Annex F: Mapping of key issues and response to Gavi and Global Fund assessments

This document presents a comparative summary of key issues emerging from Gavi's Evaluation Function Review (EFR) and MOPAN assessment (2024) and the 2026 Global Fund Office of the Inspector General (OIG) audit of the Evaluation and Learning Office (ELO). See Table 1. below for a detailed analysis of convergence/divergence across issues identified and Gavi's response.

Many of the issues identified in the Global Fund OIG audit align with those identified through Gavi's 2024 Evaluation Function Review (EFR), and noted to some extent in the 2024 Gavi MOPAN report, including:

- Evaluation function's **mandate and purpose lack sufficient clarity** and need sharpening to better guide the functions.
- **Current oversight arrangements are inadequate**, requiring more fit-for-purpose governance.
- **Balance between independence and usefulness needs consideration**, with more emphasis needed on elevating utility.
- **Operating model needs consideration (i.e. use of external suppliers, Quality Assurance)**, as external supplier model does not fully support high-quality, value for money or timely evaluations and Quality Assurance (QA) can be fragmented and inconsistent.
- **Opportunities to strengthen learning**, with insufficient utilisation of findings and limited senior engagement (*TGF absence/delay in learning; Gavi exists but needs strengthening).*
- Evaluations **miss key decision windows** and require better alignment with organisational cycles *(although Gavi's period of review was significantly impacted by C19).*
- **Systematic tracking of evaluation management responses should be strengthened**, as at the time of the OIG report, systematic tracking at the Global Fund on management responses had just started and will be reported to the Strategy Committee in 2026, whereas Gavi notes *tracking exists but needs strengthening.*

Three critical success factors identified for an effective evaluation function in the Global Fund ELO Audit, aligned with key findings in the Gavi EFR and some of the 2024 MOPAN Assessment were: i) a clear mandate is essential, ii) a robust operating model, and iii) appropriate oversight framework, are needed.

Table 1. Summary of Convergent/Divergent Findings and Gavi Actions

Theme	Global Fund OIG Audit of ELO	Gavi EFR Key Findings + *additional MOPAN Insights*	Degree of Convergence	Gavi Actions / intended actions status as of Q1 2026
Clarity of mandate and purpose	Mandate not operationalised; unclear roles; independence prioritised over quality and learning.	Purpose, audience and value proposition need sharpening for Gavi 6.0. *Better link the centralised and decentralised evaluation by creating stronger mechanisms for the oversight of decentralised evaluations.*	Convergence on mandate and roles need clarity. Noting that the Global Fund doesn't have centralised/ decentralised distinction. Partial convergence on independence/quality/ learning - Gavi's EvU is positioned within MEL rather than a standalone evaluation office	To be clarified and addressed both through the revised evaluation policy, the MEL approach and subsequent evaluation operating guidelines.
Governance and oversight arrangements	Overly complex governance structures; unclear accountability between ELO/IEP blurring responsibilities, insufficient strategic oversight	EAC oversight not fully fit-for-purpose – unable to deliver against role and mandate. *Complex structures and blurred accountabilities between committees and Board (general not evaluation specific)*	Strong convergence - complex governance structures, unclear accountabilities	To be addressed through the revised evaluation policy, including stronger linkages to the PPC. The MEL function now has oversight of Gavi-wide MEL activities as part of the 2025 Secretariat reform, including decentralised evaluations.
Balance between independence and quality/utility	Independence over-emphasised at expense of quality assurance and utility.	Gavi's evaluation function relies more on behavioural rather than organisational independence, and could consider re-balancing toward use and learning. *Transparency re: resourcing for evaluation needs strengthening.*	Partial convergence related to independence (given the Global Fund has a structurally independent office). Convergence related to strengthening utility.	This was reviewed as part of the 2025 Secretariat reforms and its positioning within MEL/OCOO to best facilitate learning and operationalised as part of an integrated MEL approach in Gavi 6.0.
Evaluation delivery and operating model	Fully outsourced model has not resolved quality or value-for-money issues; inconsistent engagement during evaluation execution; fragmented/ inconsistent Quality Assurance (QA)	Model broadly functional but issues with supplier performance, inconsistent QA, inadequate team resourcing/level for delivery of Evaluation Work Plan (EWP). *Address and incorporate cross-cutting issues, specifically gender,*	Partial convergence related to inconsistent QA, supplier performance	Strengthened evaluability assessments to ensure feasible evaluation implementation by suppliers. Potential QA models and strengthening efforts to address inconsistent QA under consideration.

		environmental sustainability and climate change.		
Learning, dissemination and use	Learning delayed or absent; weak senior engagement, CELO's non-inclusion in key management forums hinders alignment with strategic priorities.	Learning central but utilisation can be strengthened. *No systematic tracking of how evaluation findings are used. Use of learning is encouraged but not enforced.*	Partial convergence in relation to delayed or lack of learning vs some learning.	Gavi embedded evaluation within a broader Learning System in Gavi 5.0, and is further strengthened in Gavi 6.0 through an integrated MEL approach, leveraging better use of utilisation-focused and rapid evaluation methods, and use of Gavi's revised MEL team structure.
Management responses and follow-up	Tracking of management responses initiated and will be reported to the Strategy Committee in 2026.	Management responses exist but need stronger follow-up. *No comprehensive loop from evaluation → action → results tracking.*	Partial convergence in relation to emerging EMR vs need to strengthen follow up in established EMR system.	Gavi has a long standing tracking mechanism and accountability for follow-up of actions is strengthened in Gavi 6.0.
Timeliness and decision relevance	Evaluations often miss decision windows.	Need better alignment with decision cycles.	Strong convergence	Enhanced process for Gavi 6.0 with the application of the evidence prioritisation process and alignment with the CPPG and PPC, expanding evaluation types and methods. Note: timing for decision cycle alignment in Gavi 5.0 was complicated by COVID-19.
Performance management	Performance management processes for the function are insufficient, and limitations in IEP performance.	Lacks a clear performance framework for its evaluation function, no evaluation strategy or theory of change. KPI established for EMR action follow-up.	Strong convergence	The evaluation strategy and performance metrics will be integrated in the Gavi 6.0 MEL approach and linked to the Secretariat Performance Management (e.g. Delivery Dashboard or Gavi Leap Master Dashboard).

Next steps: The Global Fund ELO and Gavi MEL continue to work together to identify opportunities to leverage cross-team learning and streamlining processes where applicable. Through 2026, the Global Fund will engage with its Strategy Committee including a benchmarking exercise and development of proposed actions in response to the Audit findings, and Gavi will continue to engage with Governance bodies to revise the evaluation policy as part of its response to the EFR and MOPAN Assessment.