

## Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

21-22 September 2022

Gavi Alliance, 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 21 September 2022. James Hargreaves, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair noted that regrets had been received from Viroj Tangcharoensathien.
- 1.3 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a in the Committee pack).
- 1.4 The minutes of the 30-31 March 2022 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 10 June 2022.
- 1.5 The Chair also referred to the EAC action sheet (Doc 01c), noting that the actions it contained had been followed up.
- 1.6 The Chair informed the EAC that Mira Johri had accepted the position of inaugural Chair of the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP) at the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and had resigned from the EAC in July 2022.
- 1.7 The Chair briefed the EAC on several discussions he had held since the EAC last met, including with Anne Schuchat, Chair of the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC); Sarah Goulding, Board Vice-Chair; as well as with key Gavi Secretariat staff, including Aurelia Nguyen, former COVAX Managing Director; Anuradha Gupta, former Deputy Chief Executive Officer (DCEO); and David Marlow, Chief Operating Officer (COO). He also reported on his participation at the PPC and the Board meetings of May and June 2022 consecutively.
- 1.8 The Chair also proposed a short closed session of the Committee at the beginning of day two of the meeting.

-----

### 2. Update from the Executive Office

- 2.1 David Marlow, Chief Operating Officer, provided the EAC with introductory remarks, reflecting on his first months in office at Gavi. He underlined the importance of operational excellence and organisational culture in achieving the

greatest impact of Gavi programmes, reaching zero-dose children and ultimately achieving success. He referred to the importance of the role of the EAC noting that the evaluation function is critical for Gavi's mission and must be underpinned by independence and objectivity.

- 2.2 He updated the EAC on Gavi 5.0 and Gavi 5.1 noting that Gavi 5.1 represents an opportunity to reaffirm Gavi's recalibrated 5.0 priorities, as well as to integrate learnings from COVID-19 (including impact on routine immunisation (RI)) and from COVAX. He also briefly touched on key ongoing and upcoming evaluations.
- 2.3 He outlined recent structural changes within the Gavi Secretariat, highlighting the transitional phase that Gavi is currently going through following the departure of Anuradha Gupta, Deputy CEO, and the active CEO recruitment for Seth Berkley's successor, with Seth's tenure ending in August of 2023.

### *Discussion*

- The EAC welcomed Mr Marlow and thanked him for his update.
- The EAC discussed various topics with the COO including:
  - i) The role of the EAC, the independence of the evaluation function and fostering a culture of trust;
  - ii) Better coordination and clarity of roles and responsibilities amongst the Alliance partners;
  - iii) Strengthening the linkages between the EAC, the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) and the Board;
  - iv) Focusing on Gavi's core mission and innovation;
  - v) Simplifying business processes and increasing programmatic efficiency;
  - vi) Understanding country challenges and contexts; and
  - vii) The future role of the deputy CEO.
- With reference to learning, the COO emphasised the importance of openness, willingness to share as well as focusing on the relevance of learning to Gavi's work.
- In relation to EAC engagement in the ongoing discussions on Gavi 5.1, the COO referred the deep dive sessions that are ongoing and open to Board and PPC members and suggested exploring the possibility of having the EAC contribute to that process.
- With reference to the reporting line of the Measurement, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) function, Mr Marlow explained that while the MEL function currently reports to the COO as a continuation from the previous arrangement, it is being considered whether the MEL team could join the newly reconfigured Policy, Programme Design and Delivery Support (PPDDS) team once the new Managing Director has been onboarded. He reiterated that the future location of the MEL function within the Secretariat must be in full alignment with its independence and objectivity, and welcomed the EAC's guidance in this regard.

- On the contribution of the EAC to the upcoming assessment of Gavi by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN), the Secretariat clarified that it would engage with the MOPAN evaluators during the inception phase and recommend to them that they also engage the EAC members to support inclusion of EAC perspectives.

-----

### **3. Gavi 5.0 evaluation update and workplan**

- 3.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, provided a framing for this item on progress on the ongoing centralised evaluation workplan (Doc 03).
- 3.2 The EAC was requested to provide guidance on: i) progress of the planned Gavi 5.0 centralised evaluations, and ii) the request by the Secretariat to appoint a Steering Committee for the Zero-Dose evaluation.

#### *Discussion*

- In relation to the request for guidance on establishment of an evaluation Steering Committee to support the evaluation of Gavi's contribution in reaching Zero-Dose children and missed communities (Zero-Dose Evaluation), EAC members discussed and noted the following:
  - i) EAC members acknowledged the complexities in the Zero-Dose Evaluation, particularly given its cross-cutting nature which raises the risk of additional complexity and inefficient stakeholder engagement;
  - ii) Given the cross-cutting touchpoints and noting the three-year Zero-Dose Evaluation timescale, EAC members were mindful of the need for a consistent and efficient structure to support and access resources required in bringing about finalisation;
  - iii) One EAC member queried whether EAC members could be plugged into existing working group structures, rather than establishing separate structures; and
  - iv) In relation to the distinction between the EAC and Steering Committee roles, the Secretariat explained that there is a Terms of Reference for Steering Committees (previously shared with the EAC for review) and that their primary role is around utility.
- Noting the discussions, the Secretariat provided additional context around the proposed establishment of a Zero-Dose Evaluation Steering Committee. The EAC reached consensus on establishment of a Steering Committee for the Zero-Dose Evaluation, including the secondment of two EAC members, and noted the potential overlap with the EAC role, and the need to avoid complexities.
- The EAC provided guidance on the following Gavi 5.0 evaluations:
  - i) **Strategy Operationalisation Evaluation.** EAC focal points for this evaluation include Malabika Sarker, Marta Nunes and Juan Pablo Gutiérrez, who commented that:

- a. It was difficult to fully understand the evaluation strategy. Gavi’s overall strategy operationalisation model has remained broadly the same since it was established. The Secretariat explained that the scope of the strategy operationalisation evaluation was based on the Board-approved Gavi 5-year strategies, from Gavi 4.0 through the current strategic period, given the essential building blocks of the operationalisation model remain unchanged. A Steering Committee has been fully established, and the Inception Report is expected at the end of October 2022;
  - b. Noting a supplier had been sourced, EAC members were keen to hear about the work around barriers to bid. The Secretariat explained the evaluation was commissioned in 2021, and that there were delays in implementation with the strategy operationalisation process, in particular the Funding Policy Review process, which was paused due to COVID-19; and
  - c. Following a question as to incorporation of learnings and strengthening of future operationalisation, the Secretariat described the below-mentioned Mid-Term Evaluation TOR, as a basis in providing guidance in course correction and raising supplier awareness.
- ii) **Mid-Term Evaluation.** EAC focal points for this evaluation include James Hargreaves, Marta Nunes and Bvudzai Magadzire, who commented that:
- a. A much improved upon final TOR had been received. The EAC focal points had held discussions to establish an understanding of the main questions and organisation of the TOR; and
  - b. One member mentioned the complex and heavy content in the TOR and it was proposed that the Secretariat consider ways to simplify or make clearer content provided in ToRs in the future.

**The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:**  
With respect to the appointment of a Steering Committee for the Zero-Dose evaluation, to proceed with the proposal including the secondment of two EAC members. The EAC noted the potential overlap with the EAC role and need to avoid complexity.

-----

#### **4. Update on COVID-19 Evaluation**

- 4.1 Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 04). She explained that the purpose of the presentation was to provide an update on the evaluation of Gavi’s initial response to COVID-19 through Respond & Protect (R&P) and Maintain, Restore & Strengthen (MR&S), and to seek EAC feedback on progress and challenges as well as guidance on enhancing the utility of the evaluation with the intent to have the actionable and relevant conclusions.
- 4.2 Tim Shorten, Evaluation Team Lead, EHG, presented the key takeaways on the evaluation findings. He recalled the evaluation’s purpose, objectives, scope and methodology, and referred to the case study selection noting that the country selection represents a range of country contexts.

- 4.3 Mr Shorten reported on limitations and challenges that evaluators faced mainly in relation to data availability and accessibility. Finally, he presented the key draft evaluation findings and conclusions and outlined some lessons learned and recommendations.
- 4.4 He concluded by noting that context is a key lens through which the evaluation's observations and the findings should be interpreted, keeping in mind that Gavi, like other organisations had no choice but to respond to COVID-19 given the potential impact on its strategic goals.

### *Discussion*

- The EAC congratulated the evaluators on the draft report, recognising the complexities and challenging context in which the evaluation was conducted.
- Several EAC members emphasised that the evaluation findings must inform Gavi 5.1 and recommended that the draft recommendations be as specific as possible, including where they relate to data strengthening. The presenter explained that the future iteration of the recommendations would aim to address this to the extent possible.
- With reference to the low uptake of R&P support, the presenter emphasised the importance of timing and context. At the outset of the pandemic countries had expressed challenges in continuing RI activities due to COVID-19, and funding was being made available from non-Gavi resources, therefore countries tended to make rational decisions about not taking up flexibilities in order to protect funding for future RI programmes. The presenter also indicated that other factors may have constrained uptake of flexibilities such as the way in which flexibilities were communicated to countries.
- On the finding related to R&P presumably having positive impact on frontline health workers (FHWs), the presenter explained that indications from case studies suggest that this is related to Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and other Infection, Prevention and Control (IPC) equipment was most likely to have been used by FHWs (however, precise data on the use and allocation of materials and equipment procured with R&P funds, for instance, is scarce).
- One EAC member underlined the importance of linking Gavi's initial response to COVID-19 with COVAX and look further into preparedness and the role of partners to respond, noting the importance of bringing the results of this evaluation to the Alliance partners and placing it in the broader evaluation landscape. The presenter clarified that the final report would contextualise Gavi's response noting that flexibilities were only one aspect of what Gavi has done to respond to the pandemic and maintain RI.
- The presenter clarified that having more positive results under R&P than under MR&S was due to availability of data and timing, including that the capacity within the Secretariat to undertake R&P was greater than for MR&S activities which is when COVAX was launched.

- In relation to the finding on whether Gavi was right to support general COVID-19 responses or should have maintained focus on RI as per its comparative advantage, the presenter clarified that this would require more nuanced understanding which links to country-level capacity.
- With reference to the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework, the presenter noted the need for more specific recommendations in the final report, recognising the limitations that the evaluators faced.
- The Secretariat noted that it will continue to work closely with the evaluators to refine the final report before it is concluded and circulated.

**The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:**

- The evaluators should pay particular attention to ensuring the COVID-19 Evaluation report demonstrates a transparent and robust linkage between the primary data collected/collated, the analysis process and the evaluation findings, conclusions, lessons, and recommendations;
- MEL should develop a system to prospectively assess likely data needs and formulate a plan in relation to strengthening data systems that will be of value to evaluations when these are being considered/developed, in order to avoid evaluations needing to conclude that "data wasn't available"; and
- In relation to maximising utility, to try to target recommendations to 5.1; contextualise with COVAX; and consider how to best put evaluation results before the Board, keeping in mind the Mid Term Evaluation and 5.1.

-----

## **5. Update on COVAX Evaluation**

- 5.1 Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 05) and indicated that the Evaluation Advisory Committee was requested to provide feedback on: i) overall progress of the evaluation process; ii) any additional perceived risks to be considered; and iii) further opportunities for stakeholder engagement to enhance utility of the interim and final report findings.
- 5.2 The evaluation team from Itad, led by Sam McPherson, shared emerging findings following the first four months of work on the the Formative Review and Baseline Study. He and his team presented on data collection to date, methodology, and interim findings, and reviewed ten emerging lessons at this stage in the work.

### *Discussion*

- EAC members encouraged the evaluators to build in country voices as this seemed to be missing from the emerging findings (due in large part to the Country Case Studies not being included in this interim report).
- EAC members also cautioned the evaluators to be more clear about the link between the emerging data collected and the content of summary as presented.

- EAC members also advised the evaluators to be bold and critical in their assessment, which had not come out strongly in the materials provided to the EAC or in the presentation. The evaluators signalled that they felt confident there would be strong findings, based on triangulated data, but reminded the EAC that there were still a few months remaining for data collection.
- The evaluators also sought guidance from the EAC on how to best manage divergent views in responses to the interim report and on how to hold the line on the scope of the evaluation. The EAC advised the evaluators to seek advice or input from the Evaluation Manager and/or EAC focal points on specific issues as needed.

**The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:**

- To encourage the evaluators and the EAC focal points to pay particular attention to ensuring the report demonstrates a transparent and justifiable linkage between the primary data collected / collated, the analysis process and the evaluation findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations;
- To ensure that the report focuses in on providing evaluative conclusions with a critical lens, including in the high-level conclusions and recommendations; and
- To encourage the evaluators to transparently reflect divergence of opinion in the final report at all levels of input and feedback from stakeholders, and, with the EAC's backing, to hold the line on scope of the evaluation - and in both cases to seek advice or input from the EAC focal points / Evaluation Manager on specific issues as needed.

-----

## **6. Evaluation Methods**

- 6.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, provided an introduction to this item (item 06) and was joined by the Evaluation Managers for the COVAX and Zero-Dose evaluations, Leslie Moreland and Emmanuella Baguma, respectively.
- 6.2 The first portion of the discussion was dedicated to the methodology for the COVAX evaluation as it moves into its next phase. This was followed by an in-depth discussion of methods across evaluations, with a focus on the Zero-Dose evaluation.

### *Discussion*

- With respect to the COVAX evaluation, EAC members:
  - i) Advised that the next phase of COVAX evaluation should evaluate the causal connections in the Theory of Change (TOC);
  - ii) Encouraged the collection of data from the Ministries of Health by direct outreach to counterparts, rather than by broad survey;
  - iii) Discussed whether it is always the case that evaluations would seek to determine impact or rather to learn more about the implementation as a way to inform future design; For COVAX, EAC members tended to agree that there needs to be a focus on results, but linked to a TOC; and

- iv) Discussed a realist approach, which would allow for context and mechanisms to be considered together.
- In relation to the methodology for the Zero-Dose evaluation, EAC members advised:
  - i) That evaluators should develop a more detailed design and analytic plan, for review by the Steering Committee/EAC within the inception report;
  - ii) That there would be real challenges with the lack of denominator for this evaluation;
  - iii) To consider using administrative data from DHIS2 and surveys, which EAC members advised is much better than it used to be; and noted that geographical analysis could be possible from this data set in some countries
  - iv) Given skepticism about the feasibility of certain methodologies, to plan an evaluability assessment upfront;
  - v) To consider investing in enhancing the data in limited settings where there are concerns about the data quality;
  - vi) To look at opportunities through the learning hubs which are exploring approaches and innovations being implemented by hub countries across the IRMMA framework using implementation research; and
  - vii) To be ambitious and pragmatic in approaches.
- EAC members also requested to revisit this topic at the next EAC meeting.

**The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:**

- The next phase of COVAX evaluation should ensure it evaluates the causal connections in the Theory of Change; and
- Zero-Dose evaluators should develop a more detailed design and analytic plan, for review by the Steering Committee/EAC within the inception report.

-----

## **7. EAC engagement in Gavi 5.0 Evaluations**

- 7.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, provided framing for this item (Doc 07).
- 7.2 The EAC was requested to: i) assign EAC members to the Zero-Dose Steering Committee (in line with guidance issued under Doc 03); ii) agree on EAC focal points on the Zero-Dose Evaluation and MTE following the departure of Mira Johri; iii) agree on an EAC member on multi-stage COVAX and COVAX Advanced Market Commitment (AMC) Evaluations following the departure of Mira Johri; and iv) agree on ways of working with the centralised evaluation team (CET) between bi-annual meetings.

### *Discussion*

- Marta Nunes notified the EAC that she would be stepping off her Board seat at the end of 2022 and as such would vacate her position as Board Representative to



the EAC. She would, therefore, also need to be replaced as evaluation focal point for the Strategy Operationalisation evaluation.

- EAC members discussed each of the evaluations, and made the requested member and focal point updates, a summary of which have been included as Attachment B to these minutes.
- EAC members discussed how best to ensure that findings from the COVID-19 evaluation are integrated and communicated, particularly at the upcoming PPC meeting. The Secretariat highlighted expected September and October 2022 touchpoints ahead of year end finalisation.
- Building on this discussion, EAC members felt it important to have visibility as to how evaluation findings, particularly interim findings, are generally communicated to Board and Committee structures.
- Given the importance, relevance and appetite for early findings, EAC members felt it would be particularly beneficial to have a representative attend the upcoming PPC meeting. The Secretariat suggested final draft papers could be shared with EAC focal points and Steering Committee members to ensure alignment.
- In terms of review timelines, reporting and communication, the Secretariat flagged the overlap in the Evaluation of the Operationalisation of Gavi's Strategy (Strategy Operationalisation Evaluation) and Zero-Dose Evaluation, given both evaluations run in tandem and feed into the MTE. The Secretariat noted the potential time constraints this could place on several EAC members. The Secretariat noted EAC members request for advanced diary placeholders in preparation of the aforementioned reviews.

**The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:**

- To allow EAC focal points and EAC Steering Committee members the opportunity to advise on the presentation of evaluation findings, particularly in the case of interim findings, in the lead up to Governance meetings, as appropriate (with a particular focus on COVAX evaluation and COVID-19 evaluation over coming 6 months, including in upcoming PPC papers).

-----

**8. Operationalising the Revision to the Gavi Evaluation Policy and Enhanced EAC Engagement**

- 8.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, presented this item (Doc 08) and provided an update on the progress to date.
- 8.2 The EAC was requested to provide guidance on: i) proposed timing and process for review of change to the Evaluation Policy for EAC members to serve on Steering Committees; ii) reflections on the 'group' approach and suggested actions to strengthen implementation thereof; iii) feedback on the summary of supplier review and further actions to address issues raised; and iv) other suggestions to strengthen EAC voice and visibility.

## Discussion

- EAC members provided the following comments on the proposed timing and process for review of the change to the Evaluation Policy to allow EAC members to sit on Steering Committees:
  - i) EAC members acknowledged the importance of Steering Committees as a vehicle for information sharing and perspective shaping. The EAC Chair noted that he had not been made aware of any issues related to independence in relation to Steering Committees since the EAC members have been sitting on Steering Committees;
  - ii) Overall, EAC members felt that Steering Committee engagement was working well, but could benefit from enhanced communication between evaluation focal points and Steering Committee members.
  - iii) Responding to a question from an EAC member as to the value-add for the Secretariat in Steering Committees, the Secretariat observed the enhanced utility in bringing contextual information, broader understanding and information, as well as supporting access to partner organisations; and
  - iv) Finally, EAC members reached consensus on an after-action light-touch review.
  
- EAC members provided the following comments on reflections on the ‘group’ approach and suggested actions to strengthen the implementation:
  - i) EAC members recognised the need for structure, particularly in finding ways to maintain and sustain communication between meetings, whilst aligning on guidance where needed in advance of meetings;
  - ii) The Secretariat acknowledged EAC members reaffirmed usefulness of diary placeholders for meetings of ‘the group’ prior to EAC meetings, and offered assistance in this area; Building on these discussions, EAC members agreed on named focal contacts responsible for coordination and taking the lead in bringing a relevant group together;
  - iii) As such, the following EAC members agreed to take on this role, namely: Penny Hawkins for Strategy Operationalisation Evaluation; Ezzeddine Mohsni for Zero-Dose and COVID-19 Evaluations; Justice Nonvignon for COVAX Evaluation; and James Hargreaves for MTE.
  
- EAC members provided the following comments on feedback on the summary of the supplier review and further actions to address issues raised:
  - i) EAC members were keen to understand the positioning of country-focus in Gavi’s centralised evaluation RFPs and in relation to ‘levelling the playing field’;
  - ii) Whilst webinars were yet to be hosted for evaluations, the Secretariat reported that webinars had been held for the Learning Hubs where country level consortia had been critical to success. The Secretariat explained the positive role the webinar played in terms of raising visibility and engaging potential hub partners in conversations with each other. One EAC member noted the benefits in hosting webinars in levelling the playing field, and encouraged more thinking in this area;
  - iii) EAC members requested the Secretariat to provide feedback at the next EAC meeting on each of the key actions to address barriers;

- iv) An EAC member raised the suggestion that one approach to addressing concerns about the small number and high-income-country base of many suppliers engaged in GAVI evaluations, may be to consider targets for supplier diversity. EAC members discussed the implications of this suggestion and EAC members noted a range of concerns with operationalising such an approach. Bvudzai Magadzire and Adolfo Martinez Valle agreed to engage further on this topic. EAC members suggested a broader understanding is needed to determine what success in relation to expanding supplier diversity would look like, and that defining success would be a useful step. It was acknowledged by all that the issues underlying discussions enhancing supplier diversity are complex and difficult to address; and
  - v) Following this discussion, the Secretariat emphasised the importance of a country voice/focus in Gavi evaluations especially where country case studies are a core component of the design; stressed resourcing constraints given that the Unit is not set up to work with organisations to strengthen capacity and that the priority is to deliver high quality evaluations to Gavi’s Board by selecting the strongest bidder through a strict procurement process. The Secretariat pointed out the potential EAC role in mobilising additional resources for capacity strengthening, for example as part of the review of the function, if this is considered essential in delivering against Gavi’s centralised evaluation priorities.
- In relation to suggestions on ways to strengthen the voice of the EAC, the EAC agreed not to pursue a Vice-Chair role but to continue in discussing options for strengthening engagement with the PPC.

**The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:**

- With respect to the review of the change to the Evaluation Policy, to conduct a light touch after action review, and to discuss at the March 2023 EAC meeting; Evaluation Unit to design, bringing in Steering Committee EAC members and evaluators and others, as required;
- In relation to ‘group of 5’ approach – one Steering Committee member per evaluation will act as convener to coordinate interaction between the group between meetings. Put placeholder into calendar ahead of next EAC meeting;
- On supplier review, update and provide experience in relation to each item on recommended actions, with 2 members (Bvudzai and Adolfo) to look at barriers – and what success might look like;
- Not to pursue Vice-Chair role; and
- Continue to discuss options for strengthening engagement with PPC.

-----

## **9. Review of Gavi’s evaluation function**

- 9.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, presented an overview of the current Gavi structure and planned shifts that may have implications for Gavi’s evaluation function and for behavioural independence along with other factors that may influence timing for a review of Gavi’s evaluation function (Doc 09). She flagged the leadership transition in Gavi, repositioning of Gavi’s evaluation function within

the organisational structure (embedding MEL within a new department), the MOPAN assessment of Gavi planned for 2023, upcoming Mid Term Review, and pressure on Gavi to deliver on its Gavi 5.0 strategy. She also highlighted the need to ensure the evaluation function can mitigate potential risks to behavioural independence.

9.2 Cindy Carlsson, Chair of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and Mira Johri, inaugural Chair of its Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP), joined the discussion to share experiences in the development of a new evaluation model at the Global Fund. Ms Carlsson described the variety of models that had been proposed and the reasons the Strategy Committee had decided to endorse a bespoke model, in which the Evaluation Unit is more visible and has a dual reporting line to the Office of the Executive Director as well as to the IEP.

9.3 The EAC was asked to provide guidance on proposed measures to further safeguard independence and whether a review of the evaluation function should take place, as well as the objectives, approach/scope, timing, process and roles and responsibilities for a review.

### *Discussion*

- EAC members expressed concern over the proposed structural changes and the potential negative impact of these changes with respect to independence of the evaluation function. EAC members requested that there be an opportunity to communicate their perspective to the MOPAN evaluators.
- EAC members reviewed the proposed mitigation measures set out in the paper (see Annex A to Doc 09) and advised to move ahead with all measures that could be implemented immediately, with the exception of one measure of having EAC Focal Points routinely attend evaluation co-creation workshops.
- In addition, several of the proposed mitigation measures implied an enhanced role for the EAC, may require changes to the EAC Terms of Reference and/or could be viewed as approaching management responsibilities. The EAC advised that care was needed to maintain the EAC's advisory and governance role.
- EAC members were strongly supportive of a review of Gavi's evaluation function. In the short term, the EAC requested more information about, and an opportunity to engage with, the MOPAN review planned for 2023. One EAC member reflected that it has been possible with previous MOPAN reviews to request a particular focus in some areas, and that suggesting this could be considered in relation to Evaluation.
- It was proposed that Gavi and the Global Fund could collaborate on how to expand the supplier pool. The EAC Chair clarified the steps that had been discussed to move forward, including a small group to work on how to address barriers to country level organisations bidding/being selected and a next discussion on this at the EAC meeting in March; and that the EAC would be open to exploring opportunities to collaborate.

**The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:**

- Expressed concern that the proposed structural changes appear to bring more negatives than positives;
- Proposed that Gavi Management not implement structural changes until after MOPAN review concludes; and requested that the MOPAN evaluation have an enhanced focus on evaluation and the EAC would like to be assured that its consensus view about direction of travel will be shared with the evaluators;
- Advised to proceed with implementing the mitigation measures that are immediately actionable, with the exception of EAC participation in co-creation workshops; and
- Advised to avoid the EAC getting pulled into management activities and focus on its advisory / governance role.

-----

**10. Closing remarks and any other business**

- 10.1 The EAC reviewed the formal guidance that had been refined throughout the meeting.
- 10.2 The EAC Chair warmly thanked the three EAC members whose terms either have already concluded or will conclude at the end of the year: Mira Johri, Marta Nunes, and Viroj Tangcharoensathien.
- 10.3 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)
- Juan Pablo Gutiérrez
- Penny Hawkins
- David Hotchkiss
- Bvudzai Magadzire
- Adolfo Martinez Valle
- Ezzeddine Mohsni
- Justice Nonvignon
- Marta Nunes
- Malabika Sarker
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien (item 10 only)

#### Guests (virtual)

- Tim Shorten, EHG (item 4)
- Giada Tu Thanh, EHG (item 4)
- Cheri Grace, EHG (item 4)
- Jette Ramløse, EHG (item 4)
- Ruth Sherratt, EHG (item 4)
- Sjoerd Postma, EHG (item 4)
- Matt Cooper, Itad (item 5)
- Pippa Page, Itad (item 5)
- Sam McPherson, Itad (item 5)
- Deborah Rugg, Itad (item 5)
- Paul Janssen, Itad (item 5)
- Monica Jain, Itad (item 5)
- Paul Wilson, Itad (item 5)
- Cindy Carlsson (item 9)
- Mira Johri (items 9-10)

#### Secretariat

- David Marlow (items 1-2)
- Hope Johnson
- Brenda Killen (items 1-2)
- Esther Saville
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Jean Zampalegre
- Anders Amaechi
- Leslie Moreland
- Sanaya Shenoy
- Johannes Ahrendts (item 3)
- Alex de Jonquières (item 4)
- Laura Crow (item 5)
- Alex Beecher (item 5)
- Mkhululi Moyo (item 6)
- Paul Balogun (item 6)(virtual)
- Nadine Abu-Sway (items 1, 2, 4)
- Cristina Cimenti
- Meegan Murray-Lopez
- Tanya Robinson (Items 1-3, 7-8)

## Attachment B

### EAC engagement in centralised evaluations

#### EAC Engagement in Gavi 5.0 Evaluations

Evaluation	Steer. Co.	EAC Secondees	EAC Focal Points		
COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC - Multi-stage Evaluation	Yes	Justice Nonvignon Adolfo Martinez	David Hotchkiss	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Penny Hawkins
Gavi's initial response to COVID-19	Yes	Juan Pablo Gutierrez Byudzai Magadzire	Justice Nonvignon	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Viroi Tangcharoensathien
Evaluation of the operationalisation of Gavi's Strategy	Yes	David Hotchkiss Penny Hawkins	Malabika Sarker	Marta Nunes James Hargreaves	Juan Pablo Gutierrez
Evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities	Yes	Ezzeddine Mohsni David Hotchkiss	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	Adolfo Martinez	Malabika Sarker
Mid Term Evaluation of Gavi's 2021 – 2025 Strategy	No	N/A	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	Byudzai Magadzire	James Hargreaves