IHP+ Executive Team Meeting, 15 September 2011
Note for the Record

Participants
Civil Society (Northern), European Commission, GAVI, Global Fund, Sierra Leone, Sudan, UNFPA, UNICEF; United Kingdom, WHO, World Bank.
Written inputs from Southern CS; verbal comments from Ausaid.
Consultants: Martin Taylor, Leo Devillé

ACTIONS:
- Core team to circulate draft IHP+ Phase 3 Workplan and finalized consultant report by the end of September, and share the two Busan documents
- The next ET meeting is scheduled on 20th October.

Main agenda item: Options for future strategic directions of IHP+

1) Conclusions from consultation with stakeholders: presented by consultants
- Broad consensus on continued need for IHP+, and on core priority areas. IHP+ should:
  - Continue the 5 areas of work with a stronger focus on results, mutual accountability, and lessons learned.
  - Continue to focus on countries, but maintain its role in global public goods, and as convenor.
  - Remain open to new partners. Continue to foster increased CS engagement, especially at country level.
- Options for IHP+ in terms of scope and ambition
  In the interviews, there was a wide range of opinions on appropriate level of ambition, deliverables and whether IHP+ should do more on HSS. To aid further discussion, the report summarises opinions in a table with 2 dimensions:
    - IHP+ Scope: either stays largely the same, or same plus adds support for HSS;
    - Deliverables (cast in terms of improved aid coordination in countries): 2-3 countries or up to 15.
      The report groups the range of opinions into four categories A-D, to facilitate discussion
- Options for type of partnership needed to achieve / sustain agreed deliverables
  - Summary table of workload implications, for Core Team and signatories

2) Main points from the ET discussion
The report was welcomed, and felt to well reflect a wide range of opinions, and present options on IHP+’s future in a clear, well organized way. Most discussion focused on future level of ambition.

Key points from the discussion on future level of ambition were:
- **Reinforcement of some key messages** in the report: IHP+ plays a unique catalytic role in bringing the aid effectiveness agenda to a higher level and ensuring a sustained focus on aid effectiveness in the health sector. IHP+ should build on its existing strengths; remain country demand driven and avoid becoming too rigid.
- **On deliverables**, there were notes of caution about framing deliverables simply in terms of a target number of countries in which there is progress, as this could become intrusive and make IHP+ more inflexible and top down. An alternative way suggested to frame deliverables could be in terms of progress across the five work areas, and in terms of results. Several mentioned that IHP+’s global public goods e.g. its tools, should remain key deliverables.
- Questions were raised about the extent to which development agencies were integrating tools into their regular ways of working, and that scale up of support for JANS should not be forgotten.
- **At global level** IHP+ should position itself in relation to the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, and look for other practical ways to increase its political influence.
- Several mentioned the need to clarify linkages between IHP+ and the Health Systems Funding Platform.
- **Three issues were noted to be largely missing from the report:** role of the regional level of agencies and networks; opportunities for S-S collaboration, and what IHP+ should be doing to improve engagement of the private sector in national policy processes.

- **The most unclear and controversial area remains IHP+’s role in health system strengthening:** Several commented on the need for IHP+ to avoid duplicating work on HSS done by other agencies or networks - at global and at regional level. However, the 2 country participants as well as some others emphasized the need for good HSS support at country level.

In summary, ET views on ‘Scope and Ambition’ covered all options A to D but additional comments and caveats suggested a larger consensus along the lines of option C, with the role of IHP+ in system strengthening activities remaining - at least for the time being - related to those most concerned with aid effectiveness.

The discussion on **future IHP+ governance** was limited as the ET wants more time to consider the questions posed. There were comments that IHP+ principles are beginning to be better embedded at higher levels within signatory agencies.

The core team reiterated that the level of ambition has to be influenced by the role all signatories are able to play in achieving objectives, and the resources available. There is a need to be realistic about how much the partnership can do and how much financial support can be mobilized in hard financial times. It reinforced a point that at country level many agency staff are actively supporting the IHP+ agenda in different ways. It stressed that added political leverage very much depends on support from all partners, not just the core team.

The Core Team estimates the cost of maintaining work in 5 existing areas, with some additions such as lesson learning, and working with a larger number of countries, is approximately US$9-10 million over the next 2 years. This is roughly the same level of funds as was mobilized for work plan 2 - i.e. the Core Team thinks that a work plan and deliverables along the lines of option C (with the 2 added options at the bottom of the table) would be feasible within that budget.

**In conclusion**
- Martin and Leo will finalise their report. It will be shared with all signatories and put on the website.
- A draft Phase 3 work plan will be circulated by end September that takes account of this discussion. For discussion in October ET. Outstanding issues can be discussed as the work plan is finalized and during its implementation.
- IHP+ governance issues should be the focus for future discussion within the ET. This will include findings ways for future ET meeting agendas to better reflect country expressed needs.

**2. Preparation for HLF4 in Busan**
- The Core Team noted plans for a possible side event at HLF4 in Busan – a panel discussion that will primarily focus on strengthening accountability of results at country level. In addition, IHP+ may be put forward as a “building block” of aid effectiveness (both documents attached).

**3. Any Other Business**
- IHP+ has 3 new country signatories: Cape Verde, Cote D’Ivoire, Guinea.
- Senegal is in the process of developing its compact.
- Nicole Klingen (WB) now HNP Sector Manager, Finn Schleimann takes over as WB lead on IHP+ and the HSFP.
- UNICEF noted that a new health initiative will be announced September 20 and is expected to launch it in Busan.