

Global Financing Facility – IPPF recommendations ahead of the 5th GFF Investors Group Meeting

April 2017

When it was first announced, the Global Financing Facility (GFF) was heralded as a pathfinding model in a new era of development financing and held the promise of delivering additional resources to sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR), including family planning (FP). Key GFF strategic documents, such as the GFF Business Plan, called for emphasis on areas and target populations that had historically been neglected and under-funded and in this context encouraged a particular focus on FP.

Now, close to two years after the GFF was officially launched at the third International Conference on Financing for Development in Addis Ababa, the prioritisation of FP and SRH in GFF processes and funding decisions varies across priority countries. As the GFF is looking to expand its donor base and is gearing up for a 2018 replenishment event, it will be important to take stock of the effectiveness of the GFF financing model, understand how it is bolstering resources for different areas of reproductive, maternal, newborn, child and adolescent health (RMNCAH), including SRH and FP, and tackle challenges around transparency and civil society participation, especially at the national level. IPPF makes, in particular, the following recommendations:

1. Provide clear evidence of the effectiveness of the GFF model in mobilising resources for RMNCAH, including for SRH and FP

The GFF should put in place robust mechanisms that **track and monitor resource flows for every area of RMNCAH, including resources dedicated to SRH and FP**. This should include GFF Trust Fund and International Development Association (IDA) and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) resources as well as complementary donor resources directed to each GFF country and identify how these allocations are split across thematic areas in accordance with GFF investment cases.

In order to understand if the GFF model is working and to gain clarity on the impact of the GFF on RMNCAH financing, it would further be important for an analysis to be conducted of the **additional amounts of funding that the GFF has so far succeeded in mobilising for RMNCAH**. This should explore amounts of funding mobilised for investment case financing per GFF country and funding source: (i) domestic resources, (ii) IDA and IBRD resources, (iii) complementary donor resources, and (iv) private sector resources.

Given the current global funding shortfall on reproductive health commodities, it would also be beneficial for an analysis to be undertaken of **how the GFF has so far contributed to addressing this shortfall through funding allocated to commodities financing, per GFF country**.

2. Increase transparency of GFF funding decisions

Priorities identified in GFF investment cases should translate into actual 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**, including on resources from the GFF Trust Fund, IDA and complementary donor financing.

GFF investment cases have so far been finalised and are publicly available for Ethiopia, Kenya, Liberia and Tanzania. GFF Project Appraisal Documents (PADs), which determine activities to be funded through GFF Trust Fund and IDA allocations, have been finalised and are publicly available for Cameroon, the DRCⁱ, Kenya, Nigeriaⁱⁱ, Tanzania and Uganda.

A review of these documents shows that a **prioritisation of SRH and FP in GFF investment cases has not necessarily translated into funding allocated to these areas through GFF PADs**.ⁱⁱⁱ While the GFF Trust Fund and IDA 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, domestic and private sector resources, **there needs to be clarity on how funding from such other sources will in fact be ensured, and how funding decisions are effectively coordinated between all financiers involved** to ensure that priorities identified in investment cases do not get neglected.

A related concern lies in **several GFF PADs having been approved ahead of the finalisation of investment cases**, which prompts further questions about the extent to which investment cases influence PADs and wider GFF funding decisions.^{iv} 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 requirements and processes for civil society engagement with GFF country processes should be put in place and operationalised, based on existing GFF guidance documents, including the forthcoming Civil Society Engagement Strategy and 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 draft Civil Society Engagement Strategy, the establishment of an **official stream of funding to support civil society engagement, in particular 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.

4. Ensure quality of all RMNCAH commodities procured through GFF support

Building upon the concerns and recommendations raised by the commodities task team mandated by the GFF Investors Group in 2016, the GFF should ensure strong focus on addressing RMNCAH commodity access issues in GFF processes. This has to involve a strengthening of in-country technical capacity to address commodity security, including through supporting a move towards a unified supply chain. **All RMNCAH commodities procured through GFF support must meet stringent quality standards, such as WHO pre-qualification.**

Key recommendations:

- The GFF should put in place **robust mechanisms that track and monitor resource flows for every area of RMNCAH, including resources dedicated to SRH and FP**. This should be complemented by an analysis of the additional amounts of funding that the GFF has so far succeeded in mobilising for RMNCAH from different funding sources.
- **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.
- **Clear requirements and processes for civil society engagement with GFF country processes should be put in place and operationalised**, based on existing and forthcoming GFF guidance documents.
- All RMNCAH commodities procured through GFF support **must meet stringent quality standards, such as WHO pre-qualification.**

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

ⁱ For a project focused on health and education management information systems.

ⁱⁱ For an emergency project focused on the northeast of Nigeria.

ⁱⁱⁱ 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>.

^{iv} Ibid.