

Global Financing Facility Review of the Investors Group

Pre-read

8 April 2019

Contents

	Page #
1. Executive Summary	3-8
2. Background & Methodology	9-12
3. Summary of findings	13-35
• Role	14-20
• Functions & Composition	21-28
• Processes	29-32
• Collaboration & Behavioral Dynamics	33-35
4. Recommendations	36-40
5. Annex	41-43

1. Executive Summary



Findings: *Role & Purpose*

- ▶ **Overarching role of IG within the GFF architecture clear to most – but a third of respondents raise need for a sharper delineation (with TFC and at country level)**
 - Key question raised: Is IG an information-sharing, advisory forum, or does it steer collective action and decision-making?
 - Roles and responsibilities of the GFF's governance bodies are not (yet) spelled out

- ▶ **Slightly less clarity on IG's role and value-add within broader global health architecture: some raise concerns about overlap with other groups; others feel its composition creates a unique value-add**
 - Focus on RMNCAH-N seen as value-add, although a few suggest it could be more strongly tied to current discussions (e.g., SDG3, UHC/PHC)
 - IG membership moderately overlaps with other governance bodies

- ▶ **Half of respondents see IG members lacking a shared purpose and expectations – leading to a split view on the IG's effectiveness**
 - Some point to IG's role in shaping the GFF and cite its contribution to the replenishment
 - Others see IG as focusing too little on strategic deliberations and collective action, which limits tangible results, and has led it to be more of a “show and tell” forum



Suggestions voiced

- ▶ **Clearly delineate the role and responsibilities of the IG:** Be crystal clear whether/where IG is information sharing, advisory, or steering collective action (with ability to take decisions)

- ▶ **Clarify the relations and engagement of the IG with other multi-stakeholder mechanisms with a similar scope**

- ▶ **Consider dissolving or merging elements of the IG with the TFC or with another mechanism**



Findings: *Functions & Composition*

- ▶ **IG's functions are understood at a high level and regarded as adding value to the global health community but could be made more actionable**
 - Members appreciate IG's country-centric approach – looking ahead, GFF's portfolio expansion offers potential for IG to become more engaged on ensuring effective country financing
- ▶ **Two-thirds of respondents dissatisfied with the group's performance in delivering on its functions and perceive a lack of accountability**
 - Meetings currently focus heavily on the IG's function to foster country learning
 - Many want the IG to step up its shaping of Investment Cases, monitoring of the GFF, and coordination and mobilization of financing
 - Some believe dissatisfaction stems from not being given the space to make decisions, while others note that performance may improve as the IG matures
 - Accountabilities of IG members and “categories” are not a focus of the GFF Governance Document
- ▶ **IG's composition and size largely perceived as fit-for-purpose**
 - Current policies may need to be updated to maintain size and protect country voice
- ▶ **Respondents largely satisfied with the seniority of members – and say future level of representation depends on purpose of IG and its meetings**

Suggestions voiced



- ▶ **Translate functions into concrete priorities for collective action:** Agree on activities for next period (2020-23); agree on responsibilities and accountability for delivering among members
- ▶ **Refresh monitoring role:** Introduce independent reviews that serve as basis for discussions, so that countries do not have to voice issues themselves; strengthen monitoring role of the IG (e.g., develop dashboard per GFF participating country to track implementation progress)
- ▶ **Review (& refresh) policies on membership structure:** Ensure participating country presence in IG remains strong as GFF grows; consider more dynamic structure (e.g., reps at meetings differ depending on content)



Findings: *Processes*

- ▶ **Respondents commend GFF Secretariat's support to IG despite its small size**
 - Members appreciate time investment by Secretariat and quality of papers
 - Secretariat may want to shift its focus – away from presenting at meetings (e.g., information sharing about GFF to IG) – to co-creating problem-solving sessions (e.g., around country issues) and ensuring the group's voice is heard

- ▶ **Meeting frequency, preparation, and execution are seen to serve the IG's purpose well, but sessions could be made more relevant and productive**
 - Timing aligns well with members' desires (i.e., with one linked to Spring Meetings of the World Bank and the other in-participating country)
 - Members want to be more involved in developing the agenda and in making meetings more impactful (e.g., problem-solving sessions; expansion of topics)

- ▶ **Room for more concrete meeting follow up and more inclusive collaboration mechanisms between meetings**
 - Respondents are less satisfied with meeting follow up and collaboration mechanisms between meetings
 - There is appetite for developing new processes for ongoing dialogue, coordination, and collective action between meetings



Suggestions voiced

- ▶ **Refocus Secretariat's support:** From writing and presenting most discussion papers to supporting others with their presentations, and facilitating exchange between the IG and TFC

- ▶ **Make meetings more relevant:** Allow all members space to provide input on agenda; develop TAGs with clear remits; establish pre (IG meeting)-calls on complex issues; time IG meeting with e.g. PMNCH meeting

- ▶ **Make actions clear in meeting materials:** Develop the agendas around clearly-stated objectives and discussion/decision questions

- ▶ **Facilitate IG engagement between meetings:** Introduce a platform for sharing news and updates



Findings: *Collaboration & Dynamics*

▶ Majority of respondents feels IG is not (yet) able to own meeting outcomes and deliver improvements in financial alignment

- Reasons cited are both formal (e.g., lack of accountability mechanisms; insufficient articulation of expectations of IG members; limited remit given WB rules) and related to mindsets (e.g., members not coming prepared and contributing to meetings constructively)

▶ Level of transparency and openness at IG meetings is perceived as limited

- Reasons cited include sensitivities and competition between the institutions represented in the meetings, as well as a feeling that there is no designated time for critical discussion
- Efforts have been made by IG chairs to improve transparency and dialogue at IG meetings

Suggestions voiced



- ▶ **Dedicate space at a future IG meeting to discuss how to encourage openness and transparency among members**
- ▶ **Introduce accountability measures:** Clearly articulate expectations of what each representative will contribute and develop an accountability mechanism to measure its performance
- ▶ **Ensure topics discussed are of interest to several members** (e.g., placing emphasis on countries where multiple IG members are actively engaged)

Our suggested recommendations fall into two categories



Operational

Process improvements that will enhance IG meeting quality & collaboration between meetings

Forward planning and strategic content

Enhanced engagement

Increased results focus

Quick wins



If agreed upon at April meeting, can be implemented immediately

Strategic


Ways to strengthen the IG's role, functions and way of working; will require a process of engagement and strategic alignment



Collaborative GFF strategy process

Clearer governance model and stronger operating procedures

Special strategy and governance session to align on way forward



Long-term engagement

Action taken over the coming months for decision-making later in the year

2. Background & Methodology

GFF IG Review aims to increase the effectiveness of the IG



GLOBAL
FINANCING
FACILITY

Investors Group

- ▶ 7 meetings since its creation in 2015
- ▶ 26 principal and 24 alternate members who represent 8 “categories” (e.g., financiers; participating countries; CSOs), all considered RMNCAH-N “investors”
- ▶ 2018 EC-commissioned GFF review identified IG as a missed opportunity
- ▶ SEEK Development contracted in February 2019 to lead IG review, with results and recommendations presented at IG8 (April 2019)

Primary objective of the GFF IG Review as stated in the TOR

To increase effectiveness of the IG, specifically support to improve country operations, coherence, and impact by:

- I Clarifying the position of IG in overall GFF structure
- II Improving the coordination between members of IG and with GFF Secretariat
- III Creating stronger ownership and clearer accountabilities of IG members
- IV Improving transparency across partnership

Review findings are presented across our methodological framework

ROLE

- *Internally:* IG's fit within the overall GFF structure and interaction with other bodies (esp. TFC)
- *Externally:* IG's role compared to other multi-stakeholder forums (e.g. P4H; UHC2030)

COLLABORATION & BEHAVIORAL DYNAMICS

- Shared sense of purpose
- Quality of conversations (incl. strategic decision-making) and interactions
- Ownership and accountability for decision-making and results

ROLE

FUNCTIONS

IG's
EFFECTIVENESS

DYNAMICS

PROCESSES

FUNCTIONS & COMPOSITION

- Clarity of responsibilities and remit (incl. decision-making capacity)
- Relevance and appropriateness of IG's remit, including topical focus
- Composition and size of IG and appropriateness to match its responsibilities

PROCESSES

- Secretariat support
- Meeting preparation (esp. agenda setting), timing, and follow-up (incl. opportunities for engagement between meetings)
- Communication processes & tools (incl. openness on website)

Our findings stem from four sources of information



Interviews with 15 IG members

Representing 7 of 8 “categories” (see Annex 1)




Survey responses from 24 IG members

48% response rate among principal and alternate members



Review of IG agendas and TORs

Publicly-available GFF Governance Document and meeting agendas



Benchmark analysis

Governance and advisory structures of 10 other instruments (see Annex 2)

3. Summary of Findings



Role & Purpose

- ▶ **Overarching role of IG within the GFF architecture clear to most – but a third of respondents raise need for a sharper delineation (with TFC and at country level)**
 - Key question raised: Is IG an information-sharing, advisory forum, or does it steer collective action and decision-making?
 - Roles and responsibilities of the GFF's governance bodies are not (yet) spelled out
- ▶ **Slightly less clarity on IG's role and value-add within broader global health architecture: some raise concerns about overlap with other groups; others feel its composition creates a unique value-add**
 - Focus on RMNCAH-N seen as value-add, although a few suggest it could be more strongly tied to current discussions (e.g., SDG3, UHC/PHC)
 - IG membership moderately overlaps with other governance bodies
- ▶ **Half of respondents see IG members lacking a shared purpose and expectations – leading to a split view on the IG's effectiveness**
 - Some point to IG's role in shaping the GFF and cite its contribution to the replenishment
 - Others see IG as focusing too little on strategic deliberations and collective action, which limits tangible results, and has led it to be more of a “show and tell” forum

Suggestions voiced




- ▶ **Clearly delineate the role and responsibilities of the IG:** Be crystal clear whether/where IG is information sharing, advisory, or steering collective action (with ability to take decisions)
- ▶ **Clarify the relations and engagement of the IG with other multi-stakeholder mechanisms with a similar scope**
- ▶ **Consider dissolving or merging elements of the IG with the TFC or with another mechanism**



Overarching role of IG within the GFF architecture clear to most – but a third raise need for a sharper delineation (with TFC and at country level)

Q - The purpose* and role of the IG **within the GFF's governance** (IG, TFC, Secretariat) is clear and compelling.



Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

“The purpose and value of the group is to align on strategy [...], recognizing that each member can make a difference in moving things forward, as well as giving advice to the GFF Secretariat, on how its activities might have more value add.”

“The IG purpose and role are more clear at the global level than national level: the practice of how government voices and other partners’ voices and technical assistance gets to bear [...] on the harmonized country platforms needs to be updated.”

“I think the role of IG is extremely questionable and weak. The mandate of the IG was always very [...] fuzzy – sharing some information; decision making rested elsewhere.”

“The mandate of the IG and the TFC needs to be clearly spelled out with no overlaps.”

“Make no division between the IG and the TFC. This will result in actual decision making and a real partnership.”



Key question raised: *Is IG an information-sharing, advisory forum, or does it steer collective action & decision-making?*

GFF's role has changed over the past years

At IG3, “for information” points **start to appear** on the agenda



At IG7, “for information” points represent **7 out of 11** agenda items

Less decision making



More information-sharing

At IG2, **6 out of 13** agenda items were “for decision”



The last two meetings (IG6 and IG7) **did not include** any items coined “for decision”



Change may be related to GFF-lifecycle, with more decisions while GFF approach was being created – **key question:** *how can IG shape direction going forward without stepping on TFC's remit?*



Roles and responsibilities of the GFF’s governance bodies are not (yet) spelled out

▶ IG has requested greater clarity on role of IG vis-à-vis TFC (at IG1, IG4 and IG5)*

GEF provides a best practice – a clear matrix that delineates responsibilities across its governance bodies

MATRIX OUTLINING LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES FOR INSTITUTIONAL ROLES AND FUNCTIONS WITHIN THE GEF

ROLE	LEAD RESPONSIBILITY
GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES	
Approve policies and direct utilization of GEF resources	Assembly and Council
Serve as Trustee for the GEF Trust Fund	World Bank
Mobilize financial resources for GEF Trust Fund	World Bank as Trustee
Provide administrative support for the Secretariat	World Bank
Provide scientific and technical advice	STAP
GEF POLICY AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	
Approve strategic priorities through the business plan, and approve Operational Programs	Council
Prepare the business plan, including strategic priorities; develop Operational Programs, Operational Criteria, and GEF Pipeline	Secretariat
Review project concepts (i) for eligibility, according to Project Review Criteria; and (ii) for strategic fit, according to the strategic priorities of the business plan; and manage Pipeline entry and exit	Secretariat

Findings from desk review




GFF Governance document does not delineate roles with the TFC & Secretariat (e.g., on what the IG can decide upon vs the TFC’s remit) nor when it exchanges with the TFC

▶ An update of GFF Governance Document would create space for this issue to be addressed



Slightly less clarity around the role and value-add of the IG within broader global health architecture

Q - The purpose and role* of the IG **within the broader global health architecture** is clear and compelling.



Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

* The stated purpose of the IG is to mobilize the resources and institutional commitment of key investors of RMNCAH-N required to optimally support efficient collective action at the country level.


- “The IG has played a critical role during the design and inception of GFF in defining its role vis-à-vis other agencies.”
- “In the global health community, GFF is more visible as a WB mechanism and not as a broader platform represented by the IG.”
- “Most in the global health community are aware but probably not clear what the IG’s role is [...] Make the links with PMNCH much clearer, many of the same players.”
- “EWEC storyline focuses on women, adolescent and children’s health - with GFF as its financing arm – it is compelling but has been overtaken by recent broader efforts for SDG3 acceleration including UHC [...] Consider whether it makes sense to transition the GFF/IG functions onto a broader shared platform as part of the SDG3 Global Action Plan.”
- “Everything in terms of advocacy and accountability is PMNCH, and GFF is the financing. It could exercise that role, in relations with PMNCH in a more intimate way.”
- “If you look at the documents, it has become about health financing, not RMNCAH financing. What is the value-add? We all fought for keeping women and children at the heart of the SDG agenda.”



IG membership moderately overlaps with other governance bodies

17 of the 28 institutions represented on the IG are **also represented in other major global health actors** (FP2020, Gavi, Global Fund, PMNCH, UHC2030)


9 of the 26 IG principal members **are also in other governance bodies**





Half of respondents see IG members lacking a shared purpose and expectations – leading to a split view on the IG’s effectiveness

Q - Members of the IG share a common purpose and are aligned on the role they play in achieving this purpose.



“Members share a common purpose but not all are not aligned on roles. There is little agreement, for example, on funding approaches among a number of partners.”

“The diverse nature of membership makes it difficult to determine the extent to which the discussions are leading to common purpose and makes them less likely to lead to ownership of meeting outcomes.”


“The question is what is the actual purpose of the IG meeting, and that is not aligned. It is not a group that has any kind of decision-making power. So then the question becomes why are we there? And it looks a little bit as if we are using it to say, ‘Everyone is on board; everyone backs it and blah blah’ – where we actually have never had a say.”

“I would say that the meetings themselves are an achievement of the IG – we get to understand what is happening at the country level.”

“The name ‘investors’ group is misleading and leads IG participants to believe that they are either in charge, or irrelevant. We need a name that captures the ‘advisory’ and ‘amplifier’ roles of the IG.”

“I’ll be open, I’ve missed the last 2 or 3 [IG meetings] and delegated to a more junior staff, because I felt that there was no role, no place to have critical discussion – it was a kumbaya moment.”

Q - IG succeeds in delivering on its objective to mobilize the resources and institutional commitment of key investors required to optimally support efficient collective action at the country level.



Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree



Functions & Composition

- ▶ **IG's functions are understood at a high level and regarded as adding value to the global health community but could be made more actionable**
 - Members appreciate IG's country-centric approach – looking ahead, GFF's portfolio expansion offers potential for IG to become more engaged on ensuring effective country financing
- ▶ **Two-thirds of respondents dissatisfied with the group's performance in delivering on its functions and perceive a lack of accountability**
 - Meetings currently focus heavily on the IG's function to foster country learning
 - Many want the IG to step up its shaping of Investment Cases, monitoring of the GFF, and coordination and mobilization of financing
 - Some believe dissatisfaction stems from not being given the space to make decisions, while others note that performance may improve as the IG matures
 - Accountabilities of IG members and “categories” are not a focus of the GFF Governance Document
- ▶ **IG's composition and size largely perceived as fit-for-purpose**
 - Current policies may need to be updated to maintain size and protect country voice
- ▶ **Respondents largely satisfied with the seniority of members – and say future level of representation depends on purpose of IG and its meetings**

Suggestions voiced




- ▶ **Translate functions into concrete priorities for collective action:** Agree on activities for next period (2020-23); agree on responsibilities and accountability for delivering among members
- ▶ **Refresh monitoring role:** Introduce independent reviews that serve as basis for discussions, so that countries do not have to voice issues themselves; strengthen monitoring role of the IG (e.g., develop dashboard per GFF participating country to track implementation progress)
- ▶ **Review (& refresh) policies on membership structure:** Ensure participating country presence in IG remains strong as GFF grows; consider more dynamic structure (e.g., reps at meetings differ depending on content)



IG's functions are understood at a high level and regarded as adding value to the global health community but could be made more actionable

Q - The IG's functions* are clear, actionable, and concrete.



"The functions as they are written are fine, but they need to be associated with priority actions [...] A function helps you frame what you are going to do, but then [...] what are the three things you're actually going to take on?"


"The GFF is extremely well placed to lead on coherence and collaboration among global health actors at the country level. Instead of asking questions, we need to do problem-solving around how we actually work together."

"We need to recognize that this is a dynamic process. First phase focused on getting GFF up and running. This was followed by the replenishment effort [...] It's only now that we can begin to evaluate GFF as a steady state program [...] The role of the IG two years ago will be quite different today."

"While IG members might be involved in investment case development, the role is not clear, nor the pathway to creating an enabling environment, nor for resource mobilization."

"The function on creating an enabling environment seems very ambitious, but it is important to have a forum to explore what the GFF can achieve – so, yes, it should be there."

Q - The IG's functions are relevant and provide a significant added-value to the global health architecture




Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree



Two-thirds of respondents dissatisfied with the group's performance in delivering on its functions and perceive a lack of accountability

Q - The IG currently delivers on its core functions.



"It is an inclusive platform, which is useful for learning but underperforming with regards to mutual accountability and collective engagement. A group of leaders, rather than a leaders' group."

"Great and useful presentation and analysis of prioritized national plans, budget (gaps) and initiatives, but insufficient accountability amongst GFF partners and variable quality of WB execution to allow for real catalytic alignment, harmonization, and collective action in a number of GFF countries."

"The meetings at present are more a forum for show and tell, and light dialogue - instead of powerful assessment, decision making and remedial action moving forward. This may be a reflection of where GFF is in its life course, since compared to other financing mechanisms, it is much younger."

"We need to go beyond information sharing in the IG, and talk about action, and actually start making some decisions on challenges that would benefit the organizations."


"I don't think we surface so much of the country bottlenecks, only the global ones."

"In terms of its monitoring function, that just isn't there."



Meetings currently focus heavily on the IG's function to foster country learning

Primary focus of IG sessions across its functions*



▶ **More sessions dedicated to monitoring performance and fostering country learning than all three financing-related IG functions together**

- Number of sessions dedicated to fostering learning significantly higher than those related to monitoring (e.g., recurring agenda items such as country focus).
- Those related to monitoring, focus on update sharing on the GFF's progress

▶ **Increased time dedicated to mobilizing domestic and international resources in run-up to replenishment**



Accountabilities of IG members and “categories” are not a focus of the GFF Governance Document

GFF Governance document does not provide clear responsibilities of its members or for each category (e.g., financiers; CSOs; private sector)

“Members are senior representatives of governments and other partners who collectively bring the expertise required to ensure effective steering of the GFF and who have the institutional authority to ensure that agreement reached by the IG are properly conveyed and seriously considered for implementation in their respective institutions.”



Other governance bodies specify clearer responsibilities



Global Fund’s Operating Procedures
Defines key competencies and responsibilities of board members*



PMNCH’s 2016 Board Member Handbook
Includes a ‘board manual’ outlining roles and responsibilities of constituency chairs**




FP2020’s Governance Manual
Lays out responsibilities of partner members, including role, time commitment, personal commitment, expertise, willingness to advocate, leadership, etc.




IG's composition and size largely perceived as fit-for-purpose

Q - The composition and size of the IG are fit for achieving its core functions.



Q - The GFF's country-centric and country-led model is reflected in the IG composition and focus of the IG work and meetings.



■ Strongly disagree
 ■ Disagree
 ■ Agree
 ■ Strongly Agree

"This is the maximum size."

"Keep membership dynamic to reflect shifting role of GFF, e.g., include an independent voice in the IG that can act as an honest broker."

"Constituency models are very limited from a governance perspective [...] The IG could have an alternative, dynamic type of structure [...] If the IG came up with an agenda of top priorities, it might be able to structure a set of IG convenings over a period of time, in which those who come are not necessarily the same people."

"My question to the private sector constituency is what is the responsibility of that representative? It is a question of whether one person is equipped to represent private sector partnerships."

"Going forward, as implementation takes off, balance needs to be in favor of the country experience."

"What I would change is to have a bottom-up approach [...] Clearly there is a set of countries – a common denominator across GF and Gavi and GFF. Start with these countries, and start looking at the kind of investments we are making, and see what the future looks like. And then say, "Okay, what is it that we are doing together? How can we unlock more domestic resources, or enhance impact of investments?"



Current policies may need to be updated to maintain size and protect country voice

GFF Governance Document is not specific about ensuring equal representation of participating countries and bilateral public financiers.

“Members of the IG shall initially consist of:

- *Five members (or more based on number of donor seats allocated) from participating countries, including both Ministries of Health and Finance [...]*
- *Public sector financiers’ seats allocated based on:*
 - I. A seat each for each member of the TFC*
 - II. 2-4 seats (possibly shared as a constituency as membership increases) for financiers providing clearly identifiable complementary financing.”*



Other governance documents better protect country voice by devoting at least 50% of seats to country representatives



GEF’s Council

GEF’s main governing body reserves 16 seats for developing countries, vs. 14 for high-income countries



GAFSP

Steering Committee's

Voting members are limited to an equal number of major donors and representatives of partner countries




Global Fund’s Board

Differentiates between implementers and donors, with 10 seats for each category. Partner and some donor constituencies follow a constituency model, based on regions for partners



Respondents largely satisfied with the seniority of members – and say future level of representation depends on purpose of IG and its meetings

Q - Representation of IG members at meetings is sufficiently senior to allow for effective coordination of organizational activities and policy alignment within the IG.



Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

Findings from desk review



GFF Governance Document updated in 2017 to include possibility for Ministries of Finance to also participate – but this has not yet occurred in practice

- “It is probably the only forum with all the key stakeholders and with such seniority attending. That is an achievement in itself.”
- “Although this may be intentional, the donors are sending the highest level of director of department. But you may need people who are less tied down and need bigger forward-thinking [...] We must have a mechanism that brings in the right people for the right topics. When we’ve had discussions related to upstream problems of commodities, we bring in someone else.”
- “If it is it an advisory board, then get working level people, don’t always target ministers, who should be doing other stuff...”
- “Regarding representation, it depends again on what you want to a achieve.”
- “As a result of meetings mostly dominated by ‘for information’ agenda items, the senior representation from agencies has been delegated to more junior people who are asked to write reports. This will require putting more substantive items on the agenda and an openness to discussing difficult items, such as perceived non alignment of GFF-WB, non-funded TA, and country dissent.”



Processes

- ▶ **Respondents commend GFF Secretariat's support to IG despite its small size**
 - Members appreciate time investment by Secretariat and quality of papers
 - Secretariat may want to shift its focus – away from presenting at meetings (e.g., information sharing about GFF to IG) – to co-creating problem-solving sessions (e.g., around country issues) and ensuring the group's voice is heard
- ▶ **Meeting frequency, preparation, and execution are seen to serve the IG's purpose well, but sessions could be made more relevant and productive**
 - Timing aligns well with members' desires (i.e., with one linked to Spring Meetings of the World Bank and the other in-participating country)
 - Members want to be more involved in developing the agenda and in making meetings more impactful (e.g., problem-solving sessions; expansion of topics)
- ▶ **Room for more concrete meeting follow up and more inclusive collaboration mechanisms between meetings**
 - Respondents are less satisfied with meeting follow up and collaboration mechanisms between meetings
 - There is appetite for developing new processes for ongoing dialogue, coordination, and collective action between meetings




Suggestions voiced

- ▶ **Refocus Secretariat's support:** From writing and presenting most discussion papers to supporting others with their presentations, and facilitating exchange between the IG and TFC
- ▶ **Make meetings more relevant:** Allow all members space to provide input on agenda; develop TAGs with clear remits; establish pre (IG meeting)-calls on complex issues; time IG meeting with e.g. PMNCH meeting
- ▶ **Make actions clear in meeting materials:** Develop the agendas around clearly-stated objectives and discussion/decision questions
- ▶ **Facilitate IG engagement between meetings:** Introduce a platform for sharing news and updates



Respondents commend GFF Secretariat’s support to IG despite its small size

Q - The level of support provided by the GFF Secretariat to the IG’s work and meetings is appropriate.



■ Strongly disagree
 ■ Disagree
 ■ Agree
 ■ Strongly Agree

“I want to reiterate the real effort by the Secretariat to engage with IG in a meaningful way, and incorporate our input in how the GFF is shaped and evolved [...] Those interactions are value-add. I’ve been on a number of committees where my input goes into a black hole, and I don’t feel that way with the GFF.”

“I don’t have a issues with regards to processes other than the fact that the MTF committee will review something, discuss, and then it goes to approve it without any advising from the IG.”

“The Secretariat could participate in joint annual review processes in countries to better understand the country’s issues.”

“The Secretariat could push the country rep and really work with them in advance – to provide a bit of support to go beyond information sharing, to use the group of people to do problem solving around that country.”

“In West Africa, not many people speak English, which restricts access to the docs. Need strengthened efforts for translating documents etc. in French.”

“Secretariat should step back more, rather than lecturing the GFF about what worked well, dominating the time it should be a consultative body that allows others, particularly recipient countries to make presentations.”

Findings from desk review




The Secretariat is increasingly involved at meetings as a presenter or co-presenter, from a low of 33% in IG3 to a high of 67% in IG7*

* Does not include opening and closing remarks
 Source: IG meetings agendas, publicly-available




Meeting frequency, preparation, and execution serve the IG’s purpose well, but sessions could be made more relevant and productive

Q - The IG has robust processes in place for meeting preparation and management that allow it to run its meetings effectively and efficiently and ensure members' engagement.



Q - Meetings are run effectively and deliver concrete results that advance the mission of the GFF partnership.



Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

- “Meeting preparation is good; everything is shared before the meetings.”
- “There could be more involvement of IG members in solving problems prior to them being discussed at IG meetings. Is there a way to have a pre-meeting/call, so that we can do pre-work?”
- “The problem is not how the meetings are run, but what can be decided on [...] it’s not like the invite says: ‘These are the 3 critical questions we’ll discuss.’ It’s more like: ‘This is what’s happening in Ghana with nutrition....’”
- “I was very encouraged that there was real alignment around trying to piggy back the IG meeting with the PMNCH meeting. I think there is huge value to that, from time, energy, and constituency perspective. It helps people keep focus, understand relationships.”
- “We should have a more formal and inclusive process around agenda-setting. The agenda is decided by the Secretariat without discussion, I think. [...] I don’t know if IG members outside of donors have the opportunity to comment.”

Findings from desk review


No systematic process in place to solicit agenda input ahead of meetings. Other groups, like GEF, have an open process for soliciting input. Meeting agendas could also be made more actionable by better defining objectives and topics (as FP2020 does).






Room for more concrete meeting follow up and more inclusive collaboration mechanisms between meetings

Q - The IG has robust processes in place for meeting follow-up that ensure action items are taken forward and executed upon.



Q - The IG has robust processes and tools for information sharing and collaboration in place that allow members to stay engaged in-between meetings.



Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree



“As GFF matures, there is need to share real time lessons in a more agile manner – in addition to the newsletter [...], e.g., members should be able to post new and noteworthy experiences from their respective role.”



“It might be helpful to have a monthly or quarterly note from the [GFF] leadership updating on any key developments, informally and personally.”



“It may facilitate the follow up actions of the group members if country progress is shared periodically, though we can do it through our country team but that could be one-sided observation.”



“If there are key topics or issues that need to be addressed – perhaps subcommittees or task forces could be created and disbanded on an as-needed basis.”



“The new approach to set up IG technical working groups might be the right way of making better and effective use of existing capacity of IG.”



“Materials are of high quality but actions are not always clear and similarly follow up. Often no [discussion] ‘threads’ maintained between meetings.”

Findings from desk review



Follow-up action items are less detailed than they used to be – tables now only include space for issue and action items, creating potential accountability issues



Collaboration & Dynamics

▶ Majority of respondents feels IG is not (yet) able to own meeting outcomes and deliver improvements in financial alignment

- Reasons cited are both formal (e.g., lack of accountability mechanisms; insufficient articulation of expectations of IG members; limited remit given WB rules) and related to mindsets (e.g., members not coming prepared and contributing to meetings constructively)

▶ Level of transparency and openness at IG meetings is perceived as limited

- Reasons cited include sensitivities and competition between the institutions represented in the meetings, as well as a feeling that there is no designated time for critical discussion
- Efforts have been made by IG chairs to improve transparency and dialogue at IG meetings

Suggestions voiced




- ▶ **Dedicate space at a future IG meeting to discuss how to encourage openness and transparency among members**
- ▶ **Introduce accountability measures:** Clearly articulate expectations of what each representative will contribute and develop an accountability mechanism to measure its performance
- ▶ **Ensure topics discussed are of interest to several members** (e.g., placing emphasis on countries where multiple IG members are actively engaged)



Majority of respondents feels IG is not (yet) able to own meeting outcomes and deliver improvements in financial alignment

Q - Members of the IG take ownership of meeting outcomes to ensure they contribute to better alignment of funding approaches among domestic and external financiers.



“We need better accountability of what is expected of each partner and a mechanism/dashboard indicating how we are doing.”

“The problem is lack of ownership to GFF, which is linked to specific role and responsibility of each actor within. If GFF is seen primarily as a funding mechanism in the Bank and less so as consolidated efforts towards national priorities and goals, the ownership will continue lacking. Not sure I can suggest how to turn this as it was intended initially.”

“I don’t see alignment happening around the table. What is happening around the table is the donors are listening to the countries talk about how they are implementing. It is more like a grant management process. It is not joint problem-solving.”


“The funders could better prepare for the meetings.”

“Where I think it works best is when you have a group of donors that are actually interested in aligning their funding. If you take Burkina Faso – you have a strong, articulate MoH who says “this is our health sector plan; I want to encourage you [donors] to align on plans. This encourages in a proactive way the donors to align.”



Level of transparency and openness at IG meetings is perceived as limited

Q - Interactions and communications within the IG are characterized by openness and transparency.



■ Strongly disagree
 ■ Disagree
 ■ Agree
 ■ Strongly Agree

Findings from desk review



Considerable effort appears to have already been made by IG chair to improve transparency and dialogue at IG meetings*

“I think there has been a high-level of openness of dialogue.”

“Meetings tend to present the positive side of what is happening without examining any of the negatives/challenges - this doesn’t allow for discussion.”

“There is a feeling that you can’t sit around the table if you’re not supportive. That is true, but you have to be able to be critical, otherwise people talk bad about the GFF behind its back.”

“At the last meeting I attended, there wasn’t much appetite for discussion on financing alignment, and I don’t know why that was. We need an honest, open conversation. State the fact that IG is not working and we need to change that”

“Transparency is very challenging when some key donors are sitting listening out for anything that might be viewed as skepticism of the GFF or its ways of working. So, everyone toes the party line, apart from bilaterals, who can talk on equal footing.”

“I heard about preparatory meetings where input is being sanitized before it comes to the IG, etc.”

“We could use independent case studies of country level investment case preparation and execution as basis for frank discussion.”

4. Recommendations

Our suggested recommendations fall into two categories



Operational

Process improvements that will enhance IG meeting quality & collaboration between meetings

Forward planning and strategic content

Enhanced engagement

Increased results focus

Quick wins



If agreed upon at April meeting, can be implemented immediately

Strategic


Ways to strengthen the IG's role, functions and way of working; will require a process of engagement and strategic alignment



Collaborative GFF strategy process

Clearer governance model and stronger operating procedures

Special strategy and governance session to align on way forward





Long-term engagement


Action taken over the coming months for decision-making later in the year

Operational recommendations *aim to enhance meeting quality (1/2)*



Forward planning and strategic content




-  **Forward-looking priority setting and planning**
 - Define IG's priorities/objectives and deliverables for following year at fall meeting
 - Objective: Aim to strengthen alignment across IG, TFC, and work of key partners through forward-looking planning
 - Form time-bound subgroups (as needed) that take responsibility for preparing deliverables related to annual priorities
-  **Dedicated space for IG functions on meeting agendas**

More equally address all IG functions (complementary financing, transitions/sustainability, domestic/international RM, monitoring and learning) at meetings
-  **Formalization of existing practice of alternating meeting locations and optimal use of locations**
 - Formalize practice of having fall meeting at country level, combined with a day of discussions and problem solving with country-level partners; where possible align with other relevant meetings
 - Link first meeting to WB Spring Meetings and proactively leverage presence of Ministries of Finance



Operational recommendations *aim to enhance meeting quality (2/2)*



Enhanced engagement

-  **Inclusive agenda setting**
Solicit input from all IG members on agenda items through email/online survey or other proposed method three months ahead of meeting
-  **Shortened presentations and increased space for participatory discussion during IG meetings**
 - Limit presentations to 10-15 min to focus on discussion and strategic alignment
 - Conduct briefing calls ahead of IG meeting on complex subjects and items for decision-making,
-  **Creation of IG members site on GFF webpage and annual letter**
 - Introduce IG members site with access to relevant IG materials, and news/updates relevant to IG members
 - Send annual letter from GFF Director and IG Chair with a review of progress and key priorities going forward

Increased results focus

-  **Outcome and action focus of agenda items**
Ensure all agenda items have clearly stated objective (e.g. for decision, for advice to TFC/Secretariat, for information); questions for discussion and (if relevant) decision items
-  **Clear follow up, responsibility and timeline for agenda items**
Reinstate practice of including follow up items/deliverables, responsible member(s) and due date in meeting notes for all agenda items

Strategic recommendations will clarify IG's role and functions



Collaborative GFF strategy process



Request Secretariat to support process with IG and TFC to articulate GFF goals, objectives and priorities for next 5 years, and roles of each group in achieving them

Clearer governance model and stronger operating procedures



Establish time-bound task team charged to lead an open, frank discussion on the IG and develop recommendations that lead to the drafting of an updated IG governance document and operating procedures

Special strategy and governance session to align on the way forward



Reserve sufficient time for special session at next IG meeting to:

1. Provide guidance on GFF strategy
2. Discuss revised IG governance document, operating procedures and ways of working prepared by task team

Focus of Task Team's work*

- Review/sharpen IG goals/functions and suggest concrete priorities for IG during coming year
- Articulate areas expected for: strategic decision making and collective action; advice to TFC and other relevant governing bodies; learning and information exchange
- Explore/propose how to deepen IG coordination and synergies with governing bodies of relevant partners
- Discuss and propose ways to strengthen collaboration between IG and TFC
- Refine membership criteria for the IG and define expected contributions by each member
- Make recommendations on strengthening ways of working

Timeline: May-Nov 2019

Composition: 1 member from each IG "category", 1 additional participating country, 1 additional financier (1 of the 2 financiers must be a member of the TFC), and 1 Secretariat representative to provide support

* Secretariat should provide to the group required information on the legal restrictions for the GFF governance model (incl. what must be handled by the TFC; what can fall under the responsibility of the IG)

5. Annex

Annex 1 – IG Members Interviewed*

Categories	Role	Organization	Name
COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES	Alternate	Office of the President, Kenya	Ruth Kagia, Advisor
CSOS	Principal	Association Sénégalaise pour le Bien-Être Familial (ASBEF), Senegal	Moussa Mane, Program Director
FINANCIERS	Principal	Norad, Norway	Paul Fife, Director of Education and Global Health Dpt
	Principal	DFID, UK	Claire Moran, Joint Head Human Development Department Meena Gandhi, Health Advisor (alternate)
	Principal	Global Affairs Canada, Canada	Amy Baker, Director General
	Observer	DEVCO, EU	Jan Paehler, Team Leader Health
MULTILATERAL FINANCING AGENCIES	Principal	Gavi	Anuradha Gupta, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
	Principal	GFATM	Carole Presern, Head of the Office of Board Affairs
	Principal	World Bank	Tim Evans, Senior Director, HNP
PMNCH	Principal	PMNCH	Helga Fogstad, Executive Director
PRIVATE SECTOR	Principal	Merck for Mothers	Mary-Ann Etiebet, Lead and Executive Director
UN AGENCIES	Alternate	WHO	Anshu Banerjee, Senior Advisor, Department of Reproductive Health and Research
	Alternate	UNICEF	Stefan Swartling Peterson, Associate Director Health
-	Chair	BMGF	Chris Elias, President of Global Development Program

Annex 2 - GFF is both a newer and different type of financing instrument than the other governance bodies in our benchmarking analysis

