

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

11-12 April 2018

Gavi Alliance, Geneva, Switzerland

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 The meeting commenced at 09.05 Geneva time on 11 April 2018. Rob Moodie, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Committee Chair welcomed new EAC member Craig Burgess whose membership became effective from 1 January 2018. Craig is the Alternate Board member for the Civil Society Organisations (CSO) constituency.
- 1.3 The Chair extended a particular welcome to Seth Berkley, Gavi CEO and thanked him for taking time to present to the Committee and share his views on their meeting agenda.
- 1.4 The Chair made the members aware that the meeting would be recorded to aid minute taking.
- 1.5 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a).
- 1.6 Committee members noted the minutes of its joint meeting with the PPC on 24 October 2017 (Doc 01b) which had been approved by no-objection on 8 February 2018 and the minutes of its meeting on 24-25 October 2017 (Doc 01c) which had been approved by no-objection on 8 February 2018. The members also noted a unanimous consent decision which was approved on 1 December (Doc 01d) and reviewed the action sheet (Doc 01e).
- 1.7 The Chair updated the Committee on the Gavi Board meeting in Vientiane in November which included some very fruitful discussions on evaluations. He reported that there was a strong consensus from the Board around learning and a strong appetite to hear about what is and is not working well within Gavi.
- 1.8 The Chair proposed a short closed session of the Committee members at the end of the day, as per a request from the Committee at the previous meeting.

2. Update from Secretariat

- 2.1 Seth Berkley, Gavi CEO, outlined key developments in the global landscape. He highlighted the growing interest in collaboration between different organisations in the global health sector and noted the importance of considering the logistics of working with multiple organisations without incurring additional costs or programme delays.
- 2.2 Dr Berkley then highlighted to the Committee the issues around global conflict and the impact on disease.
- 2.3 Dr Berkley also raised the matter of immunisation campaigns, specifically measles. He highlighted that Gavi is looking to improve the quality of campaigns and associated data collection whilst also ensuring that the focus remains on strengthening routine immunisation.
- 2.4 The CEO updated the EAC on the main discussion areas at the recent Board retreat and noted the re-structuring of some teams within the Gavi Secretariat.
- 2.5 The CEO emphasised the importance of the M&E function and the potential role for the EAC in a learning organisation. He also emphasised the importance of the link between the committees and welcomed the annual joint gathering of the PPC and EAC.
- 2.6 Dr Berkley commented on the peer review of the evaluations function. He noted that the critical point from the peer review is to understand the utility of the reports and resulting action at country level.
- 2.7 He suggested that the EAC remain cognisant of the main Board priorities, and continue to focus on quality assurance aligned with these priorities.
- 2.8 The CEO highlighted the importance of working with the Global Fund and ensuring we continue to share ideas.

Discussion

- In response to several comments from EAC members on short-term campaigns versus routine immunisation, the CEO re-emphasised that there is a need to focus on the quality of campaigns and their role in strengthening routine immunisation.
- In response to a question on the potential of merging governance structures across organisations, Dr Berkley highlighted that Gavi is collaborating in various ways with many organisations while being cognisant of differences between business models
- A member of the EAC asked if there was any work ongoing to understand how Gavi can operate effectively in fragile countries. The CEO responded that this continues to be a focus for Gavi and was discussed in detailed at the recent Board

retreat in March. Further discussions on approaches to progress coverage and equity in fragile countries will also be discussed at the upcoming Board meeting.

- The members were interested to understand from Dr Berkley how Gavi can effectively communicate the learnings from the evaluations, and how the evaluations are being used by the Secretariat/Board/partners. He highlighted the importance of working with CSOs and other organisations to ensure effective communication and the role that data analysis can play in demonstrating the impact of these learnings.
- In response to questions around the mid-term review (MTR), Dr Berkley confirmed that it will be an opportunity to report back to donors on how we are doing in delivering on the Berlin Investment Case, including providing a balanced reflection on successes and challenges. The MTR will also be the opportunity to start discussing some of the strategic considerations for Gavi 5.0.

3. Strategic recommendations from the peer review - Follow up (1)

- 3.1 The Chair noted that any changes to the Evaluation Policy or the EAC terms of reference (TOR) coming out of today's discussion should be approved at the October EAC meeting. He highlighted that the TORs will need to first be reviewed by the Governance Committee in September, ready to be presented to the Gavi Board by November.
- 3.2 Leslie Moreland, Programme Officer, Evaluation provided a brief background on the peer review. Hope Johnson, Director, Monitoring and Evaluation then outlined the strategic recommendations from the peer review and stated that the focus of the first discussion should be on the purpose and audience for the Gavi Evaluation Function. She noted that, due to unforeseen circumstances, Anna Hentinnen was absent from the meeting but that the group will continue to work with her when seeking independent advice.
- 3.3 Dr Johnson highlighted some of the areas which the Gavi Executive Office and Secretariat had discussed prior to the EAC meeting. She stated that the internal preference is to focus on what Gavi can do better in real time in order to course-correct programmes. The primary purpose therefore is to learn and improve, and evaluations should be utility focussed and practical. She noted the view that the primary audience should be the Secretariat, however there was also a recognition on the need to engage Alliance partners and countries.

Discussion

- An EAC member noted that external users can struggle to take learnings from the evaluations as they are not readily accessible, which may be a missed opportunity.
- Several Committee members asked who can request evaluations or input into the focus of evaluations. The Secretariat responded that it depends on the

circumstances; sometimes a need is identified by the Board, and at other times the Secretariat (mainly Policy and Country Support teams). Relevant Secretariat teams, as well as Alliance and external partners, are asked for input, depending on the nature of the evaluation.

- The EAC members encouraged the Secretariat to think about how they can communicate the key messages in an effective manner for all recipients e.g. in an executive summary or presentations at the Board. The Secretariat acknowledged the suggestions and informed the EAC that different approaches were previously tested such as policy briefs, a summary on the website, presentations to the staff etc.
- The Committee then discussed evaluation target audiences. Primary audiences identified were the Board and Secretariat. Secondary audiences identified were Alliance partners and countries, noting that the audiences may change depending on the nature of the evaluation.
- The Evaluation team noted that there are challenges within different Secretariat teams around translating recommendations into concrete actions and establishing a Secretariat-wide process to follow-up. The group acknowledged that there have been issues in the past within the Alliance selecting certain recommendations and not addressing them all. Questions were raised about how the Evaluation team can work with the Alliance to support processes for follow-up on recommendations.
- The Secretariat noted that the joint meetings between the EAC and PPC are a useful forum in which to share learnings and raise suggestions, such as the EAC and PPC working together to align on programme and policy recommendations and evaluation priorities. There was also a proposal to request that the PPC considers findings related to programme design in their Committee meetings.
- An EAC member enquired as to whether there is an area in the Secretariat where theory of change is managed. The Secretariat responded that there is very high demand for the Monitoring and Evaluation team to support other Gavi teams but that they do not have the capacity to undertake all of this work. They proposed that the theory of change concept should ideally be built in to programme design from the start. The Secretariat noted that there is starting to be a shift to acknowledge this in other Gavi teams.
- The Committee discussed the roles and interaction of the Gavi Board and the EAC and noted that it's not always easy for the Secretariat or the EAC members to clearly understand what the main evaluation priorities are for the Board.
- The Committee agreed that there is a clear emphasis towards learning rather than accountability within the evaluation function, although recognised that there will always be some mixture.

- The EAC members requested that the evaluation workplan is updated to include the different evaluation categories in order for them to better understand the product mix.

4. Strategic recommendations from the peer review – Follow up (2)

- 4.1 Leslie Moreland and Emmanuella Baguma, Programme Officers, Evaluation, outlined the types of products the evaluation team conduct or support on, as requested in the previous discussion.
- 4.2 Hope Johnson then presented to the Committee three possible models relating to the structure of the Evaluation team within the Gavi organisation. The options looked at how independent or closely linked to other teams the evaluation function could be.

Discussion

- Responding to a question from the EAC, Dr Johnson stated that option one was the preferred option for the Secretariat as they've essentially just moved to this as part of a wider Secretariat re-structuring. She stated that the peer review highlighted this as the 'least independent' option but clarified to the Committee that structurally they are separate from many of the other Gavi functions. It was however noted that this would not provide independence from the Executive Office (EO).
- Several members provided suggestions on how option two could be modified to ensure a good balance between independence of the function and operational understanding.
- The Committee members discussed whether the US \$500,000 Request for Proposal (RFP) threshold was still appropriate. It was proposed that, instead of a monetary threshold, clear guidelines be created in the TORs to direct which evaluations/reviews the Committee should oversee.
- Dr Johnson then reviewed the six potential roles of the EAC as per slide 19 of Doc 03 in the pack and asked members for comments.
- One EAC member noted that the way the functions have been presented appears to imply that members with a scientific background would not be useful here. After some discussion it was acknowledged that there was still an important role for technical expertise on the EAC, implicit in the quality assurance area.
- All EAC members agreed on the high value of their roles in quality assurance (role 1, slide 19), independence (role 3) and strategic steer (role 6). However, Committee members noted that facilitating learning within the Alliance, building and promoting the evaluation culture within the Alliance, identifying evaluation

gaps and proposing future evaluations were not explicitly addressed in the six current roles, but could be incorporated in roles 5 and 4 respectively.

- It was proposed that, at the next joint meeting with the PPC, an agenda item could be included to discuss how the outcomes of the meeting will inform PPC discussions and the evaluation workplan.
- Members discussed the role of the evaluation Steering Committees and how they engage with the EAC. It was noted that recently, EAC members have begun to sit on the Steering Committees. Concerns were raised around the potential erosion of independence and blurred roles of the Committees.
- After discussion, it was noted that in many cases the EAC will not need to see draft reports but can comment on the utility and quality of final reports.

5. Follow Up on peer review recommendations – Wrap up

- 5.1 The Chair asked the group to summarise their views on evaluation purpose and audience, evaluation structure within the Secretariat, and the membership and role of the EAC.

Discussion

- Several members stated that something similar to team structure option two would be their preference (i.e. analogous to the current Audit and Investigation function) if it reduced the issue around the lack of independence. The Secretariat noted the direct link to the Board in this option and highlighted what a significant change this would be.
- The Secretariat agreed to arrange a follow up call with Anna Hentinnen, peer review panel member, to discuss the structural models, after which further actions could be agreed.
- The membership of the Committee was then discussed. The EAC agreed that membership proposals 3 and 4 on slide 20 of Doc 03, i.e. including donor and Secretariat representation, were not appropriate due to the potential impact on independence. Possible representation from people with country experience was proposed as an addition to the membership.
- The Gavi Governance team agreed to explore creating an EAC skills matrix once the new policy and TORs have been defined.
- The Chair concluded that the EAC agreed the primary audiences as Gavi Secretariat, the Board and Countries but with recognition that each evaluation will likely have its own specific wider audiences. He also noted the generally aligned views on the role of the EAC. He highlighted the strong emphasis on learning and independence, which are interrelated. Finally, he noted that the composition of the

Committee will be driven by the decisions on the core roles and functions of the EAC.

- The Secretariat agreed to arrange an EAC teleconference in the second half of June 2018 to discuss the draft evaluation policy and EAC TORs.

6. Evaluations update

- 6.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, presented to the EAC an update of the planned and unplanned evaluations to date, including those in which the EAC has not previously been involved.
- 6.2 He highlighted progress on the planned evaluations including the evaluation of Gavi's support to the CSOs, the evaluation of the measles campaigns and their effects on the overall immunisation system and finally the status of the performance-based funding (PBF) review.
- 6.3 The Secretariat then commented on the ongoing unplanned evaluations, including the Assessment of 'Rapid-Pro' utilisation for the Measles-Rubella (MR) campaign in Indonesia, the Indonesia HSS desk review and the India portfolio evaluation.

Discussion

- On the CSOs evaluation, the Secretariat noted comments from members on co-creating the questions and the theory of change.
- On responding to the concerns over the limited countries chosen, the Secretariat clarified that they had asked the bidders to suggest countries rather than proposing any themselves. They noted the short timeframes which may mean they need to further narrow the list of countries.
- Responding to a question on the composition of the Steering Committee and some potential conflicts of interest, the Secretariat mentioned that discussions had already taken place around this and explained the reasons behind their selection of the various representatives. There was then a conversation around the role of the EAC vs Steering Committees, following on from the previous day's discussions.
- On the measles campaign evaluation, when members indicated a desire to be more involved, the Secretariat noted that they would welcome feedback but due to timing this would be relevant to the final draft report. The Secretariat noted that any members who would like to be kept apprised of developments were welcome to contact the Secretariat directly.
- In response to strong encouragement from the EAC members to have country representation on the Steering Committee, the Secretariat noted that, after

reaching out to many colleagues, it appears that country colleagues have limited bandwidth.

- Following a question from a member on the role of the EAC in facilitating learning, the Secretariat proposed that during the review of the workplans, there could be up front discussion with the EAC on the Steering Committees and communication strategy for each evaluation.

7. Collaboration with the Global Fund

- 7.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, presented to the EAC an update on collaboration with the Global Fund (GF). He outlined his attendance at the GF Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) and highlighted possible synergies between Gavi's Full Country Evaluations (FCEs) and GF's Prospective Country Evaluations (PCEs). He also outlined his activity with the GF on the Monitoring, Evaluation and Country Analysis (MECA) team.
- 7.2 Dr James Tulloch, TERG Chair, Global Fund, presented his views to the EAC on the potential constraints and opportunities for collaboration between Gavi and Global Fund. He particularly noted an important potential for reducing transaction costs for countries and learning from Gavi regarding FCEs.
- 7.3 He proposed defining a few achievable aims to which the two organisations could work towards such as aiming for dual involvement in thematic reviews, cross participation in a significant global evaluation or joint activities under PCEs.
- 7.4 He noted that the co-location at the Global Health Campus may help to facilitate collaborative working.

Discussion

- The members of the EAC noted their thanks for the presentations and echoed their support for working closely together, particularly on FCE/PCE activities. They also voiced their enthusiasm for the possibility of capacity building in countries and reducing transaction costs by working together.
- In response to a suggestion to host a joint meeting between EAC and TERG, it was proposed that the next joint meeting could be in early 2019, dependent on other commitments.
- In response to questions about their plans on transition and financial sustainability, Dr Tulloch responded that this should be moving forward later in 2018 at the Global Fund and could be a good opportunity for work with Gavi. Dr Tulloch also noted his view that collaboration on PCE/FCEs between the two organisations is an ongoing opportunity for collaboration due to overlapping supported countries.

- The Chair asked the presenters about their ideas on next steps. The Secretariat proposed a small team of 2 participants from each organisation to work together and bring ideas back to the Committees. There was general support from both sides for this approach. The Chair asked the Secretariat to report back at the next Committee meeting on progress.

8. Update on CCEOP evaluation

- 8.1 Leslie Moreland, Programme Officer, Evaluation presented to the EAC an update on the CCEOP evaluation. Due to the potential conflict of interest, Craig Burgess left the room for this agenda item.
- 8.2 Ms Moreland noted that opportunities for engagement with global/country stakeholders are being explored. She further noted that a UNICEF commissioned assessment on market shaping for CCEOP will likely be leveraged to inform the market shaping baseline assessment.

Discussion

- Viroj Tangcharoensathien, Steering Committee Chair, stated that the overall quality of the inception report was acceptable, but with some suggestions relating to clarity and structure of the report, contextualisation, evaluation methodology, clarity on how country partners will be involved and how the findings will be tailored to suit different audiences, especially countries.

9. Update on HSS Review

- 9.1 Marina Madeo, Senior Manager, HSIS Team, presented to the EAC an update on the HSS review. She noted that this initial 2018 review will help inform the MTR, with the feasibility of conducting an HSIS evaluation in 2019 – 2020, if relevant.
- 9.2 Ms Madeo stated that the main objectives of the review are mainly to show how Gavi HSS support contributes to increasing coverage and/or equity, strengthening health systems to deliver integrated primary health care, and to improved sustainability of national programmes.
- 9.3 Ms Madeo noted that the review will focus on HSS grants approved in the period 2014 – 2017. She highlighted that there is not yet enough evidence on the impact of new grants given the timeframe of implementation, to allow for an evaluation.

Discussion

- In response to a question over the shifting ambition of the review and short timescales in which to complete the task, the Secretariat responded that it is

designed to be a relatively quick review to help inform the MTR as well as the feasibility and design of the potential HSIS evaluation. The Secretariat noted that they are trying to ensure a robust methodology and do not expect full answers to all of the review questions.

- In response to questions from EAC members on the chosen start date of 2014, the Secretariat stated that they looked at a wider evidence base because it is too early to understand the impact of the few grants approved after June 2016.
- Responding to a question about identifying different types of fragility within the review, the Secretariat confirmed that they will consider a number of criteria for the HSS grants to be selected.
- When asked about engagement with CSOs and the private sector, the Secretariat noted that these stakeholders will be considered as part of the desk review.
- The Secretariat highlighted the difficulties of measuring grants which do not have common themes, as is the case with HSS. They noted that this desk review should highlight how we can collect better, more consistent data in the future for HSIS grants.
- Several members of the EAC asked about the scope of the review and the potential to demonstrate Gavi's attribution vs contribution, the budget categories in which the funding is being spent and non-financial benefits. The Secretariat responded that the main focus of the review is coverage but acknowledged that, if possible, it would be useful to demonstrate the wider benefits of HSS investment.
- On responding to a proposal from the EAC, the Secretariat agreed to ensure the RFP is explicit that this review will inform the potential future prospective evaluation in 2019 - 2020.

10. Evaluation Workplan 2018 - 2020

- 10.1 The Secretariat presented to the EAC the proposed workplan for 2018 – 2020 for their approval. The Secretariat noted that reviews relating to the Gender policy and engagement with the private sector still had dates to be confirmed and the Supply and Procurement Strategy should not be marked as 'cancelled'.

Discussion

- The group discussed the challenges around participant co-operation and delays in evaluations. There was also discussion around the complexity of who requests a new evaluation and whether there is an opportunity in the future for the EAC to make proposals.

- Members re-stated their preference that reviews should be shared more widely, with a proposal to clarify in the evaluation policy document the intent to communicate the results of the reviews/evaluations.
- After some discussion the EAC members asked to see a more detailed workplan every six months which includes evaluations/reviews from across all Gavi teams, and be updated electronically in the meantime when reviews/evaluations of a strategically significant nature are requested. The EAC would not input into the decision making process but would use it for information.

Decision One

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee;

- (i) **Approved** the multi-year workplan for the remaining Gavi strategy period (2018-2020) as set out in Slides 3 and 4 of Doc 10, as amended by discussions at the EAC; and
- (ii) **Noted** that in order for a programme, policy or project to be properly evaluated there must be a clear design, articulated objectives and outcomes, a theory of change and associated results framework.

11. Midline and End-line Assessment of the Targeted Country Assistance evaluation

- 11.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Programme Officer, Evaluation presented an update on the Targeted Country Assistance (TCA) with the support of Mira Johri, as the Steering Committee Chair. She noted issues raised on the baseline assessment including significant questions on the robustness of the methods and findings. She stated that Deloitte has revised the approach for the mid-term and end-line assessments based on feedback and lessons learnt.
- 11.2 She also raised the potential conflict of interest with Deloitte on continuing to do this work, as they will likely be selected as Gavi Alliance's new independent external auditor. She noted that the AFC will consider this matter in their meeting on 26 April. Mira Johri then presented three options for next steps if Deloitte were not in a position to continue this evaluation.

Discussion

- The EAC members commented that it appears as though it's either the nature of the programme design or that the programme is not yet ready to be evaluated that caused the issues, rather than the evaluation design.
- There was support for option one in general with a recognition that it would be useful to go back and redesign an RFP as well as define the conditions in which

the programme will be evaluable. There was support for the message that the lack of clear theory of change impacted on this evaluation.

- The EAC members endorsed that the Secretariat move forward with option one on slide 12 and 13 of the presentation in Doc 11, recognising that programmes need to be in an evaluable state (i.e. with clear outcomes and theory of change) in order to facilitate an effective evaluation.

Discussions and decisions in relation to Agenda Item 12 *Full Country Evaluations (FCE) 2nd Phase* are recorded separately due to commercial sensitivities.

13. Closing remarks and any other business

- 13.1 Joanne Goetz, Head of Governance, reviewed the decision language with the Committee, which was approved by them.
- 13.2 The Chair particularly thanked the Secretariat on the amount and quality of their work.
- 13.3 After determining there was no further business, the meeting was brought to a close.

Ms Caroline Bradley
Secretary to the Meeting

Attachment A

Participants

Committee Members

- Rob Moodie, Chair
- Craig Burgess (All except Item 8)
- Jeanine Condo
- Anna Hamrell (Items 1-10)
- Mira Johri
- Nina Schwalbe
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien

Regrets

- Zulfiqar Bhutta
- Wieneke Vullings

Guests

- James Tulloch (Item 7)
- Ryuichi Komatsu (Item 7)
- Jessica Shearer (Item 12)

Secretariat

- Seth Berkley (Item 2)
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Abdallah Bchir
- Caroline Bradley
- Laura Craw
- Anne Cronin (Item 12)
- Joanne Goetz (Items 1-5, 12 and 13)
- Hope Johnson
- Marina Madeo (Item 9)
- Leslie Moreland