



GAVI Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

19-20 January 2012
Geneva, Switzerland

FINAL MINUTES

Introduction and welcome

Finding a quorum of members present, the meeting commenced at 9.00 Geneva time on 19 January 2012. Sania Nishtar, Committee Chair, chaired the meeting.

Seth Berkley, CEO of the GAVI Alliance, welcomed the Committee, highlighting the issues that they would be discussing during this meeting and stressing in particular their important role in the Full Country Evaluation process. He gave an overview of the decisions made by the GAVI Alliance Board at its meeting in November 2011 and indicated that there are a number of related issues which will be brought to the EAC in the future.

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc #1a). Alan Hinman indicated that although he did not have a Conflict of Interest he would recuse himself from the discussion on the CSO Evaluation under Agenda Item 5.
- 1.2 The Committee noted the minutes of its meeting of 13-14 September 2011 in Geneva (Doc #1b). These minutes were approved by no objection on 12 December 2011.

2. Update from the Secretariat

- 2.1 Peter Hansen, Director of Monitoring & Evaluation, presented information on the outcome of the GAVI Board meeting held in Dhaka, Bangladesh, in November 2011 and an update on monitoring and evaluation activities, in particular in relation to routine programme monitoring and targeted studies.

Discussion

- The Committee discussed the fact that there is potential to shape some of the indicators related to equity and in this context wondered whether it might be possible for GAVI to look at coverage in higher risk categories.
- In relation to the performance based funding mechanism the Committee discussed the increased risk of data quality and identified that the EAC might have a role to play in defining a practical evaluation agenda in relation to this mechanism.

In the context of the procurement process in relation to the Full country evaluations the formal EAC session adjourned. A confidential note of the discussion has been recorded separately.

3. Full country evaluations

- 3.1 Peter Hansen presented an update on developments since the last meeting.
- 3.2 The Committee discussed the process and assessed the strengths and limitations of the proposals.

Decision One

The GAVI Evaluation Advisory Committee:

- **Requested** the Secretariat to submit to the Committee a new RFP for the full country evaluations, taking into account the lessons learned from the tender process and the Committee deliberations.
- **Requested** the Secretariat to take the necessary steps to close the RFP process issued in June 2011.

4. Evaluation Policy

- 4.1 Abdallah Bchir, Senior Specialist, Monitoring & Evaluation, updated the Committee on the process for revision of the Evaluation Policy, which, once endorsed by the EAC, will be submitted to the GAVI Board for approval.

Discussion

It was noted that the EAC is not mentioned in the policy document, since the role of the EAC is described in the Committee's Charter.

The Committee agreed that whilst the content of the document was good it did require some restructuring. A revised document should be endorsed by the EAC through electronic resolution for submission to the Board for approval at their June 2012 meeting.

With input to the policy itself:

- The Committee endorsed the objectives.
- The document should capture the fact that evaluation is a process which does not end once the evaluation itself is finished.
- The structure should reflect aims, objectives, principles, criteria and approaches.
- Under 2.1 it was suggested that “information for the public good” is knowledge dissemination rather than knowledge generation. The Committee agreed that one of the offsprings of evaluation exercises will be normative instruments and that this could be captured in the text by the use of the phrase “and where relevant, related normative contributions.”
- Under Section 3 the Committee agreed that principles should be stated as short headlines in bold with qualifying footnotes or a short explanation.
- The first principle should be independence, impartiality etc.
- 3.1 should be reworded to read “GAVI’s evaluation activities should take into account the points of view of varied stakeholders in order to ensure appropriate ownership of the evaluation process and findings and their subsequent utilisation”.
- 3.2 should be reworded to read “GAVI’s evaluation activities should be conducted under prevailing circumstances in a sovereign environment, and show sensitivity (...).”
- 3.2 should be reworded to read “GAVI’s evaluation activities should address equity, gender and, where appropriate, discrimination, while ensuring (...).”
- 3.4 should be deleted as it is not a ‘Principle’.
- 3.5 should be reworded to read “Commitment to the Paris Declaration and international evaluation standards and guidelines.”
- Point 3.6 should be rephrased to firstly raise the issue of shared responsibility and then address contribution and attribution.
- 3.7 should be rephrased. The principle is “integrating evaluation and monitoring”.

- It was suggested that the Paris principles should be an annex to the Evaluation Policy. Certain wording in the Policy itself could subsequently be deleted or rephrased e.g. references to harmonisation under 3.8.
- 3.9 could be rephrased to include “linkage of evidence to policy in a timely manner at an appropriate level”.
- 3.10 should include a statement that the GAVI procurement process complies with best practice in procurement processes.
- It was agreed that the annexes should be maintained and it would be appropriate to ensure the terms as defined are used directly in the Policy.

Decision Two

The GAVI Evaluation Advisory Committee:

- **Requested** the Secretariat to submit to the Committee a revised Evaluation Policy that takes into account the Committees suggestions and points for inclusion and realignment.

5. CSO Evaluation: Review of quality and usefulness of evaluation

- 5.1 Abdallah Bchir provided the Committee with information on the background to the CSO Evaluation and the next steps following the EAC’s review of the quality and usefulness of the report. At the request of the Chair he gave an overview of the key findings of the report.
- 5.2 Following a brief statement on his views on the report Alan Hinman recused himself from the discussion and left the room.

Discussion

- The Committee validated the methodology used and agreed that this is a quality and useful report and a fair evaluation of a complex programme.
- Committee members pointed out that some of the conclusions of the report might be perceived negatively and the Committee suggested that the Board should be informed of this and that a communications strategy should be implemented when the report is released.
- The Committee noted that its remit was to provide feedback to the Board on the report, and not to provide guidance in terms of policy, which is within the remit of the Programme and Policy Committee.

Decision Three

The GAVI Evaluation Advisory Committee:

- **Endorsed** the report's methodology and conclusions and requested the Secretariat and Board to use the conclusions for framing policy aimed at Civil Society engagement and support in the future.

6. AMC Evaluation: Review of Request for Proposals

- 6.1 Abdallah Bchir provided the Committee with background information on the AMC evaluation, the purpose of the evaluation, progress to date and a summary of comments received on the RFP document.
- 6.2 Johanna Fihman, Programme Manager AVI, Policy and Performance, joined the meeting to respond to any specific questions the Committee might have on the AMC.

Discussion

- It was noted that the RFP lists four relevant principles, and that the evaluation policy also lists principles. The Committee suggested that there is a need to cross check the principles listed in RFPs with the principles listed in the policy and to ensure consistency.
- It was asked if this evaluation would look at the mechanisms used to establish the price paid for pneumococcal vaccine and whether it might lead to the price being lowered in the future. It was noted that these issues are captured within the evaluation questions but that the wording should be revisited to ensure that the RFP makes this very clear. The Committee agreed that it would be appropriate to add a few sentences on context, indicating that questions have been raised about the price paid for vaccines.
- The Committee noted that issues related to impact will be covered in the impact evaluation that will be conducted in 2014.

Decision Four

The GAVI Evaluation Advisory Committee:

- **Approved** the Request for Proposal (RFP) related to the Advance Market Commitment for Pneumococcal Vaccine Process and Design Evaluation (Annex 1 to Doc 06), as further revised during the EAC Meeting; and
- **Requested** the Secretariat to issue the revised RFP.

7. GAVI data warehouse and dashboard

- 7.1 Olivier Thomas, Senior M&E Information Manager, presented the GAVI data warehouse and dashboard to the Committee. He indicated that there are 3 types of users – internal, external (GAVI Board members etc.) and the public (e.g. through the GAVI web site).

Discussion

- The Committee commended the work of the Secretariat on the data warehouse and dashboard and the way they are being used by GAVI as knowledge management tools.

8. Review of Decisions

- 8.1 Debbie Adams, Managing Director, Law and Governance, reviewed the decision language with the Committee.

9. Any other business

Discussion

- The Committee agreed on the dates of their 2012 meetings and that the dates of the 2013 meetings should be discussed and agreed by them at their July 2012 meeting.
- The Committee discussed their workplan and agreed that their next in-person meeting would focus on selection of a bidder for the full country evaluations and on M&E approaches to graduating countries.

The Chair thanked the Committee and the Secretariat for their support and as there was no further business, the meeting was brought to a close.

Ms Debbie Adams
Secretary to the Board

Participants

Committee Members

- Sania Nishtar, Chair
- Stanley O. Foster
- Gonzalo Hernández
- Alan Hinman
- Mira Johri
- Rob Moodie
- Zenda Ofir (Day 1)
- Bernhard Schwärtlander

Board members present

- Seth Berkley (non-voting)

Secretariat

- Debbie Adams
- Abdallah Bchir
- Johanna Fihman (Agenda Item 6)
- Joanne Goetz
- Peter Hansen
- Laura Stormont
- Olivier Thomas (Agenda Item 7)

Independent experts

- Marta Gacic-Dobo (Agenda Item 3)
- Osvaldo Feinstein (Agenda Item 3)