Section A: Introduction

- This report provides the Board with an overview of the activities of the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) since the Board last met in November 2018.

- The EAC had a teleconference on 15 February 2019 where the members discussed and approved the Uganda country programme evaluation proposal as well discussed the proposed content for the revised Evaluation Policy and EAC Terms of Reference.

- The EAC met in Geneva on 10-11 April 2019 where the members discussed specific evaluations, the final version of the evaluation policy and EAC Terms of Reference for Board approval as well as the 2019 evaluation workplan.
  - The EAC was updated on the progress of ongoing centralised and decentralised evaluations including key findings of the evaluation of the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP), process updates on the Uganda country programme evaluation and on the Zambia country programme evaluation as well as how the evaluation unit has engaged in the Gavi 5.0 design process.
  - The EAC assessed the quality and usefulness of the final reports for the Measles and CSO evaluations as well as the draft final report of the Gender policy evaluation and provided feedback to the Secretariat. The consolidated summaries of the EAC reviews will be published on the Gavi website alongside the evaluation reports and management responses.
  - The EAC also provided guidance to the Secretariat on the draft monitoring and evaluation approach for the yellow fever laboratory diagnostics initiative.

- There was a joint meeting of the EAC and the Global Fund Technical Expert Reference Group (TERG) on 10 April 2019. The meeting focused on lessons learned from the Full Country Evaluations (FCE) and Global Fund Prospective Country Evaluations (PCE) with perspectives from both Secretariats and the country as well as discussions on collaboration between the EAC and TERG.
The EAC Chair report is attached in the form of a presentation as Annex A.

**Annexes**

**Annex A:** EAC Chair report
EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

BOARD MEETING
Rob Moodie
26-27 June 2019, Geneva, Switzerland
KEY UPDATES

1. Revised Evaluation Policy
2. Updates on Key Evaluations
3. Reflections and learnings
4. Gavi 5.0 Engagement
5. Gavi Evaluation Workplan
Revised Evaluation Policy

Key recommendations from the peer review and how they have been addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Key Deliverable Required to Address Recommendations</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify and articulate the <strong>purpose</strong> of the Gavi Evaluation function and audience for its evaluations</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To re-examine provisions for <strong>independence</strong> (structural/ behavioural / organisational independence)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To review and clarify the <strong>EAC role</strong></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To develop a more utilisation-focused approach to evaluation</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To develop an approach for country evaluation capacity strengthening</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To document systems and processes for quality assurance and management</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To substantially review the Gavi Evaluation policy</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To improve the “branding” of the Gavi Evaluation function and products (internally and externally)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To ensure follow-up to track management responses implementation</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To further engage with other global evaluation fora and groups (including considering joint evaluations)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Evaluation Updates

Evaluation of measles campaigns and their effects on the overall immunisation system

Dissemination of key findings/recommendations:
• presented to Measles Technical Working Group in February 2019,
• Shared as part of evaluation session for March Board Retreat

Utility: Leveraged for the Nigeria MR application,

EAC Quality Assurance

Evaluation of Gavi’s Support to Civil Society Organisations

Dissemination of key findings/recommendations:
• presented to Secretariat, as well as CSO Constituency in December 2018,
• Shared with the CSO SteerCo and OAG at annual meetings

Utility: to inform ongoing planning discussions at the Secretariat, and by the CSO Constituency, including feeding into Gavi 5.0 planning

EAC Quality Assurance

*Additional information available in backup slides 14 – 16 (measles) and 17 – 19 (CSOs)
Key Evaluation Updates

CCEOP Evaluation

Dissemination of key findings/recommendations
Validation meetings of draft report held in Pakistan and Kenya with key stakeholders; reports and update shared as part of PPC May 2019;

Utility: reports to be shared with CCEOP working group to inform discussions on CCEOP 2.0

Evaluation of Gavi’s Gender Policy

Dissemination of key findings/recommendations
• Dissemination meeting to be held at Secretariat, facilitated by Itad in June

Utility: Report used to inform Gender Policy review update to PPC (May 2019)

EAC Quality Assurance

*Additional information available in backup slides 20 – 21 (CCEOP) and 22 – 25 (Gender)
# Key Evaluation Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Process Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Gavi’s Eligibility and Transition, Co-financing Policies</td>
<td><strong>Centralised evaluation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Focus: Assess the relevance &amp; appropriateness of the design, effectiveness and efficiency of implementation and the extent to which the Policies have achieved their desired results&lt;br&gt;Evaluation implementation period: May – October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavi’s engagement with the Private Sector</td>
<td><strong>Centralised evaluation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Scope and evaluation questions are currently being defined; RFP to be advertised by early Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and Procurement Strategy Review</td>
<td><strong>Centralised evaluation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Scope and evaluation questions to be defined in early Q3 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC Outcome/Impact Evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Centralised evaluation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Scope and evaluation questions to be defined in mid-Q3 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflections and learnings from 6 years on the EAC

• Major increase in interest in evaluation across Gavi

• Include evaluation principles of learning into all aspects of Gavi’s work – needs a strong link to the work of the PPC

• Need to build in evaluation from the very start of programme or policy conceptualisation
  • e.g. theories of change, results framework

• There are clearly areas of Gavi’s work that need independent evaluation, and where prospective evaluation can be very useful
Gavi 5.0 Engagement

How the evaluation unit has engaged in the 5.0 design process

- Learning from evaluations
  - Synthesis of evidence based on key centralised and decentralised evaluations/reviews to inform Board Retreat

- Engagement in key stakeholder discussions specifically providing guidance on areas such as theories of change and monitoring and evaluation framework(s)

- Working to design the evaluation workplan as part of 5.0 design and operationalisation
# Evaluation Workplan (2019 – 2020)

## EVALUATION UNIT (Centralised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioning Unit</th>
<th>Evaluation Type (by subject/focus/scope)</th>
<th>Evaluation Timeline</th>
<th>Requested by</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies, policies and frameworks</td>
<td>CCEOP (Phase I) Evaluation *</td>
<td>January-18</td>
<td>December-20</td>
<td>Board approved strategy</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Policy *</td>
<td>November-18</td>
<td>June-19</td>
<td>Board approved policy</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-financing, Eligibility and transition Policy Evaluation *</td>
<td>May-19</td>
<td>December-19</td>
<td>EAC - PPC</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply and Procurement Strategy Review</td>
<td>February-20</td>
<td>August-20</td>
<td>Board approved strategy</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gavi’s engagement with the private sector</td>
<td>October-19</td>
<td>May-20</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>TO BE CONFIRMED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-transition evaluation of Gavi support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation policy</td>
<td>TO BE CONFIRMED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>Evaluation of Gavi Support to CSOs</td>
<td>April-18</td>
<td>December-18</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measles Campaigns Evaluation</td>
<td>November-17</td>
<td>February-19</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMC Outcome/Impact evaluation</td>
<td>January-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMC Board</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROGRAMME TEAMS/COUNTRY-LED (Decentralised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioning Unit</th>
<th>Evaluation Type (by subject/focus/scope)</th>
<th>Evaluation Timeline</th>
<th>Requested by</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralised evaluations/reviews</td>
<td>Country Programme Evaluation - Uganda</td>
<td>June-19</td>
<td>September-20</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Programme Evaluation - Zambia</td>
<td>July-19</td>
<td>June-20</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>TO BE CONFIRMED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovations in Measles Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSS Review</td>
<td>July-18</td>
<td>March-19</td>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of RapidPro Utilisation for Mit Campaign (Indonesia)</td>
<td>March-18</td>
<td>June-19</td>
<td>Secretariat/UNICEF</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India HSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEF-TCA Country Assessments</td>
<td>December-18</td>
<td>October-19</td>
<td>Secretariat/EAC</td>
<td>TO BE CONFIRMED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan HSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>TO BE CONFIRMED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High strategic value - EAC Oversight*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
<td>Decision to commission yet to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Decision to commission approved; scoping, RFP development, procurement processes and contract signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Signed contract and implementation ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Final report, dissemination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaboration With The Global Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG)

Joint meeting in April 2019 with the EAC

Focus areas

• Lessons learned from the Full Country Evaluations (FCE) and Prospective Country Evaluations (PCE)
  • Appreciation of country perspectives on successes and challenges of multi-year evaluations
  • FCE have provided guidance on how to manage aspects such as capacity strengthening and transition of consortium responsibilities

• Collaboration
  • Working group with EAC – TERG representatives to develop a proposal based on brainstorm session
Thank you
Backup Slides
Revised Evaluation Policy

**Phase I: Preparation**
- ToRs launched
- Four Panel members confirmed:
  - Nick York
  - Anna Henttinen
  - Antonie de Kemp
  - Wuleta Lemma

**Phase II: Implementation**
- Desk review conducted
- Meeting with Evaluation Team held
- Self Assessment by Evaluation Team conducted
- 48 interviews conducted in-person and by phone and Skype

**Phase III: Reporting and Dissemination**
- Draft report submitted and comments provided
- Final report submitted
- Results presented to EAC & discussion

**Phase IV: Uptake and implementation of findings and results**
- Defined strategic orientation questions, input from Secretariat key stakeholders provided
- Presented to EAC for guidance (April 2018)
- Revision of Gavi Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool
- Evaluation Policy revision and approval (Board) + EOG development

**Timeline**
- April – May 2017
- June – August 2017
- September – October 2017
- November 2017 - June 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Process Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Uganda Country Programme Evaluation                  | **Decentralised evaluation**  
EAC review and approval of proposal & budget  
Scope: Urban Immunisation, Private sector and Leadership, Management and Coordination  
Implementation Period: 2019 – 2020* |
| Zambia Country Programme Evaluation                  | **Decentralised evaluation**  
Scope: Sustainability of Gavi support and Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) Vaccine Introduction  
Implementation Period: 1 year (Q3 2019 – Q2 2020) |
# Measles Campaigns and Their Effects on the Overall Immunisation System: Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested by:</th>
<th>• EO 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Objective:** | • To help the Alliance improve the design and implementation of measles support; and  
• To help Nigeria to improve the outcome of measles campaigns and measles routine immunisation activities |
| **Scope** | Campaigns conducted in Nigeria between November 2015 and January 2016 (2015/2016) and the two phased campaign conducted between October 2017 and March/April 2018  
To assess:  
• the quality of the recurrent measles campaigns;  
• the effect of the recurrent measles campaigns on the immunisation system &  
• the extent to which the campaigns integrate lessons learned from previous campaigns into their respective design, planning, implementation and post-campaign stages in Nigeria |
## Measles Campaigns – Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes &amp; results</th>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coverage improved by 3% vs previous campaign</td>
<td>• &gt;95% coverage target for first dose MCV1 not reached</td>
<td>• Assess whether national measles campaigns are the most appropriate strategy that protects against outbreaks, particularly in context of variable subnational coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Positive long term effects - e.g. availability of materials, training of health workers</td>
<td>• No evidence of overall effect on RI</td>
<td>• Tailor and target measles campaigns more to the needs of zero dose children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>• Good quality campaign design</td>
<td>• Focus on reaching zero-dose children not observed</td>
<td>• Continue micro-planning, and building HCW skills, to estimate workplan and needs for campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vulnerability analysis could be used to better target zero-dose children</td>
<td>• Micro-plan issues leading to logistic barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Measles Campaigns – Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highly motivated teams in the country</td>
<td>• No evidence that lessons learned will be used for routine immunisation to sustain increased vaccine coverage</td>
<td>• Document lessons learned and share at all levels during implementation and post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvements in quality of SIA incl. integrating lessons learned, innovative approaches to monitoring and target group estimations</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss with other platforms undertaking campaigns (e.g. polio)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficulties to assess if the campaign led to improvements in RI – Evaluation was initiated after the campaign started and completed once campaign was finished</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct a coverage assessment before and after campaign to see any changes in routine immunisation post campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Gavi’s Support to Civil Society Organisations (CSO) - Background

**Requested by:**
- Gavi Secretariat and CSO constituency, 2016

**Objective**
- To help the Alliance improve the way in which it provides support to CSOs as part of its current 2016-2020 strategy, as well as in future strategies

**Scope**
- To assess:
  - the overarching governance structure of the Gavi CSO Platform and the processes related to its design and implementation (global, regional and country level);
  - the contribution of Gavi support to CSOs to the achievement of intended outcomes and results (including through the CSO Platform and Health Systems Strengthening (HSS) grants) at the country level; &
  - the sustainability of results

Retrospective, covering the period from September 2011 to December 2017
Conducted Q1 2018 – Q4 2018; Country case studies: Burkina Faso, Chad, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Pakistan (Mali and Liberia remote, no country visits)
## CSO Evaluation – Results

### Outcomes & results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Objectives related to improving Platform functionality achieved in some, but not all, countries</td>
<td>Limited evidence of contributions to increasing performance of programmes</td>
<td>Shift from a ‘one size fits all’ to a more flexible, problem-driven approach to engaging CSOs based on country issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CSO partnership design/ governance

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CSO model relevant and aligned with Gavi’s strategic sub-objective on ‘strengthening civil society engagement’</td>
<td>• Lack of clear vision for CSO platform activities in countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complex governance / management structure (e.g. accountability issues, inefficient decision-making)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

- Develop comprehensive, long-term vision for CSO engagement
- Redesign (simplify and clearly define) governance and management arrangements for CSO support

**Board meeting**

26-27 June 2019
## CSO Evaluation – Results

### Successes

**Design**
- Increasing commitment to CSO inclusion in HSS applications and in government budget allocations
- Budget level adequate

**Implementation**
- Some demand generation activities implemented, (~6.7m beneficiaries in 2 years)

### Challenges

- Inefficiencies resulting in disbursement delays
- 2-year support for CSOs to form platforms (for policy, coordination and advocacy) in countries inadequate to achieve objectives
- Implementation severely delayed and only occurred in a few countries
- Few countries’ CSO platforms reaching programmatic and financial sustainability (e.g. few CSO Platforms have attracted external funding for ongoing functioning)

### Recommendation

- Ensure appropriate funding modalities to facilitate CSO roles/functions
- Strengthen Secretariat prioritisation and ownership of CSO support
Evaluation of the Cold Chain Equipment Optimisation Platform (CCEOP) – Evaluation Status and Summary

**Key findings:**


- **Relevance:** CCEOP responds to country priorities and needs, challenges with transparent process and stakeholder engagement, there is alignment with Gavi guidelines and other donor/partner support
- **Effectiveness:** all levels mostly satisfied with Service Bundle Provider (SBP) implementation and deployment and installation process (although information not uniformly extended to all stakeholders), Project Management Team (PMT) played an active role & effective role in deployment and coordination
- **Efficiency:** satisfaction with the efficiency and quality of work of SBPs is generally good but varies by SBP and facility preference, respondents hopeful that the new CCE will result in improved total cost of ownership (TCO), and larger capacity of new CCE to store vaccines will improve stock storage and reduce stock wastage
- **Sustainability:** Training needs not well understood and provision of training insufficient, lack of capacity of technicians for corrective maintenance is insufficient
- **Systems strengthening** (P + K only ): no plan for decommissioning, need for updated inventory, challenge in ensuring policy changes are communicated and implemented

**Progress:**

- Baseline reports (cross country + country-specific) submitted by end of Q4 2019
- Draft intermediate assessment report (cross country) + (midline for Kenya + Pakistan submitted); review by Secretariat and SteerCo underway

**Requested by:**

**Progress:**

- Baseline reports (cross country + country-specific) submitted by end of Q4 2019
- Draft intermediate assessment report (cross country) + (midline for Kenya + Pakistan submitted); review by Secretariat and SteerCo underway
## Key findings: Market Shaping (as of 2018)

- Supply of CCE continues to expand
- Procurement has not kept pace with initial forecasts for CCE
- Delays in implementation and procurement trends to date have raised questions about the credibility of CCEOP demand forecasts
- Suppliers feel that the tender award process is opaque and not currently rewarding investments made in innovation and lower total cost of ownership (TCO) options
- Limited data on longer term CCE field performance
- Questions and concerns persist around the tendering and CCE selection processes and role of country preferences
- The service bundle mandate is the greatest source of conflicted feedback: global/national v. country v. suppliers
- Information flow and transparency among partners, countries and manufacturers have made progress
- Progress has been made to improve price transparency through the UNICEF Supply Division website
### Evaluation of Gavi’s Gender Policy - Background

#### Requested by:
- As per the 2016 Gavi Gender Policy (policy to be reviewed in 2019 based on an evaluation)

#### Objective
- To assess the strengths and weaknesses of the 2013 gender policy at global/country level
- To provide evidence-based findings to assist decision making

#### Scope
- Retrospective, covering the period from Jan 2014 to Oct 2018
- To assess design, implementation and results of the application of the 2013 Gender policy
- Will involve remote country case studies
- The gender representation in Gavi governance bodies and the Gavi Secretariat gender-related HR policies are out of scope of the evaluation

---

**Annex A**
Gender Policy Review – Timeline

2019
- January: Evaluation inception report
- March: Validation workshop
- March/April: Survey
- April: Evaluation finalised
- March-June: Key stakeholder consultations
- July: Expert consultative group workshop
- Aug-Sept: Public Consultation
- March-June: Policy drafting (incl. new theory of change & M&E framework)
- March-June: Key stakeholder consultations
- July: Expert consultative group workshop
- Aug-Sept: Public Consultation
- For decision: PPC (Oct)
- For decision: Board (Dec)
- For guidance: EAC (Apr)
- For guidance: PPC (May)
- For decision: PPC
- For decision: Board

Evaluation

Stakeholder consultations & engagement

Policy drafting (incl. new theory of change & M&E framework)

Policy implementation (incl. 5.0 operationalisation)
## Gender Policy Evaluation – Results

### Preliminary synthesis of findings

**Design**
- Fairly participatory design – with good partner engagement however better at global level than national level
- Monitoring and implementation plans for assessing progress is under-developed
- Policy relevant to global efforts to achieve UHC, but insufficient for concerted investment to address gender-related barriers as part of Gavi Strategy

**Policy implementation**
- Committed leadership to support the policy
- Gender Working Group mandate and capacity has not facilitated full organisational support
- No systems in place to identify financial commitments for gender focused funding as part of Policy
- Core partners have not been sufficiently engaged in gender policy implementation efforts to date (although this may be changing)

### Recommendations

- Develop a realistic strategy to enable national and Alliance partners participation in the gender policy update and implementation
- Articulate a clear case for addressing gender issues as part of Gavi’s wider efforts
- Elaborate a strategic level implementation plan to guide the Gender Policy

---

Note: Findings are from the draft report and are not yet final; recommendations are preliminary (forthcoming final report in end of May 2019)

---

Annex A
Outcomes & results

Preliminary synthesis of findings

• Little evidence that quality and availability of data has improved over time
• More participation from Gavi in global discussions to ensure that gender related barriers to health services are part of global agreements
• Most countries applying for HSS grants conducting some level of gender analysis as part of their applications, although often not translated into programming
• Shift in some countries regarding gender related barriers, but there still lack of evidence of whether there is a clear shift in thinking

Recommendations

Strengthen internal Secretariat systems and processes to mobilise Gavi to implement the updated gender policy

Strengthen work with country partners to develop understanding of drivers of inequitable access to immunisation, including gender issues

Put in place a tailored response using grant support and technical assistance

Note: Findings are from the draft report and are not yet final; recommendations are preliminary (forthcoming final report end of May 2019)