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Overall Management Response:

WHO welcomes the comprehensive report on the External Evaluation of the Pandemic Influenza preparedness partnership Contribution – High Level implementation plan 2013-2016. WHO is pleased with the overall finding that “all Areas of Work have made progress towards targets and, on-the-whole, stakeholders report that HO member states are better prepared than they were prior to support from the PIP partnership Contribution.” Other key positive findings include, by area of work:

1) Laboratory & Surveillance: “Laboratory and surveillance capacity improved across detection, monitoring and sharing. The number of priority countries considered well-prepared for detection increased from seven to 26; the number able to monitor epidemiological data increased from seven to 17 and the number able to monitor virological data increased from 27 to 33. A total of 30 countries shared influenza viruses with WHO at least once a year in the previous two years.”

2) Burden of Disease: “The burden of disease team provided training for regional office staff and supported the development of burden studies in around 67 countries.”

3) Regulatory Capacity: “Progress was made towards each of the outputs for regulatory capacity building. The regulatory capacity building AOW achieved its target of developing guidelines and is now rolling them out in target countries. The AOW assessed capacity and developed institutional development plans in 14 out of 16 priority countries.”

4) Planning for deployment: “Stakeholders noted that countries are increasingly running self-assessments and round-table simulations for emergency situations. Countries are also beginning to diversify deployment plans that were previously focussed on resource mobilisation, to include aspects such as development of staff rosters for use in health emergencies, and engagement of relevant private sector partners.”

5) Risk Communications: “The risk communications AOW has made considerable progress in developing training material, with a total of five modules accessible on the WHO website. The number of registered users of online material at the end of 2016 was 598, exceeding the initial target of 500. Additionally, web-based risk communications training material is now accessible to all Member States in 18 languages.”

WHO acknowledges that the evaluation also provided a number areas for improvement to strengthen implementation in the next phase, as more specifically detailed the recommendations provided in the report. Specific comments on each recommendation are found in the remainder of this Management Response. Finally, WHO acknowledges the time limitations that constrained the evaluator in collecting meaningful data for analysis. Note has been made that while interviews were conducted with a broad range of stakeholders, the evidentiary bases for the conclusions were mostly founded on opinion, at times from just one or two individuals.

The PIP Framework is not a traditional WHO project – it is a bold new approach to build a broad-based partnership with non-traditional partners, notably industry, to address pandemic influenza preparedness – a critical concern for global health security – one that requires cooperation and collaboration across all sectors and stakeholder groups. Expectations for equitable sharing of benefits are predicated on the rapid and timely sharing of viruses with pandemic potential. Future external evaluations will ensure:
- adequate time is allotted to carry out the evaluation and collect meaningful data;
- a summary of overarching strengths and “what went well” is paired with opportunities for improvement.
- Opinion or comments are placed in the context of who is providing the opinion or comments and how widely they are shared.
- Greater emphasis on evidence-based findings and conclusions will be sought.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Response Status</th>
<th>In process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>31 May 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations and Action Plan

**Recommendation 1: Improve logframe design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Issue summary</th>
<th>Specific action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee observations:</td>
<td>Challenging to define overall progress and impact, progress, and links between activities, outputs, and outcomes</td>
<td>The PIP Secretariat should consider redesigning the logframe with the following aims:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Weak links between activities and indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Define impact at the global, regional and country level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Difficulty in defining impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Design and articulate robust linkages between activities, and achievement of outputs, outcomes, and impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Difficulty in measuring progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide sufficient modulation in indicators to highlight progress on an annual basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk research:</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Account for the starting point for various priority countries (i.e. more might be expected from some countries than others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Logframe includes several binary indicators, and few progress indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Impact: Work planning is more straightforward and more likely to lead to measurable impact*

**Management response**

The Management accepts this recommendation. Based on lessons learnt from implementation to date, the definitions of the outcomes, and outputs, along with indicators of progress and results, can be improved. Revisions will be made to take effect from 1 January 2018 or as soon as implementation begins under the new high level implementation plan. In the WHO results hierarchy, the “outcome” – which is the expected change that the project aims to achieve - is the equivalent of what Dalberg refers to as “impact”. Outcomes and associated indicators are defined at country level and global level, but will be reviewed and improved as necessary. Currently, outcomes and associated indicators are not defined at regional level, but they will be in the future implementation plan. Management accepts the need for more progress indicators (milestones) and will introduce these in the next implementation plan, or sooner if possible. Management will ensure that annual reporting will account for different stages of development within a given country, and progress achieved will be measured from country-specific baselines.

**Status**

In progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop progress indicators across all AOW</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>initiated</td>
<td>The indicators will be developed in close collaboration with RO, AOW and IHM DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop clear outcomes, outputs and associated indicators with clear causal links between activities, outputs and outcomes</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>initiated</td>
<td>The revised log frame components will be developed in close collaboration with RO, AOW and IHM DO as well as relevant external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 2: Improve reporting granularity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Issue summary</th>
<th>Specific action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All industry partners interviewed noted:</td>
<td>Industry partners question program implementation success, in part, due to lack of visibility of detailed expenditure</td>
<td>The PIP Secretariat should consider the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Insufficient detail over activities provided in reporting</td>
<td>Limited accountability at activity-level</td>
<td>• Monitoring and reporting financial disbursements down to the activity level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other interviewee observations:</td>
<td></td>
<td>– This would require more detailed, country-level financial reports and retrospective activity reports (including at country and regional office level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Current system does not ensure that funding recipients spend resources on activities as planned, reducing accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td>– This should include all activities of funding recipients and at the Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Desk research:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessing how best to collect laboratory and surveillance data from countries themselves, to ensure an accurate understanding of existing capacities (as well as financial data mentioned above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Secretariat ceased activity monitoring in 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>– One option is to consider external verification of activities and/or capacities – for example by engaging WHO CCs to monitor progress against specific outputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact:** Relevant stakeholders are held accountable for expenditure and outputs, and this is shared with contributors

**Management response**

In accordance with WHO financial rules, disbursements are recorded at the activity level using the WHO financial tracking system (GSM). WHO has clear and strict rules regarding expenditure of funds against detailed activity plans in GSM. Management questions the usefulness of reporting on financial disbursements at the activity level in external stakeholder reports. Activity level expenditures are not included in external reports due to the impact that such reporting would have on the size of reports and the increased workload this would entail. WHO’s Internal Control Framework drives compliance with WHO financial rules. Management agrees that expenditure rates (% of funds spent as compared to fund allocation) for activities at all 3 levels of the Organization, including the PIP Secretariat, may be provided through the PIP portal on a regular basis. The suggestion that capacity indicator data collected semi-annually for laboratory and surveillance could be shared, confidentially, with WHO CCs for verification, once such sharing has been agreed to by each individual Member State concerned, merits further review and could be pursued. Finally, Management agrees to consider introducing country level reporting through development of PIP country profiles which would be updated annually. These profiles would include a report on activities completed, results achieved, and challenges.

**Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update PIP portal</td>
<td>30 September 2017</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Updates to include expenditure rates for activities at the 3 WHO levels, including the PIP Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure approval from specific MS to share L&amp;S capacity indicator data with WHO CCs</td>
<td>30 September 2017</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>RO to share information with CCs on confidential basis as part of the ongoing capacity building collaboration between WHO and WHOCCS, subject to MS agreement on sharing data with CCs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendation 3: Provide clarity on country prioritisation

### Observations
- Many interviewees noted:
  - Process did not sufficiently involve countries
  - Criteria were not clearly communicated
- Some interviewees noted:
  - Prioritization outcomes did not yield most appropriate countries
- Desk research:
  - Prioritization process (for L&S) applied criteria objectively to all eligible countries\(^1\) although secondary factors often outweighed the outcome of primary scoring criteria.

### Issue summary
Country prioritization process is opaque, leading to some misgivings over suitability of prioritization criteria

### Specific action
The PIP Secretariat should consider the following:
- Communication of the country prioritization process itself will be critical to ensure support for the process among all member states:
  - The PIP Secretariat should consider whether responsibility for such communication sits most efficiently within the Secretariat itself, or at regional office level
  - All eligible countries should be made aware of the opportunity for PIP Partnership Contribution support and of the assessment criteria
- Prioritization criteria should be clear to all relevant stakeholders, including how and when expert opinion will be used as criteria

**Impact:** All eligible countries and other stakeholders understand decisions around future support

### Management response
Management accepts that enhanced communications on the country prioritization and selection process will be beneficial, and has already taken steps, in close collaboration with all Regional Office and headquarters-based areas of work, to achieve this. WHO CCs will be involved in the process to select countries in the Laboratory & Surveillance and Burden of Disease areas of work. The revised approach will be implemented as part of the second high level implementation plan. Management observes that the country prioritization and selection criteria and process were described in great detail in the 2013-2016 Implementation Plan (pages 9-11) and that the Regional Offices worked closely with countries to identify and select target countries.

### Status
**In progress**

### Key actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete country profiles according to agreed criteria</td>
<td>PIP Secretariat &amp; RO</td>
<td>15 July 2017</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review country profiles and select priority countries</td>
<td>PIP Secretariat, GIP, RO and WHO CCs</td>
<td>30 July 2017</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation 4: Speed up work plan approvals

\(^1\) Dalberg did not assess the suitability of prioritization outcomes
### Observations

- Many interviewees noted:
  - Work plan approval process takes longer-than-expected
  - Work plan reviewers often request several detailed iterations before approval
  - Work plan templates do not require sufficient description of rationale for choice of activities
- Industry partners noted:
  - Variable contributions (by year) create business planning challenges
  - No visibility over work plans before contributions are made, creates internal approval challenges
- Some interviewees noted:
  - Submitted work plans are often low quality and do not provide sufficient information for approval
- Desk research:
  - Work plans do not contain sufficiently explicit and detailed rationale for proposed expenditure to warrant immediate approval (without further discussion)

### Issue summary

Implementation progress was restricted by work plan approval delays

### Specific action

The PIP Secretariat should consider the following:

- Adjusting the work plan templates to enable:
  - Inclusion of relevant detail and articulation of linkages between activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact
  - Harmonization with WHO Global Systems Management (GSM) system
- Where countries and regions do not complete work plans to an adequate level, the Secretariat should consider investigating the root causes of this and what solutions exist to address them (i.e. additional capacity/support, retraining, etc.)
- Moving to a biennial funding cycle:
  - This could reduce funding disbursement delays (in year 2)
  - This would enable and require longer-term planning by all actors, including funders and funding recipients
  - This could also have advantages in aligning the PIP Partnership Contribution with the WHO PB
  - (This could also at least partially address industry partners’ desire to approve work plans before making contributions)

### Management response

Management accepts that the template should be revised to help strengthen the linkages between activities, outputs and outcomes, and is already working to improve the work plan template. Management acknowledges that aligning the PIP planning and approval cycle to the WHO biennial cycle would be beneficial and will work toward this objective; however, it must be borne in mind that funds are received annually and thus, funds can only be released annually. Management does not agree with the suggestion that industry partners approve work plans in advance of their making annual payments, for several reasons: a) the PIP Framework is an access and benefit sharing arrangement wherein industry has access to GISRS materials and information without any prerequisites and the counterpart expectations are conclusion of SMTA2 and annual payment of Partnership Contribution; b) there could be a

### Impact:

Implementation can proceed with fewer delays.
potential perception of conflict of interest if industry were known to make payments subject to approval of work plans; c) the PIP Framework is quite specific about the decision making process for use of PC resources: “The Director-General, based on advice from the “Advisory Group”, will decide on the use of resources. The Director-General and the “Advisory Group” will interact with manufacturers and other stakeholders.”

Management observes that at its core, implementation of the PIP Framework is predicated on good faith and trust among its many stakeholders and assumes that all partners implement on such bases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>In progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key actions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update PIP planning template</td>
<td>PIP Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move toward biennial work planning</td>
<td>PIP Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendation 5: Review approach and timeline for industry partner contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Issue summary</th>
<th>Specific action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Industry partners noted:  
  – Contribution calculation algorithm is too reliant on 2009 outbreak  
  – Basing calculations on cost of running GISRS is not the most relevant approach  
• Desk research:  
  – Some industry partners’ contributions vary significantly each year |
| Industry partners question rationale of contribution algorithm - which increases the difficulty of obtaining internal approval to continue PIP Partnership Contribution support |
| The PIP Secretariat should consider the following:  
  • Discussing the contribution algorithm with industry partners to identify if a more relevant formula exists:  
    – This applies to the way in which individual contributes are calculated, as well as the total funding envelope |

### Impact:
Funders are comfortable with overall expenditure volume and individual contributions

### Management response
Management does not accept this recommendation for the following reasons: the current formula was developed by industry and any revision to the formula is entirely within the control of industry. The Secretariat has participated in a process, initiated by IFPMA through a consulting firm, to revise the formula and has shared several options for consideration by the associations. The Secretariat has unequivocally indicated that that any revised formula that has consensus of the four principal associations (AdvaMedDx, BIO, DCVMN and IFPMA) will be accepted by the Director-General. The Secretariat has indicated on several occasions that it remains available to provide support and assistance as necessary.

### Status
In progress within industry

### Key actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>