

Eleventh Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel

Summary Notes

4-6 June 2025

Virtual meeting

Purpose

This document presents the Report of the Eleventh Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP), held virtually from 4 to 6 June 2025.

Agenda items. The meeting comprised six (6) agenda items, and two closed sessions.

Decisions. The Report includes a full record of the Decision Points adopted by the IEP at the 11th IEP meeting (Annex 1) and Decision Points adopted intersessionally (Annex 4).

Documents. A document list is attached to this report (Annex 2).

Participants. The participant list is attached to this report (Annex 3).

Action Items

- ELO to develop adjusted 2025 evaluation workplan considering IEP input (i.e. what can be done differently in the proposed evaluations and overall evaluation planning and management in alignment with the strategic imperative to think about value for investment in an adaptive scenario) for discussion at the 28th Strategy Committee.
- ELO will prepare an update reflecting IEP input for Strategy Committee discussion on the appropriateness of publishing a derivative learning product based on the Imbizo Global Online Survey and provide guidance on the way forward for Imbizo, including pausing Imbizo, at the 28th SC meeting in July 2025.
- ELO to ensure that once the evaluation on Community Response and System Strengthening is final, that learning and synergies from both community-related evaluations is cross-walked and synthesized along with related learning from other past evaluations.
- IEP to submit input on the Human Rights TORs to ELO in writing. Following SC discussion on the 2025 evaluation workplan in July 2025, the IEP may consider the TORs for approval via electronic decision point.
- ELO and IEP to advance on next steps of the ToR development for the Integrated People-Centered Quality Services Evaluation as per the Standard Operating Procedures. ELO to work with the Secretariat to spell out the causal logic between building blocks to guide the evaluation in terms of scope and approach.

Table of Contents

Purpose	2
Action Items	2
Report	4
Closed Executive Sessions	4
Opening	4
Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer - Operational Update	4
Final Report: Imbizo	6
Final Report: Community Engagement Evaluation	7
Terms of Reference: Human Rights Evaluation	8
Scoping: Integrated People-Centered Quality Services Evaluation	9
Scoping: End-term Evaluation of the COVID-19 Response Mechanism	11
Closing	12

Annex 1: Decisions	13
Annex 2: Document List	14
Annex 3: Participant List	15
Annex 4: Decisions taken intersessionally	16

Report

Closed Executive Sessions

The IEP met in two closed sessions on Day 1 of the meeting. Records are deposited with the General Counsel in line with provisions applicable to Closed sessions of the Committees in the Board and Committee Operating Procedures.

Opening

The IEP Chair opened the meeting by welcoming attendees and summarizing the agenda of the 11th IEP meeting. The new Strategy Committee (SC) Chair and Vice Chair were introduced, noting the SC Chair's past role in the Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG). The SC Leadership emphasized that there is an open door for IEP Members. The IEP Chair underscored the importance of SC Leadership's presence and ongoing relationship in making the IEP aware of other strategic discussions that can influence evaluation.

The IEP Chair requested disclosures of conflicts of interest from IEP Members. Several disclosures were made, one of which required an IEP Member to recuse themselves from a meeting session.

The IEP Chair provided updates from the 27th SC meeting in March 2025 and the 53rd Board meeting in May 2025. Both the SC and Board meeting included sessions on the IEP's annual report .

The Head of the Strategy and Policy Hub (SPH) provided additional strategic updates, emphasizing the unprecedentedness of the Global Fund reducing allocation amounts in the wake of the increased uncertainty regarding pledge conversion from major public donors in Grant Cycle 7. The Head of SPH shared that various functions within the Secretariat were adjusting 2025 workplans and called on the IEP to consider how evaluations are prioritized, what they focus on and how they contribute to the short-term needs of the Global Fund and the countries it serves.

Lastly, the Governance team provided an update of action points not attributable to the Evaluation and Learning Office (ELO) and their implementation status and noted that an action item tracker is available on the IEP TEAMS channel.

Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer - Operational Update

Presentation summary:

The Chief Evaluation & Learning Officer (CELO) provided an update on ELO operations, proposed adjustments to the 2025 evaluation workplan and early reflection on the 2026 evaluation workplan, as well as an update on action items from previous IEP meetings under ELO purview.

CELO provided an overview of the impact of the current context on implementing evaluations in 2025. A proposed risk mitigation plan for the 2025 workplan was shared that considered stakeholder burden resulting from the reprogramming linked to the reduction of allocation amounts and timing of evaluations. A set of principles were shared for guiding decisions on the adjustments. The IEP was informed that evaluations ongoing or beginning in 2024 are proceeding as initially planned with minor delays. The end-term evaluation of the COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM) was also proceeding as planned. Evaluations requiring adjustments to timing (separating

in two phases desk review and in-country work and delaying in country activities until reprogramming is completed) and scope included Gender Integration, HIV Prevention, Human Rights, Integrated People-centered Quality Services (IPCQS) and Imbizo. The Mid-term Review, planned for 2026, was also proposed to commence scoping in 2025, since it may incorporate elements of other evaluations previously scheduled as standalones.

The IEP received operational updates on ongoing evaluations as part of the meeting materials. The CELO provided insight into considerations for the 2026 evaluation plan and alerted IEP to the uncertainty on the amount of operational expenses and budget (OPEX) that will be allocated to the evaluation function. Preliminary evaluation scenarios prioritized for 2026 were shared with the IEP.

Discussion summary:

- **Evaluation strategy and prioritization for 2025:** IEP Members expressed concern that the proposed changes in evaluation approach may not be sufficient to ensure that the evaluation function adds value at this critical time of global change and questioned whether the topics included in multi-year evaluation calendar approved by the Board for the 2023-2028 period are still relevant, and how evaluation evidence can support decision-making to inform the GC7 reprogramming. Noting that the 2025 work plan adjustments would be further developed before SC consideration, some IEP members suggested a clearer articulation of what could be done differently in the proposed evaluations (rather than simply delaying implementation) and in overall evaluation planning and management to leverage the strategic value of evaluations. The IEP Vice Chair suggested exploring joint work with Gavi and other organizations, including research organizations. One IEP member said that they observe other evaluation functions making bigger changes; CELO welcomed examples and reflections on how other evaluation functions are adapting to continue delivering valuable evaluations in the current context. The CELO reinforced that the evaluation topics were approved, per the Global Fund Strategy, by the SC and cover specific topics that are relevant for the Strategy for which there is a gap in evaluative evidence. The IEP Chair invited, and the CELO welcomed, further conversation with the ELO and SC to reconsider the Multi-year Evaluation Calendar in the current context.
- **Resource constraints and budget flexibility for 2026:** The IEP Chair queried how the proposed reduction in evaluation budgets and subsequent number of evaluations for 2026 were calculated. The CELO clarified that evaluation budget reduction scenarios were indicative and emphasized the need for evaluations to remain relevant and offer value for money. Additionally, the CELO flagged the Mid-term Strategy Review as an opportunity to fold in other evaluation topics and for evaluations to leverage intersecting topics. The IEP Vice Chair suggested that ELO consider collaborating with partners on joint evaluations to increase efficiencies. The CELO noted ongoing conversations with partners, while being mindful that partners are facing similar disruptions. The IEP Chair asked what flexibility there is for rolling over budgets to subsequent years when an evaluation spans two years. The ELO flagged that the annual OPEX budget process does not allow for funds to be moved across years. The CELO also highlighted that the ELO budget is not ringfenced and is subject to the same potential cuts as other departments, and specifically within the Office of the Executive Director.
- **Methodological rigor and relevance:** One IEP Member asked how the ELO would ensure the methodological rigor in the current context given potential limitations in stakeholder availability and evolving program context. The CELO echoed this concern and affirmed the importance of timing and appropriate methodology.
- **Learning and dissemination:** The IEP Vice Chair stressed the importance of advancing the learning agenda in this current context, which the CELO agreed would remain a priority,

highlighting a recent Brown Bag on the Malaria Sub-national Tailoring Evaluation and specific plans for partner engagement and learning products on each evaluation.

- The SC Chair expressed appreciation for the opportunity to listen to the IEP and ELO's discussion to inform SC decision-making on evaluations.

Action items:

- ELO to develop adjusted 2025 evaluation workplan considering IEP input (i.e. what can be done differently in the proposed evaluations and overall evaluation planning and management in alignment with the strategic imperative to think about value for investment in an adaptive scenario) for discussion at the 28th Strategy Committee.

Final Report: Imbizo

Presentation summary:

ELO explained its position to not approve the final report of Imbizo due to quality concerns and presented proposed next steps. CELO highlighted that Imbizo was designed to be experimental, ongoing and an opportunity to learn. Despite not approving the final Imbizo report, CELO flagged the opportunity to focus on the elements of the feedback mechanism that were strong and offered value, and therefore proposed to develop a derivative learning product that summarizes the findings from the Global Online Survey to be made publicly available to country stakeholders.

The ELO shared a post-mortem analysis underlining Imbizo's strengths and limitations. Key strengths include a high survey response rate, inclusive stakeholder engagement, and that findings confirmed findings from other Secretariat feedback mechanisms. However, limitations were noted in the quality of analysis and reporting, over-engagement of stakeholders, and the inefficiency of natural language processing methods used for analysis.

ELO proposed next short- and long-term steps for IEP input ahead of planned discussion at the Strategy Committee in July 2025, including publishing a derivative learning product from the survey findings and pausing Imbizo for the remainder of 2025.

Discussion summary:

- **Quality and credibility:** The IEP expressed disappointment but was not surprised by the fact that the Imbizo final report was not of sufficient quality, as concerns were previously expressed by the IEP Quality Assurance Focal Points. The IEP Quality Assurance Focal Points for Imbizo agreed with the CELO decision not to publish the report due to quality concerns, although recognizing that the process still yielded important learnings regarding NLP use for evaluations and other stakeholder engagement aspects. Some IEP members raised specific concerns on the quality of the survey tool design, sampling, representativeness and reliability of results, including whether a 26% response rate could be considered good. ELO confirmed that survey questions underwent pre-testing, and that the response rate was sufficient and adequate given industry standards for this type of survey, although this was disputed by an IEP Member.
- **Process:** The IEP Chair was concerned as the IEP would not provide a Commentary and queried if IEP notes on the quality of the survey element would be helpful, which the CELO welcomed. One IEP Member highlighted the value of minority feedback as early warning signals and not necessarily outliers or statistical anomalies and also echoed ELO concerns

about the ability of NLP tools to enhance credibility and offer value for Imbizo. The IEP Quality Assurance Focal Points noted the high-quality work by the ELO to compensate for supplier performance shortcomings, pointing to a broader question about what elements of Imbizo should be internal vs. outsourced by the Global Fund. The IEP Vice Chair queried whether making more processes internal would compromise the independence of Imbizo and asked if learnings had been gathered by the IEP on Imbizo's process. An IEP member also proposed that ELO prepare a note for IEP with the learnings from Imbizo process and what could be done differently to improve quality and utility. In response to this, the CELO highlighted the post-mortem analysis on Imbizo that has already been conducted; this was presented in the pre-read for the session, although the IEP Chair expressed the view that, from the IEP's perspective, a more elaborate note of the learnings could be still helpful.

- **Publishing:** The IEP discussed whether it was appropriate to share the survey as a single element when Imbizo had initially been designed more holistically, while acknowledging that making its results public could be an important part of remaining accountable to the respondents for their contributions. IEP members expressed concerns with publishing a learning product based on findings from one element of a larger effort that was overall not deemed to be of good quality.
- **Future of Imbizo:** One IEP Member queried whether Imbizo would benefit from being revitalized in the current context and made part of the 2026 Evaluation Workplan. The CELO called attention to the ongoing reprioritization process of grants, which was demanding the attention of many key stakeholders, and which may also result in significant shifts among target stakeholders for future Imbizo work. One IEP Member suggested that future iterations of Imbizo seek to gather information on local ownership and sustainability, flagging these as persistent weaknesses in Global Fund programs. Another IEP member queried whether future iterations of Imbizo should sit with the ELO, given that it is a monitoring tool rather than an evaluation.
- **Learning and dissemination:** The IEP Chair asked about the role of the IEP in learning and dissemination, which the CELO shared was part of the Secretariat ELO function but subject to IEP oversight. The ELO affirmed its commitment to share findings from relevant evaluation elements through learning and dissemination – upholding commitment to country stakeholders – while holding on to ELO expectations for quality and methodological rigor.

Action items:

- ELO will prepare an update reflecting IEP input for Strategy Committee discussion on the appropriateness of publishing a derivative learning product based on the Imbizo Global Online Survey and provide guidance on the way forward for Imbizo, including pausing Imbizo, at the 28th SC meeting in July 2025.

Final Report: Community Engagement Evaluation

Presentation summary:

ELO presented the final Community Engagement (CE) evaluation report for IEP endorsement. The ELO presented their observations on several parts of the evaluation, including: lessons learned through the CE evaluation, specifically affirming the suitability of the realist evaluation approach for complex topics like CE; the significance of ensuring evaluators understand the Global Fund model; and the importance of carefully managed early secondary data review before final inception report approval.

Discussion summary:

- **Final report:** The IEP Quality Assessment Focal Points recommended endorsement of the final report. The Focal Points asked that the TORs and methodology of the inception report be annexes of the final report and questioned whether it was appropriate for all recommendations to target the Secretariat as the primary audience.
- **Process:** The IEP Quality Assurance Focal Points commended the ELO's well-organized work and transparency throughout the evaluation process. The Global Fund Community, Rights and Gender (CRG) representative flagged that most of the evaluation was completed before recent shifts in context and that the focus on certain pathways and the inclusion of diverse stakeholders at country level has led to more generic findings. The IEP Quality Assessment Focal Points cited the use of a theory of change for this evaluation as a positive aspect of this work and advocated for the use of theories of change for other evaluations that do not already have one.
- **Thematic overlap between Community Engagement (CE) and Community Response and Systems Strengthening (CRSS) evaluations:** The IEP Quality Assessment Focal Points queried whether sufficient coordination between the CE and CRSS evaluations had been done to avoid duplication and reveal reinforcing findings. The CELO affirmed that the evaluator teams for CE and CRSS had been in touch with one another and documents had been shared by the ELO, taking into account the need to avoid influencing or distracting one another as they are two separate activities and contracts.
- **Learning and dissemination:** As a more general point to all evaluations, the IEP Vice Chair asked the ELO about the possibility of tracking progress against evaluation recommendations and their uptake by the Global Fund Secretariat and establishing a system to track this data annually.

Action items:

- ELO to ensure that once the evaluation on Community Response and System Strengthening is final, that learning and synergies from both community-related evaluations is cross-walked and synthesized along with related learning from other past evaluations.

Decision:

- The IEP approved the decision to endorse the final report of the Evaluation of Community Engagement as reflected in GF/IEP11/DP01.

Terms of Reference: Human Rights Evaluation

Presentation summary:

ELO presented the proposed Terms of Reference (TORs) of the Human Rights Evaluation for IEP approval. Although as explained in the CELO operational update that this evaluation may not proceed in 2025, the CELO clarified that this topic remains a critical area for the Global Fund, and in the event that the Strategy Committee requested it to start in 2025, the TORs would be needed. CELO also noted that the evaluation has to be done during a period where quality and utility can be ensured. The ELO outlined how the proposed TORs address the primary areas of feedback provided by the IEP on the draft TORs and the corresponding changes made.

The evaluation's purpose is to assess the effectiveness and sustainability of the interventions supported by Global Fund investments in addressing human rights barriers in selected countries.

The evaluation will identify lessons learned to support the Global Fund partnership in prioritizing interventions and strengthening the sustainability of investments. The evaluation's objectives are to assess the effectiveness and sustainability of Global Fund-financed interventions on human rights. The evaluation approach is utilization-focused and theory-based, combining formative and summative elements while using a staged design to adapt to evolving global funding context.

Discussion summary:

- **Strategic relevance and timing:** The IEP queried the value of approving the TORs at this time if the evaluation will be postponed, noting that TORs may need to change if conducted at a later period and any rescoping should not happen at the inception phase. The CELO flagged that the postponement remains a possibility but is not certain and in the meantime, this evaluation remains on the calendar to be implemented as soon as feasible. The CELO confirmed that, per the Standard Operating Procedures, any material changes in the TORs after IEP approval would come back to the IEP for approval before proceeding. CRG representatives affirmed the value of this evaluation to inform decisions in reprioritizing grant funds, particularly given the maturity of Global Fund work on human rights.
- **Advocacy:** In response to IEP comments related to focus on advocacy in the evaluation scope, the CRG representatives affirmed that advocacy is in scope for this evaluation at the intervention level as it is part of the HIV and TB Modular Frameworks but noted that the Global Fund's diplomatic voice on human rights, at the global level, is out of scope for this evaluation.
- **Clarity:** IEP Focal Points indicated the need to review the TORs to make sure concepts are clear, encouraging language that is understandable even for those not familiar with Global Fund terminology.
- **Proposed approach:** The IEP Quality Assurance Focal Points for this evaluation commented that IEP feedback had only been addressed partially and had more feedback to provide to ELO. IEP agreed to submit written feedback. Once IEP comments are received, the ELO will update the draft TORs for the Human Rights evaluation for IEP consideration and approval.

Action items:

- IEP to submit input on the Human Rights TORs to ELO in writing. Following SC discussion on the 2025 evaluation workplan in July 2025, the IEP may consider the TORs for approval via electronic decision point.

Scoping: Integrated People-Centered Quality Services Evaluation

Presentation summary:

ELO presented the initial scoping and evaluation questions of the Integrated People-Centered Quality Services (IPCQS) evaluation for IEP input. The ELO noted that the proposed scope incorporated earlier feedback provided by the SC.

The focus of the evaluation is on one element of "integration" in the context of Global Fund support, namely "Integrating HIV, TB, and Malaria services into countries' essential healthcare packages and integrating service delivery along the continuum of care." ELO noted that the evaluation reflects the Global Fund's incentivizing role in this area and noted the lack of an existing theory of change. The Global Fund's approach and levers to support IPCQS include Strategic

Initiatives, health financing approaches and internal processes. The evaluation scoping pointed to a need for detailed analysis of examples of service integration, the Global Fund's efforts to incentivize integration and identification of lessons learned and considerations for the future.

The ELO highlighted that should the SC confirm the evaluation to move forward in 2025 per the 2025 evaluation workplan adjustments, the final report and learning products were expected to be available by June 2026.

Discussion summary:

- **Strategic relevance:** The SC evaluation focal point highlighted that integration has been a key discussion in the last several SC meetings, reinforcing the value of this evaluation and its relevance for the Global Fund Strategy, noting that while the potential breadth in scope and current context present substantial challenges, they also underscore the topic's urgency. Some IEP Members noted the opportunity for this evaluation to highlight the Global Fund's adaptive management, incentivization and lever approaches across grant cycles and their successes and drawbacks.
- **Process concerns:** Some IEP members noted the challenge presented by a lack of unified global targets and the complexity and diversity across countries. The CELO flagged that Global Fund investment in monitoring and evaluation of related key performance indicators (KPIs) through health facility assessments provided an important baseline. In response to a concern from one IEP Member about addressing the integration of laboratories within the evaluation scope, the ELO clarified that the evaluation focus would be on the results of integration, i.e. integrated services, and a limited set of contributing components. The ELO also reinforced that the focus on integration of service delivery, rather than health systems, is deliberate.
- **Theory of change:** The IEP flagged the lack of theory of change for this topic, suggesting that having one available would be beneficial and, without it, visibility of causal pathways may be limited. The IEP, ELO and representative from the Global Fund Resilient and Sustainable Systems for Health (RSSH) team discussed the possibility of developing a theory of change in the lead-up to the evaluation, which the RSSH team representative agreed to discuss within the Technical Advice and Partnerships Department.
- **Evaluation approach:** The IEP encouraged the ELO to learn from other global and country-level experience on integration from global health initiatives and others, as well as from normative guidance and previous reports by the Technical Review Panel (TRP) and TERG. IEP Members suggested several improvements for the TOR: (a) to more explicitly reveal tools and levers used by the Global Fund in support of incentivizing integration and quality improvements; (b) to expand TOR scope beyond Human Resources for Health and Financing and also elaborate on other health system blocks necessary for service integration; (c) to adjust evaluation questions to the suggested building blocks; and (d) to better elaborate Annex 1, which currently only speaks about services and not about other aspects necessary for integration. Some IEP Members also suggested the evaluation look at countries integrating primary health care by focusing on their functional and operational linkages, at national legislation on integration, at countries such as Cuba where integration is built into public health, at both the national and at the sub-national levels, and at countries across the income spectrum.
- **Thematic overlap between the IPCQS and C19RM evaluations:** The IEP Vice Chair counselled the ELO to consider cross-pollination across the C19RM and IPCQS evaluations, as well as to be cautious when suggesting that service quality be measured.

Action items: ELO and IEP to advance on next steps of the TOR development for the Integrated People-Centered Quality Services Evaluation as per the Standard Operating Procedures. ELO to work with the Secretariat to spell out the causal logic between building blocks to guide the evaluation in terms of scope and approach.

Scoping: End-term Evaluation of the COVID-19 Response Mechanism

Presentation summary:

ELO presented the scoping of the End-Term Evaluation of the COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM) for IEP input. The ELO shared the progress of scoping so far including stakeholder consultations, an evaluability assessment and memorialization report by external consultants, reviews of previous evaluations and reviews, review of the 2021 audit report on C19RM and consultations with the SC.

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess the sustainability of strengthened resilient health systems and pandemic preparedness response mechanisms through C19RM and the effectiveness of C19RM and Access to COVID-19 Tools Accelerator (ACT-A) partnerships to inform future pandemic responses and Global Fund's investments. The evaluation objectives include examining the contribution of C19RM to the achievement of intended results and the extent to which C19RM interventions contributed to building resilient and sustainable systems for health (RSSH). The ELO also presented indicative evaluation questions by objective.

The ELO outlined next steps following IEP input on the draft scope, noting that, should the SC confirm the evaluation move forward as initially planned with inception beginning in Q4 of 2025, the final report and learning products were expected to be available by June 2026.

Discussion summary:

- **Strategic focus:** The C19RM Senior Manager reinforced the importance of ELO and IEP independence as part of quality assurance of the evaluation, particularly given that the C19RM sources of funds lie outside of HIV, TB and Malaria grant allocations. The IEP reinforced that this evaluation should remain focused on health systems and pandemic preparedness rather than process efficiency and consider the extent to which changes were institutionalized at country level, as well as unanticipated outcomes. The IEP Vice Chair suggested that the evaluation questions unpack the level of investment in thematic/focus areas, their contribution and their impact on HIV, TB and Malaria health outcomes; expanding users and uses of the evaluation beyond the Strategy Committee, Global Fund Board, and the GF Secretariat, and, if relevant, consider other players involved in pandemic preparedness and response; explicitly clarify what should be evaluated: integration or contribution of C19RM interventions, and if integration is being considered, to better define it in the Global Fund context..
- **Learning and dissemination:** The IEP Vice Chair encouraged the ELO to ensure that the results of this evaluation be disseminated broadly given its relevance, in response to which the C19RM Senior Manager expressed agreement that it should serve as a public good. One IEP Member queried about planning for how the evaluation will be used, and the C19RM Senior Manager noted that lessons learned had already supported Global Fund response to Marburg Virus and Mpox.

- **Coordination:** Some IEP Members encouraged the C19RM and IPCQS evaluations consider health systems and sustainability aspects together. One IEP Member also suggested the evaluation learn from other organizations' evaluations on similar and relevant topics, which the C19RM Senior Manager agreed should be considered. In response to one IEP Member's query about the possibility of a joint evaluation, the CELO clarified that C19RM had a longer implementation period than other mechanisms with similar goals and merited a standalone evaluation.
- **Scope and methodology:** One IEP Member suggested that should the evaluation focus on adaptive logic and risk-taking that it be considered an accountability evaluation and referenced the strength of the CE evaluation in looking at causal pathways as a potential model. Another IEP Member suggested outcome harvesting as another potential methodology to assess the contributions of C19RM .
- **Theory of change:** The IEP commended the availability of a theory of change for this evaluation.

Action items:

- No action point. ELO and IEP to advance on next steps for the ToR development for this evaluation as outlined in the evaluation SOPs.

Closing

The IEP Chair summarized discussions and reviewed key outcomes of the discussions. CELO noted that several of the points were continuations of action points from previous meetings with plans in place for bringing progress to discuss with IEP at future meetings; other areas needed further discussion to agree on the actions. Governance highlighted that the formal meeting action points should be specific and time-bound and need not reflect general management or expected ways of working.

In addition to the action points noted already in this report, other immediate next steps were agreed:

- IEP and ELO reconsider the timing of the 12th IEP meeting to align with the next SC meeting later in 2025, acknowledging that IEP Members need sufficient advance notice to plan attendance, as well as the need for a possible intersessional IEP meeting.
- IEP Leadership to review the ELO proposal for the 2025 Evaluation Workplan Adjustments for the SC to consider.
- IEP and ELO to present their positions on how to best proceed with the consideration and publication of products stemming from Imbizo to the Strategy Committee.

The IEP Chair thanked the meeting attendees and flagged that important progress had been made through the meeting with a shared vision of the IEP's contributions to the Global Fund emerging more clearly. The CELO thanked IEP Members for their inputs.

Annex 1: Decisions

Decision Point	Decision Point Text	Voting Summary		
		For	Against	Abstain
GF/IEP11/ DP01	The Independent Evaluation Panel endorses the Final Report of the Evaluation of Community Engagement as presented in GF/IEP11/04.	Unanimous		

Annex 2: Document List

Reference	Document Title
GF/IEP11/01	Agenda
GF/IEP11/02	Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer Operational Update
GF/IEP11/03a	Survey Report of Imbizo, the independent country feedback mechanism
GF/IEP11/03b	Imbizo Overview
GF/IEP11/04	Final Report of the Evaluation of Community Engagement in the Global Fund Grant Cycle
GF/IEP11/04	Annexes: Final Report of the Evaluation of Community Engagement in the Global Fund Grant Cycle
GF/IEP11/05a	Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of Addressing Human Rights Barriers to Service Access
GF/IEP11/05b	Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of Human Rights – Response to IEP Comments
GF/IEP11/06	Update on the Scoping of the Evaluation of Integrated People-Centered Quality Services in Selected Countries
GF/IEP11/07	Scoping of the End-Term Evaluation of the COVID-19 Response Mechanism

Additional Background Reading

Reference	Document Title
GF/IEP10/06	Report of the 10th Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel

Annex 3: Participant List

Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP)

Juan Pablo Gutierrez, IEP Chair
George Gotsadze, IEP Vice Chair
Evelyn Ansah
Abdallah Bchir
Fred Carden
Florencia Guerzovich
Caroline Lynch
Dede Watchiba
Josephine Watera
Harley Feldbaum, Head, Strategy and Policy Hub (Non-voting, Ex-Officio)
John Grove, Chief Evaluation & Learning Officer (Non-voting, Ex-Officio)
Massimo Ghidinelli, Strategy Committee Evaluation Focal Point (Non-voting, Ex-Officio)

Strategy Committee (SC)

James Tulloch, SC Chair
Clarisse Paolini, SC Vice Chair

Evaluation & Learning Office (ELO)

Rita Benitez, Specialist, Learning & Dissemination
Rhannon James, Senior Specialist, Evaluation Partnerships
Roy Mutandwa, Evaluation Specialist, C19RM
John Puvimanasinghe, Senior Specialist, Evaluation & Learning
Michael Schroll, Senior Specialist, Evaluation & Learning
Olga Varetska, Specialist, Evaluation
Yana Daneva, Consultant

Global Fund Secretariat

Etienne Michaud, Chief Counsel, Legal and Governance Department
Stephanie Martone, Specialist, Legal and Governance Department
Jacqueline Bataringaya, Senior Manager, C19RM Secretariat
Margherita Mauri, Specialist, Governance and Oversight, C19RM Secretariat
Olga Bornemisza, Senior Technical Advisor, Resilient and Sustainable Systems for Health, Technical Advice and Partnerships
Alexandrina Iovita, Senior Technical Advisor, Community, Rights and Gender
Gavin Reid, Senior Technical Advisor, Community, Rights and Gender
Michelle Remme, Manager, Thematic Cluster, Community, Rights and Gender

External participants

Julia Bürgi, report writer

Annex 4: Decisions taken intersessionally

Decision Point	Decision Point Text	Voting Summary		
		For	Against	Abstain
GF/IEP10 A/DP01 20 March 2025	The Independent Evaluation Panel endorses the report of the Evaluation of Capacity, Quality and Decision-Making in Sub-national Tailoring of Malaria Interventions as presented in GF/IEP10A/01.	Unanimous		