

GAVI Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

2 June 2010

Teleconference

FINAL MINUTES

Finding a quorum of members present¹, the meeting commenced at 15.15 Geneva time on 2 June 2010.

Given the length of the documents, the Chair of the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) proposed that each committee member review the main report and the report from one of the four strategic goals, along with their fellow committee member as indicated.

- Strategic Goal 1: Sania Nishtar and Bernhard Schwartlander
- Strategic Goal 2: Stan Foster and Ken Hill
- Strategic Goal 3: George Wellde and Gonzalo Hernandez
- Strategic Goal 4: Minister Sezibera and Zenda Ofir

The Committee Chair suggested focusing on the following questions:

1. To what extent is there adequate description of the methods used in the evaluation study?
2. To what extent is there adequate identification and assessment of the limitations and potential sources of bias in the evaluation study?
3. To what extent do the reports adequately address the study's defined evaluation questions?
4. To what extent are the conclusions substantiated by the evaluation's findings, and supported through sound and transparent application of appropriate evaluation methods?

Discussion followed:

1 IFFIm Evaluation

- It was noted that the report for Strategic Goal #3 contains an extensive discussion of the IFFIm and AMC. The Secretariat is prepared to go to tender with a Request for Proposals for an evaluation of the IFFIm once the steering committee for this evaluation is convened and approves the terms of reference.
- Although the preliminary draft report from the Second GAVI Evaluation is not complete, the section on the IFFIm is almost final. We could therefore compare what is addressed in the Second GAVI Evaluation vis-a-vis IFFIm with what we want to get out of the IFFIm evaluation as per the draft ToRs. The EAC could then ask the IFFIm donors and other stakeholders whether we have already learned what we wanted to learn about the IFFIm and, if not, whether the best way to address outstanding questions related to the IFFIm is

¹ Attendees are listed in Attachment A.

to build upon what has been done as part of the Second GAVI Evaluation or to commission a separate evaluation study.

2 Comments on the Reports

Discussion on Summary Report

- As mentioned by CEPA, the preliminary draft Summary report is incomplete, with unfinished graphs, tables and other data.
- That said, the report has some positive qualities, as well as some limitations.
- It would be useful to have an executive summary for each section of the report, to aid reading and analysis.
- The report is wordy in some places. By making the narrative more efficient, the length of the report could be reduced considerably, without compromising on quality.
- It is important that sufficient time be given to ensure that the final report is a quality product.
 - (Note that the next Executive Committee meeting is in 29 July and then 22 September. The Board meeting is in December.)

Discussion on Strategic Goal 1

- Strategic Goal 1 was not discussed on the call.

Discussion on Strategic Goal 2

- There are two issues. Is the design of the evaluation appropriate to address the specified evaluation questions? Have the evaluators executed the design properly to address the specified evaluation questions?
- It was questioned whether the treatment of the data was sound and convincing. A question was also raised as to whether the data addressed by the evaluators were the most appropriate data to address the evaluation question.
- Overall, since this is largely a desk review building upon existing data sources, with some additional, targeted collection of new data, the report must be viewed with a clear eye to its inherent limitations.
- A question was raised as to the extent to which observed changes described in this report can be attributed to GAVI. The results reflect the input of many actors, rather than GAVI alone, and this is not apparent in reading the report. The role of countries and other actors should be acknowledged.

- Although the evaluators have done a good job in addressing some of the sub-goals (e.g., introduction of new vaccines), the treatment of the data should be refined, as should the accompanying text and interpretation.

Discussion on Strategic Goal 3

- The document is very dense, not reader friendly, and there is an acute need for a coherent executive summary to direct the reader through some of the detail.
- The report should address the key implications of the findings for GAVI's work in the next 5 years.
- There was extensive discussion on the grades assigned to the evidence for this strategic goal.
 - It was noted that the report honestly evaluates the strength of the evidence, which is essential to an evaluation of this sort. The evaluators should be encouraged to assess the strength of the evidence honestly and openly, as they have done here.
 - The evaluators should ensure that they are as objective as possible in assigning grades. Many of the grades appear to be subjective.
 - Committee members thought that some of the evidence was stronger than indicated by the evaluators. This impression does not match the grades for "robustness," which were overwhelmingly in the "C" and "D" range.
 - The committee raised the question, if the evidence is so weak that it only rates a "D" grade, why is it even considered?
 - The Committee would be reluctant to just highlight the "A's" in the report. However, rather than remove the other findings and questions completely, the evaluators can identify them as questions that were addressed, but where there was insufficient evidence to draw a firm conclusion. Where the evidence is so weak that the evaluators can only assign a "D", it would be better for the evaluators to say that they were asked to address questions X, Y, Z, but these could not be addressed adequately due to weak evidence.

Other issues

- The Committee discussed the need to evaluate the Alliance structure, the partnerships and the accountabilities between partners.
 - This was not addressed in the evaluation to the extent that it could be.
 - There are several issues that need to be addressed in relation to accountability for the partners that receive GAVI funding.
 - However, it was noted that there is a risk that a focus on more "upstream" activities such as how partners work together might detract from the organisation's focus on morbidity and mortality.
 - This must be balanced against the fact that there is more control in managing upstream processes as opposed to downstream processes.

Moving Forward/Next Steps

- The Committee was satisfied that it had explored the preliminary draft report as much as they could at this point in time, given the preliminary nature of its

findings. The Secretariat will follow through with Committee members regarding additional written feedback.

- In consultation with the Committee Chair, the Secretariat will synthesise the feedback given by the EAC and send it to the evaluation team.
- For the next round of discussions, there should be a more refined and complete product to review.

There being no further business the call was adjourned.

Dr Bernhard Schwartlander
Committee Chair

Attachment A

Participants

Committee Members

- Bernhard Schwartlander, Chair
- Stanley Foster
- Ken Hill
- Richard Sezibera
- George W. Wellde, Jr

Regrets

- Zenda Ofir
- Sania Nishtar
- Gonzalo Hernandez

GAVI

- Abdallah Bchir
- Peter Hansen
- Stephen Nurse-Findlay