

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

2-3 October 2019

Gavi Alliance, Geneva, Switzerland

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 The meeting commenced at 14.04 Geneva time on 2 October 2019. Nina Schwalbe, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a). The EAC Chair indicated that after submitting her declarations of interest, she had taken action to mitigate the interests listed, and so the next version of the declarations of interest would show that she has no relevant organisational or financial/personal/other interests.
- 1.3 Committee members noted the minutes of its meeting on 10 and 11 April 2019 had been approved by no-objection earlier.
- 1.4 The Chair referred to the EAC Action Sheet (Doc 01c) and briefly explained its purpose.
- 1.5 In relation to the EAC/TERG (Technical Evaluation Reference Group) collaboration, the EAC Chair informed the Committee that she and the Gavi Secretariat had met with the TERG chair and Global Fund Secretariat and agreed on a series of action items (see Doc 01d). In the spirit of collaboration, Ryuichi Komatsu was invited to the EAC meeting to share an update on their learnings and key findings from the market shaping review conducted by the TERG.

2. Gavi 5.0

- 2.1 Johannes Ahrendts, Head, Strategy, Funding & Performance, presented this item to the Committee giving some context for Gavi 5.0 (the Alliance's 2021-2025 Strategy) as to how it was developed and next steps.
- 2.2 He highlighted some changes in Gavi 5.0 as compared to the earlier strategy, including a new vision statement, the word 'people' and 'sustainable' in the mission statement, the principles, strategic goals and objectives. He also highlighted the new Gavi Vision 'Leaving no-one behind with immunisation'.
- 2.3 Mr Ahrendts explained that key shifts from the current strategy include reaching under immunised children and zero-dose children, stronger focus on gender, having a more differentiated portfolio, and supporting countries in prioritising vaccine introductions while being conscious of their capacities. He highlighted and

emphasised the discussion at the Board meeting on Gavi's role in supporting middle-income countries (MIC).

- 2.4 He referred to the ongoing work related to the revision of the theory of change for Gavi 5.0, and the review of Gavi funding policies.

Discussion

- EAC members commended the aspiration of reaching underserved and unreached communities with immunisation. Challenges were raised concerning the assumption that reaching these children with immunisation would automatically contribute to improving the delivery of other basic health services. The Secretariat explained that this area is being further developed. The EAC suggested that evidence be gathered as this is a critical element of Gavi 5.0.
- Some EAC members asked whether a market based approach was the right approach for thinking about vaccine access. The Secretariat clarified that the concept of “healthy markets” entails ensuring availability of vaccines, achieving an affordable price, and diversifying the supplier base as well as balancing number of manufacturers from developed and developing countries.
- The EAC raised a number of questions related to reaching migrant populations, refugees and unidentified children. EAC members noted that a lack of data was a hindrance and that investment is being made to rectify this and get good data from country level. The Secretariat noted that in the coming months there will be discussions around working with humanitarian institutions since they have better access to this population.
- In relation to a question on Gavi's role in outbreak in countries, it was noted that Gavi is funding stockpiles and providing operational support, and that this would continue in Gavi 5.0 as well.

3. Evaluation Approaches for Gavi 5.0

- 3.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Monitoring & Evaluation, presented this item to the Committee (Doc 03) and summarised the process to develop the monitoring and evaluation framework for the 2021-2025 period.
- 3.2 She requested that the EAC provide guidance on the proposed guiding principles for the development of the evaluation workplan for Gavi 5.0.
- 3.3 Dr Johnson also requested that the EAC identify preliminary areas for centralised evaluations of high strategic value to the Gavi Board.

Discussion

- EAC members were supportive of the proposed guiding principles for the development of the evaluation workplan for Gavi 5.0.
- EAC members noted that “users of evaluation” can be wider than the Gavi Secretariat and Alliance partners include the broader development community.
- EAC members suggested incorporating the following elements into the principles:
 - evaluations should be comprehensive across the results chain and should be evaluated against its Theory of Change (ToC);
 - there should be a link to 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs);
 - reference to differentiated approaches as a central feature of Gavi 5.0;
 - reference to the use of rigorous methods;
 - in addition to sustainability and equity, mention country ownership, and gender; and clarification of what is meant by ‘country’ – whether government or also other actors such as civil society;
- EAC members debated whether the number of centralised evaluations should be ‘limited’ or ‘adequate,’ and tended to agree that adequate was a better descriptor.
- EAC members also discussed whether Gavi should consider doing an evaluation of the whole enterprise or rather programme-by-programme and requested further discuss at the next meeting as well as consultation at with the Board through the Board representatives. There was agreement that any evaluation should be grounded in a need for information to drive program or strategy as opposed to “evaluation for the sake of evaluation”.
- One EAC suggested that Gavi should work closely with UNICEF on its Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) to ensure the questions are designed to target most vulnerable and to obtain the level of data on equity that Gavi would find necessary for assessing Gavi 5.0.
- On the proposed list of preliminary areas for centralised evaluations of high strategic value to the Gavi Board, EAC members suggested considering:
 - a prospective evaluation on increasing coverage and tackling zero-dose communities with the impact on broader health;
 - reaching refugees/mobile populations;
 - market shaping;
 - programmatic as well as financial sustainability as key elements of Gavi’s model;
 - vaccine access, coverage and equity in MICs that were never-eligible MICs;
 - Gavi’s relevance towards the SDGs;
 - evaluations to inform the key assumptions of the 5.0 strategy as well as to evaluate the key assumptions;
 - demand and impact of action to strengthen capacity at country level;
 - the impact of past strategic periods; and
 - Gavi’s investment in innovation.

- It was agreed that the upcoming PPC should be used as an opportunity to get the PPC's inputs on the guiding principles and potential areas for evaluation of 5.0. The evaluation workplan should also be discussed and reviewed by the Board to make sure that evaluations were appropriately addressing strategy and policy issues of relevance and concern.

4. Reflections on Gavi's Approach to Evaluations

- 4.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, provided some candid reflections about the Evaluation function at Gavi during his tenure with the organisation, including key achievements, remaining challenges, and some considerations for the future.

Discussion

- EAC members wholeheartedly thanked Dr Bchir for his presentation and thoughtful assessment.
- The EAC recognized Dr Bchir's remarkable contribution to Gavi, to the evolution of Gavi's approach to evaluation and to driving an evaluation culture.
- It was recommended that portions of his presentation be made available as part of any future onboarding session for new EAC members and that he provide a similar presentation to Gavi's Executive Office.

5. Evaluation Update and Workplan

5a. General Update

- 5a.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluations, presented this item to the Committee (Doc 05a), providing an update on the progress of centralised and decentralised evaluations.
- 5a.2 Viroj Tangcharoensathien, EAC member and chair of the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP) Steering Committee, provided an update on the status of the centralised evaluation of the and noted that the quality has been sufficient from his perspective. Ms Anna-Carin Matterson, Consultant with the Gavi Evaluation Team, described how the evaluation is feeding into other workstreams.
- 5a.3 Dr Bchir then reviewed the status of management responses for centralised evaluations, including recent evaluations of civil society engagement, gender and measles.
- 5a.4 Finally, the EAC reviewed the list of ongoing decentralised evaluations and reviews, which was provided for their information. This list included: 1) HSS

Review 2018, HSS India, RapidPro, Uganda, Zambia, Partners' Engagement Framework/Targeted Country Assistance, and Yellow Fever.

Discussion

- In relation to the two publications referenced in the presentation for the Uganda and Zambia evaluations, one EAC member queried whether country colleagues had been empowered. It was confirmed that there had been country engagement.
- With respect to the decentralised evaluation of yellow fever (YF) diagnostic capacity, it was clarified that no further action by the EAC is required.

5b. Workplan

5b.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluations, presented this item to the Committee (Doc 05b), providing an update on changes to the 2019-2020 evaluation workplan since the EAC last reviewed and approved it in April 2019.

5.b.2 Dr Bchir highlighted the three questions needing further input from the EAC, namely:

- Whether the current rules around post-transition evaluations of Gavi support should be maintained, thereby only conducting an evaluation two years after all Gavi support ends?
- At what steps of the AMC evaluation would the EAC like to be involved?
- Whether an HSIS evaluation should be added to the 2019-2020 evaluation workplan, and if yes, what should be the priority questions and proposed approach?

Discussion

- On the question of post-transition evaluations, the EAC noted that sustainability is a critical element of Gavi 5.0, but based on the information provided, the EAC was not prepared to opine on whether every two years is the best approach. The EAC requested that this come back to the next meeting for further discussion considering the available information from the monitoring system and the number of countries.
- With respect to the question of the Advanced Market Commitment (AMC) impact evaluation, the EAC agreed that AMC was of strategic importance thus should be a centralised evaluation and therefore that the EAC should be involved in defining the evaluation questions. The Chair noted that she would have a potential Conflict of Interest (CoI) in relation to this evaluation.
- On the question of whether an HSIS evaluation should be added to the 2019-2020 workplan, the EAC agreed that it would be best to wait and see how the Gavi 5.0 policy development process evolves before making any decisions. However, the EAC agreed that any future evaluation of HSIS would be strategically important and should be conducted as a centralised evaluation. It was proposed that the

Gavi Alliance Board provide some clarity on what questions they have about HSIS. This would inform the approach (prospective or retrospective). The EAC requested that this topic come back to the next meeting for further discussion including on potential approaches.

- The EAC also discussed the two decentralised country programme evaluations of Uganda and Zambia. The Secretariat noted that the Evaluation Team has been dedicating time to this despite the EAC moving these two evaluations to the decentralised list at its April 2019 meeting. The EAC asked for a report back on these evaluations at the October 2020 EAC meeting given that while “decentralized,” they represent the follow up to the Full Country Evaluations and are thus important to track from a process perspective.
- The EAC made several additional suggestions on the 2019-2020 workplan, including to: 1) reflect that there may be some additional, still undefined work to build in related to Gavi 5.0 before the end of 2020; and 2) note that the Zambia and Uganda evaluations require time from the Evaluation Team (see above) and thus are somewhat of a hybrid in terms of status.

6. Evaluation of Gavi’s Co-financing and Eligibility & Transition Policies

- 6.1 Santiago Cornejo, Director, Immunisation Financing & Sustainability, presented this item to the Committee (Doc 06), requesting the EAC reviewers - Mira Johri, Viroj Tangcharoensathien, and Wieneke Vullings to give their review of the quality and usefulness of the draft evaluation report of the co-financing, eligibility and transition policies.

Discussion

- The EAC Chair expressed appreciation for the Gavi team’s work and efforts on the report.
- The EAC reviewers commented that the report was well structured and clear, given the limited time within which the report was prepared. They acknowledged the good mix of countries selected for the case studies.
- The EAC reviewers, however, expressed some methodological concerns including related to the quantitative analysis and subjectivity of robustness ratings. Detailed comments were provided to the Secretariat in reviewer reports.
- The EAC reviewers also highlighted the descriptive tone of the report and the fact that findings seem to rely more on information provided by the Secretariat; as such they questioned the utility of the report in shaping future policy.
- It was discussed and agreed that the findings of the report were not completely novel to the Secretariat. However, the Secretariat noted that getting external validation on known issues was helpful.

- In relation to Co-financing Policy, one of the findings highlighted by the report was that no country had defaulted in paying; however, an EAC reviewer noted that this was due to the intervention of third parties. EAC members agreed that this development should be further elaborated on by the external evaluator as this was not foreseen by the policy.
- Another EAC member expressed concerns on the limited number of key informants interviewed in some countries for the case studies.
- The Secretariat was requested to take corrective steps on the finding that suggested a third of the transitioning countries decrease their immunisation coverage, if this was verified.
- In response to a query by an EAC member, the Secretariat responded that 18 countries will fully transition out of Gavi support by 2020 and another 8 to 10 by the end of the next strategic period.
- It was agreed that as the next step the Secretariat team would liaise with the evaluators to get a revised and final report. The Secretariat noted that the revised report would have more supporting evidence and data backing findings therein but there would not be new findings.
- It was agreed that Mira Johri, Viroj Tangcharoensathien and Wieneke Vullings will review and make a final assessment of the quality and usefulness of the draft evaluation report on behalf of the EAC.

7. Evaluation of Gavi's Supply and Procurement Strategy

- 7.1 The purpose of this item (Doc 07) was to request that the EAC 1) review the draft high-level evaluation questions of the evaluation of Gavi's Supply and Procurement Strategy, and 2) indicate at what steps of the evaluation the EAC would like to be involved.
- 7.2 Ryuichi Komatsu, TERG Secretariat, presented the experience of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Global Fund) in its ongoing Market-Shaping Strategy Mid-Term Review.
- 7.3 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, then presented the high-level questions that had been identified with the business owner for feedback from the EAC.

Discussion

- EAC members suggested additional questions, including: 1) whether there have been unintended consequences of the strategy, 2) whether Gavi could have done anything to better support in contexts of shortage of vaccines (e.g. HPV, rota), 3) whether the evaluation should also consider more downstream issues (e.g.

whether warehouses were properly managed and pooled procurement was efficient).

- The EAC recommended to reframe the questions in terms of their value for Gavi 5.0.
- The EAC noted that there would be methodological complications for this evaluation related to contribution/attribution, given that there are other actors also working on market shaping. The EAC pointed out a need to clarify whether evaluators would have access to confidential information. The Secretariat will review what levels of information will be confidential for this evaluation and treat this as a limitation to the review. The Chair also indicated she may have a Conflict of Interest to declare for this evaluation.
- The EAC agreed that it would want to review the final list of proposed questions, including what is in and out of scope for the evaluation, and then provide input on the inception report, especially on the Theory of Change (ToC).
- It was agreed that Juan Pablo Gutiérrez, Viroj Tangcharoensathien, Mira Johri, and Ezzedine Mohsni will review and approve the evaluation reports on behalf of the EAC.

8. Evaluation of Gavi's Engagement with the Private Sector

- 8.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluations, and Marie-Ange Saraka-Yao, Managing Director, Resource Mobilisation and Private Sector Partnerships, presented this item to the EAC (Doc 08) requesting guidance from the EAC on the scope and questions on draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation of Gavi's engagement with the private sector.
- 8.2 Referring to the objectives of the evaluation, Dr Bchir emphasised the programme approach and modalities – financial contributions, leveraged partnerships and operational partnerships. He explained that the scope of the evaluation was to address: the approach in general, modalities of the approach and projects within those modalities.
- 8.3 The Secretariat provided some background information in relation to private sector engagement at Gavi and elaborated that it began with a focus on vaccine supply and subsequently shifted to funding. The hypothesis underlying the approach is that private sector has unique competencies and assets that can be useful to Gavi's work including to address bottlenecks in immunisation uptake and delivery.

Discussion

- Overall members suggested to streamline the ToR and to address the key questions to get a succinct and actionable report. It was agreed that the ToR needed to be more organised and clear.

- The EAC questioned whether the intent was to inform 5.0 or report past activities. Based on the response it was agreed the evaluation should be summative but that questions should be geared toward informing the design of the strategy 5.0.
- An EAC member questioned whether benchmarking was required given and recommended that this be done as separate exercise and not as part of the evaluation.
- In relation to the discussion on innovation, it was noted that “innovation” and “private sector engagement approach” are not synonymous and should be evaluated separately.
- The EAC requested to reflect that INFUSE partnerships were not only from private sector, but other sectors as well, such as non-governmental organisations and academia.
- The EAC members recommended that evaluation questions in the TOR should also look at costs, cost effectiveness, notion of capacity building of Government by private sector, and one member suggested benchmarking against other public-private partnerships, potentially beyond Global Health.
- It was agreed that the EAC Chair, Marta Nunes and Wieneke Vullings will review the ToR questions and assist with restructuring and design on behalf of the EAC. Comments should be provided to the Secretariat by Friday, 11 October 2019. It was agreed that the same reviewers would comment on the inception report, review the draft final report and based on the draft final report, decide if they would like to review the final report (with Ms Dia replacing Ms. Vullings when Ms Vullings’ term on the committee ends).
- On the question of timing of the evaluation, it was agreed that the Secretariat should publish the RFP by the end of the year and a timeline of six months from awarding the contract to receiving the final report was reasonable and would best serve to inform 5.0.

9. Process for Evaluations

- 9.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Monitoring & Evaluation, presented this item to the EAC (Doc 09) seeking guidance from the EAC to standardise the EAC evaluation summary assessments.
- 9.2 She referred to the slides on the actions from the EAC, the tools and templates that the Evaluation team at the Secretariat is developing to strengthen evaluation function. She highlighted the changes to the operational guidelines. With regards to the publication of summaries, she added that the intention was to make the evaluation report accessible and enable learning. On the timeline, to be more efficient she asked the EAC members if there was a need to be more prescriptive

for finalising the evaluation questions and invited suggestions for expediting management responses. She further asked if the EAC members desired to be aware about any step in the procurement process or if they had suggestions on any group that should be listed on the procurement list.

Discussion

- In relation to the discussion on the EAC summary assessments, EAC members preferred to retain the four categories of rating, including 'fully meets Gavi quality standards.' EAC members also agreed that the summary assessment should not be posted as an attachment, but rather should appear in some form at the start or the bottom of the report itself. It was agreed that the word '*felt*' appearing in the second point on the EAC summary assessment should be changed to '*assessed the report to have*'.
- EAC members indicated that the part on publishable quality should be removed from the QA tool. They also asked to add the limitations, where relevant, into the summary assessment and add their assessment to the downloadable report as a single document.
- In relation to the changes to the operational guidelines, the EAC suggested that policy briefs should be available in at least English, French and Spanish.
- It was proposed that additional forms of communication could be used to disseminate the policy briefs to a wider audience, including a brief video or news flash. The EAC also suggested that a country focused brief would be useful and that the conclusions and recommendations should also be made disseminated at country level.
- The EAC suggested that the one pager on evaluation should be sent to the Board in a timely manner as opposed to annexing it to the EAC Board paper as that may not meet the requirement for timeliness. The Secretariat suggested to use multiple channels in communication with the Board including potentially as part of the CEO monthly report to the Board.
- In the discussion on management response, the EAC recommended a change to a more readable format. They also emphasised the need to get the same in a timely manner. It was discussed and agreed to have the timeline laid out upfront on the SOP which would also help in facilitating timely response.
- EAC members also agreed that strict timelines should be added to the operational guidelines for finalising evaluation questions and preparing the EMR.
- EAC members also agreed that RFP announcements for evaluations could be shared with EAC members for broader distribution and that the Secretariat should continue its efforts to solicit bids and bidders from institutions based in Gavi eligible countries.

10. Review of decisions

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

11. Closing remarks and any other business

- 11.1 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

- Nina Schwalbe, Chair
- Marta Nunes
- Maty Dial
- Juan Pablo Gutiérrez
- Mira Johri
- Ezzedine Mohsni
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien
- Wieneke Vullings
- Jeanine Condo (via teleconference)

Regrets

- Zulfiqar Bhutta

Guest

- Ryuichi Komatsu (item 7)

Secretariat

- Hope Johnson
- Abdallah Bchir
- Joanne Goetz
- Meegan Murray-Lopez
- Gilbert Asimwe
- Valerie Valera
- Jean Rachid Zampalegre
- Anna-Carin Matterson
- Iryna Wydler
- Prachi Shah
- Lee Hampton
- Johannes Ahrendts (item 2)
- Dave Cagen (items 2 and 3)
- Wilson Mok (item 6)
- Maria Patyna (item 6)
- Santiago Cornejo (item 6)
- Dominic Hein (item 7)
- Raphael Ferry (item 8)
- Marie-Ange Saraka-Yao (item 8)
- Mireille Gomes (item 8)