

Global Financing Facility – IPPF recommendations ahead of the 6th GFF Investors Group Meeting

November 2017

The Global Financing Facility (GFF) is currently active in 16 countries. In September, the GFF launched the first replenishment for its Trust Fund with a funding target of USD 2 billion. If reached, this would allow for an expansion of the GFF to another 34 countries over the 2018-23 period. IPPF sees the GFF's first replenishment as an important moment to take stock of the GFF's achievements so far and to assess and address challenges encountered in its implementation to date. We welcome the ambition of the GFF to increase resources available for reproductive, maternal, newborn, child and adolescent health (RMNCAH) from different funding sources, as well as its efforts to rally RMNCAH stakeholders and financiers around country-developed Investment Cases determining country priorities for investment and ensure better alignment of external support. However, we also see a need for greater transparency on how the GFF is increasing resources for different areas of RMNCAH, including for sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) and family planning, and to tackle challenges around the transparency of funding decisions and civil society participation, particularly at the national level.

IPPF makes the following recommendations:

1. Be **more transparent on the resources made available** in support of GFF Investment Cases from all funding sources and disaggregate funding **by thematic areas, such as sexual and reproductive health and rights, including family planning**, as well as on a **country-by-country basis**
2. Provide for **more clarity on how GFF funding decisions are made**, including to ensure that areas prioritised in Investment Cases do not get neglected in GFF funding allocations
3. **Formalise processes for civil society participation at the national level**, based on the recently adopted GFF Civil Society Engagement Strategy and the Guidance Note on Inclusive Multi-stakeholder Country Platforms

1. Greater transparency on resources made available in support of GFF Investment Cases

In order to gain clarity on the impact of the GFF on RMNCAH financing and to understand if the GFF model is delivering on its promise, it will be important for the GFF to be **more transparent on the resources made available** in support of GFF Investment Cases from all funding sources and to disaggregate funding **by thematic areas, such as SRHR, including family planning**, as well as on a **country-by-country basis**.

The GFF is envisioned as a pathfinding model in a new era of development financing that seeks to mobilise additional resources for RMNCAH from four key funding sources: (i) domestic government resources, (ii) financing from the International Development Association (IDA) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), (iii) aligned external donor financing, and (iv) private sector resources. However, **beyond the resources provided by the GFF Trust Fund and IDA/IBRD, little concrete information has so far been made available on the resources provided in support of Investment Cases**. A recent GFF Secretariat documentⁱ gives examples of resources the GFF has mobilised under the above four categories, but acknowledges that “it has not yet been possible to achieve the full benefits of all four sources of financing in every GFF country”. It suggests that aligned external financing from multi- and bilateral partners accounts for approximately 55 per cent of the total financing for the initial set of Investment Cases, but also says that “most of this financing would have been committed even in the absence of the GFF” and points to the challenges with quantifying “what share of the commitments to the Investment Case represent new resources that would not have been available without the GFF process”. A GFF fact sheet on SRHRⁱⁱ suggests that SRHR have been identified as a priority in all of the 16 current GFF countries, and that nearly 30 per cent of GFF Trust Fund and linked IDA and IBRD financing “contribute to SRHR”. However, no further detail or breakdown of this figure is provided and no information is given on support for SRHR from other funding sources, beyond GFF Trust Fund and IDA/IBRD resources.

IPPF has long called for the GFF to put in place **robust mechanisms that track and monitor resources made available in support of Investment Cases from all funding sources, on a country-by-country basis, and by thematic area**. The GFF's current replenishment and expected expansion to a larger set of countries presents an opportune moment for the GFF to put in place structures that will allow for such greater transparency moving forward.

2. More clarity on how GFF funding decisions are made

Priorities identified in GFF Investment Cases should translate into GFF investments. **Funding decisions must be transparent and well-coordinated between all financiers involved** to ensure that **priority areas identified in Investment Cases are not neglected in GFF funding decisions**.

GFF countries are expected to identify priorities for investments by GFF financiers in Investment Cases developed in inclusive, country-led processes bringing together the full set of RMNCAH stakeholders. GFF Investment Cases have so far been finalised and are publicly available for six GFF countries.ⁱⁱⁱ GFF Project Appraisal Documents (PADs), which determine activities to be funded by GFF Trust Fund and IDA/IBRD resources, have been finalised and are publicly available for ten countries.^{iv} Several of these PADs were approved ahead of the finalisation of the respective Investment Cases, which prompts questions about the extent to which the latter could influence the funding allocations determined in the PADs. A review of some of the early Investment Cases and PADs furthermore showed that a prioritisation of family planning in Investment Cases did not necessarily translate into funding allocated to this area through the respective PADs.^v

The GFF Trust Fund and IDA/IBRD are to provide only a portion of the funding for the implementation of GFF Investment Cases, with other funding to come from complementary donor funding and domestic and private sector resources. However, little information is available on funding made available for Investment Cases from these other funding sources or on how and when decisions on such funding are made. There is a need for **more clarity on how funding from such other sources will be ensured, and on how funding decisions are effectively coordinated between all financiers involved to ensure that priorities identified in Investment Cases do not get neglected**. It puts in doubt the impact and value of stakeholders' efforts, including of civil society, to engage with the Investment Case country prioritisation process, if Investment Cases are not shown to consistently influence GFF funding allocations.

3. Formalise processes for civil society participation at the national level

Clear processes for civil society engagement with GFF country processes should be put in place and operationalised, based on the recently adopted GFF Civil Society Engagement Strategy and the Guidance Note on Inclusive Multi-stakeholder Country Platforms.

Possibilities for civil society involvement with GFF processes at national level so far have differed from country to country, were often limited, and in many cases dependent upon initiation by civil society actors. Moving forward, governments and other official stakeholders involved in GFF country processes should put in place more **systematised engagement structures for civil society** and **clearly communicate opportunities** for civil society engagement throughout different stages of the process, such as through setting out a roadmap for the national GFF process, highlighting engagement opportunities. Particular effort should also be invested in **outreach to a broad set of civil society stakeholders, including those representing marginalised population groups**.

IPPF's work on the GFF so far shows that national civil society stakeholders' engagement with GFF country processes also greatly benefits from even small amounts of funding support. As called for in the Civil Society Engagement Strategy, the establishment of an **official stream of funding to support civil society engagement at the national level** would be very welcome. **Complementary donor financing, outside of formal GFF structures**, for civil society engagement with national GFF processes, including for civil society-led accountability efforts, would also be highly beneficial.

For further contact: Raffaella Dattler, rdattler@ippf.org

ⁱ A New Financing Model for the Sustainable Development Goals Era: The Global Financing Facility in Support of Every Woman Every Child, available at: https://www.globalfinancingfacility.org/sites/gff_new/files/First-GFF-Replenishment-Document_EN.PDF.

ⁱⁱ GFF Fact Sheet: Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, available at: https://www.globalfinancingfacility.org/sites/gff_new/files/documents/Sexual-Reproductive-Health-Rights.pdf.

ⁱⁱⁱ Cameroon, Ethiopia, Kenya, Liberia, Tanzania and Uganda

^{iv} Bangladesh, Cameroon, the DRC, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria (for an emergency project focused on North East Nigeria), Tanzania and Uganda

^v Please see PAI, The Global Financing Facility and Family Planning, October 2016, available at: <http://pai.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/PAI-GFF-and-FP-Brief-110116.pdf>.