

FOR INFORMATION

This document is being provided for information only. This paper provides an update on the activities from the Evaluation Advisory Committee including its views on the quality and usefulness of the Second GAVI Evaluation.

No requests are being made of the Board.

Report from Chair of Evaluation Advisory Committee to the Board

1. Introduction

1.1 The GAVI Alliance Board approved the charter for an Evaluation Advisory Committee in June 2009 and the Executive Committee appointed members the following month. The Committee is comprised of Board members (or their delegates) and independent experts and requires a majority of independent experts. The purpose of the Committee is to assist the Board in fulfilling its responsibilities in respect to the oversight of GAVI's organisational and programmatic evaluation activities. The Committee aims to support a "learning culture" by maximising the utility and quality of evaluations and helping develop a forward-looking monitoring and evaluation system to assist in the Board's decision-making.

1.2 The Committee's charter is in Annex 1.

2. Update on activities

2.1 The Committee convened an in-person meeting in January 2010, a teleconference in June 2010 and an in-person meeting in June 2010. Much of the committee work is done through email exchange. The next in-person meeting is scheduled for January 2011.

2.2 A summary of the Committee's activities to date follows:

- **Second GAVI Evaluation.** The GAVI Alliance commissioned the Second GAVI Evaluation in late 2009 to a consortium led by Cambridge Economic Policy Associates. The final reports were submitted by the evaluators in September. The Committee reviewed the adjudication process to select the firm and concluded that it was appropriate. The Committee reviewed the inception report, a preliminary draft of the evaluation report and the final version of the report. The Committee's report on the quality and usefulness of the report is in Annex 2.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.** The Committee reviewed the draft Monitoring and Evaluation Framework developed by the

FOR INFORMATION

Secretariat for the new strategy period (2011-2015) and provided guidance to the Secretariat on further development. It then reviewed and approved the final version, endorsing a shift in focus from retrospective to prospective evaluation. They also provided guidance on the proposed work plans and budgets for the cross cutting M&E element of the business plan.

- **Indicators for GAVI Alliance Strategy for 2011-15.** The Committee reviewed the key performance indicators proposed by the various working groups for use in measuring progress under the GAVI Alliance Strategy for 2011-15. The Committee provided guidance on the revision and further development of these indicators.
- **Evaluation of the International Finance Facility for Immunisation (IFFIm).** The Committee convened a time-limited steering committee comprised of a minority of IFFIm donors and a majority of independent experts to oversee the evaluation of the IFFIm. The Chair of the Committee reviewed and approved the terms of reference and Request for Proposals. Through a competitive tendering process, the IFFIm evaluation steering committee has recommended that HLSP be selected to conduct the evaluation. The GAVI Secretariat contracted HLSP to complete the inception report by late November 2010. Following review of the inception report by the steering committee, the contract for completion of the evaluation will be finalised.

3. Update on membership

- 3.1 One independent member of the Committee resigned in October 2010. As of the time that this paper was finalised for submission to the Board, the Secretariat was working with the Chair of the Committee and the Board's Governance Committee to add one or more independent members to the Committee. The issue of lack of remuneration has been a clear barrier in retaining independent members and will be discussed with the Governance Committee in due course.

4. Next steps

- 4.1 The Committee will meet in person in Geneva in January, and in the mean time continue to work through email and phone calls.
- 4.2 The Committee's immediate priorities include:
- Review of the IFFIm Evaluation
 - Review of the design for the full country evaluations to be conducted as part of the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and Strategy for 2011-15
 - Revising the GAVI Evaluation Policy

FOR INFORMATION

- Consulting with the Board on identification of major strategic questions to be addressed through evaluations during GAVI's next phase

5. Annexes

1. GAVI Board Evaluation Advisory Committee Charter
2. Evaluation Advisory Committee members
3. Evaluation Advisory Committee report to the Board on the Second GAVI Evaluation

FOR INFORMATION

ANNEX 1 GAVI Evaluation Advisory Committee Charter

1. Purpose

The GAVI Evaluation Advisory Committee (“Committee”) is established by the Board (“Board”) of the GAVI Alliance (“GAVI”) to assist the Board in fulfilling its responsibilities in respect to the oversight of GAVI’s organisational and programmatic evaluation activities. The Committee serves the Board in an advisory function in all matters covered by this Charter. In so doing, it shall be the responsibility of the Committee to maintain regular and open communication among Committee members and with the Board.

Words and expressions used in this Charter shall, unless the context requires otherwise, have the meaning attributed to them in the GAVI By-laws and the GAVI Alliance Evaluation Policy.

2. Composition

The Committee shall be an Advisory Body of the Board as defined by Article 5 of the GAVI By-laws. The Board shall select the Committee Chair (“Chair”) and members¹ who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. Further, the Committee shall consist of at least three members comprising a majority of independent evaluation experts and a minority of board members. The criteria for Committee membership shall be consistent with the GAVI Alliance Gender Policy, specifically, that gender balance in all areas of GAVI work should be ensured, including throughout the governance structures, to the extent possible.

3. Operations

The Committee will be governed by the following provisions:

Meetings. The Chair, in consultation with the other Committee members, shall determine the schedule and frequency of Committee meetings. A majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. Any Board Member / Alternate who is not a member of the Committee may attend Committee meetings as an observer. Other observers may attend meetings under exceptional circumstances and contingent upon Chair approval.

Agenda. The Chair shall develop the Committee’s agenda for each Committee meeting in consultation with the Secretariat. The agenda and all pertinent information concerning the business to be conducted at each Committee meeting shall, to the extent practicable, be delivered to all Committee members sufficiently in advance of each meeting to permit meaningful review.

¹ The Board reserves the right to delegate this authority to the Executive Committee.

FOR INFORMATION

Reporting. The Committee formally reports to the Board. The Committee shall keep minutes of its meetings and regularly report on its meetings and other activities to the Board.

Voting. The Chair should aim for consensus on all decisions. If consensus cannot be reached, majority and minority positions shall be reported to the Board.

Amendment. This Charter may only be amended or varied by resolution of the Board passed in accordance with the provisions of the By-laws.

4. Duties and Responsibilities

In carrying out its responsibilities, the Committee shall:

- Review and approve GAVI's multi-year and annual evaluation work plans.
- Review the quality and usefulness of evaluation reports from the independent consultant.
- For evaluations costing more than \$500,000, review and approve Terms of Reference and selection of final contractor.
- Report on the work of the Committee to the Board as requested.
- Review and reassess the adequacy of this Charter from time to time and recommend any proposed changes to the Board or Governance Committee
- Review and reassess the GAVI Alliance Evaluation Policy from time to time and recommend any proposed changes to the Board

FOR INFORMATION**ANNEX 2 Evaluation Advisory Committee members****Independent members:**

Name	Title/Affiliation
Bernhard Schwartländer, Chair	Director, Department for Evidence, Strategy and Results, UNAIDS
Gonzalo Hernandez	Executive Director of the Mexican National Council for Evaluation (CONEVAL)
Zenda Ofir	Executive Director, Evalnet
Sania Nishtar	President, Heartfile

Board members:

Name	Affiliation
Stanley Foster	Board delegate (Civil Society Organisations)
George Welde	Board member (unaffiliated)
Richard Sezibera	Board member (developing country)

FOR INFORMATION

ANNEX 3 Evaluation Advisory Committee report to the Board on the Second GAVI Evaluation

1. Overall conclusion

1.1 The evaluation reports are well written, comprehensive and balanced, with more extensive description of the methodology, its limitations and the robustness of findings than is normally found in evaluation reports of a similar type. The structuring of the reports according to the evaluation questions and strategic goals increases its clarity and utility. The methods used are generally appropriate, though more could have been done to tailor the evaluation methods and data sources more specifically to each evaluation sub-question. The Committee's overall assessment is that this is a credible and useful evaluation. The evaluation has yielded a number of important insights that will prove useful to the Board and Alliance as it prepares for and then implements its new strategy for the 2011-15 period.

2. Strengths

- 2.1 The report layout by evaluation question is very useful and in line with good evaluation practice.
- 2.2 The rationale for the evaluation design, the use of appropriate mixed methods (within given constraints), the emphasis on triangulation and the rating (even though subjective, as the evaluators point out) of the robustness of evidence all point to sound evaluation methods that were fit for purpose.
- 2.3 The evaluation report is balanced.
- 2.4 The evaluation questions, as described in the terms of reference and inception report, are generally well covered by the evaluation.
- 2.5 The findings, conclusions and their supporting evidence are clearly laid out and convincingly linked.
- 2.6 The rating of the robustness of the evidence is a useful and innovative approach that increases the transparency and rigor of the analyses.

3. Limitations

- 3.1 The summary report is longer than desired and thus somewhat inaccessible to readers looking for a concise summary of the main evaluation findings. The separate document summarising recommendations from the evaluation reports is helpful, but it would have been ideal if the evaluators submitted a twenty page executive summary of the main findings of the evaluation.
- 3.2 The questions under each strategic goal are answered using the same techniques and sources of information, without tailoring the methodology specifically to the special features of each evaluation question. In some cases, the evaluators should have explored alternative approaches to addressing specific evaluation questions with

FOR INFORMATION

particular features that warrant use of different techniques and data sources.

- 3.3 Some of the results are presented in terms of concepts that are not clearly defined and for which there is no establishment of a theoretical framework to determine the best way to measure them. Examples include *affordability, predictability, sustainability, efficiency and effectiveness* and *added value*.
- 3.4 Impact on mortality reduction was not assessed, except in reference to the WHO calculated indicator of the number of future deaths averted. Greater engagement on this issue would have been helpful, but the limitations related to assessing impact were stated explicitly and clearly from the beginning.
- 3.5 The analysis of public private partnerships could have been strengthened by the utilisation of current frameworks and methodologies for partnership evaluations available in the evaluation literature.
- 3.6 Although the reports produced a number of findings that are useful as the GAVI Alliance looks forward to its coming five year strategy, the evaluation had a backward looking design. That is to say, the evaluation was designed at the end of the time period covered by the evaluation and the evaluators by necessity had to rely on documentation compiled for other purposes, respondent recall of past experiences and events and limited engagement of countries in the design and implementation of evaluation. The evaluators executed this evaluation well per its design, but its backward looking design has inherent limitations. The methods and findings would be more robust if forward looking monitoring and evaluation systems were built into the strategy from the beginning, as is currently being done for the coming five year period.

4. *Lessons learned for future evaluations*

- 4.1 Given the inherent limitations of backward looking evaluations, future evaluations conducted by GAVI should be more forward looking. The Committee is working with the Secretariat to finalise the design of a forward looking monitoring and evaluation system that is built into the strategy for the coming five year period, designed in advance and conducted from the beginning of the strategy period.
- 4.2 The role of in-country actors in the design and execution of future GAVI evaluations should be re-examined, and GAVI should establish principles on evaluation partnership to guide future work. In-country partners should participate as evaluators in all phases of the evaluation, rather than as researchers to set up interviews, facilitate logistics and contribute to writing the country reports. They should participate in the design of the evaluation, lead the work in-country and participate in the synthesis of results across countries and integration of findings into synthesis reports.
- 4.3 Better insight into the role of context and other factors influencing performance and results in different countries, and what this means for

FOR INFORMATION

GAVI operations and results, would add value to future evaluations. An in-depth focus on comparative case studies can be a useful evaluation approach to synthesise results across countries.

- 4.4 Future evaluation studies should build impact measurement into the design from the beginning of the strategy period. It is not possible to adequately measure impact in a backward looking evaluation conducted at the end of a strategy period.
- 4.5 For development, it is crucial that identifying and assessing the unintended consequences – negative and positive – should be key evaluation questions. Although the report makes reference to two unintended consequences – the concern of displacement of funds to GAVI partners and the lack of waste disposal in countries – this issue has not been a focus of the evaluation. This should be explicit in future GAVI evaluations.
- 4.6 Future evaluation studies of the Alliance's strategy should not aim for comprehensive breadth, but should focus on a smaller number of specific strategic issues.
- 4.7 The Committee notes that the Second GAVI Evaluation contains numerous insights and issues that would be beneficial to explore in more detail. The Committee seeks to engage with the Board to identify priority issues to be explored further through targeted evaluation studies in the future, to ensure that evaluation activities address the priority issues identified by the Board.

Committee members:

Stanley Foster
Gonzalo Hernandez
Zenda Ofir
Sania Nishtar
Bernhard Schwartländer, Chair
Richard Sezibera
George Welde