

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

15 February 2019

Teleconference

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 The meeting commenced at 14.39 Geneva time on 15 February 2019. 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 16-17 October 2018 (Doc 01b) as well as the minutes of the joint meeting with the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) on 17 October 2018 which had been approved by no-objection on 7 December 2018 and 20 December 2018 respectively.

2. Uganda Country Programme Evaluation

- 2.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Programme Officer, Evaluation, presented this item to the Committee (Doc 02) highlighting the process leading to the submission of this proposal and providing information in relation to the key evaluation themes namely urban immunisation, private sector and leadership, management and coordination.

Discussion

- EAC members provided a number of comments in relation to the proposal, with some members noting in particular that they would have found it useful if the data analysis component had been described in better detail.
- There was lack of clarity on how the mixed methods had been balanced out and it was also unclear as to how the sample size for the household survey had been arrived at. The Secretariat noted in relation to the latter that the team wanted to leverage some of the work carried out during Phase 1 of the Full Country Evaluations (FCE) project and that they would be asked to build this out more specifically in light of input from EAC members.
- EAC members agreed that DTP1 should be included in the outcomes.
- It was suggested that it would be good to link how the evaluation fits into or could learn from ongoing activities in Bangladesh, Mozambique and Zambia. The

Secretariat noted that this is indeed an area which could be further elaborated on and in particular in relation to Zambia where there will be ongoing work in parallel.

- It was also suggested that it could be useful to share the immunisation urban toolkit which the evaluators may wish to consider, noting that in relation to the urban immunisation component the proposal is somewhat weak on the quantitative side. The Secretariat noted that this had already been done. It was suggested that they may wish to look at drop out and quality and sustainability of services.
- In relation to the private sector it was suggested that it would be useful to see more on the regulation of private sector and reporting of private sector issues.
- EAC members agreed that in terms of dissemination it would be interesting not only to share data but also to collect some human interest stories along the way.
- The Secretariat noted that in relation to the leadership, management and coordination component and related definitions there is ongoing work within the Secretariat on building out a theory of change, standardising definitions, defining what success might look like etc. and that this will be shared with the evaluators once finalised.
- It was agreed that it would be useful for the EAC to have further information in relation to the proposed collaboration with the Global Financing Facility (GFF).
- In relation to a number of comments received the Secretariat noted that it is customary to work on developing the methods more fully once the initial proposal has been approved. As this is a two-year proposal, the primary focus for year one will be the urban immunisation work with work on the other components commencing towards the end of year one.
- In response to questions from the EAC, the Secretariat noted that based on internal reviews including with country facing teams, it is felt that the proposal is timely and good to move forward.
- EAC members therefore generally agreed that in the context of their input from this meeting being taken on board, within the parameters of the proposed budget, they could approve the proposal now and looked forward to receiving a report at their meeting in April 2019 confirming that their input had been taken on board.

Decision One

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee:

Approved the Infectious Diseases Research Collaboration (IDRC) proposal and budget as attached in Annexes A and B to Doc 02, as amended by discussions at the EAC.

Mira Johri abstained from voting on Decision One above.

3. Review of Evaluation Policy

- 3.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Monitoring and Evaluation, presented this item to the EAC (Doc 03). She focused on the key issues which had arisen during the written consultation with EAC members leading up to this meeting namely on the value/purpose of Steering Committees; maintaining independence and ensuring that appropriate safeguards are in place; utility of evaluations; centralised v. decentralised evaluations; the quality assurance (QA) tool and typologies definitions.

Discussion

- EAC members were comfortable with the proposed solution whereby EAC guidance would be sought on the relevance of having an evaluation Steering Committee for proposed evaluations as part of workplan sessions.
- In relation to independence and in particular to the idea of a firewall between the Executive Office and the Evaluation Team, some EAC members were not fully comfortable with the proposal and it was agreed that this should be further reflected on and some new wording proposed for the discussion at the EAC meeting in April 2019. It was again highlighted that the peer review of the evaluation function found no concern for structure or behavioural independence and with the reorganisation of the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) department in 2018 there was little appetite to address any additional restructuring.
- EAC members were comfortable with the proposed modifications to the *Utility* section of the policy based on written input from EAC members in advance of this meeting.
- EAC members agreed that going forward the EAC would be asked to review draft final reports and approve final reports. The Secretariat noted that this would have implications on the workload of the EAC going forward which it would be important to consider further during the discussion on the review of the EAC Terms of Reference (ToR) under the next item.
- In relation to the notion of centralised v. decentralised evaluations, the Secretariat noted that while both are normally independent the differentiation is more around EAC engagement and the robustness of the evaluation. Gavi is growing as a learning organisation and in this context the aim is to provide clarity on where the role of the EAC is seen to be important.
- EAC members were comfortable with the clarifications provided in relation to comments on the QA tool and the typologies distinction.

4. Review of Evaluation Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

- 4.1 Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance, presented this item to the EAC, focusing in particular on comments received from EAC members in writing requiring further discussion as outlined in Annex A to Doc 04.

Discussion

- In relation to the proposed responsibilities of the EAC namely “*Review the use of centralised evaluation findings*” and “*Report to the Board on the status of follow up on the Evaluation Management Response of centralised evaluations*”, it was agreed that while these should not be the role of the EAC it will be important to ensure that the EAC has sufficient information to report to the Board on the status of the evaluation work as a whole.
- In light of the EAC’s agreement under the previous item that the EAC going forward should review draft reports for centralised evaluations and approve the final reports, the Secretariat noted that it will be necessary to come back to the EAC at its meeting in April 2019 to have a further discussion on how this can be done in practice. Some options to consider will be approval of reports at EAC meetings (in-person or teleconferences), approval electronically by unanimous consent, delegation of approval to a subset of Committee members etc.
- EAC members agreed that the Committee should evaluate its performance at least one every two years and not five as currently stated in the ToRs.
- Due to time constraints it was not possible to conclude discussions on the proposed amendments to the ToR and outstanding topics will be addressed with the EAC at its next meeting in April 2019.

5. Review of Decisions

- 5.1 Joanne Goetz, Head of Governance, reviewed the decision language with the Committee, which was approved by them.

6. Any other business

- 6.1 After determining there was no further business, the meeting was brought to a close.

Mrs Joanne Goetz
Secretary to the Meeting

Attachment A

Participants

Committee Members

- Rob Moodie, Chair
- Zulfiqar Bhutta
- Craig Burgess
- Mira Johri
- Nina Schwalbe
- Wieneke Vullings

Secretariat

- Emmanuella Baguma
- Joanne Goetz
- Hope Johnson
- Leslie Moreland

Regrets

- Jeanine Condo
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien