



**7TH EUROPEAN CONGRESS ON TROPICAL MEDICINE & INTERNATIONAL HEALTH
BARCELONA, 3-6 OCTOBER 2011**

Comparative analysis of two different approaches to putting IHP+ into practice: Mali and Benin

Elisabeth Paul^{1*}, Issa Berthé^{2*} and Salif Samaké²

¹ Université de Liège, GRAP-PA Santé, Belgium (E.Paul@ulg.ac.be)*

² Cellule de Planification et de Statistique du secteur santé, Mali

1. Introduction

- **International Health Partnership and related initiatives (IHP+) launched in 2007, seeking to achieve better results in health / MDGs**
- **At country level: “Country Compact” → commitments // SWAp:**
 - To support the NHP in a common framework (coordination, fiduciary, M&E)
 - To respect the principles of aid effectiveness (including financing modalities)
- **Determining features:**
 - Broad ownership + national leadership
 - Mutual accountability for results

2. Methods

- **Comparative analysis of IHP+ country Compact preparation and implementation in Mali and Benin**
- **Mali: the 3 authors have been supporting + documenting the SWAp & IHP+ processes for years + interviews**
- **Benin: follow-up of the SWAp process since 2004, interviews and coaching of 2 PhD students**

3. Results (1/6)

1. In Mali:

- **Functioning SWAp since 1999 → achievements:**
 - Ownership (national policy documents, steering bodies, bottom-up planning process, ...)
 - Donors align on the NHP, participate in steering bodies
 - MoH capacities strengthened → leadership
 - Partial alignment on (improving) national systems
 - Joint missions, annual audit
 - HSS efforts, in a more coherent way
 - Trust building, transparency of processes, improved quality of policy dialogue → sector-wide reforms

3. Results (2/6)

1. In Mali:

- **IHP+ builds on strong SWAp grounds:**
 - Joined in 2007, country Compact signed April 2009 by MoH + 13 donors (*only* – out of about 50!!)
 - Preparation process extremely inclusive (trust), under MoH leadership
 - Common M&E matrix (35 indicators)
 - Preferred aid modalities
 - IHP+ Compact uses SWAp framework / bodies → implementation and M&E started immediately
 - Increased domestic resources allocated to Health
 - Improvement and acceleration in reporting

3. Results (3/6)

1. In Mali:

- **IHP+ has an added value compared to SWAp...:**
 - Compact preparation process (1,5 year) accelerated the preparation of the HRH policy and revision of MTEF
 - Rather strong commitments (19 for GoM, 8 for donors), followed-up during the PRODESS steering bodies → mutual accountability
 - Preparation of the new NHP supported by CHPP & JANS
 - Improvement in ex ante predictability of external funding

3. Results (4/6)

1. In Mali:

- **... but there are still important problems:**
 - Donor proliferation (about 50)
 - Still many targeted projects (geographically or thematically) rather than general support to HSS
 - Donors keep intervening at procurement stages
 - Donors maintain individual missions/audits in addition to joint ones
 - Ex post predictability of external funding still weak
 - National financial procedures sometimes cumbersome
 - Donor have not yet kept on their promise to increase aid to health in Mali

3. Results (5/6)

2. In Benin:

- **No real SWAp until recently:**
 - Governance problems within the MoH
 - Donor fragmented / disengaged from health sector
 - Donor coordination mechanism exists, but MoH not very involved
 - Embryo of SWAp following the NHP 2009-2018
- **IHP+ seen as the impetus for building a SWAp**
 - Country Compact signed November 2010 by MoH, MoF + 5 donors

3. Results (6/6)

2. In Benin:

- **IHP+ seen as the impetus for building a SWAp (c'ed):**
 - Short preparation process, under the leadership of UNICEF (lead donor) ⇔ no agreement on the common framework / “minimalist” commitments:
 - Coordination / M&E framework not defined
 - Fiduciary framework / preferred aid modalities not defined
 - Implementation has been slow to start up
 - Positive prospects:
 - Donor-led harmonization initiatives expected to make it happen (joint HSS platform + BTC) → harmonization
 - Common M&E framework / NHP Performance Plan

4. Conclusion

- **IHP+ grounded on general SWAp principles, but implementation very country-specific → hence results will be such!**
- **Need to carefully monitor implementation**
- **Benin starts with less assets than Mali, but in both countries IHP+ has stimulated a new dynamic**