

Independent Evaluation Function

46th Board Meeting

GF/B46/05 revision 1
8-10 November 2021, *Virtual*

Board Decision

Purpose of the paper: This paper seeks Board approval on the revisions to core governance documents required to implement the Global Fund's new model for independent evaluation that have been recommended to the Board by both the Strategy Committee (SC) and the Ethics and Governance Committee (EGC). This model is derived from extensive consultations between the Secretariat, TERG, Strategy Committee Monitoring & Evaluation Working Group (SC M&E Working Group) and the SC.

Decision

Decision Point: GF/B46/DP06: Independent Evaluation Function

The Board notes the recommendation of the Strategy Committee and of the Ethics and Governance Committee, as set forth in GF/B46/05 rev1, with respect to the new independent evaluation model which shall replace the Technical Evaluation Reference Group ("TERG") and decides to approve the creation of the Independent Evaluation Panel, as described in GF/B46/05 rev1.

Accordingly, the Board:

- 1. Amends the Global Fund Bylaws, as set forth in Annex 1 of GF/B46/05 rev1, effective 31 December 2022;*
- 2. Amends the Charter of the Strategy Committee, as set forth in Annex 2 of GF/B46/05 rev1, effective 31 December 2022;*
- 3. Approves the Terms of Reference of the Independent Evaluation Panel ("IEP"), as set forth in Annex 3 of GF/B46/05 rev1 effective 31 December 2022, which will constitute one structure of the independent evaluation function previously held by the TERG, noting that approval of subsequent non-material modifications to this document are delegated to the Strategy Committee;*
- 4. Requests the Secretariat, under the oversight of the relevant standing Committees, to update any policies, relevant governance documents, charters, terms of reference, agreements or prior decisions needed to align with the documents approved under paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of this decision point and to manage the orderly transition between the Technical Evaluation Reference Group ("TERG") and the IEP;*
- 5. Requests the Strategy Committee, in fulfilling its oversight role over the independent evaluation function, to consider the effectiveness of the guidance and procedures developed to safeguard both the independence and the learning components of the evaluation function; and*
- 6. Decides to dissolve TERG following the transition period ending 31 December 2022 and instructs the Strategy Committee to develop and oversee transitional arrangement between the IEP and the TERG.*

Budgetary implications (included in, or additional to, OPEX budget)

Executive Summary

Context

- The Global Fund’s independent evaluation function is being transformed to improve and strengthen accountability, evidence-based decision making and greater learning from evaluation evidence.
- The need to strengthen the current evaluation function was identified by the findings from the Independent Assessment of the TERG (2019) and Review of Global Fund M&E Functions (2020).
- The new model proposed for independent evaluation function has the potential to address the “pain points” identified with the current approach and is unique to the Global Fund. The new model is based on insights from benchmarking how other organization approach independent evaluation and is the result of extensive consultations with key stakeholders.
- The new model will require changes to the structure of how independent evaluation is managed to how oversight of the quality and independence of the evaluation function is assured. The Strategy Committee (SC) recommended the creation of this new model at its 17th SC meeting in October 2021 and requested the Ethics and Governance Committee (EGC) to consider the corresponding changes to core governance documents at its 17th EGC meeting in October 2021, in accordance with the respective committee mandates.
- The SC and the EGC recommended to the Board the changes to relevant governance documents to enact the new model for consideration at the 46th Board meeting.
- Approval by the Board would enable transition to the new model over 2022 in advance of the next Strategy period.

Questions this paper addresses

- A. What is the new model for the independent evaluation function and why?
- B. What do we need to do next to progress?

Conclusions

- A. In the new model, the implementation of the evaluation function is a shared responsibility between Governance bodies and the Secretariat. Independent evaluation is delivered by two structures (1) a new evaluation function, to be established by the Secretariat in the Office of the Executive Director as the Evaluation Unit, responsible for executing the multi-year evaluation calendar approved by the Board; and (2) an Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP), an advisory group, independent from the Secretariat and accountable to the Board through the SC. The IEP provides assurance as to quality and independence of Global Fund evaluation activities and supports the Board and SC in fulfilling oversight responsibilities with respect to the independent evaluation function.

The new model is recommended as it addresses critical “pain points” identified from the reviews of the current evaluation model, particularly around fragmentation, relevance and learning. The new model also has a series of safeguards, to protect independence of the evaluation function,

and establishing checks and balances around its operations. The key safeguards are embedded in core governance documents.

- B. Should the Board approve the recommended decision, the immediate next step will be to recruit the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer (“CELO”) and begin the transition from TERG to IEP. The year 2022 will remain a transition year but the new entities in the new model should be established as soon as possible in order to develop the multi-year evaluation calendar in advance of the next Strategy period.

Input Sought

- The Board is requested to consider the new model for independent evaluation function as detailed in this paper and recommended by the SC and approve the revisions to core governance documents. The SC has recommended approval of the revision to the TERG Terms of Reference and their replacement by the IEP Terms of Reference, and the EGC has recommended the revisions to the Global Fund Bylaws and the Charter of the Strategy Committee.

Input Received

- The new model for independent evaluation function was prepared with input from the Board at its 45th meeting, and the SC from its 15th and 16th SC meetings in March and July 2021 respectively. Input was also received from the TERG, the Office of the Inspector General and the Secretariat.
- The final proposal for the new model was presented and discussed at the 17th SC meeting in October 2021. A summary of the discussion and input received is presented in Annex 5 for information.

Report

What is the need or opportunity?

1. The Global Funds needs a strong evaluation function to serve accountability and learning needs of its Governance bodies and Secretariat, as well as global and country level partners. There are known weaknesses and challenges with the current independent evaluation function. The Independent assessment of TERG (2019)¹ and review of M&E functions (2020)² identified the following as areas requiring improvement:
 - Coordination over all independent evaluation commissioned by the Global Fund to avoid the current fragmented approach;
 - Enhanced relevance and utility of evaluation aligned to decision-making processes in Strategy and grant making cycles;
 - Improved accountability and uptake of learning from evaluation alongside targeted dissemination of evaluation evidence to specific audiences including governance bodies and country level stakeholders;
 - Address the current unsustainable workload of TERG; and
 - Use TERG member evaluation expertise skills more effectively for assurance of quality and independence of evaluations.

2. Addressing the pain points of the current evaluation function is an opportunity to build a “best in class” evaluation model that provides independent and credible evaluation evidence which generates knowledge to drive program improvement and achieve greater impact of Global Fund investments. Independent evaluation in the new model serves the following purposes:
 - To inform learning and demonstrate accountability on performance as well as to provide assurance to the Board on programmatic progress or lack there off;
 - To complement other types of programmatic assurance tools where performance is challenging to measure through other means and requires both qualitative and quantitative input;
 - At the country level independent evaluation identifies lessons on how to accelerate and advance programmatic progress and provides a feedback mechanism between country level partners and the Secretariat and Governance bodies to identify and strengthen aspects of the Global Fund business model, operations, and policies to support achievement of results; and
 - At the enterprise level independent evaluation facilitates thematic and programmatic learning from across countries and/or regions to advance progress in critical and priority areas of the Strategy as well as identifying strengths and weaknesses of aspects of the Global Fund business model, operations, and policies in order to make adjustments where necessary.

¹ [GF/SC10/05](#)

² [GF/SC12/15](#)

3. Potential models for a new independent evaluation function were prepared by an independent senior M&E consultant. The models were informed by a benchmarking analyses of how other organizations working in the field of public health and development structure and provide oversight to their independent evaluation function. Evaluations and lessons were drawn upon where available to assess the strengths and weakness of the different approaches.
4. The different models were extensively discussed between the SC, the M&E Working Group³, the TERG and the Secretariat. The models were assessed against their potential to address the 'pain points' identified from the reviews of the current evaluation function, particularly around fragmentation, relevance and learning and also assessed against the degree to which independence of the evaluation could be protected. At the 16th SC, it was agreed that the Secretariat should pursue the model recommended by the SC M&E Working Group and provide more detail and clarity in key areas. Such clarifications were provided to the 17th SC meeting and satisfied the committee, which provided its approval of the model and the recommendation to the EGC and the Board regarding modifications to the core governance documents. The EGC considered the proposed changes and recommended to the Board for approval at its 17th meeting.

What do we propose to do and why?

What is the proposal?


5. The new model for the independent evaluation function is a shared responsibility between Global Fund Governance bodies and the Secretariat. Independent evaluation that comes under the scope of the independent evaluation function can be any of, but not limited to, the following types of evaluation:
 - **Strategic evaluations:** These evaluations are focused on the work of the Global Fund and implementation of its strategies. Strategic reviews (SR) such as the SR2020 which assess overall progress towards the Strategy goals and objectives and the operationalization and implementation of the Strategy.
 - **Thematic and programmatic evaluations:** These evaluations are focused on issues of strategic significance that contribute to achieving the objectives and sub-objectives of the Strategy with regard to development effectiveness and organizational performance. Thematic evaluations have a cross-cutting programmatic scope or address organization-wide issues intended to evaluate aspects of the Global Fund business model. They can also focus on specific initiatives i.e., Strategic initiatives or in specific programmatic areas in accordance with the M&E Framework when program outcomes are difficult to observe through other monitoring systems and tools and key performance indicators (KPIs). Evaluations can be both summative and formative and usually include learning from a number of countries and/or embedded country level evaluations.

³ Following the 13th SC, the SC arranged for a working group on M&E matters, with representation by the AFC and the EGC. The ME Working Group aimed to facilitate and feed input into:

- a. Near-term M&E discussions at the SC level, including options for Secretariat reviews of TERG recommendations and future of country-level evaluations.
- b. The longer-term development of the broader M&E framework, including the role of the independent evaluation function.

- **Country program evaluations:** The evaluation function may exceptionally and on a case-by-case basis conduct country program independent evaluation which assess progress of the entire or specific area of the national disease programs against results achieved. This would be in situations where, in the past cycle there was no country-led review managed through the grant and/or no plans/grant budget for the current cycle; or is a recommendation from previous program review(s), OIG audit or thematic evaluation, donor or partner on the need for an independent country evaluation commissioned by the Secretariat.
6. In the conduct of evaluation, the independent evaluation function will draw on learning, best practice and innovations in areas of evaluation methodology, evaluation management and the use of evaluations. Currently an appropriate approach and mechanism for conducting country level evaluation is being informed from learning from the External Evaluation of the Prospective Country Evaluations (GF/SC17/03A) and elsewhere. Options will be explored for a mechanism, that can be steered by implementing partners or an entity on their behalf, to facilitate their independent feedback channeled to the Secretariat and governance bodies to promote learning on how to better achieve the shared Global Fund partnership results, within a year.
 7. The Global Fund supports a spectrum of oversight and research activities that support an enabling environment for accountability and learning that inform the conduct of evaluation and their use (i.e., program reviews, audits, research and routine monitoring), however these activities are not considered as independent evaluations and are not within scope of the independent evaluation function. The M&E Framework being developed for the post-2022 Strategy will define the formal process for reporting and for synthesizing learning coming from all sources so that they complement and contribute to independent evaluation evidence.
 8. In the new model, independent evaluation is delivered by two structures (1) an Evaluation Unit, which is situated in the Office of the Executive Director (the “OED”) headed by the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer⁴ (2) an Independent Evaluation Panel (the “IEP”), an advisory group, independent from the Secretariat and accountable to the Board through the SC.

⁴ The Evaluation Unit is referred to as the “evaluation structure of the Secretariat” and the CELO as the “Head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat” in the governance documents and in the terms of reference for the Independent Evaluation Panel.



Proposed model of the independent evaluation function

9. The main responsibility of the Evaluation Unit is to execute all Global Fund independent evaluations as per a multi-year evaluation calendar approved by the Board, through the SC, and engage regularly across the Secretariat, with the SC and IEP as well as with global and country level partners at different stages of planning, implementation and dissemination of evaluation evidence. The Evaluation Unit will provide administrative support to the IEP to fulfil its effective functioning (noting there will no longer be a separate TERG Secretariat as in the current function).
10. The Evaluation Unit will be headed by the CELO. The CELO will be accountable for ensuring the effective operation of the Evaluation Unit and efficient and effective management of its budget and personnel under oversight of OED and the IEP. The SC, IEP and OED will take part in the recruitment panel for the CELO. For the first CELO recruitment, it is proposed the SC representative on the TERG fulfills that responsibility and the current TERG Chair in advance of the establishment of the IEP for future appointments. The performance assessments for CELO will be jointly conducted by the OED and IEP with input from SC. Reflecting inputs from the M&E Working Group, TERG and SC Leadership, the job description for the CELO was developed by the Secretariat to respond to the mandates of the Evaluation Unit and IEP. The job description was reviewed by the SC and is presented in Annex 4 of this paper for information. Any future material changes to the job description will subject to the oversight of the SC.
11. As renowned technical experts in the field of evaluation, the responsibility of the IEP is to provide quality and independent assurance to the Board over Global Fund independent evaluation activities. As a marked difference from the TERG mandate, the IEP will not be involved in the day-to-day management of evaluations, which will serve to safeguard its own independence over the evaluation process. Following the completion of each evaluation, the IEP will provide an assessment of quality and independent conduct of the evaluation and 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. This commentary is intended to be published alongside the evaluation.

12. The IEP, in its advisory capacity to the SC and Secretariat, and in its annual report to the Board, through the SC, the IEP recommends improvements to evaluation methodologies, procedures, quality-assurance mechanisms and safeguards for independence; and recommends innovative ways to strengthen conduct and use of evaluations, including improvements to knowledge-sharing and dissemination. The full terms of reference for the IEP are included in Annex 3 of this paper for approval by the Board. On the establishment of IEP, the current TERG shall be dissolved, with delegations to the Secretariat and the SC to manage transitional arrangements.
13. The SC is responsible for appointing the IEP members and its Chair. The SC will be provided with support by the Secretariat to conduct the IEP nomination and selection process, following similar existing selection processes, balancing independence and allowing for a streamlined process, funded through the evaluation function budget.
14. The SC will also recommend for approval to the Board the multi-year evaluation calendar, following its development by the CELO and endorsement by IEP. The SC will approve the annual workplan for evaluations and recommend the budget associated with the workplan as part of the regular OPEX process. The SC will have a delegated representative on the IEP as an ex-officio member. The Board and SC authorities indicated here are reflected accordingly in the Global Fund Bylaws (Annex 1) and the Charter of the SC (Annex 2).
15. The OED will be accountable for safeguarding the integrity and independence of the evaluation function within the Secretariat. It will ensure that the Evaluation Unit is sufficiently resourced and mandated in the Secretariat to fulfil its role. The OED will ensure the development and implementation of the management responses that are derived from evaluation findings and recommendations.
16. It is recognized that the new model has several layers of assurance and oversight which could result in operational bottlenecks and confusion on roles and responsibilities. To mitigate this risk, following the appointment of the CELO and IEP standard operating procedures (SoPs) will be developed to detail out the role of each stakeholder for different evaluation related procedures. The OED will ensure that SoPs are reviewed by the Evaluation Unit and IEP during the first 9 – 12 month period to confirm they are comprehensive and clear to all stakeholders and can be periodically reviewed thereafter.
17. Other Secretariat teams, OIG, TRP and global and country level partners also contribute to a coherent and effective evaluation function. The OED will ensure engagement of other stakeholders including integration of roles into the SoPs where relevant, engagement may entail some or all of the following:

- Systematic identification and timing of learning needs arising through routine monitoring, oversight activities and dialogue (considering other ongoing assurance/research activities and decision-making periods);
- Technical guidance to scope of evaluation questions, input to terms of references and review of inception and draft for technical and factual accuracy
- Facilitation of access to information, data, reports and links to key stakeholders as relevant for specific evaluations;
- Development of management responses and reporting on progress of management response implementation and update of learning;
- Supporting wider and targeted dissemination of evaluation evidence; and
- Integration and synthesis of evaluation evidence with information coming from other parts of the Global Fund M&E framework and programmatic assurance and oversight activities.

Why is this the proposal and what are the risks?

18. The new model is designed to deliver on learning; however, it is recognized that strengthening learning is a complex issue and requires an enabling organizational culture that goes beyond the evaluation function. The positioning of the Evaluation Unit in the OED is an important aspect of the model to ensure learning is driven from 'the top'. Learning from evaluation is also enhanced by the provision of evaluation results in forms that are usable by decision-makers, including, for example, communication tools tailored to specific audiences and their specific needs. The Evaluation Unit will have dedicated staff to lead this work, a role that does not exist in the current function. Dissemination plans will be put in place for all evaluations which identify and address the needs of the different users and audience. Priority audiences for all evaluations include the Board, country partners, and the Secretariat. The IEP is also mandated to advise and support wider learning and dissemination from evaluation evidence.
19. The new model is also designed to address the fragmentation issues and mitigate duplication. The Evaluation Unit will serve as a one stop shop for all independent evaluation. Through a coordinated process of identifying learning needs with input from Committees and Board, Secretariat teams, OIG, TRP, IEP and country level partners. The Evaluation Unit and IEP will determine which topics meet the criteria for independent evaluation ("evaluability"). The Evaluation Unit and IEP will also maintain contact with similar units in partner organizations to promote joint evaluation where possible and to ensure cross fertilization of learning.
20. The new model is designed to improve accountability of evaluation findings. An embedded Evaluation Unit in the Secretariat will enable a stronger link and insight to the operations and day-to-day business of the Global Fund to facilitate greater relevance and timing of evaluation findings. Relevant well-timed evaluation findings have greater propensity to lead to quality recommendations that facilitate the development of actionable management responses. The OED will be responsible for ensuring management responses are delivered within a determined deadline from the endorsement of the final evaluation report by the IEP (timeline to be determined as SOPs are developed). The management response should include specific, time-bound actions with clearly assigned responsibilities to implement them and discussed with broader stakeholders involved in the development of the ToR where relevant. As per current policy, OED will continue

to ensure management responses are presented to the SC, and will also include how learning will be taken forward over a longer time period where relevant for example with regard to future Strategic directions. The OED also has accountability for ensuring implementation of the management response. The Evaluation Unit will consolidate progress updates on actions against management responses and report to the Board and Committee as part of the annual report.

21. Finally, the reason this model is recommended is because, despite not being a structurally independent evaluation model there are a series of safeguards that can be applied to protect different aspects of independence. The Evaluation Unit, whilst positioned in the Secretariat under the OED, will be independent from the operational, policymaking, management and decision-making functions in the Secretariat. The dual reporting line of the CELO to the OED and IEP also serves to protect the CELO’s organizational independence from the Secretariat when necessary. The IEP is mandated to monitor and report on the effectiveness of the independent safeguards in its annual report to the Board.
22. The Evaluation Function will be part of the Global Fund's audit universe and subject to periodic review, based on OIG’s comprehensive risk assessment. The OIG has indicated it will initiate a review of the Evaluation Function and the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP) by not later than 31 December 2023, subject to approval of its proposed work plan by the Audit and Finance Committee. The review is expected to include the adequacy and effectiveness of the Evaluation Function and the IEP, with a particular focus on the measures to safeguard independence.
23. Potential risks to functional and behavioral independence and the safeguards put in place to mitigate these risks are described in the following table:

Evaluation Stage	Risks	Safeguard
Selection of topics	<p>Topics known to be challenging or problematic, or topics requested by Board for assurance needs are avoided.</p> <p>Input into workplan is not initiated or is dismissed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board, through the SC and following recommendation by the IEP, approves the evaluation multi-year calendar developed by the CELO, ensuring that the accountability and learning needs of governance bodies are included in the calendar. • The Evaluation Unit, under oversight of IEP and the SC, identifies learning needs with input from the Board, Secretariat teams, OIG, TRP and global and country level stakeholders to develop the multi-year evaluation calendar against agreed criteria for independent evaluation topics. • The SC approves the annual workplans developed by the CELO, following endorsement by the IEP, ensuring the Evaluation Unit is effectively executing the multi-year evaluation calendar.

<p>Managing and implementing of evaluations</p>	<p>Evaluations are conducted by GF staff.</p> <p>Evaluations are conducted by a small pool of consultants well known or close to the GF with little effort to ensure sufficient competition.</p> <p>ToRs/inception reports avoid evaluation questions of most interest to governance bodies. Risk that Secretariat staff influence or interfere in evaluation process and content of reports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All evaluations managed by the Evaluation Unit are conducted by independent firms or consultants selected through transparent and competitive selection, subject to the oversight of the IEP. • Each evaluation’s terms of reference are approved by the IEP. • The IEP reviews the inception draft and final reports with a focus on evaluation quality and independence – it will provide final endorsement on evaluation reports assuring evaluations are being conducted free from influence and bias. • Potential conflicts of interest are assessed prior to hiring of evaluation teams and reporting obligations to the Ethics Officer for conflict declaration and management are in place for both the CELO and the IEP, in line with practice for TRP members and Code of Conduct for Governance Officials. • The IEP also guides mitigation actions in cases of perceived potential risks related to independence in the conduct of the evaluation and escalates these issues to the SC as necessary. • The CELO maintains and enforces an escalation mechanism to the IEP should there be disagreements between the evaluators and the Secretariat.
<p>Publication of evaluations</p>	<p>Risk that not all evaluation reports and management responses are made public in a timely manner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All final evaluation reports, Secretariat management responses and commentaries by the IEP are expected to be published on the Global Fund website and shared with relevant stakeholders under the publication. This is captured requirements that those deliverables be prepared with a view to publication. The SC will need to approve a revised publication policy, in line with what was done previously for the work of the TERG, to fully operationalize this commitment to transparency.

What do we need to do next to progress and what are the next step?

24. The Board is requested to consider the new model for independent evaluation function and approve and approve the revisions to the Global Fund Bylaws and the Charter of the SC, as well as the new Terms of Reference for the IEP, replacing the TERG.

25. After Board approval, there will be a transition period to establish the new function with the following steps taken:
- Proceed with the recruitment of the CELO; and
 - With the current TERG leadership, initiate transition planning from the TERG to the new IEP
26. Once the CELO is recruited and the IEP is established, SoPs for the function will be developed. Examples of SoPs will include, but not be limited to:
- Identification of learning needs and selection and prioritization of evaluation topics;
 - Management and conduct of evaluation;
 - Management response development and follow-up; and
 - Learning and dissemination from evaluation evidence.
27. The SC will need to revise its TERG Document Procedure (GF/SC05/07) prior to the completion of the first evaluation report overseen by the IEP, in collaboration with the Secretariat, to correspond to the new evaluation model.
28. Moving in a timely manner on the CELO recruitment and establishment of the IEP is critical for ensuring operational aspects including SoPs are ready for going into 2023 with a multi-year evaluation calendar for next Strategy period. The SC will be updated on progress and will provide guidance during the transition process.

Recommendation

The Secretariat, the SC and the EGC recommend to the Board the approval of the Decision Point presented on page 2.

Annexes

The following items can be found in Annex:

- Annex 1: Amendment to Bylaws
- Annex 2: Amendment to the Charter of the Strategy Committee
- Annex 3: Terms of Reference of the Independent Evaluation Panel
- Annex 4: Job description for the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer
- Annex 5: Summary of Previous Committee Input
- Annex 6: Relevant Past Board Decisions
- Annex 7: Relevant Past Documents & Reference Materials

**BYLAWS OF THE GLOBAL FUND TO FIGHT AIDS,
TUBERCULOSIS & MALARIA¹**

¹ Approved by the Board on 28 January 2016 (GF/B34/EDP07) and amended by the Board on 14 November 2017 (GF/B38/DP05) [and on XX November 2021 \(GF/BXX/DPXX\)](#).

Article 1. Structure

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the “Global Fund”) is a multi-stakeholder international financing institution duly formed as a non-profit foundation under the laws of Switzerland and recognized as an international organization by various national governments. The Global Fund is governed by these Bylaws and the applicable provisions of Swiss law, is registered at the “Registre du Commerce” in Geneva, and operates under the supervision of the Federal Supervisory Board for Foundations (the “Supervisory Authority”).

Article 2. Purpose

The purpose of the Global Fund is to attract, leverage and invest additional resources to end the epidemics of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria to support attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals established by the United Nations.

Article 3. Headquarters

The Global Fund's headquarters is in the Canton of Geneva, Switzerland.

Article 4. Duration

The Global Fund shall remain in operation indefinitely.

Article 5. Governing, Administrative and Advisory Bodies

The governing, administrative and advisory bodies of the Global Fund are:

- the Partnership Forum;
- the Global Fund Board (the “Board”);
- the Committees of the Board;
- the Coordinating Group;
- the Secretariat;
- the Office of the Inspector General;
- the Technical Review Panel; and
- the ~~Technical Evaluation Reference Group~~ Independent Evaluation Panel.

Article 6. Partnership Forum

6.1 Purpose and Composition

The Partnership Forum is an ongoing process linked to the Global Fund Strategy providing persons and entities concerned about the prevention, care, treatment and eventual eradication of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, a forum to express their views on the Global Fund's policies and strategies.

Participation in the Forum shall be open to a wide range of stakeholders that actively support the Global Fund's objectives, including representatives of donors, multilateral development cooperation agencies, developed and developing countries, civil society, NGO and community based organizations, technical and research agencies, and the private sector.

6.2 Functions

The Partnership Forum will:

- Provide input into the development and implementation of the Global Fund strategic plan; and
- Provide an important and visible platform for debate, advocacy, continued fundraising, and inclusion of new partners for the development of the Global Fund strategic plan.

6.3 Frequency and Notice of Meetings

The Partnership Forum is an ongoing process of consultation that will be coordinated and convened as deemed appropriate by the committee charged with overseeing the development and implementation of the Global Fund's strategy.

Meetings of the Partnership Forum shall be convened by written notice from or on behalf of the Board.

Article 7. The Global Fund Board

7.1 Composition of the Board

The Board shall consist of twenty voting members and eight non-voting members. Each voting member shall have one vote.

Voting members of the Board shall consist of:

- Seven representatives from developing countries, one representative based on each of the six World Health Organization ("WHO") regions and one additional representative from Africa;
- Eight representatives from donors; and
- Five representatives from civil society and the private sector (one representative of a non-governmental organization ("NGO") from a developing country, one representative of an NGO from a developed country, one representative of the private sector, one representative of a private foundation, and one representative

of an NGO who is a person living with HIV/AIDS or from a community living with tuberculosis or malaria).

The eight ex-officio non-voting members of the Board shall consist of:

- The Board Chair;
- The Board Vice-Chair;
- One representative from the WHO;
- One representative from the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (“UNAIDS”);
- One representative from the Partners constituency;
- One representative from the trustee of the Global Fund;
- One representative of the public donors which are not part of a voting donor constituency but have each pledged a contribution of at least \$10 million in the current replenishment cycle; and
- The Executive Director of the Global Fund.

Members of the Board (“Board Members”) other than the Board Chair and Board Vice-Chair may each appoint one Alternate Member to serve in their stead, under policies and procedures determined by the Board.

7.2 Appointment of Board Members

Each group mentioned in Article 7.1 of these Bylaws will determine a process for selecting its Board representation, with reference to the minimum standards for selecting Board Members and Alternate Members that may be established from time to time by the Board. Except for the Board Chair and Board Vice-Chair who shall each act in their personal capacities, Board Members will serve as representatives of their constituencies. Board Members will serve on the Board for two years or such other term that the Board may determine. The Executive Director shall act in his or her capacity as chief executive officer of the Global Fund and will serve the Board for the duration of his or her term as Executive Director.

Other than the Executive Director, Board Chair and Board Vice-Chair, Board Members shall be deemed to act in their capacity as representatives of their respective governments, organizations, constituencies or other entities.

Subject to their respective representative roles, Board Members shall act in good faith in the best interests of the Global Fund in furtherance of its purpose.

7.3 Chair and Vice-Chair

Board Members will select the Board Chair and Board Vice-Chair, provided that the two positions will alternate every two years between the voting groups described in Article 7.6. The Board Chair and the Board Vice-Chair will each be elected for two-year terms and shall

serve until the appointment of their successors. In addition to chairing Board meetings, the Chair will also have an important advocacy, partnership and fund raising role.

Between Board meetings, the Board Chair and Board Vice-Chair, acting together, shall take action on behalf of the Board, which they consider must be taken urgently without recourse to other procedures as provided in the Bylaws or Operating Procedures of the Board and Committees of the Global Fund. In the event the Board Chair and Board Vice-Chair are unable to agree, the Board Chair shall take the decision. To the extent practical in the circumstances, the Board Chair and Board Vice-Chair shall take such action following consultation with the Coordinating Group.

Decisions taken between Board meetings shall be notified to the Board immediately, with an explanation of why such decision was deemed urgent. A full report on the decision shall be presented to the Board at its subsequent meeting.

7.4 Roles and Functions of the Board

The Board is the supreme governing body of the Global Fund. The Board shall exercise all powers required to carry out the purpose of the Global Fund, including the following core functions:

- i. Strategy Development:
 - Establish the strategies and initiatives of the Global Fund; and
 - Establish the principles that govern the grant-making activities of the Global Fund.
- ii. Governance Oversight:
 - Appoint Board and Committee leadership and Members;
 - Establish Board Committees as appropriate;
 - Establish overall principles and direction for the governing, administrative and advisory bodies of the Global Fund; and
 - Select, appoint, assess and, if necessary, replace the Executive Director and the Inspector General.
- iii. Commitment of Financial Resources:
 - Review and approve funding proposals;
 - Approve work plans and budgets for the governing, advisory and administrative bodies of the Global Fund; and
 - Approve the annual report and financial statements of the Global Fund.
- iv. Assessment of Organizational Performance:
 - Establish and oversee the framework for the monitoring and periodic performance and accountability assessment of activities supported by the Global Fund; and

- Establish and oversee the framework for the periodic assessment of the performance of governing, administrative and advisory bodies of the Global Fund.
- v. Risk Management:
- Establish and oversee the strategy for identifying and managing risks (including but not limited to financial, reputational, legal, regulatory, operational and strategic risks); and
 - Establish and oversee the risk-tolerance framework of the Global Fund.
- vi. Partnership Engagement, Resource Mobilization and Advocacy:
- Promote the active engagement of and collaboration with a wide and diverse range of partners;
 - Mobilize public and private sector donors to support the mission of the Global Fund; and
 - Promote the mission, principles and activities of the Global Fund.

7.5 Delegation of Board Authority

The Board may delegate its powers, except where governing law or these Bylaws may otherwise prohibit delegation. Powers delegated by the Board under this Article will, notwithstanding such delegation, be exercised under the authority and direction of the Board. The Board reserves and retains all powers not expressly delegated to any other governing, administrative or advisory body.

7.6 Operations

The Board shall meet as often as necessary but not less than twice per year.

A meeting of the Board shall be convened by written notification from the Board Chair or Board Vice-Chair.

The Board shall use best efforts to make all decisions by consensus. If all practical efforts by the Board and the Board Chair have not led to consensus, any member of the Board with voting privileges may call for a vote. In order to pass, motions require a two-thirds majority of those present of both: a) the group encompassing the eight donor seats, one private sector seat and one private foundation seat; and b) the group encompassing the seven developing country seats, the two NGO seats, and the representative of an NGO who is a person living with HIV/AIDS or from a community living with tuberculosis or malaria.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Board may decide to take action on a no-objection basis. On such basis, and subject to procedures set by the Board, a motion shall be deemed approved unless four Board Members of one of the voting groups described above objects to the motion, except that a motion not to make a funding commitment shall be deemed approved unless four Board Members of each of the voting groups described above object to the motion.

The Board may act by means of proxy letter, teleconference, e-mail or such other method of communication in which the votes of each Board Member may be recorded, subject to procedures determined by the Board. When acting on a no-objection basis by proxy, e-mail, or other mode of communication in which actual participation may not be verified, participation shall be deemed to have occurred provided that notice to Board Members of the action to be taken conforms to standards set by the Board.

All decisions of the Board will be recorded in minutes of the Board meetings, approved by the Board and provided to all voting and non-voting Board Members, and retained in the permanent records of the Global Fund.

7.7 Quorum

The Board may conduct business only when a majority of Board Members of each of the two voting groups defined in Article 7.6 and at least the Board Chair or Board Vice-Chair are present.

Article 8. Committees of the Board

8.1 Standing Committees of the Board

The Board shall have the following standing committees:

- the Strategy Committee;
- the Audit and Finance Committee; and
- the Ethics and Governance Committee.

The functions, composition and deliverables of each Committee shall be as set forth under its Charter, as approved and amended from time to time by the Board. The Board may establish such other committees as it deems necessary to carry out the business of the Board from time to time.

8.2 The Strategy Committee

The purpose of the Strategy Committee of the Board is to:

(i) provide oversight of the strategic direction of the Global Fund; and (ii) ensure the optimal impact and performance of its investments in health.

8.3 The Audit and Finance Committee

The purpose of the Audit and Finance Committee of the Board is to:

(i) provide oversight of the financial management of the Global Fund's resources; (ii) provide oversight of the internal and external audit, as well as investigation, functions of the Global Fund; and (iii) ensure optimal performance in the corporate and financial operations of the Global Fund.

8.4 The Ethics and Governance Committee

The purpose of the Ethics and Governance Committee of the Board is to oversee:

(i) adherence by the Global Fund and its stakeholders to appropriate standards of ethical behavior, as described in related Global Fund policies, codes and requirements; and (ii)

implementation of the procedures and operations related to the Global Fund's governance structure and its core governance functions.

Article 9. The Coordinating Group

The Board is supported by the Coordinating Group, comprised of the Board Chair and Board Vice-Chair and the Chair and Vice-Chair of each of the Committees of the Board. The Coordinating Group is responsible for ensuring coordination and collaboration between the Board and the Committees of the Board, including, among other areas of work, ensuring collaboration across the committees with respect to cross-cutting matters, including risk management and organizational performance, and any other responsibilities as may be directed by the Board. The purpose, functions, composition and deliverables of the Coordinating Group shall be as set forth under its Terms of Reference, as approved and amended from time to time by the Board.

Article 10. Secretariat

10.1 Composition

The Secretariat is responsible for managing the day-to-day operations of the Global Fund.

The Secretariat is headed by an Executive Director, who is selected by the Board based on merit, in a non-political, open and competitive manner. The Executive Director acts as the chief executive officer of the Global Fund and serves for a term of four years.

The Executive Director is responsible to the Board for the day-to-day management of the Global Fund, and for specific duties and responsibilities assigned to him or her by the Board.

Secretariat staff are selected by the Executive Director, under policies and procedures approved by the Board and/or its Committees for recruitment and selection of Global Fund staff.

10.2 Roles and Functions of the Secretariat

Within its responsibility for managing the day-to-day operations of the Global Fund, the Secretariat will undertake the following functions:

- organize the receipt and review of grant applications and negotiate and execute grant agreements;
- commission the Technical Review Panel and ensure the independence of the review process;
- coordinate the process for recommending members of the Technical Review Panel and other advisory group candidates to the Board;
- coordinate the preparation of issues papers and operational strategies for Board meetings and assist committees of the Board, their advisory and technical panels, and other support structures;
- implement the risk management strategy adopted by the Board;
- commission and supervise contracted work;

- support and guide partnerships and coordinate with relevant agencies;
- communicate the Board’s decisions to stakeholders;
- oversee the monitoring and evaluation process, as well as coordinate and support the independent evaluations of the Global Fund business model, investments and impact in collaboration with the Committee with powers duly delegated by the Board;
- support the Board in advocacy and resource mobilization;
- organize and prepare for meetings of the Partnership Forum; and
- organize translation and interpretation services.

Article 11. Office of the Inspector General

The Office of the Inspector General is responsible for providing the Board with independent and objective assurance over the design and effectiveness of the controls in place to manage the key risks impacting the Global Fund's programs and operations.

The Office of the Inspector General is an independent unit of the Global Fund, reporting directly to the Board, and is headed by an Inspector General, who is selected by the Board based on merit, in a non-political, open and competitive manner. The Inspector General reports directly to the Board through the Audit and Finance Committee.

The purpose and functions of the Office of the Inspector General shall be as set forth under its Charter and Terms of Reference, as approved and amended from time to time by the Board.

Article 12. Technical Review Panel

The Technical Review Panel (the “TRP”) is an independent, impartial team of experts appointed by the Board to guarantee the integrity and consistency of an open and transparent proposal review process. It reviews applications submitted for the Global Fund’s support, makes recommendations to the Board, and undertakes such other functions as may be directed by the Board. The purpose, functions and composition of the TRP shall be as set forth under its Terms of Reference, as approved and amended from time to time by the Board or a Committee with powers duly delegated by the Board.

Article 13. ~~Technical Evaluation Reference Group~~ Independent Evaluation Panel

The Independent Evaluation Panel ~~Technical Evaluation Reference Group~~ (the “IEP ~~TERG~~”) is an advisory body of the Global Fund, consisting of an independent experts in evaluation who are all institutionally independent from the Secretariat, Board, and Committees. ~~The and impartial team of IEP experts that provides assurance to the Global Fund b~~Board regarding the independence and the quality of evaluations ensures the independent evaluation of the Global Fund business model, investments and impact. ~~The TERG oversees such independent evaluations, makes recommendations to the Board, and undertakes such other functions as may be directed by the Board.~~ The purpose, functions and composition of the IEP ~~TERG~~ shall be as set forth under its Terms of Reference, as

approved and amended from time to time by the Board or a Committee with powers duly delegated by the Board.

Article 14. Audit

The Board or a Committee with powers duly delegated by the Board will select an external, independent auditor to annually audit the accounts of the Global Fund (the “Auditor”).

The Auditor shall deliver a written report of the audit findings to the Board or a Committee with powers duly delegated by the Board, which shall file it with the Supervisory Authority.

The fiscal year of the Global Fund shall be the calendar year.

Article 15. Account

Funds contributed to the Global Fund will be held in a trust account at The International Bank for the Reconstruction and Development (“World Bank”) and any other account as deemed appropriate by the Board.

Article 16. Vacancies

A vacancy in the office of Chair or Vice-Chair resulting from death, resignation, disqualification or any other reason shall be filled in the same manner in which the original holder of that office or position was appointed or selected. Individuals selected or appointed to fill vacant positions shall hold such positions for the unexpired term of their predecessor.

Article 17. Dissolution and Liquidation

In the event that the Global Fund is unable to continue its activities, the Board shall notify the Supervisory Authority.

The Global Fund may be dissolved in accordance with Articles 88 and 89 of the Swiss Civil Code. The Board shall carry out the liquidation unless it designates another party to act as a liquidator.

In the event of liquidation, the assets of the Global Fund shall be returned to the donors to be applied to similar objectives to those of the Global Fund.

The dissolution of the Global Fund shall only be carried out with the consent of the Supervisory Authority and based on a written report which sets out justification for the dissolution.

Article 18. Amendment

These Bylaws may be amended by the Board at any time.

Article 19. Entry Into Force

These Bylaws shall enter into force after their approval by the Board and the Supervisory Authority.

Annex 2 – Amendment to the Strategy Committee Charter

CHARTER OF THE STRATEGY COMMITTEE

~~14~~XX November ~~2019~~²⁰²¹¹

¹ As approved by the Board on 28 January 2016 (GF/B34/EDP07) and amended on 13 June 2018 (GF/B39/EDP02) ~~and, on 14 November (GF/B42/DP06). Amendments of 14_ and on XX November enter into force upon the expiry of the 2018-2020 term of the SC in May 2020-2021 (GF/B46/DPXX).~~

A. Purpose

1. The purpose of the Strategy Committee (the “Committee”) of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the “Global Fund”) is to (i) provide oversight of the strategic direction of the Global Fund; and (ii) ensure the optimal impact and performance of its investments in health.

B. Functions

2. The Board has delegated its authority to the Committee to exercise the following powers and perform the following functions.

Decision-Making Powers

- 2.1 The Committee shall exercise the following decision-making powers:

- a. Approval of and/or modifications to frameworks for the implementation of strategic funding policies and initiatives adopted by the Board, including reprogramming of grant programs and funding in order to align investment decisions with strategic funding policies and optimize operational impact.
- b. Approval of and/or modification to the Terms of Reference for the Technical Review Panel (the “TRP”) and ~~Technical~~ the Independent Evaluation Reference Group Panel (the “~~TERG~~IEP”), or any other advisory bodies of the Global Fund under the oversight of the Committee, in accordance with the Board-approved mandate for such bodies.
- c. Appointment and removal of members to the TRP and ~~TERG~~IEP, or any advisory bodies of the Global Fund under the oversight of the Committee.
- d. Joint recruitment of the head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat, with the IEP and the Executive Director of the Global Fund.
- e. Approval of the strategic priorities, guidelines, evaluation criteria, processes, work plan and procedures of the TRP and ~~TERG~~IEP.
- f. Approval of the strategic priorities and the annual work plan for the evaluation structure of the Secretariat, considering IEP advice.

Advisory Functions

- 2.2 The Committee shall advise and make recommendations to the Board on the following:
 - a. Key performance indicators—methodology and targets—to assess the Global Fund’s performance with respect to the strategy and grant portfolio.
 - b. Development and review of the institutional strategy of the Global Fund.
 - c. Modifications to the Board-approved policies governing the grant portfolio operations and other strategic initiatives of the Global Fund, based upon assessment of the performance of the Global Fund’s grant portfolio and

initiatives, and taking into consideration advice and recommendations received from the other Standing Committees of the Board.

- d. Modifications to Board-approved strategic funding policies and initiatives.

- e. Strategies for enhancing investment impact and value for money, taking into consideration issues such as epidemiological trends, technological developments, and market-shaping interventions.
- f. Adoption of, and modifications to, strategic policies on market dynamics matters such as market-shaping interventions and the sourcing of quality-assured pharmaceuticals, devices and other health products.
- g. Modifications to Board-approved funding policies on eligibility, prioritization and counterpart financing.
- h. Material modifications to the mandate of the TRP, [TERGIEP](#) or any other advisory bodies of the Global Fund under the Committee's oversight.
- i. Areas of risk that affect strategic objectives, goals and targets or other risk matters assigned by the Coordinating Group.

j. [Adoption of and modification to the multi-year evaluation calendar.](#)

[Actions to be taken in relation to the IEP's annual report and associated recommendations.](#)

Oversight Functions

2.3 The Committee shall have responsibility for oversight and review in the following areas:

- a. The implementation of the strategy through the grant portfolio and related initiatives of the Global Fund, making use of assessments based upon relevant key performance indicators adopted by the Board, internal and external evaluations, reports of the advisory bodies of the Global Fund, and the advice and recommendations of the other Standing Committees of the Board.
- b. Oversight of the TRP, [TERGIEP](#) and other advisory bodies of the Global Fund designated as being under the oversight of the Committee, including review of evaluations, [commentaries](#), and recommendations of such bodies, and annual performance assessments of such bodies in accordance with the performance assessment framework adopted by the Board.

c. [Adoption of, or modifications to, the job description of the head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat, acknowledging that the Secretariat may make non-material modifications to the job description in the due course of its operations.](#)

e.d. The implementation of the strategic policies of the Global Fund, taking into consideration issues such as changes in the disease landscape, forecasted demand for Global Fund financing, and the overarching principles, objectives and enablers of the institutional strategy.

d.e. The overall impact and effectiveness of Global Fund investments in health, including its market-shaping strategy, partnerships and strategic funding decisions.

e.f. ~~Developments and trends in the disease landscape, taking into consideration issues such as epidemiological trends and the activities of partner~~

organizations.

for example, forecasted demand for Global Fund financing, based upon epidemiological trends and analyses presented by partners, advisory bodies of the Global Fund and the Secretariat.

- g.h. Identification and analysis of risk implications of the strategic policies and initiatives of the Global Fund, which may impact its strategic objectives and investments, and implementation of related mitigation measures.
- i. Outcome of the work of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat, including a) its contribution to learning within the Secretariat and b) inputting in the performance assessment processes of the head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat.
- j. The appropriate allocation of resources to the evaluation structure of the Secretariat, in accordance with the strategic priorities and work plan of the IEP and the evaluation structure of the Secretariat, for proposed inclusion in the operating expenses budget recommended by the Audit and Finance Committee to the Board.

C. Composition

3. The Committee shall be comprised of the following members:²
 - a. Six voting representatives of constituencies from the implementer group;³
 - b. Six voting representatives of the constituencies from the donor group;⁴
 - c. One non-voting, neutral Chair;
 - d. One non-voting, neutral Vice-Chair;
 - e. Three representatives of the non-voting, ex-officio members of the Board, each acting in a non-voting, ex-officio capacity; ~~and~~
 - f. The Chair of the Technical Review Panel, acting in a non-voting, ex officio capacity; ~~and~~
 - g. The Chair of the ~~Technical Evaluation and Reference Group IEP~~, acting in a non-voting, ex officio capacity.
4. Nomination and appointment of Committee Members shall be according to the Operating Procedures of the Board and Committees.
5. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee will alternate between individuals nominated by donor and implementer constituencies each term, provided that the Chairs of the Committee and the Audit and Finance Committee are selected from nominations by different constituency groups each term.
6. Committee Members shall have: (i) qualifications and expertise in senior positions in the key areas of work and mandate of the Committee; and (ii) the key competencies of committee members set forth in the Operating Procedures of the Board and Committees.

² The constituencies contained within the implementer group and donor group are identified based upon the description of the Board within the Bylaws (Article 7). The implementer group consists of the group encompassing the seven developing country seats, the two non-governmental organization seats, and the representative of a non- governmental organization who is a person living with HIV/AIDS or from a community living with tuberculosis or malaria. The donor group consists of the group encompassing the eight donor seats and the private foundation and private sector seats.

³ Pursuant to the Board's decision GF/B42/DPO6, this paragraph will enter into force upon the expiry of the term of the current Strategy Committee in May 2020. Until such date, the Committee shall be comprised of five voting representatives of constituencies from the implementer group.

⁴ Pursuant to the Board's decision GF/B42/DPO6, this paragraph will enter into force upon the expiry of the term of the current Strategy Committee in May 2020. Until such date, the Committee shall be comprised of five voting representatives of constituencies from the donor group.

D. Term of Office

7. Committee Members shall serve coinciding two-year terms, or until the appointment of their respective successors. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee shall serve coinciding two-year terms, or until the appointment of their respective successors.

E. Reporting and Communication

8. The Committee will develop its activity in accordance with the committee work methods outlined in the Operating Procedure of the Board and Committees.
9. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee shall interact regularly with and report to the Coordinating Group on the results of the Committee's deliberations, as well as any issues relevant to its discussions.
10. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee shall prepare a report of its work after each committee meeting and submit a report summarizing the Committee's work for each meeting of the Board. The Committee may also prepare ad-hoc reports as requested by the Board and/or Coordinating Group, which may relate to the inter-sessional activities of the Committee and its members.

F. Rules of Procedure, Member Roles and Responsibilities

11. The rules of procedure of the Committee, including procedures for quorum and voting, and the roles and responsibilities of Committee Members and Committee Leadership shall be as set forth under the Operating Procedures and the Board and Committee Member Roles and Responsibilities, respectively.

G. Review of the Strategy Committee

12. The Committee and its members are held accountable by the Board. The Committee will undergo a performance self-assessment against its mandate based on the performance assessment framework approved by the Board.
13. This Charter may be amended from time to time by the Board.

Annex 3

Terms of Reference

Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP)¹

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP) is an advisory group, independent from the Secretariat and accountable to the Board through the Strategy Committee (SC), providing assurance of quality and independence over Global Fund independent evaluation activities to the Board. In its advisory role to the SC and Global Fund Secretariat, the IEP recommends improvements to evaluation methodologies, procedures and quality-assurance mechanisms; and recommends innovative ways to strengthen conduct and use of evaluations, including improvements to knowledge-sharing and dissemination. The IEP's work is intended to support cross organizational learning from evaluation conducted by other partners related to the Global Fund learning needs.
- 1.2 The IEP is empowered by the Board to undertake responsibilities outlined in these terms of reference.

2. Mandate

- 2.1 Acting pursuant to delegated authority from the Board, the IEP shall provide:
 - a. Oversight over the Secretariat's policies and guidelines regarding:
 - i. selection of evaluators to conduct evaluations and approaches to manage evaluator pools; and
 - ii. core evaluation procedures established and implemented by the Secretariat, including oversight of associated standard operating procedures, guiding norms and principles, and performance and quality standards for the conduct and management of evaluation.
 - b. Oversight in the form of quality assurance to individual evaluations at critical stages of the process through:

¹ Approved by the Board on XX November 2021 (GF/B46/DPXX)

- i. provision of advice on the scope and questions to inform development of evaluation terms of reference;
 - ii. approval of the evaluation terms of reference;
 - iii. review of the quality of inception and draft reports with a focus on evaluation quality and independence; and
 - iv. endorsement of the final evaluation report
- c. For each evaluation conducted by the Secretariat in accordance with its annual evaluation work plan a commentary will be presented to the SC that includes:
- i. an assessment of the quality and independence of the evaluation; and
 - ii. implication analysis on the findings, conclusions and recommendations including key areas of policy, process and implementation that have been identified through the evaluation that require specific attention of the SC and/or Board. The IEP commentaries will be posted on the Global Fund website alongside final evaluation reports and Secretariat management responses.
- d. . Coordinate with the evaluation structure of the Secretariat to provide input in the development of the multi-year evaluation calendar and the annual evaluation work plan.
- e. Review the multi-year evaluation calendar and the annual evaluation work plan prepared by the evaluation structure of the Secretariat and advise the SC regarding, respectively the SC's advice to the Board regarding approval, or the SC's approval. The advice of the IEP considers whether these documents:
- i. Identify learning and accountability needs across stakeholders; and
 - ii. Prioritize evaluation topics, with a focus on evaluability.
- f. On an ongoing basis, oversight of the implementation of the evaluation multi-year calendar and annual evaluation work plans by the evaluation structure of the Secretariat.
- g. An annual report to the Board through the SC including:
- i. an opinion on the independence, quality, capacity and working modalities of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat; and
 - ii. recommendations on improvements.
- h. Advise the Secretariat and the SC on the dissemination, communication and engagement with stakeholders in response to evaluation findings. Reviews and provides input to evaluation syntheses reports presented to the SC and Board.

3. Composition

Membership

- 3.1 The IEP is a group of experts in evaluation who are all institutionally independent from the Secretariat, Board, and Committees. Members serve in their personal capacities and will not represent their employers, governments or Global Fund partners organizations including the United Nations and its specialized agencies.
- 3.2 The selection of IEP members is guided by the following criteria: expertise, experience or knowledge of evaluation methodology including design and quality assurance, evaluation theory and qualitative and quantitative methods.
- 3.3 IEP members will collectively have a balance of skills, recent and relevant expertise, experience or knowledge, including, at a minimum, of the following: international development systems and functions: development of theories of change; HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria; gender; health systems in low and middle-income countries; procurement and supply chain management; community systems, human rights, political economy analysis and social determinants of health; understanding of the Global Fund's mission and strategy and how evaluations can help achieve them; ability to work in a team and reach a compromise to support IEP decisions and recommendations.
- 3.4 IEP members are required to participate in a program of induction, training, and familiarization with the work of the IEP and the Global Fund to enable members to keep abreast of current developments of the work of the IEP and leading practices.
- 3.5 The IEP is composed of no less than 7 and no more than 11 members, including the Chair. A representative of the SC, the head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat and the Executive Director, or their representatives, will be invited to participate in IEP meetings as ex officio members.
- 3.6 The Chair of the IEP is selected by the SC and normally serve for an initial term of 3 [three] years and shall be eligible to serve not more than two consecutive terms or 6 [six] years. The Chair shall:
 - a. Plan, lead and facilitate the conduct of meetings;
 - b. Facilitate and summarize discussions objectively and with clarity seeking to gain consensus and exert authority when necessary;
 - c. Ensure all IEP members appropriately contribute to deliberations and regularly participate in all meetings;
 - d. Collaborate with the Board Committee Chairs as appropriate;
 - e. Collaborate closely with the Office of the Executive Director (OED) and Secretariat on all matters relating to the oversight of the activities of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat;
 - f. Report to the Board on relevant and material matters as appropriate;

- g. Participate in and advise on the selection of IEP members in conjunction with the SC and the Board, including providing guidance on matters relating to the independence of candidates;
- h. Take part in the recruitment of the head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat jointly with the SC and the Executive Director of the Global Fund.
- i. Meet regularly with the head of the head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat; and
- j. Collaborate with the OED for the joint performance assessments of the head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat, with systematic input from the SC, in accordance with the applicable Global Fund human resources processes.

4. Ethics and conflicts of interest

- 4.1 IEP members are "Covered Individuals" as defined under the Policy on Conflict of Interest² and are subject to the Code of Conduct for Governance officials³.
- 4.2 IEP members shall uphold the integrity of the IEP and its independence and confidentiality requirements. IEP members must abide by the requirements of various policies and codes relevant to the IEP⁴. IEP members that have not complied with reporting requirements, as stipulated in these documents and signed confidentiality undertakings, shall not be eligible to participate in any activities until such requirements have been fulfilled.
- 4.3 Prior to each IEP meeting (in-person or virtual) and throughout their terms as IEP members, IEP members will be required to update the Declaration of Interest to disclose to the Ethics Officer and IEP Chair any and all actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest in relation to the evaluation conducted by the evaluation structure of the Secretariat and will recuse themselves, or may be required by the IEP Chair to recuse themselves, from review of particular evaluations or other IEP work in the event of an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest. The IEP Chair may consult with the Ethics Office on any conflict-of-interest situations when needed.
- 4.4 If an IEP member is considering taking new professional activities that may create a conflict of interest with the responsibilities on the IEP, they must disclose it to the IEP Chair, who may ask the IEP member to step down from the proposed professional activity, recuse themselves from certain IEP activities or any other mitigation measures that are defined by the IEP Chair if a conflict of interest is identified. The IEP Chair may seek advice from the Ethics Office in reaching such decision.

² https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/6016/core_ethicsandconflictinterest_policy_en.pdf, as amended from time to time

³ https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/4293/core_codeofethicalconductforgovernanceofficials_policy_en.pdf, (GF/B44/EDP16) as amended from time to time

⁴ The ethics policy framework relevant to the IEP include the following, as amended and updated from time to time: Ethics and Integrity Framework; Policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest for Global Fund Institutions; the Global Fund Policy to Combat Fraud and Corruption; Whistle-blowing Policy and the Code of Conduct for Governance Officials.

- 4.5 In case an IEP member's professional or personal activities should cause repeated and continuous conflicts of interest that would make it hard for the member to be effective in their IEP role and/or that would be hard to mitigate, the IEP member may be requested to step down from IEP membership. Such decisions would be made jointly by the SC Leadership in consultation with the Ethics Office, upon recommendation from the IEP Chair.
- 4.6 To ensure independence and avoid actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest during their terms of service on the IEP, IEP members shall observe a "cooling off" period of 2 [two years] after they have completed their service to the IEP, during which they are required to abstain from engaging in activities funded by Global Fund-supported programs or seek employment or business opportunities with the Global Fund.
- 4.7 The IEP Chair and Vice-Chair shall disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest they may have in writing to the Ethics Office for a decision. In view of their leadership roles, they may be subject to additional conflict of interest restrictions as determined by the Ethics Office.
- 4.8 In case of ambiguity or disagreement over the interpretation of the existing policies on ethics and conflict of interest, the matter will be referred to the Ethics Office by the IEP Chair or by the Secretariat, including by the head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat directly, for decision.
- 4.9 Conduct-related matters in relation to IEP members shall be raised to the Ethics Office and may be escalated to the Ethics and Governance Committee of the Board as provided by the Global Fund Code of Conduct for Governance Officials. The Ethics Office has the responsibility to undertake a preliminary assessment of potential ethical and integrity-related misconduct by Global Fund governance officials, determine if breaches to the Global Fund Code of Conduct for Governance Officials or the Policy on Ethics and Conflicts of Interest for Global Fund Institutions have occurred and advise the Ethics and Governance Committee of the Board as provided by the Policy on Ethics and Conflicts of Interest for Global Fund Institutions.

5. Recruitment and appointment

- 5.1 The recruitment of the IEP Chair and IEP members shall be managed by the SC with support from the Secretariat and input from the Executive Director and through an open, transparent, and criteria-based process.
- 5.2 A working group on IEP recruitment shall be constituted before IEP recruitment consisting of the following members: the SC Chair or Vice-Chair; the SC focal point to IEP; the IEP Chair; and the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer (non-voting).
- 5.3 The SC shall appoint IEP Chair and IEP members in accordance with the SC's Charter and voting procedures.

- 5.4 The IEP Chair self-selects one of its members to serve as Vice-Chair to assist the Chair and serve in the Chair's absence. To ensure continuity through a gradual, staggered expiration of IEP membership, the IEP Chair may extend the 3 [three]-year term of service of an IEP member up to a maximum of 3 [three] years, to allow for staggered transition of IEP members and effective carryover of institutional memory over time. All such extensions must be reported to the SC through regular reporting by the IEP Chair.

6. Working modalities

Meetings and activities

- 6.1 The IEP may set internal operating rules and procedures in line with these Terms of Reference, building on achievements and lessons learned.
- 6.2 The IEP will have three formal meetings per year including 2 in-person meeting of a 3-day duration and a remote meeting of one-day duration (e.g., potentially spread over 2 days given different time zones), scheduled in consideration of the governance calendar and evaluation work plan. Additional meetings may be scheduled if the need arises, as requested by the Chair. This amounts to a level of effort about 8 days per year for formal meetings. Additional days of up to 14 per year is estimated for remote activities depending on specific needs (e.g., review of documents). For the Chair, the total time commitment is estimated up to 50 days over the course of the calendar year.
- 6.3 With the support of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat, the IEP shall maintain other means of communication, including an electronic discussion group or video conferencing, to facilitate the exchange of views between in-person meetings. Arrangements will be made for regular access to relevant information on the Global Fund and its activities as well as activities related to evaluation as specified by the IEP.
- 6.4 IEP shall aim to make decisions by consensus. In the event, if consensus cannot be achieved, decisions shall be made by a 2/3 majority threshold with quorum considered achieved if over 50% of members are in attendance.
- 6.5 If an IEP member is unable to attend a scheduled meeting, they cannot designate a replacement. If an IEP member has two consecutive absences from IEP meetings, the Chair will discuss with SC members the validity of his/her continued involvement on the IEP.
- 6.6 In the event the Chair is unable to attend a scheduled meeting, the vice-Chair will lead the meeting.

- 6.7 All decisions of the IEP, including endorsement of evaluations and commentaries, will be recorded in minutes of the IEP meetings, approved by the IEP and provided to IEP members, and retained in the permanent records of the Global Fund.
- 6.8 Additional experts and resource persons may be invited to participate in meetings as the need arises and by approval of the IEP Chair. The IEP may also choose to have closed sessions, from time to time, during which any or all ex officio members can be excluded. Decisions taken in closed sessions will be recorded in the minutes of IEP meetings.

Honoraria

- 6.9 The eligibility and the amount of honorarium for IEP members shall be governed under the Honorarium Framework, effective at the time, and applicable delegations of authority.

Relations with Board and Committees

- 6.10 The IEP reports to the Board through the SC and is subject to oversight and regular assessment by the SC.
- 6.11 The IEP collaborates with the Board through the SC to identify evaluation needs with regards to design, implementation, and results of Global Fund's policies and programs and ensure timely communication of evaluation findings and recommendations to inform decision-making processes.
- 6.12 The IEP shall maintain open communication between SC members and the Board as appropriate.

IEP Attendance at Governance meetings

- 6.13 The Board Chair will extend a standing invitation to the IEP Chair to participate in Board meetings.
- 6.14 The IEP Chair participates in SC and Board meetings to present on the quality of evaluations; the independence, quality and capacity of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat and issues related to evaluation practice and implementation more broadly. The IEP Chair may also present additional commentary or analysis as they deem appropriate.
- 6.15 Where evaluation findings are being presented by the Secretariat to the SC or the Board, the IEP Chair is invited to comment including on a) the technical quality of the evaluation and b) the implications of the analysis of findings, recommendations and conclusions.

Relations with the Global Fund Secretariat

- 6.16 The primary focal point for the IEP is the head of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat. The Chair will also have regular and direct engagement with this focal point on matters relating to the performance of the evaluation structure of the Secretariat, technical or strategic issues, and any other issues arising in connection with the mandate of the IEP and the implementation of the evaluation work plan.
- 6.17 The evaluation structure of the Secretariat shall provide operational, administrative and logistical support to the IEP in the implementation of the IEP work including the review of documents, organization of meetings and preparing meeting minutes.
- 6.18 All communications of a technical nature from the IEP Chair and its members shall be coordinated with designated Secretariat focal points. The focal points shall:
- a. Ensure that the IEP receives required documents and information to perform their advisory and oversight role to the evaluation structure of the Secretariat;
 - b. Provide timely responses to enquiries of the IEP as well and ensure the cooperation of the Secretariat with the IEP;
 - c. Ensure the proper management of records of IEP meetings, and related publications in line with applicable policies; and
 - d. Communicate to the new IEP members the structure, and roles within, the evaluation structure of the Secretariat.
- 6.19 In order to promote efficiency, avoid duplication, and help ensure a positive working environment, productive working relationships should characterize the IEP's interactions with Global Fund staff; the external auditors; the Office of the Inspector General, and other governance officials and committees.

Annex 4

Job Description

Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer

Purpose of the job:

The Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer (CELO) is accountable for the performance of the Global Fund's newly established Evaluation Unit in its provision of independent evaluation to drive learning, accountability and assurance.

The CELO is responsible for the independence, objectivity, transparency, inclusivity, timeliness, relevance, and utility of independent evaluation, as well as managing the personnel, work plan and budget of the Evaluation Unit. The Global Fund evaluation function is a shared responsibility between the Global Fund Governance bodies and the Global Fund Secretariat. The Evaluation Unit is part of the Secretariat's Office of the Executive Director (OED). Technical and functional oversight to the Evaluation Unit, through the CELO is provided by a body of independent evaluation experts, the Independent Evaluation Advisory Panel (IEP), which reports to the Board through the Strategy Committee (SC).

The CELO interacts directly with Secretariat teams, Global Fund governance and advisory bodies, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), Technical Review Panel (TRP) as well as partners at the global, regional and country levels (e.g., communities, governments, civil society, donors, technical partners, private sector) to identify and prioritize learning and accountability needs and ensure timely communication of evaluation findings and recommendations to inform the decision making processes of the Global Fund.

Furthermore, the CELO ensures coordination and coherence with complementary monitoring, risk and assurance activities across the Secretariat as well as related work of external partners.

Appointment and Term:

The CELO is appointed for a term of six years, non-renewable, by joint decision of the SC, the IEP and the OED.

Key responsibilities:

The CELO will be accountable for ensuring the effective operation of the Evaluation Unit and efficient and effective management of its budget and personnel. Under oversight of OED and the IEP this will include:

- a. Planning and coordination
 - i. Identify and translate learning and accountability needs into a multi-year evaluation calendar translated into annual evaluation workplans for IEP endorsement and SC approval.
 - ii. Select, categorize and prioritize evaluation topics based on open and inclusive consultation, including implementer country feedback (e.g., government, communities, partners).
 - iii. Ensure scope and timing of evaluations and other work align with the learning and accountability needs they serve and are coordinated with other relevant or complementary functions or analysis (e.g., OIG, TRP, other Secretariat teams such as monitoring and risk, partner reviews) to ensure complementarity and avoid duplication.
 - iv. Establish and apply guidelines, norms, or standards for conducting and managing evaluations as well as assessing their performance and quality.
 - v. Develop and maintain standard operating procedures for all evaluation related procedures.
 - vi. Coordinate with partners (e.g., Gavi, GFF, OECD) and build networks to support joint evaluation, innovative approaches, and capacity development.
 - vii. Develops and keeps up to date a database of related activities supported by the Global Fund Secretariat and partners (e.g., country reviews, audits, global evaluations).
 - viii. Supports Secretariat staff to develop theories of change to underpin achievement of objectives.

- b. Management and implementation
 - i. For each evaluation, manage recruitment of independent evaluators through transparent and competitive selection, including the provision of onboarding/orientation, administrative, and logistical support to evaluators as well as access to relevant data, information, and informants.
 - ii. Coordinate meetings and workshops (including evaluation steering committees as required), to review reports at different stages of the evaluation process between relevant Secretariat teams, independent evaluators and the IEP.

- iii. Facilitate dialogue and coordination between relevant Secretariat and evaluation teams with respect to developing recommendations based on the evaluation findings (e.g. organizing workshops with Secretariat business owners and stakeholders).
- iv. Establish and enforce reporting and escalation mechanisms, in collaboration with the IEP, to enable the IEP to support the Secretariat and independent evaluators in areas of disagreements, as well as assess and advise on mitigating potential risks to independence throughout the evaluation lifecycle.
- v. Ensure that in case of ambiguity or disagreement over the interpretation of the existing policies on ethics and conflict of interest in relation to evaluation work, the matter is referred to the Ethics Office and the IEP Chair for decision.

c. Dissemination and learning

- i. Ensure timely publication of evaluations, management responses and IEP commentaries, as applicable, IEP in accordance with relevant disclosure policies.
- ii. Manage internal and external dissemination of evaluation evidence, lessons and follow-up actions timed and tailored to inform specific decisions, processes and audiences.
- iii. Facilitate integration of evaluation evidence, lessons and follow-up actions into strategic performance reporting in accordance with the M&E Framework.
- iv. Manage the synthesis of evaluation evidence and lessons from both levels (viz., enterprise, country) to provide continuous learning and improvement along strategy, policy, programmatic and operational lifecycles.
- v. Establish and execute a systematic approach to regularly monitor and report on the uptake of learning and implementation status of management responses.

d. Governance and IEP engagement

- i. Receive input from the Board, SC, IEP and other relevant stakeholders of evaluation topics for development of multi-year evaluation calendar and present plan for review by IEP and SC for approval by the Board.
- ii. Presents terms of reference and final reports for evaluations to the SC for review and input.
- iii. Submits an annual synthesis report to the SC, through the IEP, on recommendations and learnings from previous evaluations and through the OED on uptake of learnings and implementation of management responses.
- iv. Support all operations of the IEP including meeting preparation and execution, provision of relevant documents for review of request for proposals, inception, draft, and final reports. Support the IEP in the review of documents and preparation of reports, as requested.

- v. Seek technical, methodological, and quality-assurance advice and guidance from the IEP and incorporate such advice and guidance into the planning, coordination, and operations of the Evaluation Unit.
- vi. Support the IEP, as requested, in its preparation of its annual report to the Board

Performance and Reporting:

The CELO has an open channel of communication with both the Board, the SC, the IEP and the OED. Performance objective setting and performance assessments of the CELO will be jointly conducted by the IEP and the OED. The IEP shall seek input from the SC with respect to the performance evaluation.

Qualifications and Experience:

- Advanced University degree in public health, social science, or related field.
- At least 15 years of professional experience in evaluation at a progressive increasing level of management, with final position at an executive level.
- At least 8 years of professional experience in development at a field level and international level.
- Extensive technical and methodological knowledge of evaluation theory and practice including experience in applying quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods, participatory methods, mix methods, realist, and complex systems evaluations, and designing and leading overall evaluations.
- Expert level knowledge of global health, especially extensive knowledge of and experience in global development; HIV/AIDs, tuberculosis and malaria, and health systems strengthening.
- Extended experience in designing, implementing, and evaluating complex health interventions in low- and middle-income countries.
- Strong knowledge and experience in project management.
- Extended knowledge of the Global Fund and its partners, including on substantive and operational aspects.
- Demonstrated ability to lead and manage a cross cultural team and deliver results in a timely manner.
- Excellent written and oral communication and outreach skills.
- Ability to explain and communicate complex topics, including in relation to evaluation methods, to a range of stakeholders.
- Strong knowledge on addressing and integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation practice.

Annex 5 – Summary of Previous Committee Input

Extract from Draft Chair Notes of the 17th SC Meeting

Presentation

1. The SC Vice-Chair expressed appreciation for the extensive collaboration between the SC, M&E Working Group (M&E WG), the TERG, the OIG and the Secretariat which has resulted in the proposal for a new model of independent evaluation which is unique and specifically tailored for the Global Fund with good potential to address the pain points identified in the current system.
2. The Secretariat echoed the Vice Chair comments recognizing the strong and effective collaboration. The Secretariat thanked the SC for its guidance and input and provided further clarification to the comments and questions raised in constituency statements. Some key clarifications included:
 - a. The name of the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP) was adopted over the former proposal (Evaluation Advisory Panel) as the IEP is envisaged to have a larger role than just advisory.
 - b. Technical oversight to the Evaluation Unit will be provided by the IEP. The OED will not oversee the IEP but has an oversight role to ensure the Evaluation Unit is fully supported and staffed and to drive the relevance, timing, utility and follow-up to findings and recommendations coming from evaluation.
 - c. It was clarified that the SC will recommend the multi-year evaluation calendar for Board approval and will approve the annual evaluation work plan ensuring the SC is in a strong position in making sure critical evaluation topics that support Governance accountability and learning needs are addressed.
 - d. It was emphasized that country level stakeholders voice and engagement is core to the new model. In response to the request for an independent mechanism for implementers to provide feedback on their experience with the Global Fund, it was noted that discussions will take place with the TERG on exploring such a mechanism and this will be reflected in the decision paper that goes to the Board.
 - e. Prior to the Board, the Secretariat will engage with TERG leadership to begin work around the transition plan for establishing the IEP in 2022. If the decision is approved by the Board, the Secretariat will launch the search and recruitment of the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer (CELO).
3. The new model will need to be supported by changes to the Bylaws and Strategy Committee charter, which require an EGC recommendation to the Board for approval. The EGC Chair was present at the session and reported that the EGC has discussed the new model during its 17th meeting and expressed support of the proposal. Any changes to the TERG Terms of Reference, such as the adoption of the IEP Terms of Reference, are recommended by the SC to the Board for approval.
4. The Inspector General (IG) expressed appreciation for the work undertaken and for the good collaboration and noted the considerable evolution of the proposal. The IG

highlighted several aspects around the safeguards for independence and establishment of IEP where the SC and OED will need to provide particular attention and clarity to enable the success of the model. In terms of the role of OIG, it was clarified that the OIG would commence a review of the new model no later than 31 December 2023. The focus of the review will be on adequacy/ effectiveness of the Evaluation Unit & the IEP, with particular focus on the measures taken to safeguard independence. This will also be noted in the updated version of the decision paper that will go to the 46th Board meeting.

SC Discussion

5. The SC commended the SC M&E Working Group and the Secretariat on the work done and noted that the new model is a significant improvement from the current evaluation model.
6. Overall, SC members were appreciative of the comments from the IG and endorsed the timeline for the first OIG review and noted the importance of ensuring that any learnings regarding the new structure are fed back in a timely manner.
7. Requests for clarifications were raised with respect to the nature of IEP recommendations, resolving conflicts of interest, coordination between the IEP and OIG and the term length of the IEP Chair and the CELO. The SC also emphasized the need for a well-planned transition and appointment of experienced evaluators within the IEP.
8. On the collaboration between OIG, IEP and CELO, the SC M&E Working Group Chair clarified that the M&E Framework, which is currently under preparation, will look at how the different parts of the institution will coordinate and collaborate. The IG added that the TERG and the OIG have collaborated in the past and that this will be more enhanced with the establishment of the new evaluation function within the Secretariat.
9. The SC fully endorsed the proposed model for independent evaluation for Board approval in November 2021 (46th Board Meeting).

Secretariat Response

10. The Secretariat thanked the SC members for their support and comments and reassured members that many of the issues raised will be taken up and clarified during the operationalization of the new model and development of the Standard Operating Procedures which is the next stage following recruitment of the CELO. Following the SC meeting the Secretariat will start discussing transition arrangements with TERG leadership.
11. The Secretariat clarified that the term of the IEP Chair is 3 years with the ability to extend for 3 more and that the term for the CELO is 6 years (non-renewable). Terms of Reference of both IEP and CELO explicitly describe management of Conflict of Interest. The Secretariat agreed on the need to ensure a high caliber of evaluation experts of high caliber for the IEP.

Annex 6 – Relevant Past Board Decisions

Decision	Context
Revisions to the selection process of the members of the Board Standing Committees and to the Charters of the Board Standing Committees (November 2019) GF/B42/DP06 ⁵	Previous revision of the Charter of the Strategy Committee. The SC Charter also delegates to the SC the authority to make non-material changes to the TERG Terms of Reference.
Integration of Additional Public Donors into the Global Fund Governance Structure and Amendment of the Global Fund Bylaws (November 2017) GF/B38/DP05 ⁶	Previous revision to the Global Fund Bylaws

Annex 7 – Relevant Past Documents & Reference Materials

- (a) SC17 and EGC17 decisions from October 2021 regarding the Independent Evaluation Function, GF/SC17/DP04; GF/EGC17/EDP01
- (b) *Independent Evaluation Function*, [GF/SC17/16 Rev 2](#)
- (c) *Update on M&E Matters*, [GF/B45/15](#)
- (d) *M&E Update: Recommended Model for strengthening the Independent Evaluation Function*, [GF/SC16/05](#)
- (e) *Update on M&E Matters*, [GF/SC15/07](#)
- (f) *Global Fund Oversight, Accountability and Learning Focus on Global Fund M&E*, [GF/SC12/15](#)
- (g) *Independent Assessment of the TERG*, [GF/SC10/05](#)
- (h) *Approval of Revised Terms of Reference of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group*, [GF/SC01/DP02](#)

⁵ <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b42-dp06/>

⁶ <https://www.theglobalfund.org/board-decisions/b38-dp05/>