

Twelfth Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel

Summary Notes

8-10 September 2025

Virtual meeting

Purpose

This document presents the Report of the Twelfth Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP), held virtually from 8 to 10 September 2025.

Agenda items. The meeting comprised of nine (9) agenda items.

Decisions. No decisions were taken at this meeting, as the agenda did not include any items for IEP decision.

Documents. A document list is attached to this report (Annex 1).

Participants. The participant list is attached to this report (Annex 2).

Action Items

- IEPL, with ELO feedback, to revisit approach to IEP commentaries ahead of the next IEP commentary to align with SC expectations and IEP TOR.
- ELO to finalize the approach to rapid assessments, building on discussions and recommendations from IEP members captured in this report.
- IEP Chair to provide final comments to finalize the 2026 Evaluation Workplan.
- Following the HIV Prevention and Gender evaluations, ELO to prepare a learning session on use of AI in evaluations
- Building on the discussions at the 12th meeting of the IEP, ELO to further articulate and communicate the approach to learning within the context of the evaluation & learning function.
- By November 2025, IEPL to outline the details of how changes in the role of FPs at the report review stage of the SOP2 will be implemented.
- IEPL (or designate) to update the IEP Quality Assurance and Quality Assessment tools and share with ELO for feedback before finalization.

Table of Contents

Purpose	2
Action Items	2
Report	4
Opening	4
Chief Learning and Evaluation Operational Update.	4
Approach to Rapid Assessments	5
2026 Evaluation Workplan	7
HIV Prevention Evaluation Updates	8
Gender Evaluation	10
Evaluation Follow-up, Learning and Influence	11
Role of IEP Focal Points	12
IEP Quality Assurance and Quality Assessment Tools Review	13
IEP and Gavi Evaluation Advisory Committee Collaboration	14
Closing	15

Annex 1: Document List	16
Annex 2: Participant List	17
Annex 3: Decisions taken intersessionally	18

Report

Opening

The IEP Chair summarized the agenda for the 12th meeting of the IEP. The IEP Chair ('Chair') highlighted key takeaways from the 28th Strategy Committee ('SC') meeting, including SC members' emphasis on the importance extracting timely recommendations and learning from evaluations to support organizational decision-making, in addition to evaluations providing accountability and assurance. The Chair noted the need to revisit the approach to IEP commentaries to align with SC expectations and with the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the IEP.

Governance presented the action points arising from previous IEP meetings and progress to date on their execution.

Action items:

- IEPL, with ELO feedback, to revisit approach to IEP commentaries ahead of the next IEP commentary to align with SC expectations and IEP TOR.

Chief Learning and Evaluation Operational Update.

Reference document: GF/IEP12/02 - CELO Operational Update

Presentation summary:

The Chief Learning and Evaluation Officer (CELO) provided an operational update on the Evaluation & Learning Function, including a look back on the vision for the Function presented to the IEP in 2023 and progress against the following areas: insights and learning, ways of working and partnerships. The following achievements were noted, among others: mainstreaming of learning briefs, setting up of a searchable public Global Fund evaluations database, operationalization of the standard operating procedures of the Function; strides made in the development of an approach to rapid assessments and a follow-up framework for evaluations. Considering the progress made so far in 2025 and the vision set out for 2028, the CELO also noted the opportunity for further developing the approach to learning and for continuing to explore ways to diversify the evaluator pool.

Additionally, the presentation covered the following topics:

- A review of progress against action points for the ELO from previous IEP meetings;
- A scorecard self-rating on agreed-upon priorities;
- Updates on ongoing evaluations;

- Updates on the rapid assessment of Human Rights Barrier to Access and the consultancy to document the Global Fund's efforts in Integrated People-Centered Quality Services (IPCQS); and
- Efforts to expand the evaluator supplier pool, including collaboration with Gavi, an analysis of bids received from 2023 to 2025 and thoughts on the way forward.

Discussion summary:

- **Operating challenges:** Highlighting the challenges currently facing the Global Fund and the global health landscape more generally, the CELO emphasized the need for pragmatism in advancing priority activities in 2025 and 2026 with focus on timely delivery of the highest-quality and most relevant evaluations and learning, aligned with the organization's decision-making windows, to help drive the Global Fund's mission. In this context, the CELO noted that rapid assessments offer the necessary flexibility to generate timelier evidence to inform Grant Cycle 8 (GC8).
- **Learning and influence:** IEP members queried about plans to further develop the learning approach of the Global Fund's Evaluation & Learning Function. Noting that this would be discussed during a dedicated session in this meeting, the CELO stressed that the learning approach must be tailored to the needs and current context facing the Global Fund.
- **Expanding the evaluator pool:** The Vice Chair remarked on the progress to date including the increased diversity in the proposals received. Whilst acknowledging the ongoing efforts to expand the evaluator supplier pool, several IEP members urged ELO to continue considering innovative ways to further diversify the pool. IEP members queried the extent of meaningful consideration of low and lower-middle-income country (LLMIC) bidders in the selection process. IEP members further suggested that binding requirements be added in the selection process, that the Global Fund offer capacity building and that implicit assumptions in bidder selection be examined. The CELO responded that organizational guidelines require all bidders be offered a level playing field, adding that the Global Fund is not placed to provide capacity building to evaluation suppliers but is doing what it can to address bottlenecks and barriers to applying and being selected for evaluations.
- **The IEP collectively recommended that ELO continue to consider innovative ways to enable diversification of the evaluator pool.**

Approach to Rapid Assessments

Reference document: GF/IEP12/03 - Rapid Assessment Concept Note

Presentation summary:

The Vice Chair recalled the SC's suggestion to explore new modalities that generate timely decision-relevant evidence. The CELO also acknowledged the importance of thinking outside the traditional evaluation mindset and emphasized this as an opportunity to enhance the Evaluation & Learning Function's strategic contribution to the organization.

The presentation included an explanation of the rationale for conducting rapid assessments, a description of rapid assessments in comparison to an evaluation, and a proposal of the process, roles and responsibility in conducting a rapid assessment. Rapid evaluations are proposed to be completed in two to six months with one to two objectives as part of a focused scope, and reliance on secondary data with limited effort to collect new data. Rapid assessments would be conducted at the request of the Secretariat and governance bodies to inform key decision-making processes and Secretariat processes. Oversight and quality assurance would be provided by ELO senior staff and the CELO in collaboration with the IEP.

Discussion summary:

- **General feedback:** The IEP commended the diversification of tools used by the ELO to include rapid assessments and affirmed the Human Rights Rapid Assessment as a pilot. One IEP member welcomed this development, recommending that rapid assessments be used exceptionally and not as a routine replacement for evaluations. IEP Members asked how it would be determined whether a rapid assessment vs. a full evaluation would take place for a given topic. The ELO shared that rapid assessments would be used when evidence is needed urgently for decision-making by governance bodies and the Secretariat. The Chair flagged the need to discuss further IEP's role in assessing the quality and independence of rapid assessments.
- **Topics:** There was broad agreement that rapid assessments require more flexible approaches to topic selection, beyond the Multi-Year Evaluation Calendar (Evaluation Calendar) framework, to ensure that assessments can respond to emerging evidence needs. The ELO acknowledged that while the Evaluation Calendar provides a starting point, alternative methods for topic selection should be explored to enable responsive prioritization. One IEP member proposed joint input from the SC, ELO, and IEP for topic selection, with another IEP member noting that this would be particularly relevant where external providers are not engaged to ensure independence.
- **Management Response and recommendations:** IEP Members queried whether Management Response and recommendations would be mandatory elements of rapid assessments, flagging the importance of the Management Response in generating a sense of ownership over assessment findings. Noting that the standard Management Response approach may compromise the ability to undertake assessments within the two-to-six-month timeline, the ELO committed to exploring streamlined approaches. The CELO advised that all rapid assessments generate proposed actions, learning steps or commitments, but emphasized the need to meet learning needs with agility.
- **Timeline & Publication:** IEP members suggested that the timeline for rapid assessments be under six months, which the ELO agreed with, pointing out that scoping and contracting would also be considered within this timeframe. The Vice Chair sought clarity about the publication policy for rapid assessments. The CELO clarified that he intends for final findings to be published on the Global Fund external website.
- **Supplier & Costs:** IEP members requested more details about the proposal that the ELO would undertake certain rapid assessments on its own. The ELO shared that it operates with a certain level of independence from the Secretariat, similar to external suppliers, but with greater understanding of internal needs. One IEP Member questioned

how costs compare between rapid assessments and full evaluations. The ELO clarified that rapid assessments would cost between US\$50,000 and US\$100,000 compared to US\$300,000 upwards for full evaluations.

- **The IEP collectively recommended the following, for consideration by ELO in the revision of the approach to rapid assessments:** i. Each rapid assessment should be required to propose actionable recommendations or learning topics; ii. Need to clarify if a Management Response will be required for rapid assessments; iii. Need to define the process for topics selection. In addition, the IEP will further develop the approach for assessing quality and independence of evaluations in the context of rapid assessments.

Action items:

- ELO to revise the approach to rapid assessments, building on discussions and recommendations from IEP members captured in this report.

2026 Evaluation Workplan

Reference document: GF/IEP12/04 - 2026 Evaluation Function Workplan

Presentation summary:

The 2026 Evaluation Workplan ('Workplan') session began with remarks from the OED ex-officio IEP member, who shared contextual milestones, including the Global Fund's first de-allocation process earlier in the year, the current reorganization of the Secretariat, the upcoming Eighth Replenishment in November 2025 and ongoing work to explore further collaboration with Gavi, including for the Evaluation Function.

The CELO noted key feedback received during the development of the Workplan, at Governance meetings and in past evaluations, highlighting the following emerging priorities for 2026: integration and optimization, informing essential service delivery, maintaining the resilience of the systems in which the Global Fund has invested significantly and the need to consider the limited span of control of the Global Fund vis-à-vis evaluation recommendations. The ELO presented the process through which the proposed Workplan was developed and an overview of the proposed evaluation topics and timing of 2026 evaluations and rapid assessments.

Discussion summary:

- **Proposed focus of 2026 evaluations:** IEP members acknowledged that evaluations have in the past yielded findings or recommendations that are outside of Secretariat span of control, focusing on what recipient countries or partners should do. Several IEP members emphasized the need to improve the strategic focus of evaluations in 2026 so that they can better inform decision-making by governance committees and the Secretariat. ELO pointed out that while it is helpful to keep specific questions in mind

from the start, there is a need to continuously monitor gaps in the evidence base to support complex decision-making processes, such as the development of the next Strategy. One IEP member suggested the Evaluation Function focus on providing decision-makers with an evidence base to draw upon during this pivotal moment.

- **Quantity, quality and integration:** Recognizing the challenging financial landscape, one IEP member supported the focused nature of the Workplan and encouraged focusing resources on mission-critical evaluation activities instead of spreading them too thinly across many activities. Additionally, IEP members suggested both the IEP and ELO breakdown the perceived siloed nature of evaluations in 2024 and 2025 and explore further integration across evaluations in 2026. The CELO emphasized the CELO Annual Evaluation Synthesis Report as an opportunity to draw upon past evaluations and provide a more cross-cutting view.
- **Learning and influence:** The IEP Chair and other IEP Members asked how investments in evaluations can be leveraged further for learning and influence, particularly given the context of limited resources. Several IEP members recommended adding a learning activity to the Workplan, focusing on using insights from past evaluations to inform strategic discussions. The CELO flagged that completed evaluations can continue to generate learnings and influence, such as through the Annual CELO Evaluation Synthesis Report, and emphasized that the Mid-Term Review will have a strong learning component. ELO added that learning also happens during evaluations by engaging primary stakeholders and user groups throughout the process. The Secretariat's willingness to learn and derive value from evaluation reports was highlighted, reinforcing the need to ensure evaluations bring new evidence and actionable insights.
- **The IEP collectively recommended the following for the Workplan and Budget ahead of SC decision-making in October:** i. Further clarifying in the paper presented to the SC the questions and learning objectives proposed for each evaluation; ii. Embedding in the Workplan a learning activity that focuses on supporting cross-fertilization between evaluations.

Action items:

- IEP Chair to provide final comments to finalize the 2026 Evaluation Workplan.

HIV Prevention Evaluation Updates

Reference document: GF/IEP12/10 - HIV Prevention Evaluation Inception Report

Presentation summary:

Recalling that the HIV Prevention and Gender Evaluations are beyond the inception phase, the Vice Chair explained that this session was not intended to lead to any revision of the inception reports, but rather to ensure uniform understanding of the evaluations across all IEP members.

The ELO presented an update on the HIV Prevention Evaluation, recalling that the inception report was completed and the data collection and analysis phase was underway. It was

noted that the evaluation questions were slightly revised considering the changing situation related to HIV prevention funding. The analysis of secondary data for 12 specific countries and globally using artificial intelligence (AI) was described. The IEP was informed that the next steps would include finalization and sharing of the interim report and conducting country stakeholder interviews in 12 countries.

Discussion summary:

- **General feedback:** The IEP Focal Points commended the progress to date on the HIV Prevention Evaluation. One IEP Member queried how the ELO was ensuring the relevance of evaluation findings to the SC. The ELO responded that the evaluation was adaptive to the developing environment in which HIV prevention programs are being delivered by means of incorporating questions on changing funding landscape, introduction of Lenacapavir and other emerging areas. Findings will be available in time for Grant Cycle 8 funding request submission and grant-making.
- **Technical focus:** One IEP Focal Point reaffirmed the importance of HIV prevention for the Global Fund at this point in time. One IEP member echoed this point, noting critical allocation funding going to Lenacapavir roll-out in Grant Cycle 7 and the unprecedented milestone in public health of low- and middle-income countries and upper-income countries rolling out this innovative tool simultaneously.
- **Use of AI:** One IEP Focal Point flagged the tension between deploying AI to increase the volume of data analyzed with the matter of reliability. The Vice Chair asked the ELO to comment on quality assurance steps to validate the rigorousness of AI outputs. The ELO highlighted the phased approach, the importance of human validation – such as the feedback from the Country Team and User Group on AI outputs – and backstop support for AI use from the Secretariat’s Emerging Technologies & Enterprise Architecture Team. The CELO emphasized the importance of checking the sources used and outputs generated by AI. One IEP Member asked if the prompts used for AI had been duplicated to test for consistency and suggested they be shared for transparency in evaluation reports, which the ELO said it would look into. Another IEP Member pointed out the utility of AI primarily in combination with human expertise, asking how the ELO would ensure transparency for stakeholders to understand the line between AI and human contributions. The ELO flagged the evaluation supplier’s visual representation of this complementarity, and the importance of it being described well in the final report.
- **Capturing lessons learned and expanding learning on AI:** The Vice Chair underscored the importance of CELO and IEP Members learning more from practical experiences of AI use of in evaluations, including to fulfill the IEP and ELO’s quality assurance role. IEP Members suggested ELO carry out an analysis of lessons learned from AI use in evaluations and documenting the experience for future steps.
- **Level of Quality Assurance Focal Point involvement:** The IEP Quality Assurance Focal Points noted that their involvement in this evaluation has been light, nevertheless sufficient for being able to implement their quality and independence assurance role.

Action items:

- Following the HIV Prevention and Gender evaluations, ELO to prepare a learning session on use of AI in evaluations, possibly with other global partners.

Gender Evaluation

Reference document: GF/IEP12/11 - Gender Evaluation Inception Report

Presentation summary:

The ELO provided an update on the Gender Evaluation, which is in the data collection and analysis phase. IEP Quality Assurance focal points also made remarks on progress of the evaluation.

Discussion summary:

- **General feedback:** The IEP Focal Points flagged the emerging finding that integration of gender falls short for some diseases compared to others and the hope that primary data collection cover some gaps in secondary data, some of which arises from lack of gender-specific line items in budgets. One IEP Member asked how serious the data gaps were, which the IEP clarified was not significant but arising from the asymmetrical structuring of data across HIV, TB and malaria documents, complicating AI analysis. The Chair highlighted this as a potential learning for the Secretariat. In response to IEP interest in the relevance of the evaluation to the SC, the ELO flagged the importance of providing the SC with evidence – particularly in a resource-constrained environment – of what gender programs are having success in fighting HIV, TB and malaria.
- **Technical focus:** The Chair requested the ELO to clarify the rationale of revising the phrasing of the first evaluation question to “gender equality” instead of “gender transformative”, which the ELO clarified was to align wording across questions in consultation with the Gender Team. One IEP Quality Assurance Focal Point anticipated that the evaluation could improve future reporting on gender beyond its integration under human rights broadly.
- **Use of AI:** The Vice Chair commended the ELO demonstrably addressing in its presentation challenges faced when using AI for evaluations and asked how the ELO was learning from each evaluation supplier’s models. The ELO flagged the tailored nature of AI tools to each evaluation, unlike generative AI models, and highlighted the rapid advancements in AI yielding new features since past evaluations or even the bidding phase. The importance of human validation and learning from other evaluation units was emphasized. IEP members suggested including AI prompts as an Annex to evaluations utilizing it.
- **Capturing lessons learned and expanding learning on AI:** The ELO suggested further conversation with the IEP and the Secretariat’s Emerging Technologies & Enterprise Architecture Team on the topic of AI, which the Vice Chair proposed be guided by topics and issues provided by the ELO. The CELO added that this conversation could also benefit from learnings generated by Gavi or other organizations’ Evaluation Functions.

- **Cross-evaluation learning:** IEP Members queried how the ELO was ensuring synergies and dialogue across evaluations. The ELO shared that the gender and HIV evaluation suppliers at the selection and inception report stages met for discussion, citing the risk that the evaluations generate contradictory recommendations otherwise.

Evaluation Follow-up, Learning and Influence

Reference document: GF/IEP12/05 - Evaluation Follow-up, Learning and Influence

Presentation summary:

The ELO presented the learning and influence approach proposed for inclusion in the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) of the Evaluation & Learning Function, including a definition of learning and influence that fits the needs and context of the Global Fund; the systematic evaluation follow-up approach, content and process; the proposed roles and responsibilities; and an overview of evaluation recommendations. The focus was on a system that would ensure structured, periodic follow-up of evaluation recommendations (disaggregated by level of acceptance) by comparing qualitative and quantitative data, with the results to be shared with the IEP and Secretariat through in a brief report and with governance bodies through the CELO Annual Learning and Synthesis Report.

Discussion summary:

- **General feedback:** The IEP commended the development and advancement of this process as an important step forward in the work done together by the IEP and ELO. One IEP Member flagged the possibility of a holistic learning strategy for the organization, to which the CELO responded that this extended beyond the mandate of the ELO, noting that in the current context the focus should be on improving socialization of learnings emerging from evaluations as a first step. One IEP Member flagged the context of polycrises as both limiting but also an opportunity in which learning might be more appealing.
- **Learning across evaluations:** IEP Members asked how the ELO was looking at recommendations across evaluations generally as well as at recurring recommendations highlighted by multiple evaluations. The CELO confirmed the importance of doing so, citing the CELO Annual Evaluation Synthesis Report as one opportunity to share emerging cross-evaluation themes. In response to the Chair's question on the level of ambition for learning, the CELO flagged recommendation follow-up as a critical moment of reflection on the level of change, with cross-evaluation follow-up as a next step for the ELO.
- **Scope of accountability and level of Secretariat acceptance:** The IEP recognized that not all evaluation recommendations were within the scope of remit of the Global Fund. Regarding the possibility of integrating evaluation recommendation response within departmental workplans, the CELO said this would be a possibility as the learning and influence system matures; one IEP Member suggested that compliance monitoring be avoided, which the CELO echoed. The IEP queried how the ELO would assess and

manage recommendations rejected or partially accepted, which the CELO affirmed as an important measure that would be explored.

- **Learning definition and tools:** One IEP member queried what learning tools the ELO was using beyond documents. The ELO flagged that User Group, technical partner and regional hub meetings were all strategic learning tools, but not ones that are formally captured. IEP Members underscored the essentiality of defining purpose and meaning of “learning” function within Global Fund context, including whether it covers generating impact or just informing of about evaluation findings. One IEP Member suggested the ELO take an approach of “remix” rather than “revolution” to encourage a learning culture and another suggested prioritizing appropriation and use rather than producing knowledge. The CELO emphasized the ELO’s support for evidence, action, recommendations, User Group discussions and follow-up, though the mechanism for change remained with departmental and organizational leadership.
- **Learning and influence in decision-making:** The IEP queried what mechanisms were foreseen to transform evaluation results into decision, which the CELO highlighted as a SC concern as well and emphasized the importance of the ELO instigating critical conversations.
- **Focus of discussion:** The ELO acknowledged that the presentation and discussion focused on a subset of the learning work. The Chair added that the IEP was required to understand the constraints within which the ELO was working.
- **The IEP collectively recommended that the ELO produce a theory of change and a more ambitious strategy for the learning component of the Evaluation & Learning Function, focusing on the potential for cross-fertilization and learning across evaluations and rapid assessments.**

Action items:

- Building on the discussions at the 12th meeting of the IEP, ELO to further articulate and communicate the approach to learning within the context of the Evaluation & Learning Function.

Role of IEP Focal Points

Reference document: GF/IEP12/06 - Role of IEP Focal Points

Presentation summary:

The Chair recalled that this topic is associated with an action point from the 10th IEP meeting, noting the feedback shared by IEP members at the time concerning the perceived limited value of the Quality Assessment Focal Point’s comments if the comments cannot be used to improve the quality of the final report. The Chair emphasized the importance of getting the timing and process of incorporating comments from IEP Quality Assessment FPs right to help ensure the highest quality evaluation reports. The Chair further noted that other aspects of the SOPs will be discussed more broadly in 2026 following the OIG Audit on the Evaluation & Learning Function.

The Chair recalled the revised approval process originally proposed by IEP members. ELO summarized the Secretariat feedback regarding the IEP-proposed revised process, including the potential of extended timelines, Legal's concerns about maintaining IEP independence.

The Chair presented a proposed revised evaluation approval process endorsed by the IEP Leadership and ELO for IEP member input:

- The draft final evaluation and complete set of evaluation documents be reviewed by the both the Quality Assurance and Assessment Focal Points;
- Then shared with the CELO who may or may not request the comments be incorporated into the final report;
- The IEP Commentary be produced by both the IEP Quality Assessment and Assurance Focal Points
- The full IEP read the final report and IEP Commentary to consider their endorsement.

Discussion summary:

- **Maintaining independence of IEP review:** There were mixed views about whether the provision of comments by the IEP on the draft evaluation report would compromise independence, with legal concerns raised by some about this constituting an instance of "self-review" while others considered that independence would be preserved.
- **Collective vs. independent review:** The IEP insisted that the proposed process would better reflect the opinion of the Panel rather than one that only considers the perspective of the IEP Focal Points. IEP members clarified that this would help address the issue of earlier IEP comments remaining unaddressed in the final report, better leveraging IEP expertise and enhancing final report quality, and yielding a more efficient and accountable process. The ELO and IEP emphasized that the Panel would need to come to a unified perspective and avoid providing contradictory comments, noting also risks that this could protract the approval process.
- **Process:** The Chair suggested that the Quality Assessment Framework only be formally filled by the IEP Quality Assessment Focal Points in by the IEP at the last stage of reviewing the final report.

Action items:

- By November 2025, IEPL/ELO to finalize the details of how changes in the role of FPs at the report review stage of the SOP2 will be implemented.

IEP Quality Assurance and Quality Assessment Tools Review

Reference documents: GF/IEP12/07- IEP Quality Assurance & Quality Assessment Tools Review_01; and GF/IEP12/08 - IEP Quality Assurance & Quality Assessment Tools Review_02.

Presentation summary:

IEP presented an overview of comments from IEP members on the Quality Assessment Framework, such as clarity in and range of scoring, the merging or deletion of certain sub-questions to reduce length and minimize duplication, and wording changes to improve clarity. The presentation also included IEP comments on the Terms of Reference (TOR) Checklist, including explicit criteria for ratings, definition of “not applicable”, addition of a column for comments, the merging or deletion of certain sub-questions to reduce length and minimize duplication, and wording changes to improve clarity. ELO provided their own comments on the tools and responses to some of the IEP’s detailed suggestions.

Discussion summary:

- **General feedback:** The ELO and IEP welcomed dialogue on how to improve these tools, noting that they should be “living documents” and evolve with the model. While some of the discussion focused on detailed feedback, one IEP member suggested focusing on ensuring that the tools are serving their purpose of informing and aligning expectations from evaluators and the ELO about quality parameters, ultimately improving evaluation quality.
- **ELO use of TOR Checklist:** The ELO highlighted its own use of the TOR Checklist in creating the TOR template and drafting TORs, in addition to enabling the IEP to provide structured feedback and informing evaluation bidders of expectations.
- **Finalization process:** As a next step, the Chair recommended considering IEP and ELO comments together to finalize a revised version of the tools. Noting that both tools are IEP products, the Chair proposed that IEP members should take on the task, with the Vice Chair volunteering to compile comments, revise the tools with input from IEP members and share a final version on the Sharepoint site. ELO to ensure version control in the respective TEAMS space.

Action items:

- IEPL (or designate) to update the IEP Quality Assurance and Quality Assessment tools and share with ELO for feedback before finalization.

IEP and Gavi Evaluation Advisory Committee Collaboration

Presentation summary:

The Chair opened this agenda item by recalling that the objective of the session was to inform IEP members about Gavi’s Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) to support future exploration of further collaboration opportunities between the IEP and the EAC. The Chair then introduced the two guests: Hope Johnson, the Director of Evaluation and Learning at Gavi, and James Hargreaves, the EAC Chair.

Discussion summary:

- **Gavi Evaluation Function and evaluations:** The EAC Chair provided a high-level overview of the current evaluation work plan. The EAC Chair further reported on ongoing work to strengthen Gavi's evaluation model. The EAC Chair noted that discussions about the forward-looking vision for Gavi's evaluation function have included explorations about potential joint evaluations with the Global Fund and noted that further Gavi-Global Fund collaboration initiatives could include collaboration on monitoring, evaluation, and learning activities.
- **Broad Gavi-Global Fund collaboration:** The Director of Evaluation and Learning at Gavi underscored collaboration between Gavi's and the Global Fund's evaluation functions is regular practice, recalling the success of joint webinars aiming to expand and diversify the evaluation supplier pool. She noted that impediments to deeper collaboration tend to be linked to divergent use cases and operating models, which create specific timing needs. She concluded by noting that aligning strategy periods could contribute to significantly expanding collaboration between the two organizations. One IEP member stressed the increasing pressure from donors to scale up collaboration.
- **Evaluation-specific Gavi-Global Fund collaboration:** The IEP Chair flagged an opportunity to jointly leverage the technical capacities of the IEP and the EAC through joint evaluations. One IEP member recalled prior collaborations between the two evaluation functions and the complexities that halted it, counseling the groups to start slowly by sharing evaluation reports, tools, and lessons learned. IEP members suggested integration as one evaluation topic to consider for future collaboration. The Director of Evaluation and Learning at Gavi agreed that this could be explored and suggested exchanging scoping questions to enable an assessment of common objectives. One IEP member suggested, rather than co-running evaluations, collaborating on a larger topic with complementary evaluations and approaches by both organizations. The EAC Chair also mentioned efficiency of evaluation processes as a priority and the need to balance oversight and advice with Secretariat operations. The Evaluation Functions of both organization agreed to put a list together of these potential areas of collaboration to discuss moving forward.

Closing

The IEP Leadership and Governance presented the action items they each proposed arising from the 12th IEP meeting for a brief discussion. The CELO clarified which items would be most useful to include in the meeting report given their nature as exceptions to business as usual. The IEP Leadership and the CELO agreed to work together to finalize the action points.

The Chair flagged the upcoming discussion on the 2026 IEP meeting workplan, noting the intention to follow a similar approach to 2025, scheduling IEP meetings in advance of those of the Strategy Committee, which will take place in May and October 2026.

The productive and useful nature of discussions at the 12th IEP meeting was highlighted by the Chair. The Chair and CELO thanked all attendees for their contributions and the important items on which agreement was found through discussion.

Annex 1: Document List

Reference	Document Title
GF/IEP12/01	Agenda
GF/IEP12/02	CELO Operational Update
GF/IEP12/03	Rapid Assessment Concept Note
GF/IEP12/04	2026 Evaluation Function Workplan
GF/IEP12/05	Evaluation Follow-up, Learning and Influence
GF/IEP12/06	Role of IEP Focal Points
GF/IEP12/07	IEP Quality Assurance & Quality Assessment Tools Review_01
GF/IEP12/08	IEP Quality Assurance & Quality Assessment Tools Review_02
GF/IEP12/09	Action Points Tracker
GF/IEP12/10	HIV Prevention Evaluation Inception Report
GF/IEP12/11	Gender Evaluation Inception Report

Additional Background Reading

Reference	Document Title
GF/IEP11/12	Report of the 11 th Meeting of the Independent Evaluation Panel

Annex 2: Participant List

Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP)

Juan Pablo Gutierrez, IEP Chair
George Gotsadze, IEP Vice Chair
Evelyn Ansah
Abdallah Bchir
Fred Carden
Floencia Guerzovich
Caroline Lynch
Dede Watchiba
Josephine Watera
Harley Feldbaum, Head, Strategy and Policy Hub (Secretariat *ex-officio*)
Massimo Ghidinelli, Latin America and Caribbean Alternate (SC *ex-officio* Member)

Evaluation & Learning Office (ELO)

Yana Daneva, Evaluation and Project Specialist (Consultant)
John Grove, Chief Evaluation & Learning Officer (IEP *ex-officio*)
Rhiannon James, Senior Specialist, Evaluation Partnerships
Roy Mutandwa, Evaluation Specialist, C19RM
Michael Schroll, Senior Specialist, Evaluation & Learning
Marc Theuss, Specialist, Evaluation
Olga Varetska, Specialist, Evaluation

Global Fund Secretariat

Fernanda Benini, Specialist, Governance
Maximilian Mueller, Lead, Governance
Etienne Michaud, Chief Counsel, Legal

External participants

Julia Bürgi, report writer
Hope Johnson, Director of Evaluation and Learning (Gavi)
James Hargreaves, Evaluation Advisory Committee Chair (Gavi)

Annex 3: Decisions taken intersessionally

Decision Point	Decision Point Text	Voting Summary		
		For	Against	Abstain
GF/IEP11A/DP01	Endorsement of the Final Report of the Evaluation of Community Responses and Systems Strengthening	Unanimous		
GF/IEP11A/DP02	Terms of Reference: End-term Evaluation of the Global Fund's COVID-19 Response Mechanism and its Contribution to the Strengthening of Sustainable Health Systems and Pandemic Preparedness.	Unanimous		