

Civil Society Feedback: Financial Intermediary Fund for Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and Response

Feedback from the Nuclear Threat Initiative

The Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) appreciates the time and effort the World Bank took to put together this White Paper, which clearly outlines the problem, challenges, and potential solutions over the near term to rapidly scale up global preparedness and response capacities.

We commend the World Bank, World Health Organization (WHO), and the G20 governments for their efforts to clearly define the need through several rounds of consultation and engagement with civil society and the private sector. [This is clearly seen as multiple countries and organizations – such as NTI– have already committed money to the FIF once created.](#) We specifically would like to commend the World Bank for highlighting the following as part of this white paper:

- Complementarity with existing structures and not duplicating efforts, which is a critical part of any system improvement;
- The need for future investments in pandemic preparedness and response, including through the incentivization of domestic funding lines in national budget processes; and
- The need for a more coordinated and coherent approach, which the FIF can provide, particularly through the needed mobilization of non-ODA funding.

The key principles outlined by the World Bank in Paragraph 6 of this paper clearly get at the heart of the problem and, if kept in high regard throughout negotiations, would radically transform the global system while avoiding broader system fragmentation. **NTI looks forward to the Executive Board’s decision and stand ready to support efforts to improve global preparedness, including through better monitoring and evaluation using tools such as the Global Health Security Index.**

Additionally, **NTI notes the Focus Areas for Financing in Paragraph 9 are critical areas for system improvement, particularly as countries seek to comply with the International Health Regulations.** These needs should align with the IHR Monitoring and Evaluation Framework by prioritizing efforts under the National Action Plans for Health Security. These plans have been developed based on the best available data, country buy-in, and WHO support and provide a pathway for rapidly impacting system development. The proposed FIF must support the funding of these plans thereby providing a key role for national governments in priority setting and guiding implementation.

We are, however, concerned about the following points and would highly encourage the World Bank and other founding partners to consider them fully during FIF negotiation and development. To support these points, we have also included key questions for discussion during negotiations that we believe are critical to solve and for which to account.

- **The centrality of national ownership and buy-in:** It is imperative that countries remain at the center of these efforts and all activities taken support their rapid capability development. This should not simply be a “Fund of Funds”, where financing for country capacity development is only routed through existing funding organizations. While we recognize that fiscal discipline is needed and accreditation mechanisms are in place for this reason, there should be no barrier for countries to receive funding through approved mechanisms as well as have control over prioritization and agenda setting.

Founding members of the FIF must consider if this structure is appropriate for the magnitude of the need and determine the best mechanisms to ensure gaps at the country level are ameliorated.

- As “matching” has been a significant portion of the global conversation around need and ensuring domestic investment in pandemic preparedness, how will the FIF encourage such a structure? Matching could be implemented by countries being able to show their current capacity gaps by way of an external assessment and their plan for future, multi-year national-level budgets that leverages the matching grant.
 - How can countries be encouraged to show commitment to preparedness, both from a technical perspective, but also from a resource and finance perspective? By publishing feedback from the FIF Governing Board and accredited mechanisms, this transparency could allow for further encouragement to countries to show that the process and funding is working well and providing results towards filling gaps in capacity.
- **Focus and attention on capacity building:** While we commend the interest in funding learning and convening exercises under the FIF, we would caution that these programs be minimal, not taking up significant budget, and in line with country needs and requests. Priority must be given to building capacity at the country-level to prevent the next pandemic and empowering national entities to develop their systems. Additionally, should the FIF be funded through a regular replenishment cycle, we encourage the World Bank to consider existing cycles for other organizations and schedule accordingly to minimize competition and duplication of funding to help ensure there is a global increase in funding instead of simple reallocations.
 - How will funding proposals be considered, particularly given the World Bank’s noted interest in utilizing eligible entities? How can we ensure that countries remain prioritized in these efforts, and we meaningfully fill noted gaps at country level? Similar to the above, leveraging existing external evaluations as part of the proposal considerations could show commitment to transparency and country-level prioritization and involvement.
 - To reduce burden on countries and organizations, how will the World Bank streamline and standardize reporting frameworks and needs across organizations and eligible entities? Annual or biannual reporting would be helpful in driving progress towards solidifying the FIF and showing progress towards addressing existing gaps.
- **An emphasis on multisectorality as part of FIF design:** All sectors of society must be clearly represented as part of these efforts. For the purposes of full representation, the security sector should be effectively incorporated in this paper, particularly as they were a key partner for many countries in pandemic response. Additionally, the private sector must be adequately represented within FIF operations and structure, not simply viewed as a funding source. Negotiators must find concrete ways to incorporate their views and participation effectively.
 - How will the World Bank fund eligible entities beyond the health sector through the FIF, such as other United Nations and multilateral organizations focused on non-health topics, such as the security sector? Using National Action Plans for Health Security could be a way to capture all eligible entities as identified by countries and regional organizations.
 - How are founding FIF members able to affect change and new thinking in FIF application to ensure it meets the current need and draws upon all relevant players to support country preparedness?

- **Clear and meaningful civil society participation:** It is also critical that civil society have a voice and position in the decision making of the FIF, particularly when it has provided financial backing for the fund. We call on WHO, the World Bank, and other partners to consider inclusion of representatives within the governing board itself in a concrete manner as negotiations proceed.
 - How are civil society organizations to be included in the governance structure of the organization? Representation across sectors for civil society organizations would be a good approach to ensure broad equities are addressed and that decision are even more well informed.
 - What is the process for FIF governance negotiations and how can civil society be effectively engaged?