

Richard Seifman

From: Richard Seifman [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, May 27, 2022 4:16 PM

To: Consultations <consultations@worldbank.org>

Subject: Comment re "Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF) for Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and Response" from Richard Seifman

[External]

Dear World Bank former Colleagues,

Congratulations to those who have pursued the initiative and produced the White Paper draft, which is one which I have understand commits this institution and its partners to a multisector approach to infectious diseases.

I offer the following comments:

- 1) What I found missing --or at least I did not see in the White Paper is explicit mention of an Independent Evaluation Group equivalent.
 - In my view, this should not be simply assumed but needs to be spelled out in the document.
- 2) WHO plays what appears to be the only non-Bank technical entity.
 - In my view WHO does not have the expertise or orientation to deal with One Health aspects such as zoonotic prevention
- 3) Engagement of civil society and the private sector
 1. Advisory committees are invaluable "if" they are drawn upon in the decision making process. This is not always the case,
- 4) In going forward with this new FIF I suggest an in-depth review of the Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility (PEF). This assessment/reassessment should be in various regards, including its design, implementation, and costs. In particular PEF limitations in responding to an epidemic unfolding in one country that has the potential to morph into a cross-border pandemic. The result of the review should be a separate paper accompanying to be shared publicly, thus assuring full transparency.

The objective of my comments is simply to assure that this new Prevention, Preparedness, and Response Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF), will succeed in facing future new infectious disease challenges.

Regards

Richard Seifman
World Bank Senior Health Advisor (retired)