

2016 Round of Monitoring Development Effectiveness in Health

Overview & key issues



What is being monitored?

- 2016 is fifth round of IHP+ monitoring
- 2016 monitoring framework developed in consultation with IHP+ signatories, based on **previous IHP+** and **GPEDC** experience
 - Seven EDC practices agreed by IHP+ signatories, both for government and development partners
 - 7th EDC practice also for <u>civil society organisations</u>. 8th EDC practice added for <u>private sector</u>;
 - Combination of quantitative and qualitative information
- IHP+R will oversee implementation of 2016 monitoring round, including providing support to data collation and discussion of findings at country level
- A <u>national expert</u> will be contracted by IHP+R to support the MoH and other stakeholders during the 2016 Monitoring Round



EDC practices in the health sector

- 1. A strong single national health strategy is supported by both government and development partners; they agree on priorities reflected in the national health strategy, and underpinning sub-sector strategies, through a process of inclusive development and joint assessment, and a reduction in separate exercises.
- 2. Resource inputs are recorded on the national health budget and in line with national priorities, with predictability of government and development partner funding.
- **3. Financial management systems** are harmonized and aligned; requisite capacity building done or underway, and country systems strengthened and used.
- **4. Procurement/supply systems** are harmonized and aligned, parallel systems phased out, country systems strengthened and used with a focus on best value for money. National ownership can include benefiting from global procurement.
- 5. Joint monitoring of process and results is based on **one information and accountability platform**; joint processes for mutual accountability on EDC are in place, such as Joint Annual Reviews or compact reviews.
- **Technical support** is strategically planned and provided in a well-coordinated manner; opportunities for systematic learning between countries are developed and supported by agencies through south-south and triangular cooperation.
- 7. **Civil society** operates within an environment which maximizes its engagement in and contribution to health sector development
- **8. Private sector** has the space to participate in the development and implementation of effective, efficient and equitable health policies*



Process & Milestones

November
/December
Country-level
decisions on
participation

December-March Finalise tools and process April-May
Data collection
(8 weeks)

June-July Data analysis & reporting (8 weeks)

July-December Findings discussed at country level

More than just data collection



- 2016 IHP+ monitoring is broader in scope than previous rounds and goes more in-depth compared to previous rounds:
 - More inclusive : CSO & private sector
 - EDC practices put into local context: focus on qualitative information
 - Stronger focus on mutual accountability: discussion of findings and actions at country level
 - Additional exercise: institutionalisation of EDC monitoring in existing country review mechanisms (depending on country's interest)
- The following factors are important:
 - MoH in the driving seat
 - Using existing data; existing data collection frameworks or procedures; and other country-based monitoring such as GPEDC
 - Focusing on use of findings in national decision-making
 - Eye on the **future**: consider integration of EDC criteria and accountability into existing national frameworks and fora



MoH in the driving seat

The Ministry of Health will lead the process to:

- Agree country-level process for data collation and use of findings
 - Including to identify relevant existing data & systems
- Coordinate submission of data collation tools

 (including DPs, CSO and private sector). This should ensure that:
 - MoH has access to relevant data
 - MoH is involved in any conversations to clarify data issues
- A national expert will be available to support the MoH in this process

ihp results

...drawing on existing data & systems

...to minimise transaction costs. IHP+R encourages stakeholders to draw on for example:

- Aid Information Management Systems (AIMS) and Development Assistance Databases (DADs)
- Other country level monitoring systems (e.g. data prepared for JARs, reviews of compacts)
- Data submitted to the GPEDC (although noting that this not a sector-level exercise)
- Data available through the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) and through the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS)

Furthermore, any other available indicators can be discussed with IHP+R.



Promoting use

- Data is necessary but insufficient if not used
- Country process should plan for discussion of findings in existing forum with the right participation.
- IHP+R will support the country discussion with a national report, a country profile and a PPP.
- IHP+R provides a national expert to support the data collection and discussion of findings.



...with an eye on future monitoring

IHP+R will encourage countries to identify opportunities to build EDC indicators and accountability into existing systems/processes to:

- Minimise transaction costs
- Promote comprehensiveness, consistency and quality of available data
- Use the findings to discuss at national level and take action
- Maximise potential for raising issues at the global level

Who should be involved?



Inclusive and transparent dialogue with broad participation in:

- 1) Design and management of the process: MoH, lead donor, MoF (GPEDC focal point), participating stakeholders (DPs, CSOs, private sector).
- 2) Discussion of findings: above, plus MPs, media? Early discussion to raise profile and manage expectations?
- 3) Which forums already exist and can be used?

Tailoring the process & creating national buy-in



- Which DPs are participating (are all DPs invited)? How was participation decided? What discussions have taken place with DPs already? This needs careful communication.
- What are the current dynamics? Which participating DPs are likely to be supportive?
- What was the experience with GPEDC?
- How best to raise awareness, promote value, manage expectations, ensure use?
- What data exists that we can use? Has there been a review of the compact or discussion in JAR?
- What are established conventions in terms of responding to requests of this nature? What is realistic?



Suggested process

