Terms of References – LFA Review of Infection Prevention and Control (IPC)

April 2024

**Background:**

*(Country Team to add background on the country and why the review is being requested)*

**Objective(s):**

The objective of the review is to assess the adequacy of implementation of investments for infection prevention and control to identify risks that may impact the success of program implementation.

**Scope of Review:** [scope to be agreed with Country Team prior to commencing the review]

1. Desk review: Review of available documentation or discussion with relevant authorities including, but not limited to, budget, workplans, guidelines, national action plans/ strategies, available technical expertise and assistance, available project management, availability and readiness of resources including funds, contracting support, and monitoring and oversight.
2. Site visits: Visit to a targeted sample of healthcare facilities where GF investments for IPC are occurring, discussion with key stakeholders to observe implementation of IPC programs. Key stakeholders typically are the health facility administrator, IPC focal person, and occupational health. The targeted sample should focus on sites that may be under-performing or at risk for delayed or incomplete implementation.

**Required background reading**

1. C19RM Technical Information Note
2. GC7 Modular framework
3. WHO Minimum requirements for IPC programmes (available at: <https://www.who.int/teams/integrated-health-services/infection-prevention-control/core-components>)

**Tasks:** As a part of the desk review and site visits, the LFA should:

1. Verify whether, and to what extent, the appropriate national authorities and stakeholders are engaged in the IPC implementation process
2. Identify potential bottlenecks (e.g., financial, administrative, technical) in the implementation process
3. Confirm that workplans are in alignment with appropriate policies, including national strategies or guidelines, WHO guidelines, or WHO minimum requirements
4. Confirm that activities are being implemented at designated sites in timely, efficient, and effective manner

To assist the LFA in gathering assurance information, the following table may be used as a template. Please note that the below is not an exhaustive list of questions the LFA should address in the review.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Purpose | Question | Response and comments |
| Verify that the appropriate national authorities and stakeholders are engaged in the IPC implementation process | Is there a national IPC directorate, programme, or focal person?  |  |
| Has the national IPC programme been engaged in the funding request and the budget, workplan, and implementation? |  |
| Is the national IPC program a sub-recipient (SR)? If not, please describe how the national IPC program maintains financial or programmatic visibility over the IPC activities implemented as part of the Global Fund grant. |  |
| Identify potential bottlenecks (e.g., financial, administrative, technical) in the implementation process | Who is responsible for the implementation of the IPC activities? Is this entity the PR, SR, or other? |  |
| Does this entity (or entities) currently have access to the funds intended for the IPC activities? |  |
| Does this entity (or entities) have capacity to implement the activities, from a technical perspective? |  |
| Does this entity (or entities) have capacity to implement the activities, from a program management, program support, or administrative perspective? |  |
|  | Is there adequate planning of IPC activities and coordination with all relevant stakeholders to ensure timely and effective implementation? |  |
|  | Are there adequate oversight mechanisms in place to ensure timely and effective implementation of IPC activities? |  |
| Confirm that IPC activity workplans are in alignment with appropriate policies, including national strategies or guidelines, WHO guidelines, or WHO minimum requirements | Is there a national IPC strategy or action plan? Is it based on WHO guidelines?  |  |
| Are the IPC activity work plan aligned to these documents? |
| Confirm that activities are being implemented at designated sites in timely, efficient, and effective manners | Is there someone at the facility who is in charge of IPC and safety? |  |
| Which IPC activities have been conducted at this site? |  |
| Are there barriers to implementing the activities on schedule according to the workplan? If so, what are they? |  |

**Output/Deliverables and timing of deliverables:**

The report should address each of the points listed under the scope of review/list of tasks and include:

1. A detailed description and analysis of implementation of IPC related activities, including related issues/risks identified. The LFA should comment on the context and root causes of the issues identified, providing background information as necessary and prioritise the list of issues in an executive summary according to their significance.
2. Recommendations for addressing issues identified. Recommendations should be:
* Detailed and actionable
* Specific and contextualised
* Time-bound
* Identifying the main entity responsible for implementation
* Precise and prescriptive

Should the review identify clear evidence of fraud, the LFA should ensure it uses the GF communication protocol to inform the GF Secretariat and the OIG to allow consideration of evidence collection and other issues relevant to a possible criminal investigation.

**Level of Effort**

This task should be undertaken by the LFA Programmatic/M&E expert who is accountable for the technical content of this report. S/he can be supported, as needed, by other LFA team members in the planning and during the verification. The LoE for this task, including report writing, depends on which elements of the ToR and the number and location of service delivery sites are included in the review, as agreed between the Global Fund Country Team and the LFA.