

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

10-11 April 2019

Gavi Alliance, Geneva, Switzerland

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 The meeting commenced at 09.01 Geneva time on 10 April 2019. Rob Moodie, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair extended a particular welcome to Anuradha Gupta, Gavi Deputy CEO.
- 1.3 He highlighted that this would be his last meeting in his capacity as Chair of the EAC, and informed the members that the recruitment process for his successor is ongoing and being overseen by the Governance Committee.
- 1.4 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a). During the course of the meeting, Dr Johri indicated that she is involved in projects funded by the Government of India and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
- 1.5 Committee members noted the minutes of its meeting on 15 February 2019 which had been approved by no-objection on 9 April 2019.
- 1.6 The Chair referred to the written summary of the November Board meeting which he had shared with the EAC. He mentioned in particular the survey the Board had been asked to complete on the EAC by the Governance Committee and which was being used to inform the revision of the Evaluation Policy and the EAC Terms of Reference. He expressed his encouragement with the Board's increasing interest in Gavi's evaluation function, noting in particular that the importance of evaluation is being stressed in the context of the Gavi 5.0 discussions.

2. Update from Secretariat

- 2.1 Anuradha Gupta, Gavi Deputy CEO, referring to the fact that this would be the Chair's last meeting thanked him warmly for his fruitful and positive relationship with the Alliance.
- 2.2 Ms Gupta informed the EAC that the Board, at its retreat in March in Ottawa, had been able to reflect on key findings from evaluations on various thematic areas to consider how they could inform not only the ongoing implementation of Gavi 4.0 but also the development of Gavi 5.0 (the Alliance's 2021-2025 Strategy).

- 2.3 She highlighted that the Board had considered a number of options and key questions that face the Alliance and had emphasised that equity should be the organising principle for Gavi 5.0. *Demand* and *gender* had been called out as two areas which would be core to the strategy going forward.
- 2.4 The Board had discussed the acceleration of vaccines remaining as Gavi's key focus, confirming that Inactivated Poliovirus Vaccine (IPV) should be very much a part of Gavi's programmatic portfolio, while remaining cognisant that IPV is only one component of the polio endgame strategy.
- 2.5 In relation to the Vaccine Investment Strategy (VIS), the Board is comfortable with moving forward as discussed at the November 2018 Board meeting, noting that this is a step-change in Gavi's approach focusing on a life-course approach which will require more work to be done with countries to prioritise and sensibly sequence new vaccine introductions.
- 2.6 There had been a robust discussion on Health System Strengthening (HSS) and Immunisation Delivery and the Board had agreed that equity should be the organising principle for Gavi's immunisation delivery support. It was also agreed that there is a need to do segmentation – differentiating between different categories of countries both at the national and subnational level and subsequently bringing more tailored approaches which will require more flexibility in terms of Gavi policies.
- 2.7 The Board highlighted that Gavi's processes can be complex and agreed that work needs to be done to make structures and processes fit for purpose.
- 2.8 In relation to sustainability, the Board agreed that while retaining GNI per capita as a key criterion of eligibility and transition is important, other programmatic and systems considerations could be factored in to potential adapt transition trajectories.
- 2.9 Ms Gupta referred to the discussion relating to Middle Income Countries (MICs), noting that there are differing views, in particular relating to never-eligible Gavi MICs and that there will be further analyses done for the Board before any final decisions are taken.
- 2.10 Ms Gupta highlighted the Board's support for Gavi's work in relation to market shaping and innovation and finally that the Board called for more collaboration with other organisations such as the Global Fund and the Global Financing Facility (GFF).

Discussion

- EAC members noted the focus on equity and the challenges that this will present in particular when dealing in conflict, post-conflict and fragile settings. In this context, Ms Gupta highlighted that it will be necessary for Gavi to have policies which enable the Alliance to be both opportunistic and strategic.

- In response to a comment from an EAC member, Ms Gupta indicated that in terms of financing for Gavi 5.0, as had been promised during the previous replenishment, there is an expectation that the ask be less than it had been for Gavi 4.0. There are however different views in particular on financing for Inactivated Poliovirus Vaccine (IPV) which will require further discussion before the investment case is finalised.
- Responding to a question on the malaria vaccine, Ms Gupta noted the disappointing delay in implementing the malaria vaccine pilot which is only now starting in three countries.

3a. Review of Evaluation Policy

- 3a.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Monitoring & Evaluation, presented this item to the Committee (Doc 03a) recalling the process and timeline which aimed to enable the EAC to present to the Board for approval at its June 2019 meeting a revised and updated evaluation policy.
- 3a.2 She highlighted the three remaining issues for the EAC to discuss relating namely to i) centralised vs decentralised evaluations, proposing that the EAC focus on evaluations of high strategic value to the Board; ii) evaluation reports, proposing that the EAC will review selected draft reports and approve the final reports; and iii) reporting to the Board, proposing that the EAC inform the Board on overall status of the evaluation work programme.

Discussion

- EAC members agreed that it would be important to ensure that it is clear that the EAC has reviewed the reports of centralised evaluations and that there should be an indication in the final reports of decentralised evaluations indicating that they have not been reviewed by the EAC. The Secretariat noted that this would indeed be the case.
- It was proposed that it would be useful to include some more narrative around how evaluations are commissioned and how they get onto the workplan. It was also suggested that there should be a greater linkage to learning, and it was subsequently noted that this could perhaps be done by cross linking to the M&E framework.
- EAC members agreed that as gender and equity will be important components of Gavi 5.0 it would be useful to ensure that this is reflected when evaluations are commissioned, and it was agreed that wording around the key areas of focus of the new strategy be included in the evaluation operational guidelines (EOG).
- EAC members discussed the publication of their assessment of evaluation reports, and it was agreed that the Secretariat will prepare a summary for the EAC

reviewers to review before finalisation. The EAC Chair would then be asked to approve the final summary before publication.

- An EAC member underlined the importance of diversifying candidates' pool for evaluation and the Secretariat noted that a new procurement process is being put in place, adding that a database exists, and will be enhanced based on cooperation with WHO and the Global Fund.
- EAC members highlighted the importance of capacity building as outlined in 6.3.3 of the policy. It was suggested that this is a cross-cutting issue for the Alliance, not only in the field of evaluations, and that it could be useful to have further discussions on this between different functions.

Decision One

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee **recommended** to the Gavi Alliance Board that it:

Approve the revised and updated Gavi Evaluation Policy as set out in Annex A to Doc 03a, effective from 1 July 2019, as amended by discussions at the EAC

3b. Review of Evaluation Advisory Committee Terms of Reference (ToRs)

- 3b.1 Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance, presented this item to the Committee (Doc 03b) inviting comments in particular in relation to the proposed criteria for determining independence of EAC members and to how the EAC might best engage with the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) going forward.
- 3b.2 Mrs Goetz also took this opportunity to provide information to EAC members in relation to the definition of conflicts of interest as defined in Gavi's Conflicts of Interest Policy for Governance Bodies, which is applicable to the EAC.

Discussion

- Following discussion EAC members agreed that the following text be included in the ToRs:

Independence should be determined by taking into account the following questions, the answers to which will assist in ascertaining independence:

- *Is the candidate institutionally independent of the Secretariat, Board and Board Committees?*
- *Is/has the candidate been an employee of the Gavi Secretariat within the last three years?*
- *Is/has the candidate had, within the last three years, a material business relationship with Gavi Alliance, whether directly as a partner, shareholder,*

- contractor, grantee, director or senior employee of a body that has such a relationship with Gavi Alliance?*
- *Has the candidate received remuneration from the Gavi Secretariat within the last three years?*
 - *Does the candidates have any close family ties with any of Gavi's advisers, Board or Board Committee members, or senior employees?*
 - *Does the candidates have any conflict of interest, as defined in Gavi's Conflicts of Interest Policy for Governance Bodies, and if so can they be managed appropriately?*
- It was noted that it will be important to ensure that “institutionally independent” is clearly defined, and that what is meant by “Gavi advisors” will also be made clear.
 - EAC members agreed on the importance of aligning the evaluation workplan with that of the PPC and Board as appropriate.
 - EAC members also agreed on the importance of maintaining a strong link with the PPC. It was agreed that this would not necessarily require a joint meeting of the committees on an annual basis, but that the EAC Chair, or another member of the EAC, could perhaps attend PPC meetings as an observer. It will also be important to sure that there is a more systematic channel of communication between the respective committee chairs.
 - EAC members regretted that the EAC Chair is not invited to attend the Gavi Board retreats and Mrs Goetz committed to sharing their concerns as appropriate.

Decision Two

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee **recommended** to the Gavi Alliance Governance Committee that it recommends to the Gavi Alliance Board that it:

Approve the updated and revised Evaluation Advisory Committee Terms of Reference as set out in Annex B to Doc 03b, effective from 1 July 2019, as amended by discussions at the EAC.

4. Joint session with Global Fund TERG (Technical Evaluation Reference Group)

A record of the discussions during this session will be provided by the TERG Secretariat.

5. Evaluation Update and Evaluation Workplan

5.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluations, presented this item to the Committee (Doc 05) providing an update on the progress of centralised and decentralised evaluations,

outlining how the evaluation unit has engaged in the Gavi 5.0 design process, and finally requested input from the EAC on the 2019-2020 evaluation workplan.

- 5.2 In relation to centralised evaluations, Dr Bchir informed the EAC on key findings of the evaluation of the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP), provided an update on the Uganda country programme evaluation and on the Zambia country programme evaluation.
- 5.3 In relation to decentralised evaluations, discussions focused on the HSS review, which in the context of discussions on Gavi 5.0 had become quite strategic, whereby EAC members had been invited to review the draft report in advance of the Board retreat.
- 5.4 In relation to Gavi 5.0, it was noted that there had been engagement in key stakeholder discussions areas such as theories of change and M&E frameworks, and this signalled a key positive shift in approach.

Discussion

- In relation to the HSS review, some EAC members indicated that they had been approached directly by individual Board constituencies while the EAC was reviewing the work and that they were not sure that this was appropriate, in particular in view of the independent nature of the EAC. The Secretariat noted these concerns and agreed to follow up on this matter as appropriate.
- In relation to the information presented to the EAC, it was suggested that it would be useful to include more information for each evaluation on timelines, next steps and budget. It was also suggested that the names of contractors should be included systematically.
- In relation to the workplan, EAC members discussed in particular the timelines around the evaluation of Gavi's co-financing, eligibility and transition policy. Concerns were raised around the feasibility of the evaluation being completed in order to inform the PPC discussions in October 2019 and in this context EAC members agreed that it would be useful to understand which questions the PPC might need to be addressed as a priority for that meeting in order to ensure utility of the evaluation.
- In relation to the proposed HSIS prospective evaluation, EAC members felt that an objective and independent evaluation of HSIS should be a high priority as it is of strategic importance to Gavi 5.0. The HSIS funding stream represents a substantial portion of Gavi spending and there is scope for improvements in equity, efficiency and performance. However the EAC members expressed reservations about pursuing a prospective evaluation, noting the high demands of a prospective design, and the need to define a clear purpose for such an evaluation and to ensure that it would target key decision-making processes.
- It was noted that there are polarised views on Gavi's investments in health systems, and that there is an appetite to have more information to understand what

is working and what is not working and how Gavi support can be better aligned with country processes and other donors such as the Global Fund, the Global Financing Facility and others.

- The Secretariat noted that a review of the HSIS framework as part of the larger review of Gavi's core funding policies is on the workplan to inform PPC discussions in October 2019 as part of the Gavi 5.0 operationalisation discussions.
- EAC members agreed that an HSIS evaluation is needed to inform Gavi 5.0 and that it would be important to have input from the PPC and/or Board to understand the questions they would like to see answered.
- Noting that the Secretariat evaluation team might be resource-constrained over the coming months, EAC members asked if the strategic and thematic evaluations could be deprioritised. The Secretariat indicated that the implications of deprioritising the Uganda and Zambia country programme evaluations had not been considered and could indeed have negative impacts.
- EAC members noted that it is now foreseen that the evaluation of Gavi's engagement with the private sector commence later in the year. In this context, EAC members agreed that it would be useful to ensure that the Board is aligned with the questions which have been defined for this evaluation.
- It was agreed that Mira Johri, Viroj Tangcharoensathien and Wieneke Vullings will review the evaluation reports of the co-financing, eligibility and transition policies on behalf of the EAC.

6. Measles Evaluation

6.1 Leslie Moreland, Programme Officer, presented this item to the Committee (Doc 06), requesting the EAC to provide an assessment on the quality and usefulness of the final report, based on the assessment already completed by the reviewers.

Discussion

- Overall, EAC reviewers expressed concern that the report itself had not been an easy read and one member suggested that it might have read more easily if a theory of change had been retrofitted with a clear framework.
- It was noted that objective two of the request for proposals was relatively weak and that the evaluation lacked information on the impact of campaigns on routine immunisation (RI). It was suggested that moving forward it could be useful to put in place a framework to be used to determine how the influence of RI on campaigns can be looked at. EAC reviewers on the whole did not agree that the findings outlined in relation to objective two were sufficiently robust.

- It was noted that the health workers interviewed appeared mostly to be involved in campaigns and it was suggested this if more health workers from RI had been included the findings from the evaluation might have been somewhat different.
- One EAC member expressed concerns on the robustness of the evaluation assessment of routine immunisation. There were also some concerns expressed in relation to the methodology approach for the literature review and the quantitative measures.
- EAC members noted that quite a few recommendations were addressed to actors in-country and fewer to Gavi. In this context it was wondered how feasible the recommendations might be for the countries and therefore questioned the usefulness of the report.
- It was noted that the Secretariat will draft a consolidated summary of the EAC review, sharing with the EAC reviewers and the EAC Chair for validation before publishing alongside the report and the management response.

7. CSO Evaluation

- 7.1 Leslie Moreland, Programme Officer, presented this item to the EAC (Doc 07), requesting the EAC to provide an assessment on the quality and usefulness of the final report, based on the assessment already completed by the reviewers.

Discussion

- EAC members noted their overall satisfaction with the report and considered that the overall conclusions are adequately robust.
- It was suggested that there is perhaps insufficient depth in the report in relation to community engagement and representation within CSOs.
- One EAC member suggested that one thing to consider for evaluations going forward, based on thoughts relating to this evaluation, would be to ensure that evaluations focus on findings and that subsequent recommendations are not formulated by the evaluators but by programmatic experts.
- It was noted that the Secretariat will draft a consolidated summary of the EAC review, sharing with the EAC reviewers and the EAC Chair for validation, before publishing alongside the report and the management response.

8. Evaluation of Gavi's Gender Policy

- 8.1 Leslie Moreland, Programme Officer, presented this item to the EAC (Doc 08), requesting the EAC to provide an assessment on the quality and usefulness of the draft report, based on the assessment already completed by the reviewers.

Discussion

- EAC members found this to be a robust report on the whole, noting that some of the recommendations might not be within Gavi's mandate.
- The EAC expressed disagreement with a comment in the report that argued that when sex-disaggregated data indicates that there are no inequities, there is no longer a need for countries to continue to produce such sex-disaggregated data.
- EAC members appreciated that the evaluators had included comparator organisations but it was suggested that they have not used information sufficiently in terms of the analysis.
- In relation to the reconstructed theory of change, it was suggested that there is a need to be clear on the rationale for doing this.
- It was suggested that it would have been useful to have more clarity on the kind of obstacles holding Gavi back in implementing the policy. There were also some questions raised around how the impact of implementation of the policy can be measured going forward.
- In relation to the recommendations, it was suggested that those focused on cultural and behavioural change at all levels of the Alliance will be challenging and that there could perhaps be more advice for the target groups that the recommendations were made for.
- One EAC member indicated that there could be strong links between Gavi's work on gender and gender discourse more broadly. An example was a lack of reference to intersectionality.
- EAC members agreed that based on the quality of the draft report they did not need to see the final report and that the Secretariat can draft a consolidated summary of the EAC review, sharing with the EAC reviewers and the EAC Chair for validation, before publishing alongside the final report and the management response.

9. Yellow Fever Laboratory Diagnostic Capacity: Monitoring and Evaluation Approach

- 9.1 Lee Hampton, Senior Specialist, Evaluation and Leslie Moreland, Programme Officer, presented this item to the EAC (Doc 09) requesting guidance from the

EAC on the draft monitoring and evaluation approach for the yellow fever laboratory diagnostics initiative.

Discussion

- EAC members agreed that more work needs to be done on the theory of change particularly regarding changing use of yellow fever vaccine. It was also noted that the focus appears to be more on monitoring rather than evaluation.
- Overall, the EAC members requested that the evaluation should assess the extent to which there is added value from Gavi's contribution in this regard and to what extent there is a unique value proposition from Gavi investment.
- Specifically, the EAC noted that the evaluation should assess: i) the added value of Gavi in market shaping for diagnostics; ii) field level impact on what is being seen in terms of malaria negative fever; iii) the relationship with vaccine suppliers; iv) predicting the future size of investment for diagnostic kits in relation to yellow fever and also perhaps for some other vaccine-preventable diseases.
- The Secretariat noted that while on the one hand there had been requests to keep this initiative very narrowly focused, there are on the other hand calls to look at how this evaluation will address some very large broad problems. It is difficult to reconcile both of these perspectives, particularly given the resources allocated for this initiative. It was suggested that the initiative should remain focused but remain aware of and be able to report on some of the other issues.
- In response to a question from the Secretariat relating to how to best engage with the EAC on this project, some EAC members did suggest that the programme might be better overseen by the PPC. It was clarified that the Board had requested EAC oversight. The EAC then requested the Secretariat to come back to the EAC with a more detailed M&E approach and updates on how it is being implemented.

10. Review of List of Potential Candidates for EAC

- 10.1 Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance, presented this item to the EAC (Doc 10) highlighting that the Governance Committee, at its meeting in March 2019, had endorsed a process whereby the EAC Chair and current EAC members, supported by the Secretariat, be invited to consider potential candidates for EAC membership and come back to the Governance Committee with recommendations for appointments preferably in June 2019.

Discussion

- EAC members discussed briefly the draft EAC skills and competencies matrix suggesting that it could be useful to include linkage with other global health initiatives, country voice, public sector background, independence etc.

- EAC members briefly discussed the list of potential candidates shared with them as Annex A to the paper.
- It was agreed that Rob Moodie and Mira Johri will coordinate the process, working with the Secretariat, to review biographies, shortlist candidates and carry out interviews on behalf of the EAC, with the aim of submitting up to three nominations to the Governance Committee for consideration in June 2019. It was agreed that ideally this should include a second Board member, with the aim of having an EAC comprising a maximum of 11 members in total.
- In order to ensure a balance of skill sets on the EAC, once the skills and competencies matrix has been finalised it will be circulated to current EAC members to complete so that it can be taken into account already when identifying potential candidates for the upcoming appointments.

11. Review of decisions

- 11.1 Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance, reviewed the decision language with the Committee which was approved by them.

12. Closing remarks and any other business

- 12.1 EAC members also agreed on the importance of maintaining strong links with the PPC. It was agreed that it is desirable to have a joint meeting annually, but when a joint meeting is not feasible, the EAC Chair, or another meeting of the EAC should be present at the PPC meetings as an observer, It will also be important to ensure that there are more systematic channels of communication between the respective committee chairs.
- 12.2 Given that there would not be a joint EAC/PPC meeting in 2019, it was therefore noted that the EAC could meet earlier than currently scheduled and agreed that the Secretariat would confirm a new date for the meeting, provisionally 2-3 October 2019, following internal consultations.
- 12.3 After determining there was no further business, the meeting was brought to a close.

Mrs Joanne Goetz
Secretary to the Meeting

Attachment A

Participants

Committee Members

- Rob Moodie, Chair
- Zulfiqar Bhutta
- Craig Burgess
- Mira Johri
- Nina Schwalbe
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien
- Wieneke Vullings

Regrets

- Jeanine Condo

Secretariat

- Anuradha Gupta (Item 2)
- Nadine Abu Sway
- Devi Aung (Item 6)
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Abdallah Bchir
- Susan Brown (Item 7)
- Joanne Goetz
- Lee Hampton (Item 9)
- Hope Johnson
- Maya Malarski (Item 8)
- Anna-Carin Matterson
- Wilson Mok (Item 8)
- Leslie Moreland
- Iryna Wydler (Item 5)
- Hamza Zekrya (Item 7)