



## Gavi – The Vaccine Alliance

### KEY RECOMMENDATIONS OF STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE EVALUATION MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

**Business Owner:** Dominic Hein, Head, Market Shaping  
**Evaluation Title:** Evaluation of Gavi's Supply and Procurement Strategy (2016-2020)  
**Evaluation Year:** 2020

1.	FINDING/S	RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	ACTION
	The current Strategy has focused primarily on addressing supply-side challenges. Within the Strategy pillars, there is also an emphasis on meeting supply-side objectives, with the possible exception of the long-term view aspects, where although in the design of the Strategy, country-owned decisions were emphasised, during implementation this aspect of the strategy has been given lower priority and seen more limited results.	Build up the Strategy to be truly a "market" strategy, reflecting both demand and supply aspects and arms of the market. This is in terms of the Strategy as a whole, and all its pillars, and would warrant greater coordination within and across Secretariat and Alliance partners. This would also require careful consideration of what specific demand-side attributes could be effectively incorporated, noting that the strategy itself is being implemented at the global cross-country level. For example, a more detailed consideration of country product and presentation preferences, and a more	Partially Agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demand health workstream in MS strategy.</li> <li>2. Product characteristic communications materials.</li> <li>3. HMF revision to include demand health</li> </ol>

		<p>“managed” or planned approach by the Alliance to scheduling of campaigns. It would also be important to continue to support improvements in demand forecasts that build on ongoing work to account for multiple factors.</p>		
2.	FINDING/S	RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	ACTION
	<p>While incorporation of the long-term view is a step in the right direction, its framing and operationalisation in the Strategy has been inadequate and represents an area for improvement for the next strategy. There is no reflection of this objective in the Strategy M&amp;E. There is also a need to strengthen components on long-term vision and strategic outlook in the roadmaps, to bring clarity on the “end-game” amongst partners and possibly also encourage more proactive market shaping.</p>	<p>Long-term considerations should be a guiding principle across all aspects of the Strategy, including planning for vaccine and non-vaccine markets and the operationalisation of the VIPS initiative. Rather than describing a specific strategy pillar on long-term view, as has been the case in the current strategy, long-term considerations should be a guiding principle across the strategy in its next iteration. This would enable a more joint-up view of the long-term rather than considering as an independent objective. While long-term considerations have been reflected in different components of the current strategy, we emphasise that going forward,</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Long-term horizons MS Strategy workstream</li> <li>2. Roadmap process update</li> <li>3. Gavi 5.0 innovations strategy</li> </ol>

		the next strategy should make this a core focus and clearly bring out long-term considerations and implications.		
<b>3.</b>	<b>FINDING/S</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	Innovation objectives in the Strategy are well supported by stakeholders but would benefit from further clarity. Gavi has made notable achievements in the context of incremental innovations and the VIPS work has been regarded as a key value-add that has achieved its intended objectives. Going forward, Gavi should work towards providing greater clarity on the innovation agenda within market shaping, in terms of how the various supported innovations fit within the “broader picture” of Gavi’s aims for market health and overall strategy, and also consider the next stage of VIPS in terms of the use of the supported innovations.	Adopt a more consolidated, joint-up and long-term approach to innovations in the next strategy. This recommendation also links with the recommendation above, regarding a need to adopt a long-term lens on innovations in terms of considering country demand for specific innovations, planned procurement and financing approaches, as well as delivery issues. This relates to the VIPS initiative in particular which, while not in scope for the current strategy, requires detailed consideration going forward. It also relates to the set of incremental innovations where country uptake needs to be considered upfront.	Agree	1. Innovations MS Strategy workstream 2. Gavi 5.0 innovations strategy
<b>4.</b>	<b>FINDING/S</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	There is the need for Gavi and its Alliance partners to consider how its	Integrate approaches within the strategy that more closely	Agree	1. Gavi 5.0 MIC engagement

	<p>market shaping activities in individual markets affect, and are affected, by the wider landscape in which these activities are implemented. The next steps for this work could be to consider implications of activities in non-Gavi markets within Gavi's market shaping work.</p>	<p>consider the wider ecosystem within which Gavi's market shaping work functions. Evolve from a vaccine-by-vaccine approach to consider the manufacturing portfolio as a whole and how this may impact individual vaccine markets. More deeply consider non-Gavi markets, in terms of HICs and MICs, and their implications on Gavi markets.</p>		<p>2. Future supplier base MS strategy workstream</p>
	FINDING/S	RECOMMENDATION/S	RESPONSE	ACTION/S
5.	<p>The HMF has been regarded as an important, well developed and much needed framework for assessing market health, with the need to consider improvements in identified areas in its next iteration. Challenges to be addressed include: i) limited formalised representation of demand; ii) loose definitions of some attributes creating ambiguity; iii) lack of clarity of Total Systems Effectiveness (TSE) aspects and the application of this attribute; iv) limited applicability of the HMF in its current form to some markets, particularly CCE; and v) current approach to scoring attributes</p>	<p>Incorporate key updates to the next iteration of the HMF, including a stronger linkage with demand, potential reworking for CCE products, improved definitions and assessment approaches for all attributes to facilitate coordinated assessment, and a tighter definition and measurable approach to TSE.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>1. HMF update via MS strategy workstream</p>

	masking significant variability between markets.			
	FINDING/S	RECOMMENDATION/S	RESPONSE	ACTIONS
6.	<p>While a broadly functional and effective process, there are some areas for improvement in the roadmaps process. Alliance partners have commented that their development is a "heavy lift" and would be helpful if streamlined and simplified further. Partners have also emphasised that roadmaps often become obsolete very quickly due to rapidly changing market developments. Alliance partners noted that the roadmaps have historically focused to a lesser extent on developments and impacts of non-Gavi market activity, with many calling for future roadmaps to take a more holistic view of individual supplier health and strategies across markets. Stakeholders have highlighted the importance of reflecting upon a long-term vision for the markets within each of the roadmaps, to help align and drive Alliance partner activities towards a common longer-term goal.</p>	<p>Incorporate suggestions for improvements in the development of roadmaps. In particular, the following options should be considered to further enhance the effectiveness of the roadmaps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Ensure that roadmaps include a long-term strategic vision for the markets.</li> <li>ii. Continue to follow more recent roadmap processes and structures that have adopted a more streamlined approach.</li> <li>iii. Conduct annual updates of short-term roadmap sections (including short-term TOs) to remain relevant (including aligning with tenders).</li> <li>iv. Expand the approach to more formally/deeply consider implications of wider ecosystem for Gavi markets – specifically interconnected markets with HICs and MICs.</li> </ul>	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Roadmap process revisions</li> <li>2. Partnership optimisation MS strategy workstream</li> </ul>

	<b>FINDING/S</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION/S</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
7.	<p>The M&amp;E framework for the 2016-20 period has been able to effectively track developments on some aspects of the strategy, but in many areas, the activities, outputs and outcomes have not been comprehensively and systematically monitored. The Strategy includes a number of process and operational indicators, yet these have not been monitored centrally nor periodically, making it difficult to fully monitor how and when such activities were carried out, as well as map out how and whether such activities link to changes in the SG4 indicators. More generally, a number of stakeholders within Gavi noted that the Strategy and the SG4 indicators fail to capture what the Alliance is doing on an operational basis, including some of the specific activities and interventions that the Alliance sets out during the roadmap process for individual vaccines. Although the targets that have been set seem suitable, there was little consideration of revising targets as markets evolved to ensure they were</p>	<p>Consider additional processes and metrics to improve the monitoring and evaluation of the activities and results of the Strategy, including to develop a ToC framework and based on this develop a series of more detailed indicators that pick up the scope of the strategy, supplement quantitative indicators with relevant qualitative assessments, and incorporate the assessment of counterfactuals within the M&amp;E framework.</p>	<p>Partially Agree</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SG4 M&amp;E framework workflow</li> <li>2. Theory of Change approach to 5.0 Strategy</li> </ol>

	appropriate for the situation that was in place.			
	FINDING/S	RECOMMENDATION/S	RESPONSE	ACTION
8.	<p>The extent to which countries have been engaged in Gavi’s market shaping work, and the progress on implementing activities linked to country-owned decisions has been more limited compared to other areas of the Strategy. In some respects, continuous engagement of countries in such aspects may not be appropriate, but throughout the evaluation both global and country stakeholders emphasised the need for more engagement with countries to input into and understand Gavi’s work on market shaping. This would enable a closer linkage between what countries see as priorities and what is being implemented through Gavi market shaping, as well as better inform countries on market shaping overall which would enable them to be better prepared for transitioning form Gavi support.</p>	<p>Work with wider Secretariat teams and partners to more effectively engage with countries in relation to Gavi’s market shaping work, especially for transition countries, including to develop a formalised process for countries to input into any lessons learnt, work more actively to ensure better socialisation of market shaping objectives, build up better and more coordinated systems with regards to market shaping, systematically organise capacity building work with regards to country decision making and procurement of vaccines and CCE, support the provision of technical assistance in the areas of local vaccine production and regulatory oversight, consider relevant approaches for price stability for transitioning countries alongside wider coordination with MICs.</p>	Partially Agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demand health MS strategy workstream</li> <li>2. Capacity building for transitioning countries</li> <li>3. Innovation MS Strategy</li> </ol>

	<b>FINDING/S</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION/S</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
9.	Gavi has made improvements in its coordination with several stakeholders involved in market shaping during the implementation of the Strategy, with coordination between Alliance partners highlighted as being a particular area of improvement. Further coordination and engagement would be welcomed with manufacturers and global partners beyond UNICEF and BMGF.	Build on current successes in partnerships with key stakeholders, while expanding coordination with other market shaping stakeholders where relevant.	Agree	1. Partnership optimisation MS strategy workstream
10.	Dynamics in individual vaccine markets are clearly the primary drivers of market outcomes, but manufacturers face considerable challenges with regards to regulation and country registration, which in turn impact their ability and willingness to supply Gavi-supported countries, and at affordable prices. It is recognised that across organisations this issue is beyond the direct scope of the market shaping function per se.	Move away from approaching vaccines as a vertical intervention, with better coordination with other global partners on key cross-cutting issues particularly with regards to the challenges posed by country regulatory requirements. This recommendation is wider than Gavi's market shaping function but has implications for the success of it. In conjunction with the priorities and work of partners and other related organisations working on market shaping, the	Partially Agree	1. Regulatory workstream



		<p>following should be considered:          coordination with WHO PQ and NRA strengthening work to ensure better information and support for suppliers,          coordination with WHO, Global Fund, USAID and other relevant stakeholders on strengthening country pharmaceutical and vaccine regulation, and information sharing on approaches and best practices across different market shaping organisations in the global health architecture.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--