

SUBJECT: CONSENT AGENDA: CHANGES IN 2016-2020 STRATEGY INDICATORS

Agenda item: 02h

Category: For Decision

Section A: Introduction

- The Gavi Alliance Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) recommends that the Gavi Alliance Board approve changes to six strategic indicators to strengthen Gavi's ability to effectively track and analyse progress.
- These changes are recommended based on a review by the Secretariat of all strategic indicators, as well as engagement with Alliance stakeholders. This process highlighted certain indicators that were not able to measure change in a meaningful way or be used effectively for performance and accountability management. Targeted updates to certain indicators are proposed to address these challenges.
- The PPC were supportive of these changes in enabling better monitoring of performance and incentivising effective prioritisation of resources. The PPC asked for the original strategic indicator definitions and targets to continue to be tracked for monitoring purposes. The PPC also noted modifications to three Alliance KPIs managed by the Secretariat.

Section B: 2016-2020 Strategic Indicators

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Gavi introduced the Alliance Accountability Framework in 2015, to support the implementation of Gavi's 2016-2020 strategy. This new framework puts a strong emphasis on enhanced transparency, accountability and performance management across constituents of the Vaccine Alliance, including the Secretariat, partners, countries, and the Alliance's governance mechanisms. The Alliance Accountability Framework cascades all the way from long-term Mission Targets, through output and outcome-focused Strategy Indicators, to input, process and output Alliance Indicators.
- 1.2 Semi-annual discussions held over the last two years have provided greater insights into how we are progressing as an Alliance in implementing our strategy. They have also shown that a few indicators are not well suited to the new approach of frequent progress review and may in some limited instances produce misleading information. Targeted updates to indicators are proposed to address this.

- 1.3 One area of concern in the indicator framework is how thresholds affect the monitoring of progress and incentives in the Alliance. Examples include the Effective Vaccine Management (EVM) indicator, which measures the percentage of Gavi68 countries with a composite EVM score of 80% or above. Whilst such an indicator provides a succinct measure and is simple to communicate, the threshold can mask significant improvements or deteriorations that occur below or above the threshold. Such issues are exacerbated in situations when few data points are available, or data quality is low. Thresholds further incentivise attention by the Alliance on countries that are close to the threshold and discourage attention on countries that face deep challenges and where incremental improvements can drive a much larger impact.
- 1.4 Other indicators are not accurately capturing whether the Alliance is making progress, or not. Examples of this are equity indicators on wealth and gender (S1.4 and S1.5), which currently include information from surveys conducted in the last five years. At the current time, 43 of 68 countries had qualifying surveys in the last five years that included measures of the gender proxy (maternal education)¹. Limited data availability means that indicator values are complex to interpret when compared between years: changes in the indicator do not necessarily indicate changes in performance but rather reflect a changing sample of countries included in the indicator. The long-term solution to this issue is to increase the availability of survey data. In the short term, we propose specific changes to the indicators in order to mitigate the risk of them producing misleading information.
- 1.5 Over the past six months, the Secretariat has engaged in exchanges with Alliance stakeholders at multiple occasions to inform this indicator refresh. All Strategy Indicators have been systematically assessed for their strength of measurement and their utility in accountability and performance management, and alternatives have been explored. Proposed enhancements to Strategy Indicators presented below build on the assessment and consultations.

2. Proposed enhancements to Gavi's Strategy Indicators

- 2.1 In reviewing Strategy Indicators for their strategic fit, we have followed guiding principles: changes are only proposed where there is a strong rationale, maintaining indicators as far as possible, to build continuity in reporting and to help assess trends. Changes either improve the Alliance's ability to measure progress, improve data quality, improve availability of data, or better align the indicator with Gavi's objectives and investments across countries. In Annex A to this paper, we present details, including revised definitions and adjustment to targets, for these indicators to align with the new measurement. The targets aim to maintain the same level of ambition established with the existing measures.

¹ Only 4 countries had 2 surveys in the last 5 years, making trend analysis at a country level impossible.

- 2.2 **Equity indicators (S1.3 Geographic Equity, S1.4 Equity by Wealth and S1.5 Equity by Maternal Education):** equity is a central theme of Gavi's 2016-2020 strategy, and at the same time it is an area that is challenging to measure, with limited data available, and data often being of low quality. The changes we propose aim to provide a more detailed understanding of how the Alliance is progressing in improving equity.
- 2.3 Geographic equity is the primary dimension that Gavi targets in its investments to increase coverage and equity. Currently, S1.3 measures the percentage of countries where all districts achieve at least 80% Penta3 coverage, subject to a data quality criterion². The threshold of 100% of districts limits our understanding of developments that occur below the threshold and the data quality criterion excludes 36 of 68 Gavi countries. We propose removing the threshold of all districts achieving 80% and to instead track the average percentage of districts that achieve more than 80% coverage across Gavi68 countries, to better assess progress in geographic equity. To complement this indicator, it is important to track progress among districts with <80% coverage, too. However, data availability for this category is limited. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Reporting Form (JRF) currently only provides information for broad categories (i.e. proportion of districts with <50% and 50-79% coverage), making it difficult to track progress in these districts. We propose to work with WHO and UNICEF to strengthen the availability of data to track progress among districts with <80% coverage.
- 2.4 The indicators on equity by wealth and maternal education measure the share of countries where immunisation coverage between the top and bottom quintiles (by wealth and maternal education) differs by less than 10%. These indicators are affected by the same considerations regarding thresholds discussed above and also by the fact that data availability is very limited. We propose measuring the average difference in coverage between the highest and lowest quintile across countries and to include the latest available data point for each country, even if it is more than five years old. These adjustments aim to reduce the challenge of limited data availability, eliminate incentives to focus Alliance investments on countries close to the threshold, and show trends in a more granular manner. Given the low number of data points that are added each year, it is likely that any changes in indicator values between years will be small.
- 2.5 **S2.1 Effective Vaccine Management:** this indicator aims to measure the progress countries are making in improving their supply chains and to date it was formulated as a threshold, measuring the share of countries that achieve an EVM composite score of >80%. Data availability for this indicator is limited, as EVM assessments are conducted at most every three years. Similar to the equity indicators discussed above, we propose revising it towards the average score achieved by countries on their last EVM assessment. The revised formulation is more sensitive to changes.

² Data quality criterion: country administrative data matching WUENIC estimates, or WUENIC estimates being ≥90%

- 2.6 **S3.2 Country Investment in Routine Immunisation:** the formulation of this indicator has been based on 2010 prices and only includes countries currently receiving Gavi support. We propose re-basing the indicator on 2015 US\$, using World GDP deflator figures published by the World Bank, and to include all 72³ Gavi countries, to ensure transitioned countries are not falling out of sight.
- 2.7 **S3.4 Institutional Capacity:** this indicator was newly developed in 2016 under a learning agenda. Lessons from the first year of monitoring show that the formulation of the indicator with multiple thresholds (on EPI capacity, NITAG functioning, and Coordination Forum (ICC/HSCC) functioning) provided a binary picture of country performance. Also, using Programme Capacity Assessments (PCA) as data collection tools is challenging, as new data points are only available every three years. To address this, we are proposing changing to a single composite score on institutional capacity for each country that includes the three dimensions and to present the average across Gavi countries. We will also report values for each dimension separately so as to track progress in strengthening EPI programmes, ICCs and NITAGs individually. The new approach also uses a revised data collection tool that will be filled by Senior Country Managers on an annual basis and that is triangulated against PCAs every three years, to avoid the risk of adverse incentives or skewed results. Both changes should lead to a more differentiated view on institutional capacity and more timely information on changes.

Section C: Actions requested of the Board

The Gavi Alliance Programme and Policy Committee recommends to the Gavi Alliance Board that it:

- a) **Approve** the changes to the definitions and targets of the Strategy Indicators as set out in Annex A to Doc 02h; and
- b) **Requests** the Secretariat to also continue tracking the original definitions and targets of these Strategic Indicators for monitoring purposes.

The PPC was unable to reach consensus on the recommendation above and in line with the PPC Charter a minority position expressed by Dure Samin Akram, representing the Civil Society Organisations (CSO) constituency, is being reported to the Board.

Annexes

Annex A: Proposed updates to Strategy Indicators

³ Excludes Ukraine