

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

22-23 March 2023

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 22 March 2023. James Hargreaves, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair indicated that Michael Kent Ranson, Alternate Board (World Bank) and Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) member would join the meeting to make the link between the EAC and the PPC; and that Mira Johri, Chair of the Independent Evaluation Panel at the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, would join the EAC for part of the discussion on day two.
- 1.3 The Chair noted that regrets had been received from Bvudzai Magadzire.
- 1.4 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a in the Committee pack). One EAC member indicated she had an additional declaration of interest to include for 2023 filing and this was provided to the Secretariat.
- 1.5 The minutes of the 21-22 September 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 16 November 2022.
- 1.6 The Chair also referred to the EAC action sheet (Doc 01c), noting that the actions it contained had been followed up.
- 1.7 The Chair briefed the EAC on his activities since the EAC last met, including in attending on an exceptional basis an All-Chair's Group on 6 December 2022 in which there was a discussion about coordination of Board Committees; attending and presenting to the Gavi Board in December 2022; and participating in an interview with the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN).
- 1.8 He also noted that interim findings of ongoing evaluations had been shared with EAC Focal Points for the COVAX and COVID-19 evaluations prior to inclusion in Governance papers and that this had been found to be a useful practice.
- 1.9 He also indicated that the EAC would be implementing some of the ways of working that had been trialed in the last meeting including presenting the Secretariat with more formalised guidance that would be agreed prior to the end of the meeting. In addition, he suggested that ideally the meeting minutes would be comprehensive and there would not be a need for an additional action sheet.

- 1.10 Michael Kent Ranson provided a summary of the deliberations at the last PPC meeting on 21-22 October 2022, including on: i) next steps related to the Vaccine Investment Strategy (2018 and 2024); ii) the Funding Policy Review exercise; iii) key strategic issues for COVAX; and iv) Gavi's role in future COVID-19 programming for 2024-2025, regional manufacturing, and inactivated polio vaccine (IPV).
- 1.11 EAC members commented that it would be useful to continue to strengthen links between the EAC and PPC, and to ensure that evaluation questions are set up to respond to PPC needs for making recommendations.
- 1.12 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 (COO), provided the EAC with an update on a number of important topics including: Gavi 5.1 strategy and implications, trends impacting Gavi, 2023 priorities and the Board retreat of March 2023. He also provided an overview of 2022 performance and spoke of steps taken to set the Secretariat and the Alliance up to deliver on Gavi 5.1, noting the upcoming leadership transition.
- 2.2 Mr Marlow touched on the ongoing Operational Excellence journey to remove complexity, simplify and streamline, and ensure Gavi is set up to effectively deliver on Gavi 5.1. He emphasised that Operational Excellence offers an opportunity for a differentiated approach to consider country applications through the Independent Review Committee (IRC), informed by an external evaluation. He noted that Operational Excellence also covers internal Secretariat workstreams on people and culture, including emphasising Gavi's values and reviewing the approach to ethics and compliance. Lastly, he outlined structural changes in the Secretariat including new staff appointments.
- 2.3 He emphasised the importance of partnerships for the Gavi Alliance and updated on a recent Partnership Team retreat in Zambia earlier in March 2023, as well as the Alliance core partner leadership retreats.
- 2.4 Finally, he concluded by reiterating the importance of evaluations and the role of the EAC.

Discussion

- EAC members queried country capacity to roll out new vaccine introductions, particularly the HPV and malaria vaccines amid COVID-19 integration and given existing health system challenges. The COO acknowledged the challenges in country absorption capacities and noted that while funding is available through multiple funding levers (including Health Systems and Immunisation Strengthening

(HSIS) and the Partners' Engagement Framework (PEF)), countries continue to face challenges to absorb and implement which is top priority for the Secretariat, as well as for the Alliance partners on the ground such as UNICEF and WHO.

- One participant noted that the World Bank is currently looking into healthcare workers' capacities and is exploring innovative ways to introduce HPV vaccine through education platforms to help alleviate pressure from traditional vaccinators. As for the malaria vaccine, the roll-out beyond the three pilot countries will be incremental. It was noted that better integration between immunisation programmes and the broader Primary Health Care (PHC) programmes in countries would help increase absorption capacities.
- On the interconnectivity between the Board Committees, the COO noted that this would be one of the priorities to be discussed at the Board retreat, including the Board effectiveness review.
- The COO underlined the importance of reflecting on the theory of change and rethinking the monitoring of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to focus on what really matters to advance the Alliance's work.
- The EAC chair highlighted the link between operational excellence initiatives, including the EVOLVE project, and the evaluation work. He underlined the importance of maximising EAC input on key evaluations by seizing opportune moments to provide added value. The EAC's contribution to the Mid-Term Evaluation was particularly highlighted in this regard.

3. Panel on Partnerships

- 3.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Measurement, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 03) and briefed the EAC on the latest discussions on the Alliance's partnerships. She noted that it is critical to have consistent guidance and a shared understanding across stakeholder groups on the approach to evaluating the role of partners across the evaluation workplan.
- 3.2 Thabani Maphosa, Managing Director, Country Programmes Delivery, provided an overview of the Alliance's partnership model, principles and expectations. He highlighted contexts, challenges and tensions in the partnership model, and provided an overview of the different funding levers related to partners.
- 3.3 Marumbo Ngwira, Head, Programme Support, presented a brief overview on the Partners' Engagement Framework (PEF) funding and outlined the approach to performance management.
- 3.4 Esther Saville, Head, Measurement, Evaluation & Learning, highlighted key related recommendations from past evaluations and outlined the current approach to partnership in evaluations.

Discussion

- The EAC emphasised the importance of partnerships given the nature of Gavi as an Alliance and the relevance of the EAC role in the evaluation of partnerships.
- EAC members provided the following guidance to the Secretariat:
 - i. Endeavouring to have clarity on the roles and responsibilities of Gavi and its partners, and having a clear definition of partnerships from the onset is critical. Addressing this through clear Terms of Reference and work planning for Gavi 6.0 would be helpful in this regard;
 - ii. Assessing the contribution of partners to Gavi's objectives and priorities guided by Theories of Change (ToC) is important;
 - iii. Articulating the characteristics of what constitutes a partnership and expectations on how they should work, while focusing on relational aspects and ensuring trust and mutual learning are key components for successful evaluations;
 - iv. Maximising access to information available to evaluators is critical in helping them ask the right questions and conduct meaningful evaluations;
 - v. Promoting early buy-in to mitigate perception that partners are being criticised by Gavi, and exploring options for partners to undertake their own evaluations by their in-house functions to promote learning was suggested; and
 - vi. Enabling country capacity to forge relationships with partners, and empowering countries to be central to partnerships by making partners accountable to governments rather than to Gavi is important.
- The Secretariat noted that the feeling of inclusion by partners highly affects how evaluations are owned, received and acted on.
- The Secretariat indicated the need to refocus partnerships at country level around implementation given Gavi's increased involvement in global level partnerships and the need to recalibrate its efforts for the best return on investments by Gavi.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

1. Recognising that Gavi is an Alliance and that partnerships at all levels are central to the Theory of Change for the Alliance, Gavi's Centralised Evaluation Team (CET) should develop and promote an approach to enhanced engagement with partners on the scope and questions for evaluations, in order to promote shared ownership of findings and recommendations.
2. Partners should be considered within the scope of the evaluations where their roles, responsibilities and delivery contributes to the area of Gavi's work or Theory of Change (ToC) being evaluated. With guidance from EAC Focal Points, Requests for Proposals should be made clear on how partnerships will be assessed within the scope of the evaluation.

3. Partnership functioning should be considered within scope for all evaluations where the functioning of such partnerships is relevant to the theory of change under assessment. The Gavi EAC advises that the focus for evaluations should be on learning rather than accountability of specific partners.
4. Independent evaluators undertaking evaluations should be well briefed on the Gavi Alliance model and on the assumptions related to the roles and responsibilities of partners within the ToC being evaluated. This should be conducted as part of the inception process rather than as a condition of bidding and validated by relevant Alliance stakeholders.

4. Update on COVAX Evaluation – Formative Review and Baseline Study – Phase 1

- 4.1 Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 04).
- 4.2 Sam McPherson and Pippa Page, evaluators from Itad, presented on the COVAX Evaluation – Formative Review and Baseline Study – Phase 1.
- 4.3 Justice Nonvignon and Adolfo Martinez Valle, members of the evaluation Steering Committee, commented on their engagement and some questions that had been raised during the evaluation process and that could be considered moving forward, including the limited number of country case studies, the understanding of partner roles and engagement, and the targeting of recommendations.

Discussion

- The EAC thanked the evaluators for their good work on this evaluation.
- EAC members queried what could be learned from Phase 1 that could inform the next phase. The evaluators indicated that obtaining better country-level data would be important along with resources for that purpose.
- EAC members asked about whether the evaluation had led to any course correction, which had been an objective of this phase. The evaluators noted that course correction had been challenging given the swift design changes that had been implemented in 2021 and 2022. The Secretariat reflected that COVAX had been constantly course correcting drawing from other learning activities undertaken concurrently, and promptly taking on board findings from the evaluation as they became available, particularly ahead of the governance cycle in late 2022.
- EAC members also asked about the decision not to implement additional rapid reviews that had previously been planned. Evaluators indicated that it had been

considered that there were resource trade-offs and that they felt they had been able to reach key constituencies.

- One EAC member asked about whether it was still possible to be more clear in the report about limitations and about learning about a moving target. The evaluators noted that this had already been made clear in the inception and main report and did not require any additional language in the report.
- With respect to whether the recommendations could be more targeted, the evaluators commented that they had been targeted to the extent possible. The Secretariat indicated that the push to target recommendations had been helpful.

5. COVAX Evaluation – Phase 2

- 5.1 Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 05).
- 5.2 Derrick Sim, Managing Director, Vaccine Markets and Health Security, also provided introductory comments.

Discussion

- EAC members noted that they had previously advised that the second phase of the COVAX evaluation should evaluate the full Theory of Change(s) and build upon the learnings from the first phase.
- EAC members provided guidance on country selection, including: i) that it should be carried out in a transparent and deliberate manner with the criteria clearly stated and that they were comfortable with including specific countries in the Request for Proposal; ii) that Self-Financing Participants be included; and iii) that the evaluation look for complementarity with the COVID-19 Vaccine Development Partnership (CoVDP) country case studies.
- With respect to the broader evaluation landscape on COVAX, including by partners, EAC members advised that partners should be engaged and phase 2 should reflect a full picture of the evaluation landscape.
- EAC members discussed whether to leverage impact modelling work to try to get to the counterfactual, including potentially by commissioning work on this topic. The EAC advised that any relevant work that had already been commissioned by Gavi in this regard should be brought into phase 2.
- EAC members also suggested to include as a design question whether COVAX could have been designed differently to get closer to its aims, and in this way to get closer to a pandemic preparedness and response (PPR) lens.

- EAC members noted their previous guidance that EAC members should not participate in Technical Evaluation Committees (TECs) given the need for independence, however it was clarified that they would refer individuals with relevant expertise.
- One participant noted the need in phase 2 to undertake an objective review of the CoVDP-related work as well as to consider governance changes to COVAX bodies, including by capturing perspectives from leadership of those bodies.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance on scope and commissioning of the Phase 2 evaluation, in particular:

- To proceed with naming potential case study countries in the evaluation RfP, provided that criteria are made clear for the selection of the countries and that countries are meaningfully engaged from early in the process, and to plan for a larger number of countries for Phase 2.
- That Gavi CET should seek enhanced engagement with partners during the next phase of the COVAX Evaluation, especially with focus country stakeholders, and should include reference in the Request for Proposal to how the scope of this evaluation complements the existing landscape of COVAX-related evaluations, both completed and ongoing.

6. Gavi 5.1 Evaluation Update and Workplan

- 6.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Senior Programme Officer, provided introductory remarks (Doc 06) and an update on the multi-year evaluation workplan since the EAC meeting in September 2022.
- 6.2 Aurélia Nguyen, Chief Programme Strategy Officer, provided high-level remarks and highlighted that the programme work which she oversees has been informed by the EAC's work. She touched on four top priority evaluations: i) Gavi's initial response to COVID-19; ii) COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC evaluation; iii) the Mid-Term Evaluation of Gavi's 2021-2025 Strategy (MTE); and iv) Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities and the Strategy operationalisation evaluation and its interlinkages with the Evolve project. She concluded by expressing appreciation to the work of the EAC and its contribution to these important evaluations.
- 6.3 With respect to the Strategy Operationalisation Evaluation, Anders Amaechi, Programme Officer, Evaluation and Learning, provided some comments on the timeline of the evaluation and key milestones of the report. Penny Hawkins as EAC Focal Point noted that the summary of the report had identified a lack of clarity of partners and on the ToC, and highlighted that timelines had been shifted to address the concerns raised.

- 6.4 Emmanuella Baguma provided some remarks on the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE). She outlined the objectives of the MTE and noted the Mid-Term Review (MTR) exercise would be completed ahead of the MTE, which will provide an opportunity to receive recommendations from the donors on investment opportunities.
- 6.5 Tim Shorten and Julian Schweitzer, Euro Health Group (EHG), presented on the key features and methodologies of the MTE design as per the final inception report of February 2023. He updated the EAC on progress made and presented a brief summary on five proposed thematic studies to be carried out between May and October 2023. He outlined the evaluation deliverables and key milestones, noting that the final report would be submitted to the Gavi Board in March 2024. Mr Schweitzer briefly outlined responses to the EAC feedback on the draft and final inception report namely on partnerships, added value of the MTE and evaluability.

Discussion

- EAC lead Juan Pablo Gutiérrez summarised the discussion of the EAC Focal points on the MTE evaluation and the comments submitted in writing on the final draft report. He noted that one outstanding issue that remains from the initial draft is related to the approach to synthesis for this evaluation. The presenter clarified that the added value would be to bring together important messaging across the four key evaluations to the Board.
- Furthermore, the presenter noted the evaluation scope is broader than the four evaluations, covers the Gavi 5.0 and Gavi 5.1 ToCs and involves undertaking additional data collection. The analytical framework for the evaluation would be the Gavi 5.0 ToC following some adaptations, which would then inform data collection and analysis. An existing coding framework also provides an explicit base for the analysis.
- One EAC member emphasised the importance of including country voices in this evaluation and asked if country partners would be contacted to undertake interviews. The presenter noted that 90 key informative interviews and 5 thematic case studies would be undertaken to dive into specific aspects in addition to the evaluations that will be synthesised. Additionally, there would be country level work in 15-25 countries representing a good proportion of Gavi-eligible countries.
- In relation to the independence of findings and balancing of information emanating from interviews, the presenter clarified that they will be looking into progress and plausibility of achieving the strategic goals and will then be providing an independent view on those questions to the EAC.
- With reference to questions on the selection of thematic studies, the presenter clarified that these were chosen to fill gaps in understanding based on data availability and to strengthen the evidence base for the evaluation questions.
- In relation to the Gavi Board being the primary audience for this evaluation, the EAC Chair noted that the EAC may not be the appropriate channel to relay feedback from/to the Board given its limited engagement with the Board. This

requires further deliberation on how best to engage the Board for this evaluation through the available channels.

- Several EAC members also informed the EAC about comments they had exceptionally provided on a decentralised evaluation of the Gavi IRC at the request of the Gavi Governance Committee. Comprehensive comments had already been provided in writing.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

1. The EAC requested that the Secretariat in consultation with EAC Focal Points develop and implement a plan to engage with the Gavi Alliance Board as the primary audience of the evaluation; and to list some of the strategies that would be used (including sense checking on thematic case studies).
2. The EAC requested that the evaluators should clarify their methodological approach to synthesis including justifying the criteria for the thematic studies.

7. Zero-Dose Learning Agenda

- 7.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Measurement, Evaluation & Learning, provided an overview of the Zero-Dose learning agenda (Doc 07). She briefly outlined the integrated Gavi 5.0 measurement and monitoring frameworks including on key zero-dose metrics; informed the EAC on the Zero-Dose learning hubs and community of practice; and presented a summary on retrospective evidence syntheses and case studies, as well as on Zero-Dose analytics.
- 7.2 Dr Johnson also gave a high-level view on the Zero-Dose Immunisation Programme (ZIP) Measurement and Learning Framework and outlined a set of related activities. Finally, she concluded by providing an overview on leveraging evidence to inform the Zero-Dose Evaluation (2023-2025) and requested EAC guidance on how the independent evaluators can most effectively utilise the evidence base to inform the evaluation questions, and for any additional recommended literature to consider.

Discussion

- One EAC member underlined the importance of considering the right denominator for identifying zero-dose children through immunisation coverage. This is usually directly linked to birth registrations which may not be the same across all countries. Assessing immunisation coverage data is critical, given that Diphtheria, Tetanus & Pertussis vaccine (DTP) coverage does not provide data on the percentage of children that need immunisation but rather on the distribution of vaccine. The Secretariat acknowledged that measuring immunisation coverage is challenging particularly due to administrative data and estimating the target population, which could be complemented by survey data. Geospatial modelling techniques were cited as helpful however not for monitoring progress.

- In relation to equity and data sources, one EAC member highlighted the challenges related to data quality particularly in the most disadvantaged geographies.
- In relation to the scale of investments in the learning agenda, the Secretariat clarified that US\$ 22 million is forecast to fund activities through 2025.
- EAC members highlighted that having the Zero-Dose learning agenda widely disseminated and open to academic institutions would yield greater visibility for this agenda. The Secretariat referred to increasing external interest in learning from the Zero-Dose agenda including on malaria and measles. Gavi is working closely with the Global Financing Facility (GFF), the President’s Malaria Initiative (PMI) as well as with the Global Fund on sharing some of these learnings.
- In relation to sharing information and learning hubs, the Secretariat clarified the following important aspects:
 - i. The learning hubs will be using different methods to obtain data, through triangulation analyses including quantitative and qualitative information, which will yield information on the Zero-Dose metrics as well as on transition;
 - ii. The scope of the learning hubs in the medium term through 2025 would be to strengthen the routine health information system, with targeted scope in sub-national areas. This would lead to better data on indicators on whether children are being reached and will bring more clarity on the status of the denominators and the ability to reach children who have been missed before;
 - iii. The learning hubs will be conducting implementation research to provide information on approaches to identify and reach Zero-Dose children; and
 - iv. Gavi should have better visibility on the results coming out from subnational targeted monitoring through quarterly reporting and will aim to share this through the global learning partners.

8. Update on Zero-Dose Evaluation

- 8.1 Emmanuella Baguma, presented this item (Doc 08) and requested the EAC provide guidance on progress and on how to further strengthen the utility of the evaluation.
- 8.2 Evaluators from the Ipsos firm outlined the evaluation approach including the methodology and process. They updated the EAC on progress to date on data collection and desk reviews. Finally, they outlined timelines for next deliverables, and requested EAC guidance on key questions.

Discussion

- The EAC focal points who reviewed the inception report provided some comments and noted that outstanding questions remain around the methodological approaches on the use of secondary data. The evaluators noted the comments and confirmed that secondary data will be used at various points of the evaluation.
- With respect to the evaluator's question on the best approach to take in relation to the strength of evidence, one EAC member advised to select the most appropriate approach and remain as transparent and explicit as possible on how they approached the strength of evidence.
- The EAC encouraged the evaluators to ensure balancing data emanating from country interviews with those of global surveys, particularly on equity.
- Several EAC members underlined the importance of bringing added value of this evaluation, and clearly defining next steps for this evaluation's learnings to feed into Gavi 6.0 strategy. The evaluators recognised the complexity of reaching Zero-Dose children and noted that Gavi depends on partners to implement interventions.
- The EAC encouraged the evaluators to consider the following aspects in their evaluation:
 - i. Gender;
 - ii. Unintended consequences of focusing on Zero-Dose children who are highly concentrated in rural areas which can potentially lead to neglecting children in urban areas;
 - iii. Climate and health in view of recent flooding and other natural disasters effect on countries;
 - iv. Delayed funding processes affecting programme implementation and other funders investments;
 - v. Innovative approaches of reaching communities and channelling funds through governments;
 - vi. Evidence on immunisation as a pathfinder for introducing other health care interventions;
 - vii. How the zero-dose agenda is impacting investments made by other funders other than Gavi in countries; and
 - viii. Innovative approaches to reaching communities including through CSOs and governments.
- In relation to desk reviews, the evaluators were encouraged to assess potential existing data on the impact of HSS investments in countries during Gavi 4.0 strategy should data be available.
- The evaluators acknowledged the EAC's request to link their evaluation to the Zero-Dose Learning Agenda (which includes important evidence-generating interventions, including - but not limited to - the ZIP Programme, Learning Hubs, retrospective evidence syntheses and case studies on 4.0 pro-equity interventions, subnational country data sets).

- The EAC chair noted that the inception report could be considered complete, and the Secretariat noted that any outstanding issues particularly on the agreed analytical approach/methods regarding the contribution story will be incorporated into the next progress report and shared with the EAC Steering Committee and focal points.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

1. That the evaluators and the Secretariat ensure close collaboration between the Zero-Dose Evaluation team and other relevant internal workstreams, e.g. the Zero-Dose Learning agenda, and provide an update to the Steering Committee;
2. With respect to the question of how to reflect strength of evidence, the EAC advised that the evaluators should select a framework and be transparent about its strengths and weaknesses, and report back to the Steering Committee and EAC Focal Points;
3. Reaffirming the need for evaluators to come back with a detailed data analysis plan to be reviewed by the Steering Committee and EAC Focal Points as soon as feasible.

9. Evaluation Policy Operationalisation

- 9.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, introduced a discussion on the operationalisation of the revised Evaluation Policy (Doc 09), starting with an update on the review of evaluation suppliers. She updated the EAC on the first discussions with the group of EAC members (Adolfo Martinez Valle and Bvudzai Magadzire) who had volunteered to provide guidance on this topic.
- 9.2 Mira Johri, Chair of the Independent Evaluation Panel at the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Global Fund), presented on the steps the Global Fund had taken, noting the ongoing wish to collaborate with Gavi and the Global Financing Facility in this area. She noted that the Global Fund recently launched an RFP stating that preference would be given to people and firms from Global Fund-served countries and people with lived experience of the priority diseases. The Global Fund is also considering steps to simplify the application process, especially for firms that are not set up to be able to meet RFP timelines.
- 9.3 Ms Saville also provided short introductions on the topics of the after-action review and MOPAN evaluation.

Discussion

- On the subject of the supplier review, EAC members advised: i) to consider whether language could be added to RFPs to clarify assessment criteria and encourage applications from those suppliers with understanding of local context, recognising the higher quality that would stem from that understanding; ii) to use language that makes clear that proposals would always win on merit; iii) to use the next two evaluations as testing grounds to try out ideas – so that when the Gavi 6.0 workplan comes into effect there is a process to widen the supplier base.

- The following EAC members agreed to provide further guidance on the supplier review: Adolfo Martinez Valle, Bvudzai Magadzire, and Penny Hawkins.
- On the topic of the after-action review, the EAC noted that the review had not turned up major issues and that the EAC Chair was prepared to communicate back as needed that the experience with the change in the Evaluation Policy had been positive. It was noted that moving forward in advance of upcoming EAC meetings, the latest evaluation materials should be shared with EAC Focal Points to make sure the 'group of five' on each evaluation are on the same page.
- With respect to the ongoing MOPAN evaluation, the EAC expressed concern that the evaluation might not be elevated and/or reported on in sufficient detail for EAC purposes moving forward. The EAC advised that the Secretariat and EAC Chair should explore options for reinforcing this request, including potentially having the EAC Chair reach out directly to MOPAN focal point countries.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- On the ongoing work on expanding the supplier base, the EAC requested that the Secretariat revert at the next meeting against actions agreed and guidance provided; and to continue collaboration with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and the Global Financing Facility.

10. EAC Engagement in Gavi 5.1 Evaluations

- 10.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, presented the current allocation of EAC members as reviewers across the centralised evaluations (Doc 10). It was noted that the Secretariat will be sharing calendar placeholders with EAC members for review of deliverables on a quarterly basis moving forward.

Discussion

- The EAC made some adjustments to the current allocation, which appear in Attachment B to these meeting minutes.
- The EAC discussed the reasoning for not establishing a Steering Committee for the Mid Term Evaluation. The EAC requested that the Secretariat consider whether there was an emerging need for a Steering Committee and update the EAC Chair after the meeting on the preferred way forward.
- The Chair provided feedback from the closed session in which the EAC had discussed potential individuals who could participate in the TEC for COVAX Phase 2.

11. Review of EAC Guidance

- 11.1 The EAC reviewed and finalised the formal guidance that had been refined throughout the meeting.

12. Closing remarks and any other business

- 12.1 The Chair provided further feedback from the closed session, including that: i) all current EAC members had indicated their desire to continue for another term; ii) EAC members had discussed potential recruitment for additional EAC members and suggested that an open call refresh process be launched, and in addition, that EAC members would seek to identify and promote this call to experts who would bring value to the EAC, noting previous discussions on characteristics and skills that would do so; iii) Gavi should explore engaging with the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Synthesis Coalition; and iv) EAC members would endeavour to provide names for bidders for upcoming evaluations.
- 12.2 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)
- Juan Pablo Gutiérrez
- Penny Hawkins
- David Hotchkiss
- Adolfo Martinez Valle
- Ezzeddine Mohsni (virtual - items 1-3, 7-9, closed session)
- Justice Nonvignon
- Malabika Sarker

Committee Members-elect

- Rhoda Wanyenze

Regrets

- Bvudzai Magadzire

Board members

- Michael Kent Ranson (Day One and item 8)

Other Guests (virtual)

- Matt Cooper, Itad (item 4)
- Pippa Page, Itad (item 4)
- Sam McPherson, Itad (item 4)
- Paul Janssen, Itad (item 4)
- Monica Jain, Itad (item 4)
- Paul Wilson, Itad (item 4)
- Helen Merati, Itad (item 4)
- Tim Shorten, EHG (item 5)
- Julian Schweitzer, EHG (item 5)
- Michele Gross, EHG (item 5)
- Giada Tu Thanh, EHG (item 5)
- Cheryl Brown, EHG (item 5)
- Ruth Sherratt, EHG (item 5)
- Yannick Vuylsteke, Ipsos (item 8)
- Jessica Baxendale, Ipsos (item 8)
- Annette Bongiovanni, Ipsos (item 8)
- Will Attfield, Ipsos (item 8)
- Jessica Bruce, Ipsos (item 8)
- Mira Johri (item 9)

Secretariat

- David Marlow (virtual - items 1-2)
- Aurélie Nguyen (virtual - item 6)
- Thabani Maphosa (item 3)
- Derrick Sim (virtual - item 5)
- Hope Johnson
- Brenda Killen (item 6)
- Alex de Jonquières (item 3)
- Esther Saville
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Jean Zampalegre (virtual)
- Anders Amaechi
- Leslie Moreland
- Audrey Beaulieu
- Abdallah Bchir (virtual - Day One and items 9-12)
- Marumbo Ngwira (item 3)
- Alex de Jonquières (virtual - item 4)
- Laura Craw (item 5)
- Alex Beecher (item 5)
- Hannah Kettler (item 5)
- Richard Mihigo (item 5)
- Heidi Reynolds (items 7-8)
- Gustavo Correa (items 7-8)
- Sophie La Vincente (items 7-8)
- Dan Hogan (items 7-8)
- Nadine Abu-Sway
- Natalia Matola
- Meegan Murray-Lopez

Attachment B - EAC engagement in centralised evaluations

EAC Engagement in Gavi 5.1 Evaluations

EVALUATION	Steer. Co.	EAC Secondees	EAC Focal Points		
COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC - Multi-stage Evaluation	Yes	Adolfo Martinez Valle Justice <u>Nonvignon</u> *	David Hotchkiss	Ezzeddine <u>Mohnsi</u>	Penny Hawkins
Evaluation of the <u>operationalisation</u> of Gavi's Strategy	Yes	Penny Hawkins* David Hotchkiss	James Hargreaves	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	<u>Malabika</u> Sarker
Evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities	Yes	David Hotchkiss Ezzeddine <u>Mohnsi</u>	Adolfo Martinez Valle	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	Malabika Sarker*
Mid Term Evaluation of Gavi's 2021 – 2025 Strategy	No	James Hargreaves* Bvudzai Magadzire Rhoda Wanyenze	Justice <u>Nonvignon</u>	Penny Hawkins	Juan Pablo Gutierrez

* = Convening Focal Point for the evaluation