

Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting 24-26 September 2024 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 13.05 Geneva time on 24 September 2024. James Hargreaves, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, chaired the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed a new EAC member, Onei Uetela (Alternate Board member, CSO Constituency). He also welcomed Justice Nonvignon, who joined virtually as an EAC member-elect. Mr Nonvignon had stepped back from the EAC in early 2024 to work at Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). After completing his assignment in June 2024, he expressed interest in rejoining the EAC. Although his appointment was still pending Board approval, the Chair had agreed that he should attend the meeting and participate fully in the discussions.
- 1.3 He informed the EAC that Julia Betts, who had only joined the EAC at the 20-21 March 2024 meeting, had needed to step down due to changes in her professional situation. A moment was taken to honor the memory of Phyllis Dako-Gyeke, who had recently joined the EAC, but had passed away unexpectedly in June.
- 1.4 The Chair invited Rhoda Wanyenze, Unaffiliated Board member, to present an update from the Board that had last met in June 2024. Ms Wanyenze highlighted important themes that were discussed and that could represent potential topics for evaluations, such as: Health System Strengthening (HSS) with an equity lens, specific approaches for fragile settings, climate change, pandemic preparedness, the African Vaccine Manufacturing Accelerator (AVMA), improving coordination between health actors (aligned with the Lusaka Agenda), scaling up and introducing new vaccines (like malaria and HPV). She noted that evaluation was prominently referenced at multiple levels, and reflected on how the EAC envisions engaging the Board on the most prominent questions that could be answered via evaluations and how answers can be provided in a timely manner. Ms Wanyenze also prompted her EAC and Secretariat colleagues: i) to reflect on the Theory of Change (ToC) for the strategy and to rethink through the complex assumptions within; ii) to reflect on how to incorporate local voices in relation to the Lusaka agenda; and iii) how we can have synergies between country-level evaluations and centralised evaluations.
- 1.5 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Doc 01a in the Committee pack). One member elaborated on the declarations already reported through the annual process and it was confirmed these would be added to her record.

- 1.6 The minutes of the 20-21 March 2024 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 27 May 2024.
- 1.7 The Chair informed the EAC he would be presenting an Evaluation update to the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) for the first time in late October, an action to strengthen the linkage between the PPC and EAC stemming from the Board and Committee evaluation in 2023, as well as providing a report to the Board in December.

2. Update from the Office of the CEO

- 2.1 Hannah Burris, Chief of Staff, joined on behalf of the CEO, who was unable to attend. Ms Burris provided the EAC with an update on several important topics including: the latest WHO/UNICEF Estimates of National Immunization Coverage (WUENIC) data, Gavi's response to the mpox pandemic, the replenishment for Gavi 6.0, the launch of AVMA, the operationalisation of Gavi 6.0, and the CEO's 180-day plan. She also outlined outcomes from the ongoing organisational workforce improvement initiative and touched on evaluations informing Gavi 5.1 and 6.0.
- 2.2 Finally, Ms Burris provided reflections on the emerging findings from the evaluation function review and proposed way forward, including the need to: i) capture and act upon the learnings from within the organisation; ii) use evaluations to apply the lessons learned to strengthen Gavi's credibility, transparency and accountability; iii) bring visibility to the PPC and the Board on how evaluations are used to inform Gavi's work; iv) coordinate across evaluations, audits and other complementary activities to minimise the burden on countries and Secretariat teams; v) coordinate across decentralised evaluations to ensure quality, cohesion and use of the evidence generated; vi) consider alternative approaches to relying on external suppliers for activities that could potentially be lead internally; and vii) obtain a balance between maintaining independence and ensuring operational efficiency.

Discussion

- One EAC member highlighted the challenge of reaching zero-dose children in challenging contexts like the Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMRO) when introducing new vaccines. The Secretariat stressed the Board's focus on balancing the scale up of current vaccine coverage with the introduction of new vaccines, while prioritising country decision-making.
- One EAC member emphasised the need to use evaluations for decision-making, particularly for developing the Gavi 6.0 strategy. The Secretariat highlighted the importance of early stakeholder involvement in hypothesis development and question testing, citing the important role that evaluation played in the Pneumococcal Conjugate Vaccine (PCV) Advance Market Commitment (AMC).

The Secretariat also underscored the need to recognise “moments of influence” and to focus on providing evidence on time with the information that is available when the information is needed.

- The EAC discussed the opportunity costs of commissioning external evaluations, including their timeframes, costs, and relevance. The Secretariat highlighted the need to aim for specific questions early in the evaluation process to maximise their value to Gavi.
- Regarding Gavi’s contribution to HSS, the Secretariat emphasised the importance of partnership to maximise the impact and scope of Gavi’s contribution.
- With reference to Gavi’s response to the mpox outbreak, the Secretariat underlined the importance of managing external expectations on Gavi’s role, which at times can exceed the remit of the Board-approved First Response Fund.
- The EAC discussed risk mitigation and trade-offs in the context of an upcoming replenishment with a backdrop of pressing needs to reach zero-dose children and responding to disease outbreaks.
- In relation to the EVOLVE project, the Secretariat referred to ongoing changes at the Secretariat which are a direct result of this project including the creation of a central project management office reporting into the Office of the CEO, the decentralisation of several workstreams, and the restructuring of the Senior Leadership Team.
- Country engagement in evaluations was underlined as critical. Partners’ roles in involving countries were highlighted given their direct relationship with countries. The Secretariat also noted that Audit programmes represent an opportunity to obtain important data from countries given their direct access to data sources.

3. Gavi 5.1 Evaluation Workplan Update – Part 1

- 3.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 03) She outlined the requested guidance from EAC in relation to the initial reflections on the evaluation, scope and timing of potential evaluative work on the enhanced Eligibility, Transition and Co-Financing (ELTRACO) model. She noted that given that utility for this evaluation is anticipated post 2025, it was being proposed to pause updates on this evaluation until Gavi 6.0.
- 3.2 Nathalie Gons, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation and Learning, elaborated further on the guidance requested from EAC noting that given the complexity of the topic, the Secretariat wished to commence high-level reflection on the evaluability and potential evaluation approaches with the EAC focal points. She broadly outlined the potential scope of this evaluation.

- 3.3 Adriana Jimenez Cuen, Director, Middle-Income Countries, gave an overview on two main potential areas for evaluation on the determinants of back-sliding in Middle-Income Countries (MICs), and exploring country case studies that could describe how these countries have been able to mobilise additional resources and support from partners and Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), which would be important to reform the catalytic phase in Gavi 6.0.
- 3.4 Benjamin Loevinsohn, Director, Immunisation Financing and Sustainability, briefly highlighted areas for potential evaluation under the proposed ELTRACO model, including: i) vaccine pricing and whether change to vaccine price fraction would change country's choice of vaccines; ii) impact of new vaccine introductions and whether this would lead to increasing the breadth of protection; and finally, iii) making available country envelopes for financing vaccines which would allow countries to make decision on allocating money for vaccines of choice.
- 3.5 Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, provided an update on the progress in relation to expanding evaluation supplier partnerships.

Discussion

- Regarding the potential evaluative work on the enhanced ELTRACO model, EAC focal points raised: i) that it would be important to start thinking of the key questions for this evaluation, and keeping the EAC informed in order for the EAC to be well positioned for when an independent evaluation is commissioned; and ii) that it would be important to look into determinants of backsliding in MICs countries through the suggested case studies, and noted that it would be equally important to look into HSS in countries that have not successfully transitioned.
- Regarding the evaluation timing and scope, it was underlined that having access to Board material would provide necessary data and given the financial implications of this particular topic there was appetite to have EAC members with financial background to engage as focal points.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- EAC noted that utility for this evaluation work on the enhanced Eligibility, Co-financing and Transition (ELTRACO) model is anticipated post 2025 and that the exact form of this model will not be decided until a decision by the Gavi Board in December 2024; the final ELTRACO and health systems and immunisation strengthening (HSIS) policies in June 2025; and subject to Replenishment outcomes;
However, given the centrality and the complexity of this policy, requested that the EAC Focal Points be periodically briefed by the Centralised Evaluation Team (CET) outside of the formal EAC meeting cycle on the questions and issues emerging from the learning agendas on ELTRACO/Middle Income Countries. This would ensure they were in a better position to constructively advise on the nature, terms of reference and timing of the evaluation. This will include suggestions on alternatives to a large retrospective evaluation, and approaches to assessing evaluability; and

- Mindful of the heavy workload in the CET, the Focal Points will take responsibility for updating EAC at appropriate points until Gavi 6.0.

4. Update on the Zero-Dose Evaluation – Phase 2

- 4.1 Anders Amaechi, Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 04).
- 4.2 Following up on the pre-recorded presentation, Louisiana Lush, Jessica Baxendale, and Spencer Rutherford, evaluators from IPSOS, provided additional insights on the evaluation.
- 4.3 Malabika Sarker and Juan Pablo Gutiérrez, EAC members, provided feedback on behalf of the EAC focal points, including: i) a summary of the engagement of the EAC focal points since the last EAC meeting; ii) comments on the final Phase 2 evaluation products, as captured in the EAC’s formal guidance below; and iii) reflections on the importance of teasing out exactly what in the complexity of the Gavi model is proving difficult for countries.
- 4.4 Alex de Jonquières, Director, Health Systems & Immunisation Strengthening, provided comments on the evaluation process, noting that the policy brief approach had allowed for a deeper look at some areas and at the same time had felt less heavy. He indicated that the briefs would be used to inform the programmatic elements of the Gavi 6.0 Health Systems Strategy that is currently being developed. He also noted there were some areas for improvement, including: i) variability in the depth of analysis and specificity of findings; ii) lack of clarity at time of whether ‘Gavi’ referred to Gavi Secretariat or Alliance given this is a critical difference; iii) some of recommendations were in tension with each other and it would be helpful to acknowledge that, prioritise, and be clear about what to change; iv) that it would be helpful to apply a level of confidence to the findings; and v) that the findings did not identify anything that was working well and this could also be helpful from a learning perspective.

Discussion

- The EAC noted that overall this phase of the evaluation had gone well.
- The EAC discussed whether the topics identified for this phase had been the right ones. The Secretariat indicated that they had been and that the approach had been useful but could be adjusted to be even more useful if the Secretariat had the opportunity to co-create the recommendations with the evaluation team. At the same time, there were also other topics that could have been included, and it would be helpful to explore more about how to separate these policy briefs from other learning work.

- The EAC also reflected that the theme of country ownership and that the burden on countries had featured as an issue in this evaluation as it has in other recent evaluations.
- The EAC also touched on the policy brief on primary health care (PHC) integration, which had set out the general debate on this topic, and noted the importance of community health workers and community based activities as a component of PHC.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- Overall, the evaluation has demonstrated quality. However, some policy briefs have limited information regarding accountability or unintended consequences, despite these elements being referenced within the text;
- To improve clarity and utility, the policy briefs could benefit from being renamed to reflect their length, and an executive summary could be included to highlight key issues upfront. Additionally, recommendations could be clustered to better serve the audience by distinguishing between: (1) Gavi Alliance, Secretariat, and country-level stakeholders; and (2) separating zero-dose-specific issues from broader Gavi-related matters;
- While the perspectives of the countries have been well captured, it is essential that the recommendations align closely with the findings to ensure coherence and logical flow. Using direct quotes or concrete evidence from the findings would further enhance the credibility of the recommendations.
- The streamlined approach for the phase 2 evaluation has been effective due to its agility, shorter timeframe, and reduced burden on Secretariat colleagues. This approach should be considered as a model for future evaluation processes, provided the context is similarly focused. Pre-meets with EAC Focal Points and suppliers should be mainstreamed for all centralised evaluations.

5. Update on the Zero-Dose Evaluation – Phase 3

- 5.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item, and Nathalie Gons, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, presented on process (Doc 05).
- 5.2 Following up on the pre-recorded presentation, Louisiana Lush, Jessica Baxendale, and Spencer Rutherford, evaluators from IPSOS, provided additional insights on the evaluation.
- 5.3 Alex de Jonquières, Director, Health Systems & Immunisation Strengthening, and Rita Rhayem, Head, Equitable Immunisation Programmes, highlighted the indicative themes/evaluation questions proposed for Phase 3, specifically on implementation fidelity and lever consolidation; however, they noted that implementation of new zero-dose programming had just started following

pandemic-driven delays to new Health System Strengthening and Equity Accelerator Fund grant applications and proposed that there would be more value in waiting for more data to be available to implement a Phase 3 evaluation.

Discussion

- The EAC discussed the value in undertaking evaluative work throughout 2025 on phase 3, by building on analysis conducted in 2024 for Phase 2 and leveraging the in-country relationships built over the Phase 1 and 2.
- Whilst acknowledging the potential need to pause the commencement of Phase 3, an EAC member expressed concerns about losing the opportunity and momentum gained in Phase 2 particularly in relation to the relationships built at the country level with the evaluation team.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- Considering the current pace of implementation, data availability constraints, and the nature of relevant evaluation questions, a Contribution Analysis (CA) for 2025 that focuses on outcomes depicted in the Zero-Dose Theory of Change will have limited utility;
- As further scoping work occurs through Q4 2024, the EAC suggested continued thinking about the value of the proposed work in Phase 3 noting that it proposes deep dives into some of the topics already analysed in 2024, and subject to ongoing consultations including Secretariat business owners; and
- Recognising the continued importance of the Zero-Dose agenda in the Gavi 6.0 mission, and the relatively low implementation of Gavi 6.0 programming to date, consideration should be given in work planning for Gavi 6.0 to commissioning a further Zero-Dose multi-phase evaluation.

6. Update on the COVAX Evaluation

- 6.1 Leslie Moreland, Senior Programme Officer, introduced this item (Doc 06).
- 6.2 Members of the Delivery Evaluation Partnership Group (DEPG) also joined the discussion, including Beth Plowman, Senior Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF), Aude Mommeja (Consultant, UNICEF), and Riccardo Polastro (Chief Evaluation Officer, WHO). They commented on some of the early lessons learned to date on a conducting a joint evaluation of this nature but also indicated that the evaluation is still mid-stream and while a lot has been invested in getting countries to engage, a lot of the payoffs have yet to be achieved.
- 6.3 Following up on their pre-recorded presentation, Rebecca Flueckiger, Team Lead, RTI Intl, and Matthew Cooper, Deputy Team Lead, provided additional insights on the evaluation.

- 6.4 Ezzeddine Mohsni, EAC focal point, provided some context on progress on the joint evaluation and noted there had been good progress despite the complexity. He also commented that the paper had been clear on evaluation components and that the shifts that had been incorporated had been justified.
- 6.5 Laura Craw, Senior Manager, Global Health Security, Vaccine Markets and Health Security, reflected that there is a lot of potential for learning through this process and that she is looking forward to the country voice coming through in the emerging insights.

Discussion

- EAC members noted that there was cautious optimism that the initial investment will pay off substantively along with the learning from a joint evaluation process with Alliance partners.
- EAC members queried when the next component of work would be delivered, as the EAC focal points had expected the emerging findings prior to the EAC meeting. It was clarified that it would be distributed shortly.

7. Gavi 5.1 Evaluation Workplan Update – Part 2

- 7.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning introduced this item (Doc 07).
- 7.2 Laura Craw, Senior Manager, Global Health Security, Vaccine Markets and Health Security, explained the development of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework and Theory of Change for the African Vaccine Manufacturing Accelerator (AVMA), which had been developed in consultation with a broad set of stakeholders, and had been reviewed by the Gavi Board.
- 7.3 Claudia Lo Forte, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation and Learning, who led the recent light touch evaluability assessment of the Big Catch-Up, provided an introduction on the initiative.
- 7.4 Tom Davis, Senior Manager, Equity & Zero-Dose, Health Systems and Immunisation Strengthening, and Sud Balasubramaniam, Senior Specialist, Measurement and Strategic Information, commented on use cases for the evaluation of the Big Catch-Up, potential utility of the evaluation and other considerations, and on the overall M&E framework including on the monitoring approach and data.

Discussion

- With respect to AVMA, the EAC agreed to add an evaluation to the current centralised evaluation workplan.

- EAC members discussed the proposed approach for evaluating AVMA and the linkages between the different proposed reviews (annual reporting, triennial reviews, eco-system review, joint end-line evaluation) and indicated it seemed like a good direction of travel.
- EAC members queried what steps would be in place to safeguard the independence of the triennial reviews. It was clarified that these would be commissioned out to independent providers and that CET would provide guidance on principles for independence and safeguards.
- EAC members asked for more information about the governance arrangements for AVMA, which were clarified.
- EAC members also discussed the role of the EAC, understanding this framework had already been reviewed by the PPC and the Board. The Secretariat provided a comparable example of the Pneumococcal AMC, which was also a ten-year instrument that had resulted in a centralised evaluation.
- In relation to the Big Catch-Up, the EAC agreed to add an evaluation to the current centralised evaluation workplan.
- EAC members appreciated the context that was provided about the rapid development of the initiative and the fact the Board had not requested an evaluation, which sets the direction that this evaluation would be for learning rather than accountability.
- One EAC member queried whether countries seemed enthusiastic about the approach and whether it was perceived that this evaluation would benefit the countries themselves. It was clarified that no country had pushed back.
- One EAC member asked whether it would be possible to incorporate an evaluation question related to any effects of climate change within the Big Catch-Up initiative. It was explained that this would need to be discussed with partners who are leading on this and it might also be worth considering issues of gender and accessibility.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- In relation to the African Vaccine Manufacturing Accelerator:
 - To ensure triennial reviews and the end-line evaluation are appropriately linked and complementary;
 - That a focus on learning through the triennial reviews is appropriate, the EAC notes the importance of robust documentation of course correction throughout this phase; and
 - Additionally, the evaluability assessment should support early definition of the questions and methods for the end-line evaluation to ensure that data is effectively collected and including early-stage scoping of the potential value of, and actions needed to support, an independent impact or contribution analysis at endline, given the importance and size of the AVMA investment.

- With respect to the Big Catch-Up, to incorporate questions related to coherence, particularly in terms of alignment with the Zero-Dose Evaluation.
- For both evaluations, consideration should be given to an appropriate approach to country engagement through the phases of these evaluation processes, by CET, EAC Focal Points, and Alliance Partners, particularly in defining questions, to enhance their relevance and utility. This collaborative effort may lead to more contextually appropriate and actionable insights.

Decision One

The Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee:

- **approved** the revised multi-year (2021-2025) centralised evaluation workplan attached as Annex A to Doc 07.

8. Evaluation Policy Operationalisation 1: Evaluation Function Review

- 8.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 08) and requested guidance on the draft findings, conclusions and key strategic areas emerging from the Evaluation Function Review (EFR); and the proposed next steps for finalising the report, stakeholder and EAC engagement, and the decision-making pathway. She also outlined the continuous engagement in evaluation activities with key Gavi fora in Q4 of 2024 noting that further engagement and action planning would take place in Q1 2025.
- 8.2 External evaluators from IOD Parc presented the draft findings of the evaluation, including conclusions and tradeoffs.
- 8.3 Esther Saville provided key points that emerged from recent touch points with the Gavi Senior Leadership Team (SLT) on key strategic areas pertaining to evaluations including defining the purpose and audience of evaluations.
- 8.4 Johannes Ahrendts, Director, Strategy, Funding & Performance, underlined the importance of utility, implementation and the co-creation element. He noted that Gavi 6.0 presents an opportunity to rethink evaluations from start to finish.
- 8.5 Hope Johnson, Director, Measurement, Evaluation & Learning, highlighted the growing demand for evaluations in comparison to five years ago. She underlined the need to clarify the role of evaluation versus audits, accountability to the Board, and having independence where it is required. She noted that sensitivity exists around partnerships, and referred to the uniqueness of Gavi and the need for careful consideration of tradeoffs around utility, risk mitigation, and independence.

Discussion

- In responding to a query from an EAC Focal Point on any areas where Gavi's evaluation function is doing well, the evaluators explained that the evaluation function within Gavi is on a positive trajectory, with significant progress made in systems and processes. However, there is a need for more positive progress in behavioral and cultural aspects. Some issues remain challenging to address, including the connection between the evaluation function and the rest of the organisation, as well as the utility and strength of the evaluation, which relates to culture.
- One EAC member questioned how to reconcile the finding that evaluations are of good quality but do not meet the organisation's needs. The evaluators explained that evaluation quality is systematically measured according to norms and standards using a structured metric. This metric indicates high scores for quality. However, challenges exist in terms of utility and usefulness, as the evaluations do not fully align with the organisation's needs when considering quality holistically.
- Regarding separating the operational and the strategic recommendations, the external evaluators noted that they would be presenting prioritised recommendations. There are however existential questions that Gavi has to answer before putting these recommendations in place, such as questions regarding the purpose of evaluation, the development of an evaluation strategy, the positioning of the evaluation function within the organisation, resourcing, etc.
- In relation to tracking the implementation of recommendations, it was noted that the CET monitors the implementation of actions in management responses for centralised evaluations, but do not have oversight over decentralised evaluations to ensure that management responses are also completed for these.
- The EAC discussed the purpose of evaluation in Gavi and highlighted: i) that Gavi needs both learning and accountability from evaluations, ii) the need for a more formal engagement with the PPC to serve as a bridge with the Board, and iii) the importance of learning on the impact of programmes, as well as on Gavi's contribution to that impact.
- Regarding the purpose of decentralised evaluations the EAC discussed: i) the importance of involving countries to improve utility; ii) the need to monitor and improve their quality considering they represent an important proportion of Gavi's evaluation activities and their high importance in programmatic decision-making; iii) the value of Monitoring and Learning (M&L) frameworks and ToCs, and the limited bandwidth of MEL to support the other teams with those; iv) the limited involvement of EAC and CET impacting their ability to guarantee the independence and quality of these evaluations, and also leads to a lack of visibility on how well resources are spent; v) the need for a better coordination between centralised and decentralised evaluations; vi) the necessity of having clear questions from the Secretariat, partners, PPC and the Board that would provide

answers regarding information that is needed in order to enhance use of evaluation findings.

- On country-level engagement in evaluations, the EAC reiterated the importance of country engagement, and noted the need for creativity to incentivise participation. As capacity at country level is a challenge, in addition to internal barriers, harnessing capacity of various partners working in Gavi’s space at country level would be important in this regard.
- In terms of next steps, it was noted that decisions on changes to the Evaluation Policy and EAC Terms of Reference would only take place in June 2025. The Secretariat indicated it would endeavour to keep all relevant parties informed as appropriate, including the Board, PPC, and Governance Committee. Any financial implications would be brought to the Audit and Finance Committee for recommendation to the Board. It was proposed that the EFR Oversight Panel could help with the preparation for a Technical Briefing around the messaging to the Board and PPC.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

Advised that the Evaluation Function Review is still in process and is now behind schedule due to quality issues with the draft report(s), hence the points below are preliminary guidance aimed at supporting the completion of the review, in advance of the final report being received from the suppliers.

At this stage, several key areas have been identified for strengthening the Gavi evaluation function:

- The need for a shared vision for the role and purposes of evaluation relative to other functions;
- Ownership of evaluations;
- Enhancing the usefulness of evaluation at Gavi;
- Stakeholder engagement in evaluations, particularly country partners;
- In the context of Gavi 6.0 it is timely to review the role of the EAC and alignment between the TOR and practice; and
- The EAC Focal Points propose to support a light touch After Action Review to reflect and distil key learning points from the review process to inform future practice for reviews of this type.

9. Evaluation Policy Operationalisation 2: Gavi 6.0 evaluation work planning

9.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, introduced this item (Doc 09).

9.2 Nathalie Gons, Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation & Learning, reviewed the planning for this item that was intended as a brainstorming session.

Discussion

- EAC members broke into three discussion topics on: i) What is our vision for country engagement in evaluations at Gavi for the near and future term? ii) How can we strengthen our categorisation of evaluation types/approaches for Gavi – and criteria/implications? and iii) Lessons learned in data collection and analysis for Gavi evaluations.
- EAC members provided short read-outs of their discussions as well as detailed notes for the CET team to take away to build into next steps from the EFR.
- The sessions addressing country engagement reported back on discussions related to engagement across the evaluation cycle, including i) contacting local evaluators to help Gavi identify ways to conduct better evaluations; ii) using feedback loops to allow countries to feel they are empowered and that the evaluations will be useful; iii) undertaking a mapping of existing mechanisms and partners at country level; iv) working with PhD/Masters students; and v) drawing on expertise in the Research & Technical Health Institutes Board constituency.
- On the question of how to strengthen Gavi’s categorisation, the group discussed i) how to define types of evaluation and the tension between centralised and decentralised evaluation, and how this fits with other sources, as well as the decision making process at Gavi; ii) how the EAC might be able to help in this effort; iii) the tradeoff and prominence of independence and its link to audit; and iv) the need for a whole system picture.
- With respect to lessons learned around data collection and analysis, the group discussed i) the utility of using a staged approach to evaluation despite the potential increased transaction costs; ii) the importance of understanding at the outset the data landscape and opportunities for data collection within that; iii) needing clarity on evaluation questions before assessing which methods are most effective to address these evaluation questions, while considering cost and level of effort; iv) impact evaluations, noting the feasibility and cost of different approaches; and v) the issue of supplier competency.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following formal guidance:

- Aligned with the CEO’s 180-day plan and Gavi 6.0 direction, the Lusaka Agenda and Gavi Alliance’s principles, the Gavi Secretariat should, with EAC oversight, clearly articulate and implement a vision for an enhanced country and Alliance partner engagement (including at least evaluation ownership, oversight, question setting, participation, interpretation of findings, and use) across its evaluation portfolio.

10. EAC Engagement in Gavi 5.1 Evaluations

10.1 Esther Saville, Head, Evaluation & Learning, presented the current allocation of EAC members as Focal Points across the centralised evaluations (Doc 10).

Discussion

- The EAC made some adjustments to the current allocation for centralised evaluations, which appear in Attachment B to these meeting minutes.
- In addition, the allocation of EAC members to serve as Focal Points on other workstreams was also agreed, and these appear in Attachment C to these meeting minutes.
- EAC members also advised that it would be worth revisiting the skills needed for any new EAC members prior to the next recruitment exercise, to be informed by a skills mapping.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee provided the following additional formal guidance:

- For future evaluations, data availability limitations should be assessed during the inception phase to ensure that the proposed approaches are feasible;
- The Secretariat could compile a list of relevant data produced by the organisation and ensure that this data is accessible for evaluations as needed;
- The compiled list of data sources could also be useful when putting together Requests for Proposal;
- Efforts should be directed toward developing tools and mechanisms to track Gavi financial resources at the country level given its usefulness for evaluation purposes; and
- Develop a skills matrix for EAC members.

11. Review of EAC Guidance and Decisions

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

12. Closing remarks and any other business

12.1 The EAC Chair reported back briefly on the closed session, noting the EAC's recognition of the emerging findings in the EFR that EAC meetings were burdensome to CET in terms of workload and that members wished to work on this and seek ways to improve the situation.

12.2 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
- Juan Pablo Gutiérrez
- Penny Hawkins
- David Hotchkiss
- Adolfo Martinez Valle
- Ezzeddine Mohsni (items 1-6, 8-10)
- Malabika Sarker*
- Onei Uetela
- Rhoda Wanyenze

Committee Member-elect*

- Justice Nonvignon*

Guests (virtual)

- Louisiana Lush, Ipsos (items 4-5)
- Jessica Baxendale, Ipsos (items 4-5)
- Spencer Rutherford, Ipsos (items 4-5)
- Beth Plowman, UNICEF (item 6)
- Aude Mommeja, UNICEF (item 6)
- Riccardo Polastro, WHO (item 6)
- Rebecca Flueckiger, RTI Intl (item 6)
- Joanna Springer, RTI Intl (item 6)
- Matthew Cooper, RTI Intl (item 6)
- Rob Whitby, United Kingdom (item 8)
- Naomi Blight, IODParc (item 8)
- Joy McCarron, IODParc (item 8)
- Vittoria Moresco, IODParc (item 8)
- Nick York, IODParc (item 8)

Secretariat

- Hope Johnson
- Esther Saville
- Nathalie Gons (items 1-5, 7-12)
- Anders Amaechi
- Leslie Moreland (items 1-3, 6-12)
- Hannah Burriss (item 2)
- Benjamin Loevinsohn (item 3)
- Sophie LaVincente (item 3)
- Inga Savin (item 3)
- Adriana Jimenez Cuen (item 3)*
- Alex de Jonquières (item 4-5)
- Rita Rhayem (item 4-5)*
- Gustavo Correa (item 5)
- Heidi Reynolds (item 5)
- Laura Crow (item 6-7)
- Tom Davis (item 7)
- Sud Manni Balasubramaniam (item 7)
- Johannes Ahrendts (item 8)
- Daria Piccand
- Nadine (items 1-3, 8)
- Cristina Cimenti
- Meegan Murray-Lopez

Attachment B

EAC engagement in centralised evaluations

EVALUATION	SC	EAC Members on SC	EAC Focal Points		
Evaluation of Gavi's contribution to reaching zero-dose children and missed communities	Yes	David Hotchkiss Ezzeddine Mohsni	Adolfo Martinez Valle	Juan Pablo Gutierrez	Malabika Sarker*
COVAX Evaluation: COVAX Facility and COVAX AMC (Gavi Secretariat) and COVAX Partner Delivery Efforts (Joint)	Yes	Adolfo Martinez Valle Justice Nonvignon*	David Hotchkiss	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Penny Hawkins
Evaluation of Gavi's contribution to sustainability of coverage post-transition	TBD	n/a	Ezzeddine Mohsni	Malabika Sarker	Helen Evans*
AVMA	TBD	n/a	Rhoda Wanyenze*	Adolfo Martinez Valle	James Hargreaves
Big Catch-Up	TBD	n/a	Onei Uetela*	Helen Evans	Justice Nonvignon

* EAC member in convening role

Attachment C

Additional EAC engagement

Workstream	EAC Focal Points		
Evaluation Function Review	Penny Hawkins*	Adolfo Martinez Valle	Helen Evans
Supplier Review	Penny Hawkins	Onei Uetela	Adolfo Martinez Valle*
Workplan 6.0	Rhoda Wanyenze	Penny Hawkins	James Hargreaves

* EAC member in convening role