

## The Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Report

### Quality assessment of the evaluation

Name of evaluation: **Evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching Zero Dose children and missed communities**

Year of report: 2024

#### a) The Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) rated this report as:

- Fully met or exceeded Gavi quality standards
- Met Gavi quality standards with only minor shortcomings
- Partially met Gavi quality standards with some shortcomings
- Did not meet Gavi quality standards with major shortcomings

#### b) General comments:

The EAC emphasises that this is an important evaluation as it provides essential insights to the Gavi Board, Secretariat and Alliance partners into how Gavi Alliance's work is contributing to immunizing children in the most vulnerable and marginalized communities across Gavi-eligible countries. Moreover, it provides critical insights into the relevance and coherence of the Zero Dose (ZD) agenda for Gavi 5.0/5.1, and the manner in which it is being operationalized through Gavi's funding levers, policies, processes and programs. The evaluation also sheds light on and draws on the experiences of eight countries in operationalizing the ZD agenda. The EAC acknowledges the significance of this report as a valuable document for Board and PPC (Programme and Policy Committee) members, especially in the context of the implementation of the ZD Agenda to inform course correction and development of the Gavi 6.0 strategy.

#### Strengths:

Within this context, the EAC felt that the report fully met Gavi quality standards. The report is logically structured, clearly written, and largely contains all the relevant elements. The executive summary clearly and succinctly reflects the salient issues in the evaluation; and the purpose, scope, objectives and use case are well outlined. The slight departures in relation to results from original ToR/RFP are well justified given the delayed implementation of Gavi 5.0 strategy. Additionally, the theory of Change / intervention logic is largely described and provides sufficient information on the robust methodology and evaluation framework e.g. on the judgement criteria, analytical methods and approaches employed. The findings are well presented, organised, analysed, interpreted systematically and logically against the evaluation with clear strength of evidence ratings at the level of the evaluation questions. The conclusions, strategic and operational implications are clear, well stated, targeted and based on good evidence. Finally, the overall quality and utility of this report is high as it offers valuable analysis that can be drawn upon to inform the design of the 6.0 strategy in relation to prioritizing, improving and simplifying processes, policies, and tools. Additionally, it provides implications for working through the broader Health System Strengthening (HSS), Primary Healthcare (PHC), and Universal Health Coverage (UHC), emphasising the importance of leveraging pooled funding and aligning with broader development initiatives. Additionally, it highlights the need for a nuanced approach to resource allocation, considering the complexity of these decisions. The

report is well positioned to contribute to the shaping of the Gavi 6.0 in understanding the drivers and barriers to the operationalisation as well as the coherence and relevance of the ZD agenda.

### **Other observations**

Though this report is robust, the EAC wishes to emphasize some observations. The report, despite its significant strengths, also presents some areas for improvement in subsequent phases. For example, the report could have benefitted from enhanced evidential support for some of the findings to bolster the credibility of some of its conclusions as Additionally, while it effectively addresses many of the Terms of Reference (TOR) questions, there are a few key aspects that could have been more comprehensively explored, which would have provided a more holistic understanding of the evaluation's findings. Also, the report's Theory of Change (TOC) has more emphasis on the left side (inputs to outputs). Although the evaluation's timing and data constraints may have contributed to this, a more even distribution of the TOC's focus would have provided a more nuanced perspective. Also, assessing the Theory of Change (ToC) for each case study would have been beneficial as a conclusion, aiding subsequent phases of evaluation and future practices. Additionally, establishing a direct causal link between Gavi 4.0 funding and demand generation was not feasible due to limited data on these activities' implementation and the poor institutional memory among Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). Delayed qualitative data from some challenging operating contexts, along with the limited number of interviews, impacted some of the conclusions. Though the findings benefitted from insights from country case studies, some summaries of the case studies in the report would have provided users with a complete assessment of what worked and what did not in each country's specific context. Moreover, instead of slightly changing the evaluation scope due to data limitations, discussing innovative approaches to measure Gavi's contributions would be helpful for future evaluation phases. Again, whilst there's strong evidence that Gavi 4.0 activities fit within the Identify element of the IRMMA framework, establishing the contribution of Gavi 4.0 funding to these outcomes was challenging. The claim that Gavi's contribution to ZD agenda is equitable is not fully supported by the findings, which indicate that equity mainly focuses on socio-economic factors rather than gender. Also findings suggest that capacity-building at the country level is not focused on zero-dose (ZD) children, but the conclusion does not mention this implication. Furthermore, the EAC suggests that a formal contribution analysis of 4.0 grants would have strengthened the report, even though it was deemed unfeasible due to data limitations. The committee emphasises the importance of exploring the feasibility of conducting contribution analysis in the initial stages of the next phases of the evaluation and a clearer articulation of the type of data needed to undertake it. In conclusion, while the report is well-structured and presents valuable insights, it could have benefitted from enhanced evidential support, a more balanced TOC focus, and a more comprehensive exploration of key areas. These enhancements would have further strengthened the report's ability to provide specific insights into decision-making processes.