

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

24-25 October 2017

Gavi Alliance, Geneva, Switzerland

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 The meeting commenced at 09.05 Geneva time on 24 October 2017. Rob Moodie, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a).
- 1.3 Committee members noted the minutes of its meeting on 29 May 2017 (Doc 01b) which had been approved by no-objection on 2 August 2017, as well as a unanimous consent decision which was approved on 8 June 2017 (Doc 01c). They also reviewed the action sheet (Doc 01d).
- 1.4 The Chair reported to the EAC on his participation at the Gavi Board meeting in June 2017. He informed members that he had had an opportunity to meet the Chair of the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC), with whom he discussed the agenda for the joint session of the EAC and PPC, which was to follow the next day, on 25 October.
- 1.5 The Chair welcomed the members of the EAC whose membership, effective 1 January 2018, had been approved by the Board, namely Craig Burgess, and Mira Johri. It was noted that while Craig Burgess was not present, Dr Johri was attending the EAC meeting as an observer. The Chair also welcomed Nick York, who had chaired the panel that conducted the peer review of the Gavi Evaluation function, to the meeting.

2. Update from Secretariat

- 2.1 Seth Berkley, CEO, thanked the EAC for its great work and provided an overview of the key developments in the global landscape.
- 2.2 Dr Berkley referred to the work recently undertaken by the newly appointed Director General of WHO in terms of presenting a bold workplan, with a focus on Universal Health Coverage (UHC), as well as having announced his new leadership team. He informed the EAC that WHO had strongly signalled the importance it gave to collaborating with Gavi on immunisation.
- 2.3 He updated the EAC on the work done by the Alliance to ensure that a more appropriate indicator for immunisation as part of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (that factored the coverage of DTP3, last dose of PCV, MR and HPV2) was recommended by SAGE, which is considering the suggestion.

- 2.4 He informed the EAC that in the context of use of evaluation work, Gavi's mid-term review (MTR) which will take place in 2018 would be an opportunity to showcase Gavi's achievements and how it's delivering on the current strategy. It would also help determine the next steps as Gavi moves towards its replenishment and preparation for the next strategic period around 2020.
- 2.5 The CEO provided an update in relation to progress made in implementation of the current Gavi strategy. Referring to the low coverage and equity numbers as presented in the 2016 WUENIC data, he said that there was a need to delve into the data at the subnational level to determine what could be done to see improved coverage and equity numbers. He noted that the Full Country Evaluation (FCE) included subnational estimates.
- 2.6 He provided a synopsis on the progress of various vaccine strategies including HPV, yellow-fever, cholera, as well as vaccines stockpile with regards to engagement with the ICG and polio strategies.
- 2.7 He noted that Gavi's Health systems goal was an important area for the consideration of the EAC. He said the programmes were being adapted to ensure a country focus within such a framework that would allow Gavi to use indicators to monitor progress. He emphasised that performance based financing evaluation and the Health Systems and Immunisation Strengthening (HSIS) evaluation will be important for Gavi in determining how well the approach is working.
- 2.8 He informed the EAC that 9 countries had already transitioned out of Gavi support, and that the Board had suggested to take a country-by-country approach for the countries facing higher transition risk, like Nigeria and Papua New Guinea.
- 2.9 He highlighted that Gavi's co-financing performance for 2017 was very high, with the least number of defaulters and highest payments in Gavi's history.
- 2.10 Dr Berkley appreciated the Evaluation function peer review report and noted that the results from the peer review exercise help determine opportunities for improvement. He also highlighted that the second phase of the Full Country Evaluations project not only provides an opportunity to help countries develop evaluation capacity, but also strengthen the collaboration between Gavi and the Global Fund.
- 2.11 Finally, he appreciated the efforts made by the EAC and PPC Chairs to conduct a joint session, observing that PPC members are important users of evaluations and the joint session would help inform how the contributions of the EAC and PPC can be synergised in building an evidence-based culture at Gavi.

Discussion

- EAC members appreciated the CEO's update and were pleased to learn about Gavi recommendation to SAGE for a more comprehensive vaccine indicator.
- In response to a question about Gavi's possible role in Universal Health Coverage (UHC), the Secretariat informed the EAC that immunisation plays an important role in creating the necessary building blocks for UHC systems in a country, and opportunities for integration of Gavi's work with UHC would potentially be discussed when defining the next strategy.
- An EAC member asked whether Gavi had considered initiatives that allowed it to work across borders and include non-Gavi countries. The Secretariat responded that Gavi worked with refugee populations that enter Gavi countries, and had also recently helped Syrian refugee populations in Jordan by being part of an Alliance wide effort that included UNICEF and WHO.
- Responding to a query regarding diagnostic and laboratory capacity issues, the CEO opined that one of the ways to improve the situation is to strengthen reference laboratories and utilise updated technology that allow field diagnostics. He noted that this will be an important consideration going forward in the context of outbreak management, as faster diagnostics allow for rapid response.
- An EAC member highlighted that negative public opinion around vaccinations could affect the vaccine coverage. The Secretariat acknowledged that this is a challenging issue for Gavi, especially when the public opinion in the developed countries not supported by Gavi, could impact those countries where Gavi has its programmes.
- In response to a question about how the evaluation results were fed back to the countries, the Secretariat explained that the Joint Appraisals (JAs) provide a platform for evaluation findings and recommendations to be shared with the countries and these may factor into the decision making process. It was also noted that Leadership Management and Coordination (LMC) is a strategic focus area that is used to address any issues around countries' management capacities. The information relating to specific evaluations are disseminated at the country level, and the Senior Country Managers (SCMs) play an active role in engaging with the countries on the basis of the evaluation findings.

3. Evaluations update

- 3.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Monitoring and Evaluation, provided an overview to the EAC on the progress made towards the Evaluation workplan, which had been approved by the Committee in March 2017.
- 3.2 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, provided an update on the status of evaluation activities since EAC's last in person meeting in March 2017, noting that the specific modifications to the 2017 Evaluation workplan. He explained the actions

being taken to strengthen the evaluation function (Doc 03), in line with the evaluation principles for Gavi's 2016-2020 strategy period.

- 3.3 He provided an overview of the steps taken to determine the priority areas for the coming years in order to ascertain the strategic direction for the evaluation function, in relation to which a peer review of the Gavi evaluation function had been undertaken.

Discussion

- Viroj Tangcharoensathien, EAC focal member for the agenda item, recalled that the Request for Proposal (RFP) process for Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP) was launched in July 2017, based on the draft RFP which was presented to the EAC for its approval in March 2017. He informed the EAC that the proposals were evaluated by an Adjudication Committee, and based on the analysis one was about to be preselected.
- The Secretariat noted that after completing the clarification process currently being undertaken by the Adjudication Committee, the EAC will be requested to consider and approve the selection of the service provider to conduct the CCEOP evaluation.
- EAC members observed that developing evaluation capacity within countries was an important role that Gavi must play while commissioning and conducting evaluations. It was also discussed that given the high risk around data quality it was imperative to help strengthen country capacity for data collection and evaluation, again noting that this would require some focused discussions around the role and responsibilities of the Gavi Evaluation function, as part of discussion on the peer review recommendations. The Committee also noted some concerns around costs and that bidders were not evaluation experts and primarily from Europe and US.
- The Secretariat confirmed that it has been indeed focusing on building evaluation capacity in countries and the new RFP processes requested bidders to submit detailed plans for capacity building as well as encourage to partner with in-country institutions where feasible. The Secretariat assured the EAC that it would continue to seek its guidance on how best to ensure that it struck the right balance while conducting in-country evaluations, in a way that would enable capacity building and meaningful participation from local institutions.

4. Baseline Assessment Report of the Targeted Country Assistance evaluation – Review of the quality and usefulness and next steps

- 4.1 Anuradha Gupta, Deputy CEO, provided an overview of the Baseline Assessment Report of the Targeted Country Assistance (TCA) evaluation. Ms. Gupta reminded the EAC that Deloitte had been commissioned to conduct a baseline, a mid-term and a final assessment of the TCA evaluation.

- 4.2 Ms Gupta summarised the findings that were obtained through the TCA Baseline Assessment Report. She informed the EAC that the report's findings had been used to inform the discussions at the PEF Management Team meetings to establish the need for approaching Technical Assistance (TA) differently under the TCA approach.
- 4.3 Alba Vilajeliu, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation, updated the EAC on the TCA Evaluation and the dissemination activities, including the development of a report-brief that was underway (Doc 04). Finally, she presented the key lessons learnt and the explained how the study findings are and expected to be used.

Discussion

- Anna Hamrell and Nina Schwalbe, EAC members who were the focal points for the agenda item, noted that the report's executive summary could be significantly improved. They appreciated the report for being logically structured, but raised significant questions on the robustness of the methods and findings. They noted that many of the conclusions were not adequately backed up by data or the limitations adequately explained.
- Wieneke Vullings, an EAC member and Chair of the TCA Evaluation steering committee, provided input on the role played by the steering committee in providing methodological guidance for this evaluation, reviewing the Baseline Report and identifying areas to consider for the next phase of the Evaluation. She noted some of the challenges faced by Deloitte, including difficulty in defining and establishing the theory of change of the PEF TCA.
- EAC members emphasised the need to ensure that the peer review of any evaluation include individuals who understand the country context and know the country well. They also noted that it would be useful to improve the overall structure of the country reports, and align these with the main global report.
- In response to a question by the EAC, the Secretariat noted that the baseline assessment would set the basis for the future assessments as part of the TCA evaluation.
- The Secretariat further informed the EAC that the evaluation had brought forth a number of important lessons with respect to both the evaluation methodology and the TCA process, which will be used to define the way forward, and make mid-course corrections.
- The EAC Chair noted the despite the significant challenges with the design of the programme and the evaluation, the evaluation has high utility. A discussion ensued about the balance of quality, independence and utility.
- Finally, the EAC agreed that it was necessary to ensure that as the TCA Evaluation moves from the baseline to mid-term assessment, it remains cognisant of the weaknesses in the Baseline assessment and avoids repeating these. These

weaknesses related to imperfections in the methodology, inadequate representativeness of respondents, and the potential biases resulting from the Alliance partners having been part of the steering committee for this evaluation.

5a. Gavi Full Country Evaluations (first phase) – Review of the quality and usefulness of 2016 Reports

5a.1 Alba Vilajeliu, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation, provided an overview of the first phase of the Full Country Evaluations (FCE) project, summarising the process to prepare the Alliance Management response (Doc 05a).

Discussion

- EAC member Zulfiqar A. Bhutta and EAC member-elect Mira Johri were the EAC focal points for this agenda item and debriefed on their assessment of the quality and usefulness of the FCE 2016 reports. They appreciated the FCE first phase evaluation and acknowledged the team's comprehensive efforts in presenting and addressing the evaluation questions.
- Prof Bhutta emphasised that the value of FCE is in how they can help sustainable capacity development in the country, and this should be focused upon during the FCE second phase, as well as ensuring that there is a higher level of country-engagement when conducting these evaluations.
- EAC members appreciated the FCE 2016 reports and discussed how the reports could be further utilised by the Gavi Board, and presented in a meaningful way. They also stressed the importance of putting findings in the public domain through peer review publications.
- The Secretariat suggested that a second technical briefing may be provided to the Board, but also noted that the utility of the FCE would be to continue being relevant to inform new approaches and reviews of Gavi policies.

5b. Gavi Full Country Evaluations (second phase) - Update

5b.1 Alba Vilajeliu, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation, provided a status update of the FCE second phase to the EAC (Doc 05b), Jessica Shearer, PATH provided an update from the FCE Consortium perspective.

5b.2 Hind Khatib-Othman, Managing Director, Country Programmes discussed with the EAC how the uptake of the findings could be increased within countries, based on the lessons learned.

5b.3 James Tulloch, Chair, Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG), Global Fund provided his views to the EAC on the collaboration between the Global Fund and Gavi Secretariat on, the FCE project and the Global Fund Prospective Country Evaluations (PCE) project.

Discussion

- The EAC Chair applauded the collaboration between the Gavi Secretariat and the Global Fund TERG Secretariat, and encouraged cross-learning opportunities to be fully leveraged between the two organisations.
- EAC members underscored the importance of identifying and working with appropriate in-country partners. The Secretariat informed the EAC that this was being done through the in-country FCE teams that map the specific demands of the in-country stakeholders with input from the Alliance partners, as well as the expanded in-country partners.
- EAC members discussed the role of the FCE Alliance group, and suggested that the technical skills of Alliance partners be better leveraged during the FCE second phase. The Secretariat noted that while partners' ownership of the FCE project would be useful and will ensure that the efforts are not duplicated, this may affect the overall independence of the evaluation. They sought the EAC's view on transforming the FCE Alliance group into an independent Steering Committee for the FCE second phase.
- EAC members requested that the FCE Alliance group should be kept intact with the possibility of expanding the membership of this group. The overall responsibility for the quality assurance of the evaluation would remain with the EAC.
- The Committee Chair noted that the second phase of the FCE project should focus on the lessons learned from the first phase in terms of evaluation design, implementation and use of evaluation results.
- An EAC member suggested that where it may make sense, Gavi and the Global Fund may combine elements of the FCE and the PCE and if relevant conduct joint surveys and/or interviews. This would help provide efficiencies to both organisations and also could help to mitigate respondents fatigue in countries.
- The Secretariat and Global Fund colleagues acknowledged that this would be a preferred way forward, and noted that through regular information sharing this momentum was being built, and in future more joint planning on areas of overlap is foreseen. They however cautioned that a realistic approach should be taken in the extent of such a collaboration as some contracts under the FCE and the PCE have already been finalised, and work is underway.
- It was proposed that a presentation of the status of the collaboration with Global Fund, be provided to the EAC at its next meeting in April 2018, and Dr Tulloch be invited to participate to the discussion.
- In response to a question about capacity building of FCE consortium partners in countries, Jessica Shearer, who was representing PATH, informed the EAC that it would be taking a human centered design approach for the second phase of the

FCE project and is in the process of establishing the indicators that would facilitate in checking the performance and growth of the consortium as well as the individual teams. She mentioned that the indicators to measure capacity building would be developed by the country teams.

6. Potential approach for Health System and Immunisation Strengthening evaluation

- 6.1 Alan Brooks, Director, Health Systems and Immunisation Strengthening (HSIS) and Adrien de Chaisemartin, Director of Strategy, Funding and Performance provided a HSIS update and highlighted the limited HSS outcomes to date and the need to document HSIS results to inform Gavi's mid-term review (MTR) and design of the next strategy period (Doc 06).
- 6.2 Laura Crow, Senior Programme Manager, Monitoring, Data Systems and Strategic Initiatives, Monitoring & Evaluation presented the revamped approach used to monitor grants, explained how the analysis of grant performance frameworks reported data is undertaken and outlined the challenges in monitoring HSIS.
- 6.3 The Evaluation team explained that it was seeking the EAC's guidance on the proposed stepwise approach with a short term component to undertake a review of the existing HSS results and provide recommendations for measuring HSIS outcomes, to inform then a longer term approach with the aim to evaluate the HSIS outcomes.

Discussion

- The Secretariat, as requested by the EAC members, explained how Gavi through its JAs is working to enhance the ownership and use of data among countries. They informed the EAC that countries saw JAs as a value add, however data quality remained as high on Gavi's risk radar.
- EAC members underscored that from a donor's perspective as well as an organisational learning point of view, it would be important to see whether the HSIS model is producing the desired outcomes in countries or not, from a big picture perspective.
- EAC members suggested that before determining the long term approach, it would be prudent to consider the short term approach to review existing HSS results, including consideration of the learnings obtained from FCE.

7. Results of Peer Review of Gavi Evaluation Function

- 7.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, outlined the process that was followed to commission the peer review of the Gavi Evaluation function (Doc 07).
- 7.2 Nick York, who chaired the panel that conducted the peer review, introduced the panel members, briefly explained the methodology used in conducting the peer review, and then presented the salient findings to the EAC.

Discussion

- The EAC Chair appreciated the Secretariat's enthusiasm in having this peer review conducted. He thanked the peer-review panel for outlining the opportunities for improvement and helping define the strategic direction for the evaluation function.
- EAC members appreciated the opportunity this peer review exercise provided to help determine more clearly the expected role and responsibilities of the EAC.
- An EAC member appreciated that while the primary function of the Evaluation team was not to build in-country evaluation capacity, during prospective country evaluations over a long term duration, it would be important to remain conscious of the sustainable capacity element when designing and implementing these evaluations. The Secretariat agreed with this view, but observed that with a limited team size, the evaluation function within Gavi did not have the bandwidth to undertake capacity building work, however this work was increasingly being done by Gavi on the programmatic side.
- An EAC member noted that given the sometimes sensitive information that emerges from the findings of evaluations, it is imperative that the EAC continues to be constituted of a majority of independent individuals, in order to ensure credibility and utility of the evaluations.
- EAC members commented that the Committee should have more visibility and interaction with the Board, and discussed what might be the various ways to engage with the Board. The Secretariat acknowledged this and informed the EAC that in most cases it is the PPC that utilises evaluations to inform programmatic and policy considerations. Once these decisions are elevated to the Board, the relevant evaluation findings used to inform the decision are provided in the programmatic papers to set the context for the decision.
- The EAC noted that the one of the key findings of the report was the need for better articulating the role of the EAC and remaining cognisant of credibility, independence and utility of evaluations.
- Additionally, it was recognised that capacity strengthening of countries to conduct evaluations was a big topic and should be considered and discussed in a focused way, as a separate topic.

- The EAC discussed the way forward and agreed that it would take a phased approach to discussing and implementing the recommendations of the peer-review report.
- EAC sought the continued guidance of the peer-review panel lead, Mr York, to guide the process to determine the strategic orientation for the evaluation function. It was agreed to conduct a one-day workshop involving EAC members, Evaluation team members, Gavi Executive Office and any other relevant stakeholders.
- It was agreed to use the EAC meetings in April 2018 as a mid-term checkpoint and to ideally conclude the process by October 2018.
- Finally the CEO and Deputy CEO commended the report and said that there was now an increased focus within the Secretariat towards use of evaluations. They noted that as outlined by the findings of the report, it will be imperative to update the Evaluation policy as soon as possible and translate the updates into operational guidelines.

8. Preliminary Evaluation Workplan 2018 - 2020

- 8.1 Alba Vilajeliu, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation, presented the preliminary multi-year Evaluation workplan for the remaining strategic period 2018-2020 (Doc 08). She explained how the criteria was being applied to prioritise the work, and also provided a status update of the evaluations to date.

Discussion

- Zulfiqar A. Bhutta, EAC member and the focal point for the agenda item proposed several approaches that the Secretariat could take in packaging various evaluations together. He advised the Secretariat and EAC to ascertain the key players like the Global Fund or Global Financing Facility that conduct large scale evaluations, and collaborate with them to leverage these evaluations. He also noted that there was a need to link these evaluations with existing national programmes of data collection and monitoring systems to avoid creating parallel ones.
- Prof Bhutta noted that there should be a focus in understanding the emerging data collection and monitoring technologies and methodologies. He also stated that setting out evaluation work in fragile country settings will require a separate evaluation approach.
- An EAC member suggested that the Secretariat add a column against each evaluation in the workplan, to specify who had requested the evaluation.
- EAC members endorsed the proposed revision of the gender policy and underscored the importance of an evaluation of the revised gender policy.

- In response to an EAC question, the Secretariat agreed that it would look into either conducting the Performance Based Funding (PBF) evaluation together with other institutions or at least compare the evaluation findings with them.
- The EAC suggested a potential evaluation of the work of the market shaping team to determine the impact of vaccine stock-out and co-financing. It was discussed that the latter could be covered as part of the policy review, when relevant). They also suggested that another possible area for evaluation could be around the environmental footprint of Gavi as it undertakes its operations.
- The EAC endorsed the evaluation workplan 2018-2020 as altered by the input provided. It encouraged the evaluation team to explore how further efficiencies can be achieved through packing evaluations together, exploring newer evaluation methodologies and designs, and leveraging other evaluation programmes in countries of Gavi's interest.

9. Review of EAC Charter

- 9.1 Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance presented to the EAC the proposed updates to the Committee's current charter and explained that these represented the first set of changes to align the EAC Charter with the recent changes made to the Charters of other Board Committees, as well as the development of a Terms of Reference of a newly formed advisory Committee of the Board.
- 9.2 Ms Goetz outlined the key changes and explained their rationale to the EAC. She explained that most of the proposed updates were of editorial nature. She noted that further changes will be made to the current Charter, in addition to the proposed changes, at a later stage, once the findings of the Evaluation function peer review exercise are fully incorporated and role and responsibilities of the function are clarified.

Discussion

- The Secretariat confirmed, in response to a question, that the EAC had direct access to the Board for decisions that required Board approval, and not a reporting mechanism which was through the PPC.

Decision One

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee **recommended** to the Gavi Alliance Governance Committee that it:

Request the Gavi Alliance Board to approve the revised and updated Committee Charter for the Evaluation and Advisory Committee attached as Annex B to Doc 09.

10. Review of decisions

- 10.1 Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance, reviewed and agreed the language of the decisions with the Committee.

11. Any other business

- 11.1 The Chair sought input from members of the EAC and the Secretariat on how the Committee functions, and solicited recommendations on any specific areas for improvement.
- 11.2 The EAC requested that for the agenda items requiring its guidance, where relevant, a cover-paper should be prepared, outlining the specific areas of guidance being sought by the Secretariat, such that the documentation needed to be adequate to inform the discussions.
- 11.3 The EAC endorsed the suggestion to have a closed session of the Committee at its meetings, going forward.
- 11.4 After determining there was no further business, the meeting was brought to a close.

Ms Mahwesh Bilal Khan
Secretary to the Meeting

Attachment A

Participants

Committee Members

- Rob Moodie, Chair
- Anna Hamrell
- Jeanine Condo
- Nina Schwalbe
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien
- Wieneke Vullings
- Zulfiqar Bhutta

Committee Member-elect

- Mira Johri

Secretariat

- Seth Berkley (Items 1-4 and 7)
- Anuradha Gupta (Items 3-5 and 7)
- Hind Khatib-Othman (Item 5b)
- Abdallah Bchir
- Alba Vilajeliu
- Hope Johnson
- Joanne Goetz (Items 7 and 9-11)
- Mahwesh Bilal Khan
- Leslie Moreland
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Phyo Aung
- Adrien de Chaisemartin (Items 4 and 6)
- Alan Brooks (Item 6)
- Laura Craw (Item 6)

Guests

- Nick York
- James Tulloch (Item 5b)
- Jessica Shearer (Item 5b)
- Logan Brenzel (Item 5a and 5b)
- Ryuichi Komatsu (Item 5a and 5b)