Proposed Approaches for GFF Second-round Financing
Second-Round Funding for GFF-Supported Countries

**Background and Session Objective:**

In TFC meeting on May 15 it was agreed that the GFF Secretariat would:

- Outline the operational next steps for determining countries that receive second round financing based on progress on six key factors:
  - Country Platform
  - Investment Case
  - Results Framework
  - Resource mapping and tracking
  - Initial programmatic results
  - Health Financing
## Background

The GFF Expansion strategy stipulates number of rounds of financing a country is eligible for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># rounds of financing over X years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>3 over 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-middle income, low growth</td>
<td>2 over 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-middle income, high growth</td>
<td>2 over 10 years (except IBRD borrowers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-middle income, approaching upper-middle income threshold</td>
<td>1 over 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

- The GFF engagement has the ambition to bend the curve on RMNCAH-N results and catalyze transformative change to reach Universal Health Coverage
- Countries are in the lead of this transformation that can take several years
- Country context is a key factor for determining second-round financing
- Proposed approach needs to take into account the diversity of GFF countries (from fragile and conflicted affected to lower-middle income) with different starting points and challenges
- The allocation of second round grant is an opportunity to review how the country, with support from the GFF partnership, is performing in delivering results on original objectives, course-correct and identify and incentivize next frontier for change
- Focus is on country results and collective impact of GFF partnership rather than GFF Trust Fund contribution only
- Results are defined as programmatic (e.g. increase in coverage of services) as well as progress in implementing priority reforms (e.g. institutionalization of an RBF program)
Proposed approach for being eligible for second round financing

- To be eligible for 2nd round financing the country needs to recommit its interest (in writing) to the GFF and express government commitment to key areas

- Letter is requested from Ministry of Finance

- Appoint government **focal point**
- Prepare and implement an **investment case**
- Have a functioning country **platform**
- Increase **resources** allocated for health
- Increase **equitable access** to health services and financial protection
- Use **data** for decision making and create **accountability**
- Demonstrate a willingness to commit IDA/IBRD resources for health
Proposed approach for determining size and focus of 2\textsuperscript{nd} round financing

- For each country that is eligible for second round financing and that has recommitted to the GFF partnership, the GFF Secretariat prepares a \textit{Country Investment Summary (CIS)} to TFC.

- The CIS is an analysis of the country’s performance to date, with support from GFF partnership, in bending the curve on RMNCAH-N results and catalyze transformative change taking into account country context, and it includes a proposal for the size and focus of a second round grant.

- The process for developing CIS involves data analysis, in-country discussions to validate data and collection of qualitative data, including consultations with Government and country platform on main recommendations in CIS.

- Decision on second round grant is made by TFC based on CIS on a case-by-case no objection basis with a rolling timeline throughout the year.

- The CIS is submitted to TFC 12 months before closing date of 1\textsuperscript{st} grant and TFC has 14 days to provide no objection.

- Upon request by a TFC member, country specific discussions on CIS can be held in TFC meetings.

- Announcement of second round grant is an opportunity to discuss the focus of 2\textsuperscript{nd} round grant, incentives and potential co-financing requirements.
How the Country Investment Summary pushes the boundary for change

Relentless **focus on results** and assessment of progress helps us gain insight in what is working/not working in current approach (including GFF model)

Triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data from various stakeholders creates a more **objective analysis**

Nuanced country focused analysis helps identify next frontier of change and **structure financing to incentivize change**

Size and focus of GFF TF grant can be weighed against the **government’s commitment** to change

By **creating clarity** for all GFF partners (including Government) on the focus of GFF engagement in 2nd round
CIS summarizes key results during first grant period

(1) Summary of country progress on results indicators (based on GFF Results Framework)

GFF Process indicators

**Investment case**
- Investment case for RMNCAH-N or equivalent
- Set of evidence based priorities financed
- Government Focal point and Liaison officer (in country)
- An inclusive process with CSO and private sector engagement

**Health financing**
- Health financing reforms defined and financed
- IDA/IBRD/ GFF TF- Bank financing in support of the IC

**Monitoring Implementation**
- M&E strategy and framework in support of IC
- Country-led multi stakeholder platform
- Disbursement of IDA/ GFF TF funds

Core programmatic indicators:
- Maternal mortality ratio
- Under 5 mortality rate
- Neonatal mortality rate
- Adolescent birth rate
- Proportion of the most recent children age 0-23 months who were born at least 24 months after preceding birth
- Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years of age
- Prevalence of wasting among children under 5 years of age (added later)
- Proportion of children who are developmentally on track

Core health financing indicators:
- Health expenditure per capita financed from domestic sources
- Ratio of government health expenditure to total government expenditures
- Percent of current health expenditures on primary health care
- Incidence of financial catastrophe due to out of pocket payments

Tailored set of indicators

- Investment case specific prioritized indicators linked to scaleup of reforms in health systems strengthening, especially health financing
- Based on the Investment case, results framework and available quality data each country will have a set of defined indicators to report from routine and survey data
- Data sharing agreements and country verification process
(2) Qualitative information summarizing:
   A. Added value of the GFF in the country
   B. How/if 1st round of financing has contributed to catalyze change
   C. Main challenges and level of government commitment to achieve original objectives
   D. Status of collaboration with Gavi and Global Fund
   E. Programmatic and financial sustainability

With a proposal of:
   A. Size and focus of second round of financing
   B. Structuring of financing (e.g. incentives/co-financing requirements) (see Part 1B)
   C. Risks to achieving results and mitigation measures
CIS uses multiple data sources for more objective analysis

Independent and credible data sources:
- Outcome and coverage data (e.g. DHS, routine date, PBF data etc.)
- Health Facility surveys in country (e.g. SARA, SDIs etc.)
- Impact assessments and operational research
- Health financing data (Global Health Exp database, resource mapping etc.)

Process data:
- Information from the GFF annual report
- GFF Secretariat is launching a score-card to captures information on key aspects of GFF model including survey of performance of country platform, Investment Case quality/completion, as well as results framework and use of data

Various in-country discussions with Government, Country Platform and broader GFF partnership:
- Mid-term review of Investment Case and/or GFF TF Grant/WB Project
- Interviews with key informants
- Country self-assessment
- Discussions about key CIS recommendations