

Commenter: Dr. Michael Grewe

Affiliation: Germany

From: Grewe, Dr. Michael [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, April 29, 2024 9:25 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: The Pandemic Fund Secretariat

<The_Pandemic_Fund_Secretariat@worldbankgroup.org>; [REDACTED]

Subject: AW: Pandemic Fund: Draft Strategic Plan for public consultations

thank you for sending us the new version of the Strategic Plan. We have the following comments and would appreciate if you could already consider them in the update that you are planning to circulate on Wednesday.

Funding scenarios

We think that the question which funding scenarios seem likely and how the PF should strategically prioritize its spending in a low and a high funding scenario is very important for such a strategy. Please note that we do NOT ask to reintroduce the “low scenario” of 300 million per year which we have criticized for being under-ambitious leaving a huge PPR funding gap. We imagine a low scenario could be at 500 million per year (for us the absolute minimum considering the effort benefit ratio of running such a fund and the reachable impact) and a high scenario at 1 billion per year. These two scenarios should at least be briefly outlined.

We do not agree that the difference between two or more funding scenarios should only consist in the (number of) countries to be supported (as stated on page 9), but also in the thematic approach. More funds could mean that the PF takes up more/broader thematic approaches. Furthermore, the Strategic Plan should not fix that the PF over the next five years will prioritize its resources on the three geographic scopes according to Sections 3.1 and 3.3, as stated on page 9. Also this should depend on the available funds.

National Public Health Institutes (NPHI)

As discussed at the last Board Meeting, it should still be made clearer that the PF will NOT support NPHIs *per se*, but only PPR-related activities by NPIHS or other relevant institutions. (e.g. pages 7 and 23). In a national context NPHIs shouldn't be the only institutions to be supported by the PF, please mention others always together with NPHIs (e.g., under the bullet point on page 23 ... we recommend to say “NPHIs or other relevant public institutions” once in the headline and omit it in the bullet points – all points should apply to both).

Besides working with local health entities and community-based organisations, NPHIs should also work with academic institutions, as these are crucial to support evidence-based decision-making of NPHIs (this should be specified on pages 7 and 23). The role of academic institutions is not mentioned in the Strategic Plan.

Commenter: Dr. Michael Grewe

Affiliation: Germany

Other comments

For all thematic areas (e.g. laboratory systems, workforce) it should always be clear that the PF only finances investments in PPR (e.g. some of the wordings of page 7 are too broad in that sense).

On page 18 please add the word including in “The Pandemic Fund's Strategic Plan (2024-2029) sets a clear path for enhancing foundational pandemic PPR capacities in surveillance, laboratory systems, and workforce **including** in NPHIs and regional/global networks...”, as the work of the PF has to be much broader than focusing only on NPHIs and regional/global networks.

On page 22 please use the broader term antimicrobial-resistant pathogens instead of antibiotic-resistant pathogens.

Best regards

Michael

Dr. Michael Grewe

German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development

[Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]

Tel.: [Redacted]



Bundesministerium für
wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit
und Entwicklung

Der Schutz Ihrer Daten ist uns wichtig. Nähere Informationen zum Umgang mit personenbezogenen Daten im BMZ können Sie der Datenschutzerklärung auf www.bmz.de/de/service/datenschutzerklaerung entnehmen. For English, see www.bmz.de/en/services/privacy-statement