Monitoring the Funding Flow of Investment case (IC)

Making sure government and donor funding follow the IC priorities
GFF supports countries to get on a trajectory to reach the SDGs and UHC through three related approaches:

- Identifying priority investments to achieve RMNCAH outcomes
- Identifying priority health financing reforms
- Getting more results from existing resources and increasing financing from:
  - Domestic government resources
  - IDA/IBRD financing
  - Aligned external financing
  - Private sector resources

- Strengthening systems to track progress, learn, and course-correct
Objectives of Session

1. To understand what monitoring the funding flows of the Investment Case (IC) means

2. To understand what resource mapping and tracking are and how they can help GFF platforms monitor the implementation of the IC or National Health Strategy (NHS)

3. To understand the data needs and tools to conduct resource mapping and tracking exercises and their challenges

4. To understand what global public good for resource mapping and tracking the GFF is after and potential next steps for GFF countries
This presentation is about a deep dive into monitoring the funding flow of IC: If no money for IC → No Implementation → No results

GFF approach: Mapping and tracking financial resources to results at subnational levels

MONITORING GEOGRAPHIC PRIORITIES (REGIONAL DISPARITIES, URBAN VERSUS RURAL)

- Are we in the right places?
- Do the results match the available resources?
- Do the committed investments match the amounts disbursed?
- Are the funds matching the needs?
Monitoring the funding flow of IC and beyond

Platforms:

A Mapping of Resource commitments (budgets)

B Resource allocation
   By program,
   By region

C Resource tracking
   By program
   By region
   (expenditures)

D Review Expenditure
   analysis that is linked to results

Subnational data

Definitions that work for all 4 steps

Analysis and use at different layers of the system

Monitor the implementation of the IC from a funding prospective but also:
- Programmatic Efficiency
- Allocative & Technical Efficiency
A. Examples of Resource Mapping Results in GFF countries
High level Resource mapping in Cameroon: who does finance what?
The Resource Mapping (RM) helped the Senegal GFF platform prioritizing further their IC

- Initial Resource Mapping showing Donor and Gov Commitment to the IC in Senegal– Huge Funding Gap
- Final Resource Mapping showing increased Donor and Gov Commitment of the IC in Senegal – Gap reduced

**Bar Chart:**
- BM/GFF: 54%
- Ministry of Health: 32.9%
- Other Donors: 0%
- USAID: 10.2%
- UNICEF: 10.2%
- UNFPA: 2.5%
- OMS: 0.2%
- JICA: 0.1%
- GAVI: 3.5%
- Banque Mondiale: 11.9%
- Fonds Mondial: 2.6%
- LuxDEV: 0.0%
- AFD: 0.4%

**Pie Chart:**
- BM/GFF: 54%
- Government (budget): 32.9%
- Other donors: 0%
- USAID: 10.2%
- UNICEF: 10.2%
- UNFPA: 2.5%
- OMS: 0.2%
- JICA: 0.1%
- GAVI: 3.5%
- Banque Mondiale: 11.9%
- Fonds Mondial: 2.6%
- LuxDEV: 0.0%
- AFD: 0.4%
The RM also helped the Senegal GFF platform understand who does and funds what by IC priority

Fig. 1 External and Domestic Funding of Priority 4 (Strengthening Supply) of the Senegal IC
B. Examples of Resource Allocation
Emerging regional states (Somali, Afar, Gambela) are receiving the highest per capita. Amhara, Oromia and SNNPR are receiving the least per capita.

The RM in Ethiopia assisted the annual planning process of the Health System Transformation Plan and is a tool to allocate resources in a more efficient way.
The resource mapping was used to ensure better planning at geographical levels in DRC.

Funding gap
- National
- Tanganyika
- Haut-Lomami
- Sankuru
- Maniema
- Lomami
- Tshuapa
- Kongo Central
- Sud-Kivu
- Kasai
- Kasai Central
- Lualaba
- Luvungi
- Total (5ans)

Funding Available
- National
- Tanganyika
- Haut-Lomami
- Sankuru
- Maniema
- Lomami
- Tshuapa
- Kongo Central
- Sud-Kivu
- Kasai
- Kasai Central
- Lualaba
- Luvungi
- Total (5ans)
C. Examples of Resource Tracking Results in GFF countries
Tracking implementation of the RMNCAH Package and HSS Priorities in DRC through the Single Contract

- Contract between the Ministry of Health at the provincial level, the provincial health authority and DPs.
- Objectives: Pool virtually financial resources to support ONE integrated provincial health action plan to ensure proper implementation and monitoring of the RMNCAH-N package.

Traditional approach

- Sources of financing (government, partners)
- Provincial health authorities

Single Contract

- Sources of financing (government, partners)
- Provincial health authorities

Better alignment among government and partners

Less fragmentation, greater efficiency and transparency

Better performance

Sud Kivu: improvements in work plan execution from 54% to 68% in 2017
Sub Ubangi: 47% of commitments disbursed
Mai Ndombe: 62% of commitments disbursed
This tool provides a clear picture on which activities are not implemented, some of them because of delay in disbursement of government and donors funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Activities Performed</th>
<th>Activities non-performed</th>
<th>Activities in process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Health Zones</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Controle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS and research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene and Public Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Execution rate 53% 31% 16%

Why only 53% of the 49 activities are performed in South Ubangi:
Because of delay in disbursing funding on some activities:
• Training on GPS and M&E at Provincial level (WB)
• Delay in organizing training on HMIS and Data use (GF)
• Inventory in medicines and equipment (Government)
• Organized national days against polio (WHO)
• However various causes on low disbursement (disease outbreak, political instability, bottlenecks in financial management and procurement process)

Evaluation of Budget Execution of Gov and DP on the 49 activities in South Ubangi
In the absence of “dollar value” at activity level, Activity Mapping per activity in IC regions can help countries determine gaps.

### Priority Investment Area II: Adolescent Health

Detailed activity tracking shows existing gap for specific activity under each sub-priority of the IC, by region.
D. Review Expenditure
And analysis that is linked to results
In Tanzania, routine HIV/AIDS expenditure generated by PEPFAR monitors whether external funding (PEPFAR) is efficient and reaches its targets!
In Cameroon, the PER highlighted a disconnect between public expenditure allocation and health needs at regional level that is addressed by the IC targeting the poorest regions.

Before the IC, Regions with the highest incidence of under-five mortality—the North, Far North, East, and Adamaoua Regions—received the lowest budget allocations per capita.

Figure 1: Per Capita Public Health Spending (2017) and Under-Five Mortality Rates by Region (2014)

The GFF platform would need to conduct similar analysis now that the IC is being implemented to assess whether the government has spent more on prioritized regions of the IC.
4. Data needs and tools
Ideal Data Need to monitor the implementation of the IC/NHS from a funding perspective

Resource Mapping
Commitments are tracked in pre-defined categories that map to health sector priorities
Sufficient detail to monitor IC objectives
Routine collection with sufficient frequency
Data disaggregated sub-nationally and by program area and/or intended beneficiaries

Resource Tracking
Expenditures are tracked in pre-defined categories that map to health sector priorities
Sufficient detail to monitor budget execution toward IC objectives
Routine collection with sufficient Frequency
Disaggregated sub-nationally And by program areas
Linked to results

Expenditure Review
Account for actual expenditures towards objectives
Calculate total financial cost per result (where possible)
Assess variance and efficiency across units and adaptively manage
Have empirical inputs to budgeting and projections for future cycle

The IC or Prioritized National Health Strategy is implemented
## Existing RM/RT tools to monitor implementation of the IC/NHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Tools</th>
<th>Data Source/Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RM/trackin for the IC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific data collection tool developed relying on budge/exp. data from donors and gov</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Most GFF countries have developed their own resource mapping and tracking tool of IC/NHS</td>
<td><strong>Sometime use of the routine gov. financing information system – IFMIS or Program Budgeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Excel based matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with support from IP (e.g. CHAI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other specific resource tracking tools</strong></td>
<td><strong>NHA</strong>: Retrospective survey of expenditures by standardized classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) NHA</td>
<td>2. <strong>Other donors tools</strong>: specific data collection system for diseases and programs, going down to service delivery unit cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Donors funded resource tracking tools: NIT (USAID-Nutrition) NASA (ONUSIDA), PROMIS (USAID), EPICORP (GAVI, GF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Challenges in Data Need and Conducting Resource Mapping and Tracking of IC or National Health Strategy

• **Government Side**
  - Difficulty to identify IC priorities in MOH budget
  - This difficulty comes from the fact that not all countries have program budget / functional IFMIS
  - Issue of transparency in sharing the budget and expenditure data
  - No clear budget information by activity at decentralized level

• **Donor side**
  - Delay with transmission of information and issue of transparency in sharing financial data
  - Difficult to match donors budget with IC priorities because different budget formats
  - RM/RT tool → can be cumbersome to fill-out
  - Limited information by donor on activity level → need to consult IP → time
5. Looking for a comprehensive Resource Mapping and Tracking (Global Public Good)
What is the dream platform to monitor implementation of the IC from a funding perspective?

✓ Country owned and managed
✓ Digital platform and systems
✓ Funding commitments and expenditures monitored against country objectives
✓ All sources of health funding captured
✓ Routine and adequately frequent collection
✓ Low latency from collection to use
✓ Data disaggregated by lowest administrative unit
✓ Full interoperability between systems
✓ Cyclical use of data to inform adaptive management and future planning
A robust, automated resource mapping and expenditure monitoring system reduces HR needs and costs, and increases utility of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Quo Approach</th>
<th>Develop Robust Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct exercise every 2-3yr</td>
<td>Use HR to analyze, understand and use data – rather than collect it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire consultants</td>
<td>Allows for continuous monitoring of financing and expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect and analyze data in a snapshot in time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An interesting “resource tracking and mapping” example: Mohinga system in Myanmar track donor funding in real time

1) A resource tracking and mapping system which tells the government and donors in real time how much has been spent on priorities of the IC by region and by activity

2) User-friendly data entry

3) Owned by MOH/GFF platform

4) Contains visualization/a dashboard

https://mohinga.info/en/dashboard/location/
1. How are you mapping resources and monitoring commitments for the IC implementation – what works well and what needs to improve?

2. What can be done to improve coordination amongst donors and government – what works well and what can be improved?
6. Conclusion and Next Steps
Concluding Remarks

- **RM/T & review expenditures are necessary to ensure IC is implemented:** it helps visualizing donor and government alignment to IC

- **RM** is implemented in most countries and shows gaps by priority but rarely by activity

- As GFF countries are moving into implementation of their IC, **RT** becomes a critical priority to ensure financing is following the priorities of the IC and results of IC can be achieved

- **GFF and its partners can support countries developing/improving a tool tracking expenditures** in real-time and producing budget report by priority & region

- **Resource tracking require PFM TA** to identify IC priorities in MOH budgets