

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

29-30 September 2021

Virtual meeting

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 The meeting was held virtually via teleconference and commenced at 14.02 Geneva time on 29 September 2021. James Hargreaves, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair thanked the EAC members for their availability and noted that this would be his first meeting as Chair following his appointment in July. He informed the Committee of the introductory meetings he had already held to date, including with Secretariat leadership, the Board Chair, as well as with EAC members.
- 1.3 He noted that that while no regrets had been shared ahead of the meeting, he had learned that Viroj Tangcharoensathien would not attend the meeting due to unforeseen circumstances; Jeanine Condo would not be present on the first day; and Rafael Vilasanjuan would not be present on the second day the EAC meeting.
- 1.4 Dr Hargreaves updated the EAC on the ongoing recruitment to identify new EAC members, noting that the process is being managed by the Governance Committee with the participation of Juan Pablo Gutiérrez on the recruitment sub-Committee. The aim is to have new members start their tenure in January 2022.
- 1.5 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a in the Committee pack).
- 1.6 Meegan Murray-Lopez, Senior Manager, Governance, informed the EAC that on two recent occasions, in line with the requirements of the Gavi Conflict of Interest Policy for Governance Bodies, EAC members had identified and declared perceived conflicts of interests at the time of undertaking reviews of evaluations. In order to streamline the process in the future and prevent any delays in the case an EAC member were to discover an actual conflict of interest while reviewing an evaluation report, the Governance team will share a process with EAC reviewers on the management of any such situations.
- 1.7 The minutes of the EAC meeting on 14-15 April 2021 were tabled to the Committee for information (Docs 01b in the Committee pack). The minutes had been circulated and approved by no-objection on 03 June 2021.
- 1.8 The Chair also proposed a short closed session of the Committee at the end of the first day of meeting.

2. Update from the Executive Office

- 2.1 Seth Berkley, CEO, welcomed the new Chair of the EAC and provided an update on developments since the last EAC meeting. His remarks touched on areas including: i) the impact of COVID-19 on Gavi operationalisation, ii) the status of Gavi 5.0 operationalisation, iii) COVAX, and iv) what this means for Gavi's priorities and Gavi's strategic goals for this period.
- 2.2 Dr Berkley also highlighted the critical role of evaluation and the EAC at this point in time. He noted that it will be important to ensure we learn from these experiences to inform future pandemic response and beyond to enable Gavi to be agile and effective at achieving its mission.

Discussion

- One EAC member noted that the cold chain equipment evaluation includes a market shaping strategy, but that the market shaping strategy does not have environmental sustainability in it. It was clarified that Gavi does have an environmental sustainability statement and this should be made clear.
- With respect to the nascent COVAX evaluation, one EAC member asked for input on what would be the most useful form of evaluation from the perspective of Gavi leadership, given that this is an area that is still shifting, and what types of questions would be most useful. Dr Berkley responded that given all the factors that were outside Gavi's control as COVAX developed, it would be helpful for the evaluation to consider both the positive and negative elements, so that Gavi can learn about what it should be doing differently moving forward. This should include how decisions were made considering the information available at the time. It would also be helpful to consider the counterfactual and what would have happened if COVAX had not been created at all.
- One EAC member queried how to go about building a more resilient system at the global level, now that Gavi has some experience working at the country level. Dr Berkley agreed that this was an important question, and that in his mind it is still unclear whether if there had been contingency money available at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic that COVAX would have been able to secure the doses that were needed or whether the same nationalism would have occurred.
- With respect to another question on COVID-19 vaccine wastage, it was noted that there does not appear to be much wastage, but that there is still a lot of analysis around other questions related to proper use and how to manage doses for which there had not been demand by priority groups.
- One EAC member questioned the proposal to delay the zero-dose evaluation given the concern that numbers of zero-dose children may be increasing as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, and whether it would make more sense to do a modified evaluation instead. It was clarified that this is a question of whether there is bandwidth in countries to engage on any form of evaluation at this point in time. It was highlighted that there would still be the opportunity for learning on the zero-dose approach through the COVID-19 and mid-term (MTE) evaluations.

- With respect to the goal of reaching 70% with COVID-19 vaccine by the end of 2021, it was clarified that the World Health Organization goal is to reach 70% of the population of every country and the feasibility of this goal will need to be evaluated as in some cases it implies extending target populations beyond those currently approved.
- Finally, responding to a question on Gavi moving into the humanitarian space, it was noted that with its equity approach Gavi is shifting into that space and needs to adapt.

3. Update on ongoing evaluations

- 3.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, provided a framing for this item on progress on ongoing commissioned evaluations (Doc 03) with the focus on evaluations that have started under Gavi 4.0 strategic period.
- 3.2 The EAC was requested to: (i) provide guidance on progress on ongoing centralised evaluations on the Gavi evaluation workplan; and (ii) take note of progress on decentralised evaluations.

Discussion

- The Secretariat noted that the written feedback provided by the EAC focal points on each evaluation report had been shared with the evaluators.
- In relation to the evaluation of Gavi's engagement with the private sector, EAC focal points for this evaluation noted that the report had not considered the coordination to minimise wastage of vaccines when engaging the private sector. They highlighted that hybrid schemes of private public engagements should be considered, and more granularity on the private sector actors is needed. They noted that timing of such evaluations is important, particularly as the private sector engagement strategy will be presented to the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) in October 2021. The Secretariat noted that during the co-creation workshop, evaluators had held discussions with all stakeholders engaged in the process to understand what the future of the private sector looks like across the Secretariat and across the Alliance, and confirmed that the proposed strategy is informed by the findings of the evaluation.
- With regard to the evaluation of the Fragility, Emergencies, Refugees policy, the EAC focal points noted that the report was comprehensive, but lacked details on methodology. The recommendations and lessons learned may have had an over-positive tone. The Secretariat noted that the evaluators had faced multiple difficulties in obtaining responses from countries due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and this had proven particularly challenging for suppliers that did not have country-level presence to collect data. This is acknowledged in the report, and attempts were made to mitigate this risk at the co-creation workshop with the participation of country-level stakeholders.

- With respect to the Pneumococcal Conjugate Vaccine (PCV) Advance Market Commitment (AMC) outcome/impact evaluation, the EAC focal points noted that the report was well structured and followed a good logic on recommendations, providing useful conclusions on supply issues. However, it was noted that the sampling methodology for conducting interviews was not described and that very few policy makers were engaged. Country perspectives seemed to be missing, as the report focused on the global level. The Secretariat acknowledged the challenges related to obtaining country perspective which is a common challenge across many evaluations in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Given that the evaluation is retrospective, it was particularly challenging to find the individuals who were involved in the process at the time.
- On the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP) (Phase 1) evaluation, it was noted that the methods proposed lacked methodological coherence. The report lacked clarity on quantitative research, and challenges on assessing the quality and the utility of the findings were highlighted. It was also noted that the environmental sustainability element of market shaping was missing in the evaluation. The Secretariat clarified that the methods were previously established and shared as this evaluation had been going on for four years with the engagement of the EAC and several feedback groups that generated several reports at the country and the global levels. Further details will be provided in an annex to the final report detailing the methodological approaches, together with a link to the market shaping report.
- EAC members requested that the Secretariat routinely include the cost of evaluations and selected bidders as part of the information provided in the background documents for these updates.
- In relation to the workplan and existing evaluation, the Secretariat called on the EAC members to provide insight and direction on how to best secure country engagement which would be instrumental for the future work.
- The Secretariat referred to a rapid uptake of evaluation findings to inform various strategies and policies. This includes those that have informed forthcoming Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) papers related to private sector engagement and revisions to the FER policy. Results from the FER policy evaluation were also discussed at a recent Alliance Coordination Team meeting. These are all good examples of optimising timing of evaluations to ensure optimal utility.

4. Next steps on the Evaluation Operational Guidelines

- 4.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, provided opening remarks about next steps on the Evaluation Operational Guidelines (EOGs)(Doc 04). The purpose of this item was to update the EAC on CET's response to the EAC's Consensus Statement and to seek any further guidance to resolve any remaining issues in operationalising Gavi's evaluation management through the EOGs.

4.2 The Consensus Statement had included feedback across five key areas, including: i) independence in commissioning evaluations, ii) selection of external evaluators, iii) Independent Quality Assessment Panel (IQAP), iv) Steering Committees, and v) reporting channels.

Discussion

- On the question of independence in commissioning evaluations and selection of external evaluators, EAC members noted that additional useful information had been provided in the Secretariat's report about a number of points raised by the EAC consensus statement in relation to past centralised evaluations. The EAC stressed the importance of ongoing assessment of supplier diversity. CET will continue to provide analysis from the annual supplier review to the EAC for centralised evaluations, including number and origin (HIC/MIC/LIC) of applications received. In addition, EAC members suggested that the Secretariat carefully consider whether there are any additional steps that might be taken to improve participation in tender processes for both centralised and decentralised evaluations. Specific suggestions included trying to identify ways to provide mentoring within existing procurement rules, advertising broadly on different platforms, developing webinars, and remaining mindful about getting participation from the Global South.
- With respect to Independent Quality Assessment Panels, it was clarified that these panels would not be established and the EOGs have been revised to reflect this.
- On the question of EAC member participation on Steering Committees, three options to allow the EAC to better fulfil its role of supporting the Board in its oversight responsibilities in respect of Gavi's evaluation activities were considered, including: i) fully exercise EAC engagement in centralised evaluations within the scope of the current Evaluation Policy and EAC Terms of Reference; ii) revise clause 7.5.1 in the Evaluation Policy to allow EAC members to sit on SCs; and iii) review and assess the independence, quality and capacity of the Gavi Secretariat Evaluation Unit and make recommendations (as per Responsibility J in EAC Terms of Reference (ToR)).
- The Secretariat provided additional information about many ways the EAC could expand its engagement in centralised evaluations without modifying the policy, including: a) adding a touchpoint for EAC focal points with Secretariat leads for area of work to be evaluated for briefing and Q&A; b) EAC focal points providing guidance/feedback on SC composition; c) EAC focal points reviewing inception reports and providing guidance on risks to independence; d) independent evaluators regularly presenting at EAC meetings; and e) EAC reviewing the response matrices for draft reports with SC feedback and evaluator response.
- The following risks were raised for consideration related to recommending a change to the policy:
 - Potential significant increase to workload of the EAC, i.e. three EAC focal points (as required by the EAC ToRs) per evaluation and up to two additional EAC members to for the SC. A recruitment process is underway to recruit new

EAC members as part of the biannual Committee refresh process, and this provides an opportunity to expand the size of the EAC to accommodate this change;

- Challenges ensuring adequate coverage across evaluations by EAC members depending on number of evaluations on workplan and number of members with a Conflict of Interest for a specific evaluation. An expansion of the size of the Committee will also potentially alleviate this pressure; and
- Whether this change would present a risk to the EAC's ability, or perceived ability, to be objective when undertaking their quality assessment of an evaluation. This risk would need to be mitigated by maintaining a separation of duties between the EAC focal points and EAC members sitting on SCs; and regularly reviewing whether EAC focal points have identified any challenges in this arrangement.
- The EAC agreed to action i) and ii) above as immediate next steps, with option iii) to be addressed at a later date. EAC members considered it important to remove the restriction set out in Clause 7.5.1 in Gavi's Evaluation Policy on the basis that it prevents the EAC from ensuring the independence and quality of evaluations, and that only by participating throughout the process, including on SCs, would the EAC be able to maintain the oversight required to fulfil its Terms of Reference.
- It was agreed that the EAC would reconvene before the December 2021 Board meeting to review the proposed policy revision in order to present the Board with a recommendation to approve the amendment to the policy.
- Finally, the EAC discussed the guidance that it had provided to strengthen reporting channels with the Board. EAC members expressed interest in increasing the visibility of centralised evaluation. The Board members who sit on the EAC indicated that they would continue to use their voice at the Board but noted that they face challenges in doing so, both in trying to balance the need to also represent their constituencies in their interventions, and as a result of the limited time available. EAC members also noted that it would be worth engaging more with the PPC and to consider using technical briefings to share findings from evaluations.

5. Update on planned evaluations

- 5.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, provided opening remarks about the Gavi 5.0 planned evaluations (Doc 05). She thanked the EAC members for their review of the following evaluations: i) Gavi's initial response to COVID-19, and ii) the operationalisation of Gavi's policy framework and funding levers.
- 5.2 In relation to the evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities, she noted that extensive consultations with different Secretariat and country-level stakeholders had highlighted limited bandwidth and shifting priorities at the country level, largely due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The

Secretariat is proposing that the development of the request for proposal (RFP) is postponed to Q1 2022. She also noted that the Secretariat is relying on ongoing activities to generate early learning on the zero-dose approach through retrospective case studies, incorporating questions on zero-dose children into planned evaluations and through learning hubs, and to address zero-dose learning through the mid-term evaluation.

- 5.3 Thabani Maphosa, Managing Director, Country Programmes, provided framing remarks. He noted that the Secretariat had already been preparing for the zero-dose agenda through its equity agenda under Gavi 4.0 which has crossed over to Gavi 5.0. He highlighted the importance of reaching zero-dose children now more than ever as the latest WHO UNICEF Estimates of National Immunisation Coverage (WUENIC) estimates have showed an increase in zero-dose children. The Secretariat has been focusing its efforts to ensure that its levers are well synched to place the zero-dose agenda in the heart of Health System Strengthening (HSS) and Targeted Country Assistance (TCA) support. He concluded by noting that countries are extremely stretched due to the COVID-19 pandemic; however, some countries such as Pakistan and Ethiopia have shown promising results, which would hopefully move the needle on advancing the zero-dose agenda.
- 5.4 Alex de Jonquières, Director, Health Systems & Immunisations Strengthening, outlined some key shifts and lessons learned from Gavi 4.0 which the Secretariat has built on in order to design and implement Gavi 5.0. He noted that the zero-dose agenda is a very measurable indicator of equity and can be operationalised in a deliberate way. Gavi is pivoting its investments and focus to be more targeted on the equity agenda. He also highlighted lessons learned from Gavi 4.0, including: i) building an overarching theory of change to ensure all the different levers come together and cascade into guidance and tools for countries and partners, ii) creating an Equity Accelerator Fund, and iii) building a robust and a deliberate learning agenda. He concluded by underlining the importance of undertaking evaluations at the right time in order to achieve maximum utility and success.
- 5.5 Gustavo Correa, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, outlined the key pillars of the zero-dose agenda learning agenda, including through: i) learning hubs to develop and prepare evidence at the country level for programmatic course correction and capacity building and enhancing the monitoring of Gavi grants, and ii) case studies to produce evidence in a retrospective nature. He noted that these components will feed into the centralised evaluation focused on Gavi funding levers.
- 5.6 The EAC was requested to: i) provide feedback on progress of the planned 5.0 centralised evaluations, and ii) provide guidance on the proposed delay to the evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities.

Discussion

- The EAC generally agreed with the proposed delay to the evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities. It was noted

that the COVID-19 pandemic has had multiple negative impacts on countries and health systems but may have increased awareness about vaccinations. The Strategic Advisory Group of Experts on Immunization (SAGE) working group on behavioural and social drivers for demand was referenced as a potential source for guidance to inform this evaluation.

- The Secretariat noted the EAC reflections on the multiple deprivations associated with zero-dose children, noting that finding these children would be instrumental in addressing these deprivations through a multisectoral approach. The Secretariat noted that US\$ 100 million have been set aside for cross-border community programming in addition to the US\$ 500 million Equity Accelerator Fund (EAF) given that these communities are constantly missed. The importance of sustainability in the context of generating and sustaining vaccine demand was highlighted.
- One EAC member noted that country contexts may not considerably change in the first quarter of 2022 given the evolving nature of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Secretariat acknowledged this important consideration but underlined that the sense of urgency must be sustained in order to prevent further impact on routine immunisation (RI), which could manifest in the form of outbreaks if not carefully managed in a timely manner.
- One EAC member noted that it would be important to have a refined theory of change for interventions to understand the factors that increase the probability of zero-dose children. Furthermore, considering the multiple agendas and players such as the Immunization Agenda 2030 and COVAX, it would be critical to have a careful design for this evaluation. The EAC could provide support to ensure the evaluation is well thought through and reflects the roles of multiple partners.

Decision One

The Evaluation Advisory Committee:

Approved the revised multi-year (2021-2025) centralised evaluation workplan attached as Annex A to Doc 05.

6. Interim progress update on COVAX evaluation

- 6.1 Laura Craw, Senior Programme Officer, Measurement & Strategic Information, provided introductory remarks related to the COVAX evaluation (Doc 06).
- 6.2 The EAC was requested to provide feedback on progress shared and guidance related to some of the challenges identified at this early stage of the evaluation.

Discussion

- EAC members noted the evolving nature of COVAX as an evaluation challenge and potential ways to respond to that, such as trying to track the changing theory

of change and key design discussions, retaining a flexible and dynamic approach within the evaluation design, and considering a real-time approach, potentially supported by an external resource.

- Another challenge to the COVAX evaluation will be the capacity of key stakeholders to engage. EAC members proposed that Gavi consider ways to address that, including putting resources against this to help them manage with evaluation requests.
- The importance of considering the unintended consequences in the way COVAX is rolling out, which is already in the RFP, was re-emphasised.
- EAC members also indicated it will be important to build in how decisions are being made and how stakeholders are participating, tracing power relationships, although this might be hard to implement in the current context.
- EAC members also considered it was important to use a country lens to understand how decisions are being made, how implementation is going, and who has access - and from that country view also shift to the citizen level. It was confirmed that the Secretariat considers the country lens as critical.
- In terms of engagement of key informants, it will be useful for evaluators to develop more flexible tools to get the information they need. There is no time for full interviews with some stakeholders, so it might be best to look to more web-based questionnaires that could provide insights but are more flexible.
- It will also be important to find out how synergies could be found across evaluations that are being conducted across this topic. The Secretariat clarified that one of the ways the Secretariat is trying to keep on top of this is through the OECD DAC COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition, where there is a Vaccines Working Group where those who wish to engage in this space are participating and cross-sharing evaluation plans and potential synergies.
- EAC members also raised the question of how to delineate COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC from the broader COVAX Pillar. COVAX AMC is an important part that needs to be evaluated, and should take lessons learned as relevant from the PCV AMC evaluation. The COVAX Facility on its own is something we need to learn from.
- EAC members also remarked that in addition to the questions that are possible to answer, it will be important to articulate the key questions that are not possible to answer.
- One EAC member suggested building in a question on vaccine demand and what happens if there is not sufficient demand in country.
- The Secretariat asked for EAC support in delivering the message to Gavi's Board and other stakeholders that this evaluation must occur and that it will require engagement despite people being stretched.

7. Expected EAC engagement in Gavi 5.0 evaluations

- 7.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning presented this item (Doc 07). She noted that the EAC was requested to discuss its engagement in Gavi 5.0 evaluations.
- 7.2 In her remarks, she highlighted that the objective of this session was to clarify EAC focal points for Q4 2021/Q1 2022 across the evaluations as far as is possible and to determine the level of engagement of focal points for the mid-term evaluation.
- 7.3 In relation to the COVAX Facility multistage evaluation, the EAC was requested to confirm whether the same secondees, Mira Johri and Juan Pablo Gutiérrez, would continue through all phases of the evaluation or whether new secondees would be appointed.
- 7.4 The EAC was requested to delegate authority to the EAC Chair to identify EAC focal points for centralised evaluations of strategic importance to the Board, on an as needed basis, drawing from the available pool of EAC members, prior to the next regular meeting.

Discussion

- EAC engagement in on-going centralised evaluations was discussed and the allocation of EAC focal points was agreed as follows (see Attachment 2):
 - i) Where already allocated as an evaluator, Rafael Vilasanjuan would need to be replaced as he rotates off the EAC on 31 December 2021. This concerns the evaluations of: i) Gavi's Engagement with the Private Sector, ii) Fragility, Emergencies, Refugees policy; and iii) Gavi's policy framework and funding levers.
 - ii) In relation to the COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC Multi-Stage Evaluation, it was confirmed that Mira Johri and Juan Pablo Gutiérrez would continue on all phases of the evaluation. James Hargreaves, Ezzeddine Mohsni and a new EAC member would be appointed as EAC focal points. On the Evaluability, Evaluation Design and Baseline Study, Zulfiqar Bhutta, Ezzeddine Mohsni and Jeanine Condo would like to have sight of the inception report but will not conduct a formal review given that Juan Pablo Gutiérrez and Mira Johri will be doing so as the designated EAC secondees on the Steering Committee.
 - iii) On Gavi's initial response to COVID-19, the EAC requested to be represented on the Steering Committee.
 - iv) In relation to the Evaluation of Gavi's policy framework and funding levers, the EAC agreed that Jeanine Condo and Rafael Vilasanjuan would be replaced by new EAC members once appointed. The EAC requested to be represented on the evaluation Steering Committee.
 - v) The EAC expressed interest in appointing more than three EAC focal points on the evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities in the future.
 - vi) The EAC agreed that James Hargreaves and Marta Nunes would formally replace Jeanine Condo and Rafael Vilasanjuan on the Mid-term evaluation of

Gavi 5.0 from January 2022 but would begin to engage immediately to enable continuity. Mira Johri would remain as one of the three EAC focal points.

- The EAC agreed to have high-level engagement on the Mid-term evaluation of Gavi 5.0 and requested to review the inception report.
- In relation to the proposed EAC representation on the evaluation SCs, it was agreed that the EAC representatives would be distinct from EAC focal points. EAC members were requested to express their interest to the Chair following the meeting by writing.
- The Secretariat highlighted the importance of carefully considering level of engagement and feasibility of operationalising the proposed policy amendment, as this would have implications on the EAC members workload.

Decision Two

The Evaluation Advisory Committee:

Delegated authority to the Chair of the Evaluation Advisory Committee to identify focal points for centralised evaluations of strategic importance to the Board, on an as needed basis, drawing from the available pool of EAC members, prior to the next regular EAC meeting.

8. Review of decisions

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

9. Closing remarks and any other business

- 9.1 The Chair thanked the EAC members for their active participation and for the positive and open discussions that led to agreement on the way forward to address challenging questions. He recognised the work of outgoing EAC members, namely Jeanine Condo, Rafael Vilasanjuan and Zulfiqar Bhutta and thanked them for their service and for their contribution to the EAC.
- 9.2 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)
- Zulfiqar Bhutta
- Jeanine Condo (day two)
- Rafael Vilasanjuan (day one)
- Juan Pablo Gutiérrez
- Mira Johri
- Ezzeddine Mohsni
- Marta Nunes

Regrets

- Viroj Tangcharoensathien

Secretariat

- Seth Berkley (item 2)
- Hope Johnson
- Brenda Killen
- Esther Saville
- Gilbert Asiimwe
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Laura Craw (item 6)
- Chris Taylor
- Jean Zampalegre
- Marie Thomazic
- Cristina Cimenti
- Nadine Abu-Sway
- Meegan Murray-Lopez

Attachment B - EAC engagement in centralised evaluations

Classified as Internal

EAC Engagement on On-going Centralised Evaluations

Evaluation	Steer. Co.	EAC Secondees	EAC Focal Points		
CCEOP Evaluation	Yes	Viroj Tangcharoensathien	James Hargreaves	Jeanine Condo	Mira Johri
Gavi's Engagement with the Private Sector	Yes	N/A	Marta Nunes	Zulfiqar Bhutta	Rafael Vilasanjuan*
Fragile, Emergencies, Refugees Evaluation	Yes	N/A	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	Rafael Vilasanjuan*
PCV AMC Outcome/Impact evaluation	Yes	N/A	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	Zulfiqar Bhutta
COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC Evaluability, Evaluation Design and Baseline Study	Yes	Juan Pablo Gutierrez Mira Johri	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Jeanine Condo* (James Hargreaves as of 2022)	Zulfiqar Bhutta* (new EAC member as of 2022)

1

Evaluation Advisory Committee
29-30 September 2021

Classified as Internal

EAC Engagement on Planned Centralised Evaluations

COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC - Multi					
's					
's					
's					

2

Evaluati