

## Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting 17-18 September 2025 Geneva, Switzerland

### 1. Chair's report

- 1.1 Noting that the meeting had been duly convened and finding a quorum of members present, the meeting commenced at 09.05 Geneva time on 17 September 2025. James Hargreaves, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair informed the EAC that John Grove, Chief Evaluation & Learning Officer at the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Global Fund), and Juan Pablo Gutiérrez, Chair of the Global Fund's Independent Evaluation Panel, would be joining the discussion on agenda item 06B on Ways of Working: Collaboration with the Global Fund.
- 1.3 He welcomed Rob Whitby (United Kingdom), Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) member, who would attend virtually for part of the meeting.
- 1.4 The Chair invited Rhoda Wanyenze, EAC member and Unaffiliated Board member (Research & Technical Health Constituency), as well as Onei Uetela, EAC member and Alternate Board member (Civil Society Organisation Constituency), to present an update from the last Board meeting in July 2025. Dr Wanyenze highlighted important themes that the Board discussed such as the changing geo-political context, outcomes of Gavi Global Summit, and the challenging but valuable Gavi 6.0 recalibration exercise. She emphasised the importance of maintaining a fragile and humanitarian approach, the significance of Gavi Leap, and the Board's appreciation for evidence to improve accountability. She indicated that she looked forward to future operational efficiencies, aligning with new changes, and using data for evidence and learning in Gavi programmes.
- 1.5 Mr Uetela underlined that the Gavi 6.0 recalibration had sharpened Gavi priorities, emphasising the importance of evaluating outcomes and strategic trade-offs. He highlighted key Board decisions that included indicators for the Measurement, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) strategy, noting that monitoring these changes would be crucial for evaluation work.
- 1.6 Mr Whitby was invited by the Chair to provide a summary of the deliberations at the last PPC meeting held in May 2025. He highlighted that the PPC supported a closer link to the EAC and its role in approving the multi-year workplan, and the importance of learning for Gavi 6.0, which would be crucial for future operational changes.
- 1.7 The Chair noted that he attended parts of the PPC meeting in May 2025 and provided a Committee Chair Report to the Board in July 2025. He also referred to

his close engagement since the last EAC meeting with the EAC Focal Points on the action planning following the Evaluation Function Review.

- 1.8 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a in the Committee pack).
- 1.9 The minutes of the 5-6 March 2025 meeting were tabled to the Committee for information (Doc 01b in the Committee pack). The minutes had been circulated and approved by no-objection on 6 June 2025.

-----

## 2. Update from the Office of the CEO

- 2.1 Hannah Burris, Chief of Staff, provided the EAC with an update on several important topics including: i) the current changing geo-political context and its implications for Gavi, ii) the 2024 WHO and UNICEF estimates of national immunization coverage (WUENIC), iii) Gavi replenishment, Gavi 6.0 recalibration outcomes and Secretariat review, iv) Gavi Leap framework with focus on the collaboration with the Global Fund. She outlined the staff cuts to the Secretariat which brings staff numbers close to the 2020 level.

### *Discussion*

- The EAC exchanged with the Secretariat on organisational changes and challenges following the Gavi 6.0 recalibration exercise. The Secretariat responded to concerns about the need to prioritise effectively to ensure manageable workload.
- EAC members discussed the impact of budget cuts and the recalibration on the Fragile and Humanitarian Approach, noting that the Board emphasised that this area is a priority however there would still be cuts expected across all areas. The Secretariat underlined that Gavi's role in these settings is critical but remains small, as it is only one contributor in a wider and complex setting.
- The EAC highlighted the need for continued collaboration with partners and the importance of evaluating trade-offs made during the Gavi 6.0 recalibration exercise.
- With regards to collaboration with the Global Fund, the Secretariat clarified that the goal is to increase impact toward our respective missions, country centricity and realizing efficiencies. It was noted that the extent to which financial efficiencies could be achieved through this collaboration remain to be seen, and may be limited in view of the difficult budgetary context for both organisations.
- The EAC and Secretariat exchanged on the broader prospective view on the value of evaluation work in the context of ongoing changes in the global health architecture. The Secretariat underlined the growing demand for accountability

and country ownership, and the need to learn about the tradeoffs made with recalibration and to anticipate the evidence needs to design Gavi 7.0.

-----

### **3. Update on Measurement, Evaluation and Learning for Gavi 6.0**

3.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Measurement, Evaluation and Learning, provided an update on measurement, evaluation and learning for Gavi 6.0, highlighting key changes including a focus on utility, integration of monitoring and evaluation activities, and the introduction of an adaptive monitoring and learning team (Doc 03).

#### *Discussion*

- EAC members provided positive feedback on the holistic integration approach and country focus and that this addresses issues identified in the EFR, while noting that challenges remain related to complexity and feasibility given budget constraints, and the need for sustainable data systems.
- Key discussion points included the importance of balancing ambitious evaluation plans with available data resources, the connection between monitoring and evaluation data because monitoring will not answer the “why” question leading to the “how,” persistent issue of analytic capacity, particularly at subnational levels, the implications for the ability for predictive analysis and forecasting, and the role of artificial intelligence (AI) in data analysis.
- To address this, the EAC discussed the need to prioritise; the need to monitor the risks to evaluation processes; the important role of evaluability assessments; and the opportunity afforded by the proposed new MEL focal points as part of the adaptive monitoring and learning team.
- EAC members emphasised the need to see how the Monitoring and Evaluation are connected and the proportionality of balancing the evaluations and resources with monitoring and learning.
- The Secretariat noted that Gavi makes a contribution to impact which makes it difficult to set targets and that revisions to the model including a single cash grant will make it even harder to measure impact.

-----

### **4. Gavi 5.1 Evaluation Workplan Update**

4.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation and Learning, introduced this item and provided an update of Gavi 5.1 evaluation activities, with specific focus on the Zero-Dose Phase 2 evaluation, Joint COVAX evaluation, evaluability assessment of the

African Vaccine Manufacturing (AVMA) end-line evaluation and Big Catch-Up evaluations, with key challenges and progress highlighted.

### *Discussion*

- As per usual practice, EAC focal points led the discussion on each Gavi 5.1 evaluation.
- EAC members commended the Secretariat for the useful Annex C to Doc 04 that captured lessons from the joint COVAX evaluation.
- The EAC also responded to specific guidance questions related to joint evaluations, assessing evaluability, and strengthening evaluations recommendations.
- For joint evaluations, EAC members discussed creating guidance for suppliers based on learnings from the COVAX evaluation, but being clear what learning was specific to COVAX and what learning was more generalisable, and building on an existing report from the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD DAC). This report would need updating for current contexts. It was noted by the Gavi Secretariat that this guidance was referenced when designing the Joint COVAX Evaluation, and subsequent joint evaluation guidance documents have been developed by other organisations.
- Regarding evaluability assessments, the EAC reviewed a proposed three-pronged approach: a portfolio-wide assessment, ongoing engagement with focal points, and integration into evaluation inception periods. The EAC expressed support for this direction, particularly emphasising the importance of data availability and stakeholder engagement. At what point it would be important to assess whether the value of evaluation outweighed its limitations and whether there were any alternatives.
- In relation to evaluation recommendations, EAC members discussed the need to shift from simply summarising findings to focusing on utility and implications for Gavi, while emphasising the importance of joint processes for developing recommendations. EAC advised that recommendations should be based on guidance provided by the CET, capturing key principles on the number and nature of recommendations.
- The EAC also discussed challenges with the current Evaluation Management Response (EMR) process, including the format used and number of recommendations.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

1. To inform **potential future joint evaluations** based on the lessons learned from the COVAX evaluation:

- a. Joint evaluations are most appropriate where the initiative is a joint collaboration, and careful consideration should be given to when joint evaluation draws upon comparative advantage and adds value.
  - b. Establish governance structure and coordination processes at the beginning to facilitate smooth collaboration and build adequate time for inception phases and balance inclusivity among partners with methodological rigor.
  - c. Designate a lead commissioning agency and align all Terms of Reference and procurement tools with the joint needs identified.
  - d. Ensure that the evaluation scope is in line with available resources and manage expectations regarding the scope, depth, and trade-offs in utility, including reaching an early agreement on the framing and intended use of recommendations, with actionable outputs for each agency.
  - e. Create structured focal point systems within agencies and with governments.
  - f. Engage regional and/or country partners early and use clear protocols and timelines for selecting Country Case Studies (CCS), including how outputs will be utilised.
  - g. Identify the purpose, target audience, and ownership of dissemination products early on.
  - h. Differentiate between global and country-level recommendations.
2. On **evaluability**:
- a. Notes the importance of conducting evaluability assessments across the evaluation portfolio and updated prior to issuing the RFP or as part of the inception phase.
  - b. Notes the potential value of MEL focal points connected to relevant stakeholders to help identify relevant indicators, map decision-making events, and ensure evaluations are closely aligned with strategic priorities.
  - c. Advises that evaluability assessments should assess: the availability, quality, and timeliness of relevant data and the ability to access relevant stakeholders for interviews, sense-making, and validation - in sight of understanding of the progress of strategy implementation.
  - d. Advises consideration of the potential for conflict of interest in supplier teams commissioned to undertake evaluability assessments who may later compete for evaluation tenders, and advises that evaluability assessments are subject to appropriate scrutiny and quality assurance mechanisms.
3. **Recommendations** should be:
- a. Based on critical analysis of the conclusions (e.g. triangulating different information, implications, etc.), supported by the findings
  - b. Co-created by evaluators and relevant stakeholders, be realistic/feasible, and consistent with the Gavi strategy.
  - c. Based on guidance provided by the CET, capturing key principles on the number and nature of recommendations.
4. The **Evaluation Management Response (EMR)**, which is due within 60 days, should be comprehensive and responsive to each recommendation (but does not necessarily need to be written up point by point). It should include a forward-looking plan of action and/or actions to be developed with timelines.

## 5. Gavi 6.0 Evaluation Workplan Update

5.1 Esther Saville, introduced the draft costed workplan for Gavi 6.0 that included a multi-part strategy evaluation, additional centrally managed and centrally supported evaluations (Doc 05).

### *Discussion*

- EAC members were supportive of the approach presented and discussions centred around the approach to modular evaluations, with some questions about how to ensure interactions between different modules are considered and how to balance the evaluation budget across multiple topics.
- The EAC also emphasised the need for adaptive and data-driven evaluation planning, while acknowledging challenges around timing and resource constraints in relation to the evolving funding context. They discussed the distinction between topics included in the strategy evaluation versus those on the broader evaluation plan with the strategy evaluation focusing on new shifts in Gavi 6.0 and the other list including some evaluations containing ongoing programmes from the previous period and new topics beyond the strategy evaluation.
- The Secretariat noted the comments and will refine the workplan further, considering both country-level and organisational perspectives, and will explore different evaluation methods including potential synthesis pieces.
- The Secretariat clarified that the EAC would maintain the mandate to approve the Gavi 6.0 evaluation workplan, with guidance requested from the Programme and Policy Committee at its meeting in October 2025. Based on its comfort with the current draft workplan, the EAC delegated the authority to approve the workplan to the EAC Chair.

### **Decision One**

In accordance with Section 3 of the Terms of Reference of the Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC), the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) **delegated** to the EAC Chair the authority to approve Gavi's multi-year evaluation workplan for Gavi 6.0, taking into consideration inputs from the EAC at this meeting and from subsequent consultations with the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) planned in October 2025.

#### **The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:**

1. EAC is comfortable with the Evaluation Work Plan for Gavi 6.0 as presented on the understanding that:
  - a. There is significant uncertainty and elements of the workplan may need to be adapted;

- b. The evaluation topics are critical for evidence generation for Gavi 6.0;
  - c. The workplan also reflects the re-calibration of Gavi 6.0;
  - d. Further consideration of implementation timelines and co-ordination across MEL activities to ensure optimal delivery of evidence and its utility.
2. The EAC seeks further PPC guidance on the draft workplan on topics and their prioritisation, and its support for implementation and use of findings.

-----

## 6. Ways of working

### Part A: Post-Evaluation Function Review Actions and Collaboration with other Organisations

- 6a.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Measurement, Evaluation & Learning provided an update on the 2025 post-Evaluation Function Review (EFR) Actions and enhancing collaboration with other organisations.

#### *Discussion*

- The EAC thanked the Secretariat and the MEL team for their work on the EFR process.
- The EAC Focal Points for the EFR highlighted the engagement of focal points and noted that key recommendations would have been addressed, prior to pausing the evaluation reform process. They emphasised that recommendations relating to PPC engagement and MEL integration had been taken forward but that there is more work to do on the evaluation culture piece. Although a draft evaluation policy and future oversight mechanism for the EAC had been discussed, it was noted that the development of these work products had been paused and this had been discussed with the EAC Focal Points.

### Part B: Collaboration with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

- 6b.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Measurement, Evaluation & Learning introduced this item. She highlighted existing collaboration workstreams in the area of evaluation and outlined the role of the Gavi-Global Fund Task Force.
- 6b.2 Alex Beecher, Senior Specialist, Strategy Design & Delivery, discussed the Gavi-Global Fund Task Force, highlighting the growing momentum for collaboration over the past year. He noted that Gavi is currently seeking an external provider to review and recommend feasible areas for collaboration with the Global Fund according to mapped out initiatives, including evaluation models.

### *Discussion*

- EAC members discussed several areas including: adapting evaluation practices to new funding and geopolitical realities; challenges of vertical approaches versus systems approach from country perspective; the need to compare and understand the rationale for the differences in the evaluation functions and structures of Gavi and the Global Fund; the importance of ensuring meaningful, criteria-driven areas for collaboration between the two evaluation functions, and taking into account lessons learned including from the joint COVAX evaluation.
- EAC members discussed the significant difference between the form of the EAC and the Global Fund's Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP) and their reporting lines which would impact on the nature of any collaboration. The Global Fund made a decision in 2022 to strengthen the independence of its evaluation advisory body now called the IEP with the Chair of that panel reporting directly to the Chair of Board's Strategy Committee. The Secretariat support to the IEP was also significantly strengthened and upgraded to an Evaluation and Learning Office headed up by a Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer who reports jointly to the Executive Director and the chair of the IEP and sits outside the Secretariat's organisational structure.
- It was noted that drawing on the EFR, Gavi had appeared to be moving in the opposite direction with a small group of independent appointees advising the Director of MEL with no link to the governance structures.
- EAC members also highlighted the need to have clarity on the shared definition of success in a budget-constrained environment and where the intention is on the collaboration to cooperation continuum, and noting that form should follow function. They emphasised the importance of addressing country ownership of evaluations, sustainability and ensuring that countries have better visibility on data and monitoring.
- EAC members identified several documents that should be shared with the external provider to help guide their analysis including comparison of the evaluation policies, strategies, terms of reference, standing operating procedures for each of the organisations. The EAC also identified some areas for potential collaboration beyond evaluation such as grant management processes and health systems investments. The extent and feasibility of collaboration/coordination/integration across the continuum will be determined by wider organisational/strategic alignment across the two organisations.
- In relation to the changing global health architecture and donor priorities and perspectives, the EAC noted that Gavi's key value-add is market shaping. Donors' ability to measure what Gavi's programmes achieve on the ground, and what benefits they offer to countries, will be critical.
- Juan Pablo Gutierrez, Chair of the Global Fund Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP), highlighted some areas for collaboration opportunities with Gavi, particularly

in overlapping countries and health system evaluations. He noted potential joint efforts in evaluation methodologies and aligning with the Lusaka Agenda, for countries to lead in setting evaluation questions. Furthermore, he noted that overlapping meetings could facilitate joint sessions to enhance country-led evaluation efforts, and underlined the importance of working with countries on defining evaluation questions, reducing the burden on countries, and widening the pool of evaluators.

- John Grove, Chief Evaluation & Learning Officer at the Global Fund, emphasised that the focus in 2026 will be on enhancing collaboration, especially in overlapping areas and health system evaluations. He highlighted potential collaboration in understanding the changing supplier landscape and in finding new partners, cross-learning themes, and improving quality assurance. He noted that the upcoming process for aligning enabling functions will focus on identifying movable and less movable elements, with an emphasis on evidence gaps, data, quality of services, and marketplace work. There is potential to explore global evaluation initiatives and share learning, particularly in areas like malaria, tuberculosis, and delivery systems. He underlined that more time is needed to determine how these efforts can come together effectively.
- The Secretariat noted useful elements from the EAC discussion such as exploring the potential to collaborate on a malaria evaluation and conducting joint learning sessions, reflecting on past collaborations, learning from what worked well and what did not, and emphasising the importance of monitoring changing contexts. Sharing joint reflections with the wider field was also suggested, pending the joint Task Force analysis.
- The Secretariat noted that there would be an opportunity for the Task Force to engage with the two functions and independent evaluation committees to test some ideas in the development of options. Additionally, it was noted that the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) insight analysis report, due to be published in February 2026, could facilitate a joint discussion focused on evaluation.

**The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:**

In relation to the Evaluation Function Review (EFR), and the pausing of the Evaluation Function reform process for Gavi 6.0, the EAC:

- a) Commends the Secretariat on the work undertaken to date in response to the EFR and subsequent EAC guidance including developing the evaluation function as a component of the broader MEL system and strengthening links with PPC.
- b) In relation to Collaboration on Evaluation with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and other organisations, the EAC:
  - Advises the need for clarification of the intended vision for success of the collaboration, with a focus on adding value as well as efficiencies;

- Advises that country priorities remain an essential goal of this process, with a view to strengthening country MEL systems for the benefit of both countries and global partners;
- Notes that the value add of collaboration on Evaluation will be linked to the development of other areas of collaboration;
- Suggests the Task Force supplier consider short-, medium- and longer-term actions, domains of collaboration and consult with the Evaluation Advisory Committee and Evaluation Function as part of this process.

-----

## **7. Review of EAC Guidance and Decisions**

- 7.1 The EAC reviewed the formal guidance and decisions that had been refined throughout the meeting.

-----

## **8. Closing Remarks and Any Other Business**

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

---

Ms Meegan Murray-Lopez  
Secretary to the Meeting

## Attachment A

### Participants

#### Committee Members

- James Hargreaves (Chair)
- Helen Evans
- Rhoda Wanyenze
- Penny Hawkins
- David Hotchkiss
- Adolfo Martinez Valle
- Malabika Sarker
- Onei Uetela
- Justice Nonvignon

#### Guests

- Rob Whitby\* (items 1-2, 6a)
- Juan Pablo Gutiérrez (item 6b)
- John Grove (item 6b)

#### Secretariat

- Niamh Lawless
- Hannah Burris (item 2)
- Hope Johnson
- Esther Saville
- Leslie Moreland
- Claudia Lo Forte\* (items 4-6)
- Anders Amaechi (items 1-2, 4, 7-8)
- Nathalie Gons (item 1-2, 4, 7-8)
- Sudharsanam Manni Balasubramaniam (item 4)
- Laura Crow (item 4)
- Alex Beecher (item 6)
- Cristina Cimenti
- Meegan Murray-Lopez
- Nadine Abu Sway (items 1-2, 6)

\* Joining virtually