

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

20-21 March 2024

Geneva, Switzerland

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 Noting that the meeting had been duly convened and finding a quorum of members present, the meeting commenced at 09.00 Geneva time on 20 March 2024. James Hargreaves, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed new EAC members, namely: Julia Betts, Phyllis Dako-Gyeke, and Helen Evans.
- 1.3 The Chair indicated that Michael Kent Ranson, Alternate Board member (World Bank) and Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) member, would join the meeting to make the link between the EAC and the PPC. He also informed the committee that in the same vein, the EAC Chair has been made a standing observer to the PPC.
- 1.4 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a in the Committee pack).
- 1.5 The Chair noted that he had been informed by the Chair of the Governance Committee of an institutional conflict of interest matter for EAC member Justice Nonvignon and therefore, as per governance protocol, Mr Nonvignon would not be able to serve as an EAC member until such time as the conflict of interest was resolved. The Chair thanked him for his contributions.
- 1.6 The minutes of the 4-5 October 2023 meeting were tabled to the Committee for information (Doc 01b in the Committee pack). The minutes had been circulated and approved by no-objection on 8 December 2023.
- 1.7 The Chair briefed the EAC on his activities since the EAC last met, including the EAC Chair's Report he provided to the Board in December and All Chairs Group in February; recruitment and onboarding of new EAC members; co-hosting a meeting with global evaluation experts at the Banbury Centre, New York; and participation in a dialogue with the Future of Global Health Initiatives (FGHI), which had resulted in a set of recommendations about global health institutions in the Lusaka Declaration that would be relevant for EAC moving forward.
- 1.8 The Chair noted that in the spirit of innovation, supplier presentations had been pre-recorded and circulated to the EAC ahead of the meeting.
- 1.9 The Chair also stated that the EAC would be implementing some of the ways of working that had been trialed last year including presenting the Secretariat with

more formalised guidance throughout the meeting.

- 1.10 The Chair noted that tomorrow's meeting would begin with a closed session followed by introductory remarks by Dr Sania Nishtar, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), who started her role the same week.
- 1.11 Michael Kent Ranson provided a summary of the deliberations at the last PPC meeting held on 24-26 October 2023, including: i) Gavi 5.1 must-wins; ii) Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and Response; and iii) Gavi 6.0 strategy development.
- 1.12 Mr Ranson emphasised that there was a need to consider the role of evaluations for new initiatives including the Big Catch Up, First Response Fund of the Day Zero Financing Facility, and the African Vaccine Manufacturing Accelerator (AVMA). He also indicated that the PPC had noted that the proposed Middle-Income Country (MIC) Evaluation would be postponed and requested that the planned desk review results be shared to inform the new MICs strategy.

2. Update from the Office of the CEO

- 2.1 David Marlow, Chief Operating Officer (COO), provided the EAC with an update on several important topics including: changes in the reporting structure of key Gavi staff positions; upcoming launch of the Investment Opportunity and the African Vaccine Manufacturing Accelerator (AVMA) on 20 June; and the outcome of the Future of Global Health Initiatives (FGHI). He also provided an overview of evaluations and reviews and noted key dates for the remainder of 2024.
- 2.2 Mr Marlow emphasised that key priority areas for 2024 remain unchanged: deliver on Gavi 5.1 including the Operational Excellence enablers; develop an ambitious strategy and investment case for Gavi 6.0; and secure a successful replenishment. He noted that the programmatic must-wins and operational excellence enablers reflect these core priorities.
- 2.3 He provided an update on Gavi 6.0 strategy development including the recent Alliance Workshop in Togo and preparation for the Board Retreat in April 2024, ahead of the Board Meeting in June 2024.
- 2.4 He highlighted several critical evaluations that will inform Gavi 6.0 development including: i) Strategy Operationalisation (Strat Ops); ii) Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE); and iii) Zero-Dose. The findings from the latter two evaluations would be discussed at the April 2024 Board Technical Briefing. Additionally, insights from the COVAX Phase 1 evaluation would be used to inform programme and strategy-planning.

- 2.5 Mr Marlow provided an update on the MOPAN review, noting that the Secretariat is currently finalising corrections to the draft technical annex and that a final draft report would be shared with relevant committees when available.
- 2.6 Finally, he reiterated the importance of evaluations and the role of the EAC in ensuring that decisions are data-driven, and evidence-based, particularly as Gavi heads into replenishment later this year.

Discussion

- EAC members noted the point on efficiency in relation to commissioning and sequencing of evaluations, including avoiding overlaps and the potential of building on existing evaluations. The importance of evaluation planning being responsive to strategic shifts was also acknowledged.
- EAC members emphasised the value of country-specific evaluations in magnifying sub-national level perspectives, as well as the need to strengthen the voice of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs). It was noted that there is extensive work being done on these topics within the global health space, providing learning opportunities for the Secretariat.
- EAC members agreed that a delicate balance was needed to get country-specific data, without cascading the burden of information entirely on the countries, especially fragile countries.
- EAC members highlighted the importance of utilising pre-existing mechanisms within countries to obtain surveillance data whilst noting that the appetite for data transparency differs amongst countries.
- One EAC Member queried the strength of the link between the EAC and the PPC. The EAC Chair noted that whilst the flow of information between the two Committees has improved with the voluntary and informal role currently being undertaken by PPC member Kent Ranson, there remains a need to strengthen and institutionalise the integration of the work of the PPC and the EAC.
- One EAC member queried the scope of the Director of Measurement, Evaluation and Learning's new role as an Advisor to the CEO. The COO noted that this was a temporary appointment replacing the Chief of Staff until she returns from parental leave in August 2024.

3. Gavi 5.1 Evaluation Workplan Update

- 3.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 03) that would focus first on the work to expand the evaluation supplier pool along with other Global Health Institutions and then on the sustainability/post-transition

evaluation.

- 3.2 Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, provided context on the process to date and noted the request for EAC guidance on progress in relation to expanding evaluation supplier partnerships.
- 3.3 Penny Hawkins and Adolfo Martinez Valle, EAC Focal Points for this workstream, reflected on the recent cross-agency meeting attended by Gavi, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria ('Global Fund') and the Global Financing Facility (GFF) on this topic, noting that i) the exchange in the meeting had been open and thoughtful; ii) there is a need to further explore what is holding back a broader pool from success; iii) there might be a need for changes in the commissioning process, for example around selection criteria or creating a pool of suppliers who then partner with organisations in Low or Middle Income Countries (LMICs) supported by Gavi.
- 3.4 Colleagues from the Global Fund joined the discussion to share perspectives on the potential for continued collaboration to reduce barriers to entry for more suppliers, including John Grove, Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer; Rhiannon James, Senior Specialist; and Mira Johri, Chair of the Independent Evaluation Panel.
- 3.5 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, introduced the second discussion point on sustainability/post-transition evaluation.
- 3.6 Ezzeddine Mohsni and Malabika Sarker, EAC Focal Points for this evaluation, provided some context on recent discussions around the timeline and scope for this evaluation.

Discussion

- EAC members encouraged the Secretariat to continue the collaborative endeavour to expand the evaluation supplier pool.
- EAC members advised the Secretariat to i) develop some metrics to guide the conversation; and ii) to develop a vision of success.
- EAC members also suggested that the Secretariat take into account the complexity of understanding Gavi's business model and timeline for the standard tender process. Additionally, EAC members proposed reconsidering the commissioning process along with the selection criteria/technical weighting.
- With respect to the proposal to postpone evaluative work on sustainability/post-transition until 2025, on the basis that there is limited value-add for additional evaluative activities/retrospective review at this time, EAC members agreed the proposal was reasonable.

- EAC members discussed: i) the interplay between this evaluation and upcoming decisions on Gavi 6.0, and what would be the scope of a MICs evaluation when the decision on a MICs policy, in the context of Gavi 6.0, will have already been made; ii) what exact questions the evaluation would answer, noting that it would likely be framed to help figure out how to operationalise the Middle-Income Countries (MICs) strategy; and iii) the relationship between the MICs learning agenda and the evaluation and how to provide assurance to the EAC about the quality and the methodology of these learning activities so that the EAC can be confident it is comprehensive.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- Supported the Secretariat proposal postponing evaluative work on sustainability/post-transition until 2025, and to revisit the topic at the September 2024 EAC meeting;
- Noted that the use case for this evaluation is dependent on the Board decision on the continuation of the Middle-Income Countries (MICs) Approach in Gavi 6.0;
- Requested an update and additional information about the MICs approach learning agenda to inform the focus and value add of evaluative work on sustainability/MICs;
- Raised the importance as well of differentiating between former-Gavi-eligible countries and the never-Gavi-eligible countries; and
- Supported the ongoing work on suppliers in partnership with other Global Health Institutions.

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance related to all centralised evaluations:

- Encouraged the continuation of follow-up meetings with EAC Focal Points and evaluators to clarify important issues, including EAC recommendations;
- Emphasised the importance of an integrated framework for methodologies when indicating that a suite of tools / techniques are going to be used; and
- Noted the importance of clear and documented decision criteria for country selection.

Decision One

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee:

- **approved** the revised multi-year (2021-2025) centralised evaluation workplan attached as Annex A to Doc 03.

4. Update on the Zero-Dose Evaluation

- 4.1 Anders Amaechi, Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 04).
- 4.2 Following up on the pre-recorded presentation, Louisiana Lush and Jessica Baxendale, evaluators from IPSOS, provided additional insights on the evaluation.

- 4.3 Malabika Sarker and David Hotchkiss, EAC members, provided feedback on behalf of the EAC focal points, including: i) their support for the light touch approach; ii) the need to think strategically now about data needs for later phases of the evaluation; and iii) the need to be sure consultations on the key topics are broad and include countries.
- 4.4 Alex de Jonquières, Director, Health Systems and Immunisation Strengthening, provided some additional context as a primary user of the evaluation, noting that it was a particularly useful piece of work as it is feeding into the development and design of the HSS strategy. He noted that it would be helpful for the EAC to consider further: i) whether the scope of this evaluative work should include the Secretariat/Board or the Alliance as well; ii) the burden for countries of the various centralised evaluations running in parallel; and iii) moving towards Gavi 6.0, the trade-off between value-for-money and the equity/zero-dose approach.

Discussion

- The EAC expressed broad support for the proposed plan for a flexible, pragmatic approach to the Phase 2 of the Zero-Dose Evaluation.
- In line with past EAC guidance, EAC members noted it will be important to consider the use of learning hubs and other relevant evaluations for this phase.
- EAC members also provided the following guidance for Phase 2 of the evaluation, including to consider:
 - i) identifying data types required for contribution analysis before exploring the data availability;
 - ii) conducting a risk mapping for the report if expected information is not available;
 - iii) focusing more on in-depth case studies rather than breadth; reducing the number of countries involved if necessary;
 - iv) connecting with WHO/UNICEF's in-country network and build a relationship to support data collection at local levels as well as conducting the interviews in the local language if possible;
 - v) identifying whether the countries selected for case studies host Health and demographic surveillance systems (HDSS) to explore whether relevant data can be extracted from them;
 - vi) being specific in the report about what was challenging (could not be achieved) and why, which will be important for the next phase, especially for contribution analysis;
 - vii) exploring what would be needed to focus on the right side of the Theory of Change (TOC); and
 - viii) considering whether Alliance partners should be brought into scope if relevant.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- Supported the plans for Phase 2, including the engagement of EAC Focal Points;
- Advised that evaluators should use all available relevant decentralised evaluation reports/information from Learning Hubs and reflect this in their reports; and
- Emphasised the importance of in-depth country case study data and exploration of data sources for availability of data for contribution analysis, including communication with the partners like UNICEF, World Bank and WHO, resulting in an analysis plan.

5. Update on the Mid-Term Evaluation

- 5.1 Abdallah Bchir, Senior Evaluation Consultant, introduced this item (Doc 05).
- 5.2 Following up on their pre-recorded presentation, Tim Shorten, Julian Schweitzer, and Michele Gross, evaluators from Euro Health Group (EHG), provided additional insights on the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE).
- 5.3 Juan Pablo Gutiérrez, on behalf of EAC focal points, provided some context on progress on the evaluation following the last EAC meeting in October 2023, including the discussion on country voices within the evaluation. He noted that the report is ready for dissemination and that a Board briefing had been scheduled for 10 April 2024.
- 5.4 Aurelia Nguyen, Chief Programme Officer provided some context on the validation workshop conducted in February 2024 to discuss recommendations and highlighted the importance of the evaluation for the replenishment period and Gavi 6.0 strategy development in the second quarter of 2024.

Discussion

- EAC members recommended that the Secretariat track the usefulness and implementation of the recommendations provided by the Mid-Term Evaluation. The Secretariat noted that there is a system in place for tracking, with progress against recommendations recorded twice a year.
- EAC members emphasised that it is necessary to find creative ways to amplify country voices for future evaluations and countries could potentially be consulted on how they would like to engage with evaluations.
- Along with other definitions, EAC members recommended that definitions of what constitutes a country voice be included in the RFP for future evaluations.
- EAC members queried the selection process of countries within centralised evaluations. The Secretariat noted the countries were not identified at the RFP stage due to the requirement of impartiality from Gavi and to seek input from the

evaluators. Additionally, it was noted that as the process of commissioning evaluations can be lengthy, country contexts and thus suitability of that country for the evaluation, can change significantly.

- The evaluators provided feedback on areas of improvement for the Secretariat. This included the importance of a strong Steering Committee function to support the evaluators, in addition to strengthening the link between the evaluators and the EAC. The evaluators noted that their interactions with the Board had been positive.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- The EAC requested feedback at the next EAC meeting on the perceived usefulness of the Mid-Term Evaluation, including both in relation to what new insights were generated that inform course correction and the Gavi 6.0 strategy; and
- Recognising the importance of clear concepts for evaluations, the MTE EAC Focal Points will prepare definitions / notes on relevant topics such as what is expected in terms of “country voice”, to inform future RFP development.

6. Update on the COVAX Evaluation

- 6.1 Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning introduced this item (Doc 06). She requested guidance from the EAC on the progress of the evaluation, specifically the proposed approach including the methodology to respond to the Evaluation Questions (EQs), as put forward by the evaluators, and the evidence document review.
- 6.2 She also updated the EAC on the selection of country case studies, and a two-week shift in the original timeline that had been shared with EAC members in early March. She also noted that for those interested, the COVAX Advance Market Commitment (AMC) Evaluation RFP was available online for viewing. Finally, she observed that this was the first time Gavi had undertaken a joint evaluation and spoke to the various benefits and learning opportunities that can arise from such an arrangement.
- 6.3 Colleagues from the Delivery Evaluation Partnership Group (DEPG) including Beth Plowman, Senior Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF and Riccardo Polastro, Chief Evaluation Officer, World Health Organization (WHO) joined the discussion.
- 6.4 Colleagues from the Evaluation Consortium including Laura Morrison, Team Lead, RTI; and Joanna Springer, Systems Evaluation Specialist, RTI, also joined the discussion.
- 6.5 On behalf of the EAC Focal Points, Ezzeddine Mohsni provided comments on the

overall purpose of the evaluation and provided feedback on the guidance questions highlighted. Firstly, he requested more detail on the methodology from the evaluators and suggested the use of a systems-oriented Theory of Change. Secondly, he suggested to consider a reduction in the number of country case studies, so that more in-depth analysis could take place. Lastly, he noted the partnership evaluation and coordination between partners, suggesting that more attention be given to collaboration and coordination at the implementation level.

- 6.6 EAC Focal Point Penny Hawkins reiterated the preference for a system-based approach and asked the evaluators to clarify that if looking at fidelity whether adaptation across the implementation of the various programme phases was also being considered.
- 6.7 EAC Focal Point David Hotchkiss stated that the methodology was leaning towards a qualitative approach and noted that scenario-based modelling could be utilised by the evaluators. He also observed that there could be differing interpretations of what a joint evaluation means and asked for clarity from the Secretariat and evaluators on their understanding of this.
- 6.8 Laura Crow, Senior Manager, Global Health Security, provided perspective from the Secretariat on the utility of the evaluation and emphasised the use of the phase 1 evaluation to inform Gavi's Pandemic Preparedness, Prevention, and Response (PPPR) work, particularly regarding proposals linked to at-risk contingent financing.

Discussion

- The evaluators acknowledged remarks in relation to the methodological approach and stated that their Theory of Change was systems orientated. Additionally, they noted the advantages of a mixed methods approach, and emphasised the value of qualitative data to provide context and substance to the evaluation.
- EAC members queried the diversity of the country case studies to which the evaluators responded that they are exploring a variety of regions alongside their feasibility. Furthermore, the evaluators acknowledged that countries contexts have changed significantly since the COVID-19 pandemic, and therefore welcomed the suggestion to use snowball sampling to identify key stakeholders.
- EAC members noted that embarking on a joint evaluation was an important step for Gavi, and that whilst it will provide challenges, it will also offer substantial learning opportunities. EAC members therefore recommended that a learning piece should be integrated within the work plan to inform future joint evaluations.
- EAC members noted that they would need to review the inception report before providing more substantial feedback to the Secretariat and the evaluators.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- Advised that a plan be developed to extract maximum learning from the process of undertaking the joint evaluation;
- Emphasised the importance for the evaluation to examine partnership and how we work better as an alliance; with a particular focus on coordination and implementation at country level; and
- Advised the development of a strategy for providing findings back to case study countries.

7. Evaluation Policy Operationalisation 1: Centralised evaluation work planning for Gavi 6.0

7.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning introduced this item (Doc 07) and requested guidance on approaches to engage key stakeholders, including Gavi's Programme and Policy Committee (PPC), Board and the EAC in the Centralised Evaluation Work Plan (CEWP) for Gavi 6.0. She also requested feedback on potential topics for discussion groups at the September 2024 EAC meeting.

Discussion

- EAC members provided overall comments on the CEWP for Gavi 6.0 including: i) reiterating the purpose of centralised evaluations; ii) ensuring the work plan is holistic, feasible and solution focused; and iii) finally, encouraging a systematic structure within the work plan to avoid duplication. EAC members also stated that more regular visibility of the learning questions would be useful.
- EAC members discussed the proposed Gavi 6.0 principles for the CEWP workplan and noted the absence of utility, credibility, evidence partnerships and country engagement and ownership within the principles outlined. Additionally, principle 6 was observed as not adequately highlighting the importance of the Alliance. The Secretariat stated that the principles would be revisited for discussion by the EAC at the September 2024 meeting and that utility, credibility and country engagement and ownership have dedicated sections in the current policy.
- Several points relating to country voices were raised by EAC members. Firstly, it was noted that the term 'country voice' was potentially patronising, and thus its use required reexamination. Secondly, the Secretariat highlighted the Implementing Country Caucus as a body that could be utilised by the evaluators to amplify country voices.
- In reference to the stakeholder plan, there was broad agreement by EAC members on the plan, and more detail was requested ahead of the September EAC meeting.

- Several EAC members requested more information on Country and Zero-Dose Learning Hubs, due to their critical role in engagement with countries. The Secretariat agreed to share more information with EAC members including the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) update that had been shared at the last PPC meeting and with the EAC.
- EAC members discussed several options on potential discussion topics ahead of the September 2024 meeting. There was overall support for point vii) on optimising access to, and use of, potential data sources for evaluation purposes. For point v), on how to strengthen synergies between qualitative and quantitative sources/analyses, EAC members highlighted areas of research including smaller studies and larger data sets that could contribute to this topic.
- One EAC member suggested that Artificial Intelligence (AI) could be a potential discussion topic, given its rising importance across the health landscape and beyond.
- EAC members asked for clarification on the discussion topic relating to the consideration of climate change in evaluation design and implementation. The Secretariat responded that it is exploring two ways of including climate change: one of which is exploring climate change itself within the evaluation questions and/or, how evaluations are conducted in terms of their carbon footprint.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- **Stakeholder consultation:** Encourage the Secretariat to consult with stakeholders and consult with relevant partners and map against other evidence generation functions such as learning labs, audit, decentralised evaluations;
- **Principles (work planning):** Clarify purpose of the proposed principles for work planning; revisit content ahead of September 2024 meeting to align with Policy aims of credibility, utility and independence. Include issues of country representation/evidence partnerships; and
- **Issues for discussion:** Clarify distinction between these and Principles (including purpose); separate into approaches, methods and data issues; clarify focus of some, e.g. climate change; discuss with Focal Points prior to September meeting; consider spectrum of evaluation types.

8. Evaluation Policy Operationalisation 2: MOPAN and Evaluation Function Review

8.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 08) and noted that the purpose of this session was to provide an update on key relevant developments and considerations on issues related to the Evaluation Function Review (EFR), including the Board and Board Committee Evaluation in late 2023, the ongoing Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network

(MOPAN) assessment of Gavi, and the internal evaluation function benchmarking activities, and to seek EAC guidance on next steps.

- 8.2 The EAC Chair expressed his disappointment that the MOPAN assessment was not yet available for EAC consideration and noted that he had pushed for this to be available. He also updated the group on reflections he had shared with MOPAN and then took to the Gavi Board's All Chairs Group in February 2024, which were attached to the meeting pack, and requested that these remarks be provided to the EFR reviewers.
- 8.3 Penny Hawkins, EAC Focal Point for this workstream, reflected on the work to date in preparation for the EFR Terms of Reference, and emphasised the need to ensure: i) the scope for the review includes the Centralised Evaluation Team and also decentralised evaluations; ii) establishment of a governance structure for the review; iii) building into the Terms of Reference the context of CET work, and questions focused on how the rest of the organisation sees the value of evaluation, and how the work is done; iv) consideration of whether to look at the impact of evaluation; and v) consideration of adding a survey to strengthen the methodology.

Discussion

- The EAC advised that it would be important to put in place arrangements (e.g. stakeholder panel) to ensure independence and oversight of the review, including key stakeholders across the Gavi governance bodies, and with EAC Focal Points operating as an advisory group supporting the management of the process.
- EAC members also provided the following guidance related to the draft Terms of Reference:
 - i) Some of the specific recommendations from the last function review appear still relevant and should be analysed and brought into the review;
 - ii) The governance, structures, accountability, independence of CET should be included in the scope; and
 - iii) Whether the scope should include the overall MEL Framework and the purpose of EAC within that.
- EAC members also reflected that the Evaluation Function Review will be not just a technical but political exercise, requiring buy-in from Secretariat senior leadership and Board structures.
- The Secretariat noted that any broad shifts to the Evaluation Policy and EAC Terms of Reference would require Board approval. The Secretariat also suggested that the EAC should share the Terms of Reference for the Evaluation Function Review with the All Chairs Group and that the Programme and Policy Committee and Governance Committee would also be interested. A Board Technical Briefing has been planned for Q4 2024 after the next EAC meeting.
- EAC members also commented on the results of the benchmarking exercise, which found that Gavi resources for centralised evaluation are lower in terms of

Full Time Equivalents (FTE) and their grades compared to other similar organisations.

- EAC members also queried the rationale for using the same consultants for this review, versus bringing in ‘fresh eyes.’

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- Advised that arrangements should be put in place to ensure independence and oversight of the review, including bringing in key stakeholders across Gavi’s Board, Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) and Senior Leadership Team, and to keep them informed early and throughout the process;
- Noted that this review should consider the implications of all relevant development trends, e.g. *Leave No One Behind*, localisation, subnational focus, Lusaka agenda, and partnership; and
- Advised that a survey be added to the methodology for the review.

9. EAC Engagement in Gavi 5.1 Evaluations

- 9.1 Esther Saville, Head, Measurement, Evaluation & Learning, presented the current allocation of EAC members as reviewers across the centralised evaluations (Doc 09).

Discussion

- The EAC made some adjustments to the current allocation for centralised evaluations, which appear in Attachment B to these meeting minutes.
- In addition, the allocation of EAC members to serve as focal points on other workstreams was also agreed, and these appear in Attachment C to these meeting minutes.

10. Review of EAC Guidance and Decisions

- 10.1 The EAC reviewed the formal guidance and decisions that had been refined throughout the meeting.

11. Closing remarks and any other business

- 11.1 The EAC Chair flagged two procedural points for upcoming meetings, including: i) for agenda items in which suppliers are invited to join, the discussion should be

structured so the EAC has the opportunity to discuss any relevant points prior to the suppliers joining the meeting where appropriate, and ii) that the Secretariat should plan for evaluation deliverables to arrive, where feasible, prior to EAC meetings.

- 11.2 After determining there was no further business, the meeting was brought to a close.

Ms Meegan Murray-Lopez
Secretary to the Meeting

Attachment A

Participants

Committee Members

- James Hargreaves (Chair)
- Julia Betts
- Phyllis Dako-Gyeke
- Helen Evans
- Juan Pablo Gutiérrez
- Penny Hawkins
- David Hotchkiss
- Adolfo Martinez Valle
- Ezzeddine Mohsni
- Malabika Sarker
- Rhoda Wanyenze

Guests

- Kent Ranson
- Mira Johri (item 3)
- John Grove (item 3)(virtual)
- Rhiannon James (item 3)

Guests (virtual)

- Louisiana Lush, Ipsos (item 4)
- Jessica Baxendale, Ipsos (item 4)
- Tim Shorten (item 5)
- Julian Schweitzer (item 5)
- Beth Plowman, UNICEF (item 6)
- Riccardo Polastro, WHO (item 6)
- Laura Morrison, RTI Intl (item 6)
- Joanne Springer, RTI Intl (item 6)

Secretariat

- David Marlow (item 1-2)
- Hope Johnson (items 1-8)
- Brenda Killen (items 1-2, 7-8, 10-11)
- Esther Saville
- Natalie Gons
- Anders Amaechi
- Leslie Moreland (items 1-3, 6-11)
- Abdallah Bchir (items 1-2, 5, 9-11)
- Mkhululi Moyo (item 4)
- Aurélia Nguyen (item 5 in part)(virtual)
- Richard Mihigo (item 6)
- Laura Craw (item 6)
- Alex de Jonquières (item 4)(virtual)
- Benjamin Loevinsohn (item 3)
- Sophie LaVincente (item 3)
- Inga Savin (item 3)
- Paul Balogun (item 8)(virtual)
- Ombline Richard (item 7)
- Daria Piccand (item 7)
- Adviya Khan (items 1-2, 5-7)
- Cristina Cimenti
- Meegan Murray-Lopez

Attachment B

EAC engagement in centralised evaluations

EAC Engagement in Gavi 5.1 Evaluations (Mar 2024)

| EVALUATION | Steer. Co. | EAC Secondees | EAC Focal Points | | |
|--|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero - dose children and missed communities | Yes | David Hotchkiss Ezzeddine Mohsni | Adolfo Martinez Valle | Juan Pablo Gutierrez | Malabika Sarker* |
| Mid Term Evaluation of Gavi's 2021 – 2025 Strategy | No | n/a | James Hargreaves* | Rhoda Wanyenze | Juan Pablo Gutierrez |
| COVAX Evaluation: COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC (Gavi Secretariat) and COVAX Partner Delivery Efforts (Joint) | Yes | Adolfo Martinez Valle Julia Betts | David Hotchkiss | Ezzeddine Mohsni* | Penny Hawkins |
| Evaluation of Gavi's contribution to sustainability of coverage post-transition | TBD | n/a | Ezzeddine Mohsni | Malabika Sarker | Helen Evans* |

* EAC member in convening role

Attachment C

Additional EAC engagement

Additional EAC engagement (Mar 2024)

| Workstream | EAC Focal Points | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Evaluation Function Review | Penny Hawkins* | Adolfo Martinez Valle | Helen Evans |
| Supplier Review | Penny Hawkins | Phyllis Dako-Gyeke | Adolfo Martinez Valle* |
| Procedures and processes | Juan Pablo Gutierrez | Malabika Sarker | Julia Betts* |
| Workplan – Gavi 6.0 | Julia Betts | Rhoda Wanyenze | n/a |

* EAC member in convening role