

Third Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel

Summary Notes

June 14-15, 2023

Virtual Meeting

Wednesday, June 14, 2023

Participant List (see Annex A)

Agenda (see Annex B)

Session Title: Opening and updates from Chair & ELO Operational update

The CELO introduced the new staff who have joined the ELO since the last IEP meeting and shared an operational update of the Evaluation and Learning Office (ELO):

- The CELO noted its continued work to develop a learning culture within the Secretariat, highlighting the ELO's engagement model's User Group, which comprises Secretariat stakeholders relevant to the respective evaluation topic, as a new and important feature to strengthen utility and learning throughout the evaluation engagement.
- The CELO emphasized the criticality of truly understanding the Global Fund model of engagement at country level, and highlighted how the ELO team is seeking ways to further integrate with these processes and connect with stakeholders.
- The CELO referred to ELO's work with external partners to expand ELO's RfP outreach to more LMIC evaluation vendors.
- Noted that ELO's advisory work on various Secretariat reviews, such as the DHIS2 facility-based reporting system, will produce valuable learning.

Session Title: Overview of the revised version of the Standard Operating Procedures & Business Procedures of the IEP

This session highlighted how the revised draft SOPs for the ELO which describe processes linked to the development of the yearly workplan and to the management of individual evaluations, have evolved since the version shared with the IEP in February 2023. The ELO described how the draft SOPs have adapted taking on board the IEP feedback at that time. The revised draft SOPs included extensive inputs and review by the Legal and Governance Department (LGD) to ensure alignment with the Strategy Committee Charter and the IEP ToRs approved by the Board, the Job Description of the CELO, and applicable performance assessment frameworks. The LGD representative was present and provided guidance.

These SOPs are subject to IEP oversight, the IEP was not engaged in the content development process since the February meeting. The updated version of the SOPs were provided to the IEP as draft for review two weeks prior to this meeting alongside all the pre-read meeting documents.

The complementarity and distinct approval processes between the draft SOPs and the Business Procedures of the IEP was also described. The draft Business Procedures were provided for information only and are scheduled to be discussed at the IEP September meeting, to be eventually submitted to the SC for approval.

The ELO concluded with the proposed next steps which included the commitment to finalize SOPs by September, following input from the IEP.

Session Title: Country Steered Review - update on scope/design

The ELO described the evolved CSR approach and design, status and activities and the proposed name change and branding to Imbizo.

Summary of main discussion points:

IEP

- Acknowledged the value of the CSR for evaluation and learning and appreciated ELO's progress made and continued efforts to leverage existing feedback channels implemented by the Secretariat.
- Country stakeholder consultation and feedback:
 - Requested details about how results of CSR would be shared with country stakeholders.
 - Requested details about how country-level stakeholders will provide input on what is being evaluated.
 - Requested clarity on the Global Fund's existing country feedback mechanisms, and how ELO will learn from them.
 - Requested details on who will be carrying out the country consultation, emphasizing that the quality of feedback relies on who is asking the questions.
 - Requested assurance that ELO aims to offer feedback mechanisms in different languages.

ELO Response

- Country stakeholder consultation and feedback:
 - The 'platform' and 'feedback' components of CSR will focus specifically on providing feedback by country stakeholders. This will be captured within the ToR for this component of Imbizo and will be shared with the IEP for review.
 - ELO plans to investigate beforehand which topics are relevant to the country stakeholders and focus the reviews accordingly. This will be achieved through internal document analysis, a stakeholder survey and the online platform.

- For country consultations, the ELO will work with several different suppliers and partners. A diverse range of suppliers offering different approaches and skills to engage with local stakeholders will be selected at the country level. The goal will be to ensure that dialogue is open and frank.
- Clarified that the CSR's platform and feedback mechanisms will sequentially become available in different languages.

Next Steps/Actions:

- IEP to identify QA focal points for Imbizo.

Session Title: IEP Closed Session- Focus on Standard Operating Procedures

The purpose of this session was for IEP to discuss the new version of the SOPs and to provide initial feedback for the ELO. The IEP also discussed the state of development of an evaluation policy as a living document, as the evaluation policy and SOPs are complementary and this was agreed at the second IEP meeting on February 7-8, 2023 in Geneva. The relevant action item was: "ELO to develop an evaluation policy to orient the evaluation function in the Global Fund. The IEP will support this by providing examples of similar policies and reviewing drafts."

Given that this meeting was the IEP's first opportunity to discuss the revised SOPs, it had been communicated in advance that the IEP would require additional time post-meeting to provide consolidated feedback. The SC ex-officio member to the IEP was invited to attend this session. No decisions were made during this closed session.

Thursday, June 15, 2023

Session Title: Standard Operating Procedures

The IEP began by congratulating the ELO on the work and team building that has taken place since the last IEP meeting and the exciting directions of the work. With regard to the SOPs, as discussed, the IEP requested more time to provide their written feedback and to reach consensus internally before sharing final feedback by the end of July.

The following represents the first set of comments from the IEP:

- In terms of philosophy of the panel, it was emphasized that the IEP does not want to manage the ELO but to add value to the ELO and work collaboratively in partnership with the ELO while fulfilling its role in oversight of independence, credibility, quality, and utility.
- It was stressed that it is the balance of powers between the IEP and ELO that ensures the independence of the function, and the IEP currently considers the relationship to be asymmetrical.

- The IEP does not want to micro-manage the ELO but has to have sufficient proximity to Global Fund processes in order to play its oversight role.
- IEP reiterated its request to the ELO to develop an organization-wide Evaluation Policy, stating that it is very difficult to gauge if the SOPs will work without seeing how they fit into a policy and asked when this policy would be drafted and affirmed their willingness to help draft the policy.
- It was noted that it is important to include a provision for a review and revision, both for the SOPs and the Evaluation Policy.
- IEP noted that they would like to identify efficiencies where IEP can eventually step back, but only after they are sure that the processes will deliver. Participation in the Tender Evaluation Committee (TEC) process that governs RFP selection was cited as an example and which needs additional clarity about how the process proposed would work to safeguard independence. In particular, more clarity was requested on the proposed role to be played by the OIG, what mechanisms would be used to identify potential threats to independence, and whether this would be done concurrently or retrospectively. As one possibility for consideration, it was suggested that, for each evaluation, the OIG representative might be briefed by the IEP and report to the IEP on the TEC process.
- The IEP noted it should be enabled to participate in the activities required to fulfill their mandate.
- When referring to the IEP Commentary in the SOP, it should be described as it is in the IEP TOR.
- IEP proposed additional considerations for the SOPs, including:
 - early engagement of the IEP and SC in developing possible evaluation topics (SOP1);
 - clarification of the proposed role for the SC, as it and IEP are the only external voices to the evaluation process.
- With respect to decision points, the IEP expressed the opinion that decisions can only be made by an individual so decisions would be attributable to the IEP Chair as the IEP panel may not always reach consensus. Decisions will be made in consultation with the panel.
- IEP proposed identifying complementary ways for ELO and IEP to work together to strengthen the evaluation function at the Global Fund.

ELO and LGD Comments and Response

- ELO thanked the IEP for the thorough review and feedback and eagerly await the written comments, particularly around joint decision points which is critical to receive soon.
- ELO agreed that developing an Evaluation Policy is useful. Considering the policies are organization- wide and are Board approved documents, this is a time-consuming process and will not be possible to have a valid and vetted draft policy

by end of summer but possible for an outline and/or principles to be developed as a first stage.

- ELO emphasized that evaluations are being commissioned and in progress now. Hence, the draft SOPs will be applied in the interim until their finalization later this year.

Next Steps/Actions:

- IEP will provide written comments to the revised draft SOP by end-July and specifics on how they would like to engage with ELO on finalizing SOPs.
- In the interim, IEP will support the ongoing and planned evaluations following the revised draft SOPs with the appropriate consultation and exchange.
- IEP to engage with the ELO in the development of a proposed plan for an Evaluation policy.

Session Title: Update on End-Term Evaluation of the 2017-2022 Strategy (SR2023)

The session provided a recap on SR2023 objectives and a status update outlining key deliverables, timelines and milestones. It described ELO's process for SR2023 publicity, evaluator outreach and selection.

- ELO emphasized that its new evaluation engagement approach is a core feature of SR2023 that will engage with key stakeholders early in evaluation processes to ensure their ownership, identify learning opportunities early on in evaluation processes, and provide a holistic approach to evaluation design and implementation.
- ELO presented the evaluation methodology and approach, noting the evaluation's formative and summative aspects and theory-based nature.
- ELO noted that the evaluation framework underpinning the evaluation approach, comprised of three objectives and eight workstreams, is currently articulated at a high-level.
- ELO described the SR2023 User Group (UG) providing an outline of its core role, membership, and evolution.

Summary of main comments and discussion points:

IEP

- IEP congratulated ELO for its efforts to raise awareness and increase knowledge of evaluation approaches and processes within the Global Fund through webinars and other outreach events.
- IEP expressed concern that the Global Fund procurement process guiding vendor selection is composed of internal actors who are implementers of the

Strategy. IEP expressed concerns about the degree to which the TEC can be considered independent, and encouraged ELO to consider in the future a mechanism for ensuring the participation of stakeholders in the TEC who are not directly involved in the implementation of the subject of the respective evaluation.

- IEP expressed concern about weighting proposals on technical criteria that may favor the selection of vendors with previous Global Fund experience.
- IEP encouraged ELO's continued efforts to identify actors that have not undertaken evaluations commissioned by The Global Fund and from LMIC geographies.
- Requested more detail about the expectations of Focal Points (FP) for the SR2023 evaluation, including when they will be involved, how, and what documentation and information they will receive.

Next Steps/Actions:

- ELO to move forward with quality assurance and management of implementation of ongoing evaluations.
- IEP and ELO need to then finalize full package of quality assurance and quality assessment criteria.
- IEP and ELO will discuss and potentially reconsider the issue of balance and voting in TECs.
- IEP and ELO will revisit the weighting criteria of technical proposals to facilitate the diversification of the evaluation vendor supply.

Session Title: Resource Allocation Methodology (RAM) Evaluation – Update and overview of current methodology

This session provided an overview of the current Global Fund Allocation Methodology and outlined the background and objectives of the evaluation on this subject. ELO informed the IEP that the RfP period had been extended by 2 weeks in order to elicit more bids. The RfP was now closed, and the TEC will proceed in the next week.

Summary of comments:

- IEP appreciated ELO's progress and acknowledged the global significance of this evaluation on HIV, TB, malaria and RSSH.

Next Steps/Actions:

- ELO to send IEP Focal Points an updated timeline on RAM implementation.

Session Title: SDG Synthesis: Redressing North-South power differentials in evaluation

The first part of this session was a presentation on the SDG Synthesis Coalition initiative from Kerry Albright, UNICEF's Principal Adviser, Evaluation and Anna Rosa Soares, UNDP's Chief of Evaluation Syntheses and Lessons, and Tae Young Kim, UNDP.

The presentation included a brief overview of the initiative's synthesis scoping exercise for the People Pillar (SDGs 1-5). It was emphasized that there is an overwhelming quantity of evaluative evidence on Health/SDG3. However, it was noted that malaria and TB were less frequent evaluation themes relative to, for example, HIV/AIDS access to treatment and testing.

The second part of this session was an update of IEP and ELO's joint efforts on initiatives focused on redressing the North-South divide in global health and evaluation this includes drafting a comment for the WHO Bulletin to capture joint thinking across agencies on increasing the engagement of LMIC evaluation consultants.

IEP Chair opened the floor for a discussion wherein IEP and ELO reflected on opportunities to support the SDG Synthesis coalition and leverage efforts to achieve shared objectives. IEP expressed strong interest in participating and supporting the SDG Synthesis Coalition's efforts.

Next Steps/Actions:

- IEP Chair to follow up and determine specific review questions to further guide Global Fund engagement.
- ELO to provide focal person for this effort to provide access to Global Fund evaluations and/or commentary for syntheses.

Annex A: Participants List

IEP	ELO
<p>Mira Johri – IEP Chair Cindy Carlson- Vice-Chair</p> <p><i>IEP members:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abdallah Bchir • Caroline Lynch • Dede Watchiba • Elilarasu Renganathan • Evelyn Ansah • George Gotsadze • Helen Evans • Josephine Watera • Mark Bardini • Javier Hourcade Bellocq 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Grove, Chief Evaluation & Learning Officer • Jutta Hornig, Team Coordinator • Betty Brady, Program Officer • Rhiannon James, Sr. Specialist Eval. Partnerships • John Puvimanasinghe, Sr. Specialist Eval. & Learning • Michael Schroll, Senior Specialist, Eval. & Learning • Marc Theuss, Specialist Eval. & Learning • Olga Varetska, Specialist • Nathalie Gons, M&E Specialist • Rita M Benitez, Specialist, Learning and Dissemination (will be staff as of July)

Global Fund Secretariat for select sessions: SOP- IEP closed session; Resource Allocation Methodology Evaluation	
<p>Legal and Governance Department Etienne Michaud, Chief Counsel Madalina Ciasar, Legal Counsel Rachel Pellet, Deputy Head, Governance</p>	<p>Human Resources Pichaya Patanapongpibul</p> <p>Strategy and Policy Hub Carol D'Souza, Allocation Manager Shantih Van Hoog</p>

<p>External Participants for select session: SDG Synthesis: Redressing North-South power differentials in evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kerry Albright (UNICEF) • Ana Rosa Monteiro Soares (UNDP) • Tae Young Kim (UNDP)

Annex B: Agenda

Day 1: Wednesday 14th June			
Time -PM	Agenda Item	Session Purpose	Lead/Presenter(s)
1:00-1:20	Opening and updates from Chair ELO Operational update	For information	Mira Johri John Grove
1:20- 1:40	Overview of the revised version of the Standard Operating Procedures & Business Procedures of the IEP	For information	John Grove, Rhiannon James, Michael Schroll & Etienne Michaud
1:40-2:10	Country Steered Review - update on scope/design	For guidance	Michael Schroll & Marc Theuss
2:10-2:15	5 min pause		
IEP Closed Session 2:15-4:20			
2:15-3:35	IEP discussion SOPs	For discussion	Mira Johri & Cindy Carlson
3:35- 3:40			
3:40-4:00	Briefing: CELO performance evaluation process	For information	Rachel Pellet (LGD) Pichaya Patanapongpibul (HR) & Etienne Michaud (LGD)
4:00-4:20	IEP input to CELO performance assessment	For discussion	Mira Johri
Day 2: Thursday 15th June			
1:00-2:00	Standard Operating Procedures (Open session with ELO)	For decision	Mira Johri John Grove
2:00- 2:35	Update on End-Term Evaluation of the 2017-2022 Strategy (SR2023)	For information	John Grove & Team
2:35-2:55	Resource Allocation Methodology Evaluation – Update and overview of current methodology	For information	Rhiannon James & Carol D’Souza – (Allocation Manager)
2.55-3.05	Pause		
3:05-4:00	SDG Synthesis Redressing North-South power differentials in evaluation AOB and wrap up	For guidance and discussion	Mira Johri (Lead) Presenters: Kerry Albright (UNICEF) Anna Rosa Soares (UNDP)