

Africa Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) Working Group on Preparedness and Response - recommendations for the Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF) for Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and Response (PPR).

The Pandemic Action Network and PATH as co-chairs of the Africa Civil Society Organizations Working Group on Preparedness and Response, submits the below comments on behalf of the Working Group. Our submission covers the following; priorities that the FIF should focus on, governance and financing.

1. Focus of FIF financing:

As African CSOs we propose that in the initial phase of FIFs operationalization, the fund should prioritize:

- Building and enhancing systems and capacities for emergency preparedness including disease surveillance in low and middle-income countries.
- Investment in strengthening health systems in low-and-middle income countries (LMICs) including in a well-trained, well-equipped frontline health workforce and infrastructure capable of timely, agile, and effective infection prevention and control in the event of a serious outbreak while ensuring continued delivery of essential health services.
- Strengthening health research and development (R&D) and local manufacturing of medical countermeasures (MCM) in a coordinated manner in LMICs. Equitable access to MCMs should be core to the FIF priorities. As African countries work to strengthen their preparedness and response capabilities and with protracted and uncertain intellectual property (IP) waiver negotiations, it is important to ensure that R&D investments and MCM manufacturing are sustainable, efficient and able to ensure equitable access in the next pandemic.
- Investment in initiatives geared towards improving the health seeking behavior of individuals with the aim of improving demand for quality services and medical products
- Incentivizing new, diverse, and sustainable resources for pandemic preparedness beyond overseas development assistance (ODA) and health budgets and leveraging both public and private sources of finance. Such a fund should NOT contribute to further indebtedness of African countries.
- Cross-sectoral collaboration and promote an integrated, whole-of-government approach to pandemic preparedness, including health, security, environment/climate, One Health, and finance sectors to reflect the full reach and impact of pandemic threats.
- Link to measurable progress toward global preparedness indicators and support technical assistance to implement capacity-building and monitor and evaluate effectiveness, leveraging leading tools such as the Joint External Evaluation (JEE), the International Health Regulations (IHR) Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, and the Global Health Security Index.
- Strengthened national, regional, and global systems that can stop localized outbreaks from spreading, such as emergency operations centers, national public health institutes, communications networks, simulations, and pre-agreed response protocols.

Governance:

- On the representation of different constituencies in the governance of the FIF, we dissuade the Bank from the categorisation of countries as recipients. This takes away their power to engage and provide co-leadership at a time when governance and operationalisation of a new global fund for Pandemic Preparedness and Response is being discussed. As African CSOs, we propose that instead of recipient countries, focus be put on where the most affected and vulnerable populations are and as we have seen from COVID-19 pandemic, these can be in any part of the world. We encourage consistency in phrasing in part 9 of the paper all throughout the document — *The FIF would allocate additional financing where investments are most urgently needed to bolster PPR ...*
- We urge the Bank to consider an enhanced role for regional organizations in pandemic governance and inclusion of regional institutional representatives alongside Member States representation in the structure and composition of the governing board. Given the diversity of the African continent which in itself is reflected in the existence of different economic blocks, we urge that besides Member States representation, a high level representation from the African Union Commission (AUC) or Africa CDC be included in the governing board. The AUC and Africa CDC have provided continental leadership in response to COVID-19 pandemic and have attracted immense political will and trust that would be critical at this level.

Financing

- This FIF can be unique in a positive way. The Bank should not work so hard to make it conform to other FIFs in existence. As African CSOs, we urge for adoption of the [Global Public Investments](#) (GPI) approach that would blur if not eliminate unhelpful classification of countries as poor or rich, contributing or recipient countries that have been the bane of such global efforts in the past. GPI is an approach where all countries contribute, all countries benefit and all countries get to decide with the civil society having a seat at the decision making table — not just relegated to observer status. Since GPI includes all countries as contributors, resource constrained countries have the opportunity to mobilize domestic funding for agreed PPR priorities and globally agreed outcomes in areas such as regulatory harmonization and building regional manufacturing capacity among others.
- We note that the FIF would be channeled through implementing entities such as WHO and other UN agencies, the World Bank and other MDBs. As African CSOs, we propose that global health institutions such as CEPI, Gavi and the Global Fund be **explicitly** included as implementing partners. These institutions play a critical role in the PPR ecosystem ranging from procurement to deployment of countermeasures and essential medical supplies and therefore are a key part of the PPR ecosystem. We have further seen the value of CSOs especially in fragile settings and other hard-to-reach areas. Our work has guaranteed health equity, access and contributed towards reducing suffering and death during pandemics. We strongly advise that FIF considers channeling and

leveraging the comparative advantage that CSOs bring in addressing health inequalities, access barriers and reaching fragile and hard-to-reach environments.

Sincerely,

Africa Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) Working Group on Preparedness and Response

KANCO

PATH

Pandemic Action Network