I. Background

1.   When the Ebola outbreak spread across West Africa in 2014, the response revealed weaknesses in the systems and mechanisms that were expected to address health emergencies at the country, regional and global levels. The outbreak triggered a number of reviews and evaluations of the response. One such review was conducted by the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on the Global Response to Health Crises ("Panel"), which issued its report, entitled "Protecting humanity from future health crises" (A/70/723), in early 2016. The Secretary-General set out his observations on the Panel's recommendations in his report, entitled "Strengthening the global health architecture" (A/70/824).

2.   The Secretary-General also established the Global Health Crises Task Force for a one year period from 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017. The purpose of the Task Force was to monitor, coordinate and support the follow-up and implementation of the recommendations of the Panel.   The Task Force was comprised of 15 members, including three co-leads, the United Nations Deputy Secretary-General, the Director-General of the World Health Organization and the President of the World Bank Group.[1] The Task Force and its Secretariat received financial support from the Governments of Germany, Norway and the Human Security Trust Fund.[2]

3.   The Task Force held meetings every quarter – in total, four teleconferences and two face-to-face meetings. The Task Force also prepared quarterly reports to highlight progress on the Panel's recommendations. The quarterly reports and the summaries of the meetings can be found on the website of the Task Force.[3]

4.   In the course of the year, the Task Force focused on ways in which health crises can be better anticipated and a dependable response could be assured. The Task Force highlighted positive developments, identified vulnerabilities, located bottlenecks to implementation and made proposals for improvements. The Task Force sought to catalyse action on the Panel's recommendations. At the same time, it enhanced the preparedness and capability of the UN.

II. Progress in advancing health security

5.   In monitoring the implementation of the Panel's recommendations, the Task Force considered each of the recommendations individually. A document setting out the details of progress on the 27 recommendations can be found on the website of the Task Force.

6.   At the same time, the Task Force was of the view that it would be useful to focus on priority areas relevant to advancing health security. The term "health security", as used in this context, refers to the range of conditions that need to be in place to ensure individual and collective health through preparing for, preventing and responding to health threats of animal and human origins. These conditions include, but are not limited, to compliance with the

---

[1] The composition of the Task Force is set out in Annex 1.
[2] The Task Force members were reimbursed for their travel to meetings of the Task Force only when it was not otherwise covered by their respective entities and not prohibited by the rules of their employers.
[3] http://www.un.org/en/global-health-crises-task-force/index.html.

International Health Regulations (2005), access to health services and medicines, functioning health systems and strong health workforces.

7.   The Task Force identified the following nine priority areas of work on preparing for, preventing and responding to health crises:

    a. Strategic support for national health systems
    b. Integrating communities and civil society organizations
    c. Supporting regional arrangements
    d. Strengthening UN system capacity
    e. Testing capacities and processes through simulations
    f. Catalysing focused research and innovation
    g. Securing sustainable financing for health security
    h. Focusing attention on the gender dimensions of health crises
    i. Ensuring health security remains prioritised on national and global political agendas

8.   Significant developments from January 2016 to May 2017 in these areas are highlighted below.

Strategic support for national health systems

9.   The Panel recommended that States achieve full compliance with the core capacity requirements in the International Health Regulations (IHR) and that WHO strengthen its periodic review of such compliance.[4]

10.   One key achievement has been the development by WHO of a new IHR monitoring and evaluation framework. This framework consists of four components: annual reporting to the World Health Assembly; after action review; simulation exercises; and voluntary joint external evaluations.

11.   The joint external evaluations have introduced more objectivity, depth and transparency in the assessment of national core capacities. As of 9 June 2017, 44 countries have completed a joint external evaluation, 29 countries are scheduled for the evaluations, and another 23 countries have expressed an interest in the joint external evaluations. The joint external evaluation teams – composed of experts from Member States, WHO and other international organizations – conduct the evaluations in close collaboration with national authorities across ministries. The full reports are posted online. Importantly, the joint external evaluations are linked with the evaluations by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) of animal health systems and the gaps identified are addressed in costed national action plans for health security ("national health action plans").

12.   Through the composition of the joint external evaluation teams and the conduct of the evaluations, multi-sectoral collaboration has been embedded as a standard way of working. The Task Force welcomes this new framework and appreciates its application. The Task Force encourages the systematic integration of animal health experts and civil society organizations in the IHR monitoring and evaluation framework, to promote the "One Health" approach and to highlight the critical importance of community engagement.

---

[4] A/70/723, Recommendations 1 and 6.

13.   The Task Force welcomes the substantial progress with the introduction of the voluntary joint external evaluations. However, it is not enough just to diagnose the problems; they must be remedied. Gaps identified in the joint external evaluations, as well as in after action reviews and simulation exercises, need to be prioritised and incorporated within the national health action plans and addressed through the provision of technical and financial assistance to the country. As of 9 June 2017, country planning missions to develop national health action plans have been completed in three countries and are planned in 21 countries. The Task Force stresses the importance of completing costed national health action plans promptly and making financial and technical support available. Countries need to be motivated to report accurately on their capacities. One important incentive is to ensure that financing for health systems is prioritised both within domestic budgets and supplemented, as needed, by external partners.

14.   The Task Force stresses the importance of promoting a culture whereby national authorities adopt travel and trade measures consistent with the IHR and based on the evidence of what is needed to address the spread of disease, thus avoiding undue adverse consequences for travel and trade. The WHO Secretariat will reinforce the current process for monitoring travel and trade measures, by posting the measures and the rationale provided by Member States on a WHO website. The Task Force considers that the public posting of this information could be useful in promoting greater transparency and accountability. WHO will be working with the World Trade Organization to develop dispute resolution mechanisms that can be invoked if a country considers that disproportionate measures have been imposed. The Task Force considers that work on these mechanisms needs to advance more rapidly.

15.   The Task Force notes that strengthening of national health systems and cross-sectoral response capacities should also address the vulnerabilities faced by children. The systematic collection of age and sex-disaggregated data in national surveillance systems and in the monitoring of interventions is critical in understanding risks specific to children, impact of the disease, and efficacy of interventions. Risk and vulnerability assessments should also consider the indirect impact of the disease outbreak on children.[5] In addressing the specific needs and vulnerabilities of children during large-scale outbreaks, it is critical to have cross-sectoral engagement.

16.   The Panel highlighted the need to invest in the training of health workers so they are better able to respond to crises.[6] A report by the Secretary-General's High-level Commission on Health Employment and Economic Growth issued in September 2016 concluded that investing in the health workforce is needed to make progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals, including gains in health, decent work, global security and inclusive economic growth. A five-year action plan to support country-driven implementation of the Commission's recommendations has been developed by WHO, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the International Labour Organization.

17.   Building and maintaining a strong health workforce requires protecting the safety and security of health workers. In May 2016, the Security Council unanimously adopted its first resolution to address the protection of medical and humanitarian personnel engaged in

---

[5] Such impact includes being at risk of violence, exploitation, and abuse, loss of access to services resulting from the death or hospitalization of a parent or caregiver, and loss of access to education.
[6] A/70/723, Recommendation 2.

medical duties during situations of armed conflict.[7] In this resolution, the Security Council condemned attacks against the wounded and sick, medical personnel, humanitarian personnel engaged in medical duties, and medical facilities, transport and equipment. In August 2016, the Secretary-General provided the Security Council with recommendations to prevent attacks and better ensure accountability and enhance the protection of the healthcare personnel and facilities.[8] Unfortunately, a May 2017 report by the Safeguarding Healthcare in Conflict Coalition concluded that "in the months since the passing of resolution 2286, attacks on hospitals dramatically escalated in Syria and continued without respite in other parts of the world."[9] The Task Force considers that the recommendations of the Secretary-General in his August 2016 letter, as well as those in the report by the Safeguarding Healthcare in Conflict Coalition, deserve urgent attention.

18.   The issue of security for health workers has also been highlighted by the Global Outbreaks and Alert Response Network (GOARN).[10] Robust security systems and capacity are critical for GOARN operations and for a strong WHO operational platform that can support countries and coordinate an international response. Security capability for emergencies must ensure safe and enabling operating environments. Security should be central to the planning, assessment and coordination of international responses, and staff safety must be a critical consideration for all operations. Safety for healthcare workers also requires investment in adequate supplies of personal protective equipment (PPE) and infection control training.   During outbreaks, healthcare facilities can serve to amplify spread of infection. Losing health workers not only erodes capacity but undermines public confidence and staff morale. Healthcare workers need to be prioritised for available countermeasures during outbreaks.

19.   The Panel recommended that Governments establish and train emergency workforces.[11] The WHO Emergency Medical Teams initiative has contributed to these efforts through its work to ensure quality assurance, coordination and accountability of deployable national and international Emergency Medical Teams. Building on this work, the GOARN will be launching a Public Health Rapid Response Team initiative.

20.   Advancing health security requires more than just ensuring capacity to respond to health threats. Resilience-building and preparedness are essential to preventing health threats from developing into large scale health emergencies. For this reason, the Task Force welcomes the Bangkok Principles for the implementation of the health aspects of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, adopted in March 2016.

21.   Another important area of ongoing work on preparedness relates to the development of the Pandemic Supply Chain Network, launched by World Food Programme (WFP) with other partners. The Network aims to address a critical area of vulnerability in pandemic preparedness – supply chain and logistics to facilitate the timely delivery of supplies to treat

---

[7] Security Council resolution 2286 (2016).

[8] Letter dated 18 August 2016 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2016/722).

[9] Report of the Safeguarding Health In Conflict Coalition, Impunity Must End: Attacks on Health in 23 Countries in Conflict in 2016. (https://www.safeguardinghealth.org/sites/shcc/files/SHCC2017final.pdf)

[10] The specific recommendations proposed by GOARN in a workshop on Ebola response and security held in August 2016 in Guinea are detailed in the Annex to the Final Report ("Progress on the 27 Recommendations of the High-Level Panel") under Recommendation 1.4.

[11] A/70/723, Recommendation 1.

patients and protect health workers. Through the Network, public and private sector partners will collaborate in identifying supply sources for critical response items, mapping transport routes, and developing an information platform to give countries and emergency coordinators a real time view of the availability and location of response items.

22.   Another logistical bottleneck that needs to be addressed in advance of an emergency is the streamlining of customs processing. Often, emergencies lead to an influx of unwanted donations – for example, following the 2010 earthquake, Haiti received 10 containers of refrigerators operating on an unusable voltage. The Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) have designed an Automated System for Relief Emergency Consignments (ASYREC) to expedite the processing of relief items by customs authorities during emergencies. Prior to an emergency, ASYREC will enable customs authorities to take preparatory steps, such as establishing streamlined customs procedures, and pre-registering humanitarian partners. During an emergency, national disaster management authorities can use ASYREC to list priority relief items and the required quantities, and fast-track the processing of relief items once they arrive. OCHA plans to introduce ASYREC in a few pilot countries by mid-2017 and aims to launch the platform by the end of 2017. The Task Force welcomes the development of ASYREC to address the persistent problem of unsolicited shipments during emergencies and delays due to customs formalities. Broad adoption of the ASYREC platform by all countries is critical, as any country is potentially vulnerable to natural disasters and health emergencies.

23.   The Panel considered that there is a "close relationship between compliance with the IHR core capacity requirements and the wider improvement of health systems." The International Health Partnership ("IHP+"), established in 2007 to promote more effective development cooperation in health, has been adjusted to focus on health system strengthening towards achieving universal health coverage by 2030. In September 2016, the new International Health Partnership for UHC2030 was announced by the WHO Director-General.   Guidance on strengthening health systems for countries involved in UHC 2030 should help to support the development of the IHR core capacities.

Integrating communities and civil society organizations

24.   The Task Force stresses that community engagement deserves greater emphasis before and during outbreaks to ensure that preparedness and response activities are culturally sensitive, better understood and meet the needs of the people concerned. Protecting individuals from health threats through community involvement is at the core of resilience and human security. It is essential to have meaningful engagement with communities in the design and implementation, as well as the evaluation of health programmes. Communities can be involved in surveillance, prevention, early response, promotion of health seeking behaviour as well as contact tracing, the identification of bottlenecks in response efforts, and the design and development of risk communication messages and approaches. Initiatives to promote community engagement, including integration into the joint external evaluations and costed national action plans, will need investment.

25.   The Task Force welcomes three notable developments to promote community engagement in health:

a. The Communication and Community Engagement Initiative was formally established in early 2017, with a secretariat hosted by UNICEF. The Initiative will develop mechanisms to provide affected communities with information, to establish channels for communities to provide feedback on humanitarian actions and to ensure that decision-making processes are informed by constructive engagement with communities. The Initiative is participating in the development of training modules for Emergency Medical Teams.

b. The UNICEF and the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Sussex in the United Kingdom established a secretariat for a global partnership to carry out research on effective community engagement and risk communication needs. The partnership will aim to generate knowledge and summarise research on community engagement and building resilience in humanitarian contexts, including public health emergencies. It will also synthesise research on cultural practices and communities to guide response and recovery efforts, and develop a network of social science researchers who can be deployed during an emergency.   The Task Force considers that learning from the work of the global partnership should inform the joint external evaluations and country action plans.

c. The WHO R&D Blueprint published guidance on Good Community Engagement Practices for conducting clinical research in emergencies.[12]

Supporting regional arrangements

26. The Panel recommended that regional and sub-regional organizations develop or strengthen standing capacities to monitor, prevent and respond to health crises, supported by WHO.[13] The Task Force supports regional initiatives, while encouraging country-centred approaches with good regional coordination.

27. To support regional capacities, the WHO Emergency Medical Teams initiative has been partnering with regional arrangements, such as the European Union, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the African Union. WHO is training regional experts on coordinating arriving Emergency Medical Teams and Public Health Teams. GOARN has held regional meetings in Europe and the Middle East, and implemented international training courses for regional response capacity in the Americas and Middle East. In Africa, WHO co-hosted a West African Regional Conference on One Health in November 2016, in collaboration with the Economic Community of West African States and others to bring together ministers from various sectors to address zoonotic diseases. The Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (Africa CDC) was formally launched in January 2017, with Dr. John Nkengasong named as its first director. WHO signed a framework for collaboration with the African Union on the Africa CDC to improve health security and Africa CDC is now a partner in GOARN.

28. In March 2017, the sub-regional action plan to implement the recommendations of the High-Level Commission on Health Employment and Economic Growth was adopted at a health and labour ministerial meeting of the West African Monetary and Economic Union (WAMEU). The action plan includes the revision of macroeconomic policy constraints on

---

[12] http://www.who.int/blueprint/what/norms-standards/GPP-EPP-December2016.pdf?ua=1
[13] A/70/723, Recommendation 5.

investments into the health workforce to create decent jobs, accelerated expansion and transformation of the education and training of health workers and coordinated strategies to develop Emergency Medical Teams with ECOWAS. The regional action plan will be discussed at a labour and finance ministerial meeting in July 2017, where health ministers will participate for the first time.

29.   In June 2016, the World Bank Group approved US$110 million in International Development Association financing to strengthen disease surveillance systems in Guinea, Sierra Leone and Senegal. This initiative is part of the Regional Disease Surveillance Systems Enhancement (REDISSE) Program, which aims to address systemic weaknesses within the human and animal health sectors that hinder effective disease surveillance and response. The second phase of the REDISSE Program was approved on March 2017 for Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Nigeria, Togo for a total of US$140 million. The third phase of the project will cover Benin, Niger, Mali and Mauritania (possibly additional countries) and is expected to be approved in February 2018.

30.   As recommended by the International Working Group on Financing of Preparedness (discussed below), attention to the sustainable financing of regional networks is critical insofar as they must develop a system for securing national contributions from network members in order to remain viable beyond initial contributions from donors.

Strengthening UN system capacity

31.   The UN system, including WHO, must have the capacity to support countries in strengthening their health systems, preparing for health emergencies, and responding to health threats. The Task Force is pleased to see the following significant developments in augmenting UN system capacity over the past year.

WHO Health Emergencies Programme

32.   The Panel recommended that WHO strengthen its leadership and establish a unified, effective operational capacity.[14]

33.   In May 2016, the World Health Assembly endorsed the establishment of the Health Emergencies Programme ("Programme") to add operational capabilities for outbreaks and humanitarian emergencies to complement WHO's traditional technical and normative roles. The Programme is headed by an Executive Director, Dr. Peter Salama, who commenced his functions in July 2016. The ultimate authority for the management of emergencies at WHO will rest with the Director-General. This authority will be delegated by the Director-General to:

a. The Executive Director, in the case of major outbreaks and health emergencies, including Grade 3 events, Public Health Emergencies of International Concern and Level 3 emergencies under the IASC.
b. Either the Executive Director or the relevant Regional Director, in the case of Grade 2 events, depending on the nature of threat and the capacity and capabilities of the countries concerned.
c. The relevant Regional Director, in the case of Grade 1 events.

---

[14] A/70/723, Recommendation 7.

34.   To ensure a rapid response to outbreaks, the Programme will initiate an on-the ground assessment within 72 hours of notification of a high threat pathogen, clusters of unexplained deaths in high vulnerability/low-capacity settings, and other events of concern at the discretion of the Director-General. GOARN partners may be activated to support risk assessment and early response, including by laboratory confirmation, epidemiological investigations, and activation of relevant technical networks. The outcomes will be communicated to the Director-General through the Executive Director within 24 hours of completion of the assessment, together with recommendations of the Programme on risk mitigation, management and/or response measures as appropriate.

35.   Achievements of the Programme to date have included:

   a. Rolling out the Early Warning Alert Response System (EWARS) in 56 health facilities in Borno State, Nigeria;
   b. Deploying mobile health clinics to Quayyarah City in Iraq, which had been under the control of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant from June 2014 to August 2016;
   c. Delivering 11 tonnes of medical supplies to health authorities in the northeastern part of Syria;
   d. Supporting the medical evacuation of residents from eastern Aleppo, Syria
   e. Deploying vaccines to respond to the yellow fever outbreaks in Brazil and elsewhere;
   f. Supporting vaccination campaigns in Benin, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, and Yemen,;
   g. Rolling out community health services in South Sudan; and
   h. Expanding mental health care services in Syria.

36.   To provide ongoing oversight over the development of the Programme, the WHO Director-General established the Independent Oversight and Advisory Committee ("IOAC") for four years. The main functions of this Committee are to assess the performance of the Programme's key functions in health emergencies, determine the appropriateness and adequacy of the Programme's financing and resourcing, and provide advice to the Director-General.[15] During its first year of work, beginning in May 2016, the IOAC held eight meetings and conducted field visits to Colombia, northeastern Nigeria, and Iraq.

37.   In its reports to the WHO Executive Board and the World Health Assembly, the IOAC expressed its view that the implementation of the Programme has significantly advanced, with particular progress in protracted emergencies. Improvements were observed specifically in WHO's health cluster co-ordination and leadership, and its effectiveness on the ground. Partners in-country acknowledge encouraging signs in WHO's field presence and partnership engagement, and their expanded role in humanitarian crises. However, the IOAC expressed concern that business processes have not developed at the pace of the Programme and are not sufficiently supporting the Programme, and that there remain constraints in the organizational culture regarding the adoption of a "no regrets policy". The IOAC also stressed the importance of establishing baseline level of emergency operational and management capacity at country level. The IOAC reiterated their concerns that the programme is underfunded and the significant progress to date is seen as fragile.

38.   The Task Force observes with satisfaction the development of the Programme and is impressed by the rigorous monitoring of the Programme by the IOAC. The Task Force

_____
[15]See http://www.who.int/about/who_reform/emergency-capacities/oversight-committee/en/

shares the concern of the IOAC that inadequate financing threatens to undermine the progress made by the Programme. It will be important to monitor the implementation of the Programme and see whether the financing enables the Programme to be sustainable for the long term. The Task Force stresses that collaboration between the agencies addressing human health (WHO) and animal health (OIE and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)) is particularly important in view of the number of emerging threats that are of zoonotic origin. The Task Force cautions against strengthening capacity only during emergencies. The UN system needs to build capacities for preparation and demonstrate commitment and attention to global health at the highest levels of senior leadership in the UN system.

Adoption of Inter-Agency Standing Committee procedures on activation during infectious disease events

39.   The Panel recommended that health and humanitarian crises trigger systems be integrated and that the processes for activating lines of command during a Grade 2 or Grade 3 outbreak be clarified.[16] The Task Force notes real progress in this area.

40.   The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) provides an important platform for UN and non-UN stakeholders involved in humanitarian action to come together. The activation of the IASC system in humanitarian crises is governed by a protocol on "Humanitarian System-Wide Emergency Activation.[17] Given the specific requirements of mobilising during infectious disease events, WHO and IASC developed the "Level 3 Activation Procedures for Infectious Disease Events"[18], which was endorsed by IASC Principals in December 2016. Both protocols are designed to ensure effective mobilisation across the IASC community, to include the immediate deployment of surge capacity and activation of appropriate field level leadership and coordination arrangements. The new activation procedures establish a link between the responsibilities of the WHO and its Director-General under the IHR and the capacities and emergency response tools of the IASC. The new activation procedures also provide an opportunity for non-IASC actors, including Chair of the GOARN Steering Committee, to feed into decision-making on activation and on the response strategy.

41.   The IASC procedures for infectious disease events will be tested in a simulation to be conducted amongst IASC principals in the latter part of 2017. The Task Force considers that future success of this mechanism is extremely important and the roles of the WHO Director-General and Emergency Relief Coordinator will be critical.

Improved information coordination on health threats within the UN system

42.   The Task Force notes that the processes for information coordination on health threats have improved with the issuance of the new WHO Emergency Response Framework issued in April 2017, the upgraded role of UN Operation and Crisis Centre (UNOCC) in reporting on health threats within the UN system, and the improved coordination of communications on health crises by DPI, working together with WHO.

---

[16] A/70/723, Recommendations 8 and 9.
[17] Humanitarian System-Wide Emergency Activation (PR/1204/4078/7).
[18] IASC Level 3 Activation Procedures for Infectious Disease Events.

43.   The WHO Emergency Response Framework provides guidance on how WHO manages the assessment, grading and response to public health events and emergencies. When conducting a risk assessment, WHO engages a range of partners, including FAO, the OIE and IASC members. The results of a risk assessment are communicated through the WHO Regional Emergency Director to the Executive Director of the WHO Health Emergencies Programme. All high-risk events are referred for grading within 24 hours. The Director-General promptly notifies the Secretary-General of health events graded at levels 2 and 3. This notification is also sent to the Emergency Relief Coordinator and the Resident Coordinator of the affected country.

44.   Upon receipt of these notifications, the UN Secretariat further circulates the information to relevant offices in the UN system, including the UN Operation and Crisis Centre (UNOCC). UNOCC is mandated to serve as an enhanced and integrated information and crisis hub working to collate and consolidate timely and accurate information from across the UN system. In addition to disseminating information about graded health events, UNOCC works with WHO to circulate information on reports of disease outbreaks. UNOCC can ensure that information is brought to the attention of the Secretary-General promptly, if needed, so that he can act on this information in conjunction with WHO Director-General and senior UN system officials.

45.   The Department of Public Information (DPI) is responsible for providing support and guidance to the UN system on communications issues during health crises. Since November 2016, DPI and WHO has convened a regular teleconference call, which serves as a platform for coordination on communications by the UN system on health crises. Frequent participants include the World Bank Group, UNDP, UN Women and UN Foundation. The Task Force recommends that OIE and FAO also be regular participants.

UNICEF Health Emergencies Preparedness Initiative

46.   In September 2015, UNICEF launched the Health Emergencies Preparedness Initiative (HEPI) to strengthen the organization's capacity to respond to public health emergencies from preparation to response, linking to recovery and building resilience, and to serve as an effective partner to national governments, WHO and others. For selected diseases, HEPI has developed cross-sectoral guidance, tools and resources, including supply requirements and pre-positioning of stock for the highest priority diseases, and human resources guidance. These products will be made available for use and adaptation by partners.

Testing capacities and processes through simulations

47.   The Panel considered that an important component of preparedness is the conduct of simulations for all relevant responders, at all levels.[19]

48.   Country-level simulation exercises are one of the four components of the IHR Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. Since 2016, 33 emergency preparedness exercises have been conducted in 18 countries. In February 2017, WHO published a Simulation

---

[19] A/70/723, Recommendations 1 and 5.

Exercise Manual to provide guidance on planning, conducting and evaluating simulation exercises for outbreaks and public health emergency preparedness and response.[20]

49.   The WHO Emergency Medical Teams initiative has been working with the International Search and Rescue Advisory Group (INSARAG) Secretariat in OCHA to include the testing of health capacities in regional simulation exercises.   Emergency Medical Teams participated in INSARAG regional simulation exercises in Europe, Asia and the Americas in 2016.

50.   Simulations have featured prominently in meetings of intergovernmental entities or other fora. During its annual meeting in October 2016, the World Bank Group conducted a simulation exercise on pandemic preparedness for ministers of finance and policymakers, which promoted awareness about the economic impacts of pandemics and generated discussion about the roles of Ministries of Finance in supporting relevant sectors to strengthen pandemic preparedness. In January 2017, at the World Economic Forum (WEF) meeting in Davos, a pandemic simulation involving 30 CEOs from the private sector was co-organized by the World Bank Group and WEF.   The CEOs acknowledged that developing preparedness and response capacity requires global collaboration across different private sector partners. A simulation exercise was also conducted at the first health ministers meeting of the G20 countries in Berlin in May 2017.

51.   The Task Force would like to see more widespread use of simulation exercises to sensitise senior leaders and other decision-makers to the importance of integrating pandemic preparedness in their operational planning. Simulations need to be conducted in different settings, at all levels (local, national, regional and global), and across countries. The Task Force stresses the critical importance of bringing together all stakeholders in country-level simulations. Involving the private sector, civil society organizations, United Nations and national governments in simulations will help to clarify the respective roles of different partners and to identify gaps in country-level coordination in the future. Simulations should not be an end in itself; rather, where feasible and appropriate, the outcomes of the simulations should be reported, with lessons learnt and follow-up.

Catalysing focused research and innovation relevant to global health crises

52.   The Panel recommended that WHO should coordinate the prioritisation of global research and development efforts for diseases that pose the greatest threat.[21]

53.   The framework for WHO's work in research and development is set out in its "R&D Blueprint for Action to Prevent Epidemics: Plan of Action"[22] which was welcomed by the World Health Assembly in May 2016 and further discussed in May 2017. The Blueprint focuses on three sets of activities: (i) assessing epidemic threat and defining priority pathogens; (ii) developing R&D roadmaps to accelerate evaluation of diagnostics, therapeutics and vaccines; and (iii) outlining appropriate regulatory and ethical pathways. The Task Force commends WHO for the substantial progress made in each of these areas.

---

[20] http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/254741/1/WHO-WHE-CPI-2017.10-eng.pdf?ua=1
[21] A/70/723, Recommendation 13.
[22]http://www.who.int/blueprint/about/r_d_blueprint_plan_of_action.pdf?ua=1

Prioritising diseases and coordinating R&D efforts

54.   A methodology for prioritising diseases for research and development was first developed by a group of experts convened by WHO in December 2015 and revised in February 2017. A list of prioritised diseases and pathogens will be reviewed and revised on an annual basis using this methodology. Between annual prioritisation exercises, an unusual outbreak may be reviewed and prioritised, if needed. It is anticipated that the prioritisation methodology will be reviewed again before the end of 2019.

55.   Of the nine diseases that have been prioritised for urgent R&D attention, the following target product profiles for medical countermeasures have been developed:

	Target Product Profiles	
	Vaccines	Diagnostics
1. Arenaviral haemorrhagic fevers, including Lassa Fever	Apr 2017 **	
2. Crimean Congo Haemorrhagic Fever (CCHF)		
3. Filoviral diseases (including Ebola and Marburg)	Nov 2016*	Oct 2014 (Ebola)*
4. Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV)	May 2017*	
5. Other highly pathogenic coronaviral diseases (such as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, (SARS))		
6. Nipah and related henipaviral diseases	Mar 2017**	
7. Rift Valley Fever (RVF)		
8. Severe Fever with Thrombocytopenia Syndrome (SFTS)		
9. Zika	Feb 2017*	April 2016*

Date of latest draft of target product profiles
** Date of latest public consultation on draft

56.   The Task Force welcomes WHO's development of the Blueprint and its collaboration with the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI). Launched at Davos in January 2017, CEPI aims to advance the development of vaccines to the stage where it is ready for full trials or emergency use when needed. It will manufacture and stockpile these vaccines, provide a global hub to coordinate vaccine development and partner with organizations that can help reach target populations. CEPI seeks to raise $1 billion for its first five years and has received an initial investment of $460 million from governments and philanthropic organizations.

57.   While recognizing the importance of establishing a list of priority diseases, the Task Force also emphasizes that the prioritisation of certain pathogens should not have the effect of restricting research on pathogens that may not yet be recognized as potential disease outbreaks. The broader development and support of translatable platform technologies for diagnostics, vaccines, and therapeutics is also important.

58.   While the Panel had recommended that WHO oversee the establishment and management of at least $1 billion fund, the Task Force notes that there are presently a number of initiatives and entities already involved in the financing of research and development of vaccines, therapeutics and diagnostics. The Task Force endorses the role of funding agencies and organizations with extensive experience in supporting and managing research activities to continue to fulfil this responsibility. However, the Task Force considers that the role of funding research would not be suitable for WHO. WHO plays an important

role in convening and coordinating partners to align with common priorities, to ensure that efforts are not duplicated, and to flag areas where increased R&D efforts are needed for particular pathogens or products. The Task Force recognizes that convening and coordination activities at WHO should be funded to ensure that efforts by CEPI and other new development initiatives provide optimal value for money. In coordinating R&D, WHO should also promote a One Health approach.

Outlining regulatory and ethical pathways

59.   In October 2016, WHO issued its "Guidance for Managing Ethical Issues in Infectious Disease Outbreaks" ("Guidance"),[23] recognising that decisions during an outbreak often need to be made urgently, in the context of scientific uncertainty, and social and institutional disruption. Some of the challenges addressed by the Ethical Guidance relate to allocating scarce resources, conducting public health surveillance, restricting freedom of movement, administering medical interventions, storing biological specimens, deploying foreign humanitarian aid workers and conducting research during infectious disease outbreaks.

60.   In May 2017, WHO announced that major funders of medical research and international non-governmental organizations agreed to require that all trials they fund, co-fund, sponsor or support be registered in a publicly-available registry, such as WHO's International Clinical Trials Registry Platform. Moreover, all results of such trials would also need to be disclosed within specified timeframes on the registry and/or by publication in a scientific journal. The Task Force supports this significant move towards increasing transparency in clinical trial research and hopes that it will provide a basis for the development of a more comprehensive set of guidelines for data sharing during emergencies.

61.   In late 2016, the International Conference of Drug Regulatory Authorities (ICDRA) met in South Africa, bringing together over 360 delegates from national regulatory authorities. The ICDRA recommended that WHO develop guidance and facilitate dialogue on regulatory pathways, platform technologies and trial designs for products to counter emerging infectious disease pathogens, while taking care to ensure that such guidance covers pregnant women, children and other vulnerable populations. The Task Force encourages WHO to share a plan and timeline for these workstreams.

62.   In March 2017, WHO, Wellcome Trust and Chatham House met to discuss the terms of reference for a Global Coordination Mechanism for R&D preparedness. This Mechanism aims to provide a high-level discussion platform and framework for key partners to address global R&D challenges during epidemics. The Mechanism has established working groups to focus on data sharing, regulatory pathways, streamlining of ethical reviews and Zika vaccine clinical trials. The Task Force considers that this Mechanism will have a critical role in stimulating the development of vaccines, treatments and diagnostics for priority diseases and new zoonoses.

63.   The Task Force recognizes the difficulties encountered with testing medical countermeasures quickly when a disease outbreak occurs, which underscores the need to build trust in communities and in countries. The Task Force stresses that the development of local research capacity and the engagement of local researchers and communities as full and

---

[23]   http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/250580/1/9789241549837-eng.pdf

equal partners in the design, conduct, and analyses in clinical studies are vital to fostering the trust needed to conduct clinical trials and other research activities.

Expanding the PIP Framework to include other novel pathogens

64.   The Panel recommended that WHO convene its Member States to "renegotiate the Pandemic Influenza Preparedness Framework with a view to including other novel pathogens".[24]

65.   A PIP Framework Review Group ("Review Group") was established in December 2015 to conduct the first review of the PIP Framework after it had been implemented for five years. In its report to the WHO Executive Board, the Review Group noted that it had declined to proceed as recommended by the Panel. The Review Group explained that the success of the PIP Framework had

> "much to do with the uniqueness of the influenza virus itself – it mutates frequently and, because of the need for updated seasonal influenza vaccines, has a continuous product cycle, which therefore results in a consistent income stream for manufacturers.... There is also a strong, established network of laboratories in GISRS, monitoring influenza, which provided the foundation for the PIP Framework."[25]

66.   Noting that these conditions are not in place for other pathogens, the Review Group concluded that the "PIP Framework is a foundational model of reciprocity for global public health that could be applied to other pathogens; however, the current scope of the PIP Framework should remain focused on pandemic influenza at this time." It also recommended that the PIP Framework should be reviewed before the end of 2021.[26] The recommendations of the Review Group were commended by the World Health Assembly in May 2017. While noting the Review Group's observation that the success of the PIP Framework was linked to the particular characteristics of the influenza virus, the Task Force shares the view that it would be desirable to use the PIP Framework as a model for other pathogens.

Securing sustainable financing

67.   The Task Force is deeply concerned that public funds for maintaining health security at the national, regional and global levels continue to be a fraction of what is needed.

National and regional levels

68.   The 18th cycle of the World Bank's fund for the poorest countries – the International Development Association (IDA), or IDA 18, will begin on 1 July 2017. IDA 18 explicitly supports the capacity of governments to prepare for and respond to pandemics. A minimum of 25 countries will be supported in developing and implementing pandemic plans and frameworks for governance, institutional arrangements, and financing for multi-sectoral pandemic preparedness, response and recovery. IDA 18 also avails a new instrument, the Catastrophe Deferred Drawdown Option, which allows countries to access contingency financing for emergencies, including health crises.

---

[24] A/70/723, Recommendation 15.
[25] http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB140/B140_16-en.pdf
[26] Ibid., pages 37 – 38.

69.   In November 2016, the International Working Group on Financing Preparedness ("IWG") was established under the chairmanship of Mr. Peter Sands, with the World Bank serving as its Secretariat. In its report[27] launched at the World Health Assembly in May 2017, the IWG observed that despite several recent deadly outbreaks, an overwhelming majority of countries are unprepared for the next devastating epidemic. Noting the low priority given to investing in strengthening preparedness and building resilience in most low income countries, the IWG issued 12 bold but practical recommendations directed at incentivizing and channelling investments to strengthening public health capacities and capabilities. Using joint external evaluations to better understand current gaps in country capacities, the IWG directs countries to practical costing and financing tools designed to help governments quantify resource needs and identify ways of raising the needed resources. Emphasizing the importance of domestic resource mobilization for strengthening preparedness, the IWG exhorts countries to strengthen tax collection and allocate more resources to investments in strengthening country health and disaster management systems, and calls upon development partners to leverage external assistance to increase domestic financing for preparedness. The IWG recognizes the potential of the private sector to be a strategic partner in the country's preparedness efforts, and underscores the importance of enabling regulations to strengthen public-private collaboration. Finally, the IWG identifies several incentives, including development of country preparedness indexes, which could play a critical role in placing pandemic risks at the same level as financial risks and terrorism threats.

70.   In May 2016, at the G7 Meetings in Ise-Shima, the World Bank announced the creation of a new financing mechanism, the Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility (PEF), which will provide surge financing to IDA countries affected by a major outbreak that has the potential of becoming a pandemic. One component of the PEF involves private sector contingency financing – "an insurance window" - to respond to known pathogens with pandemic potential including orthomyxoviruses, filoviruses, coronaviruses and other zoonotic diseases (Crimean Congo, Rift Valley, Lassa fever). The PEF also includes contingency financing through a cash window to respond to other known and unknown diseases that may have the potential to take on pandemic proportions. The PEF will be able to disburse surge financing during an outbreak both to affected countries as well as to accredited international responders such as WHO, UNICEF, and WFP, among others. The PEF is governed by a Steering Body that includes its financial contributors (Germany and Japan), the World Bank Group as trustee, WHO and stakeholder countries. Following the first meeting of the Steering Body in late June 2017, the PEF will open its insurance window in July 2017 and its cash window in January 2018.

71.   The Task Force acknowledges that, while the PEF will play a key role in future outbreak response, it is only one component of a broader comprehensive solution to the needs of pandemic response financing. The Task Force recommends that the PEF be complemented by other financing mechanisms to help countries to prepare for and respond to health emergencies.

72.   The Task Force emphasizes that the engagement of finance ministers is key to attracting attention to health issues within governments. The integration of health crises

---

[27] http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/979591495652724770/From-panic-and-neglect-to-investing-in-health-security-financing-pandemic-preparedness-at-a-national-level

preparedness into assessments by the International Monetary Fund of a country's economic and financial development will help elevate the profile of health for finance ministers and their governments. The dangers posed by disease outbreaks to the functioning of economies and governance in general must be consistently highlighted. The Task Force emphasizes that regional banks also need to become engaged in generating financing for health systems, and factoring country preparedness for health crises into their policies. Support for laboratories and regional coordination mechanisms would be consistent with the role of regional banks in financing infrastructure.

Global level

73. The Panel recommended that assessed contributions to the WHO budget be increased by at least 10 per cent and the WHO Contingency Fund for Emergencies be financed at $300 million so that it could be made available for use by Health Cluster members.[28]

74. In May 2016, the World Health Assembly authorized the Director-General to mobilise voluntary contributions for the Health Emergencies. While US$80 million has been reallocated from WHO's regular budget to the Health Emergencies Programme, it continued to face a gap of 29%, as of June 2017. As the Contingency Fund continues to face a 63% funding gap, the increase of the Fund to $300 million proposed by the Panel, although warranted, appears to be unachievable.

75. In January 2017, the WHO Director-General proposed a US$ 93 million increase in assessed contributions for the draft 2018-19 Programme Budget, reflecting a 10% increase in assessed contributions. The amount of assessed contributions has remained unchanged since the approval of the 2008-2009 budget in May 2007. In the revised programme budget submitted to the World Health Assembly, the WHO Director-General requested only a 3 per cent increase in assessed contributions. During the World Health Assembly in May 2017, this increase was approved.

76. The Task Force considers that the willingness of Member States to provide predictable and adequate financing of WHO is a key indicator of their commitment to the health security of their people. It is also critical to the success of building WHO's capability to support countries in their IHR capacity assessment and development.

Focusing attention on the gender dimensions of global health crises

77. The Panel recommended that outbreak preparedness and response efforts should take into account and address the gender dimension.[29]

78. The High-Level Commission on Health Employment and Economic Growth recognized that women constitute the majority of the health workforce but systemic gender biases and inequities in education and employment need to be addressed, including enrolment in education and training, unpaid care roles, lack of gender-sensitive policies, pay inequity and under-representation in positions of leadership and decision-making. Women in the health workforce are also at greater risk of physical and sexual violence and harassment. The five-year action plan on Health Employment and Economic Growth includes the

---

[28] A/70/723, Recommendations 18 and 20.
[29] A/70/723, Recommendation 4.

development of a global policy guidance and the acceleration of regional and national initiatives to address gender biases and inequalities in education and health labour markets. The Task Force agrees that greater attention must be paid to the disproportionate burden on women during health crises both in the health sector (as informal and formal caregivers) and with regard to economic and social impacts on women and girls.

79.   The Task Force supports the chapter in WHO's "Guidance for Managing Ethical Issues in Infectious Disease Outbreaks" on addressing differences based on sex and gender, noting that these differences have been associated with differences in susceptibility to infection, levels of health care received, and the course and outcome of illness. Information collected by public health surveillance programmes should disaggregate information by sex, gender and pregnancy status to monitor variations in risks, modes of transmission, impact of disease and efficacy of interventions. Policy-makers and outbreak responders need to pay attention to gender-related roles and social and cultural practices, including vulnerability to interpersonal violence, when developing health intervention and communication strategies.

80.   An additional positive development is the establishment of a maternal and child health working group by the WHO Emergency Medical Teams (EMTs) initiative to develop principles and standards of care for EMTs delivering maternal and child health services. This will complement the important work already being done on maternal and child health coordinated through the health cluster.

81.   UN Women, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) have jointly developed a Global Programme in Support of a Gender Responsive Sendai Framework Implementation (GIR Programme). Noting the higher fatality rates of women and girls in natural disasters such as the 2008 cyclone in Myanmar and the 2014 Solomon Island floods, the GIR Programme emphasizes the need to focus on the high and unequal risk exposure of women and girls to the impact of climate related natural disasters and its detrimental effect on individual, household and community resilience. The Task Force encourages UN Women, IFRC, UNISDR and relevant stakeholders to ensure synergies between the GIR Programme and efforts to strengthen the health dimensions of crisis prevention, preparedness and response.

Ensuring health security remains prioritised on national and global political agendas

82.   The Panel considered that global health crises should be elevated on the international agenda. It recommended the creation of a council of Member States within the General Assembly and the convening of a summit on global public health crises in 2018.[30] To date, Member States of the General Assembly have not yet taken a decision on the proposals for a high-level council or the 2018 summit.

83.   Preparedness for global health crises has continued to be a focus of discussions in various multilateral settings. Within the UN system, the General Assembly has focused on health through the convening of high-level meetings (on HIV/AIDS in June 2016 and on antimicrobial resistance in September 2016) as well as informal briefings on health emergencies in June 2016 and November 2016. In May 2017, the President of the General Assembly convened an informal briefing on a range of health issues, including health systems

---

[30] A/70/723, Recommendations 26 and 27.

strengthening, health emergencies, antimicrobial resistance, and non-communicable diseases. Member States welcomed the approach of discussing the various issues in a holistic, rather than fragmented manner, recognizing that these issues are inter-linked.

84. A resolution on global health and foreign policy has been adopted by the General Assembly on an annual basis since 2008. At the request of the General Assembly made in its 2015 resolution, the Secretary-General transmitted two reports on global health prepared by WHO in November 2016. The first report on "State of health security" (A/71/598) discussed the drivers of international health crises – infectious hazards, political instability and insecurity, attacks on health care, population displacement and migration, urbanization and shifting demographics, changing weather patterns and other climate-related risks. The second report related to "Lessons learned in the public health emergency response to and management of previous international crises with health consequences" (A/71/601).

85. Within the G7 countries, health has featured prominently on the agenda of the G7 summits and meetings of G7 health ministers have been convened. In September 2016, the G7 Health Ministers issued the Kobe Communiqué. This statement included commitments to take action in four areas: (i) reinforcing the Global Health Architecture for public health emergencies; (ii) attaining universal health coverage and promotion of health throughout the life course focusing on population ageing; (iii) Antimicrobial Resistance; and (iv) research and development, and innovation.

86. In December 2016, Germany assumed the presidency of the G20. For the first time, a meeting of G-20 health ministers was convened in May 2017. The "Berlin Declaration of the G20 Health Ministers" issued at the end of this meeting focused on global health crises management, health systems strengthening, and antimicrobial resistance. The G20 Health Ministers stressed the importance of complying with the International Health Regulations, providing assistance to countries to implement the IHR and address gaps in core capacities, reporting on health emergencies and following WHO recommendations on trade and travel.

87. The Task Force stresses the importance of political processes in determining the extent to which people enjoy health security. Engaging with political processes is essential to maintain health security as a priority on national and global political agendas. High-level political engagement on health issues is needed to ensure that health security is recognized as a global public good and that effective financing policies are in place to make best use of available funds. Those concerned about the adequacy of financing for health security, including the UN, should reach out to government ministries, beyond the ministry of health – the ministries handling development, research, environment foreign affairs, finance and national security all need to understand that health threats will undermine their national and economic security. Coordinated action across different sectors is needed to address health crises effectively. To secure the financing they need, health programmes and initiatives must be ready to be held accountable for results in order to build confidence and trust.

88. The Task Force emphasizes that effective advocacy for health cannot only rely on the utilization of the UN system and intergovernmental processes, and focus on international organizations and Member States as the primary actors and agents of change. Advancing health security in its fullest sense means engaging all relevant stakeholders, and creating an inclusive space in which all non-UN stakeholders and non-governmental actors can come together, contribute and be heard.

III. Future actions

89.   Over the past year, the Task Force has seen significant progress in many areas highlighted in the Panel's report.   Key achievements include the introduction of the Joint External Evaluations and other components of the IHR monitoring and evaluation framework, the establishment of the WHO Health Emergencies Programme, the issuance of the IASC activation procedures for infectious disease events, the launching of the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, the implementation of the WHO R&D Blueprint, the simulations exercises at country and global levels, the formation of the Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, the operationalization of the Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility, the development of the Automated System for Relief Emergency Consignments, and the establishment of the Pandemic Supply Chain Network. At the same time, many of these initiatives are in their early stages of implementation and do not represent the finalized construction of a system that is predictable, dependable and effective. While the systems for advancing health security are developing in the right direction, potential vulnerabilities in the systems on which societies depend for health security must continue to be monitored.

90.   In view of the developments in the past year and its assessment of the current state of global preparedness for health emergencies, the Task Force urges that careful monitoring of and increased efforts in these areas are needed in the coming years:

   a. ***Strategic support for national health systems***: The Task Force stresses the importance of the rapid roll-out of the voluntary joint external evaluations. These evaluations need to be enhanced by integrating animal health experts and civil society organizations. Following the conclusion of the joint external evaluations, costed national health action plans should be promptly developed with the support of WHO and it will be essential that adequate financing both in-country and through donors is available to implement the development plans. The Task Force welcomes ongoing initiatives to strengthen health systems and enhance preparedness, including the Pandemic Supply Chain Network, the Automated System for Relief Emergency Consignments**,** and the International Health Partnership for UHC2030.

   b. ***Integrating communities and civil society organizations***: The Task Force stresses that community engagement deserves greater emphasis before and during outbreaks to ensure that preparedness and response activities are culturally sensitive, better understood, meet the needs of the people concerned, and involve and engage the communities. Assessment of community engagement needs to be strengthened in the joint external evaluations, and costed action plans developed that include community engagement and that are sufficiently financed through domestic and external funding.

   c. ***Supporting regional arrangements***: The Task Force welcomes WHO's collaboration with the Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (Africa CDC) and work to bolster the capacities of emergency medical teams in different regions. The Task Force encourages WHO to continue to support the capacities of regional organizations and coordinate actions to strengthen these capacities.

   d. ***Strengthening UN system capacity:*** The Task Force commends the Health Emergencies Programme for its strong first year, during which it has built up its

capacity, and clarified its processes for managing emergencies with the revision of the Emergency Response Framework. The adoption of the IASC procedures for infectious disease events provides additional clarity in the roles and responsibilities of WHO, the wider UN system and non-governmental partners in responding to outbreaks. The Task Force reinforces the need for WHO to implement the recommendations of the IOAC. Collaboration between WHO, OIE and FAO is important in view of the number of emerging threats that are of zoonotic origin. The Task Force welcomes improvements in the processes and mechanisms for information dissemination on health threats within the UN system.

e. ***Testing capacities and processes through simulation:*** The Task Force confirms that simulation exercises are essential to sensitise all stakeholders to the importance of integrating pandemic preparedness in their operational planning. Simulations need to be conducted in different settings, at all levels (local, national, regional and global), and across countries. Simulations should not be an end in itself; rather, where feasible and appropriate, the outcomes of the simulations should be reported, with lessons learnt and follow-up.

f. ***Catalysing focused research and innovation:*** The Task Force commends WHO for the advancements made in coordinating research and development, acknowledging that the R&D Blueprint provides a valuable framework for coordination. The Task Force regards the development of a methodology to prioritise diseases to be a significant achievement, while emphasising that such a list should not have the effect of restricting research on pathogens that may not yet be recognized as potential disease outbreaks and that the development of translatable platform technologies needs to be encouraged. The Task Force encourages WHO to promote a One Health approach to research and development.

g. ***Securing sustainable financing for health security***: The Task Force expresses significant concern that financing for advancing health security at the national, regional and global levels falls short of what is needed. The Task Force endorses the recommendations of the International Working Group on Financing of Preparedness and welcomes the establishment of the Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility. The magnitude of the economic threat arising from health insecurity deserves greater attention of finance ministers.. While WHO has made significant strides in implementing the health emergencies programme, the IOAC reiterated its concerns that the programme is underfunded and the significant progress to date is seen as fragile, an assessment which is shared by the Task Force.

h. ***Focusing attention on gender dimensions of health crises:*** The Task Force welcomes the focus on gender equality and rights by the High-Level Commission on Health Employment and Economic Growth. It agrees that greater attention must be paid to the disproportionate burden on women and children during health crises. The Task Force encourages UN Women, IFRC and the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) to ensure that health dimensions are fully integrated into the new Global Programme to address the Gender Inequality of Risk and Promote Women's Resilience and Leadership.

i. ***Ensuring health security remains prioritised on nation and global political agendas:*** The Task Force stresses the importance of political processes in determining

the extent to which people enjoy health security. Engaging with political processes is essential to maintain health security as a priority on national and global political agendas. High-level political engagement on health issues is needed to ensure that health security is recognized as a global public good and that effective financing policies are in place to make best use of available funds. There should be multi-sectoral outreach to government ministries, beyond the ministry of health. To secure the financing they need, health programmes and initiatives must be ready to be held accountable for results in order to build confidence and trust. Effective advocacy for health cannot only rely on the utilization of the UN system and intergovernmental processes, and focus on international organizations and Member States as the primary actors and agents of change. Advancing health security in its fullest sense means engaging all relevant stakeholders, and creating an inclusive space in which all non-UN stakeholders and non-governmental actors can come together, contribute and be heard.

91.   The Task Force reflected on next steps following the conclusion of its mandate on 30 June 2017. The Task Force recalled that the General Assembly requested WHO to submit reports on the state of health security in 2016 and 2017, and considered the possibility of continuing this reporting process beyond 2017. A majority of Task Force members recommended that the Secretary-General develop and implement a new time-limited independent mechanism for reporting on the status of the world's preparedness through (i) monitoring system-wide progress towards increased health crises preparedness and response, (ii) helping to ensure political visibility and accountability for efforts at country, regional and global levels, and (iii) providing an alert to the Secretary-General and other key stakeholders if the system is not functioning adequately.

Annex 1: Composition of Global Health Crises Task Force

Co-leads

Ms. Amina J. Mohammed
Deputy Secretary-General, United Nations

Dr. Margaret Chan
Director-General, World Health Organization

Dr. Jim Yong Kim
President, World Bank

Members

Dr. Chris Elias
President, Global Development Program, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

Dr. Anthony S. Fauci
Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health,
United States of America

Dr. Mohammed-Mahmoud Hacen
President, Mauritanian Public Health Association

Dr. Felicity Harvey
Member, Independent Oversight and Advisory Committee for WHO Health Emergencies Programme

Prof. Ilona Kickbusch
Director, Global Health Centre at Graduate Institute of International & Development Studies

Prof. Yvés Levy
Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, National Institute of Health and Medical Research, France

Dr. Poh-Lian Lim
Senior Consultant, Ministry of Health and Tan Tock Seng Hospital, Singapore

Dr. Shigeru Omi
President, Japan Community Health Care Organization

Mr. Elhadj As Sy
Secretary General, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Mr. Achim Steiner
Administrator, United Nations Development Programme

Mr. Anthony Lake
Executive Director, United Nations Children's Fund

Mr. Stephen O'Brien
Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs, Emergency Relief Coordinator