

# GFF Accountability Scorecard Scoring System

2. COUNTRY PLATFORM	GREEN	YELLOW	RED
<b>2.1 The list of members of the country platform, including the Government focal point who acts as a liaison with all stakeholders, is available on a public website</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The list of members is available on a public website; AND</li> <li>The details of the government focal point for GFF is available on a public website</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The list of members is available on a public website; OR</li> <li>The details of the government focal point for GFF is available on a public website</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The list of members, including the details of the focal point, are not available online</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 The roles and responsibilities of the country platform outlined in writing and available on line (eg in a MOU, compact, checklist)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roles and responsibilities of the country platform are available in writing (eg in a MOU, TOR, compact, checklist); AND</li> <li>Roles and responsibilities available on line</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roles and responsibilities of the country platform have been outlined in writing but are not available on line</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roles and responsibilities are not available in writing</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 The country platform members are given the opportunity to contribute to all key GFF documents from the time that the platform was constituted</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key documents are shared with the country platform with sufficient time for review. AND</li> <li>Key documents are shared with the country platform sufficiently early in the process for feedback to be incorporated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key documents are shared with the country platform but with insufficient time for review or too late in the process for feedback to be incorporated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all key documents are shared with the country platform members</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 Key GFF documents and reports are made available in a timely manner through a public website</b>	<p>All of the following documents available online within one month of completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final investment case including the results framework;</li> <li>Final health financing strategy;</li> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>Financial disbursement data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One of the documents not available on line; OR</li> <li>All documents available online but not within the specified time period (one month of completion)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More than one of the documents is not available on line</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 The Country Platform meetings are regular and well attended</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The meetings are regular, as per the TOR AND</li> <li>The meetings reach the quorum as per the TOR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The meetings are regular OR</li> <li>The meetings meet the quorum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The meetings are irregular AND</li> <li>The meetings do not meet the quorum</li> </ul>
<b>3. CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT</b>	<b>GREEN</b>	<b>YELLOW</b>	<b>RED</b>
<b>3.1 The country platform includes civil society representation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The country platform includes 2 civil society representatives including one local CSO AND</li> <li>Civil society representatives are elected by their constituency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The country platform includes 1 civil society representative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The country platform does not have any civil society representation</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 Civil society representative(s) on the country platform seek inputs from and report back to broader civil society</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil society representative(s) on the country platform regularly seek inputs from AND</li> <li>report back to broader civil society</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil society representative(s) occasionally engage with broader civil society on issues relating to GFF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil society representative(s) do not engage with broader civil society on issues relating to GFF</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 A CSO coalition / network has been identified to engage with the country platform and is informed on GFF progress</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One CSO coalition has been identified as the lead on GFF; AND</li> <li>This coalition is actively engaged with the country platform and GFF processes as outlined in their TOR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is more than one CSO coalition and it is not clear which one is leading; OR</li> <li>There is one CSO coalition leading but they are not very engaged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no CSO coalition engaging in the GFF processes</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 Civil society has an engagement strategy and have mobilised resources for its implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil Society Engagement Strategy has been completed; AND</li> <li>Resources have been mobilised to implement some or all activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil society engagement strategy has been developed (in draft) but no resources have been mobilised for its implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil society engagement strategy has not been developed</li> </ul>

4. DESIGN OF KEY DOCUMENTS	GREEN	YELLOW	RED
4.1 The IF is prioritised based on resources available based on different funding scenarios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimation of resources available have been calculated based on different funding scenarios; AND</li> <li>• The Investment Framework has been prioritised based on these</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been some level of prioritisation but not based on a specific resource envelop</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IF has not been prioritised based on resources available</li> </ul>
4.2 The Investment Framework and Health Financing Strategy are accompanied by a costed implementation plan that sets out concrete steps (3 – 5 year)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A costed implementation plan setting out concrete steps has been developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A costed implementation plan is partially developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A costed implementation plan is yet to be developed</li> </ul>
4.3 The Health Financing Strategy is consistent with the Investment Framework priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategies outlined in the Health Financing Strategy are consistent with those in the Investment Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategies outlined in the health Financing are partially consistent with those in the Investment Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are considerable inconsistencies between the strategies in the Health Financing Strategy and those in the Investment Framework</li> </ul>
4.4 The Project Appraisal Document (PAD) is consistent with the Investment Framework priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategies outlined in the PAD are consistent with those in the Investment Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategies outlined in the PAD are partially consistent with those in the Investment Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAD not aligned to Investment Framework</li> </ul>

5. IMPLEMENTATION	GREEN	YELLOW	RED
5.1 Annual progress reports indicate progress against the results framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An annual progress report has been developed and it outlines progress against the results framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An annual progress report has been developed but it only partially outlines progress against the results framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An annual progress report has not been developed</li> </ul>
5.2 The annual work planning process at national level is designed to reflect the priorities of the IF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an agreed process in place (eg guidelines) to ensure that the annual work planning reflects the priorities of the IF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some effort to reflect the priorities of the IF in the annual work planning process but this is not done in a structured way</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no clear process of reflecting the IF priorities in the annual work planning process</li> </ul>
5.3 The annual work planning process at sub-national level is designed to reflect the priorities of the IF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an agreed process in place (eg guidelines) to ensure that the annual work planning reflects the priorities of the IF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some effort to reflect the priorities of the IF in the annual work planning process but this is not done in a structured way</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no clear process of reflecting the IF priorities in the annual work planning process</li> </ul>
5.4 There is increased government investment in RMNCAH (or in Health if data is not available)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an increased budget allocation for RMNCAH OR</li> <li>• There is an increased budget allocation for health</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some evidence of prioritisation of RMNCAH in the public budget eg a new budget line or increased investment in RH commodities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence of increased allocation for RMNCAH or Health in general</li> </ul>
5.5 The Ministry of Health has an agreement with the private sector to provide resources to implement IF priorities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An agreement has been made with the private sector to provide resources (operational, financial or technical) to implement IF priorities (eg supply chain management, medical technology)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiations with the private sector have initiated and are ongoing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions have started but are still in the exploratory stage</li> </ul>
5.6 There is a mechanism in place to ensure that donor funding for RMNCAH is aligned with the investment case (eg pooled fund, joint planning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mechanism for ensuring donor alignment with the IF has been agreed and is being implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mechanism for donor alignment is in place but only partially implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no mechanism for ensuring donor alignment with the IF</li> </ul>
5.7 GFF Committed Funding is released in a timely manner and is utilised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFF Funding is released on a timely manner AND</li> <li>• At least 80% of committed GFF funds are spent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFF funding is released but with some delays AND</li> <li>• At least 50% of committed funds are spent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFF funding is not released OR</li> <li>• GFF funding is released but less than 50% of it is spent.</li> </ul>