
From: Eriksen, Tom Edvard
Sent: 30. april 2014 18:05
To: Ass.Utenriksråd
Cc: NORAD-Post-EVAL; Seksjon for etatsstyring budsjett og forvaltning; Seksjon for multilateral utviklingsfinansiering og global økonomi; Haaland, Hege; Seksjon for budsjett, økonomistyring og forvaltning; Seksjon for globale initiativ
Subject: Rapportering fra oppfølging av evaluering av HRITF
Attachments: HRITF evaluering oppfølging.docx; Rapport for oppfølgingsplan av Verdensbankens flergiverfond for resultatbasert finansiering av helse.docx; 1100822-97 oppfølgingsnotat - evaluering av flergiverfondet for resultatbasert finansiering innen he 1092374_1_1 PDF - Adobe Reader.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Vedlagt følger det opprinnelige oppfølgingsplanen av evalueringen av det helsebaserte resultatfondet som ble sendt til Utenriksråden i januar 2013.

Vedlagt følger også rapport på oppfølgingsplanen med en oppdatert matrise med oppfølgingspunkter til godkjenning i henhold til Evalueringsinstruksen.

Tom Eriksen, Multiseksjonen

Rapport for oppfølgingsplan av Verdensbankens flergiverfond for resultatbasert finansiering av helse (HRITF)

Resultatbasert finansiering (se boks) er et av fem satsingsområder i FNs generalsekretærs globale kampanje for helsetusenårsmålene. Et flergiverfond i Verdensbanken (*Health Results Innovation Trust Fund, HRITF*), ble etablert av Norge i 2007 og er siden 2009 samfinansiert med Storbritannia. Det er et av de største helsefondene i Verdensbanken. Lav- og mellominntektsland kan søke om finansiell og faglig bistand til å teste ut ulike former for resultatbasert finansiering i sine helsetjenester. Målet med fondet er å øke kunnskapen om hvordan slik finansiering kan gi bedre resultater innen mødre- og barnehelse. Det er også et mål å utvide programmer som gir gode resultater i arbeidet med å redusere barne- og mødredødelighet. Det er igangsatt pilotprogrammer i 21 land, hvorav en håndfull er oppskalert til å dekke hele landet.

Norge har forpliktet seg til å støtte Verdensbankens flergiverfond med om lag to milliarder kroner i perioden 2007 til 2022. Storbritannia bidrar i flergiverfondet med omlag én milliard kroner i perioden 2009 - 2017. Per 2013 har Norge utbetalt 600 millioner kroner til fondet

Britiske HLSP gjennomførte i løpet av 2012 en midtveisgjennomgang av HRITF. Evalueringen ble presentert i april 2012. Norad har oppsummert evalueringen i sitt notat til ass. utenriksråd 11. september 2012. I etterkant av evalueringen diskuterte UD v/Multiseksjonen og Norad oppfølging av evalueringen med det britiske DFID.

UD og DFID utarbeidet en felles oppfølgingsplan. I desember 2012 mottok vi også kommentarer og oppdatering på planen fra Verdensbanken. Oppfølgingsplanen, datert 21.01.2013, er å anse som et levende dokument og er gjenstand for løpende dialog mellom giverne og Banken. Flere av tiltakene i den planen var allerede gjennomført da den ble presentert.

Vedlagte matrise er utarbeidet på bakgrunn av de anbefalingene som ikke var gjennomført per januar 2013. Som matrisen viser har Banken i dag gjennomført de aller fleste anbefalingene fra evalueringen, mens de få som ikke er fullført enten er under arbeid eller ikke skal gjennomføres før i 2015 da neste gjennomgang er planlagt.

Konklusjon

- Verdensbanken har i samarbeid med sine partnere og giverne til fondet (DFID og Norge) fulgt opp og gjennomført anbefalingene fra evalueringen på en tilfredsstillende måte
- De få resterende anbefalingene som ikke er gjennomført følges opp i forbindelse med de årlige giverkonsultasjonene med Banken.

Vedlegg: Oppsummering av oppfølgingsplan for midtveisgjennomgang av HRITF

Recommendation	Priority	Status
<p>Results Framework 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.</p>	Immediate	Complete: Revised and agreed new results framework
<p>Balancing demand driven approach with need for strong evidence base The TF needs to develop a more strategic approach in the choice of pilots. It needs to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - map more precisely what is currently being funded - identify the gaps - discuss with donors/other partners - consider ways if necessary to incentivise TTLs <p>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.</p>	High	Complete: A wider variety of pilot projects than earlier. The total number of programmes now 36.
<p>Improving and streamlining reporting</p>		
<p>The Annual Report should focus on progress against the four HRITF objectives, as specified in the results framework.</p>	For 2013	Complete: Reporting has been revised in 2013
<p>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.</p>	High	Ongoing: this has been improved, but not completed
<p>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.</p>	High	Ongoing: staffing level increased and overall capacity improved considerably.

<p>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: · the cash flow situation of the Trust Fund – clearly outlining revenues (investment income and donor contributions) and expenditures (by activity and by country) ; 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.</p>	<p>For 2013</p>	<p>Completed: revised financial reporting provided regularly</p>
<p>For the HRITF evaluation planned for 2015 evaluators should have full access to data from the secure donor connection from the outset.</p>	<p>For 2015</p>	<p>Will be set in progress for 2015evaluation Completed: annual donor consultation 2013.</p>
<p>Donor consultations should focus on reviewing performance against the previous work plan and on the focus of the next work plan.</p>	<p>For 2013</p>	<p>Completed for the annual donor consultation and report</p>
<p>Selection and operation of CPGs - policy level recommendations</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Completed for the annual donor consultation and report</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>Strategically oriented and more hands-on HRITF team</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>Completed: HR increased and capacity improved</p>
<p>Monitoring, documentation and dissemination of learning and evidence</p>		
<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>High</p>	<p>In progress: partly through implementation research and web-site</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>	High	Ongoing: web-site revised
<p>There should be more HRITF content on the website – including country pages with key operational documents.</p>	Immediate	Completes: now available
<p>Sustainability and attracting additional financing</p>		
<p>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.</p>		<p>Complete: The HRITF now makes pre-pilot funding available when grants are approved which allows for better capacity assessments</p>
<p>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.</p>	High	<p>Ongoing: close collaboration with e.g. GF, GAVI, etc.</p>
<p>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?</p>		<p>Ongoing/complete: web-site revised, meetings with partners, etc.</p>
<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>Ongoing: This has now been addressed while scaling up programmes</p>
<p>There should be more systematic reporting of additionality – assumptions/judgements need to be clearly set out</p>	High	<p>Complete: part of revised results framework and reporting</p>