

## **Background**

### *Scope and objective of evaluation:*

- Overall objective: Assess current SAGE scope and objectives, working mechanisms and processes in terms of their relevance, effectiveness and quality to assure that SAGE continues to provide high quality strategic advice in all areas of the evolving immunization agenda.
- The evaluation should focus on SAGE as the key advisory body on immunization policy and strategy, other advisory bodies relevant to immunization and biologicals will only reviewed in the role and function as contributing to SAGE objectives.

### *Desired outputs of evaluation:*

- Ascertain SAGE's role in relation to the evolving immunization agenda
- Improve SAGE effectiveness by optimally linking to other advisory bodies
- Assure optimal coordination with WHO regions and regional committees, as well as key partners
- Assure SAGE working mechanisms meet the highest standards
- Assure that presentation and dissemination of SAGE/WHO recommendations is effective
- Revisit secretariat composition and resources needs

### *References:*

1. Excerpt from **SAGE Terms of Reference**, February 2016

([http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/Full\\_SAGE\\_TORs.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/Full_SAGE_TORs.pdf?ua=1)):

“SAGE is the principal advisory group to WHO for vaccines and immunization. It is charged with advising WHO on overall global vaccination policies and strategies, ranging from vaccines and technology, research and development, to delivery of vaccination and its linkages with other health interventions. SAGE's remit extends to the control of all vaccine-preventable diseases as part of an integrated, people centred platform of disease prevention that spans the human life-course and in the context of health systems strengthening.

SAGE advises the WHO Director-General specifically on the:

1. adequacy of progress towards the achievement of the goals of control of vaccine-preventable diseases worldwide such as those laid out in the Decade of Vaccines Global Vaccine Action Plan 2011-2020.
2. major issues and challenges to be addressed with respect to achieving the disease control goals, including issues and challenges to achieving and sustaining high and equitable vaccination coverage;
3. immunization programme response to current public health priorities;
4. major general policies, goals and targets including those related to vaccine research and development;
5. adequacy of WHO's strategic plan and priority activities consistent with its mandate and considering the comparative advantages and the respective roles of partner organizations;
6. engagement of WHO in partnerships that will enhance achievement of global immunization goals.”

2. [http://www.who.int/immunization/policy/WHO\\_vaccine\\_development\\_policy.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/immunization/policy/WHO_vaccine_development_policy.pdf?ua=1) (June 2017)
3. [http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/Guidelines\\_development\\_recommendations.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/Guidelines_development_recommendations.pdf?ua=1) (January 2017)

### ***Scoping questions***

- The relevance and strategic position of SAGE:
  - Do the SAGE terms of reference from February 2016 and overall objectives meet the current and emerging needs of the immunization agenda?
  - Are the priorities of SAGE and relative emphasis of work appropriate?
  - Is SAGE making the best use of existing resources, including the use of other WHO advisory bodies? [GACVS, IPAC, IVIRAC, PDVAC]
  - Do SAGE and other committees have a coordinated and longer-term prioritization process for agenda items?
  - Are the linkages between SAGE and RITAG's adequate? Are the linkages to partners adequate?
- The usability of SAGE recommendation and advice
  - What is the reach and influence of SAGE recommendations (effectiveness, not impact) with various stakeholders (other WHO programmes, regions, countries, medical associations, key international partners, global health initiatives, industry, donors)?
  - Is the format and presentation of SAGE and subsequent WHO recommendations appropriate?
  - Can dissemination be improved?
- SAGE and SAGE working group processes:
  - Do the composition and expertise of SAGE members meet the needs of SAGE?
  - Are SAGE working groups adequate in terms of composition, format and scope of work?
  - Can the format of plenary meetings and other group interactions be improved?
  - Are evidence review processes appropriate?
  - Are the working mechanisms adapted to the scope of work?
  - Are review processes adequate for topics that are not product-specific recommendations, e.g. for crosscutting issues?
  - Is Secretariat support to and coordination of SAGE adequate?