

Seventh Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel Summary Notes

22-24 May 2024

In-person
Geneva, Switzerland

Purpose

This document presents the Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP), held in-person in Geneva, Switzerland from 22 to 24 May 2024.

Decisions. The Report includes a full record of the one (1) Decision Point adopted by the IEP (Annex 1).

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

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

Table of Contents

Purpose	2
Report	3
Opening	3
Governance Procedures	3
Chief Learning and Evaluation Officer Update	4
Update on Ongoing 2024 Evaluations	5
Evaluation Timeline Management	5
Evaluation and Learning Principles	6
Evaluation Terms of Reference (TORs) Checklist	7
Community Engagement Evaluation TORs	8
2025 Evaluation Topics	9
Follow up on the 2023 Strategy Review and Evaluation of the Allocation Methodology	10
Community Responses and System Strengthening (CRSS) Evaluation TORs	11
Gender Responsive Evaluations	12
Expanding Evaluation Supplier Partnerships	13
IEP Recruitment and Appointment	13
Closing	14
<hr/>	
Annex 1: Decisions	15
Annex 2: Document List	16
Annex 3: Participant List	17

Report

Opening

The IEP Chair and Vice Chair opened the Meeting by welcoming members of the IEP, Evaluation and Learning Office (ELO), and new Secretariat staff working on IEP- and ELO-related matters. The IEP Chair summarized the agenda of the Seventh IEP Meeting.

A quorum was present. A list of participants and observers is in Annex 3.

Some IEP members declared potential conflicts of interest, but none leading to a recusal. The Ethics Officer thanked the IEP members for declaring.

The IEP Chair gave a summary of the discussions at the 24th Strategy Committee meeting (March 2024) and 51st Board Meeting (April 2024) on evaluation matters, including the IEP Annual Report and evaluations on Allocation Methodology and the Strategic Review 2023.

The IEP Chair announced that she was resigning her position, and this will be her last IEP meeting. She expressed appreciation for the opportunity to work with the Global Fund and with the IEP.

Governance Procedures

This session brought together the IEP with the leadership of the Strategy Committee (SC) and Office of the Inspector General (OIG) to continue discussions on IEP governance procedures.

The SC Chair reiterated that while the IEP is independent in its assessment of evaluations, it sits within the Global Fund structure and should align with other governance bodies, and include transparency and inclusion as core principles. The Board intentionally included ex officio, non-voting, members on the IEP and intended that they be included in all Panel deliberations to inform the work of the panel, except where circumstances justify an executive session. It was noted that the OIG and Ethics and Governance Committee Leadership (EGCL) had been consulted on best practices to maintain independence, including appropriate use of executive sessions to maintain the principle of transparency and trust at the Global Fund. The SC Chair noted that the EGCL's views were aligned with guidance shared by the SC Leadership with the Panel in 2024 regarding governance procedures, IEP membership, and independence.

The Inspector General (IG) was invited to share the OIG's approach to independence. The IG acknowledged an inherent tension between the OIG and Secretariat given that any entity providing assurance and asking questions can cause discomfort and emphasized the importance of understanding the perspectives of stakeholders who may not agree with OIG conclusions. The IG flagged the successful stakeholder engagement model that guides OIG engagement and consultation with stakeholders throughout the audit and investigation processes. She highlighted the importance of building trust and that it is a process that happens over time.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Ex officio IEP members:** The Secretariat recognized that some IEP Members may feel constrained by the inclusion of ex officio members in discussions and guarded in expressing themselves with independence. The SC Vice Chair flagged that this tension is inherent in many

Global Fund processes and not necessarily counterproductive, as seen through the SC experience where ex officio members participate in discussions but do not vote. The IEP reinforced the value of ex officio member inputs. The SC Vice Chair further clarified that per the IEP TORs, ex officio members are included by default in IEP discussions, unless concerns about confidentiality or risk relating to specific topics justify an executive session, such as a performance evaluation. It was reinforced that ex officio members do not vote or take decisions (as a safeguard of IEP independence) but are not observers in the process either and may participate in deliberations. The advice the IEP provides to the Board is independent but ex officio members are meant to participate in and inform the discussion.

- **Informal discussions:** Reflecting on the Secretariat’s and Strategy Committee Leadership’s guidance on not using certain communication channels for formal business, IEP members asked about how to appropriately conduct remote informal conversations between IEP voting members outside of formal IEP meetings. The IG and SC Chair reinforced the importance of being able to hold informal conversations for operational efficiency or private conversations related to confidential matters, as outlined by the EGC. The SC Chair noted that a Teams channel was created in May 2024 to facilitate IEP informal collaboration. The CELO indicated ELO support for informal discussions, calling for the spirit of partnership between the IEP and ELO in maintaining IEP independence throughout evaluations.
- **Clarifying the TORs:** The IEP Vice Chair acknowledged that the IEP, as a new body, is at an important stage to build trust with its stakeholders. Some IEP members highlighted that the TORs as currently written could be open to interpretation, which has already caused some confusion. One IEP member raised the opportunity to establish procedures in line with the IEP mandate before new IEP members join. Concluding the conversation, the IEP Vice Chair proposed that the IEP TORs be updated to clarify the Board’s intent and facilitate the unambiguous understanding by future IEP members.

Action points and next steps

- The Strategy Committee is invited to consider reviewing the IEP TORs to enhance clarity.

Chief Learning and Evaluation Officer Update

The CELO provided the IEP with an operational update, highlighting the ELO’s 2024 priorities, CELO performance against goals and emerging Board and SC discussion themes. The significant progress was emphasized, while noting the importance of continuing to increase use and influence of evaluation findings.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Learning, use and dissemination:** The IEP commended upcoming ELO focus on learning, use and dissemination and asked about any challenges in this agenda to date. One IEP member urged the ELO to consider distinguishing between learning among ELO and broader Secretariat groups. The ELO highlighted its effort to instill a culture of trust among stakeholders within the organization to maximize utility of evaluations and linked materials, including through prototyping learning and dissemination materials. Additionally, the importance of evaluation findings and recommendations being written with Global Fund interest, ambition and influence in mind to support future learning was emphasized by the ELO.
- **Report publication:** IEP members asked about the status and anticipated timeline of evaluation report publication. The CELO flagged efforts to ensure that evaluations and linked

materials are made available on the website in a way that is easy to locate and use for the intended audiences. The IEP Chair noted the potential importance of evaluation publication, including through use of tags, for future emerging and university-based evaluation suppliers for whom publication is essential.

- **Partnerships:** The IEP acknowledged the importance of partnerships, noting the opportunity to build these by making evaluations publicly available. One IEP member asked about measures to address barriers to entry for evaluators from countries where the Global Fund and Gavi invest, pointing to exemplary initiatives pushing for inclusion by entities such as scientific publications. The IEP Chair encouraged the ELO to track progress and quality of partnership expansion over time to adequately address barriers.

Update on Ongoing 2024 Evaluations

This session included updates on the 2024 evaluations already underway, namely on Funding Request and Grant-Making, Imbizo and Malaria Sub-National Responses.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Technical Evaluation Committees (TECs) and TORs:** Several members expressed appreciation for the IEP observer role in TECs, which provided insights to the IEP's assessment of the independence of the related evaluations. The IEP suggested gathering further reflections about the success of expanding the evaluator pool through TECs to date. IEP members observed that TECs offered substantive learnings on TOR creation, suggesting that these feed into the TOR checklist being developed.
- **Funding Request and Grant-Making:** The IEP Focal Point for this evaluation observed the Secretariat's needs to gain efficiencies through the processes under evaluation and encouraged that evaluator findings be used to address needs of implementer countries as well. The support provided by the ELO to the supplier in consolidating comments from stakeholders on the inception report was commended.
- **Imbizo:** One IEP member stressed the importance of ensuring that community stakeholders feel heard and see that their contributions to the evaluation make a difference, suggesting evaluation publication as one means to do so.

Next steps:

- ELO and IEP to continue implementation and oversight of the Funding Request and Grant-Making, Imbizo and Malaria Sub-National Tailoring Evaluations.

Evaluation Timeline Management

This session included a presentation by the CELO on analysis of evaluation timelines, actions to ease pressure on timelines linked to SC and Board schedules, and projected time estimates for IEP engagement across an evaluation lifecycle.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Lessons learned:** The IEP suggested that timely publication be prioritized and expressed appreciation to the ELO for efforts to condense the timelines for future reports, while acknowledging delivering quality work across the evaluation lifecycle requires time. IEP members asked for feedback from ELO on their evaluation support across TOR development, TEC, implementation and dissemination stages. The ELO emphasized that the consolidated

feedback approach on TORs and high-level comments on reports (as opposed to editorial comments in track changes) is the most useful way to receive feedback from IEP.

- **Publication policy:** After learning that already completed evaluations were yet not made public, the IEP Vice Chair requested clarification on whether SC and Board input were necessary for evaluation report publication when evaluations may be ready for publication. The Secretariat acknowledged the burden and pressure created by adhering to SC and Board meeting schedules. The Secretariat clarified that SC and Board input and consideration of a report during one of their meetings prior to publication were not required by the Evaluation Function Documents Procedure if there was consensus on the publication and IEP endorsement of the evaluation. The Secretariat encouraged the Evaluation Function to maintain the organizational culture of “no surprises” by keeping the SC and Board informed through a stakeholder engagement approach, as practiced by the OIG, and being mindful of the use for discussions at SC and Board meeting, either before or after the publication of the report, as appropriate based on the evaluation topic. The IEP and ELO agreed to maintain a goal of publishing evaluation reports within 90 days of their finalization, while noting the need for good communication within the Secretariat’s political ecosystem to effectively operationalize this timeline; IEP flexibility was requested where this standard may need adjustment. Some IEP members expressed appreciation for ELO efforts to de-bottleneck the process and to support the efficient implementation of the Evaluation Function Documents Procedure.

Next steps:

- The ELO will develop an articulation of the publication process, including stakeholder engagement, with the possibility of delinking report publication from SC and Board discussion timelines.
- The ELO will track evaluation process and publication timelines.

Evaluation and Learning Principles

This session included a review of the Evaluation and Learning Principles developed jointly between the ELO and select IEP members to obtain feedback and advice toward finalization.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Link to other documents:** IEP members asked how these principles are reflected in other documents and policies, including the TORs, to ensure consistency in scoring of bidder applications. The CELO suggested that TOR development link to the principles and noted that the choice of “principles” over an additional “policy” was deliberate given the broader organizational context.
- **Talent and innovation:** The IEP discussed whether talent and innovation should be a combined principle or separated, given that they do not always function in combination. CELO agreed to decouple these two, suggesting that innovation be combined with another principle to maintain succinctness.
- **Roadmap and monitoring:** IEP members suggested that a roadmap and indicators be developed to make the principles actionable and well monitored.
- **Learning and accountability:** The IEP and ELO discussed clarifying “learning” as broader than a matter of course correction and how to sufficiently emphasize “accountability” throughout the document. The ELO agreed to develop operationalization examples for each principle. The ELO is currently developing a mechanism to track and monitor influence of evaluation findings. The mechanism will be piloted during 2024 using one to two TERG reports from 2021 or 2022. IEP members encouraged an adaptive learning approach, including

reflection on both successful and poorly received past evaluation reports as well as TORs from the new evaluation function's early evaluations in 2023 and 2024.

- **Sharing externally:** The CELO flagged that draft principles would be shared at an upcoming conference via webinar in early June 2024. IEP members emphasized that these principles were a signal both within the Global Fund and to other organizations, underpinning the evaluation function's credibility. The IEP Chair asked if the ELO would consider publishing an annual evaluation synthesis, which another IEP member noted as an opportunity to address contradictions across evaluation findings.

Next steps:

- The ELO will share the updated draft Evaluation and Learning Principles with the IEP electronically to be finalized.

Evaluation Terms of Reference (TORs) Checklist

This session involved discussion on the Evaluation TORs Checklist, including small breakout group discussions on different elements to be incorporated into a draft TORs Checklist. The IEP working group will use the feedback to develop an IEP Evaluation TOR Checklist.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Benchmarking:** ELO members discussed their findings based on benchmarking the proposed TORs Checklist against checklists from the Gavi, the UN Evaluation Group and the Swedish International Development Agency quality assurance document.
- **Evaluator pool:** The ELO flagged the need to make TORs friendly for evaluators still cultivating their knowledge about the Global Fund, which IEP members suggested be addressed by accompanying TORs with a background document. IEP members agreed with the TORs Checklist emphasis on gender and human rights, suggesting that inclusivity be added to encourage use of local evaluators and communities.
- **Timeframe, scope and budget:** The IEP suggested including the evaluation timeframe on the TORs Checklist. IEP members also suggested a point on the TORs Checklist to flag what is out-of-scope for a given evaluation and also queried whether to link scope with evaluation criteria. The IEP asked about the omission of budget from the TORs Checklist, which the ELO clarified was the result of organizational procurement guidelines but agreed that this is useful information for IEP members to know as they consider feasibility of the scope of the TOR.
- **Methods:** The IEP and ELO agreed that TORs should not be overly prescriptive on the methodology nor provide insufficient guidance on it, noting the suggestion of one IEP member to request bidders to provide justification for methodology selection.
- **Qualitative inputs:** IEP members asked how comments and qualitative inputs on TORs would be submitted as a complement to checklist completion.
- **Beyond TORs:** The IEP acknowledged the availability of the Quality Assurance Framework and learning metrics under development as a means of monitoring TORs Checklist elements beyond the procurement phase, while noting there is no distinct tool at the inception report phase.

Next steps:

- The IEP working group will develop a draft TORs Checklist for IEP and ELO feedback at the next IEP meeting.
- ELO to prepare an overview document to submit to IEP alongside TORs when they come to the IEP for review (Completed).

Community Engagement Evaluation TORs

This session included ELO presentation of the TORs for the Community Engagement Evaluation, on which IEP feedback was requested. ELO presented a response to the consolidated nine high-level comments received from IEP on 8 May:

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Process:** The IEP Chair commended the revised process of ELO solicitation and IEP provision of comments on the first draft of the TORs for this evaluation.
- **Evaluability and Theory of Change (TOC):** One IEP member queried about ELO consideration of evaluability of this topic, which the ELO shared was covered through the pre-scoping exercise. IEP members raised concerns about the lack of TOC to clarify the assumptions that underpin the evaluation, enable quality configurational analysis and improve overall evaluation quality. The ELO agreed to include the development of a TOC as deliverable during the inception phase in the next version of the TOR. ELO agreed emphasizing the importance of ensuring that the level of effort associated with TOC development is aligned with utility both within the evaluation phase and afterwards. IEP agreed with this consideration.
- **Inclusion:** The IEP Chair flagged the necessity of careful planning to ensure inclusion of underrepresented populations and openness to bidders from Global Fund implementing countries. IEP members flagged the possibility of using local evaluators as extensions of a centralized evaluation team and emphasized the need to avoid overburdening community representatives with information requests, which the ELO clarified would be partially mitigated by making existing Global Fund surveys available to evaluators. The IEP Chair and ELO observed the heterogeneous level of community organizing across HIV, TB and malaria, necessitating disease-specific thinking.
- **Key internal stakeholders:** One IEP member asked for clarification on who internal Global Fund stakeholders were for this evaluation, which the ELO clarified is across multiple departments and teams including the Grant Management Division, Technical Advice and Partnerships Team, and Community, Rights and Gender Team. The latter is the Primary Stakeholder for this evaluation.
- **Methodology and case selection:** IEP members echoed earlier calls that TORs ask bidders to present justification for methodology and case selection approaches, while also suggesting that the TORs consider up front case selection comparability. The ELO shared the proposed “Community Engagement Index”, which emphasized emergency and challenging operating environment contexts per stakeholders’ request. It was noted that representativeness and external validity would be complicated by the need to reflect the reality that conflicting views will be held even within a single country.
- **Other planned evaluations:** The IEP asked for clarification on the distinction between this evaluation and others planned that have potential content overlap. The CELO clarified that the Community Engagement Evaluation would focus on engagement during the grant cycle while the Community Response and Systems Strengthening (CRSS) Evaluation will focus on (1) community-led monitoring to enable communities to oversee and report on the quality and effectiveness of health services; (2) community-led research and advocacy to support communities to conduct research and advocate for their health needs and rights; (3) community capacity building and leadership development to strengthen the abilities of community members to lead and manage health initiatives, the TORs for which were to be discussed later in the Seventh IEP Meeting.

Next steps:

- The ELO will integrate a requirement for a TOC in the TORs for the Community Engagement Evaluation as well as address the other high-level comments.
- The ELO will share the revised TORs for the Community Engagement Evaluation for IEP electronic approval by the end of May 2024 to enable timely procurement procedures.

2025 Evaluation Topics

This session included a review of potential evaluations to be undertaken in 2025 and sought IEP approval on the approach to prioritizing evaluations for the 2025 evaluation workplan. The ELO presented the potential evaluations to be conducted in 2025, criteria to assess their candidacy, and ranking to support the rationale for which evaluations they propose be conducted in 2025.

Summary of the main discussion points on evaluation selection criteria:

- **Evaluation culture:** The IEP commended the ELO on the advancement and application of the evaluation eligibility criteria over the past year. One IEP member emphasized the importance of the criteria for contributing to the evaluation culture.
- **Implementer country input:** The IEP queried whether implementer countries had been consulted on the proposed evaluation selection, which the ELO said was addressed through the proxies of implementer country input on the Global Fund Strategy, Multi-Year Evaluation Calendar, SC and Board participation and feedback from Global Fund teams.
- **SC and Board input:** One IEP member encouraged the ELO to directly pose the question to governance bodies about the relevance of evaluating certain topics without high levels of evaluability. The ELO echoed IEP concerns that the evaluation function consider the timing, utility, and evaluability of topics suggested by the SC and Board.
- **Joint evaluations:** The IEP Vice Chair asked about the possibility of joint evaluations with Gavi or the World Bank's Global Financing Facility (GFF). The CELO and Chief of Staff affirmed that the ELO maintained contact with relevant partners within the Global Fund ecosystem, including and also beyond Gavi and GFF, to work together on evaluations but did not have any specific evaluations to date that were planned to be undertaken jointly.

Summary of the main discussion points on evaluation topics proposed for 2025:

- **Sustainability:** IEP members suggested that a future evaluation on sustainability needs to include both financial and programmatic sustainability, using new guidance from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. The ELO clarified that the IEP would receive an update on the changing Global Fund levers for sustainability, which, in the meantime, had a knock-on effect on the topic's evaluability in 2025.
- **HIV, community, human rights and gender:** One IEP member suggested that the evaluations on human rights and gender be combined into one evaluation. The ELO noted each evaluations' distinct purpose and called attention to plans to stagger the evaluations to maximize linkages and utility. The Chief of Staff called attention to the multiple proposed evaluations for 2025 that would require work from – but also benefit – the HIV and Community, Rights and Gender Teams. One IEP member called attention to the gender-related dimensions of malaria, including human resources for health.
- **COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM):** The IEP acknowledged the evaluations completed or underway for the Global Fund's C19RM and that the four evaluations posed as part of the 2025 evaluation workplan would be in addition to the evaluation on C19RM.
- **TB:** The IEP queried why there were no plans for a TB-related evaluation, to which the ELO responded was planned for 2026 or later given the TB prevention evaluation completed in 2022.

Decision point:

The Independent Evaluation Panel has considered the proposed evaluation topics for the 2025 annual evaluation workplan of the ELO (GF/IEP7/05).

- The IEP decides to advise the Strategy Committee to approve the 2025 evaluation workplan containing these topics and requests the IEP Chair to convey this position to the Strategy Committee at the appropriate times.

Next steps:

- The ELO will share the 2025 Annual Workplan paper to IEP Leadership for input. This paper will be submitted for Strategy Committee approval at its July 2024 Meeting.
- The Secretariat will provide a short update on organizational strategic issues and shifts to set the broader context for evaluation-related discussions at future IEP meetings.

Follow up on the 2023 Strategy Review and Evaluation of the Allocation Methodology

The Global Fund Strategy and Policy Hub (SPH) joined this session to discuss with IEP the learning and utility of the first two evaluations conducted under the new evaluation function. The session was also used to provide the IEP members with a short briefing on the discussions within the Global Fund on sustainability. The ELO also presented plans for disseminating the results from the first two evaluations.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Evaluation of the Allocation Methodology:** The IEP Chair noted that this evaluation report was unable to address the issue of balance between the three diseases and resilient and sustainable systems for health (RSSH); however, it did confirm that no magic solution is available to this problem. The Secretariat noted that the evaluation provided an independent verification of the robustness of the Allocation Methodology as well as a helpful assessment of benefits and challenges of a separate RSSH allocation ahead of the Strategy Committee and Board discussions about the Allocation Methodology for Grant Cycle 8 (GC8). At the same time, the Secretariat noted that some recommendations lacked specificity, for example, the report did not specify which disease(s) the recommended increased share for tuberculosis should be taken from and why. The Secretariat also highlighted the unique nature of this evaluation, in that its findings are already being used to inform the review of the allocation methodology.
- **2023 Strategic Review (SR2023):** The Secretariat noted that SR2023 provided helpful independent verification of the impact of the Global Fund partnership towards the 2017-2022 Strategy aims and the maturity of the funding model. To further increase utility, the Secretariat noted that the recommendations could have greater specificity and more in-depth consideration of associated trade-offs. In terms of timing, the Secretariat highlighted that Strategic Reviews would have greatest utility if finalized ahead of the development of the next Strategy, and suggested that the evaluation function think carefully about timing and scope of forthcoming Strategic Reviews. The ELO informed the IEP that learnings from this evaluation would contribute to the mid-term review of the 2023-2028 Strategy.
- **Evaluation focus, guidelines, findings and recommendations:** The IEP Vice Chair recommended that future evaluations be more narrowly focused and include fewer questions to yield more succinct findings with more specific recommendations. The ELO echoed IEP

suggestions to introduce report standards on length, level of synthesis, structure and specificity on recommendations. The IEP observed the opportunity to distinguish between whether a final report provides findings, options or recommendations depending on a given evaluation's scope and objectives.

- **Stakeholder engagement:** IEP members queried about stakeholder engagement across the evaluation lifecycle and recommended tracking this parameter, with one IEP member suggesting extended timelines for workshops to discuss evaluation findings and recommendations. The SPH team affirmed their participation throughout these two evaluations, including periodic check-ins with evaluators. The IEP and ELO highlighted the need to strike balance between evaluation independence and working closely with stakeholders to ensure utility and uptake.
- **Distinguishing evaluations and audits:** The Secretariat noted that when the SC and Board request a review, it's important to assess whether an evaluation is the appropriate tool to assess the topic, or whether an audit is more suitable. The IEP Chair commended efforts to document the distinction between evaluations and audits.
- **Dissemination and learning:** The ELO confirmed plans to publish the full evaluation report and annexes, IEP Commentary and Management Response (alongside an evaluation brief and the intention to publish a multi-media learning product for SR2023). The ELO emphasized its work to prototype written and visual communications products to accompany evaluation reports against industry standards which the IEP commended. The IEP Chair noted the importance of distinguishing materials for internal versus external audiences, including sensitively framing critical or negative findings.

Next steps:

- The ELO will continue to update the IEP on dissemination of evaluations and learning.

Community Responses and System Strengthening (CRSS) Evaluation TORs

This session included a review of the TORs for the upcoming evaluation on CRSS for IEP input, noting that the TORs had been developed in consultation with both external implementers as well as internal stakeholders.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Program scope:** IEP members asked for clarity on the Global Fund levels of funding and how the programs are structured at the community level across HIV, TB, malaria and RSSH, as well as what indicators measure these investments. The ELO flagged that there is significant diversity in community-level investments across implementing countries, with CRSS emerging as a newly combined area of focus to ensure accessible uptake and quality delivery of HIV, TB and malaria interventions. The complexity of indicators, given that they range across the three diseases and RSSH was emphasized, and the ELO flagged that some of this information would be available to the evaluator as background.
- **Evaluation focus and TOC:** IEP members encouraged that the TORs focus on a narrow set of questions to adhere to the proposed timeline and available resources and asked about the availability of a TOC, which the ELO shared was under development. The IEP Chair flagged that attention to evaluability up front will help yield comparable insights given the diversity of CRSS programming. ELO confirmed comprehensive scoping work was done including with country stakeholders as part of country visits by the C19RM evaluation specialist. The ELO flagged that the present number of questions in the TORs reflects a full potential scope of the

evaluation but were anticipated to be compressed or synthesized in the initial evaluation stages.

- **Overlaps with other evaluations:** One IEP member inquired about what efficiencies or gains were available between this and other evaluations, including those on Community Engagement and Malaria Sub-National Tailoring, and the difference between this evaluation and the evaluation on Community Engagement. The ELO affirmed that cross-over and learnings between evaluations would be ensured through sequencing and sharing of internal focal points.
- **Country visits:** IEP members inquired whether country visits would be conducted by the evaluator, which the ELO shared was a priority as long as the supplier could provide rationale.
- **Conflict of interest:** The IEP raised concerns about the possibility that requesting a community-led or -based organization as co-lead of the evaluation could result in actual or perceived conflict of interest. The ELO recognized the challenges this requirement could pose but noted that these are accounted for in the TOC under development and the contextual information to accompany the TORs, as well as through the conceptual framework the bidders are asked to develop.
- **Budget:** The IEP Vice Chair acknowledged that budgetary information is not available to evaluators, which IEP members reflected would be helpful for them to know to evaluate the feasibility of the TOR scope.

Next steps:

- The ELO will submit a revised draft of the CRSS Evaluation TOR to the IEP for review and written feedback. Based on this feedback and following any further changes, the TORs will be sent to IEP for approval via an electronic decision point.

Gender Responsive Evaluations

This session included a presentation of and solicitation of IEP input on benchmarking, analysis, and considerations for a proposed high-level checklist for conducting gender-responsive evaluations in response to the IEP's request to develop guidance for inclusion of gender, human rights, and intersectionality in evaluation in its 2023 Annual Report.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **High-level checklist:** The IEP Chair commended the analysis and draft Gender Checklist for being trackable and useful, while noting that gender must be looked at through an intersectional lens that includes social determinants, which the Secretariat explained was built into the proposed approach. The ELO clarified that the Gender Checklist was developed simultaneously with the TORs and would be piloted pending IEP feedback, possibly including on a completed evaluation to test its application. The IEP and ELO discussed additional formats to consider in applying a gender lens to developing evaluations, with the IEP recommending the approach be practical and operational. The IEP was informed that a Technical Brief on Gender Equality was available to prospective evaluators to support their understanding of how gender is operationalized within the Global Fund.
- **Gender expertise:** One IEP member queried whether it would be realistic to find experts for each evaluation to look at evaluation topics from a gender lens, which the ELO proposed would be part of TORs and a goal.
- **Evaluators:** One IEP member echoed an earlier request that a gender lens be applied to the evaluator teams in addition to the evaluation content. The IEP was informed that a Technical Brief on Gender Equality was available to prospective evaluators to support their understanding of how gender is operationalized within the Global Fund.

- **Benchmarking and partnership:** The ELO asked for IEP members to share relevant guidance from other organizations to ensure alignment and streamline development of IEP tools.

Next steps:

- The IEP and ELO will work on further developing and piloting tools to ensure gender responsive and intersectional approaches in Global Fund evaluation work.

Expanding Evaluation Supplier Partnerships

This session aimed to gather IEP input on the actions being advanced to expand and remove barriers to evaluation supplier partnerships from countries that receive Global Fund and Gavi investments, as well as mechanisms to track progress. This session was attended by Leslie Moreland, a Senior Programme Manager for Evaluation and Learning at Gavi.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Request for interest (RFI):** The IEP Vice Chair commended the RFI to be launched by the Global Fund and Gavi soliciting implementer country service providers to attend webinars to familiarize them with the organizations, suggesting that the focus be on the corporate rather than individual level. The ELO was encouraged to disseminate the RFI widely based on research of where these service providers are sourcing work, including to avoid receiving bids only from multi-national companies with implementer country offices.
- **Familiarity with organizational culture:** IEP members asked how bidders would learn about the organizational culture in addition to Global Fund policies and vocabulary. The ELO shared plans to continue proactive outreach and webinars for each evaluation as well as continuously and systematically learn through the success in - or lack of - expanding the supplier pool, which the IEP echoed as critical. The IEP Vice Chair acknowledged that other organizations may be more appropriate than the Global Fund to strengthen capacity of new evaluators, but that Global Fund evaluations would be a suitable opportunity to support emerging talents' work. The Senior Programme Manager of Gavi's Evaluation and Learning Team recognized that the high level of effort required to brief evaluators not familiar with the two organizations' systems may be significant, requiring tradeoffs and realism about available resources.
- **Benchmarking and partnership:** One IEP member asked how the Evaluation Function could learn from the experience of other organizations, such as health and scientific journals, in broadening supplier pools to countries receiving Global Fund and Gavi investments. Another IEP member suggested a TOC for this undertaking. The IEP Chair stressed that the assessment of partnership expansion could be a productive exercise and the IEP Vice Chair asked that baseline indicators be established by the end of 2024.

Next steps:

- The ELO will continue work on expanding the evaluator supplier pool in collaboration with Gavi and GFF, including through the establishment of baseline indicators and tracking of progress.

IEP Recruitment and Appointment

This session included a review of term end dates of current IEP members and solicitation of IEP members who wish to extend their membership up to three years longer. Per the IEP TORs, the IEP Chair may extend the terms of voting members up to an additional three years to facilitate transition and carryover institutional knowledge.

Summary of the main discussion points:

- **Upcoming workload:** The IEP acknowledged the workload ahead, noting the benefits of current IEP members extending their terms to stagger the onboarding and learning curve of new members.

Next steps:

- Current IEP members interested in extending their term to indicate to the IEP Chair and Vice Chair by 28 June 2024.

Closing

The IEP Chair summarized the meeting and action points and thanked the IEP and ELO for a productive and successful meeting.

The IEP Vice Chair flagged that the Seventh IEP Meeting would be the last in-person meeting for the current IEP Chair, thanking the IEP Chair for the service, steer and guidance provided over the past few years.

Annex 1: Decisions

Decision Point	Decision Point Text	Voting Summary		
		For	Against	Abstain
GF/IEP07/DP01	<p>The Independent Evaluation Panel has considered the proposed evaluation topics for the 2025 annual evaluation workplan of the ELO (GF/IEP7/05).</p> <p>The IEP decides to advise the Strategy Committee to approve the 2025 evaluation workplan containing these topics and requests the IEP Chair to convey this position to the Strategy Committee at the appropriate times.</p>	9	0	0

Annex 2: Document List

Reference	Document Title
GF/IEP7/01	Agenda
GF/IEP7/02	Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer Operational Update
GF/IEP7/03	2024 Ongoing Evaluations Update
GF/IEP7/04	Evaluation Timeline Management
GF/IEP7/05	2025 Evaluation Topics
GF/IEP7/06	Evaluation Principles
GF/IEP7/07A	UNEG Quality Checklist for TORs
GF/IEP7/07B	Sida Evaluation TORs Checklist
GF/IEP7/07C	Quality Assurance Tool for Gavi Evaluations Terms of Reference
GF/IEP7/09	Evaluation: Community Responses and Systems Strengthening
GF/IEP7/10	Gender-Responsive Evaluations
GF/IEP7/11	Evaluation Partnership: Expanding LMIC Supplier Pool

Annex 3: Participant List

Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP)

Mira Johri, Chair
George Gotsadze, Vice Chair
Abdallah Bchir
Evelyn Ansah
Fred Carden
Florenca Guertzovich
Caroline Lynch
Dede Watchiba
Josephine Watera
John Grove, Global Fund Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer, Ex-officio, non-voting
Katie Kampf, Global Fund Chief of Staff, Ex-officio, non-voting

Strategy Committee

Julia Martin, Strategy Committee Chair
Carolyn Gomes, Strategy Committee Vice Chair

Evaluation & Learning Office (ELO)

Rita Benitez, Specialist, Learning & Dissemination
Yana Daneva, Consultant
Jutta Hornig, Team Coordinator
Rhiannon James, Senior Specialist, Evaluation Partnerships
Roy Mutandwa, Evaluation Specialist, C19RM
John Puvimanasinghe, Senior Specialist, Evaluation & Learning
Michael Schroll, Senior Specialist, Evaluation & Learning
Marc Theuss, Specialist, Evaluation
Olga Varetska, Specialist, Evaluation

Global Fund Secretariat

Harley Feldbaum, Head, Strategy and Policy Hub
Carol d'Souza, Manager, Allocation Model, Strategy and Policy Hub
Hannah Grant, Senior Strategy and Policy Advisor, Strategy and Policy Hub
Toyin Idowu, Support Officer, Governance
Stephanie Martone, Specialist, Governance
Max Mueller, Deputy Head, Governance
Susie Rhee, General Counsel and Head, Legal and Governance Department
Etienne Michaud, Chief Counsel, Legal and Governance Department
Tracy Staines, Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General
Shanti Van Hoog, Consultant, Strategy and Policy Hub

External participants

Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation and Learning, Gavi
Julia Bürgi, report writer