Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting
26 June 2018
Teleconference

1.   Chair's report

1.1   The meeting commenced at 13.07 Geneva time on 26 June 2018. Rob Moodie, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting, which was co-chaired by Mira Johri at the request of the Chair.

1.2   Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a).

------

2.   Review of Evaluation Policy

2.1   Abdallah Bchir, Head, Monitoring and Evaluation, briefly introduced this item, recalling the process which had been undertaken to develop the proposed revised Evaluation Policy for review by the EAC (Doc 02).

2.2   Anna Henttinen, Peer Review Panel Member, outlined some of the main points from the proposed new policy - i) it will cover all Gavi evaluations (centralised and decentralised); ii) it is proposed that the Operational Evaluation Guidance (OEG) becomes a working manual for all evaluations; iii) there is a proposed new process in relation to quality assurance of Gavi evaluations with the proposed creation of an independent quality assessment panel (IQAP), managed by the Secretariat Evaluation Unit, which would review reports before they are presented to the EAC; and iv) it is proposed that all evaluations would have a Steering Committee (SC) whose role and scope would depend on each evaluation.

2.3   She also referred to the proposed ethical principles for Gavi evaluations as well as to the description of the roles and responsibilities of the different actors in Gavi's evaluation function.

Discussion

- EAC members expressed concerns around what appeared to be the addition of a number of layers in the overall process with the introduction the IQAP, and questioned in particular in relation to the latter, what role would remain for the EAC in relation to quality assurance of the evaluations. It was unclear as to what exactly was meant when it was stated that the EAC would play a more strategic role.

- It was suggested that given the different size and nature of Gavi evaluations it might be more appropriate to have a more flexible approach whereby some

evaluations might require a more complex oversight and quality assurance process while a lighter touch approach might work for other exercises.

- In response to a comment made whereby it was suggested that an EAC member should sit on each SC, EAC members recalled the discussion they had held during their April 2018 meeting on this topic and where they had agreed that they did not feel that it was appropriate for EAC members to sit on the SCs as this could create a conflict around the EAC's independent role.

- Following discussion, and agreement that Gavi needs to ensure that it remains a lean and flexible organisation, it was agreed that it might be more appropriate to have a pool of independent experts which the EAC could draw from if for a specific evaluation they feel that additional expertise is required for them to be able to fulfil their quality assurance function. It was also agreed that the Secretariat should also be able to request external help on a case by case basis as and when required.

- One EAC member asked if any thought had been given to the additional costs which might be generated due to the addition of the different layers proposed and it was suggested that costs could be minimal and included in the budget for each evaluation exercise.

- In response to some questions asked about other evaluative activities, the Secretariat referred to the list on page 5 of the proposed policy and added that further work is being done on detailed guidelines and criteria to differentiate between evaluations and other evaluative activities such as reviews etc. The Secretariat also recalled, as had been discussed at the April 2018 EAC meeting, that when reviewing the evaluation workplan, the EAC would be asked to opine on their own level of involvement at the different evaluation stages as well as on the SC needs for each evaluation.

- Some concerns were expressed around the proposed decentralisation of evaluations within the Secretariat and the importance of the EAC having an overview of all such activities was reiterated, with the possibility for the EAC to engage in a differentiated fashion as appropriate.

- EAC members did not feel that the role proposed for the Committee in reporting to the Board on the implementation of the management responses to evaluations was appropriate.

- In line with a suggestion from one of the members of the Peer Review Panel, EAC members welcomed the proposal to map out the roles of the different layers of the evaluation function.

- In relation to the composition of the EAC and SCs, the importance of ensuring that there are more country voices was highlighted.

- EAC members welcomed the inclusion of information in relation to dissemination plans for evaluation findings and it was suggested that it could be useful to include some further information in relation to dissemination activities.

- It was noted that to date Gavi does not always put its evaluations out for public tender, as the volume of applications to an open call rapidly becomes unmanageable for the Gavi Secretariat and extremely low success rates may be frustrating for applicants. It was suggested that procedures be reconsidered to ensure that they appropriately balance the principles of transparency and independence while remaining manageable for the Secretariat and respectful of applicant time investments. It was also suggested that the selection process for providers should be clearly outlined in the OEG.

- EAC members noted the importance of ensuring transparency in relation to documenting and explaining Gavi's evaluation processes so that Gavi does not become vulnerable to criticism on the management of the evaluation function.

- Finally, one EAC member suggested that it would be useful to tease out more how Gavi might work with others such as the Global Fund or the Global Financing Facility on joint evaluations and/or on sharing results.

------

3.   Review of Evaluation Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

3.1   In light of the discussion on the previous item it was agreed that discussions on the proposed revisions to the EAC Terms of Reference (ToRs) would be postponed pending further revisions of the Evaluation Policy, to ensure alignment of both documents.

------

4.   Review of decisions

4.1   There were no decisions at this meeting.

------

5.   Closing remarks and any other business

5.1.   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

Secretariat
- Seth Berkley
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Abdallah Bchir
- Joanne Goetz
- Hope Johnson
- Leslie Moreland

Regrets
- Jeanine Condo
- Anna Hamrell
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien
- Wieneke Vullings

Guests
- Nick York, Peer Review Panel Member
- Anna Henttinen, Peer Review Panel Member