

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

15-16 March 2017

Gavi Alliance, Geneva, Switzerland

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 The meeting commenced at 09.05 Geneva time on 15 March 2017. Rob Moodie, Evaluation Committee Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a). It was noted that Nina Schwalbe had a contractual obligation for consultancy services for the Country Programmes team, which did not represent any conflict with the proceedings of the EAC meeting.
- 1.3 Committee members noted the minutes of its meeting on 4-5 October 2016 (Doc 01b) which had been approved by no-objection on 5 December 2016.
- 1.4 The Chair reported to the EAC on his participation at the Gavi Board meeting in December 2016. He informed members that he had had an opportunity to meet the Chair of the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC), with whom he agreed on having a joint session of the EAC and PPC in October.
- 1.5 The Chair welcomed new members of the EAC, namely Anna Hamrell, Nina Schwalbe and Viroj Tangcharoensathien.
- 1.6 The Chair informed the Evaluation Advisory Committee members that in order to deal with the commercial sensitivities under Item 07, the representatives from UNICEF, WHO and BMGF, who had been invited to join for the FCE annual report session and the presentation from PATH on their technical proposal, would be requested to leave the meeting during PATH's presentation of the financial proposal. PATH would then also leave the meeting so that the EAC continues its own deliberations to arrive at a decision in line with its Charter.

2. Update from Secretariat

- 2.1 Seth Berkley, CEO, expressed his appreciation to the EAC for their work and highlighted the importance of evaluations for Gavi, as it increasingly transforms into a learning organisation. He highlighted the importance of being able to measure and learn, and thereby make evidence-based decisions. He noted that the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) work was not always visible and referred to a recent donor review that highlighted a lack of M&E work at Gavi which emphasised this point.

- 2.2 Dr Berkley provided an update on new and revised Gavi policies, frameworks and programmes including recent Board decisions on the Country Engagement Framework (CEF) and the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP), as well as the review of Gavi support for HPV and the ongoing review of a Fragile settings, emergencies and displaced people policy.
- 2.3 He updated the EAC on the mechanisms deployed by the Alliance to deliver the 2016-2020 strategy, discussing the results of the Alliance Health Survey, which was launched at the beginning of the year. He also informed EAC members about recent private sector partnerships Gavi had entered into at the World Economic Forum, with the objective of introducing and scaling innovations in immunisation delivery.
- 2.4 Dr Berkley then proceeded to provide an overview of the external environment facing Gavi. He noted that the UK's 2016 Multilateral Development Review gave Gavi the highest score ("very good") making Gavi one of the three organisations out of 38 to obtain this score. Discussing the Gavi review conducted by MOPAN, he informed EAC members that the study is expected to be officially published soon.
- 2.5 He discussed the recent and expected political changes in the US and Europe, noting possible effects on Gavi on various potential political and policy outcomes.
- 2.6 After providing EAC members with information about the upcoming Gavi Board retreat in April and the PPC meeting in May, Dr Berkley reiterated the importance of evaluation work for Gavi in allowing it to achieve its 2016-2020 targets, and helping revise and update policies, in addition to informing the design of new strategies, policies and programmes.

Discussion

- The EAC Chair and members thanked Dr Berkley for his availability and providing an update to the EAC.
- In response to a question on how the Full Country Evaluations (prospective evaluation) is utilised by the Secretariat, Dr Berkley said that most teams in the Secretariat have utilised aspects of the evaluation most relevant to informing their work, and a number of lessons that came through the data have been used to inform the work going forward. He said that as a learning organisation Gavi is in the process of putting in place a robust knowledge management process which will allow it to take evidence-based decisions and monitor implementation.
- An EAC member sought input on how Gavi was thinking about refugee movement between countries. Dr Berkley informed the EAC that the Gavi Board had considered this during its December 2016 Board meeting and had decided to allow certain flexibilities on the policy to help refugees in Gavi eligible countries.

- EAC members commended Gavi for its focus on evaluations and suggested that not only should references to evaluations be made more often in Board papers, but Gavi should also work with academic institutions to ensure that this repository of data and knowledge is effectively shared and utilised by external stakeholders, including partners, recipient countries and donors.

3. Monitoring & Evaluation Update and engagement on communications

- 3.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Monitoring and Evaluation, provided an update on Gavi's Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Framework for 2016-2020, which aims to contribute to learning and accountability for improvement of programmes, policies and implementation of strategies to maximise impact in line with Gavi's mission. She explained that the M&E framework, in its first year of introduction, had already allowed for some learnings to come through to enable consequent early course corrections. She updated the EAC members on indicator dashboards and corporate performance metrics.
- 3.2 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, provided an overview of the status of evaluation activities in 2016 and the progress made to date in 2017, noting that the activities took into account EAC members' request at the October 2016 meeting for prioritising these activities. He informed the EAC that the Evaluation team has recruited two more staff members since the EAC October 2016 meeting.
- 3.3 Christopher Endean, Head, Content & Editorials, and Susan Mackay, Head, Global & Country Media Engagement, presented how the evaluation work at Gavi is communicated externally to its various stakeholders, including donors, countries, staff, and the public at large. They articulated the need for adherence to core principles of transparency and reaching the right audience, while remaining cognisant of the requirement to mitigate and manage any potential reputational risks.

Discussion

- EAC members asked if there was a system to measure the usage of Gavi evaluation and other reports put on the website. The Communications team confirmed that web metrics can be used to track the number of downloads for documents accessed through the Gavi website, as well as visitors to individual webpages. Insight into how the reports are used would require direct assessment of the target audience through an online survey or contextual interviews.
- In relation to the information provided on the different types of monitoring and evaluation activities which are carried out, EAC members expressed that transparency is the key, and therefore both the good and bad results need to be communicated, so that the information that Gavi shares with external stakeholders is open and balanced.

- The Secretariat confirmed its focus on transparency and underscored their appreciation of using communications as a risk management tool rather than being risk averse.

4. Update: Country Engagement Framework (CEF)

- 4.1 Alan Brooks, Director, Health Systems and Immunisation Strengthening, presented information to the EAC on the Country Engagement Framework (CEF), summarising the lessons learned from 2016 and noting the continued learning and phasing-in across countries expected to take place in 2017.
- 4.2 He explained that the CEF changes will be introduced in countries applying for a new Health System Strengthening (HSS) grant or reprogramming an existing grant. He further noted that the CEF may also be introduced in countries on a case by case basis, as determined appropriate.

Discussion

- EAC members appreciated receiving an update on the CEF.
- In response to a question from an EAC member, Dr Brooks confirmed that the input of donors was taken into account as part of the CEF.
- The EAC Chair noted that there were many ongoing processes at the country level e.g. Programme Capacity Assessments (PCAs), evaluations, programme audits, and asked if this may be overburdening the countries. The Secretariat informed the EAC that it was working to sequence the different assessments. For example, the findings of PCAs can often support countries to determine areas that need support through future Gavi investments.
- An EAC member asked if integration of immunisation systems with polio programmes in the countries where they exist has been considered. Dr Brooks said that none of the countries that were part of the CEF in 2016 were priorities for the eradication initiative. Nigeria is projected to enter the CEF Process in 2017, and polio resources would be an important component of discussions there.
- In response to a question about whether any benchmarking was done with the Global Fund, Dr Brooks informed the EAC that discussions with the Global Fund had taken place, and their design lessons were utilised by Gavi in designing its CEF. In answer to another question the Secretariat confirmed that modelling was used to measure impact on deaths averted.

5. Full Country Evaluations – Preparatory Session

- 5.1 Alba Vilajeliu, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation, provided a status update to EAC members in relation to the completed 2013-2016 Full Country Evaluations (FCE) project, explaining the value of its findings in terms of helping improve Gavi support at country level and inform Gavi policies, frameworks and processes at the global level. She outlined the evolution of FCE principles from its phase one (2013-2016) to the possible phase two of the project (2017-2019).

Discussion

- EAC members suggested that the lessons learned during phase one, particularly on capacity building of in-country teams, data quality and the process design of Gavi interventions, be used as a basis for the second phase of the evaluation.
- EAC members encouraged that Gavi work closely with the Global Fund as there may be potential cross-learning opportunities from their Prospective Country Evaluations (PCE) of the eight countries that they have identified for this exercise.

6. Full Country Evaluations – Annual Report

- 6.1 Steve Lim, IHME and Nicole Salisbury, PATH presented the FCE Annual Report, explaining that the goal of the evaluation was to examine and quantify barriers to and drivers of immunisation programme improvement, through conducting this exercise in four countries: Bangladesh, Mozambique, Uganda and Zambia.
- 6.2. Dr Lim outlined the information on new vaccine introductions gathered through the FCE project in each of the four countries, explaining the key root causes of sub-optimal routinisation and providing an overview of the emergent recommendations. He reviewed the results pertaining to HPV programmes and delays across the HSS grant cycle.
- 6.3 Dr Lim and Dr Salisbury presented to the EAC salient findings and recommendations of the FCE Annual Report on key drivers including Technical Assistance (TA), leadership and management, partnerships, programmatic and financial stability as well as Alliance systems and processes.
- 6.4 The FCE team provided EAC with examples of how the FCE findings had been used to inform Gavi's various policy and approach decisions pertaining to these countries as well as improve the on-ground support and implementation mechanisms deployed.

Discussion

- EAC members noted the key findings and recommendations presented by the FCE team, including the fact that the HSS application process seemed onerous to countries.
- EAC members highlighted the need to consider gender related barriers as part of the data collection methodology, which the FCE team agreed could be an area to consider when designing the data collection methodology going forward.
- They sought information on the learnings about geospatial mapping and on the robustness of its estimate for impact (reduction in child mortality). They noted that data obtained through geospatial mapping would allow for better quality implementation decisions, if this data was collected at the sub-national level, for example at district level for some countries.
- EAC members underscored the importance of ensuring that the impact of the PEF on the relationship with partners in country is carefully considered when evaluating the efficiency of Gavi interventions in countries.
- EAC members noted that there is evaluation fatigue in the countries, and suggested that communicating outcomes of the evaluations could help countries see the value of this exercise and articulating tangible benefits may help overcome the issue of respondents' fatigue.
- EAC members noted that the FCE team is preparing and will submit several articles to be published in peer-reviewed journals.

Discussions and decisions in relation to Agenda Item 07 *Gavi Full Country Evaluations - Second Phase* are recorded separately due to commercial sensitivities.

8. Criteria for Prioritisation of Evaluation Work and Gavi Evaluation Workplan

- 8.1 Alba Vilajeliu, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation, provided the context for the evaluation approach, how it responds to the Gavi Strategy of 2016-2020 and the increased demand for evaluations as a result. She presented the suggested criteria for prioritisation of evaluation work and the selection of countries seeking EAC guidance on the proposed approach. She recalled that the EAC had requested the Secretariat to develop this prioritisation criteria at its October 2016 meeting.

- 8.2 She presented the proposed evaluation workplan for 2017, including the second phase of the FCE project in three countries: Mozambique, Uganda, Zambia, Targeted Country Assistance (TCA) prospective evaluation in Tier 1 and Tier 2 countries, and the CCEOP prospective evaluation in IRC approved countries. She also presented the preliminary multi-year evaluation workplan for 2017-2020.

Discussion

- EAC members appreciated the work of the evaluation team and noted that the higher demand for evaluation work was a testament of this work being appreciated within and outside the Secretariat. They noted that as the role of evaluations in Gavi is changing, it is increasingly becoming a fundamental part of the planning process.
- In response to a question, the Evaluation team explained that the workplan was divided into two categories to differentiate between the planned evaluations for 2017 which have already been budgeted for, and those evaluations which may be requested by the Secretariat during the course of the year on an ad-hoc basis and are not yet included in the evaluation budget for the year.
- EAC members suggested that the choice of countries for evaluation work to take place in, should be done on a basis of ensuring diversity and allowing for a full range of different country-contexts. Evaluation criteria should also be designed to cater for information collection around government engagement and in-country partners. The Secretariat noted that it appreciated the need for evaluations to take place in diverse countries, however, sometimes the choice of countries is limited by the stage of programmatic implementation that countries are in.
- EAC members underscored the need to strengthen the criteria for prioritisation of evaluations to be more specific on potential use and impact of findings. They suggested testing the criteria with existing evaluations on the workplan to see if it helps the evaluation team in prioritising, as well as capturing the level of effort for each evaluation. It was also suggested to confirm and specify what constitutes an evaluation request from the Board. The Secretariat agreed to these suggestions and said it would present the update to the EAC at its October meeting.
- The EAC discussed the idea to package relevant evaluation work together as a larger project to attract internationally renowned consortia. This would provide Gavi value for its investment, by allowing access to better quality services. It was agreed that during the next EAC meeting in October this will be discussed in more detail.

Decision Two

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee:

Approved the evaluation workplan for 2017.

9. Evaluation of Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP) - Terms of Reference (TORs)

9.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, provided information on the terms of reference for the CCEOP evaluation, for which a decision of the EAC was being sought. He summarised the request for proposal, outlining the objectives and scope of the engagement, as well as the proposed methodology and timeline.

Discussion

- EAC members noted that it may be more efficient to consider conducting this evaluation in one or two countries instead of four countries and scale up the key lessons, or at least combine the evaluation on CCEOP with other ongoing evaluations being conducted by Gavi at a minimum. The Secretariat agreed to take this input into consideration and circulate the revised request for proposal (RFP) to the EAC.
- In response to a question on whether the CCEOP was displacing ongoing efforts in the countries, the Secretariat responded that thus far it has been a positive displacement as most countries are using the funds which they would have used for upgrading the cold chain anyway.
- The Secretariat agreed to add questions to the RFP relating to impact on market shaping, as suggested by EAC members. An EAC member offered to review proposed evaluation questions regarding to this topic.

Decision Three

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee:

Approved the Request for Proposal for the CCEOP evaluation attached as Annex A to Doc 09 and as amended by discussions at the EAC.

10. Update on Evaluation of Technical Assistance provided through the Partners' Engagement Framework (PEF)

10.1 Alba Vilajeliu, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation, introduced the item and summarised the key lessons learnt to date from the evaluation of Targeted Country Assistance (TCA) provided through the Partners' Engagement Framework (PEF), both in terms of the Gavi framework design of the PEF and its implications on the evaluation, and the evaluation implementation, as well as from an oversight and project management perspective.

- 10.2 Wieneke Vullings, EAC member and Chair of the project Steering Committee, updated the EAC on the work undertaken by the Steering Committee in ensuring that adequate methodological guidance at important moments during the evaluation was provided.
- 10.3 Meklit Hailemeskal and Sally Stansfield representing Deloitte, which has been contracted by Gavi to carry out this evaluation project, presented their preliminary insights to the EAC members, on the baseline assessment of TCA planning, delivery and implementation.

Discussion

- EAC members commended the team and the Steering Committee, recognising that this evaluation requires many mid-course corrections and also attention to sensitivities around gathering data from partners and stakeholders, as well as sensitivities in presenting the results to partners and stakeholders.
- EAC members sought clarity from the team on research/data collection methodology. The Deloitte representatives responded to these queries and clarified the process and methodology used.
- The team was encouraged by the EAC members to ensure that the findings of the evaluation, even if unfavourable, are accurately presented, and any issues countries or partners highlight are clearly articulated.

11. Peer Review of Gavi Evaluation Function - Terms of Reference

- 11.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation presented the terms of reference (TORs) for the peer review of Gavi's Evaluation function, and sought guidance from the EAC on the TORs, contractual arrangement mechanism and the expected level of engagement of the EAC.
- 11.2 Explaining the rationale for this review of the Gavi Evaluation function Dr Bchir recalled that the EAC had agreed during its October 2016 meeting, that such an evaluation would inform the review of the Gavi Evaluation Policy, and the EAC Charter and also help improve the evaluation function within the Gavi Secretariat.
- 11.3 He highlighted that the peer review would assess all aspects of the Gavi evaluation function and its products in terms of independence, utility and credibility against United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards.

Discussion

- EAC members fully supported the idea of a peer review of Gavi's evaluation function. The Chair mentioned that not only would such a peer review allow the Evaluation function to learn, but will also give it access to a network of contemporaries.
- It was, however, noted that the requirement in the TOR stipulating that the peer reviewers should have had no previous interaction with Gavi was too strict and may restrict the possibility of including some important and appropriate peer reviewers. It was also noted that a consultant or panel member, and not the Gavi Secretariat, should coordinate the writing of the report and final deliverables.
- While explaining the modalities of the how best to approach a panel of peer-reviewers, the Secretariat explained that Gavi could submit a formal written request to OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) for undertaking this peer review as part of their plans, since Gavi is neither a UNEG member nor an OECD member.
- It was further explained to the EAC members that OECD/DAC is already reviewing applications for 2018, and therefore in addition to applying to the OECD/DAC, it would be prudent to reach out to individuals who could be peer reviewers and undertake this evaluation during the current year.
- The Secretariat requested EAC members to provide appropriate names of individuals who could be reached with a request to form a peer review panel. The Chair and other members agreed to propose some names in the weeks after the meeting.

12. Review of decisions

- 12.1 Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance, reviewed and agreed the language of the decisions with the Committee.

13. Any other business

- 13.1 The EAC Chair sought input from members of the EAC and the Secretariat on how the Committee functions, and solicited recommendations on any specific areas for improvement.

- 13.2 The EAC members appreciated the role that the EAC Chair played, and thanked the Secretariat for their hard work and diligence in putting together the information pack for the EAC. The Secretariat in turn praised the role that the EAC played in guiding the work of the Evaluation team and helping it move forward.
- 13.2 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
- Anna Hamrell
- Jeanine Condo
- Nina Schwalbe
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien
- Wieneke Vullings
- Zulfiqar Bhutta

Regrets

- Samba O. Sow

Secretariat

- Seth Berkley (Agenda Item 2)
- Abdallah Bchir
- Alba Vilajeliu
- Hope Johnson
- Joanne Goetz
- Mahwesh Bilal Khan
- Leslie Moreland
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Christopher Endean (Agenda Item 3)
- Susan Mackay (Agenda Item 3)
- Alan Brooks (Agenda Item 4 and 9)
- Patricia Kuo (Agenda Item 4)
- Krisztina Almasi (Agenda Item 4)
- Hamadou Dicko (Agenda Item 9)
- Caroline Dubois (Agenda Item 10)
- Reillie Acks (Agenda Item 10)
- Ann Cronin (Agenda Item 10)

Guests

- Gonzalo Hernández
- Meklit Hailemeskal (Agenda Item 10)
- Sally Stansfield (Agenda Item 10)
- Steve Lim (Agenda Item 6)
- Nicole Salisbury (Agenda Item 6 and 7)
- Jay Ward (Agenda item 6 and 7)
- Emily Carnahan (Agenda Item 6 and 7)
- Julia Rajaratnam (Agenda Item 7)
- Diana Chang (Agenda Item 5-6)
- Ulla Griffiths (Agenda Item 5, 6 and part of 7)
- Logan Brenzel (Agenda Item 5 and part of 7)