

SUPPORTING PAPER 5: PROGRESS AGAINST RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PHASE I EVALUATION

The table below presents the key recommendations made by the Phase 1 evaluation and the GAVI Secretariat response. In addition, CEPA has interviewed Secretariat colleagues to understand progress made to date against these recommendations, which is noted in the final column labelled ‘implementation progress’.

Please note that the implementation status of these recommendations is based on Secretariat feedback alone, and does not reflect CEPA’s review/ judgment on progress.

As can be seen from the table, all recommendations are either partially implemented/ in progress, while some have already been implemented. No recommendation has not yet been implemented.

Phase I Evaluation findings and implementation progress

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
Improving Support to Countries	<p>GAVI Secretariat should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiate discussions with partners at country/regional level to identify critical problems. • Develop individualised solutions. • Identify sources of additional inputs. <p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institute mechanism to regularly review progress in underperforming countries. 	<p><u>NEEDS WORK</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immunisation goals will not be reached unless all countries increase immunisation coverage. • GAVI’s country support policies have historically viewed all countries in the same light; this ‘one size fits all’ approach may need to be reviewed. • Some underperforming countries have done well with GAVI support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on the next Strategic Plan is in progress. As part of the Plan, efforts are being made to adopt a ‘grouping’ approach with respect to the various programs, as against a ‘one size fits all’ approach for countries. • For HSS, for instance, there would be Track I and Track II countries. The former would include countries for which support ended in 2010, and the latter would include countries for which the first phase of HSS support has already ended. It would then be considered how a country-based review should be done for each group, which countries need a joint proposal with GF, etc. • The co-financing policy is also being revised to reflect this grouping approach.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
	<p>GAVI Secretariat should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose a process for ensuring resolutions of problems identified within recipient countries, including briefings for the Country Support Team of problems identified through one-time evaluations. Improving Country Support Team and Finance and Administration coordination regarding funding transfers. Establishing a process for regular internal review of the problems identified and resolution status. 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of country cluster officers expanded so management of country support should continue to improve, especially in communications as identified in the evaluation. Absolute number of staff in the Secretariat remain very small to manage 72+ countries work. Without country presence the Secretariat relies heavily on partners for local communication. GAVI Secretariat is working to further streamline country support and finance functions to improve operations and responsiveness. The Phase 2 evaluation will consider whether or not current staffing is adequate to perform these functions, and to follow up on issues identified in special evaluations and through IRC process. Secretariat currently translates country application materials into English, French and Russian, and relies on Pan American Health Organisation (PAHO) for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of the IRC has been completed. Management response regarding how to do the review differently is being developed. GAVI is present at regional meetings (HSS focal point meetings, EPI managers' meetings) in order to have one to one discussions with countries, and to pick up and respond to country level issues. GAVI partners also help draw attention to issues in countries. The TAP team at GAVI has conducted 10 FMA so far. A risk approach is followed and profiling of countries is done. The purpose is to review public financial management systems in countries and identify problems. Based on this, an aide memoire is prepared that details the method of channelling of funds. Steps to improve the public financial reporting systems are suggested.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
		<p>translation into Spanish. Timelines of translated materials can be improved, but increasing the number of languages or documents for translation not recommended as this would have significant budget impact.</p>	
	<p>GAVI Secretariat should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that Accelerated Vaccine Introduction project incorporates all the elements of support required at country level (in logistics, cold chain, and other areas) for introduction of Pneumococcal and Rotavirus vaccines, convening independent reviewers. 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weakness being addressed in successor to ADIPs – Accelerated Vaccine Introduction project (AVI) which includes as its mandate preparing countries for vaccine introduction. • Hib Initiative has been highly successful in preparing countries for Hib vaccine introduction and, as a result, has informed the design of the AVI. • The new vaccine investment strategy, presented to the Board in October 2008, explicitly identifies costs of helping countries prepare for roll-out. These will be further developed in the implementation plans for GAVI investment in these vaccines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AVI management team oversees all projects, and has weekly meetings where vaccine-related issues are systematically discussed and addressed. • A task team is working on the new vaccine investment strategy that would advise on which vaccines to prioritise. The team reports to PPC.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
	<p>GAVI Secretariat should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure appropriate implementation procedures, including specifying response procedures for reported improprieties/other noncompliance. 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The one case of inappropriate use (Uganda) has been dealt with in Phase 2. • In October 2008, the Board approved a Transparency and Accountability Policy, a financial monitoring plan, which will begin implementation in January 2009. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FMA are conducted by the TAP team, and instances of misuse of funds are followed up.
Improving Strategic Decision Making	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission an independent review of how the package of country support feeds into GAVI's global strategic priorities, and whether those priorities correspond to country level priorities, incorporating input from a broad group of recipient countries. • This should feed into a review of the design of the package of GAVI support to countries. • Policy changes to consider including more differentiation among countries eligible to apply for new vaccines. 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GAVI relies upon its partners, especially WHO, to ensure that policy decisions are based on scientific and public health evidence. Positions and policies are formulated by the Board, drawing on additional technical advice as seen fit. • The Board created "Hib task team" to look at Hib vaccine uptake issue; the outcome was creation of the Hib Initiative which has been highly successful in helping health ministries decide whether the vaccine should or should not be introduced in their countries. This will help inform the AVI and future vaccine introduction efforts to ensure that countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is being done within the ongoing work on the next Strategic Plan. The vaccine investment strategy is a good example of how the package of country support feeds into GAVI's global strategic priorities. The process involves extensive country consultations to know the needs to the countries. It is thus, evidence based and there is active country involvement. • Surveys have been conducted and in-depth discussions are held at regional meetings to get country inputs for the Strategic Plan. Efforts are being made to reach all GAVI-eligible countries. • GAVI encourages WHO/UNICEF to ensure that there is information sharing between the country and global level.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
		<p>set their own priorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation also finds that “GAVI’s positions and policies were not always widely supported by all staff in partner organisations and at country level.” This will require follow up through AVI with partners that operate on the ground to address this disconnection between partners’ headquarters and field offices. 	
	<p>GAVI Secretariat should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide to the GAVI Board additional information on projected program and work plan costs for achieving various objectives. Ensure relative allocations among activities are in line with overall strategic priorities and supported by all partners. 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritising investment critical as GAVI moves forward. Board retreat planned for March 2009 to begin to define a framework for prioritising. The prioritisation process followed for the New Vaccine Investment Strategy has been a significant step forward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work in this regard is ongoing. A decision would be made by the Board in June 2010.
	<p>GAVI Secretariat should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure current information provided by UNICEF is sufficient to allow accurate cost effective evaluation of its programs. 	<p><u>RESOLVED</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to vaccine procurement disaggregated data has been available since 2007, as part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between GAVI and UNICEF. Cost effectiveness analysis is part 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHO and UNICEF have agreed to provide combined data on vaccine stock levels for all vaccines (not just GAVI-supported vaccines). This is a very useful step forward as it would enable GAVI to use real time data on availability of vaccines at the country level in making allocation decisions.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
		<p>of the current investment case/strategy framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The information is updated with actual vaccine prices as tendered by UNICEF/PAHO. 	
Strengthening Evaluation Mechanisms	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commission an evaluation of NVS including program design, implementation, and cost effectiveness, and assess how it fits into GAVI's overall strategic framework. 	<p><u>RESOLVED</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not listed as a priority by stakeholders in the design of the phase I evaluation. The evaluation policy approved by the Board in June 2008 stipulates that evaluations should not be standalone but as much as possible be comprehensive. GAVI's support to vaccines, which was a component of the phase 1 evaluation, will be addressed in the evaluation of 2006-2010. New vaccine support has been evaluated by WHO in several GAVI countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GAVI has commissioned an evaluation of Phase II, which will include an evaluation of the NVS program.
	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commission a team to ensure there is partner consensus on the evaluation framework, indicators, and processes for Phase 2, so that evaluation of Phase 2 can be conducted in a timely fashion to inform the next 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An evaluation policy for GAVI was approved by the Board in June 2008. The Board also agreed that the Secretariat increase the staff allocated for monitoring and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Board Evaluation committee has been set up. Five full-time positions have been created internally to work on M&E. Attempt to move from a retrospective evaluation model to a prospective evaluation model.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
	<p>phase of GAVI's work.</p>	<p>evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the new governance structure is put in place, the Secretariat will need to work closely with the Board to determine an oversight structure for monitoring and evaluation that is both accountable and independent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPIs and risk registers have been developed to strengthen intern M&E. M&E team at the secretariat is working on developing a Monitoring Framework Plan for all projects. There is ongoing discussion on systems and processes, and the Framework is expected to be completed by the end of 2010. Ongoing work on a data warehouse that would contain comprehensive information required by GAVI managers for decision-making. This is expected to go live in the end of June.
	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the Phase 2 evaluation framework includes indicators to evaluate partner satisfaction and commitment, and ensure there is broad partner consensus on appropriate evaluation indicators. 	<p><u>NEEDS WORK</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the completion of the governance transition, ensuring partner goodwill and commitment is important and key to the success of an Alliance. The new, clearer and accountable governance structure has established a strong platform to build a stronger alliance. However, work needs to be done to better define partner roles to ensure accountability and avoid overlap. The Secretariat notes the finding that “there has been no clear definition of what each partner is expected to bring to the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A recent paper presented to the executive committee lays down the need for a Board decision on the role of partners versus the Secretariat. The consensus among the Board members is that a more deliverable structure is required with respect to partners. The GAVI Secretariat should trust but verify. Ongoing process of considering different potential contracting arrangements. For instance, there is a trust fund for the World Bank the use of which does not have to be reported by them in a particular way.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
		Alliance...GAVI, like many Alliances has not been able to hold partners entirely accountable for carrying out their commitments.” Clearly better definition of roles and responsibilities would benefit GAVI’s operations, serve to defining accountabilities and help address potential conflicts of interest, a concern also raised in the document.	
Ensuring an Effective Partnership	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine the structures for technical debate among the partners within the new governance arrangements • Consult with technical and implementation level representatives of partner institutions to solicit their feedback to the currently proposed structures. • Ensure that Phase 2 evaluation framework includes evaluation of the effectiveness of structures for coordinating partner technical inputs. 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate technical input is critical to ensuring that GAVI is cutting edge and evidence based. • The new Program and Policy Committee will need to ensure appropriate mechanisms for all technical input of all partners as well as from outside the Alliance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement of ADIPs with AVI is a step towards promotion of technical debate among partners. • A product launch team has been set up based on pharmaceutical industry models.
	<p>GAVI Secretariat should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present a proposal to partners 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat will soon launch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A password protected pilot website has been set up for the PPC with all key documents,

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
	<p>outlining additional ways to ensure that all substantive discussions among partners and with Secretariat staff, including those that occur outside of Board meetings, are shared as openly as possible – either with notes posted for public access on the GAVI website, or on a protected website that all partners can access.</p>	<p>a password-protected website so that all committee and Board agendas and documents can be shared in advance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once the meetings have occurred, the documents and presentations will be posted promptly on the public website. All reports will be posted as soon as the committee or Board has approved them. • The Secretariat is working on an online searchable database of past Board decisions and policies. • In terms of non-Board entities, such as time-limited task teams and working groups, the Secretariat will explore how the activities of these groups in the future can be made more transparent. 	<p>meeting minutes etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes/minutes of meetings of every task team are either put up on the website or shared with the particular constituency. All task teams have a WHO/UNICEF representative. • A new GAVI website is planned to be set up by the end of this year.
	<p>GAVI Secretariat should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with partners to take advantage of opportunities presented by regional meetings to engage in substantive dialogue with countries • Propose a plan for how those discussions would feed into 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board members from developing countries, including those from civil society, are now better represented and supported. • The Secretariat now provides special briefing sessions, technical and financial support to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GAVI is present at regional meetings where it engages with country stakeholders at various levels. There is also an agenda to meet at the World Health Assembly.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
	<p>global level decision-making.</p>	<p>developing country Board members, including funding staff assistants to help them in their GAVI related work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GAVI Secretariat now participates in regional WHO and health ministers meetings and solicits input from countries to ensure appropriate input and consultations to inform policy development. 	
	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure the development of a framework and regular process for assessing the Secretariat's structure and performance, ensuring adequate input from GAVI's partners. 	<p><u>COMMENT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat welcomes ongoing assessment of its structure and the extent to which it is effectively serving the partnership. This is a prime responsibility of a Board working with its CEO and his/her senior management team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of the Secretariat's performance is the periodic responsibility of the Executive committee. There are quarterly meetings where progress against the GAVI Work Plan is assessed.
<p>Maximising Added Value</p>	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure open access to deliberations and discussions regarding new vaccine policies, mechanisms for ensuring inputs from a broad variety of perspectives, and appropriate analysis to support its policies. Request that the Phase 2 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GAVI's credibility as an honest broker must be protected and enhanced. Recent policies and programs approved by the Board, including gender, evaluation, accelerated vaccine introduction program, and vaccine investment strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Board papers are available on the GAVI website. All analysis that forms the basis of policy deliberations is shared with partners.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
	<p>evaluation framework incorporates inputs from a variety of perspectives regarding GAVI's effectiveness as an honest and technical expert.</p>	<p>have all included extensive external consultation for their development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the consultation was adequate can and should be reviewed as part of the Phase 2 evaluation. 	
	<p>GAVI Secretariat should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with partners to develop a clear advocacy strategy with targeted messages, particularly at a country level. • Commission a study that analyses the historical funding flows for immunisation, incorporating data at global, regional and country level, to assess whether total funding for immunisation has increased since the inception of GAVI, and develop a methodology for reporting on future funding changes. 	<p><u>NEEDS WORK</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rather than have separate presence, the GAVI Alliance works through WHO and UNICEF at the country level. • The peer reviewed work planning process and deliverable based grant agreements, introduced in 2008, should help to better define roles and responsibilities in this area. • With regard to redirection of funds and assessment of “additionality”, GAVI has considered conducting an analysis of funding flows for immunisation, which could be undertaken if supported by the Board. The evidence base for how funding flows to immunisation where it matters most, at the country level, needs to be better understood, less as a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GAVI Secretariat ERO integrates and coordinates advocacy work with partners through the revitalised Advocacy and Communications Task team. An advocacy and communications strategy framework was endorsed by the Alliance Board in June 2009 and is being implemented. At country level, ERO is working very closely with AVI to ensure integrated advocacy at the country level.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
		<p>vertical issue, but one of how sectors are funded overall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the global level no evidence or systematic assessment of the issue (including in this evaluation) has yet been presented regarding any reduction or diversion in overall fund flows. 	
<p>Understanding Vaccine Market Dynamics</p>	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commission an in-depth analysis of the vaccine markets that includes analysis of the production costs, technical complexities of various vaccines, transferability of technology, other barriers to entry and demand forecasts, in order to inform procurement strategy, strategic planning, and sustainability policy. 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An analysis of GAVI's role in influencing the vaccine markets has been planned for 2009-2010 as it was understood that 2000-2005 time frame would be too short to effect change. There has been success to date (e.g. decrease in price of tetravalent) UNICEF has predicted that the 2009 tender for pentavalent vaccine will evidence a dramatic price decrease because of increased market competition resulting from GAVI support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gates Foundation has hired Mckinsey to undertake analysis regarding production costs etc. which would be shared with GAVI.
	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commission a study of innovative ways to structure 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2009 tender for pentavalent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A supply strategy has been prepared which would be implemented in 2010-11. Shaping vaccine markets is now a strategic goal of

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
	<p>procurement of new vaccines (other than short term fixed price contracts) that may be more advantageous over the long term.</p>	<p>is expected to demonstrate a marked decrease in price.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New approaches such as the AMC are required and further investigation of market dynamics will be done in the work plan for 2009-2010. With regard to the issues raised on • The issue of role of industry can be further investigated in the evaluation of phase 2. 	<p>GAVI.</p>
<p>Reassessing Strategies for Sustainability</p>	<p>GAVI Board should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appoint a team to coordinate work in this area • Organise partners' meeting to solicit input and build consensus on appropriate principles and policies • Develop a sustainability strategy that may incorporate a revised definition of sustainability, revision of the co-financing policy, and new vaccine procurement strategy. 	<p><u>IN PROGRESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work on financial sustainability in Phase 1 has led to improved linkages between programme planning and financial costs in the comprehensive multi-year plans. • Without additional evidence, it is hard to address the evaluator's suggestion that some countries have reduced their financing for vaccines. • Needs further investigation as proposed in management response to Question 16, and needs to be looked at more broadly than the vertical programme approach followed by the consultants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The co-financing policy is being revised as part of the ongoing work on the next Strategic Plan. This would be finalised by November 2010. The aim would not be to have sustainability for all countries, but for say those countries that have GNI above a certain level.

Focus area	Key recommendation	GAVI Secretariat response	Implementation progress
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In phase 2, minimal country co-payments have begun as part of the co-financing policy adopted by the Board in July 2006. A review of this policy has been requested by the Board in 2010. <li>• This review provides an opportunity to reassess both short and long term expectations with regard to country contribution to the cost of new vaccines. 	

Legend:

	Implemented		Partially implemented/ In progress		Not yet implemented
---	-------------	---	------------------------------------	---	---------------------