

Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance Board Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) assessment of the quality and usefulness of the Norwegian Institute of Public Health’s “Evaluation of the Gavi Alliance Co-financing Policy”

The evaluation was reviewed in-depth by two committee members and discussed by the whole Committee. The Committee’s assessment is summarised below.

<p>Overall assessment and conclusions of the quality and usefulness of this evaluation</p> <p>Overall, the Committee assessed this as a rigorous and very insightful evaluation, completed against a very ambitious timeline.</p> <p>As detailed in the strengths section below, the authors have used an appropriate and broad set of data sources which they have triangulated, to give us what I would describe as the <i>“best understanding of what is really occurring”</i>.</p> <p>The authors have systematically and comprehensively responded to the RfP evaluation questions, and have added a number of clever and worthwhile insights – based on their own analyses and experience.</p> <p>This should be a very useful input in to the redesign of the co-financing policy.</p>
--

<p>Strengths</p> <p>Evaluation methodology</p> <p>The evaluation methodology is rigorous, clearly explained and the evaluators have used very comprehensive data sources including literature review, key informant interviews, quantitative analyses, surveys to countries and others. The team has triangulated well and appropriately across data sources and we particularly note the extensive range and number of experts interviewed.</p> <p>Comprehensiveness</p> <p>This evaluation has systematically and comprehensively responded to all the evaluation questions. The evaluation authors have constructed their own analyses where appropriate e.g. working out decision letter lead times, exploring the impact of the weighted average price and actions taken by countries, and comparison of defaulters versus non defaulters.</p> <p>The evaluation also adds very useful reflections on such issues as the need for a definition of country ownership – but they don’t just leave it there – the authors define country ownership themselves and then attempt to answer the question whether it is increasing or not. In addition their reflections on policy inconsistency are very useful.</p>
--

Recommendations

Overall we found the recommendations in the report valuable, relevant to the upcoming policy review and based on the evidence presented in the report.

Limitations / weaknesses

The limitations are well detailed by the evaluators, realistic and helped nuance the interpretation of the results. The ambitious timeline and the loss of two in-country (previous defaulters) visits are key issues. We note that not interviewing World Bank and key Finance experts seems to be a limitation in the expert group interviewees.

The evaluators bring up many key issues – but there are some that could perhaps have been explored in greater depth. In particular, we note that more could have been included about the *why and how* Ministries of Finance should be included in generating information, financial analyses and planning, and support for adequate and reliable finances in country.

Lessons learned / recommendations for future evaluations

Clarifying better the key history and timeline of different approaches could have been helpful – from FSPs, to cMYPs (2005), to the first co-financing policy (2008) , the review of it (2010), the second co-financing policy (2012), and its current review etc.

For future evaluations of a similar complex nature, we would recommend aiming for a less ambitious timeline. It is possible that planning to visit more countries in the knowledge that 1-2 will probably fall through due to in-country challenges / context (especially with fragile countries) may be worth building in to timeframes.

Finally, although the policies for eligibility, graduation and co-financing are linked, we found this examination of the co-financing policy sensitive to these interrelationships and insightful in itself. Notwithstanding, in future a single, comprehensive evaluation of these policies might be worth considering.