
Information Note IAP Update and Relationship to Partnership

16 March 2016

Background

On Wednesday, 2nd of March 2016 the Board leadership - Mrs Graca Machel, Katie Taylor, and Flavia Bustreo met with the IAP Chair, Sania Nishtar, and other panellists present in Johannesburg: Carmen Barroso, Giorgi Pkhakadze, Dakshitha Wickremarathne and Liz Mason. They were accompanied by Sarah England, Alice Gilbert and Julian Schweitzer representing the interim IAP Secretariat, and Robin Gorna from the Partnership Secretariat. This information note provides an overview of the discussions which touched on the emerging ways of working between the IAP and the Partnership.

The EC is invited to share their views on these emerging agreements and the relationship, in advance of any formal proposals being brought to the Partnership.

Key points to note:

Higher Political Reach

The Partnership's leadership underlined the potential of a higher political reach for accountability in the SDG era, including potential presentation of the IAP's Annual Report to the WHA and the High Level Political Forum on SDGs, as well as through other intergovernmental processes.

Selection Criteria

Katie Taylor chaired a working group to create the short list from which the UNSG nominated the IAP. It was emphasized that the selection criteria for the IAP short listed nominees were deep personal integrity and ability to speak truth to power.

Interface between IAP and Partnership

The IAP was briefed about the following areas of action in the Partnership's Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): Drive Accountability, that have direct interface with the IAP:

1. The Partnership will host and support the IAP secretariat and ensure its independence is maintained.
2. Board will prepare a commentary on the IAP report.
3. The Partnership will help disseminate the report and encourage action on its recommendations.

Expectations of the Partnership

Secretariat Hosted by the World Health Organization and Board Chaired by Mrs Graça Machel

The Partnership indicated that there is flexibility on implementation of SO2 and that they will seek to identify synergies between the Partnership's broader role coordinating the unified accountability framework and the role and work of the IAP. It was noted that the value add of the Partnership includes their breadth of representation and giving voice to constituencies that are not always at the public health table. The Partnership aims to ensure that these voices are a bigger part of the conversation at the country level, as well as encouraging partners and constituencies contribute to the IAP's gathering of data.

Expectations of IAP

The IAP is keen to identify synergies and draw on the comparative advantage of the Partnership through strong collaboration, as well as being cognisant of the need for independence. The panellists will make some minor revisions to the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the IAP and share those with the Partnership before sending on to EOSG for approval.

Budget discussion

It was decided that in order to ensure its independence, the IAP should not engage in fund raising and expects the Partnership to mobilise resources for its work. The IAP budget is ring-fenced within the Partnership's Secretariat budget, as indicated in the Partnership's Business Plan. Furthermore, there has been no firm earmarking for IAP by donors, but some donors have "soft earmarked" funds for accountability. There needs to be an understanding on how these funds are allocated between SO2 work and IAP. In the present context it would be difficult to increase the IAP budget and a formula needs to be agreed upon in the case of incomplete financing of the budget. The IAP will produce a costed workplan quickly to facilitate the budgeting and financing.

IAP Annual Report

The IAP will consult with the Partnership on themes of its annual report. Should there be any disagreement, then the final decision on the themes of the report will be made by the IAP.

It will be important for the IAP to include a range of inputs, from both state and non-state actors, and also through leveraging access to the Partnership's eight constituencies.

It was agreed that the IAP would submit their annual report to the UNSG, and at this point it would become public and available for the Partnership - and others – to provide any commentary. A commentary from the Partnership Board will be welcomed by the panel. It was noted that the Partnership Board should not have preferential treatment to comment on the Report, as this could compromise, or be perceived to compromise, the IAP's level of independence, and there may also be other key stakeholders (eg countries) who would also wish to prepare a commentary.

Regional forums

The IAP would like to explore using regional forums such as WHO Regional Committee meetings to assist the drive to country level accountability. It is likely that the agenda of Regional Committees will include items on the Global Strategy.