

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

4-5 October 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 14.30 Geneva time on 4 October 2023. James Hargreaves, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair indicated that Michael Kent Ranson, Alternate Board member (World Bank) and Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) member, would join the meeting to make the link between the EAC and the PPC.
- 1.3 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a in the Committee pack). Several EAC members indicated that there were additional interests or adjustments to be included for the 2023 filing and these were noted by the Secretariat.
- 1.4 The minutes of the 22-23 March 2023 meeting were tabled to the Committee for information (Doc 01b in the Committee pack). The minutes had been circulated and approved by no-objection on 24 May 2023.
- 1.5 The Chair briefed the EAC on his activities since the EAC last met, including the EAC Chair's Report he provided to the Board in June; his participation in an interview with the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN); and his participation in a consultation, briefing and interview with the Future of Global Health Initiative (FGHI).
- 1.6 The Chair noted that in the spirit of innovation and due to an exceptionally compressed schedule, supplier presentations had been pre-recorded and circulated to the EAC ahead of the meeting.
- 1.7 The Chair also stated that the EAC would be implementing some of the ways of working that had been trialed last autumn including presenting the Secretariat with more formalised guidance throughout the meeting.
- 1.8 The Chair noted that today's meeting had begun with a closed session that was largely focused on the recruitment process to identify new EAC members. He stated that Juan Pablo Gutiérrez and Malabika Sarker had volunteered to join him on the recruitment sub-committee.
- 1.9 Michael Kent Ranson provided a summary of the deliberations at the last PPC meeting held on 16-17 May 2023, including on: i) Strategy, Programmes and Partnerships; ii) the Hexavalent Investment Case; iii) COVAX update and Gavi's

role in a future COVID-19 Vaccine Programme; and iv) Vaccine Investment Strategy 2024.

- 1.10 Mr Ranson emphasised that there was a strong demand for evaluations at the PPC relating to Graduated Countries and the impact on new Middle-Income Countries (MIC) Approach, including examining how to prevent backsliding.

2. Update from the Office of the CEO

- 2.1 David Marlow, Chief Executive Officer (Interim), provided the EAC with an update on several important topics including: the One Gavi Approach (and how this is reflected in the new Senior Leadership Team (SLT)); Gavi's key priorities; and Gavi's performance measurement analysis. He also provided an overview of evaluations and reviews and noted key dates for the remainder of 2023.
- 2.2 Mr Marlow emphasised the key areas of focus for him as CEO, including leading new ways of working to create a more effective and empowered SLT. He reemphasised his commitment to Gavi's Operational Excellence journey and focus on four critical areas: i) the balanced scorecard; ii) organisational improvement and strategic workforce planning; iii) culture transformation; and iv) data & analytics.
- 2.3 He reiterated the Alliance's focus on three core priorities: delivering on Gavi 5.1, developing an ambitious strategy for Gavi 6.0, which will include deliberate engagement with countries at Ministerial and technical levels, and securing a successful replenishment.
- 2.4 He highlighted external stakeholder engagement and updated the EAC on activities throughout September 2023, including Gavi's high-level mission to Nigeria and engagement at UN General Assembly (UNGA) in New York.
- 2.5 Mr Marlow provided a summary of on-going and completed centralised evaluations and reiterated the importance of evaluations and the role of the EAC. He also noted that there was an opportunity to consider a more holistic and streamlined approach to evaluations for Gavi 6.0.
- 2.6 Finally, he concluded by providing an overview of the upcoming governance cycle, observing key meetings and highlighted the final Board Meeting of 2023 taking place in Ghana in December.

Discussion

- EAC members queried how Gavi can examine country-level impact effectively. It was also discussed that if the scope of the evaluations is to include analysing impact, the capacity and breadth of the Centralised Evaluation Team may need to be expanded.

- EAC members noted the point on the potential to streamline evaluations and rethink evaluations under Gavi 6.0. It was also acknowledged that ‘evaluation fatigue’ should not overshadow the necessity of evaluations in providing crucial data that informs Gavi’s strategic approach.
- One EAC Member questioned the impact that delayed grants may be having on evaluations and countries. Mr Marlow detailed the effort by Gavi to accelerate the review of grants by the Independent Review Committee. He also highlighted the burden that grant processes put on countries and noted that this was a broader issue that should be examined.

3. Work planning 1: Evaluation Workplan Update

- 3.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning introduced this item (Doc 03). She asked the EAC for guidance on: i) the progress of the Zero-Dose evaluation; ii) the challenges related to implementation of the Gavi 5.0/5.1 evaluation workplan; and iii) how the centralised evaluation content in the Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning (MEL) update to the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) could be strengthened in the future. She also requested that EAC members take note of completed and ongoing decentralised evaluations.
- 3.2 Anders Amaechi, Programme Officer, Evaluation, also provided introductory comments on the Zero-Dose Evaluation. He noted that the interim report on the Zero-Dose evaluation from Ipsos had been received and highlighted that there were evidence gaps including incorporating country voices from the country case studies. These gaps will be addressed in the next draft of the report. Finally, he noted that the Secretariat was continuing to work with Ipsos to derive more value from the data for the next iteration of the report.
- 3.3 Elaborating on their pre-recorded presentation, Louisiana Lush and Will Attfield, evaluators from Ipsos, provided additional insights on the Zero-Dose evaluation.

Discussion

- Several EAC members asked for methodological clarifications on the qualitative and quantitative approaches undertaken. The evaluators clarified that the data collection process had been guided by budgetary limitations, the scope of the study, as well as the range of participants with the appropriate level of seniority.
- EAC members discussed in detail the interview process for the country case studies, and questioned how participants were recruited, how background information was shared with these participants in advance, and the limitations and consequences of the short duration of some interviews in relation to data quality.
- The evaluators highlighted that participants were identified in collaboration with Centralised Evaluation Team (CET), were provided with relevant

background/briefing in advance and that additional key informants (KIs) were identified through snowballing from this initial purposeful sample.

- Several EAC members queried how secondary data was being used and analysed to sufficiently answer the question of Gavi's impact on zero-dose. The evaluators noted that a vast amount of secondary data was currently being analysed by the evaluators to understand this better, e.g. from the WHO/UNICEF Estimates of National Immunization Coverage (WUENIC); Monitoring and Performance Management (MPM) data maintained by the Country Programmes Delivery department; and from the Zero-Dose Learning Hubs.
- The diversity of the countries within the study was also highlighted by EAC members. The EAC encouraged the evaluators to include specific country-level analysis in addition to comparative analysis.
- EAC members queried the focus on the left side of the theory of change (TOC) instead of the right-hand side (impact) by the evaluators and how the evaluators will analyse the contribution of Gavi grants in Gavi 4.0. It was highlighted by the evaluators that the focus on the left side of the ToC observed that this was due to Gavi being a grant making organisation as opposed to an implementation organisation. As such assessing outcomes and contributions of Gavi 4.0 grants at the individual country level has proved challenging since the majority of Gavi grant resources were used for procurement of vaccines and associated products and therefore not captured by country-level data. They emphasised that the evaluation will move further towards the right of the ToC in Phase 2.
- The evaluators also mentioned they will work within the constraints of limited data on implementation of Gavi 4.0 grants and use the rich qualitative insights and country-level data gathered through Phase 1 of the Zero-Dose evaluation to explore the contribution of Gavi grants in Gavi 4.0.
- The evaluators also noted that Ipsos will examine how future evaluations can target interview participants more effectively, including capturing missing voices.
- One participant noted that there is interest at the PPC and Board level regarding the impact of interventions, and as noted by the FGHI report, whether zero-dose interventions proved to be the pathfinders that it was theorised they would be, i.e. whether they open the door to other primary health care (PHC) initiatives.
- The Chair also highlighted a piece of guidance from the last EAC meeting which was the EAC's request to link the evaluation to the Zero-Dose Learning Agenda.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

In future stages of the Zero-Dose evaluation and future evaluations, full consideration should be given, from RFP and resourcing through design and planning stages to analysis and reporting, to:

- Ensuring sufficient coverage and breadth of country-level perspectives through transparent data collection processes and assessment of data strength;
- Ensuring full value is gained from prior and ongoing research, evaluation, and learning activities (e.g. Zero-Dose Learning Hub);
- Ensuring that Evaluation Questions, findings, lessons, and recommendations are prioritised and justified to achieve maximum utility; and
- Clarifying how contribution analysis will be done to assess Gavi’s contribution to Zero-Dose.

4. Update on the Strategy Operationalisation Evaluation

- 4.1 Anders Amaechi, Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 04).
- 4.2 Following up on EHG’s pre-recorded presentation, Michelle Gross and Jenna Bates, evaluators from EHG, provided additional insights on the Strategy Operationalisation Evaluation (StratOps).
- 4.3 Penny Hawkins provided feedback on behalf of the EAC focal points, including: i) the importance of transparency and having access to the full methodology; ii) the need to consider evaluation fatigue and the need to look at the benefits and costs of having the evaluation running concurrently with other activities; iii) the need to ensure the roles and expectations of EAC members who are focal points versus sitting as members of the Steering Committee is clear; and iv) as a general point related to the scope of theory-based evaluations and being explicit about where the focus of the evaluation is and why in relation to the ToC.

Discussion

- Given that in recent reports there has been some question about how claims are supported by the data gathered, EAC members discussed the need to be clearer about the link between the methodology and data and how this is captured in the findings.
- With respect to fatigue, the EAC noted the ongoing challenge in getting country-level responses to interviews and that this had already been flagged as a concern on past evaluations. The Secretariat clarified that this matter had been addressed in the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the COVAX evaluation (Phase 2) by requesting bidders to be clear about their ability to engage in specific countries.
- On the role of the EAC members participating in the Steering Committee, it was further discussed that the enhanced EAC engagement had been beneficial; however, it was suggested that it might be useful to have more linkage between the Steering Committee and the evaluation supplier.

- One meeting participant from the Secretariat noted: i) that the current evaluations seem to have slightly overlapping scope; and ii) that the Secretariat is having to invest a great amount of effort and time to review draft reports and correct inaccuracies. It was suggested that evaluations should be more tightly scoped and sequenced to prevent fatigue from Secretariat reviewers.
- The EAC discussed the importance of keeping this lens for discussions on what remains in the Gavi 5.1 workplan and for the planning for Gavi 6.0.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- The EAC requested that in planning, scoping and sequencing the evaluation workplan for Gavi 6.0, a strategy is developed to minimise the burden on all stakeholders; and
- EAC requested more transparency with respect to how data and methodology are linked to findings and recommendations included in all evaluation reports.

5. Update on the Mid-Term Evaluation

- 5.1 Abdallah Bchir, Senior Evaluation Consultant, introduced this item (Doc 05).
- 5.2 Following up on their pre-recorded presentation, Tim Shorten and Julian Schweitzer, evaluators from Euro Health Group (EHG), provided additional insights on the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE).
- 5.3 Juan Pablo Gutiérrez, on behalf of EAC focal points, provided some context on progress on the evaluation following the guidance at the last EAC meeting in March 2023, and noted that there had been a progress report in July 2023, which provided more information on the value add of this evaluation. He noted that focal points had expressed a concern about the selection of individuals for interview and the balance of global versus country voices.

Discussion

- EAC members emphasised the importance of reaching country voices which has proven a challenge for this evaluation. The evaluation supplier clarified the shift in approach to reaching country voices, expanding the country list from 12 to a broader set, as agreed with Gavi, which has resulted in a broader view rather than a deep view.
- EAC members also discussed the importance of reaching sub-national voices and whether more creative approaches might be needed to do so.
- EAC members requested further details on the specific methodologies proposed for the analyses.

- EAC members also commented that the value add for this evaluation over the other ongoing evaluations was still not entirely clear and should be elaborated on in upcoming reporting.
- The evaluators discussed the complementarity of the MTE with other evaluations including the StratOps evaluation and EVOLVE project.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- EAC requested that evaluators adequately and transparently weight country perspectives in the next draft of the report; and
- EAC emphasised the importance of demonstrating the added value of the MTE in the next draft of the report.

6. Update on the COVAX Evaluation – Phase 2

- 6.1 Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning introduced this item (Doc 6). She requested guidance from the EAC on the overall approach to evaluating COVAX in this phase, including the proposed approach for: i) evaluation of the COVAX facility, and COVAX Advance Market Commitment (AMC); and ii) the COVAX Pillar Delivery Efforts. She also asked for guidance on using a counterfactual approach for this evaluation. Lastly, she asked for guidance on how best to tailor the RFP launch webinar to country needs.
- 6.2 Colleagues from partner organisations including Anna Cristina, Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF; Riccardo Polastro, Chief Evaluation Officer, World Health Organization (WHO); and Mark Lucera, Head of Strategy, Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) joined the discussion.
- 6.3 Evaluation Focal Point, Justice Nonvignon, reiterated the purpose of the evaluation and provided feedback on the guidance questions. He highlighted that in March 2023 the EAC had provided guidance on country selection including the naming and engagement of countries in the RFP. Additionally, the EAC provided guidance on the scope of the evaluation and highlighted the importance of collaboration.
- 6.4 He stated that the EAC was impressed with the work done by the Secretariat in implementing this feedback and commended the Secretariat for organising a post-launch webinar. He also sought further justification for the separation of the AMC and COVAX evaluations.
- 6.5 In relation to the second guidance question, he emphasised that the objectives of the evaluation should determine the methodology. He stated that due to the focus on impact, a counterfactual approach could be useful, and highlighted the potential opportunity to use different types of modelling to explore counterfactual scenarios in more depth.

- 6.6 On the last guidance question, Mr Nonvignon focused on the need for a diverse range of country and supplier voices. He stated that in addition to the planned webinar, engagement with countries should extend beyond, and in advance of, evaluations.
- 6.7 EAC Focal Point, Ezzeddine Mohsni, reiterated the importance of ensuring a diverse set of countries are part of the evaluation including those countries that have never been eligible for Gavi support.

Discussion

- Regarding the separation of the COVAX AMC component from the COVAX Facility as scoped in the RFP, the Secretariat confirmed that a separate decentralised evaluation is likely to be implemented, led by the Gavi Secretariat Resource Mobilisation Team, to best meet the use case and timing needs of the COVAX AMC Investors Group. This will be leveraged by, and aligned with, the COVAX Evaluation, as relevant.
- There were differing viewpoints from EAC members on the use of a counterfactual:
 - The EAC agreed that quasi-experimental and impact study designs would not be feasible nor appropriate; however, there was a lack of consensus on whether a counterfactual approach would be best suited to meet the overall evaluation purpose and answer the evaluation questions; and
 - Some EAC members felt that such counterfactual questions were an important part of evaluating the results of COVAX and learning for potential future initiatives. If these reflect the purpose of the next phase of the evaluation, then EAC members did feel this would need attention in a strong bid.
- EAC members were aligned that scenario-based modelling could be considered and that this could support a counterfactual approach. This type of modelling was noted as a powerful tool to demonstrate what would have happened if things were done differently.
- Overall, the EAC felt that a clearer purpose would help enable the EAC to provide better advice on the best approach and methods.
- In addition, the importance of utilising other qualitative methods including leveraging the wealth of evidence already available was also discussed. The need to assess the quality of this evidence was emphasised.
- The Secretariat acknowledged the remarks on methodology and noted that, as per the RFP, it is the intent for this evaluation to focus on results, leverage existing evidence, including modelling already available that the Gavi Secretariat has commissioned to assess impact.

- One EAC member reiterated the purpose of the evaluation and its importance in informing a response to future pandemics. It was also noted that it was crucial to remember that COVAX formed part of a wider response to the pandemic and was not the only measure to be put in place.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- The EAC advised that the methods for the COVAX Phase 2 evaluation will need to be appropriate for the purpose with a clear rationale for the proposed methodology to be refined in the inception phase; and
- The EAC advised COVAX Phase 2 optimally uses existing evidence, including by considering a knowledge gap map analysis in the inception phase.

7. Work planning 2: Sustainability/Post-Transition Evaluation

- 7.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning introduced this item (Doc 07) and noted that the purpose of this session was to consider the current relevance of the centralised evaluation on sustainability that had been included in the Gavi 5.0 workplan for 2024-2025.
- 7.2 Given that there had been several key shifts since the evaluation was first discussed prior to the start of Gavi 5.0, she outlined the latest thinking following consultations and analysis and proposed that: i) an independent centralised evaluation focused on Gavi's new Middle Income Countries approach (MICs) is undertaken at the earliest in 2025 once the approach has been implemented across a number of countries; and ii) given the body of emerging evidence being generated from the Mid-Term Evaluation and to inform Gavi 6.0 design, remaining evidence gaps will be assessed in 2024 to determine the value-add and potential scope of a retrospective independent evaluation in 2024 of Gavi's support to former Gavi-eligible countries to facilitate transition during the accelerated phase and the transition to fully self-financing phase.

Discussion

- EAC members generally supported the approach outlined in the paper.
- The value of retrospective analysis of Gavi Transitioned countries was noted by a participant, including the importance of examining the criteria by which countries entered the accelerated transitioned phase. The Secretariat responded that this has been reviewed, and the duration of this phase was subsequently changed from five to eight years.
- EAC members queried the impact of Gavi's funding policies on immunisation programmes and sustainability. The importance of clarifying this as Gavi develops its 6.0 strategy was highlighted.

- Acknowledging the proposed timeline and possible information gaps, EAC members suggested that a lighter touch evaluation could be a potential option for the Secretariat to fill evidence gaps after completion of a desk review.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- The EAC agreed that a MICs evaluation be revisited in 2024; and
- The EAC agreed that evidence on this topic is of strategic importance, and a light touch retrospective review could be considered after completion of a desk review to explore gaps/needs, with the EAC engaged in an appropriate manner.

Decision One

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee:

- **approved** the revised multi-year (2021-2025) centralised evaluation workplan attached as Annex C to Doc 07.

8. Evaluation Policy Operationalisation

- 8.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 08) and noted that the purpose of this session was to seek guidance from the EAC on key topics related to how Gavi’s Evaluation Policy is operationalised and on the centralised evaluation workplan development process, timing and draft principles (Doc 08 Annex D) for evaluation for Gavi 6.0. She began by reviewing a proposed process and timeline related to the review of the evaluation function.
- 8.2 Brenda Killen, Director, Governance, updated the EAC on the recent Board and Board Committee evaluation, which had been conducted by an external supplier, with a view to improving the effectiveness and efficiency of Gavi’s governance structure, systems and processes. She reported that the recommendations in the evaluation noted the importance of the link between the Board Committees and the EAC and of the use of evaluation. She also indicated that the Governance Committee had agreed to set up a sub-committee to oversee the implementation of the recommendations and associated action plan.
- 8.3 Quentin Guillon, Head, Strategy Design & Delivery, joined the meeting to present on the process steps and timeline for the development of the Gavi 6.0 centralised evaluation workplan.
- 8.4 The EAC Chair updated the group on reflections he had shared with the MOPAN assessors on Gavi’s evaluation function (Doc 08 Annex A). These included: i) recognition of the excellent work done by those involved in evaluation at the Secretariat and the external evaluators; ii) some observations in relation to some aspects of evaluation at Gavi and its oversight that warrant further consideration going forward; and iii) some specific suggestions for potential changes to be considered in the next phases of planning and review.

- 8.4 Mira Johri, Chair of the Independent Evaluation Panel at the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, joined the session to provide an update on the ongoing joint work with Gavi and the Global Financing Facility to diversify the evaluation supplier pool.

Discussion

- The EAC discussed and was supportive of the proposed timeline and process for the review of the evaluation function, with a request to bring the timelines for the function review and Gavi 6.0 evaluation work planning together to show alignment and how the processes are interconnected.
- The EAC discussed the potential impact that changes in senior leadership at Gavi may have on the evaluation function review process. EAC members emphasised the importance of ensuring their views at strategic points in the process. The proposed timeline for the function review sets out the opportunities for EAC feedback as a whole. The EAC requested that the Secretariat should follow up with the identified EAC focal points (Penny Hawkins, Adolfo Martinez Valle, and Justice Nonvignon) who would be first points of contact but also keep EAC Chair and broader EAC informed.
- With respect to the development of the Gavi 6.0 evaluation workplan, the EAC requested further information about how the EAC would provide feedback on which evaluations should be included in the centralised workplan and whether EAC should also be contributing to decentralised evaluations. The Secretariat clarified that this would be happening both through the evaluation function review at multiple touchpoints and the evaluation work planning process and that the EAC was already being asked to provide feedback on the draft evaluation principles for Gavi 6.0, which would be iterated as part of the work planning process and function review discussions through 2024.
- On the principles for Gavi 6.0 that had been shared as Annex D to Doc 08, EAC members provided the following guidance: i) that the draft principles as written were a mix of principles and practice, and should focus on principles; ii) there needs to be a focus on evaluation scope and what is meant by 'holistic' and the potential implications; iii) timeliness should be included; iv) that it will be important to consider learning versus accountability; v) country focus should be emphasised; and vi) that these should be an input into the evaluation function review.
- In relation to the current use of evidence from evaluations, it was noted by one participant that while evidence from evaluations was generally clearly presented in PPC papers on new and revised Gavi policies, the use of evidence and other learning could be strengthened in the regular Strategy, Programmes and Partnerships paper, which tends to capture many different thematic areas.
- On the supplier review, the Secretariat presented summary points from its last meeting, including that: i) the key issue is the need for stronger country voice and deeper contextual information from countries and systems thinking in Gavi

evaluations; and ii) there may be other models to employ to expand the pool, such as creating a pre-qualified supplier pool/evaluation framework, doing more outreach to evaluation associations/suppliers, exploring webinars (including jointly with other agencies), holding sessions at evaluation conferences, and introducing a requirement that bidders work in partnership with evaluators from low and middle income countries (LMICs). The Secretariat also indicated that it might extend the standard bid timeframe, provide regular feedback to unsuccessful bidders, and consider where Gavi can increase the weighting on technical criteria to emphasise criticality of country capacity.

- EAC members commended the progress to date on this topic and expressed the ongoing desire to take this area of work forward. In terms of next steps, EAC members discussed the Secretariat and focal points working together to produce a list of organising principles and consider the idea of an informal performance indicator; and to reconvene with partners prior to the next EAC meeting.
- With respect to the new Annual Evaluation Report format, EAC members were asked to provide feedback on the content included. It was requested that EAC members send any written comments to the Centralised Evaluation Team.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- There was broad agreement by the EAC on the proposed timeline and process for the Evaluation Function review, with a request for additional visibility showing the alignment with the development of the Gavi 6.0 evaluation workplan; The Secretariat should follow up with focal points who will be first points of contact but also keep EAC informed; and
- On supplier review, the EAC requested that work continue on this topic with EAC focal points and asked that a meeting be convened prior to the next meeting with partner focal points at the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and the Global Financing Facility.

9. Closed session for EAC and Centralised Evaluation Team to Discuss Emerging Guidance

10. EAC Engagement in Gavi 5.1 Evaluations

- 10.1 Esther Saville, Head, Measurement, Evaluation & Learning, presented the current allocation of EAC members as reviewers across the centralised evaluations (Doc 10).

Discussion

- The EAC made some adjustments to the current allocation for centralised evaluations, which appear in Attachment B to these meeting minutes, including for the evaluation of Gavi’s contribution to sustainability of coverage post-transition: rescoped MICs Approach where Ezzeddine Mohsni and Malabika Sarker were allocated as focal points with a further focal point to be identified in 2024.
- In addition, on other workstreams, it was agreed the following EAC members would serve as focal points (Attachment C):
 - For the evaluation function review: Penny Hawkins, Adolfo Martinez Valle, and Justice Nonvignon; and
 - For the evaluation supplier review: Penny Hawkins, Bvudzai Magadzire, and Adolfo Martinez Valle.

11. Review of EAC Guidance and Decisions

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

12. Closing remarks and any other business

- 12.1 The EAC Chair warmly thanked Bvudzai Magadzire, whose term would conclude at the end of the year.
- 12.2 The EAC Chair requested that the action sheet be reintroduced to track the EAC guidance for use in the next EAC meeting.
- 12.3 After determining there was no further business, the meeting was brought to a close.

Ms Meegan Murray-Lopez
Secretary to the Meeting

Attachment A

Participants

Committee Members

- James Hargreaves (Chair)
- Juan Pablo Gutiérrez
- Penny Hawkins
- David Hotchkiss
- Bvudzai Magadzire
- Adolfo Martinez Valle
- Ezzeddine Mohsni
- Justice Nonvignon
- Malabika Sarker
- Rhoda Wanyenze

Guests

- Kent Ranson
- Mira Johri (item 8)

Guests (virtual)

- Louisiana Lush, Ipsos (item 3)
- Will Attfield, Ipsos (item 3)
- Michelle Gross, EHG (item 4)
- Jenna Bates, EHG (item 4)
- Tim Shorten (item 5)
- Julian Schweitzer (item 5)
- Ana Cristina Matos, UNICEF (item 6)
- Riccardo Polastro, WHO (item 6)
- Mark Lucera, CEPI (item 6)

Secretariat

- David Marlow (item 2)
- Hope Johnson
- Brenda Killen (items 1-3, 8)
- Esther Saville
- Jean Zampalegre (items 1-2, 5-6, 8-12)
- Natalie Gons (items 1-2, 5, 7-12)
- Anders Amaechi (items 1-5, 8-12)
- Leslie Moreland (items 1-3, 5-6, 8-12)
- Abdallah Bchir (items 1-5, 7-12)
- Johannes Ahrendts (item 4)
- Dan Hogan (item 5)(virtual)
- Laura Craw (item 6)
- Benjamin Loevinsohn (item 7)
- Inga Savin (item 7)
- Erin Baumgartner (item 8)
- Paul Balogun (item 8)(virtual)
- Quentin Guillon (item 8)(virtual)
- Adviya Khan (items 1-3, 6-7)(virtual)
- Cristina Cimenti
- Meegan Murray-Lopez

Attachment B

EAC engagement in centralised evaluations

EAC Engagement in Gavi 5.0/5.1 Evaluations

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

4 Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting, 4-5 October 2023



* EAC member in convening role

Attachment C

Additional EAC engagement

Additional EAC Engagement – October 2023

Workstream	EAC Focal Points		
EAC recruitment sub committee	James Hargreaves	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	Malabika Sarker
Evaluation function review	Penny Hawkins	Adolfo Martinez Valle	Justice Nonvignon
Supplier review	Penny Hawkins	Bvudzai Magadzire	Adolfo Martinez Valle