



Report to the GAVI Alliance Board

11-12 June 2013

Subject:	Grant application, monitoring and review
Report of:	Nina Schwalbe, Managing Director, Policy & Performance, and Hind Khatib-Othman, Managing Director, Country Programmes
Authored by:	Daniel Thornton, Director, Strategic Initiatives, and Peter Hansen, Director, Monitoring and Evaluation
Agenda item:	12
Category:	For Decision
Strategic goal:	SG1 - Vaccines & SG2 - Health systems

Section A Overview

1 Purpose of the report

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to seek endorsement from the Board of the principles and key elements of the proposed redesign of GAVI's grant application, monitoring and review systems, which includes replacing the monitoring Independent Review Committee (IRC) with a new monitoring and review system based on strengthened routine monitoring, review of annual renewal requests by a Review Panel and review of requests for renewal of support for a country's five-year strategy and planning cycle by the IRC. The paper discussed by the PPC which includes details on all of the above is attached to this note.

2 Executive Summary – Update since the April 2013 PPC meeting

- 2.1 The Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) reviewed the attached paper at its meeting in April 2013 and recommends the proposed redesign to the Board for endorsement.
- 2.2 With regard to the composition of the Review Panel, the PPC recommended a modification to the Secretariat proposal (see Option C in the attached PPC paper) to specify that the panel should be high level, and allow for participation of additional Alliance partners, as appropriate.

3 Recommendations

- 3.1 The GAVI Alliance Programme and Policy Committee recommends that the GAVI Alliance Board:

- (a) **Approves** the principles and key elements of the proposed redesign of GAVI's grant application, monitoring and review systems, as described in section B.3 of Doc 06 to the PPC as attached to Doc 12, with the first evaluation of the system taking place after one year of implementation; and
- (b) **Approves** a High Level Review Panel consisting of senior level staff of the Secretariat, WHO and UNICEF, the IRC Chair and two other IRC members. Senior staff of other Alliance partners may be invited to the Review Panel, as participants or observers, as appropriate; and
- (c) **Requests** the Secretariat to work with affiliated entities and partners to ensure launch of the new systems starting 1 January 2014, with all existing and new grants shifting to the new system following this date.

4 Risk and Financial Implications – Update

- 4.1 The risks and financial implications are as summarised in the attached PPC paper. The Secretariat will present to the PPC at its meeting in October 2013 any additional risks and financial implications of providing multi-year commitments for vaccine support for high performing countries, along with options for how such support may be provided.



Report to the Programme and Policy Committee

29-30 April 2013

Subject:	Grant application, monitoring and review
Report of:	Nina Schwalbe, Managing Director Policy & Performance, and Hind Khatib-Othman, Managing Director Country Programmes
Authored by:	Daniel Thornton, Director of Strategic Initiatives, and Peter Hansen, Director of Monitoring and Evaluation
Agenda item:	06
Category:	For Decision
Strategic goal:	SG1 - Vaccines & SG2 - Health systems

Section A Overview

1 Purpose of the report

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to seek endorsement from the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) of the principles and key elements of the proposed redesign of GAVI's grant application, monitoring and review systems, which includes replacing the monitoring Independent Review Committee (IRC) with a new monitoring and review system based on strengthened routine monitoring, review of annual renewal requests by a Review Panel and review of requests for renewal of support for a country's five-year strategy and planning cycle by the IRC.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 The PPC is requested to

Recommend to the GAVI Alliance Board that it:

- (a) Approve the principles and key elements of the proposed redesign of GAVI's grant application, monitoring and review systems, as described in section B.3 of this Doc. 06.
- (b) Request the Secretariat to work with affiliated entities and partners to ensure launch of the new systems starting 1 January 2014, with all existing and new grants shifting to the new system following this date.
- 2.2 The PPC is requested to provide guidance to the Board on its preferred option in relation to the composition of the Review Panel, as described in section B.4.

- 2.3 The PPC is also requested to provide guidance to the Secretariat on whether it should prepare for the PPC's consideration at its meeting in October options for providing binding multi-year commitments for vaccine support for high performing countries, as described in section B.5.

3 Executive Summary

- 3.1 In 2012, the Secretariat convened a process to identify areas for strengthening GAVI's work at the country level. This process identified GAVI's grant application, monitoring and review systems as a priority for updating and improvement. This was consistent with the findings of the independent evaluation of the IRC in 2010 and recommendations from new proposals and monitoring IRCs. The Secretariat initiated a change process with participants from partner agencies and countries to inform the re-design of these systems.

- 3.2 Key elements of the proposed redesign include:

- Strengthening partner and country engagement and dialogue in the proposal development process, initiated by an Expression of Interest
- Shifting focus from an application for vaccine introduction or cash programmes designated to meet GAVI-specific requirements to supporting countries on the basis of their own plans, in line with country priorities and realities
- Strengthening the new proposals IRC assessment by increasing focus on risk and potential for impact, and providing clearer terms of reference for the IRC, including the criteria for review
- Strengthening linkages between health systems strengthening (HSS) and vaccine support, with an IRC review covering all types of support in the portfolio
- Transformation of monitoring from a "one-off" annual Geneva-based monitoring IRC, focused on grant renewal based on limited information, to a strengthened routine monitoring function that is on-going and builds on country mechanisms, with periodic review of recommendations on grant renewal by a Review Panel
- Tracking a core set of standard indicators across all grants through a scorecard, with additional M&E activities differentiated based on countries' risk/impact profile (e.g. periodic evaluation of GAVI support to country programmes where warranted)
- Introducing an IRC review of country requests for renewal of the full portfolio of GAVI support for a new country strategy and planning cycle – generally every five years
- Independent evaluation of the redesigned system to assess the extent to which the system is fit-for-purpose, is being implemented as designed and is consistent with the principles identified.

4 Risk implication and mitigation

- 4.1 The risks and potential mitigation strategies of the proposed new system are summarised below. Of note, however, given the weaknesses in terms

of oversight identified by the independent evaluation of the IRC conducted in 2010,¹ in various IRC reports over time and in the consultation process, there are significant risks in retaining the status quo. The proposed re-design includes a stronger and more explicit focus on risk than the current application, monitoring and review processes. The IRC would include its assessment of risk as part of its summary report, both for grants that it does and does not recommend for support. Following approval of a grant, the Secretariat will conduct a regular review of risks associated with all country grants in consultation with partners, to help inform on-going improvements to how the Alliance supports countries as well as to inform grant renewal decisions.

- (a) A key risk with the proposed re-design is that some aspects of the proposed new system entail higher transaction costs for the Alliance – for example, in iteratively engaging with countries to support their development of plans and in the conduct of in-country review missions to help inform renewal decisions. The primary means of mitigating this risk is to build upon existing mechanisms at the country level, including on-going engagements between the in-country partners and the government. Where existing in-country partners do not have the capacity to fulfil this role in a given country, the Country Responsible Officers will need to actively identify other partners, including civil society organisations.
- (b) The second main risk with the proposed system is that the removal of the monitoring IRC from the GAVI grant management cycle could lead to a perceived weakening of the checks and balances on GAVI grants to countries. However, the monitoring IRC provides a relatively superficial level of assurance, given that it is a remote, paper-based review of annual progress reports sent by countries, with little scope for tailoring of the process. There are long lags in the system, with the IRC reviewing progress on activities conducted up to 18 months earlier, and limited grounding in country context. In the proposed re-design, the primary means of mitigation of this risk are the strengthening of the routine grant monitoring function, the enhanced use of in-country mechanisms to help inform grant monitoring and decisions related to renewal of support, and the creation of a Review Panel consisting of individuals familiar with the GAVI portfolio (see Annex 1).

¹ The report is available at <http://www.gavialliance.org/results/evaluations/irc-review/>

This risk is further reduced by adding a new requirement that when the Alliance's vaccine and cash support for a country's strategy and planning cycle comes to an end, the full portfolio of support will be reviewed by the IRC. Therefore, country programmes and plans and how the GAVI Alliance can best support them would be independently reviewed at periodic intervals. At the end of the strategy and planning cycle—which lasts five years in most countries—the IRC would consider the country's request for a new HSS grant as well as the country's request for renewal for vaccine support, while also assessing the linkages between the two.

5 Financial implications: Business plan and budgets

- 5.1 As currently envisioned, the re-designed system will be cost neutral relative to the existing system. Business plan costs may increase as a result of the need for additional technical assistance to countries in support of their development of plans, and for in-country review missions. These costs would be offset, however, by reductions in other areas, including cost savings from not convening an annual monitoring IRC.² However, the real savings are expected to come as a result of paying closer attention to country grants that have a high risk and impact profile. For example, for some countries with large uncertainty in data sources and targets that are overly ambitious, more up-front work to better understand weaknesses in data and supply chain management systems, coupled with targeted investments to strengthen such systems, may lead to more realistic planning regarding the number of doses needed and therefore cost savings for countries and the GAVI Alliance.

Section B Content

1 Introduction

- 1.1 In the spring of 2012, the GAVI CEO convened an "action lab" process to look at how to strengthen GAVI's work at the country level. One of the recommendations of the group was to redesign GAVI's grant application, monitoring and review system (another was to increase the focus on the vaccine supply chain).
- 1.2 As a next step, the Secretariat convened a follow-on "action lab" process consisting of two three-day labs between November 2012 and January 2013 (see Annex 2 for list of participants), with sub-sets of participants working in small groups between labs. The labs built upon the IRC evaluation conducted by independent evaluators in 2010 as well as recommendations put forward in new proposal and monitoring IRC reports from recent years. A table summarising proposed changes to the system in response to limitations identified in the IRC review published in 2010, previous IRC reports and the action lab process is in Annex 3. This

² A preliminary analysis indicates approximately \$500,000 could be saved each year if the monitoring IRC is not convened.

process informed the recommendations for change described in this report.

- 1.3 Participants also noted that the most important work is in countries, and that this work can be supported by, but not driven from Geneva.

2 Lab findings

- 2.1 The Alliance's support to countries before applications are submitted could be better structured – and if necessary supported by regional and headquarter offices – by having clearer and more formal advance notice from countries of their plans. The existing application process is resource intensive, but not structured in a way that encourages and supports countries to develop their immunisation systems. So countries sometimes employ consultants to produce a GAVI-specific application which may have little relevance beyond the application process.
- 2.2 The application and monitoring processes do little to encourage the integration of HSS funding and vaccine support. While this integration has been happening through new HSS application guidelines and reprogramming, further steps are needed to implement the Board's decision that GAVI's cash support needs to improve immunisation outcomes.
- 2.3 The structure of the monitoring IRC limits its value. The remoteness of the monitoring IRC from the country level and its desk-based review of reports submitted by countries makes it disconnected from meaningful country context. Its one-size-fits-all approach to country grants does not capture the need for differentiated levels of depth and engagement based on the variable risk and impact profile of different portfolios of support to countries. The once-a-year meeting schedule introduces lags between the conduct of activities and the review of progress. The independent nature of the committee from the Alliance—i.e., its 'outsourced' nature—weakens the responsibility and accountability of line managers and in-country partners, since recommendations from the once-yearly paper-based review drive the renewal process rather than on-going management by those engaged over the full course of the business cycle.
- 2.4 The grant application, monitoring and renewal process is insufficiently tailored to country circumstances. The allocation of resources to supporting and reviewing applications and to monitoring is not tailored to the risks or likely impact of a programme. There is an insufficiently strong connection between monitoring and action.

3 Summary of proposed new system for grant application, monitoring and review

3.1 Principles

(a) The principles of GAVI's re-designed grant application, monitoring and review system are:

- Overall simplification of the process
- Better alignment of health system strengthening and new vaccine support
- Lower transaction costs for countries
- More effective and efficient use of GAVI Alliance resources
- Greater country ownership and better alignment with country processes
- Improved transparency and better fiduciary oversight to allow for more responsive supply chain

3.2 Key elements of redesign. For additional detail, please refer to Annex 1.

(a) **Expression of interest.** As part of the new system, countries will be asked to submit an expression of interest (EOI) to indicate their interest in receiving a certain type of support from the GAVI Alliance.

(b) **Country plan.** Following the EOI, a country prepares a New Vaccine Introduction Plan, or HSS Plan. This is envisaged as an iterative process, primarily between in-country partners and the country.

(c) **Secretariat screening (administrative).** In line with the existing procedure, the Secretariat then conducts an administrative screening of applications to check for completeness (e.g. that the ICC has endorsed the application).

(d) **Review of new proposals by IRC.** The schedule of IRCs will be consolidated and harmonised. Three IRCs will be conducted per year at predictable times fixed long in advance. These IRCs will consider applications for all types of support, to facilitate a more holistic view of the broad portfolio of support GAVI provides to countries, rather than looking at each new application in isolation from the others.

(e) **Country implementation.** Prior to a country introducing a new vaccine or initiating a new HSS programme, the country prepares a more detailed implementation plan and, in the case of new vaccine support, receives the vaccine introduction grant.

- (f) **Routine monitoring.** The Alliance will monitor a set of standard indicators across all supported countries on an on-going basis through a scorecard that is kept up to date over the course of the year. Each country's scorecard will be aligned with a performance framework that will be agreed to in advance of commencement of implementation of a grant to countries; when new support is added to an existing portfolio of support to a country, the performance framework will be revised accordingly.
- (g) **Review Panel.** For each year within a country's approved cycle of support, countries will submit a renewal request to the Secretariat for receipt of the next year's vaccine and cash support. Country Responsible Officers will be responsible for making a recommendation to a Review Panel on whether the support should be renewed, in consultation with partners and other teams within the Secretariat.
- (h) **IRC review at end of strategy and planning cycle.** At the end of a country's strategy and planning cycle—which usually has a duration of five years—the country's renewal request for the next cycle of five years will be reviewed by the IRC.³ The IRC will review the country's request for renewal of vaccine support for a new five year cycle alongside its request for a new cash support grant, in order to ensure that there are appropriate linkages between the two.
- (i) **Independent evaluation.** An independent evaluation of the entire grant application, monitoring and renewal system will be conducted periodically, with the first evaluation taking place after one to two years of implementation.

4 Options on Review Panel composition

- 4.1 Three options are proposed in relation to the composition of the Review Panel. One option is for the Panel to consist of Secretariat staff only. A second option is for the Panel to consist of Secretariat staff plus WHO and UNICEF. A third option is for the Panel to consist of Secretariat staff, plus WHO and UNICEF, as well as the Chair of the IRC and two other IRC members (one vaccine expert and one HSS expert). Table 1 summarises the advantages and disadvantages of the three options.

³ Note that within the redesigned system, there will no longer be two types of IRCs, but one IRC that meets three times a year. The IRC would review all new proposals, as well as country requests for renewal of support for a new strategy and planning cycle.

Table 1 Summary of advantages and disadvantages of options for composition of Review Panel

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
1. Secretariat staff only	Strongest accountability for line management in Secretariat; does not put WHO and UNICEF in position of having to make recommendations that may be contrary to what member states or country offices wish	Does not incorporate element of independence or formalize linkage with WHO and UNICEF at this step in grant renewal process (WHO and UNICEF still provide input and recommendations in other steps)
2. Secretariat staff, WHO and UNICEF	Taps into strength of two key Alliance partners	Potentially puts WHO and UNICEF in position of having to make recommendations that may be contrary to what member states or country offices wish
3. Secretariat staff, WHO, UNICEF, Chair of IRC and two other IRC members	Includes element of independence and link to new proposal review process, while still reinforcing accountability for line managers in Secretariat and tapping into strength of two key Alliance partners	Larger group may constrain flexibility and response times, which may give rise to delays; potentially puts WHO and UNICEF in position of having to make recommendations that may be contrary to what member states or country offices wish

5 Multi-year commitments

- 5.1 The PPC is requested to provide guidance to the Secretariat on whether it should prepare for the PPC's consideration at its meeting in October options for providing binding multi-year commitments for vaccine support for high performing countries, including the criteria for determining which countries would qualify for multi-year commitments, financial implications and any other implications. Provision of such commitments would lighten transaction costs and increase predictability for countries that meet specified performance criteria. On the other hand, this would increase GAVI's liabilities.

Section C Implications

1 Impact on countries

- 1.1 As reflected in the principles, the re-designed approach seeks to improve GAVI's grant application, monitoring and review system for countries, by simplifying the system, lowering overall transaction costs for countries and increasing country ownership and alignment with country systems. Every effort has been made to make the system simpler; however, the application, monitoring and review system helps to manage the risks in GAVI's programmes, and this requires countries to make a credible case that funding can be used effectively.

2 Impact on GAVI stakeholders

- 2.1 The re-designed grant application, monitoring and review system entails more active and iterative engagement by GAVI stakeholders in countries' plan development processes and in monitoring and evaluation in countries with a high risk and impact profile. The role of in-country partners—including WHO, UNICEF, the World Bank, bilateral donors, civil society and others—will be critically important in fulfilling this role. This will require close collaboration between partners. The business planning process for 2014 will address the specific resource requirements for partners vis-à-vis implementation of the new system, as well as the need to engage potential new partners.

3 Impact on Secretariat

- 3.1 Close collaboration between the Secretariat—most especially the Country Responsible Officer—and the partners with in-country presence will be required for the proposed re-designed system to work. The Country Responsible Officer will play a key role as convener of the process of supporting countries to develop plans, as well as the process of submitting a recommendation to the Review Panel regarding renewal of support. In convening this process, the Country Responsible Officer will need to draw upon the strengths of the in-country partners—who will naturally have the most frequent and direct engagement with countries—as well as the support of different teams within the Secretariat. The recent strengthening of the Country Programmes team inside the Secretariat and the scale up of the number of Country Responsible Officers make this approach feasible.

4 Legal and governance implications

- 4.1 In discharging its duties under applicable laws, the IFFIm Board relies on the current GAVI Alliance monitoring and review mechanisms, in particular on the independent nature of the IRC. Therefore, the IFFIm Board will need to assess how replacing the monitoring IRC with a different review mechanism impacts on the IFFIm directors' ability to fully discharge their duties under the applicable laws. In this context, the IFFIm Board will need to address what modified arrangements IFFIm should reach with the GAVI

Alliance to enable the IFFIm directors to be satisfied that the substance of the IRC function (including providing an independent review) continues to be performed for the benefit of IFFIm. In this connection, it is noted that the IFFIm Board has appointed a special advisor to the IFFIm Board to assist them with the technical aspects of programme approvals and monitoring.

- 4.2 To implement the proposed new system, the Secretariat will present any necessary changes to legal and governance documents, including for IFFIm, through the appropriate channels.

5 Consultation

- 5.1 The principles and key elements of the grant application, monitoring and review system proposed in this paper come from labs convened with GAVI Alliance partner agencies and countries (see Annex 2). Additional consultations with countries took place at regional working group meetings, EPI manager meetings and other fora. The Secretariat conducted consultations with donors by teleconference, and conducted an in-person focus group discussion with IRC members participating in the March 2013 review. For a full list of consultations, see Annex 4.

6 Gender implications

- 6.1 The re-design of the grant application, monitoring and review system is expected to be gender neutral. The guidelines that are developed and the iterative and engaged approach to supporting country plan development will emphasise the importance of identifying and addressing gender-related barriers to immunisation and any gender discrepancies. The Secretariat will work with partners to re-assess how gender-related issues are addressed in monitoring and evaluation tools and guidance. Each IRC will continue to include gender expertise.

7 Monitoring and evaluation

- 7.1 A working group is developing a draft monitoring and evaluation framework for the redesigned system. This framework will describe how this system will be monitored on a routine basis to ensure that it is consistent with specified principles—for example, by tracking efficiency and time taken to reach various milestones in the grant cycle. As part of this framework, an independent evaluation of GAVI's grant application, monitoring and review system will be commissioned after one to two years of implementation. The purpose of this evaluation will be to assess the extent to which the re-designed grant application, monitoring and review system is fit-for-purpose, is being implemented as designed, and is consistent with the principles identified as part of the re-design process. The evaluation will also assess the experience of countries with the new system and generate lessons learned for iterative improvement of the system in the future. The timing, frequency and scope of future evaluations will be determined in the future, based on needs.

Section D Annexes

Annex 1: GAVI's re-designed grant application, monitoring and review system

1 Principles

- 1.1 The principles of GAVI's re-designed grant application, monitoring and review system are:
- Overall simplification of the process
 - Better alignment of health system strengthening and new vaccine support
 - Lower transaction costs for countries
 - More effective and efficient use of GAVI Alliance resources
 - Greater country ownership and better alignment with country processes
 - Improved transparency and better fiduciary oversight to allow for better informed decisions including on supply chain issues

2 Key elements of redesign

- 2.1 **Expression of interest.** As part of the new system, countries will be asked to submit an expression of interest (EOI) to indicate their interest in receiving a certain type of support from the GAVI Alliance. The EOI will be a light process. The intention is to get an earlier and clearer signal of country plans, and to identify areas where technical assistance is required, and any preferences the country has in relation to the provider of that assistance. On receipt of the EOI, the Secretariat will confirm to the country whether or not the country is eligible to apply for the type of support indicated and coordinate with Alliance partners for provision of needed technical assistance.
- 2.2 **Country plan.** Following the EOI, a country prepares a New Vaccine Introduction Plan, or HSS Plan. This is envisaged as an iterative process, primarily between in-country partners and the country, to develop these plans. The plans will include a) situation analysis (new vaccine) or bottleneck and gap analyses (HSS), b) specific plan for introduction (new vaccine) or implementation (HSS), c) status update of implementation of recommendations from previous assessments conducted and persisting gaps, d) M & E frameworks and plans, e) budgets and financial implications, f) endorsements. The new application process focuses on essential requirements and using country plans and documents. The country plan is submitted with the support of existing in-country coordinating mechanisms already established.
- 2.3 **Secretariat screening (administrative).** When a country plan is received, the Secretariat conducts an administrative screening of applications to check for completeness (e.g. that the ICC has endorsed the application). If issues are identified, the Secretariat and the Alliance partners work with countries to resolve the issues in advance of the IRC review of the country plan.

- 2.4 Review of new proposals by IRC.** The schedule of IRCs will be consolidated and harmonised. Three IRCs will be conducted per year at predictable times fixed long in advance. These IRCs will consider applications for all types of support, to facilitate a more holistic view of the broad portfolio of support GAVI provides to countries, rather than looking at each new application in isolation from the others. This greater frequency and predictability of IRCs should smooth and accelerate the flow of applications, and align better with country timetables rather than forcing countries to comply with GAVI's timetable. The timing of decisions, however, will still need to fit within GAVI's governance calendar. The outcome of the IRC will be an in-principle recommendation of only two types: a) Yes (with comments on key issues and risk assessment of the proposed investment), and b) No (with reasons provided). In other words, there will no longer be a conditional approval category, under which a country needs to return to an IRC after having addressed certain issues, or conditions. The greater frequency of IRC meetings will give countries the possibility to bring revised applications back to the IRC within an interval of months rather than years. The basis for IRC recommendations will be clarified, with the IRC invited to consider whether the country plans will likely achieve the proposed results and contribute to GAVI achieving its mission and strategy, taking account of country readiness, alignment of the application with country plans, and the availability of resources to support the proposed programme. For all grants it recommends for approval, the IRC will provide a summary of its perspective on implementation risks.
- 2.5 Country implementation.** Prior to a country introducing a new vaccine or initiating a new HSS programme, the country prepares a more detailed implementation plan and, in the case of new vaccine support, receives the vaccine introduction grant. Existing mechanisms will be used to oversee the process of agreeing on the timing of vaccine introduction with countries, and the number of doses to be supplied.
- 2.6 Routine monitoring.** The Alliance will monitor a set of standard indicators across all supported countries on an on-going basis through a scorecard that is kept up to date over the course of the year. Each country's scorecard will be aligned with a performance framework that will be agreed to in advance of commencement of implementation of a grant to countries; when new support is added to an existing portfolio of support to a country, the performance framework will be revised accordingly. The monitoring around the routine requirements is elastic in response to the changing situation in the country (e.g. introducing a new vaccine, responding to outbreaks), and is informed by the country's and the programme's risk/impact profile. The risk/impact profile will drive the frequency and level of engagement, including the number of in-country visits, as well as the types and levels of disaggregation of data considered. Wherever it makes sense to do so, monitoring will build upon existing mechanisms at the country level (e.g. EPI reviews, health sector reviews, service availability and readiness assessments, data quality report cards), as well as the regional and global levels (e.g. HSS live monitoring, regional

conference calls, on-going Vaccine Implementation Management Team discussions, EPI manager meetings, regional working groups). Where existing mechanisms at the country level are weak, the HSS grant to the country as well as the Business Plan will include targeted support to help strengthen such mechanisms.

2.7 Review panel. For each year within a country's approved cycle of support, countries will submit a renewal request to the Secretariat for receipt of the next year's vaccine and cash support.⁴ Country Responsible Officers will be responsible for making a recommendation to a Review Panel on whether the support should be renewed as requested, in consultation with partners and other teams within the Secretariat. In straightforward cases, Country Responsible Officers will bring the recommendation on renewal of support directly to the Review Panel, without need for an in-country review mission. Where renewal is less straightforward, further information will be sought, including if necessary through conduct of an in-country review mission, in advance of presenting a recommendation to the Review Panel. The role of the Review Panel is to make recommendations to the CEO on the renewal of grants to countries. The precise frequency and timing of Panel meetings has not been established yet; indicatively, it is expected that the Panel would meet between three and six times per year. The exact schedule of meetings would be determined in advance, depending on the timing of renewal decisions needed within the grant cycle.

2.8 IRC review at end of strategy and planning cycle. At the end of a country's strategy and planning cycle—which usually has a duration of five years—the country's renewal request for the next cycle of five years will be reviewed by the IRC. The IRC will review the country's request for renewal of vaccine support for a new five year cycle alongside its request for a new cash support grant, in order to ensure that there are appropriate linkages between the two. This is in contrast to the current system, in which country requests for new five-year cash support grants go to the new proposals IRC for review, while the monitoring IRC continues to renew vaccine support on a year-by-year basis without further review by the new proposals IRC.

Independent evaluation. An independent evaluation of the entire grant application, monitoring and renewal system will be conducted periodically, with the first evaluation taking place after one to two years of implementation. The primary audience of the review will be the Board, and the purpose will be to assess the extent to which correct processes and procedures have been followed in implementation of the system, and the extent to which the system is fit for purpose and consistent with the principles defined. The review will also seek to generate lessons to help improve the system.

⁴ If the GAVI Alliance were to begin to provide multi-year commitments to high-performing countries that meet specified criteria, this review would not occur annually for this sub-set of countries.

Annex 2: Participants in action labs to re-design GAVI's grant application, monitoring and review systems

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	INSTITUTION	LAB
Amon-Kra	Jean Charles	GAVI TAP	1&2
Aydogan	Nilgun	GAVI CP	1&2
Cernuschi	Tania	GAVI CP	2
Downey	Casey	WHO	2
Ferenchick	Erin	Facilitator	1
Gacic-Dobo	Marta	WHO	2
Getchell	Marya	GAVI CP	2
Hafiz	Rehan	GAVI PP	2
Hansen	Peter	GAVI PP	1&2
Herrmann	Martin	Facilitator	1&2
Hugo	Claire	GAVI SI	2
Kadandale	Sowmya	WHO	1
Khatib-Othman	Hind	GAVI PP	1
Kuo	Patricia	GAVI PP	1&2
Malvolti	Stefano	GAVI CP	2
Matterson	Anna-Carin	GAVI PP	1&2
Mayers	Gill	WHO HQ	1&2
Mocova	Dita	GAVI CP	1&2
Mustafa	Amani	Sudan MoH	2
Ntakibirora	Marcelline	UNICEF RO	1&2
Oteri	Joseph	Nigeria MoH	2
Pariyo	George	GAVI PP	1&2
Peiris	Sudath	Sri Lanka MoH	1&2
Rosenbaum	Katinka	UNICEF SD	1&2
Schwalbe	Nina	GAVI PP	1
Shengelia	Bakhuti	GAVI PP	1
Sosler	Stephen	GAVI CP	1&2
Szabo	Eelco	GAVI Legal	1&2
Thornton	Daniel	GAVI SI	1&2
van den Hombergh	Henri	UNICEF HQ	2
Widmyer	Greg	BMGF	2

Annex 3: Summary of proposed changes to system in response to limitations identified through evaluations, previous IRC recommendations and the action lab process

KEY CHANGES IN PROCESS	
Limitation in current process	Proposed change
Ad-hoc communication prior to submission of application, with limited predictability of incoming proposals from countries	Expression of interest, followed by iterative engagement and dialogue
Focus on application form & GAVI guidelines, with limited technical assistance to development of real country plans	Focus on country plan and minimum requirements, with provision of technical support in line with country interests and needs
Multiple mandatory application attachments	Few key requirements centered around country plans
Limited linkages between vaccine and HSS support applications	Increased linkage between vaccine and HSS support during proposal development stage; IRC to review portfolio rather than single window of support
Limited communication and transparency in application timelines for countries; number and timing of rounds is ad-hoc	Number and timing of rounds fixed and communicated to countries long in advance; predictable IRC 3 times per year
New applications considered by IRC with little link to monitoring	Findings from monitoring feed into new applications IRC process
One-off pre-review focused on GAVI specific application form and related requirements	Iterative engagement and dialogue between Alliance partners and country, with pre-review focused on addressing country-readiness
Pre-review is too close to the IRC	Adequate time to address key issues in application
Financial management assessment (FMA) timing not optimal	FMA starts prior to IRC
Separate IRC member reviews and presentation in plenary	Separate IRC member review and small team discussion and team presentation
Separate IRCs for different support windows	Joint IRCs that consider portfolio of support in more holistic manner

IRC has limited information about country context	Open-Closed-Open IRC, with Secretariat and Partner briefing of IRC on country contextual issues and country participation where warranted, followed by sessions for IRC members only.
Past performance not taken into account when submitting new proposal and during IRC review	An analysis of risk and potential impact carried out for incoming applications prior to IRC review; risk assessment adjusted based on IRC review
Weak country performance frameworks at application stage	Iterative engagement and support for development of performance frameworks up front, based on country M&E systems where warranted
Recommendations from IRC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve • Approve with clarifications • Approve with conditions • Re-submit 	Recommendations from IRC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, with comments (including formal statement on level of risk) • No, with reasons
Passive receipt of APR once a year	On-going monitoring based on core set of standard indicators
One size fits all monitoring	Differentiated monitoring based on a country's risk/impact assessment
Remote Geneva-based desk review to inform renewal decisions	Stronger routine monitoring, with review panel and more work at country level, using existing mechanisms where possible, to address challenges in implementation and inform renewal decisions
Disconnect between GAVI requirements and country M&E systems	Strengthened integration of GAVI's routine grant management practices with countries' routine data verification systems
Information gaps in areas such as data quality, equity, surveillance, outcomes evaluation and gender-related barriers to immunisation	Strengthening of country monitoring systems, with targeted investment in strengthening country data systems and analytical capacities
Limited regular and systematic analysis of performance	More routine and systematic analysis of performance and themes across the portfolio to generate learning and inform improvements to how GAVI supports countries

Annex 4: Consultations conducted as part of redesign proces

The proposed redesigned process was presented at the following forums for consultation and review:

- Regional Working Group (RWG) meeting on Immunization, Dhaka, Bangladesh, February 2013
- Response to Conditions IRC, Geneva, March 2013
- AFRO EPI Managers' Meeting (East), Harare, Zimbabwe, March 2013
- APRO EPI Managers' Meeting (West), Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, March 2013
- Eastern and Southern African Regional Working Group Meeting, Lusaka, Zambia, April 2013
- Health Systems Funding Platform IRC, Geneva, April 2013

The GAVI Secretariat hosted a donor consultation on 27 March 2013. The following donors participated in the consultation:

- Australia
- European Commission
- France
- Germany
- Luxembourg
- Netherlands
- Sweden
- United States of America

The GAVI Secretariat circulated relevant documents to the civil society constituency for consultation in March 2013.