Minutes

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting

4-5 October 2016
Gavi Alliance, Geneva, Switzerland

1. Chair's report

1.1 The meeting commenced at 09.07 Geneva time on 4 October 2016. Rob Moodie, Evaluation Committee 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 15-16 March 2016 (Doc 01b) which had been approved by no-objection on 24 May 2016.

1.4 The Chair reported to the EAC on his participation at the Gavi Board meeting in June 2016, and commented on the positive evolution in the role of the EAC, in the use of evaluation findings within the Gavi Secretariat and in the way in which the evaluation work is featured at Board meetings.

1.5 The Chair welcomed Zulfiqar Bhutta as a new member of the EAC.

---

2. Update from Secretariat

2.1 Anuradha Gupta, Deputy CEO, expressed her appreciation to the members of the EAC for their work and highlighted the importance for Gavi of continued investment in evaluations. She noted that it is critical that evaluations keep pace with the evolving business needs of the Alliance and also that the business embraces the evaluation agenda and uses the findings to implement changes where appropriate. She stressed the importance of the timeliness of evaluations. She highlighted the importance of moving to prospective evaluations rather than retrospective evaluations, and utilising the findings in joing appraisals.

2.2 She referred to examples of evaluation findings which have recently been used to inform programme and policy reviews and encouraged EAC members to continue to guide the evaluation agenda so that appropriate changes can be made in programme and policy design to improve the work of the Alliance.

2.3 Finally, she referred to potential collaboration with the Global Fund in the evaluation field and that this would of course be welcome, where there is clear added value for both organisations.

Heath System & Immunisation Strengthening (HSIS) and Country Engagement Framework (CEF)

2.2 Alan Brooks, Director Health Systems and Immunisation, presented information to the EAC on Gavi's heath system & immunisation strengthening (HSIS) support, approved by the Board in June 2016, and country engagement framework (CEF), focusing on Gavi's financial support model and its key strengths as well as areas for improvement. He highlighted how the evaluation findings and recommendations (such as the HSS metareview and the Full Country Evaluations project) helped to design and ensuing changes and he provided information on the implementation timeline as well as the planned next steps.

Discussion

- Some EAC members raised the importance of involving civil society and academia as part of the country engagement where appropriate. They highlighted the potential usefulness of leveraging evaluations being conducted by other entities, as well as the impact that Gavi evaluations might have in shaping the global policy debate.

Gavi Policy Development

2.3 Judith Kallenberg, Head, Policy presented information on Gavi's policy development process and framework, and the role evaluation plays in helping the team formulate and review the set of policies which form the foundation for Gavi's support model.

2.4 She referred to examples of recent reviews which have been informed by evaluations, namely the co-financing policy, work in relation to Gavi's support to health systems strengthening (HSS), as well as the work currently being undertaken in relation to fragility and immunisation. She mentioned the possibility of new evaluations in the policy in the policy areas such as supply and procurement, eligibility, transition, gender and HSIS/CEF/fragility.

Discussion

- EAC members very much welcomed this presentation and indicated that to guide future evaluation work it would be useful to have information in relation to the type of evidence which would be most useful to the policy reviews so that they can ensure that this is included in evaluation ToRs. The Secretariat noted that the evaluation team increasingly works closely with internal business owners to ensure that this is indeed the case.

- The EAC members underscored the need for enhanced interaction with the PPC and agreed to explore this more in detail.

Alliance Accountability Framework and its Linkages with Evaluations

2.4 Nicolas Theopold, Strategy, Funding and Performance, presented information on the Alliance Accountability Framework, highlighting the three components, namely the Partners' Engagement Framework, Secretariat Performance Management, and Country Performance Management. He drew particular attention to the linkages between evaluations and the Alliance Accountability Framework, informing EAC members that accountability has been identified as being central to the 2016-2020 strategy period.

Discussion

- EAC members welcomed the increased transparency for countries, in particular in relation to technical assistance (TA).

---

3. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and Evaluation Update

Monitoring & Evaluation Framework

3.1 Hope Johnson, Acting Director, Monitoring and Evaluation, provided an update on Gavi's draft Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Framework for 2016-2020, which aims to contribute to learning and accountability for improvement of programmes, policies and implementation of strategies to maximise impact in line with Gavi's mission. It integrates rotutine monitoring and evaluation activities with Gavi business functions and includes an updated strategy results chain.

Discussion

- EAC members asked if there is a record being maintained of instances where a policy decision is taken based on the findings of an evaluation. The Secretariat clarified that some work is being done on this. It was agreed that further information on this tracking will be presented to EAC members when possible.

- In relation to the information provided on the different types of monitoring and activities which are carried out, EAC members expressed that it is difficult to understand the difference between an independent evaluation, a targeted assessment and a thematic review. It was agreed that some thought should go into how best to communicate these differences to the Board and other stakeholders. It was agreed that it would also be useful to show how the different activities relate to each other.

- EAC members noted that as the conceptual framework for Gavi M&E activities for the 2016-2020 strategy is being developed the possibility of linking it to the global accountability framework should be explored.

- EAC members welcomed the information that substantial progress has been in ensuring that evaluation work is already been taken into account in programme planning at the programme design level.

- EAC members regretted that there is limited communication to the general public and key stakeholders about the results of Gavi's evaluation work and it was agreed that it would be useful to invite a representative from Gavi's communications team to the next EAC meeting to have a discussion around how this might be improved.

Evaluation Update

3.4 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, provided an overview of the status of evaluation activities in 2016, both those which had been planned and discussed at the EAC meeting in March, and some unplanned activities.

Discussion

- EAC members discussed, in the light of increasing requests from different sources for evaluation work, the need to establish clear criteria that enable the evaluation team to prioritise taking into account available resources. It was agreed that this will be an item for discussion at the next meeting of the EAC.

- In response to a question from an EAC member regarding the role of countries in the decision for evaluating them, the Secretariat clarified that the country is involved from the beginning of the process, which is important to guarantee ownership and use of the evaluation findings.

---

4. Full Country Evaluations - Future Approach

4.1 Abdallah Bchir, Head, Evaluation, and Alba Vilajeliu, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation, presented information to EAC members in relation to the findings and lessons learnt so far as well the proposed principles, approach and timeline for the future of the Full Country Evaluations (FCE) project for their assessment and approval. In this context, they also sought guidance on the draft ToRs for a second phase of the FCE project (2017-2020).

Discussion

- EAC members who had been present at the meeting in Mozambique in March referred to some of the concerns that they had heard about there in relation to capacity building within the country teams in the context of the FCE project. They were assured by the Secretariat that discussions and actions with the different FCE teams have taken place in the meantime and that there is consensus that this is being and will continue to be improved. They were assured that the FCE in-country teams are therefore willing to continue to work under the same FCE consortium structure going forward.

- EAC members noted that there is lack of granularity in relation to the different cost components of the project thus far to be able to assess value for money and agreed that this is an area where they would like to have more detailed information for the second phase of the FCE. This would facilitate discussions on the different components of the project which might be prioritised for the next phase in the context of a cost benefit analysis.

- EAC members highlighted the limited number of published papers in peer-reviewed journals until now and encourage focussing on the publication of the findings to increase dissemination.

- EAC members underscored the importance of considering, for the future of the project, the balance between the applicability of in-country and cross-country learnings. It was suggested that the main objective of the next phase should be cross-country/global and that the activities of the next phase should therefore respond to that objective.

- They sought information on whether there was by now, upon near completion of the first phase of FCE, clarity around which of the initial evaluation questions this project had responded to, and what questions are expected to be addressed during the second phase of the FCE.

- The EAC drew the team's attention to questions around equity and suggested that the rationale for choosing the same countries in which to continue the FCE in should be strengthened with thought provided on the applicability of the lessons emerging and methods from these evaluations in other countries.

- The possibility of working with Global Fund was discussed and EAC members agreed that it would be a good idea to explore possible synergies ensuring that there is clarity and alignment on the objectives of any such joint evaluations, which should also leverage efficiencies for both organisations.

- The Committee discussed the options for the future as outlined in the meeting paper and agreed on the principles and an approach as outlined in the proposed decision wording (below).

- EAC members noted that pending their final decision on the contractual arrangements for the second phase of the FCE project, a bridging contract would be entered into with IHME, to allow the FCE teams to continue existing evaluation activities (including those related to the finalisation of the 2016 FCE report).

- EAC members noted that as one of their members had not been able to remain for Day Two of the meeting there was no longer a quorum enabling the Committee to take on decision at this meeting. Following discussion, participants agreed that the following would be circulated to the EAC by email for approval by unanimous consent, as foreseen in the Gavi Statues and By-Laws:

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee:

a) ***Assessed*** *the proposed principles, approach and timeline for the future of the Full Country Evaluations (FCE) project and* ***agreed*** *on a two year continuation of the FCE project with targeted priorities by country for Mozambique, Zambia and Uganda with the following components - resource tracking, process evaluation, second HFS and HHS, HMIS, SAE.*

b) ***Agreed*** *that collaboration with the Global Fund should be explored.*

c) ***Requested*** *the Secretariat to finalise the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the second phase of the FCE project and bring them back to the Evaluation Advisory Committee for approval.*

d) ***Noted*** *that following approval of the Terms of Reference the EAC will consider options in relation to the contractual arrangements for the FCE project going forward.*

---

5. Chair's Welcome and Overview of Day Two

5.1 The Chair welcomed participants to the second day of the meeting.

---

6. Update on the Evaluation of Technical Assistance (TA) provided through the Partners' Engagement Framework (PEF)

6.1 Adrien de Chaisemartin, Director, Strategy, Funding and Performance, provided information to the Committee in relation to the evaluation of technical assistance (TA) through the Partners' Engagement Framework, highlighted that this will inform the Secretariat and the PEF Management Team (MT) when considering investments in this area going forward. He highlighted that there is a behavioural change with this approach which very much ensures that countries play an important role in articulating their TA needs and also in terms of accountability.

6.2. He referred to the importance of the timing of the evaluation so that it can inform decisions in relation to the renewal of TA contracts, and also reminded EAC members that scope of the evaluation is to focus on the effectiveness and efficiency of the TA rather than on the process.

6.3 Sally Stansfield, representing Deloitte who has been contracted by Gavi to carry out this evaluation project, presented an overview of the evaluation design and approved methodology as well as the next steps.

6.4 Wieneke Vullings, EAC member and Chair of the project Steering Committee, gave an update to the EAC on the work of the Steering Committee whose role is

to oversee the methodology, to review the project reports and provide feedback to the EAC as the project moves forward.

Discussion

- In response to a question from an EAC member on how the quantitative aspects of the evaluation would potentially be triangulated and the extent of attribution that would be provided, it was stated that it will be difficult to weight attribution and contribution but that it is expected that there will be some anecdotal evidence of real change that will be attributable to Gavi investments.

- EAC members noted that in recent years there have not been any comparable evaluations and that this is a study which will potentially break a lot of new ground. In this context the EAC looked forward to seeing the baseline report at its next meeting. It was also noted that there may be the need for Gavi to sensitively and effectively manage some potentially negative findings emanating from the evaluation of TA.

---

7. Evaluation Approach for GAVI 2016-2020 Strategy

7.1 Alba Vilajeliu, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation, presented an overview of the proposed evaluation approach for 2016-2020 strategy and in particular in relation to the HSIS and CEF component and sought the EAC's views and guidance on the proposed approach.

Discussion

- EAC members welcomed the approach and the fact that it was presented in the context of a proposed set of principles. It was suggested that some of the principles as presented might appear contradictory and that this can be dependent on how outcomes and impact are defined. For EAC members this highlighted the importance, as discussed during the previous day, of having clear criteria enabling evaluation work to be prioritised. EAC members welcomed the suggestion to review the Gavi Evaluation Policy in line with the proposed evaluation approach.

- EAC members agreed that there is an opportunity for Gavi, through its evaluation work, to play a role globally and that in this context it will be important to ensure that other such work is not being carried out elsewhere, as well as identifying true gaps to be filled and opportunities to be leveraged.

- It was underscored that the evaluations should address the 'how' questions so that the lessons can be replicated in other countries. It was agreed that this 'how' will be presented more explicitly in the principles under discussion.

- The EAC members focused on the need to have a transparent country selection criteria for these evaluations, including countries with different performance levels.

- It was agreed that, in line with the responsibilities of the EAC as defined in its Charter, the evaluation workplan for 2017 and beyond will finalised and presented to the EAC for approval.

---

8. Review of Evaluation Advisory Committee Charter

8.1 Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance, provided a brief overview of the work currently being undertaken in the context of a Board and Committee self-evaluation, which includes a review of the Board Committee Charters. While the EAC does not have the same status as the Board Committees, it is proposed that this would be an opportune moment for the EAC also to review its Charter, in particular in the light of the evolution of the work of the Committee over the past two to three years.

Discussion

- Due to time constraints, the EAC did not have the opportunity to discuss this item further and it was agreed that it would be an item on the agenda for the next EAC meeting.

- EAC members noted that any changes to the Charter will have to be submitted to the Gavi Board for approval.

---

9. Review of decisions

9.1 Joanne Goetz, Head, Governance, reminded participants that while there had been a quorum for the meeting on Day One, there was not a quorum on Day Two and the proposed language of the decision in relation to Agenda Item 4 (Full Country Evaluations—Future Approach) would be circulated to all members of the EAC by email for approval by unanimous consent, as foreseen in the Gavi Statutes and By-Laws.

---

10. Any other business

10.1 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
- Jeanine Condo
- Wieneke Vullings
- Zulfiqar Bhutta
- Gonzalo Hernández

Regrets
- Fred Binka
- Angela Santoni
- Samba O. Sow

Secretariat
- Abdallah Bchir
- Joanne Goetz
- Alba Vilajeliu
- Mahwesh Bilal Khan
- Hope Johnson
- Alan Brooks (Agenda Item 2)
- Sarah Churchill (Agenda Item 2)
- Adrien de Chaisemartin (Agenda Item 6)
- Judith Kallenberg (Agenda Items 2, 7)
- Sonjelle Shilton (Agemda Item 3)
- Anna Standertskjold (Agenda Item 7)
- Nicolas Theopold (Agenda Item 2)

Guests
- Peter Hansen (Day One)
- Sally Stansfield (Agenda Item 5)