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What is IHP+?

The International Health Partnership is a global partnership that puts the Paris principles on aid effectiveness into practice, with the aim of improving health services and health outcomes, particularly for the poor and vulnerable.

Paris principles: National ownership; alignment with national systems; harmonization between agencies; managing for results; mutual accountability.

Began in 2007

Why IHP+?

- Progress towards the health MDGs remains **inadequate**.
- Many health system constraints are **unaddressed**.
- Global and domestic investment in health is **insufficient**.
- International funding is **unpredictable**.
- Support to countries is **inefficient** – rising numbers of partners; risks of fragmentation, duplication.
Who is part of IHP+?

**Developing Countries**
- **Africa**: Benin; Burundi; Burkina Faso; Djibouti; DR Congo; Ethiopia; Kenya; Madagascar; Mali; Mozambique; Niger; Nigeria; Rwanda; Senegal; Uganda; Zambia
- **Asia**: Cambodia; Nepal; Vietnam

**Developed Countries**
- Australia; Canada; Finland; France; Germany; Italy; Portugal; Netherlands; Norway; Spain; Sweden; United Kingdom

**Development partners**
- African Development Bank; European Commission; GAVI; Global Fund; International Labor Organization; UNAIDS; UNDP; UNFPA; UNICEF; WHO; World Bank; Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

**Civil Society Organizations**

*Any country or organization willing to sign the 'IHP+ Global Compact' can join*
The key ingredients of IHP+

Increased support for **one national health strategy**, by supporting

- **National sector planning processes**, government leadership of those processes
- Greater partner confidence in strategy, by ‘joint assessment’
- One system for partner support to the strategy – **compacts on alignment etc**
- **One results monitoring framework**, to track strategy implementation
- Greater mutual accountability – by **monitoring compact commitments**

Assumed benefits

- Better results through better use of existing funds, even without new money
- Stronger government leadership in sector coordination
- Reduced transaction costs, therefore more time for implementation

What it means for WHO: supporting national planning processes

- **Kenya**
  - WR used IHP to stimulate debate / support among government and partners on key health policy & performance issues, at a difficult time
  - Helping to review current health situation; achievements since 1994; develop policy options, priorities for medium term
  - WR and country office staff active in both the analysis and policy debate
  - HQ: HSS and IER staff involved; RO limited engagement

- **Related WHO activities**
  - CO: RO, HQ: Support in other countries – but mixed
  - HQ: support to AFRO sub-regional offices, to build expertise in policy dialogue and planning
  - HQ: guidance on support to national planning processes being developed
What it means for WHO supporting 'joint assessment' of national strategies

A shared approach to assessing strengths and weaknesses of national strategies, that is accepted by multiple partners as a basis for technical and financial support

- Ethiopia, Nepal, Vietnam interested
  - Will use IHP+ tool and guidelines; timing and process determined by in-country processes
  - Is complex and sensitive process; political as well as technical skills needed
  - WRs are engaged; range of CO staff will be involved, plus back up if needed from RO/HQ

- Related WHO activities
  - HQ: joint desk reviews of national health plans from programme perspectives
    - HDS; MPS, TB; HIV; RBM; CHP; MSD; EPI plus UNAIDS

What it means for WHO supporting more unified system of partner support

- Through Compacts: negotiated agreements between partners on how they will support the national health strategy. IHP has developed 'ideal' set of compact benchmarks

- Kenya
  - 2007 Code of Conduct sets out partner commitments to align programmes and projects with overall plan; to joint reviews, shared responsibility for progress
  - Signed by MOH, treasury, major development partners, NGOs, private sector
  - Code reviewed against IHP compact benchmarks. WR and WB rep managed sensitive in-country debate on the differences. Informing next review of the Code.

- Related WHO activities
  - HQ: toolkit on harmonization and alignment, for country teams
What it means for WHO
more unified reporting and performance monitoring

- **Kenya**
  - As part of policy review, MOH(s) using ‘common monitoring and evaluation framework’ to coordinate review of health trends and system performance. Multiple institutions involved.
  - WHO CO: leading partners' engagement in analysis, with APHRC
  - WHO HQ: IER supporting overall analysis

- **Related WHO activities, with partners**
  - Country level: framework used in Ethiopia, Mali, Zambia to review current reporting and performance monitoring systems
  - HQ/RO: development of ‘Country Health System Surveillance Platform’ as vehicle to improve data quality and use, and progressively reduce transaction costs of reporting

---

### Monitoring & Evaluation of health systems reform /strengthening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator domains</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Analysis &amp; synthesis</th>
<th>Communication &amp; use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs &amp; processes</strong></td>
<td>Administrative sources</td>
<td>Data quality assessment; Estimates and projections; In-depth studies; Use of research results; Assessment of progress and performance of health systems</td>
<td>Targeted and comprehensive reporting; Regular country review processes; Global reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>Facility assessments</td>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention access &amp; services readiness</strong></td>
<td>Coverage of interventions</td>
<td><strong>Prevalence risk behaviours &amp; factors</strong></td>
<td>Improved health outcomes &amp; equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention quality, safety and efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Social and financial risk protection</td>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td>Clinical reporting systems</td>
<td><strong>Coverage &amp; welfare</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financing</strong></td>
<td>Population-based surveys</td>
<td><strong>Service readiness, quality, coverage, health status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health workforce</strong></td>
<td>Vital registration</td>
<td><strong>Health infrastructure, medicines etc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply chain</strong></td>
<td><strong>ICT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intervention access &amp; services readiness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intervention quality, safety and efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation of health systems reform /strengthening</strong></td>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Financing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Health workforce</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Supply chain</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
common questions

- What is the difference between IHP+ and a SWAp? What is the added value of IHP+?
- Will there be more money?

What is the difference between IHP+ and a SWAp? What is the added value of IHP+?

- Basic principles are the same
- In some cases, helped revive an existing SWAp, expand to new partners; compact commitments to support the national plan more explicit
- More harmonization across agencies – tools (e.g., joint assessment tool), procedures
- More emphasis on mutual accountability; global leverage via Global Compact

"IHP+ is logical extension of what we are already doing"
Will there be more money?

No guarantees – IHP+ itself is not a new funding mechanism
But are two important global developments

- Outcomes of Taskforce on Innovative Health System Financing – some new sources of funds

- Health system funding platform
  - Aim: more efficient channelling of resources
  - Involves GAVI Alliance; Global Fund; World Bank, others, facilitated by WHO
  - Based on country health plan

Looking ahead: whither IHP+?

- Future of IHP+
  - Short term funding, but a sound long-term set of principles for supporting countries – in terms of content and process
  - Challenge: how to integrate IHP+ principles into the daily work of WHO

- Questions
  - National health plan development – what is the role of HQ and regional offices? How different from what we are doing now? Can we add more value?
  - How effectively are we working with key partners for example World Bank, DFID, Global Fund, to get greater coordination and alignment with national plans?
  - What would be the implications of expanding WHO's engagement in national planning processes for WHO programme activities and budgets?