

## Notat

---

Til: Christian Syse/Utenriksrådets kontor  
Via: FN avdelingen  
Kopi til: Norad - Direktørens kontor DIR Direktoratet for utviklingssamarbeid  
Seksjon for etatsstyring, budsjett og forvaltning  
Fra: Seksjon for multilaterale bank- og finansspørsmål  
Saksbehandler: Ingjerd Haugen  
Dato: 21.01.2013  
Saksnr.: 11/03669-47

### **Oppfølgingsnotat - Evaluering av flergiverfondet for resultatbasert finansiering innen helse**

#### **Bakgrunn**

Det britiske selskapet HLSP gjennomførte, på oppdrag fra UD, en evaluering av flergiverfondet for resultatbasert finansiering innen helse (HRITF). Evalueringen ble presentert i april 2012. Norad har oppsummert evalueringen i sitt notat til ass. utenriksråd 11. september 2012.

I etterkant av evalueringen har departementet v/Multiseksjonen sammen med Norad diskutert oppfølging av evalueringen med det britiske DFID. Departementet og DFID har i samarbeid utarbeidet vedlagte oppfølgingsplan. I desember 2012 mottok vi også kommentarer og oppdatering på planen fra Verdensbanken. Oppfølgingsplanen er et levende dokument og vil være gjenstand for løpende dialog mellom giverne og banken.

Planen tar utgangspunkt i de vesentligste anbefalingene presentert i rapporten og inkluderer også punktene nevnt i Norads notat 11. september. Som det fremgår av planen, er flere av tiltakene allerede under oppfølging. De viktigste sakene for oss i nær framtid er å få klarert ut: ferdigstillelse av resultatrammeverk, spørsmålet om sammenhengen mellom å være etterspørselsdrevet versus strategisk tilnærming, oppdatert arbeidsplan samt oppfølgingen av retningslinjer for integrering av sosiale hensyn.

Multiseksjonen foreslår at den vedlagte matrisen benyttes som departementets oppfølgingsplan.

En notat med status oppdatering i tråd med vedlagte plan vil bli levert innen september 2013.

### **Konklusjon**

- Vedlagte matrise, utarbeidet av UD og DFID benyttes som departementets oppfølgingsplan.
- Multiseksjonen vil rapportere til ass. utenriksråd på fremdrift i tråd med planen innen september 2013.

Recommendation	Donor Response	Priority	Status	Next steps	HRITF Response
<b>Results Framework</b> Define clearly and explicitly in a Results Framework the results that the HRITF expects to achieve over time for each of its four objectives, and include indicators to measure such progress.	Agreed. In addition we think that the result framework should include indicators on main strategy (eg. # of pilots) but also capacity/administrative indicators to reach the objectives.	Immediate	In progress	HRITF team developing draft by end Sept 2012.	HRITF developed and shared a draft results framework with the donors. Donors provided some feedback and suggestions on a recent call. The HRITF team will revise the Results Framework accordingly.
<b>Balancing demand driven approach with need for strong</b> The TF needs to develop a more strategic approach in the choice of pilots. It needs to - map more precisely what is currently being funded - identify the gaps - discuss with donors/other partners - consider ways if necessary to incentivise TTLs The Bank should proactively explore interest for HRITF support in selected countries rather than using the "demand driven" approach (Cambodia, India) when interesting PBFs are in place or might be developed due to large poverty and need for RMNCH services.	Agree criterias need to be elaborated.	High	In progress	HRITF team to confirm status of mapping and proposed next steps. We would like the HRITF team to: undertake a mapping/overview of existing pilots and possibilities identify gaps give us an assessment of if and how HRITF can or could fill the gap. This could be done during fall 2012 (WB to confirm).	HRITF will share a concept note for an Innovation Funding Stream, which would help to diversify the portfolio. Diversifying the portfolio is critical at this stage as the funds are close to be fully committed.
A more flexible approach is needed to allow for individual country circumstances. E.g. countries are allowed to apply only once for a stream	Agree eligibility issues including repeat applications need to be looked at; criterias need to be elaborated.	High	In progress	HRITF team developing criteria for eligibility for repeat or expanded applications. Donors to agree criteria	We proposed criteria for repeater projects under Funding Stream 1. These criteria were discussed during a recent call with donors. The criteria are agreed through a written exchange and will be added to the HRITF Guidelines. It is important to be flexible but is also important to have clear criteria for fairness and to guide decision making.
<b>Improving and streamlining reporting</b> The Annual Report should focus on progress against the four HRITF objectives, as specified in the results framework.	Agreed	For 2013	Not in progress	HRITF team to restructure next Annual Report, due spring/summer 2013.	Agreed. The next Annual Report will align with the new Results Framework.
The need for 2 reports annually is excessive and bears important opportunity costs for the small HRITF team: the mid-year report should be dropped.	Agreed	High	In progress	HRITF team to make any necessary amendments to agreements/send confirmation letter.	Agreed. The mid-year report has been removed from legal agreements via an exchange of letters.
Annual work plans should become standardised, and relate explicitly to the four objectives and the results framework. Performance against work plans should be reported annually in the annual report. In this manner the work plan and linked annual report would become the main basis for the annual donor consultations, which should become more forward looking and strategic. Move from activity driven to strategic reporting.	Agreed. There needs to be a clear link between strategic plan, results framework, annual work plan and annual results.	High	N/K	HRITF team to respond - can this year's work plan be developed alongside the Results Framework?	We propose that annual work plans be shared every July, which aligns well with the Bank's Fiscal Year. We shared a summary of our FY13 work plan that was aligned with the draft Results Framework. This was discussed during a recent call with donors. We are considering how to revise the summary to better address donor needs moving forward.
Information on activities by country should be included in the main Annual Report as an Annex.	Agreed: already done for last Annual Report.	Done	Ongoing		We will continue to do this in future reporting.
More clear and explicit reference should be made in annual reports and work plans about staffing and capacity issues at the HRITF Team level given the substantial programme growth.	Agreed	High	N/K	To be included in work plan and annual workplan from 2012/2013.	Agreed. Staffing and capacity issues will be included in the 2013 Annual Report.

Donors should make more use of the secure donor website – the Bank should provide support to enable them to do so effectively if felt necessary	Agreed: DFID policy leads have not been using this but now have access. Norway has access to it.	Done	Ongoing		All donors should now have access. We are happy to provide support should any questions arise.
Efforts to improve expenditure planning and reporting should continue and progress monitored. There should be a revised financial reporting format which sets out much more clearly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the cash flow situation of the Trust Fund – clearly outlining revenues (investment income and donor contributions) and expenditures (by activity and by country) ;</li> <li>forecasts to be provided by activity and country by calendar year with a comparison of the previous year's expenditure with the actual one. Major discrepancies should be identified and a brief explanation noted. It is also recommended that donors should assess the accuracy of current expenditure projections in early 2013 using April to December 2012 expenditure figures when these become available.</li> </ul>	Partially agreed. We already receive reporting on the cash flow situation and expenditures. We do not regularly receive comparisons of forecast spend with actual, or previous year with current. This would be helpful. It would be good to have information on what amount has been planned- allocated-committed - disbursed.	For 2013	N/K	To be included in next annual report	We will continue to work on making the annual reports more responsive to donor needs including further financial analysis on areas such as deviations of actual expenditures from the forecasted amounts.
For the HRITF evaluation planned for 2015 evaluators should have full access to data from the secure donor connection from the outset.	Agree that evaluators will need access to necessary data to fulfill the ToRs; not clear yet whether this would mean the donor connection or not.	For 2015	Not in progress		The Bank only provides access to the secure donor connection to donors. If donors want to share access to the site prior to the 2015 evaluation, they can do so.
Donor consultations should focus on reviewing performance against the previous work plan and on the focus of the next work plan.	Agreed. Donor consultations should also review performance against the Results Framework.	For 2013	Not in progress	HRITF team to develop work plan	Agreed. Donor consultations should also provide an opportunity to raise any concerns and make key agreements necessary to move forward.
<b>Selection and operation of CPGs - policy level</b>					
There is a need for more thorough feasibility assessments, and for clarity about what aspects will be supported in the pilot when compared to the contents of the original application.	We see this primarily as a question for the Bank. Hence, WB should assess the recommendations and define any eventual follow-up				We believe this is how HRITF CPGs are managed today, particularly after the link to IDA preparation and quality review was strengthened in phase 3 and beyond. All initial approvals are preliminary and subject to completion of IDA program preparation with in-depth analysis, not only of the RBF component of the operation but of the overall program. So the thorough feasibility assessment that the report recommends is already built into the approval process of an IDA operation and is of course applied to the RBF mechanisms that are mainstreamed within that operation. HRITF team members participate in the review process at key stages. To improve clarity about what can be supported by the HRITF, frequently asked questions and answers have been developed and are shared with TTLs via the World Bank's intranet.

<p>In addition to country criteria the Bank should only support RBF pilots where it has the capacity to take them forward effectively e.g. TTL with practical experience on RBF, based in country/ country has a strong country team, close follow up from HRITF team in Washington and/or in the region, adequate time budgeted for donor/MoH interactions e.g. attending SWAp reviews</p>	<p>Agree that effective country support and engagement on the ground is essential (however this is achieved) and it is fair to include an assessment of the feasibility of this in the selection of pilots. However support needs to be assessed. TTLs with practical experience are few, can be compensated with training or other types of support. Would appreciate WBs view on this.</p>				<p>We strongly agree with the need for effective country support and engagement. To build capacity, HRITF will continue to train TTLs and work with country teams through trainings and other work program activities (e.g., BBLs, peer learning events, etc.)</p>
<p>Social analysis should be improved as a step prior to exploring social inclusion issues that are closely linked to gender, equity and poverty. The Bank has developed a social assessment toolkit that is expected to be used in all new CPG grants and linked IEs. We recommend the Bank (through the HRITF team) to ensure that the said toolkit is being used systematically and rigorously.</p>	<p>Agreed: understand that this was previously agreed with the Bank.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>N/K</p>	<p>HRITF team to advise status and use of social assessment toolkit. WB to report in annual report on status and challenges of implementing the inclusion of social analysis.</p>	<p>The Social Assessment Reference Guide is being drafted and should be delivered by June 2013. TTLs will be encouraged to apply relevant aspects of the Guide as they work with Governments to design RBF projects.</p>
<p><b>Strategically oriented and more hands-on HRITF team</b></p>					
<p>The Bank may need to strengthen the human resource base of the HRITF Team that appears way too narrow to respond to the challenges ahead. Either the team should grow or time from RBF experts should be freed up and purchased by HRITF for them to provide additional analytical support to the HRITF team and its programme manager</p>	<p>This seems primarily a question for the World Bank to consider.</p>				<p>We agree that the team needs to be strengthened. The team is planning on hiring to enhance the skills of the current team and purchasing the time of some experienced TTLs to provide support across the portfolio.</p>

<b>Monitoring, documentation and dissemination of learning and</b>					
<p>There needs to be a stronger focus on documenting designs and pilot implementation. Every country where a pilot is being designed or implemented should have a documentation requirement built in the design that collects, analyses and disseminates information on design, pre-pilot and pilot with an agreed periodicity and in a systematic manner. This task should be contracted out to enhance objectivity and accountability.</p>	<p>Agreed. Important to focus on documentation and dissemination of knowledge when it comes to implementation and designing of RBF.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>In progress</p>	<p>HRITF team developing enhanced ways to reach out to TTLs and capture learning, and disseminate learning including through learning events, workshops, internet publications. Should report on progress/what have been done in the annual report.</p>	<p>We agree that monitoring and documentation of progress at the country level should be an integral part of our work. Given that a lot of effort was put into preparing projects and getting them ready for implementation, it is now an opportune time to capture the lessons from implementation. As we see it, the focus of the monitoring would include qualitative information generated during design, pre-pilot, and pilot phases regarding issues such as demand for services, health worker motivation, incentive levels, and unintended effects. It would also include the more design/ process oriented issues like the political economy of RBF design, stakeholder analysis, legal issues affecting the design (facility autonomy for example), etc. In addition, it would capture any strengthening of health systems that occurs due to the pilots such as improved HMIS, or timely fund flows. This has been specified in our work program for the coming years and we will be able to share the lessons from implementation as we gather and analyze information.</p>
<p>The Bank needs to reach a balance at country level between the emphasis on IE (which many see as the main or only interest of the Bank) and an equal effort on documentation that is not yet visible enough at either country or global levels. Where documentation was underestimated or under-resourced at design, countries should be allowed and encouraged to apply for documentation funds from the HRITF.</p>	<p>Agreed: donors and HRITF team have already agreed potential for 'third way' evaluation where full impact evaluation is not possible.</p>	<p>Done</p>	<p>Complete</p>		<p>Donors and the HRITF team have agreed on a new evaluation grant, the enhanced program assessment. In addition, the HRITF is developing a strategy to capture additional lessons from implementation.</p>
<p>We would propose a more flexible approach allowing additional funding to be provided – especially for impact evaluations - where a strong case can be made for doing this.</p>	<p>It would be useful to elaborate criteria for what would be considered a strong case for additional funding. We have already agreed some expansion of funding for IE, but this recommendation seems to be broader.</p>	<p>For 2013</p>	<p>N/K</p>	<p>HRITF team to advise.</p>	<p>Additional funding for IE is made available on a case-by-case basis based on justification from the country team.</p>
<p>The Bank through the HRITF should have a stronger work programme to assess financial, operational and transaction costs linked to RBF implementation, and should use this information for learning purposes and to improve its own financial management and forecasting of financial needs linked to the HRITF programme.</p>	<p>Agreed. Assessment of costs should also fall into action to improve documentation.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>N/K</p>	<p>HRITF team to advise.</p>	<p>Please provide more clarity on what you are proposing we track.</p>
<p>The website should make greater distinction between types of content. It should prioritise those related to impact. This might be done by facilitating access to documents through additional entry points (e.g. by technical area, country, and through a search function), and to have a clearer separation between 'newsy' items and features, and the more technical documents including lessons and analyses.</p>	<p>Agreed: website has a wealth of useful information but can be difficult to navigate. Action to simplify this to make it more useful to the non-technical reader would be welcome. WB should make a brief review on use of the webpage and what info they request in order to tailor the webpage.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>N/K</p>	<p>HRITF team to advise.</p>	<p>The website was recently revamped. It is now easier to navigate and has a section to display results on the home page. The search function has also been improved to make it easier to access key documents.</p>

There should be more HRITF content on the website – including country pages with key operational documents.	Agreed: this should be a relatively easy fix and would be extremely helpful to external readers. We propose there is a clear link to an HRITF page or pages, which would make it easier to find.	Immediate	N/K	HRITF team to advise.	An HRITF section has been added to the website and country pages with links to key operational documents are being developed.
There should be a stronger and more clear link between the learning activities at country level and the regional and global HRITF learning programme, with the learning programme being far more visible than it is to date. Most TTLs were found to be uninformed about the priorities of the HRITF learning programme or the existence of such a programme, yet they are the primary sources from where information should flow.	Grateful for the Bank's views on this.				We agree that there should be a more clear link between the learning activities at country level and the regional and global learning program. We are trying to improve this link through the website, blog, learning events and RBF seminars.
The learning programme will need to reach out to the general RBF/PBF “communities of practice” that exist in Africa and Asia to explore possible avenues for collaboration and possible HRITF support to interesting opportunities for mutual learning.	We agree it is important to link other COP outside health as they could also learn from the Bank. However it would be useful to get WBs view and assessment of the recommendation.				We have an existing relationship with the Community of Practice in Africa and finance some of their activities through knowledge and learning grants. We hope to continue building on this work in the coming year.
The focus on training TTLs and Bank staff on RBF should continue, and it should be combined with the provision of more spaces and opportunities for them to discuss practical progress with RBF pilots and knowledge products, and to tap into regional communities of practice.	This seems primarily a question for the World Bank to consider.				The focus on training of Bank staff will continue. As many projects are now under implementation, we are looking at opportunities to analyze initial results, discuss, and improve upon our designs.
<b>Sustainability and attracting additional financing</b>					
Since the technical assistance inputs for bringing country institutions up to speed with RBF and IE design and implementation matters can be very substantial (cost and effort) it is recommended that capacity building plans become part of any pilot being implemented and that they are based on better capacity assessments during feasibility studies and pre-piloting, since the real capacity gaps cannot be fully assessed during the application process. This may require TTLs being allowed to apply for additional capacity building support funds, which in turn require the HRITF Team to be responsive and flexible in the way internal HRITF expenditure norms are applied.	Grateful for the Bank's views. We agree that capacity is important and that an assessment of capacity should be built into the feasibility study, the design and the proposal. It would be difficult to have additional proposals.				The HRITF now makes pre-pilot funding available when grants are approved which allows for better capacity assessments and increases the likelihood of successful pilots. At this time, capacity building is not financed separately.
The involvement of stakeholders at country level should become more systematically pursued (what should TTLs do and how often) and closely monitored given that information sharing at early stages and a regular dialogue might increase the chances for other donors to help with the scale up of pilots if these are successful.	Agreed: pilot/programs supported should be within governments priorities and plans. Good communication will have multiple benefits and TTLs responsible for HRITF programmes should be asked to prioritise this.	High	N/K	HRITF team to advise.	We encourage involvement of stakeholders at country level. The Social Assessment Reference Guide currently under development will also provide information and tools to facilitate stakeholder engagement at an early stage.
At global level the platform for keeping donors informed on Bank supported RBF initiatives and for exploring funding options remains narrow. While much will depend on results there should be more proactive information strategy with key health donors in each region: what is being piloted and researched? What preliminary results? How can donors help in an eventual scale up effort?	Information needs to be accessible at global level. In country dialogue with MOF and other donors is key.			For discussion.	We agree that it is important for information at the global level to be available. This is why we have revamped our communications strategy and website. The new HRITF project pages on the website will feature a section on partnerships. In addition, regular IWG meetings provide a forum for keeping donors informed about Bank-supported RBF initiatives.

<p>Steps should be taken for the HRITF Team to explore funding and sustainability issues linked to the RBF pilots well before these come to an end. The full cost implications (including transaction costs) of the RBF pilots should be better assessed and reflected in existing reports, as should a brief discussion of efforts being made at country level towards sustainable financing</p>	<p>Agree that good country level dialogue about next steps is essential; however decisions about full national scale up would be usefully informed by outcomes of impact evaluations and a full assessment of the cost implications. Welcome response from Bank to this.</p>			<p>For discussion.</p>	<p>We fully agree with the importance of ensuring that successful RBF pilots are scaled up and sustainable. Although we will work as hard as possible to facilitate scale up and sustainability through the HRITF, the current scope, mandate, and resources of the TF, although very effective in supporting pilots and experimentation, pose significant limitations to achieve this expanded objective. We have advanced, to the extent possible, this additional objective, particularly since phase three, by linking and leveraging HRITF with IDA for RBF. This has provided a larger financial envelope. However, we recognize that any substantial scale up is likely to require far more resources than those currently committed for HRITF. In this regard, we are engaging with clients and donors at country level, to ensure integration of the RBF approach in wider health financing for the sector, donor support, and to increase government's own contribution to the program.</p>
<p>Sustainability: the HRITF Team and donors should consider how best to deal with uncertainty relating to any failure of the countries to secure the rewards set out in their pilots. If necessary an options paper should be prepared</p>	<p>For discussion.</p>			<p>HRITF team to advise what the current approach is.</p>	<p>As countries are progressing with implementation, we are supporting selected country clients to develop a sustainable financial approach based on country context.</p>
<p>There should be more systematic reporting of additionality – assumptions/judgements need to be clearly set out</p>	<p>Agreed: we have no clear way to measure this at present and it is one of the four main HRITF objectives.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>In progress</p>	<p>HRITF team addressing this in work on the Results Framework.</p>	<p>While it would be extremely difficult to measure additionality, we can continue to report on IDA amounts linked to HRITF projects in our Annual Report.</p>