


Gavi, The Vaccine Alliance



SCORE:
80.8

POSITION:
11/47

2020
VERY GOOD

OVERVIEW

Based in Geneva, Gavi is the Vaccine Alliance, an international organisation that was created in 2000 to improve access to new and underused vaccines for children living in poor countries. It brings together public and private sectors with the shared goal of creating equal access to both new and existing vaccines for children. GAVI was a founding signatory to IATI in 2008 and first published IATI data in March 2012.

2018
GOOD

2016
GOOD

2014
VERY GOOD

2013
VERY GOOD

Organisational planning
and commitments
13.7 / 15

Finance and budgets
21.9 / 25

Project attributes
19.5 / 20

Joining-up development
data
16.9 / 20

Performance
8.7 / 20

ANALYSIS

Gavi moved up into the 'very good' category, from 'good' in 2018. Gavi publishes to the IATI Registry on a monthly basis.

Gavi scored well for the **project attributes** component, including for project dates, status, and sub-national locations, only dropping points for project descriptions that we found to be too generic to be meaningful to external stakeholders. All **finance and budget** indicators were available on the IATI Registry with only a small percentage of points dropped for inconsistencies relating to project budgets and project budget documents. Gavi scored well for all **joining-up development data** indicators except contracts (zero points) and tenders (significantly below average). Gavi scored less than half for the **performance** component. This was in part because it did not make objectives and reviews and evaluations available in the IATI Registry, and in part due to a score of zero for pre-project impact appraisals.

We found Gavi's data and documents were, in some cases, out of date. This included reviews and evaluations, results documents, and objectives. Gavi failed on the contracts indicator as a result of making only generic programme terms of reference available rather than specific procurement contracts. Pre-project impact appraisals did not meet the indicator definition as they did not contain a full evaluation of the secondary positive and negative impact of the intended activity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Gavi should prioritise the publication of timely and comprehensive performance-related information to include objectives, reviews, and evaluations, and improve on results. Where possible, Gavi should publish these to the IATI Registry.
- It should review its approach to project descriptions, as this information provides an important introduction to external stakeholders seeking to review Gavi's activities.
- Gavi should also make its contracts and tenders available.

Organisational planning and commitments


Score: 13.7 / 15

ABOUT COMPONENT

This component looks at the overall aims and strategy of an organisation. We check for any public commitments to aid transparency. We also make sure audits are in place and if planning documents have been published, including by parent organisations (including national governments) where applicable. We make note of any Freedom of Information laws and critically, we make sure that organisations have tried to make their information easy to access and understand. You should not have to be an expert in open data to be able to find and use this information.

Quality of FOI legislation

Score: 0.62



Accessibility

Score: 1.88



Organisation strategy

Score: 1.88



Annual report

Score: 1.88



Allocation policy

Score: 1.88



Procurement policy

Score: 1.88



Strategy (country/sector) or Memorandum of Understanding

Score: 1.88



Audit

Score: 1.88



Finance and budgets

Score: 21.9 / 25

ABOUT COMPONENT

This component is critical to allow you and anyone else to follow the money. We expect to find the total budget of the organisation being assessed, right down to individual transactions for each development activity. In particular, forward-looking budgets from donors are important for partner country governments to be able to plan their own future finances.

Disaggregated budget

Score: 2.71



Project budget

Score: 2.09



Project budget document

Score: 3.03



Commitments

Score: 3.33



Disbursements and expenditures

Score: 3.28



Budget Alignment

Score: 3.33



Total organisation budget

Score: 4.17



Project attributes

Score: 19.5 / 20

ABOUT COMPONENT

This component refers to descriptive, non-financial data, including basics like the title and description of a project. Information like this is important as it is often the entry point for data users to quickly understand what a project is about. We also look for other information that helps to put a project in context, such as its sub-national location (rather than simply being pin pointed to a capital city or the centre of a country) or the sector that the project deals with, for example, education or agriculture.

Title Score: 1



Description Score: 0.5



Planned dates Score: 1



Actual dates Score: 1



Current status Score: 1



Contact details Score: 1



Sectors Score: 3.5



Sub-national location Score: 3.5



Implementer Score: 3.5



Unique ID Score: 3.5



Joining-up development data

Score: 16.9 / 20

ABOUT COMPONENT

This component looks at how well a donor's data is able to be linked and connected with other bits of information. There is a diverse nature of flows, activities and actors within the development sector. Aid and development finance data needs to be effectively linked and connected with the rest to provide a full picture for the user. This can be particularly important for partner country governments, who need to integrate information on aid with their own budgets and systems.

Flow type Score: 3.33



Aid type Score: 3.33



Finance type Score: 3.33




Tied aid status Score: 3.33



Conditions Score: 3.17



Project procurement Score: 0.42



Performance

Score: 8.7 / 20


ABOUT COMPONENT

This component refers to the essential data and documents that assess whether a project is on track or has been achieved. This includes things like baseline surveys, progress against targets, mid-term reviews and end of project evaluations. This information is important to hold donors to account and also to share knowledge with others on what worked and what did not during a project.

Objectives Score: 2.5



Pre-project impact appraisals Score: 0



Reviews and evaluations Score: 2.5



Results Score: 3.69

