

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

14-15 April 2021

Virtual meeting

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 The meeting was held virtually via teleconference and commenced at 14.02 Geneva time on 14 April 2021. Zulfiqar Bhutta, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) interim Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The interim Chair thanked the EAC members for their availability and informed them that all EAC members would be present during the meeting. He acknowledged Ms Nina Schwalbe, former EAC Chair, for her work and contributions to the EAC.
- 1.3 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a in the Committee pack). The interim Chair opened the floor for a discussion on the annual declarations of interest process. The EAC underlined the need for clarity on the process of declaring conflicts of interest, particularly since some EAC members are recipients of grants and research funds from some Gavi Alliance partners. The role of the EAC as an advisory body as opposed to a decision-making body was underlined in this regard. To date, EAC members have relied on recusing themselves from engaging in some areas of evaluation work as a measure to prevent conflicts; however, this approach may need to be revisited. The Secretariat was encouraged to ask for more details in the declarations form which could provide more clarity on EAC members' engagements to avoid situations whereby potential conflicts are established at a late stage. The Secretariat could also review the CVs of the EAC members to establish possible conflicts.
- 1.4 The minutes of the EAC meeting of 18-19 November 2020 were tabled to the Committee for information (Docs 01b in the Committee pack). The minutes had been circulated and approved by no-objection on 05 February 2021.
- 1.5 The Interim Chair also referred to the EAC Action Sheet (Doc 01c) and asked for comments by EAC members.

2. Update from the Executive Office

- 2.1 Seth Berkley, CEO, thanked Zulfiqar Bhutta for taking on the role of interim EAC Chair until a new Chair is officially appointed in June 2021, and thanked the former Chair, Nina Schwalbe, for her leadership and for her work on evaluations during her tenure at Gavi.

- 2.2 Dr Berkley referred to the important role of the EAC in supporting the independence of Gavi's evaluations, and in guiding mitigation actions in cases of perceived potential risks of evaluation independence. He thanked the EAC for their work on the Gavi 4.0 evaluations and for their continued support to the Gavi 5.0 evaluation workplan.
- 2.3 He updated the EAC on Gavi's organisational review and outlined the key implications on the Evaluation and Learning unit.
- 2.4 Dr Berkley referred to the impact of COVID-19 on Gavi countries noting that immunisation has shown remarkable resilience despite initial disruptions to Routine Immunisation (RI) programmes. Gavi will leverage COVAX and its innovative approaches to push for more focus on RI which will also benefit the implementation of Gavi 5.0, and help countries build back better.
- 2.5 In relation to COVAX, Dr Berkley noted that so far, close to 40 million doses have been delivered to 111 economies, with the commitment to roll-out two billion doses in 2021. He underlined supply challenges, notably the inability of the Serum Institute of India (SII) to deliver 90 million Gavi-contracted doses due to export restrictions and noted that all manufacturers are in danger of experiencing delays in the supply of critical upstream products. In relation to raising funds for the COVAX Advance Market Commitment (AMC), he noted that of the US\$ 8.3 billion ask, US\$ 6.3 billion has been raised to date. He highlighted that going forward, it will be important to consider the COVAX strategy beyond 2022, vis-à-vis supplying high-income countries (HICs) and upper-middle income countries (UMICs). Once COVID-19 vaccines are scaled up and the supply situation is improved, Gavi's efforts should be focused on the low-income countries.
- 2.6 Finally, he informed the EAC that the Gavi Board had convened in an informal meeting to discuss Gavi's role in the COVID-19 pandemic response into 2022 and beyond.

Discussion

- In relation to the COVAX vaccine portfolio, Dr Berkley clarified that deals have been signed with seven manufacturers and three more deals are in the pipeline, with the aim of diversifying the portfolio as much as possible. He noted that COVAX had purchased large volumes of the AstraZeneca (AZ) vaccine for its favorable attributes, including the possibility to store it at 2-8 degrees Celsius, its competitive price, and easy production. Assessments are ongoing following reported side-effects of the AZ vaccine, and more recently the Johnson & Johnson vaccine. Manufacturers are looking into ways to address COVID-19 variants and broaden protection through using boosters or mixing doses.
- On the ability of vaccine manufacturers to meet their commitments, Dr Berkley noted that in some cases manufacturers lacked experience in large scale vaccine manufacturing and planning which slowed down vaccine outflow. In other cases, such as with the SII, the challenge is related to a commitment made by the manufacturer to provide 50% of total doses to India, which was not met, and the

substantial uptick in cases domestically which has understandably led to India prioritising domestic use.

- In relation to scaling up vaccine production, Dr Berkley noted that manufacturers are facing multiple challenges and, in some cases, cannot obtain necessary supplies such as filters due to export bans. He underlined that RI vaccine production must also be safeguarded. He expressed his hope that high-income countries that ordered large volumes of COVID-19 vaccine would eventually share excess doses through COVAX. High-income countries that are scaling up production would also represent new sources of production once their national markets are saturated.
- It was noted that efforts are underway globally to monitor COVID-19 vaccine related side-effects which entails active and passive components. Trainings had been provided over the years to health workers in countries to report adverse events following immunisation, however passive surveillance must also be done, and finances and technical assistance are available to enable this.
- In terms of the resources necessary for COVID-19 vaccine roll-out, it was noted that the World Bank has made available US\$ 12 billion to respond to country needs. Gavi and COVAX can also make funds available to countries that cannot access the World Bank funds, but first Gavi must have a clear idea of these needs in order to adjust accordingly.
- In response to an inquiry on technology transfer, it was noted that the know-how is critical. Given the high demand, technology transfer efforts are ongoing but require capacity that is currently limited. In some cases, experts have been called from retirement to support such efforts. Furthermore, Dr Berkley referred to the COVAX Manufacturing Task Force, which works on technology transfers and is looking into helping countries to build facilities over the longer term.
- Dr Berkley underlined the need to maintain RI. It is estimated that a 15% reduction has occurred due to COVID-19 interruptions, but numbers are coming back up. Some vaccination campaigns, such as polio, have halted completely in some countries, despite ongoing efforts to resume and scale up campaigns which is more challenging in a pandemic context.
- In reference to prospective COVAX evaluations, Dr Berkley underlined that COVAX is a novel effort with room for improvements. It is important to take stock of what has been achieved so far and draw on lessons learned, but it is equally important to reflect on the global implications if COVAX had not been established. He remarked that an early lesson seems to be the value in having contingent financing and surge capacity pre-approved for future pandemic responses.

3. Update on ongoing evaluations

- 3.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, provided a framing for this item on progress on ongoing commissioned evaluations

(Doc 03). As part of her introduction, she informed the EAC that the Evaluation Management Response for the Supply and Procurement Strategy Evaluation had been signed off by the Deputy CEO within the planned 60-day timeframe.

- 3.2 Specifically, the EAC was requested to: (i) provide feedback on progress of ongoing centralised evaluations on the Gavi evaluation workplan; (ii) agree on three EAC reviewers for the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform draft final evaluation report and an additional reviewer for the Private Sector Engagement Approach evaluation draft final report; and (iii) take note of progress on decentralised evaluations.

Discussion

- The EAC indicated that the workplan and timelines for ongoing evaluations seemed very ambitious given the current circumstances related to the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly with respect to the decentralised evaluations where there was more likely to be field work. It was clarified that most of the decentralised evaluations have already reached the report writing stage. While there have been some delays in ongoing evaluations due to data collection and country engagement, the team has allowed additional time both for ongoing evaluation workplan and for the 5.0 evaluation workplan.
- Mira Johri, who is co-leading for the EAC on the COVAX evaluation with Juan Pablo Gutiérrez, provided an update on the nascent work on this evaluation. At this stage the Steering Committee (SC) and EAC reviewers have commented on the scope and evaluation questions for the draft terms of reference (TORs). The Secretariat noted that three potential SC members with expertise in modelling, market shaping, global health diplomacy / mechanisms have confirmed interest and any conflicts of interest of SC members are being reviewed prior to convening the first meeting of the SC. It is envisaged to share an interim report on the evaluability and design component of the study with the EAC prior to the next EAC meeting in September.
- The EAC agreed on three EAC reviewers for the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform draft final evaluation report: Viroj Tangcharoensathien, Jeanine Condo, and Mira Johri. It was clarified that the draft country reports are expected end May 2021, with the final end-line evaluation due by the end of August 2021.
- For the Private Sector Engagement Approach evaluation draft final report, it was agreed that Zulfiqar Bhutta would serve as the third reviewer following Nina Schwalbe's resignation.
- One EAC member noted that although it is manageable to maintain the current workload until the end of the year, it is quite heavy with each EAC member participating in three reviews. It was suggested that it would be worth an expansion in the number of EAC members or to explore engaging some external resources to alleviate the workload in the longer term.

- The EAC asked for further detail on the evaluation of the Fragility, Refugees, Emergencies (FER) Policy, noting that the countries involved will be heavily impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and enquiring whether it would be possible to build in a COVID-19 impact lens. The inception phase is now completed, and evaluators are now doing deep dive exercises in South Sudan, Afghanistan, and Bangladesh, where the evaluators have national presence. Case study countries were carefully selected with consideration given to where evaluators had presence on the ground and could therefore more effectively conduct data collection. In addition, careful consideration was given to the SC composition with some of the SC members proactively selected because they are able to help facilitate data collection in countries and with key stakeholders for key informant interviews (KIIs). The draft report will be reviewed by EAC in mid-May 2021, and the final report in June 2021.
- The EAC noted that the pool of evaluators has expanded for decentralised evaluations to include more southern evaluation groups and this was considered a positive development.
- The EAC also agreed to the allocation of EAC reviewers for the evaluations planned for 2021 (attached as Attachment B).

4. Gavi 5.0 multi-year evaluation workplan

- 4.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, provided an introduction for this item on the proposed Gavi 5.0 multi-year evaluation workplan (Doc 04).
- 4.2 The EAC was requested to: (i) provide guidance on the Centralised Evaluation Team's (CET's) proposed approach to evaluating health systems strengthening (HSS); (ii) review, provide guidance on and approve Gavi's multi-year (2021-2025) centralised evaluation work plan; and (iii) provide guidance on the proposed evaluation questions to be addressed by evaluations commissioned in 2021.

Discussion

- The EAC agreed that the proposed workplan was comprehensive and did not seem to have left out any strategic areas for evaluation. Given the level of ambition, the EAC suggested building in some buffer on the timeline.
- EAC members noted that the evaluations in the workplan are all interconnected, particularly around the zero-dose approach with fragile and conflict settings and impact of COVID-19 on Expanded Programme on Immunization (EPI) programmes (and the lack of data in these contexts), and asked for clarification on how cross-cutting learnings will be captured and information is shared. It was clarified that the team has tried to build a programme of studies that are complementary and build on one another in sequencing and feed into the mid-term evaluation (MTE) evaluation. In addition, in Gavi 5.0, there is an increased level of learning work and there will be more synthesis that will also feed in.

- On HSS, EAC members asked about what the standard metric will be for measuring for health system performance across countries. It was clarified that there has been a lot of work done to strengthen the strategy implementation monitoring approach overall. This is linked to the theories of change, which link to the strategy performance indicators and will provide a strong foundation to evaluation in this area.
- With respect to the proposed evaluation questions, EAC members commented:
 - On the zero-dose evaluation: (i) whether the evaluation design will sufficiently explore if different approaches are able to reach zero-dose children and missed communities; (ii) it was suggested to go beyond fragile states to see pockets of marginalised communities and the displaced, where the work to identify them has not been conducted extensively; (iii) to explore different forms of equity (geography, social status, ethnicity and beyond narrow definitions e.g. Pashtuns in urban areas of Pakistan); (iv) to consider what incentives might be effective in increasing coverage (i.e. demand and supply); (v) whether the evaluation will explore sub-national and non-government engagement through civil society organisations (CSOs) for reaching zero dose children and missed communities; (vi) whether the focus on zero-dose moves children from under-immunised to fully immunised and that this is sustained; and (vii) how inequalities have affected decision-making around immunisation programmes.
 - On the evaluation of transitioned countries: (i) whether the design will explore how much political will has been created to maintain immunisation commitment; (ii) how countries are planning for transition and engaging with finance sector and market shaping objectives, i.e. controlled prices/negotiation support.
 - On the Mid-Term Evaluation, whether the evaluation will address how well Gavi is supporting countries, and the impact of Gavi's engagement on country planning and on the ownership of RI of the countries.
 - Similarly, it was proposed to be more clear that evaluations are building in questions about the struggles and obstacles that countries have been facing and leveraging lessons from countries.
 - On COVAX, to broaden the scope to transitioned countries, considering the roll-out of the COVID-19 vaccine, it will be important to look at whether the response will crowd out routine childhood immunisation and budget allocation to EPI vaccines. Also it was suggested to consider the fiscal capacities of Gavi eligible and transitioned countries given the relatively high price for this vaccine and look beyond supply angles. It was noted that they may also be potential links with the FER Policy evaluation.
- EAC members asked for more detail and level of granularity that would be brought to these evaluations, particularly on zero-dose and COVAX, based on geography, socio-economic and gender, along with other dimensions, such as the urban poor.
- The Secretariat noted the complementary learning activities that will be undertaken as part of the Learning System approach with expected contributions to the evidence base from other activities like strategic analyses and targeted assessments. The Zero-Dose Learn Working Group has been established to set out a vision of what we want to achieve and the activities needed to address the

evidence gaps. It was emphasised that the MTE provides an opportunity to take stock and to synthesise this learning and redirect focus as needed.

- EAC members emphasised the importance of sharing findings between evaluations in a time-efficient manner and the Secretariat confirmed the importance of this and that efforts will be made to enable this.
- EAC members indicated that they would provide additional written feedback on specific evaluations. It was clarified that the workplan will be reviewed again by the EAC on an ongoing basis and it will still be possible to make adjustments.
- EAC also requested additional information whether there is there any resource buffer for doing anything beyond the workplan. It was clarified that for 2021 there is no buffer but that moving forward there is potentially scope to undertake additional activities if prioritised.

Decision one

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee:

Approved Gavi's multi-year (2021–2025) centralised evaluation workplan as set out in Annex B to Doc 04.

5. Enhancing the impact of evaluations

- 5.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, provided opening remarks about the key shifts in the Evaluation Operational Guidelines (EOGs) (Doc 05). She explained that the purpose of this revision to the EOGs is to clearly operationalise the policy, differentiate between the roles of the various key actors in the evaluation process and that careful consideration has been given to the feedback provided previously by the EAC.
- 5.2 She provided a brief summary of the key areas of emphasis or shifts to the policy on the basis of the review including: (i) the key role played by the EAC in relation to the quality of evaluations and in ensuring utility for the Board and PPC; and (ii) the key role played by SCs in relation to the Alliance and in bringing in other voices where needed such as specialist technical expertise, from CSOs or countries.
- 5.3 She also clarified that the guidance sought from SCs includes: (i) feedback on relevant evaluation questions for users; (ii) how to ensure use of the evaluation through the process amongst key audiences; (iii) guidance on whether the evaluation adequately recognises and understands Gavi and the wider context, including global debates, trends, issues, work of the international community on the topic under evaluation and how this affects the evaluation; (iv) key linkages between what is being evaluated and other relevant investments or actions across the Alliance or by other partners; and (v) information on other relevant evaluations/studies/analysis underway by other actors as well as the role SCs can

also play in enabling access to key informants for interview and in facilitating use of the evaluation findings.

- 5.4 She noted that SCs are no longer included in the commissioning process and will not review bids. Commissioning processes will adhere to the Gavi Alliance Procurement Policy and Manual to ensure that the Procurement process is both transparent and impartial. A Tender Evaluation Committee (TEC) is formed of relevant subject matter experts and the Centralised Evaluation Team (CET) will draw upon independent evaluation experts to provide additional methodological expertise to the TEC when assessing supplier bids, which is in line with the Procurement Policy. The Secretariat confirmed that SCs are not deemed to be required for all 5.0 evaluations (for two only) and that where there is not a SC on a study the level of engagement of the EAC should be discussed.
- 5.5 It was proposed that the CET continue to lead on assessing the quality of centralised evaluations from a methodological perspective through the evaluation process, drawing on independent experts at bid review and at other phases depending on evaluation design. The EAC will continue to play its important role in providing an overall assessment of quality – including utility and methods lens.
- 5.6 The revised draft EOGs include additional transparency throughout the process to better enable the EAC to fulfil its role in safeguarding independence, i.e. by sharing reviewer comments from SCs or independent expert reviewers with the EAC focal points.
- 5.7 The EAC was requested to provide guidance on any additional considerations for how the EOGs could be further enhanced.

Discussion

- The EAC requested further clarification on the difference in the responsibilities of the EAC, SCs and independent quality assessment panels. While some EAC members acknowledged that SCs can sometimes add value to evaluations, others raised concerns about the challenge they can present to independence.
- EAC members noted that ultimately it is the EAC that is responsible for reporting to the Gavi Board on the quality and usefulness of centralised evaluations of strategic importance to the Board. This responsibility is not facilitated by the current policy provision preventing EAC members from sitting on SCs.
- EAC members also expressed concern that some parts of the revised EOGs did not accurately capture certain provisions of the current Evaluation Policy, particularly paragraphs 4.4-4.6. In their view, the effect of this was that the balance of power leans too much towards the Secretariat and away from the EAC, thereby compromising the EAC's ability to report to the Board as foreseen.
- EAC members asked for further clarification to be built in on:
 - Which body is ultimately responsible for deciding whether to put a SC in place?
 - If there is SC, what is the relationship between the EAC and SC?
 - Who decides on the composition of the SC?

- What happens if the two bodies do not agree?
- What exactly is the role of the independent quality assessment panel?
- As next steps, it was proposed that EAC members provide written feedback on any additional questions or concerns that would then be taken forward with the incoming EAC Chair in July 2021 to establish the way forward.

6. Discussion on evaluation methods for centralised evaluations

- 6.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning presented this item (Doc 06), which was in response to an action point from the last EAC meeting. She noted that the CET had reviewed the approaches adopted in the evaluation sector to adapt evaluation methods in response to COVID-19 and in fragile and conflict contexts.
- 6.2 The EAC was requested to provide feedback on the proposed approach, and to provide guidance on any additional consideration that should be taken into account for evaluation methods.

Discussion

- In terms of data collection at country level, it was noted that utilising online survey platforms such as Google Forms, telephone interviews and online teleconferencing platforms could be useful in the context of COVID-19. Collaborating with in-country partners for data collection and evaluations was encouraged.
- Defining methods in the inception phase of evaluations was noted as important, particularly vis-à-vis the role of the EAC.
- Ensuring secure technology for evaluators is an important consideration for data safety. This should be embedded at the design phase of technology platforms particularly in contexts of conflict and fragility.
- In relation to evaluating the zero-dose approach, it was noted that covering the entire continuum of unvaccinated children, fully vaccinated children and those who fall in between is important to shift the immunisation curve, and is an important consideration for modelling and quantification perspectives. Considering catalytic effects of Gavi and Partners' efforts as part of the results chain would be important since the majority of zero-dose children live in Middle-Income countries (MICs) that are outside the purview of Gavi.
- The challenges of collecting accurate data in the context of COVID-19 were highlighted. Large pockets of low COVID-19 prevalence are emerging due to limited data, skewed information on testing, and varying reliability of disease estimation methods, particularly with the use of rapid testing. The lack of global consensus on hospitalisation data was highlighted as another challenge where serious infections and deaths are being mislabeled as COVID-19 related deaths in some countries. This can have further implications on the Gavi 5.0 strategy. A

publication by the University of Basel on capturing deaths in communities was referenced as a good source on data collection methodology in such circumstances.

- The need to improve data collection systems was reiterated by the EAC. This area could be addressed through COVAX-related data collection on COVID-19 vaccine roll-out. The Secretariat was also encouraged to consider quantification across Gavi countries before focusing on case studies.
- It was noted that many of the methodologies that are being used for modeling and projections are reliant on indirect tools. Using Google or other devices to monitor mobility patterns is contingent on availability of mobile phone and internet data services that is not accessible by poor populations. This generates data which does not reflect reality on the ground. The Secretariat was encouraged to carefully consider a range of methodological triangulation of information before COVAX-related baseline surveys are rolled-out.
- In relation to measuring equity dimensions, it was noted that mega cities represent a big challenge as large portions of the population in many lower and middle-income countries are not being captured adequately. National sampling based on information from national statistics could exclude urban slums and informal populations at times.
- In relation to evaluations in conflict and humanitarian settings, the Secretariat was encouraged to consider the guidance published by The Lancet Branch consortium series on *“Women’s and Children’s Health in Conflict Settings”* for improving data and assessment.

7. Expected EAC engagement and role of Steering Committees in Gavi 5.0 evaluations

- 7.1 For this item, the EAC was requested to discuss its engagement in upcoming centralised evaluations (Doc 07).
- 7.2 The EAC was requested: (i) to assign EAC focal points to provide quality assurance for 2021 evaluations, as approved by the EAC under agenda item 04, and (ii) to provide guidance on the engagement of SCs for the planned 2021 centralised evaluations.

Discussion

- The Secretariat underlined the need for guidance on four specific evaluations, two of which were proposed to have SCs, namely: i) the evaluation of Gavi’s policy and funding levers, and ii) Gavi’s response to COVID-19. It was clarified that the rationale for having SCs was to ensure that different stakeholder voices are heard. In addition, having representation and expertise from key areas, including from the country level, would be important to drive the evaluation process from a utility perspective. The Secretariat explained the rationale for proposing Steering Committees for both evaluations.

- Noting the anticipated written EAC feedback on agenda item 05, it was agreed that the relevant EAC focal points assigned to these evaluations would provide guidance directly on whether SCs would be necessary for each evaluation. These recommendations were requested by the end of April 2021, to allow sufficient time for the SCs to be put in place and to review the Terms of Reference of the Request for Proposals (RFP).
- The EAC agreed that Mira Johri would collate the EAC input for the Secretariat.
- The Secretariat reminded the EAC that if their feedback on the role of EAC and SCs implied any change to the Board-approved Evaluation Policy, the recommendations would require Board approval before they could be implemented.
- In relation to the two evaluations where no SCs were proposed, the EAC indicated its preference was for a substantial level of engagement.

8. Review of decisions

- 8.1 Meegan Murray-Lopez, Senior Manager, Governance reviewed the decision language with the Committee which was approved by them.

9. Closing remarks and any other business

- 9.1 The interim Chair thanked the EAC members for their active participation and for the positive and open discussions that led to agreement on the way forward to address challenging questions. With regarding the format of future EAC meetings, the EAC agreed that having shorter presentations with only key points and allowing more time for discussion and is a preferable format.
- 9.2 After determining there was no further business, the meeting was brought to a close.

Mrs Meegan Murray-Lopez
Secretary to the Meeting

Attachment A

Participants

Committee Members

- Zulfiqar Bhutta, interim Chair
- Jeanine Condo
- Rafael Vilasanjuan
- Juan Pablo Gutiérrez
- Mira Johri
- Ezzeddine Mohsni
- Marta Nunes
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien

Secretariat

- Seth Berkley (item 2)
- Hope Johnson
- Brenda Killen
- Esther Saville
- Gilbert Asiimwe
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Laura Craw (item 3)
- Chris Taylor
- Jean Zampalegre
- Marie Thomazic
- Nadine Abu-Sway
- Meegan Murray-Lopez

Attachment B

EAC engagement in centralised evaluations

	Steering Committee	EAC Focal Points		
Ongoing Centralised Evaluations				
CCEOP (Phase I) Evaluation	Yes	Viroj Tangcharoensathien	Jenny Condo	Mira Johri
Supply and Procurement Strategy Review	Yes	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	Mira Johri
Gavi's Engagement with the Private Sector	Yes	Marta Nunes	Zulfiqar Bhutta	Rafael Vilasanjuan
Fragile, Emergencies and Refugees Evaluation	Yes	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	<u>Rafael Vilasanjuan</u>
COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC evaluations*	Yes	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Jeanine Condo	<u>Zulfiqar Bhutta</u>
PCV AMC Outcome/Impact evaluation	Yes	<u>Ezzeddine Mohsni</u>	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	<u>Zulfiqar Bhutta</u>

	Deliverable for review in 2021	EAC Focal Points		
Evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities	Review of draft <u>ToR</u> Q3	JP Gutiérrez	Mira Johri	Ezzeddine Mohsni
Evaluation of Gavi's policy and funding levers	Review of draft <u>ToR</u> Q3	Jeanine Condo	Marta Nunes	<u>Rafa Vilasanjuan</u>
Gavi's response to COVID-19	Review of draft <u>ToR</u> mid-Q2	JP Gutiérrez	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Viroj Tangcharoensathien
Mid-term evaluation of Gavi 5.0	Review of draft <u>ToR</u> Q4	Mira Johri	Jeanine Condo	<u>Rafa Vilasanjuan</u>