Annex-3

TB REACH PRC Meeting
16-19 March 2010-03-23

List of recommendations made by the PRC members for further discussion

1. OVERALL

- Re-discuss the eligibility criteria - in terms of use of Case Detection Rates and the relevance of smear positivity in the context of the new diagnosis tools, TB/HIV co-infection and childhood TB
- Clarify better if the primary focus of TB REACH is on innovation or on implementation of already proven interventions
- Re-discuss the need for the NTP support letter
- Consider limiting the number of applications per country, or per applicant
- Consider grouping the applications by technical areas for the next PRC review
- Consider offering TA for applicants
- The TB REACH Secretariat to screen out more strictly ALL proposals with incomplete sections

2. APPLICATION FORM AND GUIDELINES

- Proposals to include information on:
    - existing funding: domestic and external
    - other projects/interventions implemented for increasing case detection
    - other projects/interventions implemented in the same geographical area
    - notification rates
    - consolidation with other interventions
    - information and details on the sub-grantees that the applicant plans to work with.
- To ensure there is explanation of the linkages of the diagnostics and laboratories with the plans for increasing case detection
- More instructions to be provided on how to fill in the application form
- The requested numbers and data should capture what is realistic and achievable in terms of new cases to be detected, and discourage applicants from submitting unrealistic figures to meet the unit cost target of TB REACH
- To ensure that the workplans are linked to the M&E plan

3. PROPOSALS REVIEWED

- Several proposals had too many objectives, covering too many technical areas and therefore lacking focus
- The applications that included ACSM interventions were numerous; however the ACSM sections were extremely weak, lacked focus and did not seem to be linked to the plans for increasing case detection. This needs to be addressed in future rounds

- The M&E sections of the proposals were overall weak, therefore more guidance is needed in filling in the M&E section, especially table 5a.
- The figures provided by the applicants were in general weak, inconsistent, difficult to understand - a simpler, more straightforward way of providing these figures to be explored - ideally a table that can automatically make the calculations.

4. REVIEW PROCESS

- The review process should be organized considering the following:
  - Start with a one-day orientation for the PRC members
  - Increase either the number of PRC members, or the number of days
  - Maximum number of proposals per day as primary reviewer to be 3-4
  - More in depth and longer discussions of the proposals in the small groups
  - Standardization of the proposal assessment in order to make sure that the technical background and knowledge of the reviewer does not influence the scoring
  - The grading and scoring system to be reviewed to ensure that the applications can be compared and graded fairly
- Develop guidelines for the reviewers
- PRC review form to include:
  - Executive summary
  - Objectives and service delivery areas
  - Programme gap analysis
- Ensure that there is no conflict of interest and no influence in the decisions made for grading of a proposals by the prior knowledge of the PRC members on the application, applicant or the country
- Discuss the reimbursement for the PRC members while in the PRC process
- Ensure that the location of the next PRC meeting is comfortable, quiet, specially devoted to reviews.

5. FOLLOW UP

- Consider grouping the approved grant applications by technical areas/interventions by the external M&E agency
- The category C proposals to be encouraged and helped to re-submit proposals addressing the weaknesses identified by PRC.
- The M&E workplan and indicators need to be clarified and addressed before the project starts to ensure adequate data for evaluation.