although content needed updating, the basic website was felt to be adequate – especially given the 'low usage'. Some changes were made early in 2017 but there are still things to resolve; we will discuss these separately with the Secretariat. The budget allocated in any case looks to us to be inadequate for a major rebuild.

## Objective 2: Creating solutions

16. The current status of the outputs identified on IRF for this objective in 2017 is shown below. One task, 1.2.7 was transferred to the no-cost TB MAC 2 extension programme to make best use of that budget.

Ref.	Result	Status	Comment
1.2.1	WHO TF supported, gaps filled.	Ongoing	Positive progress.
1.2.2	TORs for support of WHO TF.	Closed	ToRs issued.
1.2.3	Create MRG.	Closed	ToRs issued. 1 <sup>st</sup> mtg. held.
1.2.4	Annual TB MAC / WHO TF mtgs.	Ongoing	TBMAC OK, TF meets 2018.
1.2.5	Annual presentations to WHO TF.	Ongoing	TF meets 2018.
1.2.6	Review to support Guidance.	Closed	Guidance in draft, publish 2018.
1.2.7	Epi indicator framework.	Transfer	Transfer to TB MAC 2 extension.
1.2.9	MRG sub-grants to address gaps.	Ongoing	1 <sup>st</sup> RFAs awarded.
1.2.13	Costing model definitions.	Delayed	Scope proposed, do after RFAs.
1.2.16	Critical guidelines gaps filled.	Delayed	Guidance in draft, publish 2018.
1.2.18	Country model guidance.	Delayed	Guidance in draft, publish 2018.
1.2.19	Funding for costs/ resource work.	Closed	Grant awarded (Vassal et al).
1.2.20	Input to costs data proposal.	Closed	Compete.
1.2.21	Input to epi indicator framework.	Closed	Complete.
1.2.22	Modellers with capacity/incentive.	Ongoing	Delivered through other actions.
1.2.23	Modellers linked to policy makers.	Ongoing	At TB MAC 8.
1.2.24	Union short course moved online.	Closed	Brought forward from 2018. Webpages added.
1.2.25	Modellers access online training.	Ongoing	Needs evidence of resource use.
1.2.26	Modellers at TB MAC / WHO TF.	Ongoing	At TB MAC 8. TF meets 2018.

### Commentary

17. These tasks cover TB MAC's core business, addressing gaps in modelling capability and capacity and improving the impact of country level modelling. The MRG has been successfully set up and appears to be functioning as planned. Progress more generally has been as expected, except that:
- The modelling Guidance and model Catalogue have been drafted and reviewed. Final drafts are imminent, for sign-off at the 2018 WHO TF meeting. Response has generally been positive but there is still a gap between funders' aims on model 'certification' and what TB MAC thinks appropriate.
  - The Union short course has been moved online earlier than planned. Promotion is now required so that modellers start to use the online resources (1.2.25) and more generally to drive website traffic.
  - Two papers will address costing model definitions (1.2.13). The scope has been provisionally agreed but cannot be confirmed until RFAs have been decided. The papers will be submitted in 2018.

### Objective 3: Empowering decision-makers

18. The current status of the outputs identified on the IRF for this objective in 2017 is shown below.

Ref.	Result	Status	Comment
1.3.1	Stakeholders better equipped.	Ongoing	Delivered through other actions.
1.3.2	Introduction to modelling courses.	Ongoing	2017 Union mtg. course held.
1.3.3	Newsletters sent.	Ongoing	Newsletters ~2 monthly.
1.3.4	'Modelling ambassadors'.	Ongoing	Main event in 2017 is TB MAC 8.

#### Commentary

19. These tasks cover TB MAC's work to improve understanding between modellers, funders and decision-makers. Progress has generally been as expected and there are no delayed results. We understand there will be more use of modelling ambassadors – hopefully including some less-familiar faces - in 2018

### Objective 4: Governance and evaluation

20. The current status of the outputs identified on the IRF for this objective in 2017 is shown below.

Ref.	Result	Status	Comment
1.4.1	Annual audit of RFA / direct spend.	Ongoing	Process review in this report.
1.4.2	Increase transparency / inclusivity.	Ongoing	Wide range of actions contribute.
1.4.3	Improve project management.	Ongoing	Part planned training outstanding.
1.4.4	Add utility metric.	Closed	Metric proposed. Delivery 2019.
1.4.5	Improved committee structure.	Closed	Committee membership revised.
1.4.6	External and internal evaluation.	Ongoing	Evaluation notes + this report.

#### Commentary

21. These tasks cover TB MAC's work to improve its governance and project management. Progress has generally been as expected, except that:

- Project management training for the Secretariat is not yet complete. There will be an evaluation of project management for the 2018 interim evaluation report.
- Our 2017 interview base was focused on the main modelling groups and key stakeholders. The Committee has asked us to seek more input 2018 from national TB programme and other high-burden country network members.

## 3 Governance Themes

### Introduction

22. TB MAC has evolved over the years from an idea motivated (in part at least) by the need to attract funding for the originating groups towards an independent institution and wider network with corresponding governance mechanisms. It will no doubt continue to evolve through this incarnation.
23. The changes to governance arrangements at the start of 2017 are a matter of great interest to us and to stakeholders because they shape what is to come and if they are not properly implemented, TBMAC will not have the credibility it needs. We therefore examined some governance themes in more detail for this report.
  - We have already submitted comments on four themes to the Committee: on the MRG ToRs; the RFA process; Committee membership (particularly the 'rotating' position); and the role of the Advisory Panel. Summaries are included below.
  - We selected three more themes based on the balance of comment in stakeholder interviews (the annual meeting, potential conflicts of interests and modelling network engagement). Work on these will not be completed in 2017 but we have included some interim observations here.

### Modelling Research Group

24. The split structure of the Annual Meeting and the division of responsibilities, and the definition (and branding) of a Modelling Research Group under separate leadership, seem positive steps in line with learning from the last incarnation -though there may be some who would have preferred previous in-depth 'big issues in TB' format.
25. We reviewed the draft MRG ToRs in February 2017 before final adoption, reviewed plans for the Annual Meeting, and have talked to annual meeting participants. Our review of the RFA part of the process and the 2017 sub-grant awards is covered in the next section. The MRG purpose and terms of reference seem clear and robust and so far as we can determine, they are being fairly applied.
26. Early indications are that the creation of the MRG has had practical benefits in terms of driving forward key activities such as the RFA programme on one side and the Guidance and Catalogue on the other. It has improved perceptions of independence. It should also be helping manage the risks inherent in projects where powerful stakeholders' interests may not always align, where resources are limited, and where investment in longer-term development and shorter-term application must both be progressed to keep everyone on board. Academic teams are expected to meet their academic objectives as well as supporting model application 'on the ground' in a way more normally associated in other fields with commercial businesses and NGOs.
27. We will review the success of these changes for our 2018 interim report, when we and stakeholders can better judge how they are working out in practice and have not included any more analysis here.

### Annual Meeting

#### Theme

28. The 8<sup>th</sup> TB MAC / WHO annual meeting was held over the five days 18<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2017 in Glion, Switzerland. All the presentations are now online (under 'resources'), as is the final Meeting Report and agenda (under 'work areas/country level modelling').

29. The MRG element of the overall theme - country-level modelling and TB case detection – was determined in line with the detailed and transparent timeline and procedure set out in the MRG ToRs. An email seeking suggestions was circulated, and several were submitted to complement the Committee's own ideas. Committee members voted independently (two rounds) and case detection was agreed in the May 2017 Committee meeting as the focus. Our lead evaluator sat in on this meeting to monitor the process. The MRG meeting concept note was agreed the next month. Our conclusion is that the process proved appropriate, was properly implemented, and delivered a sensible outcome.

30. Within this overall theme, there were four main topic areas at the meeting:

#### Country level modelling

- Country-level modelling guidance and catalogue (Monday/Tuesday).
- Epidemiological data collection / collation for model parameterisation for country-level resource allocation decision making (Wednesday AM).
- Cost data needs of epidemiological models (Wednesday PM).

#### Modelling Research Group

- Modelling TB case detection: challenges and ways forward (Thursday/ Friday 22)

#### Feedback

31. We were unable to attend so we have relied on the results from the Secretariat's feedback sheets and insights from a small number (to date) of post-event interviewees. We will attend and comment in more depth next year.

32. Across the five days, 52 people attended. 32 filled in the feedback forms. The overall ratings were:

- Extremely useful 31% (10 people)
- Very useful 63% (20 people)
- Somewhat useful 6% (2 people)

33. These are strong ratings, albeit with the caveat that around 40% of people did not provide feedback and responses included at least some members of the Secretariat and Committee. We suggest feedback from the organisers is recorded separately from participants' in future.

34. The vast majority of positive comments related to high levels of interaction and engagement. The format and range of presentations seems to have worked well. Some found the economics sessions hard to follow but there were no really negative comments. Improvements were suggested, but these were mostly to do with 'fine tuning' and preparation.

35. The venue seems to have suited most people. We only have one comment suggesting five days was too long but it was certainly a major commitment for all the participants who did stay for the whole week (the Secretariat tell us it was about 50%). We do not know whether the majority prefer one longer meeting compared to the previous practice of two shorter ones per year but the budget means there is no scope to vary this during TB MAC 3. Given that it was a relatively small group of people and the meeting was away from Geneva, relationships and understanding must have been strengthened.

#### Participants

36. The procedure for inviting people to the Annual meeting is detailed and included in the MRG ToRs. It seems to have been followed, except that the draft participants' list was tabled before the theme was agreed, in April.

37. The MRG ToRs set out objectives for its two days. These are:

- All members of the TB MAC committee will be invited.
- A broad range of expertise in the meeting topic will be ensured.
- A broad range of geographical and institutional representation will be ensured, with specific attention given to inviting participants hailing from high-burden countries.
- A broad range of constituencies will be represented [examples in the ToRs].
- We will also specifically aim to include junior-level participants, for purposes of capacity building and inclusion of new voices in the dialogue.

38. Judging by our (admittedly incomplete) knowledge of the participants, Committee members and a broad range of expertise and constituencies were indeed invited and this resulted in a high-quality event. The emphasis must be on the ability to contribute in the context of, and on the theme of, the meeting but we hope TB MAC will keep trying to bring in new people in line with its aims. Taking the meeting as a whole, whether 3 from 52 represents ‘giving specific attention to high-burden countries’ might be arguable, and it looks as if one or more less familiar NTP figures could have added a new perspective. We are not clear who was nominated under the ‘younger colleagues’ heading.

Australia	2	Consultancy	3
Canada	1	Academia	28
Netherlands	1	Funder/TA	15
Nigeria	1	NGO	5
South Africa	1	NTP	1
Switzerland	12		
UK	18		
USA	15		
Vietnam	1		
	52		52

39. Looking to the future, although costs and inconvenience are obviously minimised by holding meetings in Europe or eastern USA, the wider objectives of TB MAC and the modelling community would perhaps be better served by meeting closer to high-burden countries in 2019.

10	Tbc	Tbc
9	Tbc	USA, 2018
8	Country-level modelling and TB case detection	Switzerland, 2017
7	Post-2015 Global TB targets #4	USA, 2015
6	Post-2015 global TB targets #3 report	Switzerland, 2015
5	Post-2015 global TB targets #2	UK, 2014
4	Post-2015 global TB targets	USA, 2014
3	Rational introduction of new drugs and regimens	China, 2013
2	Current and future diagnostics for TB	Netherlands, 2013
1	Optimising TB Control in High HIV Prevalence Settings	South Africa, 2012

## RFA Process & Awards

40. We have a remit to look in detail at the TB MAC's project management and financial control of its sub-grants but the first of these has only just been decided so this is not possible for 2017. We did, however, review the draft modelling research RFA process and looked at the decision-making for the first award

### Comments on draft RFA process

41. Significant sums of money are involved (£100k / year) and modelling groups bidding for grants may include those involved in TB MAC committees, so the process must be clear and operated transparently, and robust against potential bias.
42. At the Committee's invitation, in early 2017 we reviewed the draft procedure and application information requirements and we agreed that the content was sufficiently clear about roles and the detail of the assessment criteria. Conflict of interest guidance was included, and the assessment process was sufficiently independent, albeit that most of those involved would inevitably be well-known to each other.
43. The procedure is available on the TB MAC website though hard to find. In our view, key management documents in major programmes need to be consistently branded and managed. TBMAC's are much improved in this respect but there is still some work to do; for instance, there are two copies of the RFA procedure, one linked to the RFAs and one appended to the Modelling Research Group (MRG) ToRs.

### Selection of RFA theme

44. The main theme (modelling the epidemiology and/or economics of TB case detection) and specific topics of interest were initially proposed by the MRG chair. The draft RFA was reviewed by the Committee and our lead evaluator. The opening date was 21st August 2017 and the closing date was 31st October, which allowed a reasonable amount of time to put a proposal together.
45. The RFA was publicised via targeted email, published on the website, and a topic in the August 2017 newsletter. It was also discussed at the Glion meeting in the context of the two days of MRG presentations and discussions on TB case detection. Breakout groups looked at key issues and potential ways forward and participants were encouraged to submit proposals. A potential future RFA scope was also introduced at the meeting, as part of a proposed two-stage programme to collate existing data and map remaining data gaps.
46. Being at the meeting would obviously be a big advantage to anyone preparing a proposal. Most of the current main players were present but others who might hope to submit a proposal either could not attend or were not invited. One of the successful teams was represented at TB MAC 8, the other was not. We are not aware of any serious negative comments from unsuccessful bidders, and have not so far had any comments from people who wanted to bid but could not.

### RFA award

47. Eight proposals were received and reviewed by two independent non-academics. Three proposals were equally ranked so the procedure required that the Advisory Panel arbitrate. Three members were invited to review these shortlisted proposals but only one could do so within the suggested timescale. This resulted in two UK bids being provisionally accepted.
48. Proposals would be very unlikely to succeed without significant Global South involvement and all three shortlisted bids were very strong in this respect – which sends a clear and welcome message to future applicants. The scores on which the rankings were based were generally consistent across reviewers but 'sharing models and data' scores were less consistent - one proposal received both 5/5 and 1/5 – so maybe more guidance to reviewers is needed here.

49. We were sent the summary ranking and invited to review the process before the sub-grant award was notified. We did so, including Secretariat interviews and non-technical proposal read-throughs. We requested further detail on individual reasons for AP members not participating in the scoring process.
50. The procedure<sup>8</sup> required reviewers to score proposals against 11 criteria on a 1 (poor) to 5-point scale. These were then converted to a rank order for each reviewer. These ranks were then averaged to give a final result.
51. TBMAC has always used ranking to decide between RF proposals. It was felt to be fairer as it ensured each reviewer's relative judgements had the same weight, even if they consistently marked higher or lower than their colleagues. The preliminary scoring element was introduced for this round of RFAs to make the ranking process more consistent and transparent.
52. We confirmed that we were satisfied that the award had been decided in line with the published procedure as far as the main elements of the process were concerned but we also pointed out the potential for misunderstanding because the RF procedure referred to scoring, not ranking, and the Secretariat has referred in emails to prospective applicants to selecting the 'highest scoring' proposals. The procedure has since been brought into line with practice, but we suggest that for next year the Committee consider whether a simpler system would be preferable.

#### Sub-grant management

53. Our evaluation of sub-grant management will start in early 2018 with an assessment of the efficiency of the contract set-up process.

#### RFA conclusions

54. The comments we have received on TB MAC Phase 1 RFAs suggests that the formality and transparency with which processes have been applied has been steadily strengthening with the benefit of experience. That trend has continued into TB MAC 3 but some detail still needs tightening.

### **Steering Committee membership**

55. There was a commitment in the Grant Proposal Narrative to broaden Steering Committee membership, adding someone with currently unavailable experience (e.g. optimisation or operational research) to the existing core membership and rotating in other key TB modellers for 6-12 months each. In response, two independent members have since left the Committee and Professor Menzies has been added. The TIME project lead has been replaced by the rotating member from other modelling groups (currently James Trauer from Monash University, see below). The Foundation's representative has changed. Our view is that these changes fulfil the commitments made, though it is too early to say whether the balance is optimal for the long term.

#### Rotating members

56. An invitation to apply for the rotating member position was issued on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2017 to the TB MAC mailing list. Three people were to be chosen, each joining for 10 months. Potentially interested modelling groups were also prompted directly by email or word-of-mouth. The invitation linked to an application form. Fourteen nominations were received. Committee members then anonymously reviewed the applications and ranked their top six. Based on perceptions of Phase 1, there was still some scepticism about how conflicts of interests were managed by the Committee and there was some correspondence with one group in particular before a nomination was made to address this concern. This group joined the Committee in the first committee rotation.



57. Four candidates ranked significantly higher than the remainder. A decision was then taken at the June 2017 Committee meeting to accept all four rather than the original three, meaning they would now have around 7 months each. The first one sat in on the July 2017 Committee meeting and formally joined before the August one.
58. We observed the Committee meeting where the decision was made and have since reviewed the applications and ranking. We interviewed the successful candidates but are still trying to arrange interviews with some of the unsuccessful ones. Overall, it seems a transparent and sufficiently rigorous process that broadened the committee's perspective and brought in someone from Asia for the first time. Stakeholders generally seem to see it as a decent start in broadening involvement in TB MAC decision making. We will follow how the role develops and the perceptions of rotating members.

## Advisory Panel

59. TB MAC's main decision-making body is its Steering Committee, but the external Advisory Panel provided additional guidance, oversight and arbitration of sub-grant funding allocations. These roles were important during Phase 1 and are expected to be so again for TB MAC 3. We therefore checked back on relevant recommendations from our previous evaluation report. We also reviewed the current AP ToRs (Appendix C) and the notes of the last AP meeting on 26th July 2017 in the light of the major changes introduced at the start of the current grant period. We submitted an evaluation note to the Committee in November 2017. Our main points were as follows.

### Previous evaluation recommendations

60. In 2015, many stakeholders were unclear about roles, so we recommended that overviews of governance, the RFA assessment and award procedures, and Committee and AP terms of reference should be added to the website. The website (Appendix B) lists current AP members but the group is referred to as the Governance Panel, which is confusing. The RFA process is on the website but the overviews and ToRs are not.
61. Our recent stakeholder interviews show that there is still little clarity amongst those not directly involved (and sometimes even those who are) about the roles of the Committee and AP and the AP's relationship to WHO, so we think our original recommendations are still important. The website needs updating, and the current ToRs are incomplete. Though still in draft form, the ToRs are helpful in that they set out the time commitments expected of members but in our view, they are not fit for purpose because they do not do enough to define its role and responsibilities, membership criteria, or who chairs it.

### Advisory Panel role

62. The purpose of the AP according to the ToRs is to provide advice and guidance and an additional layer of governance, perhaps with a less explicit aim of helping keep key stakeholders close to the project. However, the current grant agreement included in Section 9 a commitment to replace the AP with a new one that is a subgroup of the WHO Global Task Force on TB Impact Measurement. Members are therefore no longer just offering a personal perspective. Their main responsibility will be to maintain TB MAC's alignment to TF priorities. This needs to be explicit in the TORs.
63. The previous AP's broader oversight and governance role will presumably not continue under the new arrangements and is partly superseded by our ongoing evaluation, though its RFA 'arbitration' role was retained (and used for the 2017 RFAs).

### Membership and reporting

64. We presume that the Task Force will at its annual meeting (next held in Spring 2018) appoint a sub-committee to develop - with the TB MAC PIs - the priorities and direction for the next period. Implementation will then be monitored by the AP who will also provide further clarification and feed in adjustments as necessary.
65. The AP is sensibly slimmed down compared to the previous incarnation and seems well balanced, with a representative of four key international institutions (Gates Foundation, Global Fund, WHO and USAID) plus two senior academics. Current members were invited by TB MAC (in consultation with WHO's Committee representative) rather than appointed by the Task Force. However, we expect that AP members will also need to be part of the Sub-Committee when it is agreed, and that AP nominations will need confirming by the Sub-Committee.
66. The membership of a project steering committee and an advisory or governance panel do not typically overlap but they do for TB MAC; the same funder's representative is on both. This may or may not be appropriate, but we would like to understand more about how this works in practice before forming a view.

### Conflicts of Interest

67. Potential conflicts of Interest (COIs) were a major issue for TB MAC 1 in particular and regularly came up during interviews. In some cases, feelings were obviously still running high. Stakeholder perceptions of governance have in the past focused on the influence over decision making by people with potential COIs. These have eased in some cases but not yet in others and there are some new COIs to manage.
68. Several Committee members represent or otherwise benefit from links to teams whose reputation and income may be significantly influenced by TB MAC's activities and collective judgments. This is inevitable but requires balance in influence and transparency in decision making.
69. We presumed that the Foundation's COI policy and examples in respect of its grants or equivalent can be applied by the Committee in respect of its sub-grants and suggest this is made explicit in the relevant ToRs.
70. The general rule from the Foundation's policy is that:

*Foundation employees are obligated to avoid and disclose ethical, legal, financial, or other conflicts of interest involving the Foundation, and remove themselves from a position of decision-making authority with respect to any conflict situation involving the foundation.*
71. Our interpretation is that this requires affiliations and interests that may be perceived as a conflict should be included in every Committee member's website profile as well as in Committee and AP minutes (e.g. David Wilson's declaration to the committee at its May 2017 meeting) and that profiles should give the reader a fair indication of the extent of any such potential benefit. This is not yet the case and we think it should be addressed.

### Influence of the funder

72. We cannot yet say what impact TB MAC's closer relationship with WHO will have but it will be a major change and we will include a review in our 2018 report.
73. Some stakeholders perceive that as well as being the funder, the Foundation will be more directly engaged with the operation of TB MAC in this incarnation relative to the previous one. There are potential benefits, but also potential downsides, and stakeholders are looking to the Committee to achieve the appropriate balance and maintain independence where necessary (within the scope of the agreed objectives and programme). We do not have view because we have not yet seen how things will work in practice.
74. We said the following in our TB MAC 1 evaluation report:
- “It seems to us that the Foundation has played a very constructive role, but we understand that a move to financial independence was an early topic of discussion and it is still a live issue. TB MAC has to maintain its links with the Foundation but also recognises that different project managers over time will have different levels of expertise and/or interest and may not always be in a position to champion TB modelling to the same extent. The Foundation's priorities will evolve. A wider appreciation within the policy/funding community of TB MAC's value, and more diversity of funding, may therefore be important to TB MAC's future as well as to delivering its mission.”
75. We understand that it remains a TB MAC objective to diversify for the next funding round.

### Network enlargement & engagement

76. We would not expect to see much change at this point but in line with our agreement with the Committee, we will continue to try and help it map the current and appropriate potential for extending TB MAC's reach and put measures in place to engage some of the 'harder to reach' TB modelling and related constituencies.
77. For our final evaluation report in 2019, we will apply a utility metric as promised, to gauge the extent of the change over time. In the mean time we suggest the following interim tests.
- The immediate priority is consolidation. We would be concerned if at the end of 2017, any of the main modelling teams felt they had not been engaged.
  - We recognise the challenges but by the end of 2018, we expect to see significantly increased engagement with NTPs and non-modellers within the wider network with consolidation in 2019.
78. We have analysed the current TB MAC mailing list. We note that the wider network has comprehensive coverage in some countries, roles and disciplines but not in others (see Appendix D). English-speaking, established academic groups and NGOs are well-represented but those from other parts of the world are not and TB MAC engagement with NTPs seems to be focussed on 'the usual suspects'. The Secretariat points to membership of the mailing list (as a proxy for engagement) in many high-burden countries but we are not convinced that these people necessarily have central or influential roles.
79. The point was made to us in interviews, that TB MAC should think broadly about the range of modellers it needs to engage with, including primary health care modellers which may be more common than TB modellers in the Global South. We are not in a position to say what is appropriate, but we hope to see evidence of diversity and creative thinking.

## 4 Conclusions & Recommendations

### Conclusions

80. Irrespective of issues they might have raised, everyone we interviewed was very supportive of TB MAC and its continuation and recognised the work of the TB MAC team, which augers well for its continuation.
81. Although plans have evolved response to circumstances, TB MAC is making meaningful progress and generally met its main objectives for 2017. The Guidance and the Catalogue are almost ready for issue, the separation between the Modelling Research Group and country-level modelling strands seems successful, and the Annual Meeting went well.
82. The potential for conflicts of interest was by far the most common potential problem our interviewees suggested TB MAC would need to manage. Our experience in 2017 is that the Committee and Secretariat are very committed to managing conflicts of interest and have put some quite elaborate procedures in place to avoid bias, but we recommend below further transparency measures.
83. The MRG network has been successfully consolidated during 2017 but the Committee now needs a clear strategy for further broadening engagement. Other strategic issues that will need some thought during 2018 include future funding and managing the workload on key team members, so that the programme is sustainable and so that they can meet their contractual requirements under the grant agreement.

### Recommendations

84. Generally, we think TB MAC's existing programme will deliver what is required but we have made some recommendation to support engagement objectives.
  - A documented strategy should be developed to guide the expansion of TB MAC's network within high burden countries and academic teams from a wider range of regions and countries. We will support this with our analytics data on request.
  - In line with objectives, the next Annual Meeting should increase participation from high burden countries and younger researchers. The 2019 Annual Meeting could be held in a location convenient for modellers and NTPs from high burden countries.
  - Conflict of interest statements should be added to website Committee and AP member's individual profiles.
85. We also made some recommendations related to administration and communications.
  - TB MAC should have a plan for using the modelling ambassador role to expand engagement in 2018.
  - All terms of reference and formal procedures be consistently formatted with no overlap, placed on the controlled documents list, and published on the website.
  - A systematically review of website navigation and content is needed, so the update can be completed. Site analytics will support this and help understand patterns of use.
  - Annual meeting feedback from organisers and participants should be recorded separately.
  - Consideration should be given to actively promoting the training materials now online.
  - The Secretariat project management training should be completed.
  - 2018 evaluation interviews should include more from the wider TB MAC network.

## Appendix A: Detailed Assessments

	Theme	Status	Activity Indicators	Evaluator's Comments
	<b>Improved co-ordination, knowledge sharing and management within TB community</b>			
1.1.1	Stakeholder needs managed	Ongoing	Stakeholder (2/17), Annual (9/17) and WHO TF meeting notes (Postponed to 4/18).	Positive feedback from meeting participants. Positive evaluation reports.
1.1.2	WHO TF needs ID & modelling prioritisation process TOR defined + stakeholder alignment on TB MAC workplan	Closed	WHO TF Link TORs, Roadmap meeting (2/17) notes.	Complete <sup>9</sup> . WHO TF review in 4/18.
1.1.3	WHO TF needs ID and modelling prioritisation process TOR delivered	Ongoing	WHO TF (4/18) and AP meeting (7/17) notes.	TBMAC programme, oversight by WHO TF (delegated to AP) is ongoing. Additional Task to be added for GF priorities? Meeting notes checked.
1.1.4	List of modellers tools shown on website	Open	Now delivered through Catalogue?	Draft catalogue due for website then endorsement at WHO TF (4/18). Draft checked.
1.1.5	List of WHO TF agreed stakeholder 'asks' communicated	Ongoing	TF requests for change, Results Framework changes.	TF Has not met yet. TB MAC Stakeholder 'asks' management <sup>10</sup> .
1.1.6	Expert advice to stakeholders (with core group of experts) in VC calls	Open		Not this year.
1.1.7	Improved communications between stakeholders and modellers	Ongoing	Delivered through other actions.	
1.1.8	Revamped website	Open	Long term, new website. Interim, website evaluation issues all addressed.	Deferred: Inadequate funds for new website, incremental improvements instead through 2017/18. Evaluation comments submitted.

1.1.9	Create case studies (historic and future) and disseminated	Open		Not this year.
1.1.10	Modelling lit review updated and disseminated	Closed	Website updated.	Updated review now on website. Document checked <sup>11</sup> .
1.1.11	List of ongoing modelling work created and disseminated	Open		Not this year.
1.1.12	Continuously updated list of jobs, RFAs, training; put on website	Ongoing	Website updates.	Information added as available, some jobs in newsletter. Website has 'low traffic'. Website checked <sup>12</sup> .
1.1.13	Create and disseminate 'Policymaking for TB modellers & Modelling for TB policy-makers' booklet	Open		Not this year.
1.1.14	Refresh website annually	Ongoing	Website updates. Evaluation issues all addressed.	Website updated for start TB MAC 3 but changes still outstanding. Evaluation comments submitted.
1.1.15	Shared learnings and feasibility assessments, with other BMGF modelling consortia	Open		Not this year.
	New high-quality modelling guidelines and resources			
1.2.1	WHO TF supported, modelling and data gaps filled	Ongoing	Delivered through other actions.	1 <sup>st</sup> RFAs selected, evaluation in this report.
1.2.2	TORs for TB MAC support for WHO TF	Closed	WHO TF TORs issued.	TORs issued <sup>13</sup> .
1.2.3	Create 'TB Modelling Research Group'	Closed	MRG TORs issued, Annual Meeting presentations <sup>14</sup> and notes.	TORs issued <sup>15</sup> . Successful 2017 AM, notes <sup>16</sup> and feedback checked.
1.2.4	Annual TB MAC / WHO TF meetings	Ongoing	TB MAC Annual Meeting and WHO TF meeting notes.	Successful 2017 AM, notes and feedback checked. WHO TF is 2018.
1.2.5	Annual presentations to WHO TF meetings	Ongoing	WHO TF meeting notes.	WHO TF is 2018

1.2.6	Review to support Guidelines in 1.2.18	Closed	Review complete.	Guidance in draft, for issue 2018 <sup>17</sup> .
1.2.7	Epi indicator framework	Transfer		Transferred to TB MAC 2 extension.
1.2.8	Co-ordinate modelling in regional WHO / GFATM workshops	Open	Workshop notes.	GFATM lead but expected 2018.
1.2.9	MRG sub-grants to address gaps	Ongoing	RFA process, awards and outputs.	First RFAs awarded, start 2018. Evaluation in this report.
1.2.10	MRG sub-grants to address opportunities	Open		Not this year.
1.2.11	MRG key issues in model development	Open		Not this year.
1.2.12	MRG HS constraints and issues in economic models	Open		Not this year.
1.2.13	MRG Definitions of costing model elements	Open	Two papers from MRG.	Scope agreed, document checked. Target Spring 2018.
1.2.14	MRG support to links with iDSi	Open		Not this year.
1.2.15	MRG co-ordination with GHCC pilot countries	Open		Not this year.
1.2.16	Critical guidelines gaps filled	Open	Guidance document.	Same as 1.2.18.
1.2.17	Modelling guidance for GFATM	Open		Not this year. Unclear if separate GFATM guide needed.
1.2.18	Country specific model Guidance	Open	Guidance document.	Draft now, final mid-2018? Draft checked.
1.2.19	Separate funding awarded for costs data collection and resource allocation work	Closed	Grant awarded (Vassal et al)	GRANT NUMBER NEEDED.

1.2.20	Input into costs data collection proposal	Closed	Input as sent.	Has this been sent? What is it?
1.2.21	Input into epi indicator framework 1.2.7	Closed	Input as sent.	Has this been sent? What is it?
1.2.22	Modellers with capacity/incentives to create models	Ongoing	Delivered through other actions.	
1.2.23	Modellers linked to policy makers	Ongoing	TB MAC Annual meetings, Modelling Ambassadors	Successful 2017 AM, notes and feedback checked. Also see 1.3.4 .
1.2.24	Union short course moved online	Closed	Webpages added.	Online now. Webpages checked <sup>18</sup> .
1.2.25	Modellers access online materials and training	Ongoing	Web page access data?	Needs evidence of resource USE. Putting them online is 1.2.24. How are you promoting? Do we have evidence?
1.2.26	Modellers attend TB MAC / WHO TF	Ongoing	TB MAC Annual Meeting and WHO TF meeting notes.	Successful 2017 AM, notes <sup>19</sup> and feedback checked. WHO TF is 2018.
	<b>Better informed TA/decision making communities and modellers</b>			
1.3.1	Global and TA communities are better equipped to advise on the appropriate use of TB models	Ongoing	Delivered through other actions.	
1.3.2	Union Intro modelling f2f sessions held	Ongoing	Session agendas	2017 sessions delivered at Union conference Webpage <sup>20</sup> and feedback checked <sup>21</sup> .
1.3.3	Newsletters sent	Ongoing	Newsletters	At approx. 2m intervals. Online archive checked <sup>22</sup> .
1.3.4	'Modelling Ambassadors' to policy meetings and informed discussions	Ongoing	Notes of meetings	Modellers at Annual Meeting. List checked <sup>23</sup> . Non-TBMAC events will be focus in 2018??
1.3.5	Training materials created, including handbook	Ongoing		Not this year.
1.3.6	Create materials and train global decision makers	Open		Not this year.



1.3.7	Modelling expertise shared with TA	Open		Not this year
	<b>TB MAC governance, Secretariat, evaluation and sustainability</b>			
1.4.1	Annual audit of RFA / direct spending	Ongoing	Evaluation reports.	Process evaluation for first RFAs in this report. No expenditure until 2018.
1.4.2	Increase transparency and inclusivity	Ongoing	Final TORs and processes on website	Not yet complete. Evaluation in this report.
1.4.3	Improve project management	Ongoing	Training and evaluation reports	Some training. 'Practitioner level' required in view of complexity and sums involved?
1.4.4	Add 'utility metrics' in in-person stakeholder meeting in year one	Closed	DC paper and Committee discussions.	Proposal <sup>24</sup> . Will be covered in annual evaluation reports. Initial analysis submitted <sup>25</sup> .
1.4.5	Improved committee structure	Closed	TORs, meeting notes, evaluator's observation	New committees in place. Notes checked <sup>26</sup> .
1.4.6	External and internal evaluation	Ongoing	Evaluator appointed. Y1 report due December 2017	Evaluator appointed. Reports annually.
1.4.7	Sustainability review	Open		Assessor appointed. Workshop and report at end of Year 3.
	<b>Additional Organisational Commitments in Grant Proposal Narrative.</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>DC Comments</b>
	Annual RFA audit	(see 1.4.1)		
	Review direct commission limit	Closed		What was the evidence?
	Convene stakeholder meeting	Closed	Meeting Notes	Washington, February 22, 2017. Meeting notes and presentations <sup>27</sup> checked.
	Update website	(see 1.1.4)		

	Submit RFA updates	Ongoing	Committee and AP meeting notes & papers	Only award in 2017, no RFA progress to report in 2107
	Short RFA annual report	Ongoing	Committee and AP meeting notes & papers	Only award in 2017, no RFA progress to report in 2107
	Website summaries of RFAs	(see 1.1.12)		
	RFA 'developing world' criteria	Closed	In scoring guidance	Guidance checked <sup>28</sup> . But 'Global South' needs definition.
	Project management training	(see 1.4.3)		
	Utility metrics	(see 1.4.4)		
	AP superseded by WHO TF	Open	AP TORs	AP in place but TORs not good enough yet <sup>29</sup> .
	Allocate Committee roles	Closed	Tasks allocated in GPN. Link to mtg agenda	Split responsibilities in 2017 Annual Meeting (meeting agenda).
	Update Committee membership and add rotating member	Closed	Notes of July 2017 Committee.	Process in place, 1st RM participating. Notes checked <sup>30</sup> .
	Evaluation	(see 1.4.6)		
	Sustainability review	(see 1.4.7)		

## **Appendix B: TB MAC Evaluation Terms of Reference**

### Year 1 activities

86. Evaluation activities will include:

- Review proposed programme and terms of reference and advise PIs
- Participate in one first and final TBMAC Committee meetings in Y1
- Attend (preferred) or review output of initial stakeholder meeting
- Issue outline evaluation plan (this document)
- Conduct baseline modelling group interaction survey
- Attend (preferred) or review output of Y1 annual TBMAC / WHO workshop
- Review routine progress reports and advise PIs
- Conduct Y1 RFA review and issue report to Committee via PIs
- Review progress, stakeholder interviews towards end Y1, Interim Report 1 to PIs
- Ad hoc discussions with PIs and support team as appropriate (but min 3 per year)

### Year 2 activities

87. Evaluation activities will include:

- Participate in final TBMAC Committee meeting in Y2
- Attend (preferred) or review output of Y2 TBMAC / WHO workshop
- Review routine progress reports and advise PIs
- Conduct Y2 RFA review and issue report to Committee via PIs
- Review progress, stakeholder interviews towards end Y2, Interim Report 2 to PIs
- Ad hoc discussions with PIs and support team as appropriate (but min 3 per year)

### Year 3 activities

88. Evaluation activities will include:

- Participate in final TBMAC Committee meeting in Y3
- Attend (preferred) or review output of Y3 TBMAC / WHO workshop
- Review routine progress reports and advise PIs
- Conduct Y3 RFA review and issue report to Committee via PIs
- Update baseline modelling group interaction survey
- Review progress, stakeholder interviews towards end Y3, Final Report to PIs
- Ad hoc discussions with PIs and support team as appropriate (but min 3 per year)

### Independence and Conflicts of Interest

89. As a matter of course, our customary practice is to submit all deliverables in draft form first to the Client's Project PI. Comments and clarifications are incorporated at our discretion. We offer clients this opportunity to comment on our reports at the draft stage, to allow any misunderstandings to be corrected, to enable the client to offer additional insights, and to give an early indication of the balance of comment. However, our evaluations are independent, so we must reserve the right to include client comments or not as we judge appropriate.
90. We are not aware of any conflicts of interest on this project. The lead evaluator for this project is also likely to be undertaking the same role for another on-going TB project involving the LSHTM, funded by USAID and concerned with capacity building and awareness-raising.

## Appendix C: Advisory Panel Terms of Reference

Contents of TB MAC internal email, copied Richard White / David Collier 17/10/17

---

91. As you are aware from previous communications re the TB MAC stakeholder and TB modelling roadmap meetings at the beginning of this year, it has been agreed that TBMAC's work will be guided and facilitated by the WHO Global Task Force on TB Impact Measurement during the period 2017-2019.
92. Related to this, it has been agreed that as part of these new governance arrangements, an advisory group drawn from key agencies and long-standing members of the Task Force would be established. The Advisory Group will consist of 6-8 people.
93. The terms of reference for members of this advisory group, and associated estimates of the time commitment required, are:
  - Participate in a 'TB MAC update and guidance' call twice a year. The calls would be 1-2 hours each and an estimated 1-2 hours would be needed to review documents in advance of each call.
  - Dial into or attend the TB MAC session of meetings of the full WHO Global Task Force on TB Impact Measurement. Meetings of the full Task Force (as opposed to meetings on specific streams of work) will be held every 12-18 months, with the next one to be held in December or early 2018. The session would be 2-3 hours and there would be 1-2 background documents to read in advance.
  - Contribute to arbitration of funding allocation decisions if the TB MAC Committee/Reviewers cannot agree (this has not been required so far, but if it was needed the time required is expected to be less than 1 hour per year).

## Appendix D: TB MAC's Network

### Context

94. We have provided the Committee with a spreadsheet containing an update of our analysis of TB MAC's mailing list plus a few of our own additional suggestions. It shows progress towards our utility metric and is also a contribution to the Committee's own network development thinking.
- On the Data sheet, we have started from name and email (and institution where known) and used Google to identify everyone, though department level grouping is only very partial so far.
  - On the Analysis sheet, we show a breakdown of numbers on the list by country/institution, and separate tables for breakdown by institution type and (very partial only so far) our guess as to what their area of interest is.
95. It is very much a work in progress. There are errors in the tables below, we have included them to illustrate what we are doing in this area and to give an idea of the country split. We will complete data cleaning before the new year and then try and validate it and do a graphical exercise on the key links with the Committee as previously discussed. Well before next year's Interim Report, we will also have looked for 'missing groups' or under-represented constituencies to suggest and networks (such as university Global South collaboration networks) that might offer a straightforward way to broaden contacts.

### Summary analysis

Country/Institution	
Row Labels	Count of Name
Australia	16
Belgium	2
Brazil	5
Canada	8
China	1
Denmark	1
Ethiopia	1
France	3
Germany	1
India	11
Indonesia	1
Italy	1
Japan	2
Kenya	2
Korea	1
Malawi	1
Malaysia	1
Mexico	1
Netherlands	14
New Zealand	2
Nigeria	3

Norway	2
Pakistan	2
Peru	1
Portugal	2
Russia	2
Singapore	1
South Africa	28
Spain	3
Swaziland	1
Sweden	1
Switzerland	43
Taiwan	1
Tanzania	1
Thailand	2
Uganda	1
UK	69
Unknown	5
USA	151
Vietnam	2
Xambia	1
Zimbabwe	1
#N/A	2
(blank)	3
Burkina Faso	1
Cameroon	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>405</b>

<b>Institution Type</b>	
<b>Row Labels</b>	<b>Count of Name</b>
Pharma	6
(blank)	61
NFP/NGO	31
Education	220
Clinical	8
Government	21
Funder/TA	44
Consultant	14
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>405</b>

**Personal Specialism**

<b>Row Labels</b>	<b>Count of Name</b>
Bioinformatics	1
Epi model	52
Health econ	10
Health Economist	1
IGTP	1
M&E	1
OR	1
PHP	12
researcher	1
(blank)	276
Clinical	24
Epidemiology	18
Science	3
Corporate	1
Campaigner	2
Econ	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>405</b>



## Endnotes

---

- <sup>1</sup> Comments on TB MAC Evaluation Advisory Panel ToRs. White Ox commentary 15/11/2017.
- <sup>2</sup> Proposed [TB MAC] Terms of Reference and Contractual Arrangements. White Ox commentary 15/2/2017.
- <sup>3</sup> Email Collier/Dowdy 7/8/17 and supporting correspondence and Committee meeting notes.
- <sup>4</sup> Comments on TB MAC Evaluation Advisory Panel ToRs. White Ox commentary 15/11/2017.
- <sup>5</sup> OPP1135288 Grant Proposal Narrative. TB MAC, dated 15/9/2016.
- <sup>6</sup> OPP1135288 Investment Results Framework spreadsheet. TB MAC, dated 15/9/2016.
- <sup>7</sup> OPP1135288 Results Grant Budget spreadsheet. TB MAC, dated 16/9/2016.
- <sup>8</sup> Email Collier/White 21/11/2017 and supporting correspondence.
- <sup>9</sup> <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dscIFnSZOAvig1n6rT8S7M6g2PP7L4lpJrE3DI-C9L4>
- <sup>10</sup> <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1F3dXLAlmOF6kKW1bFj8-l4ST6mSiqdnI9pm2vSPuCbU/edit>
- <sup>11</sup> <http://tb-mac.org/Resources/Resource/38>
- <sup>12</sup> <http://tb-mac.org/Jobs>
- <sup>13</sup> <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dscIFnSZOAvig1n6rT8S7M6g2PP7L4lpJrE3DI-C9L4/edit>
- <sup>14</sup> <http://tb-mac.org/Resources/Resource/28>
- <sup>15</sup> <https://docs.google.com/document/d/13nHgJtzvk9wpANb5YVzw9zBmr45EOHq2Ss2Ar5BCv8o/edit>
- <sup>16</sup> <http://tb-mac.org/WorkAreas/WorkArea/16>
- <sup>17</sup> [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1RWS8LJd9bqpb21ozyBbOVGX-dl\\_b4VIP6JRj4Hu7dxc](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1RWS8LJd9bqpb21ozyBbOVGX-dl_b4VIP6JRj4Hu7dxc)
- <sup>18</sup> <http://tb-mac.org/Resources/Resource/35>
- <sup>19</sup> <http://tb-mac.org/WorkAreas/WorkArea/16>
- <sup>20</sup> <http://tb-mac.org/Resources/Resource/36>
- <sup>21</sup> [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1hd\\_ZToUee7mRR8LyKVaz3GiLSpb7W0Wd7gGOzqwWsMY/edit#gid=570306560](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1hd_ZToUee7mRR8LyKVaz3GiLSpb7W0Wd7gGOzqwWsMY/edit#gid=570306560)
- <sup>22</sup> <http://tb-mac.org/Resources/Resource/37>
- <sup>23</sup> <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KqrXVpaVgQJEzFeygSTS5Zgc7tjkbR-v5pYcedSteU/edit>
- <sup>24</sup> <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dscIFnSZOAvig1n6rT8S7M6g2PP7L4lpJrE3DI-C9L4>
- <sup>25</sup> <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1F4NnvtHfsn-CDnuk6wUV66owUYj9kRWH4RlasKkNXqo>
- <sup>26</sup> <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1dGE26zL5t2Wqrq78mW06nCIDKrRL8aN5>
- <sup>27</sup> <http://tb-mac.org/Resources/Resource/10>
- <sup>28</sup> <https://docs.google.com/document/d/13nHgJtzvk9wpANb5YVzw9zBmr45EOHq2Ss2Ar5BCv8o/edit>
- <sup>29</sup> <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DjQz3IRXrZEx-Xw2R6EwI07ojfoNZvd13rjNzwGx2gs/>
- <sup>30</sup> <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1dGE26zL5t2Wqrq78mW06nCIDKrRL8aN5>