Second Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel
Summary Notes

February 7-8, 2023

Global Health Campus, Geneva, Switzerland

February 7, 2023

Participants List (See Annex A)

<u>**Evaluation and Learning Office (ELO): Vision, Mission, and Functions and 2023 Workplan**</u>
The Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer (CELO) presented a high-level overview of the vision, mission, mid- and long-term goals for 2025 and 2028 of the ELO.

IEP Discussion:
- IEP were broadly aligned with presentation but requested a more explicit **focus on accountability** in the ELO's Vision and Mission.
- The IEP emphasized that strategic considerations should include **decolonization and systems approaches** to evaluations. The IEP further:
  - Cautioned ELO to **manage expectations** and suggested that ELO consider participating in joint evaluations, such as SDG3 GAP, as a means to multiply its capabilities and reach.
  - Requested more detail on **utilization by whom**, noting that the ELO utilization objective does not explicitly include country-level implementers as yet.
  - Emphasized the importance of **encompassing the country level in knowledge management** to realize utilization objectives, noting a significant missed learning opportunity given the plethora of uncoordinated data collection at the country and community levels that is not supporting local level decision-making.
- Supported the proposal of developing an **Evaluation Policy** alongside the development of standard operation procedures (SOPs).
  - Recommended that **evaluators** are **comprehensively onboarded** to ensure a sufficient level of GF business model knowledge to allow for useful comment on country level and other business processes.

ACTION POINTS:
- ELO clarified that accountability is understood as foundational to the evaluation function and will examine how to make it more explicit while ensuring not to invoke a policing tone.
- ELO will include SDG3 GAP in its Evidence Scan to inform the Board-requested partnership evaluation, especially the latter's Terms of Reference (TOR) development.
- IEP will connect ELO with sample model evaluation policies from peer institutions and review future evaluation policy drafts.
- ELO will explore and implement proactive approaches ensuring evaluators understand the Global Fund business model to expand the evaluator pool, with support from the IEP as appropriate.

Review of Standard Operating Procedures

The ELO presented an overview and progress update on the development of standard operating procedures (SOPs) for the independent evaluation function. IEP members discussed the draft SOPs in a closed session before providing consolidated feedback to the ELO.

Summary of IEP feedback and guidance for ELO:
- Welcomed the draft SOPs and complimented ELO for such deep and thoughtful work in a short period of time, on a wholly new function.
- Recommended **reducing and simplifying** the draft SOPs to create a single document with concise SOPs.
- Recommended further **defining the purpose of the SOPs**, outlining the operationalisation of the evaluation function, in particular how evaluations will be identified, planned, managed, quality assured, used within the Global Fund and lessons learned disseminated more widely, and to clarify the relative roles and responsibilities of the ELO and the IEP, as well as the relationship with the Secretariat. Suggested referencing the IEP TORs.
- Recommended clarifying the roles of the IEP Chair vs the role of Panel, including procedures for consultation with the Panel and delegation of responsibilities to the Chair, to ensure that the IEP works effectively as a unit.
- Recommended to clarify how independence and quality assurance would work in the proposed system, which in the presented version was not fully clear.
- Recommended further **defining the audience for the SOPs**, which is primarily IEP and ELO, but also the Global Fund governance bodies and the Secretariat.
- Suggested that a **summary Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed (RACI) matrix** would be useful for each SOP section.
- Recommended including an **overarching flow chart** that outlines the different SOP processes and who is responsible for what.
- Recommended removing text on evaluation guidance.

Regarding **evaluation management,** IEP recommend that SOPs should:
- Lay out roles and responsibilities of the ELO evaluation manager and the IEP focal point, and also IEP leadership and CELO, at various evaluation touchpoints.
- Lay out how relevant Secretariat teams will be engaged to ensure evaluation teams have access to information required.
- Outline the evaluation management process.
- Define a process for escalating any quality concerns for example major changes to the TORs highlighted in the inception report to the IEP leadership.
- Overall evaluation management is the responsibility of the ELO, and the IEP is responsible for protecting the evaluation function from undue external influence so as to facilitate this work. An SOP should be developed to govern when issues should be escalated to the IEP Chair.

ACTION POINTS:
➢ ELO to adapt draft SOPs based on IEP input, while benchmarking with global standards (e.g. UNEG).
➢ ELO to develop an evaluation policy to orient the evaluation function in the Global Fund. The IEP will support this by providing examples of similar policies and reviewing drafts.
➢ ELO will prepare a draft of IEP Rules and Procedures that will cover numerous areas, including code of conduct/COI and conduct of IEP meetings etc., to be reviewed by the IEP.

Multi-Year Evaluation Calendar

The session reviewed and discussed (1) the Board approved Multi-Year Evaluation calendar topics and next steps to refine scope, and (2) evaluation eligibility criteria for prioritizing 'new' proposed evaluation topics.

IEP Discussion:

- **Timing of evaluations**: Recommended moving up the Funding Request Cycle evaluation to allow for a prospective or formative evaluation of how this process facilitates the delivery of the 2023-2028 Strategy in a sample of countries to explore how strategy elements related to RSSH, community system strengthening, community engagement, gender, human rights and other issues end-up being considered during the Funding Request process. It was also recommended to do the evaluation on Partnerships as the 4th evaluation in the 2023 Workplan, given that it is a Board requested topic.
- **Selection of evaluation topics**: IEP had questions on scope and timing of evaluations that occurred multiple times in the calendar.
- **GF's role in a rapidly changing global landscape**: Emphasized importance of considering the utility of evaluation in supporting how GF positions itself in the future given the rapidly changing global economic, political, social, and environmental landscape as referenced by the GF Executive Director's introductory remarks.
- **Scoping evaluations:** Reflected on how multiple evaluation topics could be interwoven into well-designed evaluations with high learning potential and high strategic value.
- **Recommended that evaluation eligibility criteria:**
  o Consider WHO's evaluability criteria: (i) requirement, (ii) significance, (iii) utility, (iv) time between evaluations, (v) risk register, (vi) alignment with audit workplan.
  o Remove Theory of Change (ToC) as a criterion, as long as there is clarity on what will be (and will not be) evaluated, noting that ToCs for evaluation can also be built retrospectively.

- Consider adding: (i) an efficiency criterion that addresses evaluation fatigue and duplication (ii) a criterion that captures multiple stakeholder demand, and (iii) a "bonus criterion" that captures whether the evaluation adds value to an existing partner evaluation.

ACTION POINTS:
➢ ELO to adapt the evaluation criteria based on IEP input.

February 8, 2023

Conflict of Interest Policy and Code of Conduct for IEP members

IEP members were reminded about the code of conduct and conflict of interest polices and discussed what may constitute a conflict of interest in the context of the work of IEP.

Business modalities and operational arrangements (IEP Closed Session)

The End-Term Strategic Review (SR2023) ToR and IEP Closed Session to Finalize SR2023 ToR

The ELO presented an overview of the Strategic Review 2023 and an update on the SR2023 consultations, scoping exercise, and ToR development process.

Summary of feedback received from IEP and the Secretariat (see Annex A for full participant list to the session):
- Welcomed the draft SR2023 ToR and complimented ELO for wide consultation on potential scope.
- Recommended **adjusting the ToR's strategic level,** in part by reducing the number of sub and primary evaluation questions and re-focusing questions to a bigger-picture view.
- Recommended **refining Sub-objectives:** RSSH, health financing and CRG should be considered under SR2023 Sub Objective 1 (SO1) and not singled out as all four strategic objectives must be reviewed. C19 RM and partnerships were to be deep dives and should not be deleted as sub-objectives keeping in mind the need to elevate the ToR to the right strategic level hence need to weave them into the restructured ToR.
- Recommended **relaxing design considerations and methods** in the TOR, to leave scope for evaluators to propose methods and designs.
- Recommended **applying OECD DAC evaluation criteria**.
- Recommended **building on past evaluations** and strategy implementation challenges.

- - ELO clarified that the SR2023 was building on challenges identified in SR2020 and other TERG evaluations, OIG advisories and Audits, TRP and other internal technical teams' reviews.
- Emphasized the importance of **coordination with OIG.**
- **Questioned the timing of countries' inclusion in SR2023,** stressing that country stakeholders should be consulted early on to promote country ownership.
- Suggested a **Theory of Change** could be constructed retrospectively building on the ToC developed for SR2020.

ACTIONS POINTS
- ➢ ELO to **adapt the SR2023 ToR** reflecting feedback received by IEP.
- ➢ **Continued leveraging of existing internal evidence & intelligence as part of the review,** especially SR2020's evaluation of the entire grant cycle and GF business processes. Other relevant internal intelligence cited includes recent OIG advisories on the country coordinating mechanism and on sourcing.
- ➢ **Continued coordination with OIG**: Finalize the principles of the ELO and OIG collaboration document. OIG and ELO will continue to map out their clear timelines and collaboration modalities.
- ➢ **Continued engagement of relevant Secretariat teams early in the process** upon finalization of the ToR and list of possible countries for case studies, recognizing the heavy workload of country teams and in-country stakeholders.
- ➢ Apply the OECD DAC evaluation criteria to strengthen the questions to be utilized for the SR2023.

Country Steered Review (CSR) recommendations based on 2022 scoping exercise

ELO presented the proposed approach to the CSR and sought IEP, Secretariat and OIG input on the way forward.

IEP, Secretariat and OIG Comments:
- Appreciated the **strong business case and approach,** especially the CSR's ability to strengthen country ownership and its use of design principles to set direction without being overly prescriptive to the evaluation team.
- Recommended **strengthening country-led data collection** by letting country applicants expand the evaluation questions ensuring future data collection is intentionally broader to allow for country-defined evaluation priorities.
- Suggested **testing data collection tools and modalities,** noting that testing the web-based consultation system's format and question order could help to increase take-up**.**
- Noted **partnerships** that could be particularly relevant to CSR, namely the Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (TDR) which funds country-driven research; and The Alliance at WHO, a network of national researchers on health systems.

- The Secretariat reiterated the importance of maintaining focus on the **intent of the CSR,** which is to establish a feedback mechanism that flows from the country level upwards in a clear way. To this end, IEP cautioned not to focus too narrowly, for example, on evidence gaps**.**
- IEP recommended **managing country level feedback** by incorporating a 2-way feedback channel, including a restitution of results process that could mitigate the risk of country perceptions of insufficient follow-up. Recommended a clear process for **prioritizing follow-up.** Emphasized the importance of having a third party manage feedback to ensure **confidentiality of feedback**. OIG emphasized the importance of **streamlining feedback channels**.
- The Secretariat noted the **opportunity to leverage internal data collection and analysis**, including inserting questions in planned data collection processes, and analyzing already collected data for learning needs, evidence gaps and scoping evaluation topics. Highlighted planned internal data collection, including CRG's data collection for its corporate KPI on community engagement in GF processes, and data channels designed to optimize business processes.
- IEP noted that the CSR feedback channel could become a **key input to scoping evaluations,** offering a rich source of intelligence that could inform scoping evaluation questions from the countries' perspective.

<u>Evaluation quality oversight and assessment</u>

Objectives: To (1) to discuss the IEP quality assessment (QA) criteria for reviewing evaluation reports drawing on experiences from other organizations, and (2) discuss the 'IEP commentary' to publish with each evaluation report.

IEP Comments:
- **QA type:** Preferred numerical QA scoring, and appreciated the logic of the different examples provided.
- **QA process:** Preferred keeping the QA process in-house, pending workload. Agreed that scores must be justified in written form via the QA form, and that those involved in QA must discuss the scores prior to finalising them. IEP experience suggests consensus on QA scores is common after discussion; in case of the contrary an additional tie-breaker reviewer could be engaged, pending resources.
- **QA touchpoints in the evaluation lifecycle** were proposed as (i) after a draft final report, which should help authors prepare the final report; and (ii) after the final report, which should help formulate the IEP Commentary. The focal points who conduct quality assurance will conduct the assessment on the draft final report, while quality assessment focal points who have not been involved in the process will conduct the assessment of the final report.
- Recommended that the **IEP Commentary** opines on the quality of evaluation findings, and their implications alongside the QA summary. Suggested that IEP

quality assurance (QAssure) focal points, quality assessment (QAssess) focal points, and IEP Vice Chair and the Chair consult and draft the IEP Commentary.

- Recommended that the **final legal review of evaluation reports and IEP commentaries** is discussed and clarified, to avoid complications and delays towards the end of the evaluation process.

ACTION POINTS:

➢ IEP members (to volunteer) to develop First draft of (1) the QA form, and (2) the IEP Commentary template by September 2023.

➢ ELO and IEP to develop an SOP governing who will be involved in the QA process and at which stage, balancing the goals of ensuring the overall efficiency of the process with the goal of keeping the entire Panel informed.

➢ ELO to start the process to review and adapt the TERG publication policy and request consultation with Secretariat on legal reviews in subsequent IEP meeting.

Annex A: Participants List

IEP	ELO
Mira Johri – IEP Chair Cindy Carlson – IEP Vice Chair *IEP members:* Abdallah Bchir Caroline Lynch Dede Watchiba Elilarasu Renganathan Evelyn Ansah George Gotsadze Helen Evans Josephine Watera Mark Bardini Javier Bellocq Hourcade	John Grove Betty Brady Caroline Berger Nathalie Gons Jutta Hornig Rhiannon James John Puvimanasinghe Marc Theuss (Michael Schroll – remotely)

Global Fund Secretariat (for select sessions: ELO Overview, SR2023, CSR)

Peter Sands Marijke Wijnroks Abigail Moreland Harley Feldbaum Collins Acheampong Kate Thomson Kalipso Chalkidou Nicole Gorman Serena Brusamento Augustine Agyeman-Duah Lily Bower Collin Pierce Daniel Petrescu Richard Grahn Shantih van Hoog Ylva Bie Erica Kufa Olga Bornemisza Siobhan Crowley Michael Olszak-Olszewski	Nathalie Zorzi Ed Ngoksin David Ennis Silvio Marinelli Lin Li David Traynor Matt Gordon Lindsay Smith Hélène Cloet-Galibourg Cynthia Urusaro Imhof Raegan Boler (Teams training) Merle Jasper (Teams training) **External participant**: Angela McCaskill – SOP consultant