



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

REVISED AND FINAL CORPORATE KPI FRAMEWORK IS APPROVED

A final revised version of the corporate key performance indicators (KPIs) was discussed at the 32nd Board meeting. Although the framework of 16 indicators had been approved by the Board in November 2013 (GF/B30/DP07), this edition showed minor revisions had been made to several of them, and most importantly, final methods of measurement, baselines and proposed were presented to the Board for approval.

In the table below we summarize the KPIs, their indicators and the targets proposed.

Table: List of corporate KPIs, with specific measures, baselines and targets

KPI	Specific Measures	Baselines and Targets	
1 Performance against strategic goals	a) Estimated number of lives saved b) Estimated number of infections prevented	a) 1.6m lives saved (2011) b) 30m infections averted in 2011	a) 10 betw b) 14 prev

	a) ARV retention rate at 12 months		a) 80%
		a) 76%	b) 90%
	b) TB treatment success rate		c) 60%
		b) 86%	
	c) Proportion of population at risk potentially covered by LLINs distributed	c) 47%	55%
	Proportion of population that slept under an ITN the previous night		
		42%	
	d) Percentage of eligible adults and children currently receiving ART		d) 50%
2	Quality and coverage of services		
	e) Percentage of HIV-positive pregnant women who received antiretrovirals to reduce the risk of mother-to-child transmission	d) 36%	e) 90%
		e) 66%	f) 90%
	f) Percentage of HIV-positive TB patients given ART during TB treatment		
		f) 67%	g) 20%
	g) Number of countries with validated population size estimates for female sex workers, men who have sex with men and, where applicable, injecting drug users	n/a	2015
			2016
			*a) th
			for 2

			a) 7.5m	a) 7.5m
		a) Number of people alive on ARV therapy (annual target)	a) 3.5m	b) 21
		b) Number of TB cases treated according to the DOTS approach	b) 2.5m	c) 39
		c) Number of LLINs distributed	c) 62m	d) 2.5
		d) HIV-positive pregnant women who received antiretrovirals to reduce the risk of mother-to-child transmission	d) 383,000	
3	Performance against strategic service delivery targets	e) Number of indoor residual spraying services delivered	e) 7.7m	e) 26
		f) Cases with bacteriologically confirmed drug resistant TB treated with a second line regimen	f) 12,000	f) 26
		g) People who received HIV testing and counseling and know their results	g) 34m	g) 35
				** target 2016 rest of 2014
4	Efficiency of Global Fund investment decisions	Alignment between investment decisions and country need; with need defined in terms of disease burden and ability to pay	2013 alignment score: 0.65	2015
				20% alignment
5	Health system strengthening	HIV, TB and malaria service availability and readiness rating: proportion of countries in which services SARA score improves by 5 percentage points or more over 2014 – 2016	2013: 3 of 4 countries surveyed showed improvement of at least 5 percentage points in HIV, TB or Malaria Score. [Range was 1 – 13 percentage points over 12 to 37 months.] 2014: 87% of High Impact countries reported Fund grants on a national budget; disease strategy or health sector budget in mid-2014 when weighted by allocation	2014 countries improved percentage SARA
6	Alignment of supported programs with national systems	Percentage of investments in countries where Global Fund support is reported on national disease strategy budgets		2015

		a) Time from final concept note submission to Grant Approval Committee recommendation		From CN to
7	Access to funding	b) Time from Grant Approval Committee recommendation to grant signing	n/a	a) for 75% month
		c) Time from grant signing to first disbursement		b) for 75% month
8	NFM implementation (temporary KPI)	Amount of grant expenses for the transition to the NFM committed to annual schedule of country demands	2013: \$0.6bn in grant expenses committed in 2013 against a forecast of \$0.4bn	2014 over 2015 out
9	Effective operational risk management	Portfolio Risk Index: QUART operational risk rating for eligible grants weighted by grant budget	2013: 1.9 (High Impact Countries)	2014 Cour 2015 with base
10	Value for money	Spend reduction in commodity purchases within pooled procurement mechanism for equivalent commodities at equivalent quality and volume	2013: 13% reduction in spend	Redu year equiv at eq volun At ea (201-
11	Grant expenses forecast	Percentage of forecast grant expenses made to schedule	2013 Corporate Expenditure Rate (CER) -grant expenses 1.44	-Actu withi - CER withi
12	Human rights protection	Percentage of human rights complaints against Global Fund supported programs successfully identified through risk assessment tools; and resolved through Secretariat policies and procedures.	To be submitted for approval March 2015	To be appr
		a) Actual pledges as percent of replenishment target	a) n/a	c) US
13	Resource mobilisation	b) Pledge conversion rate. Actual contributions as a percentage of forecast contributions	b) 2013: 97%	d) 20 forec recei repo

14	Domestic financing for AIDS, TB and malaria	Percent of programs accessing funding where government contributions meet minimum counterpart financing thresholds.	2013: 96% of renewals and early applicants met minimum counterpart financing thresholds	2014 meet 2015 meet
15	Efficiency of grant management operations	Opex rate operating expenses as a percentage of grants under management	2013: 2.3%	2014 2015
16	Quality of management and leadership	Management and Leadership Index	2013: 76% of items on the management quality survey received favourable responses	2014 mana recei respo 2015 Boar

These KPIs, which have seen considerable work in the last year, are intended to be one of the main vehicles for measuring progress towards, and achievement of, the strategic objectives under the 2012 – 2016 strategic plan. Experts joined the Board’s committees and constituencies, its technical and funding partners to produce “visible and measurable” indicators that are mapped to the Strategy.

All the indicators have now been defined and the majority have baselines (where relevant) and targets. Two indicators – human rights protection and quality of management and leadership – remain unfinished in terms of targets for 2016. These two will be completed for submission to the March Board meeting in 2015.

All the other 14 indicators now have purposes, methodologies and limitations briefly (sometimes very briefly) described in the framework.

Aidsplan comment: the development of the KPIs has been long and complex, and it is good that there are now 16 relatively clear indicators to measure the Fund’s own progress towards their strategic objectives for 2016.

That said, more information must be made available to accompany this framework to explain how several of the KPI’s will actually be measured.

For example, KPI 4: “Efficiency of Global Fund investment decisions” is an “alignment score” with a range from 0 to 1. A lower score means higher alignment, but it is not clear how this will be measured. The Fund has said it will use the same or similar qualitative factors that it used to adjust its allocations to countries. The exact way that these factors are used has not been made public under the allocations model, so cannot be made public under the KPIs — which makes it difficult for those outside the Secretariat to understand the indicator.

Since the allocations under the NFM are the main decisions taken to meet country needs (as defined by disease burden and ability to pay) it again begs the question as to how the Fund arrives at this measure of ‘efficiency’.

Perhaps we are not alone in our confusion, as the framework reports in the limitations section of this indicator that work is now underway to test a “complementary measure of investment decision efficiency”.

One of few composition changes is described in a footnote to indicator #2: quality and coverage of services. Initially these concepts were to be measured as separate indicators, but as two of the three measures were to be the same for both coverage and quality, the decision was taken to merge the indicators into one. This indicator now has seven sub measures.

As reported earlier, the indicators will be reported semi- annually or annually from next year.

Information for this article was taken from Board Document GF-B32-24a, Corporate Key Performance Indicators Narrative. This document is posted on the Global Fund website at

www.theglobalfund.org/en/board/meetings/thirtysecond

[Read More](#)
