WHO Financing Dialogue Evaluation

Annexes
Annex 1 - Financing dialogue process

Governance of the financing dialogue

The below governance structure steered the delivery of the 2013 financing dialogue process.

Leadership on the conceptualisation of the financing dialogue and its key principles came from the WHO Secretariat senior leadership team.

In particular oversight on the development of the process came from the Global Policy Group composed of the Director-General (DG), the Deputy Director General (DDG) and WHO’s 6 Regional Directors; and senior advisors from the Director General Office.

The DDG played a leading role advancing the agenda of reform on aspects of financing and resource mobilisation. The first report presented by the DG to the Executive Board 128th session, ‘The future of financing for WHO’, marked the starting point to the process for developing the concept of the financing dialogue.

Externally, Member States such as Sweden and other major donors took the lead to support the Secretariat in framing the concept and agenda of the financing dialogue process. Sweden was highly engaged and contributed as an important Member States change agent.

Project management capacity for the financing dialogue initially was initially part of the DGO and eventually transition with PRP, with the on-boarding of a Financing dialogue Project Manager in its Department in June 2013. The role of the Manager was to coordinate the process and launch of the financing dialogue.

A Global Financing dialogue Project Team was also set-up at the request of the Global Policy group (GPG) during its meeting following the 66th session of the WHA in May 2013 with the aim to support the preparations of the financing dialogue for the 24 June 2013 launch and to fast track operational planning in advance of the November 2013 meeting. The DDG and its senior advisors were lead forces behind the financing dialogue process from then on, providing vision and guidance to the PRP and the global financing dialogue project team in charge of execution.

The global financing dialogue project team was project-bound and composed of 11 senior staff involved in resource mobilisation activities from all three levels of the organisation with representation from HQ and all regions. The main activities the project team was responsible for included to:

- Refine the meeting objectives under guidance of the GPG
- Coordinate meeting content and reporting and manage internal communication across the three levels of the Organization
- Prepare briefing material for senior management in preparation of the meetings
- Support the preparation of Regional Directors in advance of Regional Committee meetings
- Organize the bilateral meetings in advance of the November meeting as well as the briefings with Geneva-based missions.
**Objectives of the financing dialogue**

Addressing WHO’s financing challenges has been at the core of discussions aimed at reforming the Organization. In 2010, in the midst of the global financial crisis, the Director-General convened an informal consultation on the future financing of the WHO. The need to address WHO’s financing came in response to Member States concerns on how WHO could better align its objectives to available funding and how it could secure funding in the future.

Following this consultation, the Secretariat issued a report presented by the Director-General to the Executive Board 128th session, ‘The future of financing for WHO’. This report marked the starting point to the process for developing the concept of the Financing dialogue.

Discussions with contributors then followed in August 2012 when the Director-General appointed a Special Envoy on the Financing dialogue, Dr. Thomas Zeltner, who held consultations with a number of contributors to obtain their views on WHO financing in advance of the PBAC session of in November 2012. These consultations helped understand the needs and expectations of major donors and to shape the framing of the Financing dialogue process.

The Secretariat thereafter presented proposals to improve WHO’s financing in December 2012 at an extraordinary meeting of the PBAC of the Executive Board. It is then that the idea to ‘establish a structured and transparent financing dialogue’ was officially proposed to WHO’s governing bodies. In this meeting, the PBAC agreed on five proposals designed to address the alignment, predictability and transparency of WHO’s funding, one of which was the establishment of the financing dialogue. These were subsequently endorsed by the Executive Board at its 132nd session in January 2013.

Member States at the WHA’s 66th session decided to establish a financing dialogue on the financing of the Programme Budget (decision WHA66(8)). They endorsed a new financing mechanism that includes a new three-phased approach to financing WHO that includes:

- the approval of the Programme Budget in its entirety by Member States
- the financing dialogue to discuss alignment of funding with WHO’s priorities as presented in the PB
- the mobilisation of resources to fully fund the Programme Budget.

The adoption by Member States in May 2013 of the PB 2014-15 in its entirety was a critical step that made for a stronger responsibility on behalf of the governments. The PB is now considered to be a financial tool that will enable the mobilisation and allocation of resources across all three levels of the Organization. It also provides clarity on what Member States can expect WHO to deliver on and builds a stronger framework for accountability.

The financing dialogue was therefore designed to facilitate, for the first time, a dialogue with and among Member States and other funders of WHO, and to identify concrete solutions to WHO’s financing challenges.

The financing dialogue aims to ensure a match between WHO’s results and deliverables as agreed in the Member-State approved Programme Budget, and the resources available to finance them, with the ultimate objective of enhancing the quality and effectiveness of WHO’s work. The financing dialogue was not to be a pledging conference.

It was set up as a mechanism to ultimately improve the alignment, predictability and flexibility of funding, while reducing WHO’s vulnerability from its dependence on 20 major donors and largely earmarked voluntary contributions. The financing dialogue process was underpinned by five core principles as set-out below:

---
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• **Alignment**: Member States and other funders to commit to allocating funding in a way that is fully aligned with the approved Programme Budget.

• **Predictability and Flexibility**: Member States and other funders to commit to striving for increased predictability and flexibility of their funding, to enhance the quality and effectiveness of operational planning.

• **Transparency**: Member States and other funders to commit to making public their funding allocations, to allow for a shared understanding of available income against budget category, programme and major office.

• **Vulnerability**: Member States and other funders to commit to reducing WHO’s dependency on a few number of major donors to the Organization and broadening its contributor’s base.

The financing dialogue was a new learning experience for the WHO, its Member States and the Secretariat alike.

**The financing dialogue events**

The financing dialogue can be considered as an integrated process that included:

• The two financing dialogue meetings of 24 June and 25-26 November 2013.

• The bilateral meetings between the Secretariat and 19 Member States and non-State contributors between the June and November meetings.

• The mission briefings convening Geneva-based missions to ensure a better understanding of the financing dialogue’s objectives for Member States.

• The discussions at Regional Committee meetings.

The following section provides a description of each of these elements.

**Two financing dialogue meetings of June and November 2013**

There were two milestones financing dialogue meetings in June and November 2013 with participation from Member States and non-state actors providing more than 1 million USD in contributions, which included foundations, philanthropists, UN agencies, and partnerships.

• **June 24 meeting**. The objective of the June meeting was to provide participants with information on the funding needs of the organization. The June meeting was attended by 256 participants from 87 Member States, 6 other United Nations agencies and 14 non-State partner organizations, participated in the meeting in person or via webcast18. From this meeting, there was strong commitment from Member States to respect the priorities set by the WHO and support to the five principles of the financing dialogue.

• **November 25-26 meeting**. The November meeting aims were to 1) review progress made since the June meeting, 2) identify areas of underfunding in view of expressed financing commitments and 3) identify concrete solutions to address remaining funding gaps. The November was attended by 266 participants from 92 Member States and 14 non-State partner organizations participated in the meeting in person or via webcast19. In terms of major outcome, 18 Member States and other contributors shared firm funding projections totalling US$ 935 million.

---

**Bilateral meetings**

The 24 June launch of WHO’s financing dialogue requested that WHO hold bilateral meetings with member states and other contributors to begin to operationalize the general commitments of the 24 June meeting ahead of the second financing dialogue meeting set for 25-26 November. As such, a request for bilateral meetings was sent to all Geneva-based missions, heads of development aid agencies and WHO’s major non-State contributors. Out of this, the Secretariat followed-up actively through phone calls with 34 contributors, including WHO’s 20 top donors, the BRICS countries, 6 emerging countries and 4 oil states.

The specific objectives of the bilateral meetings, as set out by the Secretariat, were to:

- To review collaboration between the two organizations with a view to understanding also the broader context: how does the collaboration with WHO fit with the contributor’s collaboration with other UN and global health agencies?
- To understand opportunities and challenges that may exist to the contributor increasing the predictability, alignment, flexibility and/or transparency of its funding to WHO.
- To explore actions WHO or others might take to influence the amount/predictability/alignment/flexibility/and/or transparency of funding for 2014-15.
- To identify next steps in identifying details of 2014-15 funding and what might be possible to have ready to share, also with others, ahead of the November meeting.

As a result, a total of bilateral meetings with 19 Member States and non-State contributors took place between the June and November meetings. The format of the bilateral meetings varied (e.g. part of annually planned bilateral meetings, in the Capital or in side-line of the Regional Committee meetings) and were attended on the part of the contributors, by senior-level representatives. WHO was represented by its senior leadership team including DG, DDG, RDs, ADGs, Director of PRP and other selected Directors.

**Mission briefings**

Mission briefings were organised by the Secretariat with the aim a better understanding of the financing dialogue’s objectives for Member States. A total of 5 mission briefings took place between September and November 2013. These included:

- **Joint WPR/SEAR regional mission briefing** in regions in the margins of the Regional Committee meetings on 20 Sept 2013 which convened Australia, Bangladesh, China, Malaysia, Indonesia, Korea, Singapore and Thailand.

- **Western European and Others group** on 27 September 2013 which convened the United States, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the EC, Italy, Japan, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

- **EUR briefing** on 4 October 2013 was called by EUR Coordinator of Finland and was attended Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, the EC, Finland, France, Greece, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Switzerland, Sweden and Turkey.

---

21 Financing dialogue bilateral discussions were conducted for the following contributors: Netherlands, Australia, Switzerland, United States, Japan, Luxembourg, Finland, Norway, Republic of Korea, Germany, China, Malaysia, United Kingdom, European Commission, Canada, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Sweden, South Africa.
- **APPIA group briefing** on 4 November 2013 was attended by Finland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, Netherlands and Ireland.

- **Western European and Others group** on 19 November 2013 to assist to the demonstration of the web portal.

During these mission briefings, several Member States indicated they would not be in a position to announce funding commitments at the November meeting. They also expressed their interest in better understanding the funding gaps. They also reinforced their support for the financing dialogue process.

**Regional Committee discussions on the financing dialogue**

The financing dialogue featured in all of the 6 regions’ Regional Committee meetings, either as a standing-alone agenda or as part of the discussions on WHO’s reform. The RC meetings took place between September and October 2013, prior to the November financing dialogue meeting.

Discussions reconfirmed the importance of the action to operationalize the principles agreed to at the June meeting. As an example, Member States in the AFR region indicated their support to embark on the financing dialogue which would facilitate their future funding decision. In the WPR region, Member States indicated that more flexible funding arrangements should be sought otherwise it would difficult to see how the organization could continue to serve its membership adequately. The PRP consolidated Regional Committee discussions on the financing dialogue in preparation to the financing dialogue November meeting and to inform regional level discussions during the dialogue.

---
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Annex 2- Terms of Reference

Modalities for the evaluation of the financing dialogue and resource mobilization experiences

Background

1. The financing dialogue was proposed for the first time in 2013 as a mechanism to improve the flexibility, predictability, alignment and transparency of the financing of the Programme Budget 2014-2015 and to reduce its vulnerability. Given the novelty surrounding the mechanism, in deciding to go ahead with the proposed mechanism, Member States requested that an evaluation of the financing dialogue be conducted.

2. This document outlines the proposed modalities for the conduct of the evaluation following the approach and requirements of the WHO evaluation policy.

Objective and scope

3. The objective of the evaluation will be to assess the effectiveness of the financial dialogue mechanism to support the financing the WHO programme budget and to obtain lessons learnt from the resource mobilization experiences from Member States and other contributors and within the Secretariat at the three levels of the organization. In fulfilling its objective, the evaluation will assess the flexibility, predictability and sustainability of the financing dialogue process and identify strengths and existing gaps requiring corrective action at the policy, structure and process levels to support decisions of stakeholders regarding the future direction of the mechanism

4. The evaluation will address the following key questions:
   - Has the financing dialogue and related resource mobilization experiences improved the alignment, predictability, flexibility and transparency of WHO’s financing and broadened the contributor base?
     - What are the strengths and weaknesses of the mechanism and the lessons learnt resource mobilization experiences?
   - Is the current approach to the financing dialogue and resource mobilization experiences still relevant and should the mechanism be considered for the Programme Budget 2016–2017?
     - What did it cost?
     - How can the financing dialogue be enhanced or improved?

Methodology and timelines:

5. The evaluation will cover the financing dialogue approach and resource mobilization experiences, processes and the outcomes, namely: (a) the results of the first and second sessions of the financing dialogue of June and November 2013; (b) the experiences with resource mobilization following the establishment of the financing dialogue mechanism; and (c) the “high-level” quantitative analysis of the financing situation at the start of 2014-2015 in January 2014, compared with that for the previous biennium.

6. The evaluation will be conducted by external consultants with an appropriate knowledge and skill mix of the subject of the evaluation, as well as experience in performing such evaluations involving organizational reform and resource mobilization. Financing dialogue participants are invited to comment on the proposed approach and will be given the opportunity to provide inputs during the evaluation.

7. The evaluation will be conducted during the period December 2013 through March 2014. The final report, together with the response of the Secretariat, will be discussed by the Health Assembly at its 67th
session, through the PBAC in May 2014. Subsequently, the report will be widely disseminated to Member States, partners and other stakeholders.
Annex 3 - Evaluation methodology

The financing dialogue evaluation was conducted based on a close collaboration with the WHO Secretariat, and in line with the UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, as well as its ethical guidelines. The evaluation was conducted in close collaboration with the WHO Secretariat, including the head of the office of Independent Oversight Services, who commissioned the evaluation.

The approach underlying this evaluation and which guided our reporting involved a first phase that assesses the effectiveness in which the financing dialogue was carried out and delivered. The second phase took care to provide WHO and its Member States forward looking recommendations on the way the process should be led in the future and that would be most fitted and beneficial for the organization, in the context of the reform process.

The execution of the evaluation comprised of four stages, described in detail below.

Mobilise phase

During this phase, we agreed with our focal point for this assignment, Financing dialogue Project Manager, on the objectives, scope and project plan for the assignment. We selected stakeholders for interviews and also developed detailed evaluation questions for internal and external stakeholders.

Our observation of the two financing dialogue meetings in June and November 2013 as part of the Stage 2 Evaluation of WHO’s reform, in which members of our team were engaged, allowed our team to have an already good understanding of the major issues at hand from the start of the assignment.

Assess and analyse phase

This phase comprised four data gathering activities allowing for triangulation of findings. During this phase, the PwC Evaluation Team conducted in-depth analysis as follows.

Interviews

We undertook a total of 26 interviews face-to-face or by telephone including with 12 WHO senior management across the three levels of the organisation (HQ and regional), 8 Member States representatives (Ministry of Health, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Geneva-based missions and Development Aid Agencies) and 1 non-State contributor and 2 global health organisations. Global health organisations were also consulted to understand their model for attracting donor funding. Refer to Appendix 2 for a full list of interviewees.

Desk review

We conducted a desk review of reports, working documents and articles relevant to WHO’s financing dialogue. All material issued in preparation of the financing dialogue was reviewed including the notes for the records of the two meetings. We have also leveraged our attendance as observers to the two meetings as part of the Stage 2 evaluation.

For the desk review we have considered the findings of the WHO Stage 2 evaluation of the reform and a number of important studies issued in recent years notably from WHO’s external auditor, Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), DFID, Chatham House and the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) WHO Institutional report) on the role and effectiveness of the WHO.
Financial analysis

For this we reviewed and analysed WHO's financial situation and donor contributions for the last three biennium 2008-09, 2010-11, 2012-13 and the Q1 of 2014-15. The financial figures were analysed to assess impact of the financing dialogue on funding levels.

The costs for conducting the financing dialogue process were also analysed and categorised.

Survey

We conducted an online and anonymous survey with the objective to assess the perception of Member States and non-State contributors on the effectiveness and impact of the financing dialogue and its resource mobilisation experience.

The target population for the survey considered all those who were invited to attend the financing dialogue. This included Member States representatives from Missions, Capital and development agencies as well as non-State contributors, including foundations, UN agencies and health partnerships providing more than 1 million USD in contribution.

The survey was opened for a period of 2 weeks between 21 March and 5 April 2014 and two reminders were sent to motivate completion on 28 March and 2 April 2014. It was administered in WHO’s three official languages, English, French and Spanish.

A total of 47 participants completed the survey in its entirety, resulting in a response rate of 20%. The survey results show a greater participation from contributors from the European region (54%) and a large representation (80%) of Member States and non-State contributors who participated in financing dialogue bilateral meetings between June and November 2014. This marks therefore a greater representation of WHO’s largest donors. Refer to Appendix 4 for the survey results.

Synthesise and reporting phase

The ‘synthesise and reporting’ phase consisted of consolidating the findings gathered in the previous phase, analysing and triangulating the data, validating it with WHO senior management and consolidating them in this report, which on one hand looks at how well the objectives of the financing dialogue were achieved and what are our recommendations for the future format of the financing dialogue process.

The reporting phase involved frequent interactions with staff members from the PRP, the Internal Oversight Services (IOS) and the DDG for the socialisation of the findings and improvements.
## Annex 4 - List of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Country/Organisation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adlide</td>
<td>Geoff</td>
<td>GAVI Alliance</td>
<td>Director, Advocacy and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrade</td>
<td>Filho</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asamoabaah</td>
<td>Anarfi</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Deputy Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylward</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Assistant Director-General, Polio, Emergencies and Country Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benn</td>
<td>Christoph</td>
<td>Global Fund</td>
<td>Director, External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blais</td>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capuano</td>
<td>Corinne</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Director, Regional Director's Office, WPRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuypers</td>
<td>Dirk</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>PBAC Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Planning Resource Coordination and Performance Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girod</td>
<td>Magali</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halen</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Counsellor for Health Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Zsuzsanna</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Regional Director EURO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieny</td>
<td>Marie-Paule</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Assistant Director-General, Health Systems Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klinger</td>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Director, External Relations, Partnerships and Governing Bodies, AMRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landry</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>Director, Multilateral Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Veronique</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Head of Unit, Education, Health, Research, Culture, Directorate General for Development and Cooperation, European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutnaes</td>
<td>Sverre</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makubalo</td>
<td>Lindiwe</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Health Attaché</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Director, Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Muller</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pendergast</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Renganathan</td>
<td>Elil</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reynders</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shipton</td>
<td>Nicky</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>van Hilten</td>
<td>Menno</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 6 - Survey results
Overview of the financing dialogue survey

The survey is an important component of the financing dialogue (FD) evaluation to better understand Member States and non-State Actors’ views on the way the FD was conducted and whether it achieved its objectives.

The survey was also aimed at obtaining contributors perspectives on the preferred way forward for the future of the Financing Dialogue.

The survey was conducted online, anonymously, and made available in three languages. It was open for a period of 2 weeks between 21 March and 4 April 2014.

Reminders were sent by the IOS (WHO) on 28 March 2014 and 2 April 2014.

Some of the key features of the survey results are that:

- 47 people responded to the survey, which is a response rate of 20%.

- Of the 19 contributors that engaged in bilateral meetings between June and November 2013, 15 responded to this survey.

- More than half the respondents were from the EURO region.
More than half the respondents were from EURO

- The survey was distributed in the three official languages, English, French and Spanish in order to improve participation rates.
- The majority of respondents were from the EURO region.
- There was a good representation from the AMRO, AFRO and WPRO regions as well.
87% of respondents were Member States representatives, most from Ministries of Health

Breakdown of all respondents

- Other non-State contributor: 5
- United Nations agency: 1
- Member State representative: 41

Breakdown of Member States Representatives

- Ministry of Health: 21
- Permanent Mission in Geneva: 14
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: 4
- Development aid agency: 2

There was a strong response from Ministries of Health with 10 respondents from the European region, 4 from the Americas region and 4 from the Western Pacific region.

Of the 47 respondents, only 1 was a United Nations agency, yet 4 UN agencies are in WHO’s top 20 donors.
More respondents attended the November meeting than did in June, with a majority informed through mission briefings or Regional Committee discussions.

- 21% of the respondents had engaged in bilateral discussions with WHO to prepare for the November meeting.
- 40% had briefing sessions with Geneva based missions.

Involvement in the June and/or November 2013 Financing Dialogue meetings:
- Nov-13: 52%
- Jun-13: 39%
- None: 9%

Involvement in Financing Dialogue-related meetings:
- Briefing sessions with Geneva-based missions: 40%
- Bilateral meetings with WHO Secretariat: 21%
- Financing Dialogue discussions at Regional Committees: 39%
87% of respondents provide Assessed Contributions, while 56% provide Specified Voluntary Contributions.

- The majority of respondents provide Assessed Contributions, which is expected as most respondents are Member States.
- Almost one third, however, said they provided Core Voluntary Contributions.
Section 3: Expectations from & Performance of the financing dialogue
Increased transparency of WHO’s financing is the number one priority for respondents

- 98% of respondents wanted WHO to be transparent about budget and funding shortfalls.
- 93% wanted to see the transparency of WHO’s funding improve.
- 93% wanted to see an improvement in WHO’s funding alignment to the PB.
The November meeting was rated better than June

- For the June meeting, 79% think the purpose and objectives were clearly communicated while 46% of respondents think the timeliness, adequacy and level of details of the documents circulated prior to the meeting could have been improved.
- For the November meeting, 97% of respondents think the objectives were better communicated; however, 63% of respondents confirm their satisfaction with the documentation timeliness, adequacy and level of details of the documents.
The November meeting partly addressed some of the concerns raised by the respondents in June

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What were some of your concerns, if any, following the June 2013 meeting?</th>
<th>Did the November 2013 meeting address those concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The need for WHO to give sufficient and detailed financial information as a basis for a strong analysis.</td>
<td>We expected to come out of the November meeting with a clearer picture of the financing gaps, which we did not. The web portal, although promising, was not available early enough to allow for a proper analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wished the meeting had gone further in identifying the process through which the Secretariat allocates Assessed Contributions and how the lack of funding affects WHO’s ability to do their work.</td>
<td>The November meeting addressed this partially. We appreciated the commitment of the Secretariat to provide much greater detail on its spending, activities, and results through the new web portal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance for the November meeting to clarify the expectations vis-à-vis Member States and donors.</td>
<td>This was only addressed partially. The November meeting could have benefited from clearer guidelines issued to Member States and donors on how they should prepare and which information should be presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The June Financing Dialogue did not allocate enough time to the processes for bilateral engagement and did not provide a clear understanding of the Secretariat expectations vis-à-vis donors, for the financing dialogue process.</td>
<td>The November Financing Dialogue addressed these issues in a more structured and timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned that the Financing Dialogue would become another set of governing body meetings.</td>
<td>Recognised the efforts to break away from governing body meetings, however efforts will need to continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Bilateral meetings and mission briefings
Bilateral meetings were well organised and added value to the FD process, however they were not considered more useful than FD meetings.

- 92% of the Member States and non-State Actors who participated in the bilateral meetings agreed they were **well organised**.

- 40% of respondents found the bilateral meetings **useful** to obtain a clarity on WHO’s funding gaps.

- 73% of respondents agreed that the bilateral meetings **added value to the FD process** and that the content made the November meeting more relevant.

- Nearly **a third** of respondents would have liked to be **more engaged** during the bilateral meetings.

- However, **no one** found the bilateral meetings **more beneficial as a donor** than the FD.
Bilateral meetings are much more effective with WHO departmental inputs, yet there is scope for improvement

Are bilateral meetings more effective with programmatic inputs from WHO departments, or without?

- **With Inputs:** 93%
- **Without Inputs:** 7%

93% of Member-State and non-State contributors who responded to the survey indicated their preference to have interactions with technical Departments.

**Suggestions for improving the way bilateral meetings are conducted are to:**
- Ensure consistency in the representation of parties engaged.
- Clarify the purpose and aim of the bilateral meetings ahead of time and the value-added for WHO.
- Ensure clarity on shared expectations and share as much information in advance of the meetings.
- Avoid a silo approach to resource mobilisation, even though technical input is key.

**Suggestions for improving the way mission briefings are conducted are to:**
- Include updates on WHO funding.
- Make documentation available in advance.
- Clarify expectations.
- Ensure greater interactions and dialogue between the Secretariat and missions.
Only 29% of respondents agreed that they had a positive resource mobilisation experience with WHO; there is room for improvement

Most positive RM experiences
- Effective communication with PRP/DGO
- Overall good RM approach but room for improvement in favouring a more centralised and coordinated RM approach
- Good partnership with WHO on technical issues

Least positive RM experiences
- Current disconnect between RM approaches across the organisation
- Staff continue to mobilise resources independently
- WHO’s RM approach should be more strategic and focused on PB funding gaps
- More financial details should be made available to donors
- Resource mobilisation efforts should also take place at country-level with engagement from government officials

- Most respondents are neutral about their experience with WHO’s resource mobilisation efforts.
- They indicated that there is room for improvement in the RM approach, preferring a strategic, centralised and coordinated approach.
- There is a fragmentation in the approach to RM, with different segments of staff reaching out to contributors.
Respondents highlighted some successes and areas which need improvements in the way the FD was conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Stakeholder engagement</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good preparation</strong></td>
<td>Bringing awareness on financing needs and challenges</td>
<td>Inclusive and open dialogue</td>
<td>Increasing transparency</td>
<td>PB web portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timely availability of documentation</strong></td>
<td>More detailed financial information needed</td>
<td>More discussions from participants and less from moderators</td>
<td>More regional level discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarifying the terminology of the Financing Dialogue process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6: Impact of the financing dialogue
The FD provides better transparency on how WHO is financed, but has not influenced donors to increase funding

- 96% of respondents think that the FD has provided a good understanding of WHO’s financing and challenges.
- 87% of respondents think the FD is providing greater transparency on WHO funding.
- 79% of respondents, however, indicated that the FD did not contribute to increasing funding.
- 70% of respondents think they have more confidence that WHO will be able to demonstrate accountability as a result of the FD.
- 68% think that the FD is helping with discussion to better align their funding to the PB.
A majority of respondents think that the FD has enhanced transparency and will contribute to institutional change

- The Financing Dialogue process fostered more effective communication from the Secretariat
- The Financing Dialogue process provided greater transparency from the Secretariat
- The Financing Dialogue process showed a commitment from the Secretariat to improve results reporting
- The Financing Dialogue process triggered more strategic discussions with Member States and non-State Actors

There is strong agreement from respondents that the FD has fostered change at the Secretariat, on matters of transparency (82%), communication (78%) and a willingness to improve results reporting (73%).

Further, 82% agree that the FD process triggered more strategic discussions with Member States and non-State Actors.
Respondents think the web portal is a highlight of the FD and provides greater transparency

- For 90% of respondents, the web portal was a highlight of the FD by providing greater transparency to the process.
- Compared to these high figures, 63% of respondents thought the web portal provided an adequate level of financial detail.
- While a very good result, there is still room for improvement, as evidenced by comments from contributors.
- Finally, 46% think the web portal will inform their organisation on future funding decisions.
As a result of the FD, more respondents are considering to provide predictable funding, aligned to the PB

- As a result of the FD, 45% of respondents would consider providing more predictable funding to WHO.
- On the other hand, only 10% would consider providing voluntary contributions.
Legislation compliance and national budget restrictions are limiting the funds available to WHO

- More than 60% of the respondents cited compliance with government legislation and budget process restrictions as the main causes preventing an increase of funding to WHO.
- 57% of the respondents thought suboptimal reporting by WHO was a barrier to increasing funding.
- More than a quarter of respondents think if WHO’s work were aligned more closely with MDGs and ODA priority, they would increase funding.
WHO needs to demonstrate clear results and achieve organisational efficiency to attract more funding

- An overwhelming 93% of respondents think that WHO needs to demonstrate their results in order to attract more funding.
- There are also clear indications (90%) that WHO needs to improve organisational efficiency.
- 63% of respondents think WHO needs to improve the clarity of their mandate to improve the quality and quantity of funds.
Most respondents think that Member States should be the target group to increase WHO’s resources

- The majority of respondents (81%) think Member States should be the top source of funding for WHO.

- Focus should also be given to Grant Making Foundations and Philanthropists.
Section 7: Future format for the financing dialogue
There is an overwhelming support for the financing dialogue to continue...

- 96% of respondents agree that the FD should continue.
- 70% think it should be broadened to include potential new donors.
- 60% think it should be held prior to the PB approval, 40% think after.
- No clear consensus on how often the FD should be held.
Future FDs should include presentations from WHO Regional Directors and contributors

- 57% of respondents think the Financing Dialogue should be enhanced with presentations from WHO regions and from contributors alike.
- Respondents are also in favour of having panel discussions (43%) as an interactive format.
# Annex 7- Financing dialogue budget

Cost Analysis of implementing the 2013 financing dialogue Expense Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logistics</th>
<th>24 June 2013</th>
<th>25-26 November 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Venue Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering &amp; Printing</td>
<td>$5,032</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dedicated Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Staff</th>
<th>24 June 2013</th>
<th>25-26 November 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference Staff</td>
<td>$22,094</td>
<td>$48,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebEx Operator</td>
<td>$241</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>$24,683</td>
<td>$61,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure</td>
<td>$7,041</td>
<td>$7,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IT Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Infrastructure</th>
<th>24 June 2013</th>
<th>25-26 November 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WebEx Computers</td>
<td>$14,923</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebEx License</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Costs</th>
<th>24 June 2013</th>
<th>25-26 November 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office Staff</td>
<td>$10,158</td>
<td>$51,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBAC Chair</td>
<td>$3,001</td>
<td>$2,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Bilateral Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: Direct Expenses | $87,173 | $188,272 |

Direct Cost of Hosting Meetings | $275,445 |

## Cost of Creating Web Portal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web Portal design &amp; development</td>
<td>$77,295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost (estimates of WHO staff time)</td>
<td>$143,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Cost of Web Portal</td>
<td>$220,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24 This includes interpretation services to six languages.
25 This includes materials produced in six languages.
**Total Cost of Implementing the FD**

**Direct Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2013 Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>$87,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2013 Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>$188,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Project Management Staff</td>
<td>$158,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Creating a Web Portal</td>
<td>$220,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$654,817</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimates of WHO staff time</td>
<td>$281,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$935,967</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost Analysis**

**Figure 8: Cost Breakdown for the Overall 2013 FD (USD 935 967)**

**Figure 9: Components of the Direct Costs in Carrying out the 2013 FD (USD 275 445)**
Annex 8- Web portal review

The web portal was marked as one of the successes of the financing dialogue process. In both interviews and in the survey, respondents praised the portal and mentioned that it provided a greater level of transparency which was not there before. However, there were some concerns about the level and accuracy of the information which is presented in the portal. The key issues seem to be the need for ‘granular’ information, to keep it updated, and indicate how the funds are being spent in greater details.

We compared the information on the WHO web portal to the financing information available on the websites of the GAVI Alliance (GAVI) and the Global Fund (GF).

- **A key difference between GF / GAVI sites and portal site is the information flow.** The web portal does not explain the process as to how the priorities and allocations were decided. More to the point, it does not explain how the budget fits with the global issues that face WHO. The GF portal, for example provides the total financing needs to solve defined issues, and also identifies the non-GF sources of financing. This gives the reader a clear indication of who funds what in the space GF operates in. The web portal gives an impression that the starting point is the WHO mandate, not the global health issues as such.

- **The web portal presents the programming information clearer than GAVI or GF.** All information provided on the web portal including on programme (area of focus, performance framework, results achieved) and financing (resources needed, available and shortfall) is also available in one way or another on the GF and GAVI websites. The major difference is that WHO’s web portal makes accessing this information much easier as it is a standalone site while GF and GAVI present parts of the programme and financing information in different sections of their sites.

- **The WHO web portal is much more detailed on the resources requirements.** It details resources needed by regional and country offices, programmes and sub-programmes and even deliverables. This level of detail is not available on GF and GAVI sites. To determine GAVI and GF resources needed one needs to review the preparatory reports of their replenishment conferences.

- **The WHO web portal provides more detailed accounts of funding per donor, including the breakdown of each donor’s funds to each sub-programme.** For example, it is possible to find how much one country has funded or pledged to fund each of the 30 sub-programmes. By comparison, the GAVI and GF sites provide information on the funding process including replenishment cycles, including a breakdown in form of excel sheet of contributions and pledges made by each donor. But the information does not include a breakdown of how individual donor funds are allocated. It needs noting that WHO funds are mostly earmarked to SO/Categories, as opposed to GF and GAVI who receive un-earmarked funds.

- **The WHO web portal brings added value by showing the linkages between resources and activities (integrated approach) and transparency in who funds what.** GF and GAVI provide information on the funding process which is separate from the distribution of funds to specific areas and activities.

- **The GAVI and GF sites provide more strategic information** including strategy, business plan, detailed methodology to conduct needs assessment etc, to explain why they need the funds, as opposed to the web portal which details how WHO will spend funds.