

GAVI Board Teleconference

29 September 2004

Summary Report

1 IFF for Immunization (IFFIm) proposal

- Board members congratulated IFFIm task team chair Joy Phumaphi and her team for the progress that had been achieved since the previous version of the proposal shared in June.
- The IFFIm should be considered a source of new funding for GAVI and The Vaccine Fund – to be added to the resources that are currently expected to be available to The Vaccine Fund in the absence of an IFFIm. The update from The Vaccine Fund on its financial situation at the December Board meeting will be a helpful guide to the Board.
- Many countries still need significant resources to strengthen their basic immunization services; the IFFIm funding and other funding is required to support countries – including the costs of basic EPI vaccines.
- GAVI should continue to focus on the poorest countries, including the resources that would be made available through the IFFIm. However, it might be valuable to explore whether middle income countries could be involved in vaccine procurement strategies, respecting their ongoing arrangements with vaccine manufacturers, in order to achieve more affordable pricing.
- While it will be important that IFFIm investments are based on country-driven strategies, global leadership is also needed to ensure the support of global public goods.
- The Global Immunization Vision and Strategy now being developed should help to guide the GAVI Board in its decisions on the use of IFFIm resources.

DECISIONS

The GAVI Board:

- 1.1 Endorsed the recommendation of the GAVI Executive Committee to support the alignment of the IFFIm with existing GAVI mechanisms and approved the general parameters of the governance and allocation mechanisms as outlined in the proposal, allowing that certain modifications to the current GAVI governance mechanisms may need to be made. For example, technical assistance and implementation support for certain countries in crisis or with weak governance might be provided directly through WHO and UNICEF. The necessary modifications would be explored by the GAVI Board subgroup on governance (see agenda item 2).
- 1.2 Agreed that the IFFIm should fund two programmatic areas – new and underused vaccines (including polio stockpile) and immunization services strengthening (including campaigns) – as outlined in the proposal.
- 1.3 Endorsed the three illustrative scenarios (\$4b, \$6b and \$8b) as they are presented (bearing in mind that the actual programme may look different, based on country requests and further analysis) but requested that further work be done to ascertain the real minimum feasible size of an IFFIm.

- 1.4 Requested the IFFIm task team to edit the proposal based on Board member feedback. Dr Lee would then forward it to the UK and France on behalf of the GAVI Board [note: the proposal was submitted on 6 October].

2 The GAVI Board subgroup on governance

DECISIONS

The GAVI Board:

- 2.1 Agreed that the governance subgroup should include in its mandate consideration of the governance requirements that an IFFIm would imply for GAVI.
- 2.2 Agreed that the governance subgroup should include in its mandate consideration of how convergence of the GAVI Secretariat and The Vaccine Fund management will affect GAVI governance.
- 2.3 Agreed to the expansion of the sub-group to include UNICEF and the Gates Foundation.

3 The investment case framework

- An explicit process for the development of future allocation policies will be essential to increase the transparency and rationality of the discussions. The process should be open and promote innovative thinking.
- The timeline is tight: the funding period for the first group of GAVI- supported countries will end at the end of 2005. Since the country application process will require 6 to 12 months, the GAVI Board will need to decide by mid-2005 at the latest its allocation policies for phase 2.

DECISIONS

The GAVI Board:

- 3.1 Requested the Working Group to identify potential areas for investment cases to be developed, as well as institutions, groups or individuals who would be best suited to develop the cases, for presentation to and decision by the Board at its December 2004 meeting.
- 3.2 Agreed that, pursuant to Board approval at its December meeting of which investment cases should be developed at this stage and by whom, the first completed investment cases should be presented to the Board at its summer 2005 meeting.