GFF EVALUATION

Investors Group Meeting-Nairobi Kenya
We have now entered the kickoff phase of the evaluation, following launch of the Steering Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>• Define core objectives that are responsive to TFC request as well as GFF learning needs • Advise on development of the scope and approach to the evaluation.</td>
<td>• Consider and discuss advice and guidance proposed by the Results Advisory Group. • Provide feedback on proposed scope and high-level evaluation questions</td>
<td>• Build consensus on way forward. • Agree on high level evaluation questions.</td>
<td>• Ensure quality, usefulness and independence with multistakeholder representation</td>
<td>• Deliver a high quality, independent evaluation of the GFF that informs improvements and enables learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Questions</td>
<td>• What is already covered today in terms of GFF evaluation? • What aspects of GFF evaluation could be strengthened?</td>
<td>• What are the priority topic areas/questions under each domain by OECD evaluation criteria?</td>
<td>• What are the priority questions to address through this evaluation?</td>
<td>• How to ensure inclusiveness, quality, and independence? • Is additional support needed for specific constituencies?</td>
<td>• NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>• Consider what is already covered through existing evaluation activities, and ensure coherence and non-duplication across the full set of activities. • Define areas for improvement.</td>
<td>• Identify the best options, their potential implications and make recommendation for the GFF evaluation based on the Results Advisory Group’s proposal • Prioritize a core set of evaluation questions, based on the following criteria: • Criticality • Coverage through existing evaluative activities • Suited to external evaluation modality • Timeframe</td>
<td>• High-level review and approval of • process • objectives • evaluation questions • Align on next steps</td>
<td>• Launch EOIs across TFC, Results AG &amp; IG • Ensure the SC members are able to • Prioritize sub-topics to explore • Review and approve: TORs, inception report, and draft report • Provide oversight of the evaluation • Recommend to TFC acceptance of final evaluation report</td>
<td>• Convene Steering Committee • Launch RFP • Manage competitive selection process • Contract selected firm • Initiate inception phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Steering Committee TORs

**Steering Committee Role**
- Review and approve: objective, scope and TORs for the evaluation; evaluation questions and priority areas of focus; inception report; draft report
- Support the selection of an independent entity to conduct the evaluation following a competitive RFP process;
- Oversee the analysis, reporting of the findings, and draft recommendations of the evaluation with support from the evaluation team for future implementation by the GFF; the SC will not be responsible for drafting any products.
- Make a recommendation to the TFC on the final evaluation report, based on assessment of independence, quality and utility.

**GFF Secretariat Role**
- Leading consultative process to define scope and approach for the evaluation
- Managing procurement through competitive selection process consistent with WB policies
- Contracting selected organization (and financing)
- Managing interaction with selected organization
- Supporting Steering Committee by:
  - Scheduling SC meetings at a time convenient to SC members
  - Circulating the agenda and relevant documents to SC members 10 business days before the meeting
  - Drafting and circulating meeting minutes
  - Ensuring SC is up to date on relevant activities related to the evaluation
- Leading development of management response in coordination with governance bodies

**Organization:**
- Co-chair structure comprising of both a country and a donor representative
- The Investors Group will serve as a reference group for the Steering Committee

**Guiding principles:** inclusiveness, quality, and independence
Steering Committee membership

• **Co-chairs**
  - Hon. Min. Austin Demby, Sierra Leone
  - Marnie Davidson, Canada

• **Investors Group**
  - CSO: Oyeyemi Pitan, Gem Hub Initiative
  - Youth rep: Kenneth Prudencio, ASAPSU

• **Trust Fund Committee**
  - Ingvar Olsen, Norway
  - Pamela Rao, BMGF
  - Claire Giry, UK

• **Results Advisory Group**
  - Abdallah Bchir, University of Tunisia
  - Shams El Arifeen, ICDDR,B, Bangladesh
Key points of focus for Steering Committee for initial phase

1. Confirm the written articulation of the evaluation objectives and high-level questions, with clarifications and adjustments made where needed

2. Initiate prioritization process for evaluation subtopics to address under each high-level question

3. Finalize TOR for inclusion in the RFP document, followed by launch of competitive selection process
Prioritization purpose and outputs

Purpose:
- To prioritize the sub-topics to be addressed through the evaluation, in such a manner that the evaluation focuses on the most relevant and important questions and is feasible to complete within the intended timeframe

Expected outputs of prioritization process:
- A clearly defined set of prioritized sub-topics to explore under each high-level evaluation question
Prioritization approach and criteria being used by Steering Committee

Prioritization approach:

- Step one: rank subtopics per evaluation question using structured template the Secretariat will provide
- Step two: review ranked subtopics to consider balance of evaluation dimensions (e.g. relevance, coherence, adaptations, etc.) and what the complete picture looks like holistically

Prioritization criteria considered in process:

- Criteria used to develop the long-list of potential sub-topics (Coverage, Criticality, Timeframe, and Suitability of Modality)
- Existence of strong rationale for use case of evidence to be generated, ensuring responsiveness to overarching evaluation objectives
- Feasibility of collecting reliable data on proposed topic, within timeframe and budget
- Degree of the relevance of proposed topic across the GFF portfolio, given implementation maturity, number of GFF-supported countries implicated, etc.

Decisions to be made through consensus across SC members
## Deliverables and anticipated dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft inception report</td>
<td>Draft inception phase report including approach and methods, evaluation matrix, data collection instruments</td>
<td>March 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final inception report</td>
<td>Final inception report reflecting input from Steering Committee and GFF Secretariat</td>
<td>April 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-weekly update reports</td>
<td>Minutes from bi-weekly update/progress meetings with GFF Secretariat</td>
<td>Ongoing throughout evaluation period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary findings report</td>
<td>Report detailing evaluation activities conducted (including data collection and analysis completed) and preliminary findings, including draft recommendations</td>
<td>August 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary findings presentation</td>
<td>PowerPoint slide deck summarizing the interim report, including draft recommendations</td>
<td>August 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on consultations on interim findings</td>
<td>Summary of consultations conducted and feedback received on interim findings</td>
<td>September 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Report detailing the evaluation activities, findings, and recommendations, incorporating input from consultations on preliminary findings</td>
<td>November 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final presentation</td>
<td>PowerPoint slide deck summarizing the final evaluation report, including draft recommendations</td>
<td>November 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief</td>
<td>Short brief summarizing the evaluation findings and recommendations</td>
<td>November 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dates are subject to change based on time required for different steps of the process (e.g., Steering Committee deliberations, procurement, contracting)
PART 2

Annex: Background information on GFF Evaluation
Background: request from TFC

- Prepare an evaluation of the overall GFF model (initiate in 2023 and final report in 2024)
- Recommended the setup of a steering committee to ensure quality, usefulness and independence with multistakeholder representation
- Consider what is already covered through existing evaluation activities, and ensure coherence and non-duplication across the full set of activities
- Evaluation should look at gaps across the results chain and include the GFF support (Co-financing and TA) against the logic model
Background: roles and responsibilities

**Steering Committee**
- Members: TFC Tech. Alternates, IG/CSO constituency, Results Advisory Group
- Review and approve: TORs, inception report, and draft report
- Provide oversight of the evaluation
- Recommend to TFC acceptance of final evaluation report, based on assessment of quality and utility

**Results Advisory Group**
- Advise on development of the scope and approach to the evaluation

**GFF Secretariat**
- Lead consultative process to define scope and approach
- Manage procurement (competitive selection process)
- Provide financing
- Manage the interaction with the selected organization
- Support the Steering Committee

**TFC**
- High-level review and approval (process, timeframe, final deliverable)
Process to develop proposed scope for overall GFF evaluation (‘GFF Evaluation’) 

1) Define core objectives that are responsive to TFC request as well as GFF learning needs

2) Map out long list of possible topic areas/questions under each domain by OECD evaluation criteria

3) Prioritize a core set of evaluation questions, based on the following criteria: 
   • Criticality 
   • Coverage through existing evaluative activities 
   • Suited to external evaluation modality 
   • Timeframe

4) Consultations 
   • Internal review of logic and consistency in applying the criteria (GFF Secretariat) 
   • Results Advisory Group, Trust Fund Committee Technical Alternates
OECD evaluation criteria used to generate long list of possible questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANCE</td>
<td>The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’ global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHERENCE</td>
<td>The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution. Includes internal and external coherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td>The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue. Sustainability has various dimensions (financial, economic, social and environmental).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria to prioritize from the long list to the core set the evaluation will focus on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICALITY</th>
<th>Degree to which the topic/question is critical for understanding how GFF is working and potential adaptations needed to strengthen the model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING COVERAGE</td>
<td>Degree to which the topic/question is addressed through existing or planned activities, including other evaluations and complementary activities (e.g., IC evaluations, meta-review, Strategy KPIs, other data/annual reporting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUITABILITY TO MODALITY</td>
<td>The external evaluation is the most suitable approach to responding to the topic/question (considering other ongoing or planned activities that could address the question instead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMEFRAME</td>
<td>The expected timeframe of implementation of this external evaluation (starting in 2023, finalization in 2024) a) lends itself to being able to respond to the question, and b) the findings will be relevant and useful within this time frame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of evaluation activity timelines

- **Q4 2023**
- **Q1 2024**
- **Q2 2024**
- **Q3 2024**
- **Q4 2024**
- **Q1 2025**

- **May 2024**: Round 1 Synthesis Report
- **Feb 2025**: Round 2 Synthesis Report

**Meta Review – Round 1**
Includes evaluations since 2016, including any recently completed through Feb. 2024

**Meta Review – Round 2**
Update Round 1 synthesis with evaluations completed since Feb. 2024

**Round 3**
Update to Round 2 synthesis

**IC midterm reviews and evaluations – Rolling, based on optimal timing for individual countries**

**GFF External Evaluation**
Objectives for GFF Evaluation

• To generate evidence, strengthen accountability and enable learning on the GFF country engagement model, operational structure, support modalities, and strategy

• To inform adaptations and improvements to the GFF country engagement model, operational structure, support modalities, and strategy including through financing decisions and other management actions where relevant
  o Current strategy period
  o Next strategy period
High level evaluation questions as currently drafted (under discussion with Steering Committee)

Taking into account GFF resources, structures, and capacities:

1. Country engagement model: To what extent is the GFF country engagement model:
   - Coherent and fit for the purpose of catalyzing sustainable improvements in the health of women, children and adolescents through a systems approach? (design)
   - Being implemented effectively and efficiently? (implementation)

2. Operational structure and support modalities: To what extent are the GFF operational structure and support modalities:
   - Coherent and fit for the purpose of enabling delivery of the strategy through the country engagement model? (design)
   - Being implemented effectively and efficiently? (implementation)

3. Strategy, results, and value add: To what extent is progress being made in delivery of the overall GFF strategy and specific high priority thematic areas within it? What is the value add of the GFF in contributing to country-led improvements in the health of women, children and adolescents?
1 Evaluation Questions — Country engagement model

Overarching question: To what extent is the GFF country engagement model:

- Coherent and fit for the purpose of catalyzing sustainable improvements in the health of women, children and adolescents through a systems approach? (design)
- Being implemented effectively and efficiently? (implementation)

Components of the GFF Country Engagement Model, to be considered holistically

Driving principle of country-led decision making and action
Prioritization at country level linked to available resources (Investment Cases)
National convening mechanisms for multistakeholder coordination and decision making (Country Platforms)
Alignment of stakeholders & funding commitments around country priorities
Mobilization of domestic funding
Health financing and other systems reforms on critical path to improved RMNCAH-N outcomes
Quality data/evidence available for decision making
Evaluation Questions — Operational structure and support modalities

Overarching question: To what extent are the GFF operational structure and support modalities:

• Coherent and fit for the purpose of enabling delivery of the strategy through the country engagement model? (design)
• Being implemented effectively and efficiently? (implementation)

Components of Operational Structure and Support Modalities to be considered holistically

- Secretariat resources, size, organization, and capacities
- Operational integration with WB and co-financing of WB operations, with links to IDA
- Technical assistance, including that provided directly by WB/GFF and sourced from others
- Partnerships, including internal (i.e., within WB) and external, at global, regional, and national levels
- Policy dialogue, advocacy and communications
- Knowledge & learning
Evaluation Questions — GFF Strategy, Results, and Value Add

Overarching question:

• To what extent is progress being made in delivery of the overall GFF strategy and specific high priority thematic areas within it? What is the value add of the GFF in contributing to country-led improvements in the health of women, children and adolescents?