

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

30-31 March 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 14.00 Geneva time on 30 March 2022. James Hargreaves, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed new EAC members, namely: Penny Hawkins, David Hotchkiss, Bvudzai Magadzire, Adolfo Martinez Valle, Justice Nonvignon, and Malabika Sarker.
- 1.3 He noted that that no regrets had been shared ahead of the meeting, and that one EAC member, Penny Hawkins would be participating virtually for the full meeting.
- 1.4 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a in the Committee pack). Dr Hargreaves flagged a number of conflicts that had been previously declared but not included in his annual declaration for 2022, including funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the United Kingdom Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO), and the Wellcome Trust, and collaboration with ITAD (unrelated to immunisation). Mira Johri declared organisational conflicts of interest with the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI).
- 1.5 The minutes of the 29-30 September 2021 meeting and 26 November 2021 meeting were tabled to the Committee for information (Docs 01b in the Committee pack). The minutes had been circulated and approved by no-objection on 10 December 2021 and on 16 March 2022, respectively.
- 1.6 The Chair also referred to the EAC action sheet (Doc 01c), noting that the two actions it contained had been followed up.
- 1.7 The Chair referred to consultations he had held with Helen Rees, Chair of the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC), and expressed ongoing interest for strengthened coordination between the PPC and the EAC. He also noted that the Gavi Board Chair had offered the possibility of having a side session on evaluation at the next Board meeting in 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. Looking back at Gavi 4.0 centralised evaluations

- 2.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning presented this item (Doc 02) on the Secretariat's approaches to addressing challenges identified in Gavi 4.0 in relation to credibility, utility and independence of Gavi's centralised evaluations.
- 2.2 She provided high-level updates on a number of evaluations including of the Fragility, Emergencies, Refugees (FER) Policy, the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP), and the Pneumococcal Conjugate Vaccine (PCV) Advance Market Commitment (AMC).
- 2.3 The EAC was requested to provide guidance on the proposed approaches to addressing challenges in Gavi 5.0 centralised evaluations as set out in the paper.

Discussion

- One EAC member underlined the interlinkage between the independence of evaluations and credibility, and, using the example of the recently completed FER Policy evaluation, highlighted the need to look at the counterfactual. The Secretariat acknowledged the importance of these elements noting that it is exploring different approaches and methodologies for evaluations, including by endeavouring to build longer preparation periods and conduct upfront work in terms of documentation.
- One EAC member noted that the work of the Measurement Evaluation & Learning (MEL) team should have better visibility and should be shared with relevant fora, such as the National Immunisation Technical Advisory Groups (NITAGs) and the WHO Strategic Advisory Group of Experts on Immunization (SAGE), to enhance the utility of its work. The Secretariat acknowledged the importance of this utility aspect and noted that COVID-19 has hindered engagements that were previously conducted with such bodies.
- EAC members commented on the need to expand the pool of service providers for Gavi 5.0, and proposed some means of doing so, including requiring applications from consortia, which would also potentially strengthen methodological expertise. The Secretariat noted the ongoing work to expand the pool and highlighted the following:
 - i) Existing constraints related to the strict Gavi procurement processes and selection criteria as well as the limited capacity of the MEL team;
 - ii) Focus on partnerships in countries such as the engagement with the African Center for Policy Health Research amongst others;
 - iii) In relation to applications, it was clarified that Requests for Proposals (RFPs) are all posted on Gavi's website and are circulated by email to 300+ organisations and through evaluation networks;
 - iv) It was noted that webinars to brief targeted organisations have been used to strengthen visibility, for example, for Learning Hub countries to discuss the RFP and process and this could be considered for evaluations where there is a strong country component, like for the Zero-Dose evaluation;

- v) There are ongoing efforts to investigate barriers to being shortlisted or winning the bid, of which a summary would be shared with the EAC before the next meeting; and
 - vi) The desire to explore opportunities to work with organisations in countries through the learning hubs.
- On methodology, one EAC member proposed that the EAC review inception reports which would provide an opportunity for feedback on the methods component. The Secretariat also noted on methodology that one must consider the evolution of programme design from Gavi 4.0 to Gavi 5.0. Under Gavi 5.0 there is a growing need for technical guidance from the MEL department in helping teams build through their theories of change and obtaining a better understanding of the measurement framework, learning agenda and key priorities.
 - In relation to data limitations preventing evaluation questions from being addressed, the Secretariat clarified that it is endeavouring to address this challenge under Gavi 5.0 through multiple approaches including: evaluability assessments, longer RFP development phase, and assessing data availability and feasibility of answering evaluation questions.
 - The EAC discussed its role as a Committee in following-through on evaluation outcomes and its reporting line to the Board. The Secretariat referred to the evaluation management response, where follow-up actions are documented. Discussions with the Gavi Executive Office have taken place to ensure that a system will be put in place for a follow-up process between the Executive Office and the key stakeholders implicated in actions emerging from the evaluation.
 - In relation to the utility of evaluations, the Secretariat noted that the MEL team has internal tools to track findings of evaluations and how they inform policies, such as the funding policy review which was presented to the Board for decision. It was highlighted that some evaluation recommendations may take time to be implemented, which could lead to missed opportunities in capturing examples of evaluation utility.
 - One EAC member asked whether there is a process in place to ensure that there are funds to implement recommendations made by an evaluation. The Secretariat referred to co-creation workshops where key stakeholders are brought to the discussion table with the evaluators who present their findings. During these workshops, a set of actionable and feasible recommendations are then agreed with the implementers. Actions are then agreed by key stakeholders in the Evaluation Management Response (EMR). The Secretariat also mentioned that evaluation evidence is shared with the PPC for specific agenda items and in an annual update and with the Independent Review Committee (IRC) to inform their decision-making processes on country grants.
 - One EAC member highlighted the important role that the national research and evaluation organisations can play in bringing visibility to evaluations. The Secretariat referred to a positive experience in Uganda whereby the local national institutions played an important role in terms of the dissemination events at country levels.

- In relation to the link between evaluation and learning, the Secretariat noted that the EAC's early input on the Gavi 5.0 Theory of Change (ToC) has translated into evaluation questions creating a link between evaluation and learning.
- One EAC member suggested that designing impact evaluations might be a means to generate stronger interest in Gavi's evaluation work.
- With respect to planning for a review of Gavi's evaluation function, as captured as a responsibility in the EAC Terms of Reference, the Secretariat reiterated the importance of having clarity on timelines and what would make most sense in terms having such discussions with the Board, which would need to be built into MEL work planning in order to be able to implement the process and action decisions.
- The Chair concluded by underlining the Committee's appetite to further consider conducting a review of the evaluation function given that the last review dates to 2018 and that this topic would come to the next EAC meeting. He also noted that there was enthusiasm from the EAC to move forward on the proposed side session on evaluation at the June 2022 Board meeting.

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 ongoing commissioned evaluations (Doc 03).
- 3.2 The EAC was requested to: i) provide guidance on progress of the planned Gavi 5.0 centralised evaluations, including the proposed delay to the evaluation of the operationalisation of Gavi's Strategy through Gavi's Policies, Programmatic Guidance and Use of Funding Levers, and ii) approve the revised multi-year (2021-2025) centralised evaluation workplan.

Discussion

- The EAC provided guidance on two Gavi 5.0 evaluations that are in early stages:
 - i) **Mid-Term Evaluation.** For this evaluation, James Hargreaves, Mira Johri, Bvudzai Magadzire, and Marta Nunes were EAC focal points. They commented that:
 - a. the Terms of Reference (ToR) had been slightly confusing because of the overlap with other evaluations;
 - b. the central evaluation questions were opaque enough to potentially deter applicants. The Secretariat clarified that the questions were on the impact of COVID-19 and on Gavi 5.0 operationalisation, how Gavi progressed with 5.0 operationalisation, and if progress is not as expected, what does that mean for performance; and
 - c. the requirement of 3% related to sustainability was unclear and not helpful, and some of the non-technical language was very Gavi specific

(e.g. 'utilisation,' 'theory of action') and might limit participation. The Secretariat will take this guidance back to Procurement.

- ii) **Zero-Dose Evaluation.** For this evaluation, the following EAC members are engaged as EAC focal points: Juan Pablo Gutiérrez, Mira Johri, Adolfo Martinez Valle, Ezzeddine Mohsni, and Malabika Sarker. It was clarified that there will not be a Steering Committee for this evaluation and important to further discuss EAC engagement. EAC members advised:
- a. That it will be important to seek linkages with learning work;
 - b. That COVID-19 impact should be considered – and that it is good that this evaluation is starting early to be proactive about identifying lessons learned and that it is running through mid-2024; and
 - c. That it might be worth considering accepting applications in French or other languages.
- EAC members also provided guidance related to the **Evaluation of the operationalisation of Gavi's Strategy through Gavi's Policies, Programmatic Guidance and Use of Funding Levers.** EAC members did not have any specific comments on the delay to the start of the evaluation.
 - One EAC member asked about the malaria vaccine programme, which was recently approved by the Board, and whether to already begin planning for an evaluation of that programme. It was clarified that US\$ 10 million had been approved as part of that decision for a set of activities for learning. As there will be limited doses in the first years, it is more likely to be a Gavi 6.0 evaluation and could be designed as an impact evaluation. The MEL team is managing the pilots with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and UNITAID and those studies are ongoing. It was also suggested that MEL try to link with World Health Organization who are managing allocation to see if there are any evaluations planned. It was proposed to have a follow-up discussion on this at a future EAC meeting to allow for Gavi 6.0 planning.
 - With respect to how evaluation questions are developed on some of the investments Gavi has been making for digital approaches, it was clarified that the new Gavi innovation strategy will be going to the June 2022 Board and Board members can bring that into those discussions.
 - One EAC member requested more information on the learning agendas that have been put in place and it was suggested to circulate the learning agendas/questions included in Board decisions.
 - The EAC also discussed preparation for the proposed side session with the Board in June 2022 and how to use that opportunity. EAC members suggested that James lead this with Bvudzai Magadzire and Marta Nunes who are Board members. It was proposed to focus on the Gavi 5.0 evaluations that are commencing shortly, particularly the Mid Term Evaluation.

Decision one

The Evaluation Advisory Committee:

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

4. Update on COVID-19 Evaluation

- 4.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 04). She explained that the purpose of the presentation is to provide an update on the evaluation of Gavi's initial response to COVID-19 and to seek EAC feedback on progress and guidance related to challenges identified at the inception stage of the evaluation.
- 4.2 Tim Shorten, Evaluation Team Lead, Euro Health Group (EHG), provided introductory remarks on the context of this evaluation. He outlined the temporal and geographical scopes and noted that the primary purpose of this evaluation is to feed into the Mid-Term Evaluation of Gavi 5.0, and to provide learning.
- 4.3 Mr Shorten gave an overview of the evaluation design and its methodological aspects. He emphasised that the approach is underpinned by the focus on utility which is an area where EAC input would be welcome. He presented the evaluation questions, the data collection methods and analytical methods.
- 4.4 He concluded by highlighting key questions on: i) striking a balance and expectation of different stake-holders groups, ii) linkages with other initiatives, and iii) the role of EAC in supporting engagement by stakeholder groups with this evaluation.

Discussion

- In relation to measuring effectiveness of interventions, the presenter noted that this was highlighted as a challenge in the inception report and following consultation, the decision had been taken to focus on contribution analysis on the level of outputs rather than on outcomes. In responding to an enquiry on the evaluation timeframe, the presenter clarified that the evaluation is timed to provide a strong evidence-based foundation to feed into the mid-term review scheduled for Q3 and Q4 of 2022. The question of how complete the data will be at this stage was identified in the inception report and is an important point to continue monitoring.
- On the key informant interviews and country selection, the presenter clarified that at this stage it is not planned to include other country representatives within the 60 global interviews that will be conducted, but indicated this would be kept under consideration

- With respect to the case study selection criteria, the presenter highlighted that substantial consultations had taken place with the Secretariat to understand the constraints, challenges, and opportunities.
- On the case study selection criteria, it was further clarified that the evaluators primarily started with a set of technically focused criteria and assessed the extent of COVID-19 impact at that particular point in time. Other criteria include: i) uptake of flexibilities, ii) Routine Immunisation (RI) data across countries through WHO/UNICEF Estimates of National Immunization Coverage (WUENIC) data, iii) Gavi Secretariat country segmentation of conflict, high impact and core countries, and iv) feasibility based on ongoing and planned in-country activities such as programme audits and availability of stakeholders to engage in the evaluation process. On the generalisability of results from the countries that were selected, it was clarified that the evaluators will be looking to understand the context and identify the drivers behind the changes and results that have been observed.
- In responding to an enquiry on the consideration to conduct a value for money analysis, the presenter clarified that this had been initially proposed within the inception report but following discussion with the Steering Committee it was decided that the evaluators would look into efficiency, effectiveness and equity without undertaking a cost benefit analysis.
- One EAC member asked about comparators, and it was clarified that comparative studies and list of organisations will be discussed and selected with the Centralised Evaluation Team and potentially with the Steering Committee in May.
- In relation to the theory of change versus the theory of action, the presenter clarified that the purpose is not to delink those but rather put more emphasis on the theory of action and the rationale behind the flexibilities and the interventions that Gavi funded, with the aim to understand what is expected to be achieved, the problems that are being addressed, and finally the implementation and follow-through.
- On creating linkages with other work, the presenter confirmed that the evaluators aim to use existing data sources, for example the WHO pulse surveys that are co-funded by Gavi, as well as collaborate with other initiatives, if and when relevant.
- In relation to workstream 3, the presenter clarified that WUENIC data will be one of the indicators to measure effectiveness and equity of results. However recognising the time lag and other limitations, the evaluators will be looking at a set of proxy indicators for indications of COVID-19 impact on outbreaks and stock outs amongst others.
- One EAC member highlighted that the Board decision to allow countries to use flexibilities had to be taken quickly given the emergency context, which makes it critical for the Board to assess if the right decision was taken in this regard.
- The Secretariat concluded by explaining next steps which include reviewing preliminary findings expected in June 2022.

- To conclude, the EAC Chair summarised the most important matters raised by the EAC that will need ongoing consideration by the evaluators, the Centralised Evaluation Team and the Steering Committee, including on: i) how will the effectiveness of COVID-19 mitigations undertaken by Gavi be evaluated so as to maximise the utility of the evaluation for the Board, including the justification of particular design choices such as country selection, and the analysis of quantitative data; ii) how to maximise the visibility and usefulness of this evaluation to the PPC and the Board, and the suggestion this should be part of the June side session.

5. Update on COVAX Evaluation

- 5.1 Laura Craw, Senior Programme Officer, Measurement & Strategic Information, provided opening remarks about the multi-stage evaluation of the COVAX Facility and COVAX Advance Market Commitment (AMC) (Doc 05).
- 5.2 Matthew Cooper, Deputy Team Lead, Itad, presented an overview of the approach to the formative review and baseline study and summarized the methodological approach.
- 5.3 Sam McPherson, Partner & Project Director, Itad, presented on risks related to the evaluation and proposed mitigation measures.
- 5.4 Pippa Page, Project Manager, Itad, summarised the key milestones for the evaluation.

Discussion

- The EAC was reminded that the Steering Committee members for this evaluation are Mira Johri and Justice Nonvignon, and the EAC focal points are Penny Hawkins, David Hotchkiss, and Adolfo Martinez Valle.
- The EAC provided feedback on progress and the technical approach for the Formative and Baseline Review phase, as well as guidance related to some of the risks and challenges identified.
- EAC members provided guidance related to methodology, namely on i) the need to make clear the rationale for the design, which has elements of both developmental and realist evaluation design; ii) the flexibility of approach that has been necessary to date as the situation has evolved, but the need for the approach to be finalised at a timepoint soon; iii) the need to engage with EHG and find complementarities (e.g. on country case studies) on the COVID-19 evaluation, which was confirmed had already begun; and iv) the importance of using quantitative data in the evaluation to address key evaluation questions.
- EAC members also asked for clarification on: i) the selection criteria for countries, which is currently under discussion; and ii) the rapid review component of the

evaluation, which is intended to generate learning quickly against specific part of the Theory of Change (ToC).

- One EAC member raised an issue of appropriate engagement and independence around Itad's ongoing involvement from the evaluability study to this phase. This two-phase approach was discussed and agreed with the EAC for the launch of the initial RFP, and benefits were seen to outweigh the risks in relation to this evaluation. EAC members noted that it will be a challenge to balance accountability and learning and independence. The presenters clarified that any subsequent work would be contracted separately. They have mitigated to some extent with the addition of a new Team Lead for this phase.
- It was highlighted that independence will be particularly challenging on this evaluation given all the partners who are involved in this space.
- One EAC member asked about the wider universe of learning around COVAX and how this evaluation fits within those. It was clarified that the appetite for learning around COVID-19 and COVAX is impressive. A few pieces of work happening outside the COVAX evaluation were highlighted, namely, i) the MEL team's landscaping work, using the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Coalition to understand other evaluation and learning exercises and to try to connect and understand complementarities; ii) the MEL team's work to provide learnings related to the COVAX humanitarian buffer that was requested by the PPC.
- In terms of utility, it was suggested that where relevant, the findings from this evaluation could feed into a broader synthesis across COVAX-related evaluations.
- One EAC member reflected that it might be useful to bring this evaluation to the June side session.

6. Enhancing the visibility and voice of the Evaluation Advisory Committee

- 6.1 James Hargreaves, EAC Chair, provided an introduction to the topic of voice and visibility of the EAC (Doc 06). He presented a set of ideas for potential actions to strengthen the EAC's visibility and voice that had come out of the closed session discussion on day one.

Discussion

- Several of the ideas presented could be implemented immediately, including:
 - Organising EAC pre-meetings by evaluation for EAC Focal Points and EAC members on Steering Committees (SC) (where relevant);
 - Applying a "Group" based approach to each evaluation, i.e. EAC members on Steering Committees (where assigned) and EAC Focal Points;
 - Seeking EAC input on EAC agendas;
 - Consolidating guidance more formally in meetings;
 - Inviting guests to EAC meetings;
 - Having EAC members contribute to Evaluation dissemination sessions; and

- Organising technical briefings / Board session, with PPC / Board members involved.
- Other ideas discussed appeared to require changes to the governing documents for the EAC or other governance bodies so would require further consideration, including:
 - Adding an EAC Vice chair;
 - Inviting a PPC member to be on / represent EAC;
 - Having an EAC PCC representative; and
 - Targeted approaches to recruiting new EAC members.
- EAC members were supportive of the idea of developing ‘position papers’ on the condition that there would be utility to them. As a first step, EAC members were supportive of more formally consolidating their guidance during upcoming EAC meetings, which could be used for subsequent PPC or Board meeting materials.
- Other ideas presented included:
 - Co-writing articles;
 - Strengthening links with TERG, other groups;
 - Supporting EAC Board Reps;
 - Facilitating EAC sight of / input to documents for PPC; and
 - Using / creating opportunities to address Board.
- The EAC also noted that it would be important to clarify and optimise the links between centralised evaluations and broader MEL.
- Two new EAC members who were attending their first EAC meeting indicated that they had not yet felt prepared to contribute to some of the discussions, despite the induction session and review of preparatory materials, and welcomed the opportunities to align ahead of upcoming meetings.
- It was also highlighted by one EAC member that the new structure of Steering Committee members and EAC focal points means that EAC members are spread too thin and that this should be considered from a risk perspective.
- One EAC member asked for detail about the composition of the Tender Evaluation Committees that review evaluation proposals, and it was clarified that independent experts can be included if needed.
- One EAC member asked other members what a successful EAC would look like and suggested that in an upcoming pre-meeting, the members could do their own theory of change for the EAC.

7. Operationalising the revision to the Gavi Evaluation Policy and enhanced EAC engagement

- 7.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, presented this item (Doc 07). She recalled that during its meeting on 23 November 2021, the EAC had approved a

revision to the Gavi Evaluation Policy to enable EAC members to participate in Steering Committees (SCs). She explained that clarification on how this change will be operationalised was requested by the EAC in relation to the role and reporting structure for EAC members sitting on SCs, and the implications on current evaluations. The EAC was requested to provide guidance on the proposed approach to operationalising this change in 2022.

Discussion

- The EAC supported the proposed changes to the template ToRs for evaluation Steering Committees.
- In relation to the EAC guidance on the proposed enhanced engagement on 5.0 centralised evaluations as set out in Annex B, the Secretariat presented high-level milestones and roles for EAC SC members and focal points, and provided a detailed example of what would this mean in practice for the Mid-Term Evaluation of Gavi 5.0 and the zero-dose evaluation highlighting the importance of an enhanced engagement with the EAC on these particular evaluations, given the high interest associated with there, the strategic importance and that there is not a Steering Committee in place for either evaluation.
- One EAC member noted that it would be helpful to have extra touch points with the Secretariat as necessary, particularly during the procurement and contracting phase.
- The Secretariat noted the request to include the dates of the PPC meetings in the evaluation timelines as well as to share a broad schedule with estimated timelines with the EAC for planning purposes.
- In relation to EAC focal points reviewing inception reports, the following was discussed:
 - The Secretariat noted a request to engage with the EAC members before the inception report is written and clarified that the EAC feeds into the development of the ToR stage which is also an opportunity for the EAC to engage;
 - The Chair advised the EAC to review the inception reports whenever possible particularly for evaluations that do not have Steering Committees;
 - The EAC focal points will be sent the inception reports with the option to review if they have capacity, thereby allowing for EAC members to have sight of the reports; and
 - In relation to the evaluation of Operationalisation of Gavi's Strategy through Gavi's Policies, Programmatic Guidance and Use of Funding Levers, it was agreed that the EAC focal points would decide whether to review the inception report or not when the evaluation comes up since it is the only evaluation which has an SC in 2022.

8. EAC engagement in Gavi 5.0 evaluations

- 8.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning presented this item (Doc 08). She noted that the EAC was requested to discuss its engagement in Gavi 5.0 evaluations and noted that the objective of this session was to agree on the allocation of EAC focal points who will provide quality assurance for each of the Gavi 5.0 centralised evaluations, as well as to agree on the allocation of EAC members to SCs for the Gavi 5.0 centralised evaluations, where relevant.

Discussion

- The EAC engagement in on-going centralised evaluations was discussed and the allocation of EAC focal points was agreed as set out in Attachment B to these minutes.

9. Review of decisions

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

10. Closing remarks and any other business

- 10.1 The EAC noted that it would be useful to capture guidance or recommendation statements that are beyond the official decision points in the minutes for follow-up purposes.
- 10.2 The Chair noted that series of questions surfaced during the EAC induction session which could warrant further discussion in the context of upcoming evaluations including: i) Theories of Change and how they interlink; ii) How economic evaluation fits in and value for money; iii) Involving local research institutions in evaluations; and iv) How evaluations fit in the broader MEL agenda.
- 10.3 One EAC member highlighted the critical situation in Myanmar and expressed interest in working with partners and UNICEF to ensure assistance is provided to people in the country.
- 10.4 In her concluding remarks, Dr Hope Johnson, Director of Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning noted that that EAC feedback is critical for the Evaluation unit. She clarified that on the issue related to economic analysis and value for money, Gavi uses the cost per death averted, which is of high importance for the Board. She also referred to the evaluation management response that provides responses on how to follow up and how to action evaluations that could create better visibility and linkages with the PPC. It was agreed that the use of EMRs is worth a more careful look by the EAC as this touches on the utility of evaluations.

- 10.5 The EAC Chair reported that during the closed session the EAC discussed the possibility to recruit two additional members. The EAC wishes to move forward with this recruitment and discussed that profiles be sought with top-level experience in immunisation, experience in humanitarian settings, and deep qualitative methodology, while considering gender balance and balance between members from Gavi-eligible countries.
- 10.6 The EAC Chair thanked the EAC and noted the date of the next meeting on 21-22 September 2022. He underlined the desire to have continuous conversations among the Committee and with the Secretariat.
- 10.7 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 (virtual)
- David Hotchkiss
- Mira Johri
- Bvudzai Magadzire
- Adolfo Martinez Valle
- Ezzeddine Mohsni
- Justice Nonvignon
- Marta Nunes
- Malabika Sarker
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien

Guests

- Tim Shorten, EHG (virtual)
- Giada Tu Thanh, EHG (virtual)
- Michel Gross, EHG (virtual)
- Matt Cooper, Itad (virtual)
- Pippa Page, Itad (virtual)
- Sam McPherson, Itad (virtual)

Secretariat

- Hope Johnson
- Brenda Killen (items 1-2)
- Esther Saville
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Gilbert Asiimwe (virtual)
- Jean Zampalegre (virtual)
- Anders Amaechi (virtual)
- Leslie Moreland (item 4 and 5)
- Katja Schemionek (item 4) (virtual)
- Colette Selman (item 4)(virtual)
- Laura Craw (item 5)
- Sanne Wendes (item 5)(virtual)
- Quentin Guillon (item 5)(virtual)
- Nadine Abu-Sway
- Cristina Cimenti
- Meegan Murray-Lopez

Attachment B

EAC engagement in centralised evaluations

EAC Engagement in Gavi 5.0 Evaluations – Agreed Allocation

Evaluation	Steering Committee	EAC Steering Committee members	EAC Focal Points		
COVAX Facility and COVAXAMC - Multi-stage Evaluation	Yes	Mira Johri Justice Nonvignon	David Hotchkiss	Adolfo Martinez	Penny Hawkins
Gavi's initial response to COVID- 19	Yes	Juan Pablo Gutierrez Bvudzai Magadzire	Justice Nonvignon	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Viroj Tangcharoensathien
Evaluation of Gavi's policy framework and funding levers	Yes	David Hotchkiss Penny Hawkins	Malabika Sarker	Marta Nunes	Juan Pablo Gutierrez
Evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities	No	N/A	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	Mira Johri Adolfo Martinez	Ezzeddine Mohsni Malabika Sarker
Mid-term evaluation of Gavi 5.0	No	N/A	Mira Johri	Marta Nunes	James Hargreaves Bvudzai Magadzire

Evaluation Advisory Committee
30-31 March 2022

The Vaccine Alliance