Minutes

Joint Meeting
Gavi Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee
Gavi Alliance Programme and Policy Committee

17 October 2018
Gavi Alliance Offices, Geneva, Switzerland

1. Chair's Welcome

1.1 The meeting commenced at 14.06 Geneva time on 17 October 2018. Rob Moodie, Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Chair, and Richard Sezibera, Programme and Policy Committee (PPC Chair), co-chaired the meeting.

1.2 The Co-chairs gave a brief introduction to the meeting, highlighting that Gavi is entering a critical period as it gears up for the mid-term review (MTR) of the current strategy and starts preparing for the next strategy, Gavi 5.0.

1.3 Standing declarations of interest were tabled to the Committee (Docs 01a and 01b in the meeting pack).

---

2. Evolution of Gavi's Monitoring & Evaluation Function and Future Directions

2.1 Hope Johnson, Director, Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E), introduced this item by presenting an overview of the evolution of Gavi's M&E function.

2.2 She presented Gavi's 2016-2020 M&E Framework, which comprises a number of different tools and strategies with the aim of strengthening accountability, fostering learning and catalysing data strengthening, and used the example of Niger to demonstrate how this framework works in practice.

2.3 She shared information to illustrate the importance of applying an M&E lens at the design phase of Gavi programmes, as well as how an M&E lens can been applied prospectively to programmes and activities in order to identify challenges in a timely manner and address them proactively to improve programme implementation.

2.4 Dr Johnson presented key findings from various reviews of aspects of the M&E function, as well as information on potential future directions for M&E activities for Gavi.

2.5 Dr Johnson highlighted how Gavi's routine monitoring has evolved to allow for more real-time information and timely assessment of progress and challenges.

2.6 Finally, she invited EAC and PPC members to provide input on a number of questions: 1) What are the best ways to identify the key questions of the different stakeholders to meet their learning and accountability needs and ensure this is reflected in our work plans; 2) How best to ensure use of the evaluation results; 3) How can the EAC and PPC help with this?; and 4) How/where are we willing to accept trade-offs of: i) timely but less robust results; ii) quality of control-level vs. globally implemented M&E activities; and iii) business owner engagement vs. independence.

Discussion

- Participants agreed on the importance of M&E activities being planned at the national level and highlighted that there is very often a need to provide training in-country in this area and to engage in-country stakeholders in development of evaluation.

- In response to questions from participants, the Secretariat noted that one of the challenges relates to communicating and systematically sharing the results of M&E activities to countries, including through partners, and that this has been identified as a key area for improvement.

- Participants noted the growing appetite for, and increased use of, M&E outcomes in countries, and this is seen in particular at the HLRP (High Level Review Panel) and through the use of Joint Appraisals both by countries themselves and by the IRC (Independent Review Committee).

- In relation to a question around the ethics of different kinds of M&E, the Secretariat noted that this is taken into consideration in contracts that Gavi enters into for M&E activities, and that at one stage in the Full Country Evaluations (FCE) project advice had been sought from an ethical expert. It was suggested that this is an area that should be further developed.

- Participants noted that there are ongoing discussions with the Global Fund in particular in relation to identifying areas for M&E collaboration, both at the global and country level. At its meeting immediately preceding this joint session, the EAC had noted that it is sometimes difficult to engage jointly in evaluations when decision making cycles in organisations are not always aligned. A first step therefore might be to jointly synthesise learning.

- Participants discussed and agreed on how important it is to ensure that theories of change become an essential part of programme and policy design.

- In response to a question from a participant about experience gained from carrying out evaluations over time, the Secretariat noted that a manuscript outlining the

lessons learnt from the Full Country Evaluations project and other prospective evaluations carried out is being prepared for publication.

---

3. Evaluation update and workplan 2019-2020

3.1 The EAC Chair introduced this session by inviting participants to break into small groups to discuss together their thoughts on the role of evaluation at Gavi and the key issues for the new strategy that should be in the evaluation workplan.

3.2 During this session, the group also considered the questions in relation to trade-offs, and how best the EAC can support the PPC and vice versa.

Discussion

- Participants suggested the following items to be considered as strategic questions to inform Gavi's evaluation workplan going forward:

  - Approaches to health systems strengthening – what works and what doesn't
  - Co-financing policy – looking at issues such as sources of financing, are they sustainable, etc.
  - Eligibility and Transition policy – are the right sets of criteria in place, are the benchmarks right, what is country experience?
  - Routine immunisation and supplementary immunisation activities (SIAs)/campaigns
  - Gavi's role in pandemics e.g. Ebola
  - How can Gavi contribute to the UHC agenda? How can vaccination make a strategic contribution to the PHC platform both in the context of routine immunisation and campaigns? Resource allocation processes – is there a way to put in place an overarching process for resource allocation within countries?
  - Is Gavi's mission correctly articulated as focused on coverage & equity (C&E)
  - Gavi's evaluation model – is Gavi's current way of doing M&E able to get the best information from countries
  - How does Gavi work in fragile states

- The Secretariat, considering the proposal that many of these issues could benefit from an external evaluation, noted that it will be important to think through how they could be managed either through internal or external evaluations, or other mechanisms as appropriate. Particular thought will need to be given to issues where there are political sensitivities, so as to ensure that potential evaluators have a full understanding of the complexities of the issues.

- The usefulness of having an external objective view on many of these issues was appreciated and it was suggested that using a network of people around the Alliance who understand the nuances yet bring in their own perspectives would be helpful. It was acknowledged that Secretariat involvement could lead to a perceived lack of independence and a subsequent lack of trust in the results. This

needs to be mitigated as Gavi is a complex organisation and there is a key role for the Secretariat to play in guiding the work and processes.

- The EAC Chair shared that the EAC had discussed the evaluation workplan at its own meeting and had recommended that the Supply and Procurement Strategy, and the Co-financing, Eligibility and Transition policies should be subject to external independent evaluations. He also shared the Committee's view that Gavi's engagement with the private sector is of strategic importance and therefore should have an independent evaluation.

- Participants noted that external evaluations are time-consuming and lengthy endeavours and that the outcomes of some of the strategic evaluations would be needed to feed into the Gavi 5.0 development process. The Secretariat noted that they will have to look at the priorities and potentially explore how some of the timelines might be reduced so as to feed appropriately into the process.

- It was also agreed that for evaluations there is a need to balance the robustness of results, with the need for timely information to inform decision-making.

- The importance of ensuring that M&E activities have country focus was highlighted, as well as combining in-country activities with global activities in this area.

- In relation to how best the EAC can support the PPC, it was suggested that the EAC could assess the evaluation frameworks being built into new policies and programmes. It was also suggested that it would be useful to identify a feedback loop between the EAC and the PPC.

- One PPC member noted that the work of the EAC is extremely valuable and that the PPC and Board are perhaps not sufficiently aware of the work of the EAC and how they might better use the key findings of that work.

- It was suggested that it could be useful for the PPC to be more cognisant of the evaluation workplan and perhaps find a way of having a more systematic consideration on the policies that need an evaluation.

- Participants noted that it would be useful to have more robust criteria to determine what should be a review, an internally-facilitated evaluation or an externally-facilitated independent evaluation.

- It was also suggested that it could be useful to find a way to present evaluation reports to the PPC in a form which then enables the PPC to take on board the findings in a more systematic manner when reviewing programmatic or policy recommendations. The Secretariat noted that this would indeed be most useful, but cautioned that there is currently no bandwidth to do this, either at the level of the Secretariat or the PPC and that it is something therefore that would need to be further considered and explored.

4. The importance of evaluability and the role of theories of change in programme planning

Issues relating to this item were discussed, and subsequently minuted, under items 2 and 3.

---

5. Closing Remarks

5.1 The PPC Chair thanked all participants for the useful and constructive discussions and highlighted the importance of ensuring that there is a more systematic process going forward to ensure that the work of the EAC and PPC is more closely aligned in terms of their respective workplans.

5.2 He suggested that while some additional thought might be given to whether or not the EAC and PPC should meet together systematically on an annual basis, he did see the value in ensuring that the EAC and PPC Chair interact more regularly with each other's committees.

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

Mrs Joanne Goetz
Secretary to the Meeting

Attachment A

Participants

Evaluation Advisory Committee Members

- Rob Moodie, Chair
- Zulfiqar A. Bhutta
- Craig Burgess
- Mira Johri
- Nina Schwalbe
- Wieneke Vullings

Programme and Policy Committee Members

- Richard Sezibera, Chair
- Ahmed Abdallah
- Edna Yolani Batres
- Abdul Wali Ghayur
- Violaine Mitchell
- Robin Nandy
- Kate O'Brien
- Jean-Francois Pactet
- Michael Kent Ranson
- Dure Samin Akram
- Seth Berkley, Chief Executive Officer
- Alejandro Cravioto

Other Board members attending

- Irene Koek

Observers

- Stephen Karengera, Special Adviser to the PPC Chair
- Fabienne N'Guessan Kombo, Special Adviser to AFRO francophone/lusophone constituency
- Sara Osman, Special Advisers to EMRO constituency
- Rolando Pinel, Special Adviser to EURO/PAHO constituency
- Khant Soe, Special Adviser to SEARO/WPRO constituency

Regrets

- Jeanine Condo (EAC)
- Vandana Gurnani (PPC)
- Anna Hamrell (EAC)
- Jason Lane (PPC)
- Lene Lothe (PPC)
- Susan McKinney (PPC)
- Adar Poonawalla (PPC)
- Helen Rees (PPC)
- Princess Nothema Simelela (PPC)
- Viroj Tangcharoensathien (EAC)
- An Vermeersch (PPC)

Gavi Secretariat

- Anuradha Gupta
- Emmanuella Baguma
- Abdallah Bchir
- Joanne Goetz
- Hope Johnson
- Hind Khatib-Othman
- Leslie Moreland
- Aurelia Nguyen