

**Civil Society & Communities Town Hall:
Feedback from First Pandemic Fund Board Meeting**

Thursday, September 15, 2022

8- 9pm WIB (Jakarta); 4-5pm EAT (Nairobi); 2-3pm BST (London);
9-10am ET (New York); 8-9am CT (Bogotá)

NOTES AND READOUT

Interim Civil Society Board Members to the Governing Board of the Financial Intermediary Fund for Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and Response, **Jackline Njeri Kiarie** (Amref Health Africa) and **Elisha Dunn-Georgiou** (Global Health Council), along with Alternate Board Members Nitish Debnath (One Health Bangladesh) and Olya Golichenko (Frontline AIDS), held a Civil Society & Communities Town Hall on Thursday, September 15. The Town Hall provided a readout of the first Governing Board meeting (Sept. 8-9) and updates on decisions taken and tasks ahead. Town Hall participants were invited to ask questions, provide feedback, and identify priority issues.

Key Information:

- In order to have civil society representatives in the room for the first Governing Board meeting on September 8/9, the process for selecting representatives was extremely expedited. Submissions of interest were due September 2nd, and representatives were notified of their selection on September 6th.
- Due to this rapid timeline, Interim Civil Society Board members only had limited time to review Governing Board documents before the meeting. Board Members from co-investor countries also faced similar challenges to rapidly onboard.
- The governing board has 21 Seats
 - 9 donor countries (2 years)
 - 9 co-contributor (2 years)
 - 2 CSOs (6 month interim; then 18 month permanent)
 - 1 Philanthropy
- In addition to donor countries, co-investor countries, and civil society, implementing entities, and non-voting members, such as WHO, GAVI, CEPI, GFATM, were also present at the Board meeting.
- Next Governing Board meeting: October 3, 2022.

Decisions and discussions:

- *Selection of co-chairs:* Muhamad Chatib Basri (Indonesia) and Daniel Ngamije (Rwanda) were selected as Governing Board Co-chairs. They will serve until May 2023 when the Governing Board resets. If they remain Board Members, they may be reselected after this initial period, for a two-year term.
- *Adoption of governing documents:* Governance Framework and Operations Manual were discussed, amended, and adopted
 - Notable Language Adopted, influenced by civil society constituency
 - Accountability and inclusivity in RFP process
'Project proposals will require evidence of Beneficiary ownership and support; as well as evidence of the comprehensive consultation process to develop the proposals based on the principles of accountability and inclusivity.'
 - Greater accountability and efficiencies
Board Members can undertake relevant consultations with its constituencies based on the principles of confidentiality.'
- *FY23 Budget:* Budget for FY2023 — timeline extended for Board Members' consideration and approval via email.

- *Civil Society (North and South) Constituencies and voting rights*: Description of civil society constituencies clarified and voting rights finalized. The importance of community representation on the Board was acknowledged, although there is no seat for them at present.
- *First Call for Proposals*: The first Request For Proposals (RFPs) are targeted to be issued in mid-November 2022. It is suggested that working groups of the Board be established to support the process, including finalizing a Results Framework, and determining the short-term priorities of the fund/prioritized early results.
 - Accountability and inclusivity in the RFP process: Clear accomplishment for civil society was the inclusion of the principles of inclusion and equity as part of RFP priorities (see language above).
- *Technical Advisory Panel (TAP)*: TAP will have a critical role in the FIF operations, and the Board needs to rapidly finalize/endorse ToRs for the TAP to have the TAP help guide the first Call for Proposals/RFP process. Board members requested TAP ToRs be aligned with the Governance Framework and Operations Manual. A working group of the Board will also be established to facilitate ToRs by end-Sept. Civil society will push principles of accountability and inclusion to be reflected in TAP TORs. Advisory Panel (TAP). The composition of the TAP has not yet been determined.
 - CSO engagement in TAP
 - The TAP has not been formed yet, the Secretariat is working to finalize the Terms of Reference (ToR).
 - In terms of the TAP composition, there is agreement to have experts beyond WHO. CSOs should consider identifying someone who can be part of the TAP — with the ambition to compete for the co-chair role.
 - The countries to benefit are already predetermined based on the WB IDA/IBRD eligible countries classification.
 - Once the TAP is in place the Board will determine what the call for proposals will look like. This is a key space for CSOs to engage and input.
- *One Health*: There was a discussion on One Health being a priority within the Fund, but this area is still a work in progress. There is general appreciation and understanding of the importance of incorporating the principles of One Health in the call for Proposals.
- *Scope and Priorities*: The specific scope and priorities of the fund are still not defined. In the short term, and with only \$1.4 of the target \$10 billion annually raised, many board members want to focus investments on activities with near-term, measurable results to demonstrate success and crowd in more investment.

Next steps:

- Interim Civil Society Board Members are committed to representing civil society and communities broadly, and to helping build and engage a robust civil society and communities constituency. Exact ways of working for this interim period are still being established – and feedback is welcomed. Collectively, we all need to push for permanent civil society and communities engagement structures to be prioritized and funded by the Board and Secretariat, modeled on best practices of other global organizations such as the Global Fund or UHC2030.
- As a starting point for constituency building and engagement, please sign-up to join the civil society and communities constituency google group [here](#). This listserv will be used to share information on the Fund and opportunities to engage with/inform the Board.
- Areas for future discussion
 - Civil society leadership opportunities beyond Board seats, including representatives to and leadership of the TAP
 - Growth and definition of constituency structure
 - Suggestions on and accreditation of additional implementing entities
 - New name for PPR FIF

- Official launch of the FIF in (Potentially G20 Summit November 2022).

Annex

Annex 1: Resources

- [World Bank PPR FIF website](#)
- [Governance Framework](#)
- [Operations Manual](#)
- [Global Pandemic Fund Action Hub](#)

Annex 2: Feedback/Comments from Civil Society

- Having two seats to represent CSOs in the entire world is not quite proportionate, we have to continue to push, we're inclusive as much as we can on forming the constituencies.
- The call for proposal should be inclusive of the whole scope of PPR actions (including upstream spillover actions) and then decide what to fund based on the quality of the proposals. Proposals focused on One Health and upstream prevention can deliver strong results that can help catalyze more funding.
- Prevention needs to be incentivized, as most governments will not treat it as a priority compared to preparedness and response. These have many financing instruments, and not much for prevention and One Health.
- We request the CSO representatives in the FIF Governing Board to lobby and advocate for 30% of the total FIF allocation to be prioritized to support community led interventions, to contribute to the achievement of resilient sustainable systems for health outcomes. Furthermore we request for an accountability structure to ensure member states are held accountable for their commitments made in the Pandemic Accord and the FIF.
- For LMICs, strengthening community systems is critical to reinforce sustainability. Hence, 30% allocation should be the minimum. First we need strong and responsive community systems.
- If the initial implementing entities are; Global Fund (GF), CEPI, GAVI, GFF & WHO with money not able to go to countries directly, then how these agencies engage with local partners (funding flows to country partners) will be critical.

Annex 3: Question & Response

Question: Is there space to discuss terminology (eg. communities and co-investors)?

Response: We pushed in the meeting for a broader definition of technical experts to include advocates, communities, etc. We will need to collate names to put forward.

Question: Would it be possible to have a list of participants, with the names of those who were present at the Board?

Response: If you go to the World Bank Fund [website](#) and go to the partners page, you can get an idea of the individuals on the board. (Not a comprehensive list but the most public list available).

Question: Are there already a few implementing countries identified as potential participants in the first wave of funding? What is the update from the Board meeting in terms of Eligibility, in particular for regional entities, rather than just the international orgs (e.g. GAVI, GFATM, etc.). How will the implementing entities engage with potential local implementing parties?

Response: The decisions to date on implementing entities go to the core of how FIFs are structured and the pushback from many of the global health organizations to not have this new fund fragment the existing health architecture. To note, all UN system agencies and MDBs are also eligible implementing partners by definition, but there is certainly scope for others and strong expectation to add Africa CDC and regional bodies. IDA eligible countries will be considered for the first engagement.

Question: Have you talked about the role of GF, Gavi etc to play in FIF? And is there room to allow for omnibus applications to allow such implementing partners to participate?

Response: There are about 13 implementing entities so far and GF, CEPI and Gavi have been mentioned. There is potential opportunity for accreditation of additional implementing entities and the civil society constituency should explore this opportunity. The issue of omnibus application is a good observation but will hopefully be addressed with the working groups to be established.

Question: Has there been any discussion about the need for the FIF to include more upstream prevention actions in its scope?

Response: There's a discussion related to One Health, particularly on improving One Health principles on the theory of change. During the board meeting, it was clear there is a focus on One Health but this is an area that seems to be a work in progress. There is general appreciation and understanding of the importance of incorporating the One Health principle.

Question: Is there any possibility for CSOs to be involved in the TAP?

Response: The TAP needs to be in place to determine CSO engagement and how the call for proposals will look like. We want to ensure the role of CSOs in shaping the call for proposal agenda.

Questions unable to be answered in the Town Hall:

Question: There were 130 attendees to the first virtual Board meeting ? Is there a participant cap per Board seat ?

Question: Is there anything in writing on the prospect of a FIF reset in a year?

Question: Is there discussion of expanding the TAP beyond WHO?

Question: Has there been any discussion about the need for the FIF to include more upstream prevention actions in its scope? It seems zoonotic disease surveillance is the most upstream prevention action considered for now but there is a need for actions to prevent spillover as well (in line with One Health).

Question: How best can we equip the interim CSO representatives with evidence and quick wins around the global health workforce to influence the topical focus of the FIF? What timeline would be best? What is the expected process for the CSO board representatives to harvest and collate the diversity of CSO views and positions on the various FIF board agenda items ?

Question: What was covered in the operations manual? is there anything in particular there that civil society should be concerned about?

Question: How far has the discussion around prioritizing wildlife/conservation expertise in the TAP etc. In addition, will wildlife field be well integrated in the frontline approaches in addition to human health, domestic animals, etc.

Question: Is any kind of equity or ethical framework being considered for the discussion? Any sense of how those issues would be considered?

Question: Is there already a mechanism established that guarantees the participation of CSOs and key populations when it comes to program planning and implementation at country level?

Question: Can we have a tentative time table at least till Dec, 2022?

Question: Which type of frameworks will guide the RFP priorities and how will the TAP be constituted?