History of GMS dashboards

- **2006** - 2008: Early PR dashboards
- **2007-2012**: CCM grant oversight dashboard
- **2014**: SR Management Tool and Regional Dashboard development
- **2015**: PR dashboard rollout, CCM summary development and Whole-of-Country rollout
- **2016**: Dashboard Suite handed over to Global Fund and other TS providers
- **2017**: PR Management Dashboard Pilot
Dashboard Suite
PR Management Dashboard:
For PRs, one grant, one disease

- Strengthen data-driven management
- Track HPM issues and stock outs
- Improve early alert to weak performance
- Enrich PR/SR performance dialogue
- Create inter-SR positive emulation
- Inform high level decision makers
- Refocus PR/Oversight Committee dialogue on problem solving and performance tracking
CCM Summary
Designed for the Oversight Committee

- It integrates the information of all PR dashboards of a country, all diseases.
- Focus in the CCM Oversight Committee dialogue on problem solving and performance tracking.
- Create inter-PR positive emulation.
- Inform high level decision makers.
Regional Dashboard

Designed for Regional Coordination Mechanisms

- Inform high level decision makers
- It integrates the information of all the PRs of a region. Several countries, all diseases.
- Compare efficiency between countries.
- Strengthens efficient RCM oversight
- Improve early alert to weak performance
SR Management Tool
Designed for the SRs

- It integrates the information of all PR dashboards of a country, all diseases.
- Focus in the CCM Oversight Committee dialogue on problem solving and performance tracking.
- Create inter-PR positive emulation.
- Inform high level decision makers.
EVALUATION OF PILOT COUNTRIES 2015/2016
Pilot countries and evaluation

Process evaluation:
• What happened?
• Why it happened?
• How it happened?

Qualitative Data collected in country

18 months after the pilot

7 PRs in 6 countries
Results framework for the pilot

Immediate results: Management Improves
- Improved data quality
- Quicker identification of issues
- Healthy competition between SRs
- Increased PR-SR dialogue
- Improved dialogue with CCM on grant data

Intermediate results: Implementation Improves
- Increased financial absorption
- Reduced PSM waste and risk
- Greater synergy between implementers
- Breakdowns to implementation of activities averted
- Accelerated Implementation

Impact on health outcomes
- Improved Programmatic Performance (better grant ratings)
- Improved Health Outcomes
## Pilot results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adoption Scores (max: 8)</th>
<th>Immediate results: Management improves (max: 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate results: Implementation improves (max: 5)</th>
<th>Change in grant ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance (Cote d'Ivoire)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>From B1 to A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN (Senegal)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>From A2 to A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASO (Uganda)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>No change (B2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAVIHSDA (Dominican Republic)</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>Highest possible (A1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDOH (South Africa)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>From A2 to B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT (Senegal)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>From A2 to B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOH (Laos)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>From A2 to A1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions from the pilot

1. Dashboard adoption leads to performance improvements

2. Adoption higher at civil-society PRs

3. Factors affecting adoption:
   - management buy-in
   - staff capacity
   - communication with CCM
   - data quality (but not a binding constraint!)
ROLLOUT ASSESSMENT
The Whole-of-Country approach

Multiple PR dashboards, in the CCM Summary
Objectives of the rollout assessment

To determine:

1. The degree to which dashboards were adopted
2. The key country or grant characteristics that predict the degree of ‘adoption’
3. Improvements in management and oversight through dashboard use
4. Impact on grant performance
95 Dashboards, 27 Countries, 18 Whole-of-Country (CCM Summaries)
### Methodology of rollout assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1st wave grants**  
Avg. use: 15 months  
60 grants |  
- PR survey (long)  
- CCM survey  
- Global Fund data  
- FPM survey |  
- Degree of dashboard adoption; benefits  
- Oversight process; PR dashboard use  
- Absorption rates; grant characteristics  
- Proxy grant ratings, dashboard use, observed outcomes |
| **2nd wave grants**  
Avg. use: 2 months  
35 grants |  
- PR survey (short)  
- CCM survey  
- Global Fund data  
- FPM survey |  
- Establish a baseline/control group  
- Oversight process  
- Absorption rates; grant characteristics  
- Proxy grant ratings |
Adoption scores of first-wave grants
Factors affecting degree of adoption

- Oversight
- High impact
- Grant value
- Government PR
Results framework for the assessment

**Immediate**
Management improves

**Intermediate**
Implementation improves

**Impact**
Grant rating improves

- Improved data quality
- Prevention of stockouts
- Improved programmatic indicators
- Improved performance (better grant ratings)
- Reduced HPM waste
- Improved PR/CCM dialogue
- Increased funds absorption
Improvements in management

Data quality
- Much worse: 0%
- Worse: 0%
- No change: 28%
- Better: 34%
- Much better: 38%

Communication with SRs
- Much worse: 0%
- Worse: 0%
- No change: 20%
- Better: 42%
- Much better: 38%

Communication with CCM
- Much worse: 0%
- Worse: 0%
- No change: 10%
- Better: 42%
- Much better: 48%
Association between adoption and management improvements

**Immediate**
Management improves

**Intermediate**
Implementation improves

**Impact**
Grant rating improves

- Improved data quality (p<0.01)
- Improved PR/SR dialogue (p<0.05)
- Improved PR/CCM dialogue (p<0.05)
Improvements in implementation

- Improvement in programmatic indicators: 87%
- Reduced HPM wastage: 63%
- Prevention of stockouts: 73%
- Increased financial absorption: 64%
Association between adoption and implementation improvements

Immediate
Management improves

Intermediate
Implementation improves

Impact
Grant rating improves

Improved programmatic indicators (p<0.05)

Prevention of stockouts

Reduced HPM waste (p<0.05)

Increased funds absorption*

* Calculated using Global Fund data, 2nd wave grants used as control
Theoretical effect of using dashboards on absorption rates and grant performance
Immediate Management improves
Intermediate Implementation improves
Impact Grant rating improves

Increased funds absorption (p<0.01)*

* Calculated using Global Fund data, 2nd wave grants used as control
Immediate Management improves
Intermediate Implementation improves
Impact Grant rating improves

Improved grant performance
(better grant ratings)
(p<0.05 to 0.1)*

* Calculated using Global Fund data, 2nd wave grants used as control
Conclusions

| 1 | Large majority of PRs continue to produce and use dashboards |
| 2 | Adoption differences between public and non-public PRs dissipate with CCM oversight and Whole-of-Country approach |
| 3 | Higher degree of dashboard adoption leads to better grant management and performance |
| 4 | Funds absorption rates higher for adopters |
| 5 | Good investment for countries and Global Fund! |
Improvements in Grant Management, Implementation and Ratings Through the Use of the PR Dashboard

Senegal PLAN
- Management ready, willing to change
- Established communication processes with SRs
- Data quality
- M&E, management capacity; staff enthusiastic about dashboard

Senegal PNT
- Management ready, willing to change
- Established communication processes with SRs
- Data quality
- M&E, management capacity; staff enthusiastic about dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adoption Scores (max: 8)</th>
<th>Immediate results: Management improves (max: 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate results: Implementation improves (max: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLAN (Senegal)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT (Senegal)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From A2 to A1
From A2 to B2