

CS Indicator for IHP+ future monitoring

Note for the Chair of the IHP+ Mutual Accountability Working Group

Proposed recommendations:

- Revise the indicator for civil society engagement previously used by IHP+Results by adding the words “meaningful” and “permanently” into the definition
- Maintain engagement of interested members of the CS indicator Working Group into future discussion on the process of operationalizing the indicator.

Background:

The IHP+ country health sector team’s meeting in Nairobi (Dec 2012) agreed that Civil Society engagement should be included amongst the 6 issues that will be tracked through future monitoring efforts. The IHP+ Mutual Accountability Working Group (MAWG) discussed proposed indicators for each of these issues (June 2013), and agreed on the following actions on monitoring CS engagement:

- Further work will be done for indicator 2 on engagement of civil society by a small sub-group, to see if it can be improved. This may entail adapting the CIVICUS enabling environment index, which is the approach currently considered by the GP (Busan monitoring).
- If the MAWG cannot agree on a revised indicator by October, the existing indicator will be used for the next round of monitoring.

The small working group has met by teleconference two times since then, in September and October 2013. Members of the working group were: Christian Acemah (CSO North/IOM, Chair), Rozina Mistry (CSO, South, Aga Khan University, Pakistan), Monique Kamphuis (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands), Tobias Luppe (Oxfam, Germany), Nicolas Bidault (Global Fund), Marjolaine Nicod (OECD), Tim Shorten (ResultsLab, Resource person), Finn Schleimann (World Bank and IHP+ Core Team), Carmen Dolea (IHP+ Core Team). This note presents the conclusions of the discussions.

Summary of discussions:

- There was consensus on the need to maintain an indicator on CSO engagement in policy processes within the new monitoring approach for IHP+.
- The proposed changes to the indicator used in the last round of IHP+ Results monitoring were to add the word “meaningful” in both government and DPs definition, and to add the word “permanently” to the numerator for government indicator.
- While acknowledging the importance of CSO participation in service delivery, the participants to the call endorsed the view that IHP+ monitoring process is concerned mainly with CSO engagement in the policy process, and not in the service delivery.
- The Enabling Environment Index (EEI) produced by CIVICUS was considered a good contextual reference for future monitoring of IHP+, but the actual scores were deemed insufficient for the purpose of IHP+ monitoring: the index mixes too much

information/data that is not directly related to CSO engagement in health policy making; and secondly, the coverage of African countries is very limited and does not include many of IHP+ partner countries. The GP will also not use the CIVICUS EEI in this round of monitoring, particularly because of lack of adequate data for the dimensions of the index that the GP is mostly interested in.

- Additional comments on the process for collecting data were seen as important, but it was unclear to what extent such questions are within the mandate of the small working group, or for that matter, of the Mutual Accountability Working Group; however, this issue was seen as very important for the future monitoring and the upcoming request for proposals.
- The mandate of the small working group is now finished. However members expressed an interest to maintain some kind of engagement with the MAWG and Core Team in relation to the process of operationalizing the indicator, particularly the process for data collection.