

# **Fifth Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel**

## Summary Notes

21-23 November 2023

In-person meeting

# Purpose

This document presents the Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP), held in-person in Geneva, Switzerland from 21-23 November 2023.

**Agenda items.** The meeting comprised of fifteen (15) agenda items and two (2) executive sessions listed in Annex 1.

**Decisions.** The Report includes a full record of the four (4) Decision Points adopted by the IEP (Annex 2).

**Documents.** A document list is attached to this report (Annex 3).

**Participants.** The participant list is attached to this report (Annex 4).

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Report</b>	<b>4</b>
Day 1	4
Opening	4
Evaluation Function SOPs and Document Procedure	4
Quality Assessment Framework	5
Draft Evaluation Principles	6
Advancing Influence and Learning from Evaluation	7
Day 2	8
Update on 2023 Evaluations	8
Summary of the main discussion points:	8
Imbizo Terms of Reference	9
IEP Commentary Format/Template	10
IEP Rules and Procedures	11
Expanding Evaluation Partnerships	12
Day 3	14
2024 Evaluation Scoping	14
IEP Annual Report Structure	16
Annual Planning for 2024	16
Closed Executive Sessions	17
Closing	17

---

<b>Annex 1: Agenda</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Annex 2: Decisions</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Annex 2: Document List</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Annex 3: Participant List</b>	<b>24</b>

# Report

## Day 1

### Opening

The IEP Chair opened the meeting by commending significant advancement on critical documents and welcomed the Strategy Committee (SC) Chair to the meeting and also the Global Fund Chief of Staff who is now serving as an ex-officio member to the IEP.

The SC Chair outlined the importance of the evaluation function, and specifically the establishment of the IEP. The SC Chair recognized that each IEP member is a leader in the field of evaluation. The Chief of Staff emphasized the common cause, vision and mission at the Global Fund and the critical contribution of evaluations is clarifying the way to achieve them. Both the SC Chair and Chief of Staff acknowledged the importance of evaluations in helping the Global Fund work better and focus its resources in the context of poly-crisis and shifts in global health architecture.

The CELO commended the IEP and ELO for the progress made together this year and evaluations already underway, noting the initial readout of recommendations from the 2023 Review of the 2017-2022 Global Fund Strategy (SR23). He reinforced the country-level impact of evaluation work and cited the importance of working with partners in building evaluation capacity in implementer countries. Several IEP members acknowledged and congratulated both IEP members and ELO staff for the progress to date.

### Evaluation Function SOPs and Document Procedure

This session included a review of the semifinal Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the evaluation function at the Global Fund, with a view to making any final edits before finalization of the document.

Following a review of the key IEP related aspects of the SOP key discussion points included:

- **Updates to the SOPs:** The IEP and Secretariat discussed how to handle updates to the SOPs, with the SC Chair suggesting that “material changes” be a criterion for the Secretariat informing the IEP of changes, recognizing procedure can be refined through experience and practice, consistent with the principle of the documents reviewed by the IEP. The Secretariat reinforced the importance of keeping the SOPs at a high level to avoid constant updates, relegating more detailed guidance on certain topics, such as endorsement procedures, to the IEP’s own rules and procedures. It was agreed that, once final, the SOPs would be used as they are for at least a year before reviewing and modifying as required based on practice.
- **Evaluator performance:** The IEP reflected on how to handle unsatisfactory performance from a supplier and cases when an evaluation may need to be stopped and this needs to be considered even if not explicit in SOPs at the moment but considered by the different “approval” points in the SOP. The importance of ensuring systematic and timely quality assurance for both IEP and ELO was noted to address issues in real time. The Secretariat flagged the need to adhere to Global Fund legal and procurement guidelines when managing supplier performance and terminating a contract.

- **IEP Review of documents:** Tightening up practices on reviews and comments from IEP on evaluation deliverables was discussed so that ELO receives consolidated comments from IEP arising from application of QA tool questions (for quality assurance focal points) and filled out QA tool from quality assessment focal points. In return it was requested that ELO document and inform IEP which comments have been considered with rationale of why and why not.
- **Updates to final SOP:** A few inconsistencies and edits required in the SOPs were noted and these will be addressed before finalization of the current version.

#### Action points:

- ELO to make some final edits for accuracy and consistency.
- ELO to share final version with IEP Leadership with list of all changes.
- To “close” the SOP development process and to adopt them for at least a year.

### Quality Assessment Framework

The objective of the session was to discuss the tool that has been developed to conduct the Quality Assessment of the final evaluation reports and discuss the outcome of the piloting of the tool to make any modifications and finalize it for use in early 2024.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Transparency.** The Secretariat and IEP concurred on the importance of making the Quality Assessment Framework publicly available on the Global Fund website.
- **Flexibility and applicability:** The IEP underscored the importance of a theory of change and quality terms of reference (TORs) for an evaluation, which have a bearing on the evaluation outputs in addition to how its quality is assessed. The Framework would need to be adaptable to address diverse evaluations, across which terminology of evaluation elements may differ and that not all would be accompanied by theories of change. The IEP suggested an abbreviated base of questions, noting that additional questions could be added on an individual evaluation basis.
- **Scoring:** Those who piloted the tool called for an eight-point scale (or a 4x2 point scale) in the Quality Assessment Framework to avoid neutral scores and suggested including a qualitative explanation to accompany the score. The IEP discussed whether the two quality assessors should jointly develop a single score or provide separate scores. The IEP Chair and Vice Chair highlighted their role in consolidating and mediating in the case of a discrepancy between scores by the quality assessors, with the final IEP output being a single score.
- **Finalization and Review:** The IEP agreed to use the tool for a year and, after that point, consider making further refinements if needed. The specific changes requested to the Quality Assessment Framework prior to its finalization include to:
  - Set-out scoring procedure including role of co-chair/chair as decider in cases of divergence. Divergent comments be captured and be shared with IEP and ELO after the quality assessment focal points have aligned as much as possible;
  - Allow for an 8-point rating scale;
  - Remove any duplications in questions;
  - Allow for a not feasible/not relevant answer depending on the evaluation;
  - Ensure that it provides clarity on the documents which should be reviewed (as per row 8 on the excel spreadsheet);
  - Be reviewed for language and syntax to improve clarity;
  - Contain definition of evaluation from UNEG;

- Look at engagement and innovation considerations in the tool, and whether the appropriate methodologies are being used by evaluators;
- Provide a way for the CELO to highlight the evaluation principles relevant to a given evaluation report from a quality standpoint; and
- Reflect different approaches to express divergent views with respect to draft reports and a consolidated statement, making every effort to achieve consensus, for final reports.

Decision:

- The IEP voted unanimously to approve the decision points GF/IEP05/DP01 on the Quality Assessment Framework.

**Action points:**

- Focal points to meet and discuss the tweaks to the tool and language clarifications. Organize a call with ELO within a few weeks following this IEP meeting.
- Focal points to revise tool and share with IEP for final approval over email in December 2023.

## **Draft Evaluation Principles**

This session's objective was to discuss and receive inputs on the Draft Evaluation Principles document.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Overall approach:** The CELO emphasized the need to align with IEP on the scope, length and boldness of the next version of the Evaluation Principles. The IEP called for the Evaluation Principles to be benchmarked against other organizations, Global Fund-specific, concise and clear. Additionally, the IEP flagged the need for the principles to be aspirational without becoming a straitjacket.
- **Use in practice:** The IEP called for clarity on how the Evaluation Principles would be integrated into day-to-day practices, including reference to the SOPs within the document and not just as a reference, and cascading its principles across to evaluation Requests for Proposals, TORs and day-to-day practice. They need to be translated into practice.
- **Equity:** The IEP considered integration of equity, respect for people, gender, human rights and the environment in the Evaluation Principles, the inclusion of which Secretariat noted should be aligned with Global Fund strategy and policies.
- **Innovation:** The IEP debated whether to include the term "innovation", noting that, if included, its applications should be defined. The Secretariat commented on the role of innovation in investing in diverse and emerging talent as well as in mobilizing new methodological breakthroughs and technology, such as artificial intelligence (AI).
- **Engagement and learning:** The IEP flagged the need to integrate engagement and learning, including communication and dissemination of findings, into the Evaluation Principles. The IEP stressed the role of accepting uncertainty as part of the learning approach.
- **Capacity strengthening:** The IEP considered whether a separate principle around this is required particularly with regard to expanding the marketplace to evaluators in implementer countries and transforming standards and criteria for success which is currently captured under the principle of innovation.

## Action points:

- ELO to take the next cut on document based on feedback received and share with IEP.
- IEP to review and input the document prior to the next in-person IEP meeting (May 2024).
- During next in person IEP meeting, time dedicated for both IEP and ELO to work together to bring the document to finalization.

## Advancing Influence and Learning from Evaluation

This session was aimed at a joint Secretariat and IEP discussion and brainstorm on ideas and approaches to strengthen follow-up, adaption and learning from evaluation evidence in 2024, based on an initial proposal by the Evaluation and Learning Office (ELO).

The Secretariat presented its approach of combining learning and use to achieve a measure of influence, crosscut by the ELO engagement model and enablers for increased influence. The Secretariat explained learning as the two-way process of engagement with Global Fund stakeholders, underpinned by multiple types of access to credible evidence. Use was explained as relevant and timely employment in decision-making, with influence reaching operational, conceptual and strategic levels. Influence was presented as the sum of learning from and use of evaluation evidence, findings and recommendations. The Secretariat solicited IEP feedback on conceptual frameworks and operationalization of learning.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Overall approach:** The IEP Vice Chair reinforced learning as a priority for the IEP and IEP members emphasized the importance of evaluation dissemination being acted upon.
- **Evaluation brief:** The IEP recognized the limited utility of lengthy evaluations in learning and dissemination and called for evaluations to be distilled into short one- to two-page briefs that feed priority recommendations into senior management decision-making, discussions and policy development, among other dissemination tools.
- **Means of dissemination:** The CELO emphasized the shared responsibility for dissemination across the IEP and Secretariat, requiring constantly seeking out different communication pathways and applying professional communications approaches. The IEP Chair flagged the role of trusted relationships, professional networks and one-on-one communication in spreading evaluation findings. IEP members also emphasized the importance of focusing dissemination efforts among stakeholders who demonstrate an interest in learning. IEP members and the Secretariat alike agreed that, due to turnover, movement and process change within organizations and the relevance of multiple findings to a given team, findings may also need to be communicated repeatedly.
- **Uptake of findings:** The IEP added that affected decision-makers, users and stakeholders should be identified, preferably in the ToR. The IEP emphasized that response to need is a key characteristic in learning and counseled flexibility and patience in how findings are applied, noting that recommendations may not always be taken up directly and immediately. The CELO emphasized the importance of mainstreaming follow up on learnings within existing systems.

## Action Points:

- ELO to take on the input received and develop a summary paper to be shared with IEP in 2024

## Day 2

### Update on 2023 Evaluations

This session included a summary of the Strategic Review 2023 (SR23) and Evaluation of the Allocation Methodology, highlighting learning and emerging issues relevant for future evaluations.

#### SR23

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Overall approach:** The IEP relayed the importance of respecting the SOPs but noted that this was the first evaluation for the new function and SOPs were being finalized in parallel. IEP Quality Assurance Focal Points acknowledged the need to balance their role in quality assurance with the possibility of further leveraging evaluation expertise.
- **Comments and consolidation:** The IEP acknowledged the huge volume of IEP and user group comments noting that the volume of these comments presents challenges and burdens evaluators. It is important for IEP members to consolidate or prioritize their own comments as an initial step. The User Group should do the same. It was noted however that the SR is probably the largest evaluation that cuts across the whole Secretariat with broad scope, the large number of reviewers may not be the case for future evaluations.
- **Case studies:** The number of case studies was large and has been complex to organize and needs to be carefully considered as an appropriate methodology for future evaluations. The IEP noted the importance of local consultants as partners in case studies, discussing with them what an evaluation seeks to accomplish and the role of case studies within it so that they can leverage local, contextual knowledge.

### Allocation Methodology Evaluation

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Overall approach:** The importance of providing enough time to evaluators during the planning/inception phase to gain familiarity with the Global Fund was raised.
- **Supplier relations:** The IEP called to attention the discrepancy between the team of premiere experts presented in the technical proposal and those representing the supplier in day-to-day communications on the evaluation. The Secretariat flagged that the supplier's quality of work was not lacking, but on occasion robust technical justification was missing from the outputs but this is expected to be present in the final report.
- **Survey:** The IEP inquired about the response rate to the survey administered to CCMs which on balance is low but then this is typical for such type of surveys. It is suggested to improve the response rate through direct communication from the GF to the CCMs to facilitate responses.
- **Supplier selection.** Need to be cautious when stating Knowledge of Global Fund as a criterion for evaluation implementer selection, as it contradicts the principle of broadening the scope of suppliers.

### Action Points:



- To consider how to address some of the SOP gaps for SR23 so focal points can opine on issues of both quality and independence.
- Final reports for both evaluations due in January 2024. IEP Commentaries will be required for both evaluations in February 2024.

## Imbizo Terms of Reference

This session focused on the proposed TORs for Imbizo<sup>1</sup>, highlighting revisions and updates since the IEP's first review of the TORs, with the aim of finalization.

The Secretariat outlined key updates to the TORs and that the objectives of Imbizo are to establish a regular, iterative and independent system that enables the Global Fund to solicit country stakeholder views on strategic, operational and technical topics, while communicating Global Fund response and action to this feedback. The CELO highlighted the uniqueness of Imbizo in the foundation and donor space.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Overall approach:** The IEP Chair noted that Imbizo would not be a standard evaluation, but an important opportunity for the Global Fund to learn in a cyclical fashion. The IEP Vice Chair added that Imbizo had been a long time in the making and would be one of the most complex IEP undertakings planned for 2024. The IEP raised concerns that mixed methods, complex processes and causality often lead to heterogeneous results that are averaged out, masking contextually specific issues, and one member recommended the methodology design section of the Imbizo Terms of Reference be revised to incorporate mixed-method recommendations from citizen engagement evaluations produced in the international community. The IEP Chair recommended that the ELO consider how value for money would be assessed for Imbizo to build the investment case..
- **Request for proposal (RFP):** The IEP asked about the RFP timeline, suggesting that it be extended in order to draw in additional people and organization. The IEP Chair asked if it would be possible to create mixing and matching across applicants in the RFP phase, which was confirmed by ELO.
- **Survey:** The IEP encouraged consideration of a system or campaign to increase response rate to surveys, which have low response rates despite country-level stakeholders asking to have a voice. The IEP Chair noted that it would be important to manage the expectations these stakeholders might have of Global Fund in response to their feedback.
- **Collaboration:** The IEP Vice Chair asked about the use of AI and possibility of collaborating with new partners, such as universities or other funders. The IEP encouraged consideration of data from other partner organizations in the field of citizen and stakeholder engagement.

Secretariat response:

- **Overall approach:** On value for money, the Secretariat flagged that each component will be individually costed, and outputs evaluated. During the discussions the Imbizo TOR were also revised to incorporate several of the methodology recommendations suggested by IEP members.

---

<sup>1</sup> Originally identified as EV3 Country-Steered Review.

- **RFP:** The Secretariat appreciated IEP feedback about the timeline for the RFP and shared that the RFP is already structured to give preference to consortium bidders.
- **Survey:** The Secretariat acknowledged the challenge in increasing response rates, which it would look at in collaboration with suppliers during the inception phase. The CELO shared that other parts of the Secretariat have already been invited to collaborate on and/or consolidate existing surveys to country level stakeholders through Imbizo, enhancing organizational efficiency.
- **Collaboration:** The Secretariat responded to IEP suggestions to collaborate, acknowledging the need to be clear on what can be delivered within the TORs. The Secretariat confirmed that natural language processing and machine learning were already being piloted to explore potential topic selection for deep dives, for which specific methodologies would be developed. The CELO agreed to look at other investors and actors upon receipt of initial findings.

Decision:

- The IEP voted to approve the decision points GF/IEP05/DP04 on the Imbizo Evaluation Terms of Reference.

### Action Points

- ELO to launch RFP following the meeting.

### IEP Commentary Format/Template

This session focused on determining a suitable template for the IEP Commentary and finalizing the approach and procedure for its development.

The IEP Chair presented the IEP Commentary template and associated procedure based on Board Reports and the IEP TORs. The IEP Chair clarified that the Commentary includes an assessment of quality and independence as well as implication analysis on evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Length and content:** The IEP noted that the TERG position papers were limited to 10 pages in length, and suggested keeping the IEP Commentary to an even shorter, readable length.
- **Learning and dissemination:** The IEP questioned the role of learning in the IEP Commentary, debating whether it would be premature and whether to move it to the IEP Annual Report; as an alternative, the IEP suggested commenting on the potential for learning rather than learning itself.
- **Scoring:** The IEP inquired how evaluations of poor quality would be handled in the IEP Commentary. Rather than sharing the Quality Assessment Framework score externally, the IEP Chair suggested sharing the evaluation category on the scale of “unsatisfactory” to “exceeds expectations”. : The Secretariat agreed with this approach and flagged potential legal risks when describing supplier performance.
- **Secretariat input:** Some IEP members suggested that the IEP Commentary be shared with the Secretariat for information rather than for comments or suggestions. However the Secretariat confirmed it would be at IEP’s discretion whether they take on board any of the feedback received.
- **Strategic and operational recommendations:** In addition to assessing evaluation quality and independence, the IEP mandate as described in the IEP ToR calls for "an implication analysis on the findings, and recommendations including key areas of policy, process and

implementation that require specific attention of the SC and/or Board"<sup>12</sup>. The SC Chair highlighted difficulties sometimes experienced in the past when receiving wide-ranging comments on evaluations. The IEP expressed its desire to fulfil its Board-defined mandate in a constructive fashion that builds on its competencies. As an external advisory body with strong expertise in evaluation but limited day-to-day knowledge of Global Fund operations, the IEP felt that its expertise would best suited to helping to critically interpret the strength and quality of the evidence underlying the key findings and recommendations emerging from an evaluation, so as to facilitate uptake by the SC and/or Board. Guidance to this effect will be included in the IEP Commentary Template,

#### Decision

- The IEP voted unanimously to approve the decision points GF/IEP05/DP02 on the Commentary Template.

#### Action Points

- IEP Chair will share the modified version reflecting the input received by 15 December 2023 with ELO/LGD and then with IEP for review.

#### IEP Rules and Procedures

This session was called to advance the IEP Rules and Procedures document closer to finalization through breakout sessions focused on specific areas of the document, followed by a group discussion. The topics of discussion included IEP decisions; conflict of interest, IEP Focal Point roles.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Conflict of interest:** Disclosing any personal connections, even passing ones, to avoid issues with objectivity was emphasized for IEP members. The IEP considered how to balance expertise and conflict of interest when working on evaluations within their specific professional domain. The redaction of commercially sensitive information by the Secretariat was noted, avoiding conflict of interest by IEP members.
- **Independence of an evaluation:** IEP members discussed the distinction of approving versus endorsing reports, with the unique difficulty of being asked to speak to both the quality and independence of an evaluation. The Secretariat reinforced that the SOPs outline the escalation mechanism for an evaluator who feels that their independence is compromised. The CELO recommended the development of a protocol on structural versus behavioral independence including access to information, data storage and anonymization of comments. The IEP Chair suggested that creation of an evaluation steering group composed of external independent experts, experts from partner organizations, and IEP quality assurance focal points is a best practice, as such a group accompanies the evaluation from start to end, strengthening evaluation quality, transparency, and oversight. However, this approach requires additional budget and workload.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Global Fund. Terms of Reference - Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP) (effective as of December 31, 2022). Geneva, Switzerland: The Global Fund; 2021.

- **Other IEP Decisions:** A decision on whether to approve or not approve TOR could be supported by a basic checklist. IEP members also commented that in order to recommend a workplan they should have information on budget.

#### Action Points:

- IEP members to send inputs from the group work to IEP Leadership by 27<sup>th</sup> Nov.
- IEP Leadership and ELO (and Ethics Office and LGD) to work further on the document before sending back to IEP for review.

### Expanding Evaluation Partnerships

The purpose of this session was to determine a set of common quick and long-term wins across the Global Fund, Global Financing Facility (GFF), Gavi and the Global Evaluation Initiative (GEI) to expand the marketplace of low- and middle-income country evaluation partners.

The IEP Chair and Vice Chair introduced this session to discuss quick wins in aligning for the greater benefit, noting the common concerns among attendees about how to influence positive change. The CELO shared that planned coordinated actions include exposing or addressing existing barriers, increasing diversity in the evaluation space, developing a common vision and working with partners to foster new and emerging talent.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Gavi:** The Gavi Evaluation and Learning Office shared progress at Gavi, which has developed further over the last year to be more proactive in reaching out and providing feedback to suppliers to broaden the supplier pool. The Chair of Gavi's Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) encouraged the group to consider what success looks like in the short and medium term, actively tracking progress.
- **GFF:** The GFF representative flagged that the central anchoring point of GFF's research strategy is to strengthen country leadership and evaluation capacity at country level, specifically through the development of costed and prioritized investment cases that rigorously assess needs, gaps, equity, gender and take stock of resources available from development partners.
- **GEI:** The GEI representative shared that GEI seeks to strengthen evaluation capacity by delivering diagnostic support to lead to stronger evaluation systems. He highlighted GEI's creation of a global database of evaluators, noting the challenge of qualifying what and who an evaluator is. The IEP encouraged Global Fund involvement at GEI's gLocal activities, which the CELO said Global Fund would engage in 2024, to make sure that Global Fund evaluations reach a broader audience.
- **Across institutions:** IEP members flagged the importance of making collaboration sustainable and institutionalized, and highlighted the key issue of who decides what to evaluate, in addition to who is considered an evaluator. The IEP suggested that global institutions intentionally bring in established or emerging evaluators from implementer countries to their events, which the Secretariat echoed as an opportunity for pooled collaboration. The Gavi EAC Chair encouraged the group to think about broader partnerships, including with university research programs. The IEP Chair highlighted webinars in disseminating knowledge about the institutions commissioning evaluations, suggesting these be accompanied by mentorship.

#### Action Points:

- All partners agreed to continue the collaboration meetings.

## Day 3

### 2024 Evaluation Scoping

This session solicited input on the scope of 2024 evaluation TORs, per the workplan approved by the SC and Board.

The Secretariat noted the high-level project planning done to date on scoping these four evaluations planned for 2024 and shared the projected timeline for each.

### Funding Request and Grant-Making Evaluation

The Secretariat presented the objectives for this evaluation, namely whether the existing processes lead to quality grants that drive achievement of the Global Fund strategy and the extent to which these processes are fit for purpose, adding the intended value.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **SC Input:** The SC Chair acknowledged the difficulty in separating effectiveness and efficiency and underscored the opportunity to look at value for money as an organizing principle as well as at the relationship between the application process and national strategic plans. The SC Chair also suggested looking into consultant-driven applications, the degree of TRP effectiveness, power dynamics in CCMs, the role of the private sector and transparency in grant-making.
- **Relevant Secretariat users:** Representatives of Access to Funding and Grant Portfolio Solutions and Support Departments shared their support of this evaluation and its projected utility in planning for Grant Cycle 8 (GC8), planning for which begins in July 2024. They also suggested looking at timeline challenges as well as the integration of disease and RSSH components in applications and planning.
- **Scope:** The IEP noted a similar evaluation recently conducted at Gavi with implications for country understanding, ownership and readiness. The IEP suggested looking into the role and influence of Global Fund Country Teams and civil society organizations across application and grant-making processes. The IEP and Secretariat agreed on the importance of looking at local systems, coherence and donors, with the Secretariat highlighting this pain point and the funding landscape table that tried to ease it.
- **National strategic plans:** IEP members with experience in national strategic plan development noted the challenge in timing this process well with Global Fund applications and collaboration with other development organizations. The Secretariat emphasized that it does not impose a timeline onto national strategic plan development and that updated plans could be incorporated into Global Fund programs across the grant cycle.
- **Supplier and case selection:** The IEP recalled the earlier conversation across institutions around engaging evaluators from implementer countries and suggested intentionally mobilizing this approach for this evaluation. The IEP stressed the importance of case selection that considers causal leverage and influence.

### Malaria: Sub-National Tailoring of Malaria Interventions Evaluation

The Secretariat presented the overall objective of the evaluation as assessing the capacity and quality of sub-national data generation and its use in sub-national programming and decision-making. The Secretariat flagged concurrent work being done by partners on this subject which would feed into the evaluation TOR and data pool to avoid duplication. The CELO flagged the criticality of this evaluation in driving the achievement of programmatic objectives.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Scope:** The Malaria Team asked the IEP to consider the extent to which sub-national tailoring was being effectively promoted and tracked, sharing that the evaluation would look at both modeling and data coming out of routine collection systems. The IEP noted the opportunity for and differences between using sub-national tailoring across centralized or decentralized systems and at different levels within health systems. The IEP Vice Chair suggested looking at how data production and use for a subnational decision-making has evolved over the last years after TERG has conducted **Evaluation of Data-driven Decision Making (DDDM)** in 2022 jointly with OIG.
- **Collaboration with partners:** IEP Members flagged work being done in this area through the Strategic Information and Response Unit of WHO. The IEP stressed the importance of not duplicating partners' evaluation work and asked if the Global Fund would consider dropping the evaluation entirely in the event of sizable duplication.

### **Engagement of Communities in Global Processes and Community Systems Strengthening Evaluations**

The Secretariat shared the overall objective of the Engagement of Communities in Global Processes Evaluation, which is to evaluate the extent and quality of community engagement in Global Fund related processes, best practices, and levers that lead to success in community engagement.

The objective of the Community Systems Strengthening Evaluation is to assess the contribution of community-based organizations and community-led organizations to grant performance while assessing the challenges and success factors in strengthening these organizations and their level of contribution to resilient and sustainable systems for health.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Scope:** The Community, Rights and Gender Team highlighted these evaluations as being critical to the KPI framework and evaluating how and to what degree of success communities are navigating power relationships at country level. The IEP commended the potential for depth through separating these two evaluations, suggesting that both evaluations are looking at process. The IEP and Secretariat recognized the possibility of heterogenous results and that what works for one community may not for another. The IEP counseled keeping in mind the risk of respondent fatigue. The scope and evaluation questions of these evaluations may further be refined.
- **Collaboration with partners:** The CELO flagged that the Secretariat has been in touch with partners about their data on similar evaluations, using AI to consolidate this with existing Global Fund data to make room for primary data collection in 2024. The IEP recognized this area of work as a strength of the Global Fund and the Chief of Staff underscored the opportunity for evaluation findings to be used to encourage others to similarly prioritize communities.

### **Action Points**

- ELO to share draft of TOR for the Funding Request and Grant Making evaluation with IEP for review in the weeks following the meeting.
- IEP to receive TOR for the remaining 3 evaluations in 2024.

## IEP Annual Report Structure

This session's objective was to discuss the expected content and procedure for developing the IEP Annual Report. The Vice Chair commented that the proposed structure was built on the IEP TOR and expectations based on, but adapted from, the former evaluation function.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Scope and evaluation impact:** The IEP flagged the Annual Report as an opportunity to highlight implementation of evaluation recommendations, including impact on policy and decision-making, the tracking of which the Secretariat shared was in development. The CELO asked the IEP to keep in mind what reporting the ELO would be providing as a compliment to the IEP Annual Report, particularly in how IEP outputs are being picked up throughout day-to-day Secretariat work. The IEP Chair noted the importance of the IEP commenting on cross-organization learning opportunities and methodology in the report.
- **Sharing and enhancing processes:** The SC Chair advised the IEP to focus on the effectiveness of processes and ways of evaluating in supporting independent, quality evaluations. The IEP suggested a section on the following year's workplan and a high-level summary of quality assessment processes and outputs. The IEP Vice Chair suggested using the Annual Report as a mechanism to flag systemic or policy-related issues to enhance independence and/or quality of evaluation function within Global Fund.

Decision:

- The IEP voted unanimously to approve the decision points GF/IEP05/DP03 on the IEP Annual Report Structure.

## Action Points

- IEP Chair will share with the IEP the modified version reflecting the input received by 15 December 2023 with ELO/LGD and then with IEP for review.
- 

## Annual Planning for 2024

This session was aimed at reviewing the anticipated work across 2024, including the proposed schedule for IEP meetings and distribution of Focal Point roles across evaluations.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Meeting dates:** The IEP and Secretariat exchanged ideas on dates for 2024 IEP meetings to maximize IEP member attendance. It was also requested by IEP members that in-person meetings be 3 days in length. In order to be prepared for meetings and decisions, the IEP Chair also suggested including IEP pre-meetings at the start of IEP meetings. For in-person meetings - these should be half a day.



- **Focal Point roles:** IEP members provided input, finalized by the IEP Chairs and Secretariat, on the distribution of Focal Point roles across the 2024 evaluations, noting that some work would spill into early 2025. The IEP suggested adjustments to the timing of evaluation phases to avoid overlap.
- **Working efficiently:** The Secretariat agreed to share calendar invites for IEP meetings and Focal Point commitment milestones to ensure that IEP members set aside time appropriately. IEP members requested a more detailed calendar that does not just include final deliverable dates but also the milestones leading up to that.

### **Action Points**

- ELO to confirm meeting schedule soon after meeting.
- ELO to develop and share with IEP a detailed calendar with dates leading up to the decision/submission dates of documents.

### **Closed Executive Sessions**

The IEP met in executive session on Day 1 and Day 3 of the meeting. Records are deposited with the General Counsel in line with provisions of the Board and Committee Operating Procedures.

### **Closing**

The IEP Chair thanked the IEP Members, Secretariat and guests for a productive meeting, highlighting the progress made through IEP inputs, including the four decisions finalized. The IEP Chair underscored shared understanding on action points going forward. She informed the Secretariat that the IEP Executive Session had discussed how IEP's small discretionary time allotment should be used in 2024, and had agreed that the best use would be to support the evaluation function by contributing to the efforts of the ELO and other partners to develop equitable partnerships and engage emerging and existing evaluator talent in implementer countries.

The CELO expressed his appreciation for the IEP Chairs, SC Chair, Chief of Staff and the ELO and Secretariat teams. He noted the progress on administrative and operational matters, acknowledging the appetite across the IEP and Secretariat to shift focus to discussing evaluations.

## Annex 1: Agenda

Day 1: Tuesday 21 <sup>st</sup> November		
Time	Agenda Item and Objective	Purpose
9:00-9:30	Welcome Coffee	
9:30-10:15	<b>Opening</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome remarks, introductions, and declarations of Conflict of Interest</li> <li>Overview of meeting agenda and setting expectations</li> <li>CELO operational update</li> </ul>	Information
10:15-11:15	IEP Executive Session	
11:15-11:45	<b>Break</b>	
11:45-12:45	<b>Evaluation Function SOPs and Document Procedure</b> Objective: to go through the finalized documents for clarification and adoption.	Information
12:45-13:45	<b>Lunch</b>	
13:45-15:15	<b>Quality Assessment Framework.</b> Objective: to finalize the Quality Assurance framework for use for the first evaluation reports in 2024.	Decision
15:15-15:30	<b>Break</b>	
15:30-16:30	<b>Draft Evaluation Principles</b> Objective: to discuss and receive inputs on the Draft Evaluation Principles document prior to a final draft	Input
16:30-17:15	<b>Advancing Influence and Learning from Evaluation</b> Objective: To discuss and brainstorm with IEP ideas and approaches to strengthen follow-up, adaption and learning from evaluation evidence in 2024. ELO will share an initial proposition during the session.	Input

<b>Day 2: Wednesday 22nd November</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda Item and Objective</b>	
9:00-9:15	<b>Recap from Previous Day</b>	
9:15-10:00	<b>Update on 2023 Evaluations</b> Objective: to update all the IEP on the current status of the ongoing 2023 evaluations. Focus will be on SR 2023 and the Allocation Methodology Evaluation	Information
10:00 – 11:00	<b>Imbizo Terms of Reference</b> Objective: for IEP to approve the TOR following a presentation on how the TOR has been revised since the first IEP review and how comments have been addressed.	Decision
<b>11:00-11:20</b>	<b>Break</b>	
11:20-12:30	<b>IEP Commentary Format /Template</b> Objective: to determine a suitable template for the IEP Commentary and finalize the approach/procedure for development.	Decision
<b>12:30-13:30</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
13:30-15:30	<b>IEP Rules and Procedures</b> Objective: to advance to near finalisation the document. The session will include a brief introduction to the document followed by <b>breakout sessions</b> to focus in detail on specific areas of the document.	Discussion
15:30 – 15:45	<b>Break</b>	
15:45-17:00	<b>Expanding Evaluation Partnerships</b> Objective: Determine a set of common quick and long-term wins across our funds/initiatives to expand the marketplace of LMIC evaluation partners. Session with GFF, GAVI, and GEI guests to discuss efforts to expand evaluation partnerships. <i>Source doc: Evaluating global health initiatives to improve health equity</i>	Input

<b>Day 3: Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> November</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda Item and Objective</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
9:00-9:15	<b>Recap of previous day</b>	Information
9:15-10:30	<b>2024 Evaluation Scoping</b>	Input

	Objective: to input into the scope of the 2024 evaluations before ToR development. It is expected that the IEP members will have a chance to input into the draft ToR for the funding request. Discussion will also be around the ongoing scoping on the Malaria and the Community related evaluations.	
10:30 – 11:00	<b>Break</b>	
11:00-11:45	<b>IEP Annual Report Structure</b> Objective: to discuss the expected content for the report and procedure for developing the report	Input
11:45-12:45	<b>Annual Planning for 2024</b> Objective: to review the anticipated work across 2024 and proposed schedule for IEP meetings. Confirm Focal Points Roles.	Input
12:45-13:45	<b>Lunch</b>	
13:45-15:15	<b>IEP Executive Session</b>	
15:15-15:30	<b>Break</b>	
15:30-16:00	<b>Closing</b> Objective: to recap the decisions and actions and next steps from across the meeting.	

## Annex 2: Decisions

Decision Point	Decision Point Text	Voting Summary		
		For	Against	Abstain
GF/IEP05/DP01	<p>The Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP) express support for the Quality Assessment Framework tool presented in GF/IEP04/07b_Quality Assessment Framework.xls, and decides to delegate to the IEP Chair the finalization of the Framework tool, making the required edits to address the requests for clarifications expressed by the IEP.</p> <p>The IEP notes the Framework tool will be published on the Global Fund website pursuant to the Global Fund Document Policy of the Global Fund following confirmation by the IEP Chair that the clarifications above have been made.</p> <p>The IEP expects potential revisions to the tool will be considered following its application to evaluations in 2024.</p>	11		
GF/IEP05/DP02	<p>The Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP) express support for the IEP Commentary Template presented in GF/IEP05/08 and decides to delegate to the IEP Chair the finalization of the IEP Commentary Template, making the required edits to address the requests for clarifications expressed by the IEP.</p> <p>The IEP requests the IEP Chair to confirm to the IEP that the clarifications above have been made and share the final document.</p>	11		
GF/IEP05/DP03	<p>The Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP) expresses support for the IEP Annual Report Structure presented in GF/IEP05/12 and decides to delegate to the IEP Chair the finalization of the IEP Annual Report Structure, making the required edits to address the requests for clarifications expressed by the IEP.</p> <p>The IEP requests the IEP Chair to confirm to the IEP that the clarifications above have been made and share the final document.</p>	11		
GF/IEP05/DP04	The Independent Evaluation Panel notes:	10		01

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the decision of the Strategy Committee on the 2024 work plan and budget for the Independent Evaluation Function (GF/SC23/DP01), approving an evaluation of the engagement of communities in Global Fund processes (“Imbizo”); and</li><li>• its mandate to provide oversight in the form of quality assurance to individual evaluations at critical stages of the process through approval of the evaluation terms of reference.</li></ul> <p>The Independent Evaluation Panel approves the Terms of Reference for Imbizo as presented in GF/IEP05/06 and GF/IEP05/07 revision 1.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

## Annex 2: Document List

Title	Pre-Read Document #
CELO Operational Update	01
Evaluation SOPs	02
Evaluation Document Procedure	03
Draft Evaluation Principles	04
Update on 2023 Evaluations	05
Imbizo Terms of Reference	06 & 07
IEP Commentary Template	08
IEP Rules and Procedures	09
New Evaluation Partnerships Agenda	10
2024 Evaluation Scoping	11
IEP Annual Report Structure	12
IEP Meeting & Document Calendar 2024	13
Quality Assurance Framework	-
Advancing Influence and Learning from Evaluation	-

## Annex 3: Participant List

### Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP)

Mira Johri, Chair  
George Gotsadze, Vice Chair  
Abdallah Bchir  
Caroline Lynch  
Dede Watchiba  
Elilarasu Renganathan  
Evelyn Ansah  
Florenca Guerzovich  
Fred Carden  
Josephine Watera  
Mark Bardini (virtual)

### Strategy Committee

Julia Martin, Strategy Committee  
Chair/Representative (observer)

### Evaluation & Learning Office (ELO)

John Grove, Chief Evaluation & Learning  
Officer (IEP Ex-Officio)  
John Puvimanasinghe, Senior Specialist,  
Evaluation & Learning  
Jutta Hornig, Team Coordinator  
Marc Theuss, Specialist, Evaluation  
Michael Schroll, Senior Specialist, Evaluation &  
Learning  
Olga Varetska, Specialist, Evaluation  
Rhiannon James, Senior Specialist, Evaluation  
Partnerships  
Rita Benitez, Specialist, Learning &  
Dissemination  
Roy Mutandwa, Evaluation Specialist, C19RM  
Yana Daneva, Consultant

### Global Fund Secretariat

Katie Kampf, Chief of Staff (IEP Ex-Officio)  
Abigail Moreland, Head Grant Portfolio  
Solutions and Support  
Etienne Michaud, Chief Counsel, Legal &  
Governance Department  
Maximilian Mueller, Lead Governance  
Operations and Advisory Governance  
Silvio Martinelli, Head Access to Funding  
Department  
Molly Robertson, Senior Specialist Malaria  
David Traynor, Deputy Head Community,  
Rights & Gender Department  
Gavin Reid, Senior Technical Advisor,  
Community, Rights & Gender Department  
Hélène Cloet-Galibourg, Consultant, Ethics  
Office  
Cynthia Urusaro Imhof, Analyst, Ethics Office  
Rachel Pellet, Deputy Head Governance  
Pichaya Patanapongpibul, HR Business  
Partner

### External participants (virtual for session on day 3):

Dugan Fraser, Program Manager, Global  
Evaluation Initiative (GEI)  
Leslie Moreland, Senior Program Officer  
Evaluation & Learning, GAVI  
Peter Hansen, Head of Results and Learning,  
World Bank  
James Hargreaves, Chair, Evaluation  
Advisory Committee, GAVI  
  
Julia Bürgi, report writer