

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

16-17 October 2018

Gavi Alliance, Geneva, Switzerland

1. Chair's report

- 1.1 The meeting commenced at 09.00 Geneva time on 16 October 2018. Rob Moodie, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair extended a particular welcome to Anuradha Gupta, Gavi Deputy CEO, and thanked her for taking time to present to the Committee and share her views on their meeting agenda.
- 1.3 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a).
- 1.4 Committee members noted the minutes of its meetings on 11-12 April 2018 (Docs 01b and 01c), 18 May 2018 (Doc 01d) and 26 June 2018 (Doc 01e) which had been approved by no-objection on 20 June 2018, 9 July 2018 and 23 August 2018 respectively.
- 1.5 The Chair updated the Committee on the Gavi Board meeting in Geneva in June which included some very fruitful discussions on evaluations, and a request from the Board Chair to have a presentation at the next Board meeting on how evaluations have been utilised.
- 1.6 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 a previous meeting.

2. Update from Secretariat

- 2.1 Anuradha Gupta, Gavi Deputy CEO, started by informing EAC members that at its meeting the previous week the Governance Committee had agreed to recommend to the Board that it exceptionally extend Rob Moodie's term as EAC chair to end June 2019.
- 2.2 Ms Gupta recalled that Gavi is nearing the mid-point of its current strategic period and that it is therefore time to step back and reflect on progress to date.
- 2.3 She highlighted that there has been a paradigm shift in the way Gavi works and outlined the four principles that are embedded into Gavi's approach namely (i) country-centric; (ii) differentiation; (iii) transparency; and (iv) accountability.
- 2.4 Ms Gupta indicated that Gavi has also been increasing its focus on risk assurance through its three lines of defence model. In this context, Senior Country Managers

(SCMs) play an important role as the first line of defence, along with Alliance partners in-country. As a second line of defence function, Programme Capacity Assessments (PCAs) are providing important information in relation to EPI management capacity, vaccine management, and the financial management capacity of countries. Programme audits, as the third line of defence, are also a rich source of information and now look at both financial and programmatic areas.

- 2.5 Ms Gupta noted that Gavi has also been improving its monitoring processes, to ensure that more real-time information is available to inform decisions and course-correct as needed. This includes the Joint Appraisal process, greater country engagement by SCMs and Country Teams, as well as implementing and strengthening Grant Performance Frameworks (GPF). The GPFs now provide more real time operational information and thereby enable challenges to be addressed in a more timely manner.
- 2.6 She also described the Alliance Accountability Framework (AAF), which ensures that progress is transparently monitored and there is clear accountability for key deliverables and goals. The AAF includes mission indicators, strategic goals and indicators, Alliance Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), as well as the GPFs, the Partners' Engagement Framework (PEF) and Secretariat performance indicators and targets.
- 2.7 Ms Gupta provided an update on the progress of the implementation of Gavi's current strategy for the period 2016-2020 in relation to the four Strategic Goals.
- 2.8 On *Accelerating vaccines and ensuring equitable coverage*, Ms Gupta noted that Gavi continues to reach more and more children with Gavi-supported vaccines and we have seen an increase of one percentage point in DTP3 coverage over the 2015 baseline. However, there continue to be challenges related to factors such as coverage gains being offset by an increase in the birth cohort and by specific difficulties faced by fragile countries in accelerating progress. Further acceleration in DTP3 and MCV1 is required in order to meet Gavi's 2020 target.
- 2.9 In relation to *Health Systems Strengthening*, Ms Gupta highlighted that while there has been an improvement in effective vaccine management (EVM) scores, progress is variable in countries. In terms of the *Sustainability* goal, she noted that there is a record high in country co-financing which speaks to the power of Gavi's catalytic model. There are a number of challenges to be addressed relating to programmatic sustainability and in this context the Board has already identified five countries where successful transition is at risk and for which tailored country plans have been put in place.
- 2.10 Ms Gupta indicated that in relation to the *Market Shaping* goal, Gavi is on track to meet its 2020 targets, but that there are increasingly challenges in relation to supply constraints for HPV, rotavirus and IPV.
- 2.11 Finally, Ms Gupta briefly shared some thoughts in relation to the development of Gavi's new strategy, Gavi 5.0. She highlighted some of the key questions that the

Alliance will need to address in the context of Gavi 5.0, as well as the timeline for developing the strategy and presenting it to the Board.

Discussion

- In response to a question from an EAC member, Ms Gupta noted that a PEF Targeted Country Assistance (TCA) baseline review was conducted but that it became so complicated that it had lost its relevance. She noted that it is important to ensure that Gavi's evaluation approach is fit for purpose in the context of a new operating model in which things move very rapidly.
- Ms Gupta noted that there is a greater focus on real time information and that there are already a large number of different sources of information that Gavi can utilise to inform decisions, including implementation research. The Secretariat further noted that there have been great improvements in Gavi's monitoring activities and that while some of the evaluation aspects are therefore less important than in the past, there remains a need for some very specific evaluation work.
- EAC members noted the continuous efforts to increase country capacity, and highlighted the importance of ensuring that this does not become an extra burden for countries. The Secretariat confirmed that the approach is to try and disaggregate and triangulate existing data.
- An EAC member asked on how evaluation might play a role in providing a different perspective on what is happening in-country, in particular in cases where there might be reluctance to report accurate data due to the perception of what might happen if reporting flags risks and challenges. Ms Gupta highlighted that a lot of work is being done to work with countries on the importance of reporting accurate data, despite the fact that it might not always show a positive picture. She emphasised that it is important to ensure that challenges are highlighted and understood in order to be able to react more quickly to address them and provide additional support as required. She added that it would be useful to have the EAC perspective on what Gavi's evaluation work should focus on going forward and what shape it could take, considering the different approaches to Gavi's work, as well as looking forward to the next strategic period.

3. Update on reviews of Evaluation Policy and EAC Terms of Reference

- 3.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Monitoring and Evaluation and Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance, recalled the work which had been done to date in relation to reviewing Gavi's Evaluation Policy and the EAC Terms of Reference. They informed EAC members that since the EAC's meeting in June 2018, it had not been possible to advance as far as had been hoped in relation to concluding internal consultations.
- 3.2 Ms Goetz also indicated that as it had been clearly expressed that as an advisory committee to the Board, it would be useful to have input from the Board on its

view of the role of the EAC going forward, it had been agreed that this would be sought through the Governance Committee, who would agree on a process and timeline at its next meeting in November 2018. The aim was to ensure that this process is aligned with the ongoing work of the EAC so as to ensure that the EAC is in a position at its April 2019 meeting to have final revision of both documents for consideration and subsequent recommendation for approval.

Discussion

- EAC members agreed that it will be important to ensure alignment from all stakeholders on the scope of Gavi's evaluation work going forward to inform the policy, also in the context of Gavi 5.0. This will then also help determine the role and responsibilities of the EAC and subsequently the skills and competencies which will be required of EAC members.
- EAC members also agreed that Gavi's evaluation work needs to be timely and that good use is made of the outcomes in terms of input to key policy and programmatic decisions for the Alliance.
- The Secretariat noted the recent trend whereby business owners are finding quicker and easier ways of getting information than from evaluations. EAC members noted that what might therefore be missing is more meta-learning and it was suggested that this is perhaps something that can be reflected in the evaluation policy going forward.
- The Secretariat noted that it would also be useful to have a clearer steer, e.g. from the Board, when taking decisions, on where they might expect to see independent evaluations, having firstly considered whether or not something is evaluable.
- Finally, EAC members noted the proposed timeline for the conclusion of the review of the Evaluation Policy and the EAC ToR whereby updated and revised documents would be circulated to the EAC in the first instance with an invitation to submit further comments in writing (January 2019 latest). Comments would then be further taken on board and discussed with the EAC during a teleconference (February 2019 latest), with the aim to have final drafts for the EAC to discuss and recommend for approval at its April 2019 meeting.
- In the context of general discussions during the course of the meeting it was suggested that it could be useful to have a set of operational guidelines for the EAC once the review of the evaluation policy and the EAC ToR has been finalised.

4. Evaluations update

- 4.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, Emmanuella Baguma, Programme Officer, Evaluation and Leslie Moreland, Programme Officer, Evaluation presented to the EAC an update of the planned evaluations to date, both centralised (planned, commissioned and managed by the Secretariat Evaluation Unit) and

decentralised (planned, commissioned and managed outside the Secretariat Evaluation Unit) (Doc 04).

- 4.2 They highlighted progress on the evaluation of Gavi's support to Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), the evaluation of the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP), the evaluation of measles campaigns and their effects on the overall routine immunisation system, and the evaluation of Gavi's gender policy.
- 4.3 They also provided an update on the decentralised evaluations and reviews, namely the HSS review, the HSS DRC midterm review, the evaluation of the HSS grant in India and an assessment of the use of "RapidPro" for a Measles-Rubella (MR) Campaign in Indonesia.

Discussion

- In the context of the discussion on some of these evaluations, EAC members had a number of questions around the process, in particular in relation to what is expected of the EAC when there are evaluations with Steering Committees who are involved in checking the quality of draft reports. The Secretariat noted that it would indeed be useful to have clarity on this going forward in the context of the review of the evaluation policy and the EAC ToR. EAC members noted the importance of ensuring that their work is seen as a value adding process, and that this could be in instances where it is agreed that having an external independent view could enhance the overall process.
- There was some discussion around the composition of Steering Committees and their level of independence and it was agreed that this needs to be further explored and clarified in the revised policy and operational guidelines.
- In relation to the evaluation of Gavi's support to Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) it was agreed that two EAC members, Nina Schwalbe and Zulfi Bhutta, would complete a review of the quality and usefulness of the final report once submitted.
- In relation to the evaluation of the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP), EAC members agreed to delegate the review of mid-line report to Viroj Tangcharoensathien and that the EAC would only engage in the review of the final CCEOP report (expected 2020).
- In relation to the evaluation of measles campaigns and their effects on the overall routine immunisation system Craig Burgess, Mira Johri, Nina Schwalbe and Wieneke Vullings agreed to review the quality and usefulness of the final report once submitted. The Secretariat noted some of the challenges encountered during implementation of the evaluation and in ensuring that the preliminary findings of the evaluation were taken on board in the materials being presented to the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) on this topic. In response to comments from EAC members, the Secretariat also noted that there had been some scope creep during this evaluation work in relation to what had been defined in the Request for Proposals (RFP).

- In relation to the evaluation of the gender policy Mira Johri and Wieneke Vullings agreed to review the quality and usefulness of the draft and final reports.
- EAC members reiterated, from discussions at earlier Committee meetings, the importance of ensuring that Gavi moves away from restricted tenders for evaluation work. It was also suggested that once RFPs are made available they could be shared with EAC members to enable them in turn to circulate amongst their networks.

5. Update on Gavi Policies

- 5.1 Wilson Mok, Head, Policy, presented this item to the EAC, focussing on Gavi's policy development principles and process, on the policies which are at the foundation of Gavi's support model and on upcoming reviews/updates of policies. In relation to the latter, he focused in particular on the context, process and timeline for the review of both Gavi's Gender Policy and HSIS support framework.

Discussion

- EAC members noted that it would be useful for them to have clarity on how the policy development process and the evaluation process link to Gavi 5.0 and what the Board needs in this context. The Secretariat noted that the intention is to integrate the review of the funding-related policies with the development of Gavi 5.0 and that internal discussions are ongoing in relation to how to achieve this.
- EAC members highlighted the importance of policy development/review including a theory of change, so as to facilitate potential evaluation work down the line.
- While EAC members recognised the importance of evidence-based policy reviews, there were some concerns around ensuring that the evidence is reliable. It was suggested that there might be a role here for the EAC to play and that this is therefore something that might be further explored.
- EAC members also highlighted the importance of linking both policy development and evaluations to work that other funders are doing (e.g. Global Fund, Global Financing Facility) as well as always keeping the ultimate customer in mind in terms of communities in Gavi-supported countries and the potential impact on them, and so ensure that their feedback is sought and taken on board early in the process.

6. Targeted Country Assistance (TCA) Evaluability Assessment

- 6.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, introduced this item, recalling that following the appointment of Deloitte as Gavi's external auditor they were no longer in a position to continue undertaking work in relation to the evaluation of Gavi's Targeted Country Assistance (Doc 06). In this context a TCA evaluability assessment had been carried out, the results of which were now being presented to the EAC for guidance.
- 6.2 Anne Cronin, Head, Partners' Engagement Framework, gave a brief overview of the key components of the Partners' Engagement Framework (PEF) and their respective budgets. She referred in particular to the TCA, and its annual planning process which is based on country needs. She highlighted that in addition to the work done by Deloitte on the TCA evaluation, during 2018 the PEF team had led two TCA assessment exercises. The first related to independent country-specific TCA reviews in five countries, the aim of which was to generate learnings on TCA planning, implementation and results, through desk review and in-country visits. The second was an EPI survey on the relevance and effectiveness of TCA to explore alignment of technical assistance (TA) with national plans, stakeholder involvement and contribution to skill development.
- 6.3 Ms Cronin indicated that several common recommendations has emerged through these assessment exercises and that the recommendation of the PEF Management Team going forward was to continue to develop strategic approach/theory of change in priority/fragile countries, ensuring that TCA is prioritised, focused on results, and complementary to Gavi cash grants and other funding.
- 6.4 Emmanuella Baguma, Programme Officer, Evaluation, presented more detailed information in relation to the TCA evaluability assessment which had been carried out at the request of the EAC, including the key findings and recommendations and options for the EAC to consider.

Discussion

- EAC members agreed that it had been useful to carry out an evaluability assessment. They discussed the three options presented (Option 1: no further work to enhance evaluability and evaluation using on a case study approach to explore PEF-TCA models commissioned immediately; Option 2: work to strengthen evaluability in early 2019 and evaluation focussing on contribution analysis commissioned in late 2019; Option 3: work to strengthen evaluability and rigorous evaluation of PEF-TCA results focussing on causal attribution commissioned at the end of the programme) and agreed that Option 3 was not feasible.
- A number of questions were raised as to whether or not an evaluation was even necessary, and if so whether it would be a prospective evaluation or a retrospective impact study.
- EAC members noted that the approach currently being taken by the PEF team appears to fall somewhere between Options 1 and 2. It was agreed that there is a

need for learning to be maximised and that this could continue to be done through the country case-study approach. It would however be necessary to ensure that the methodology for these case studies is standardised so as enable comparability, as this has not been the case on the studies carried out to date.

- While the spirit of Option 2 was appreciated, EAC members agreed to take stock of the work done on the theory of change and case studies, identify what might need to be done to fill gaps, and then only move forward once the scope of an evaluation and the evaluation questions have been clearly defined.

7. Performance-Based Funding (PBF) Evaluation

- 7.1 Emmanuella Baguma, Programme Officer, Evaluation, presented this item to the EAC (Doc 07) recalling the background to the review of Gavi's Performance Based Funding (PBF) component of Gavi's Health System Strengthening (HSS) support to countries. She gave a process update and finally outlined the next steps planned including the use of the findings of the evaluation to help inform the next HSIS review, which is expected to start in 2019 in preparation for the next strategic period.

Discussion

- While EAC members indicated that they did not necessarily agree with all of the recommendations of the report, there was general agreement that it was well written report, well thought out and rose to the challenge of analysing the problem. EAC members appreciated the review of literature which had helped to understand the work carried out to understand the broader concept of PBF.
- EAC members therefore agreed on the quality and usefulness of the report.
- In relation to some of the recommendations around data, the Secretariat noted that the evaluators were not experts in this area and that indeed the request for them to look at some of these related issues had come as an additional request once the evaluation work had already commenced. It was noted therefore that some of the findings and recommendations on this issue were not as strong as other areas covered in the report.
- It was agreed that it will now be up to the Secretariat to take on board the findings and recommendations of the report, triangulate with other information which is available and decide on which of the recommendations are appropriate to move forward with.
- It was suggested that in evaluations in general it could be beneficial to consider separating out findings and recommendations, and perhaps having a different group of experts working on the latter which are often of a strategic nature.

8. Collaboration with the Global Fund

- 8.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation and Ryuichi Komatsu, TERG Secretariat presented this item to the EAC (Doc 08). They provided an update on the collaboration status between the Gavi and Global Fund evaluation teams in terms of both achievements and challenges. Mr Komatsu provided a detailed update on the current work undertaken by TERG and requested input from EAC members on future thematic reviews where closer collaboration between EAC and TERG might be useful and appropriate.
- 8.2 Nina Schwalbe recused herself and left the room during the presentation and discussions on this item.

Discussion

- EAC members discussed a proposal relating to the potential sharing of evaluation reports between EAC and TERG and it was suggested that it might be useful to explore the possibility of creating a shared learning document.
- While noting that it will sometimes not be feasible to coordinate on evaluation work due to the different timelines for the decision-making processes in the two organisations, it was suggested that some issues to be considered for collaboration going forward might include sustainability, transition, co-financing and middle-income countries.
- EAC members noted that the TERG had decided to hold a meeting in Geneva in April 2019 during the same week as the EAC meeting, so as to facilitate a joint session with the EAC. The Secretariat agreed to explore further how this might work.

9. Evaluation Workplan and update on Full Country Evaluations (FCE)

- 9.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation presented to the EAC for approval a revised evaluation workplan for the 2018-2020 strategic period, differentiating between centralised and decentralised evaluations, highlighting the evaluation type and outline the proposed timelines.
- 9.2 The Secretariat also provided an update on the Full Country Evaluations project, following on from the EAC decision in May 2018 to discontinue the project.

Discussion

- EAC members noted that the timeline for the evaluation of Gavi's engagement with the private sector appeared to be continuously moving back and agreed that

this is an issue of strategic importance for Gavi and is an evaluation which needs to be done independently, and as soon as possible.

- In the context of discussions on Gavi 5.0 and the strategic importance of the review of a number of key strategies and policies for this, EAC members agreed that the review of the Supply and Procurement Strategy as well as the reviews of the Eligibility, Co-Financing and Transition policies should be independent external evaluations, managed by the Evaluation Team and overseen by the EAC.
- In general, EAC members felt that any evaluative work relating to one of Gavi's four strategic goals should be an external independent evaluation. It was suggested that the criteria to use to determine whether or not an evaluation should be managed by the Evaluation Team and overseen by the EAC would relate to the strategic importance for the organisation, the methodological relevance for evaluation and the need for independence.
- EAC members briefly discussed a scenario whereby they might approve an evaluation workplan which cannot or is not implemented. It was agreed in this context that there is a need for greater clarity, including from the PPC and Board, on who decides what in terms of commissioning evaluation work. It was suggested that this might be something for the EAC Chair to table to the Board at its next meeting for discussion.
- EAC members welcomed the progress update on the FCE project and agreed that they were satisfied that as the Secretariat was managing the follow up actions well it would therefore be sufficient for the EAC to receive regular updates on progress.

Decision One

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee:

Approved the multi-year workplan for the remaining Gavi strategy period (2018-2020) as set out in Slide 4 to Doc 09, as amended by discussions at the EAC.

10. Review of Decisions

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

11. Closing remarks and any other business

- 11.1 The Chair particularly thanked the Secretariat on the amount and quality of their work.

- 11.2 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
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien (Day One)
- Wieneke Vullings

Regrets

- Jeanine Condo
- Anna Hamrell

Guests

- Ryuichi Komatsu (Items 8 and 9)

Secretariat

- Anuradha Gupta (Item 2)
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Abdallah Bchir
- Pascal Bijleveld (Item 7)
- Anne Cronin (Item 6)
- Alex de Jonquieres (Item 7)
- Joanne Goetz
- Hope Johnson
- Wilson Mok (Item 5)
- Leslie Moreland
- Alice Ndayishimiye