

Based on Options for Establishing Institutional Platform for Strategic Management of Reforms
by Mary Ann Lansang, Oscar Picazo and Stella Quimbo

The effective execution and success of Fourmula One Plus for Health depends on good stewardship, defined in the six domains of: generating intelligence, formulating strategic policy direction, ensuring tools for implementation (power, incentives, sanctions), building coalitions/partnerships ensuring a fit between policy objectives and organizational structure and culture, and ensuring accountability.

This requires that stewards - particularly Secretary of Health and members of the Executive Committee, have ready access to credible, objective and timely intelligence that feeds into policy decisions and actions. At present, there is no institutional platform for business intelligence to flow.

- Rapid assessment of relevant local institutions and organizations
- Desk review of relevant institutional or organizational experiences in other countries
- Key informant interviews and focus group discussions with prime stakeholders

- ✓ **Rapid Assessment of Local Institutions:**

A total of 28 institutions were intervened.

- » The Philippines does not yet have an institution expressly established to provide the business intelligence so required and with interdisciplinary expertise in the areas of health policy and systems research, health economics and financing, M&E, health technology assessment and outcomes research.
- » There appears to be a trade off between capacity (research institutions based in academic institutions) and level of engagement with policy makers.
- » Local institutions face a common set of constraints that tend to reduce the quality of research and create disincentive for young individuals to join the ranks of health policy researchers. These include low pay, lack of employable and well-trained research staff, and lack of data.
- » Better coordination and management of research funds may be key to overcoming the constraints.

✓ International Experiences and Institutions:

A total of 21 Health Research Institutions (HRIs) in 11 countries were reviewed.

- » **Evolution:** HRIs evolved to address the increasing complexity of health financing and service delivery.
- » **Mandates:** HRIs' goals are support policy making and regulation, and thus focus on non-biomedical research.
- » **Stewardship:** HRI's are invariably attached to, or under the department/ministry of health or health insurance fund, to fulfill their mandate.
- » **Outputs:** In US and Canada, research produced are both policy inputs and academic output, hence destined for international peer-reviewed journals which somehow provide stronger legitimacy for these documents to be used for policy.
- » **Administrative and Legal Structures:** HRIs are governed in seven generic administrative ways: department within Insurance fund, government agency, state corporation or foundation built via law, council, civil society foundation, research consortium, public-private partnership, and academy of elected scientists.
- » **Capacity:** HRIs require advanced level training and needs investment in degree and non-degree training programs.
- » **Procurement Modalities:** HRI's use intramural (in-house), extramural (outsource) or both.

1. Function: The institutional platform needs to fulfill the following objectives:

- » to provide strategic directions to F1+ through analytical and policy research, sector reviews, impact and other evaluation studies
- » to provide monitoring support and operations research to F1+
- » to support the Office of the Secretary in managing day-to-day requirements of running F1+
- » to develop and strengthen capacity in technical areas related to evidence-based implementation of F1+

2. Form: The institutional platform needs to:

- » adopt a **‘hybrid’** model which uses a mix of institutional mechanisms rather than aim to be a stand-alone research institute
- » balance the need for **autonomy** in operations in order to ensure objectivity of researchers and analysts providing the information/evidence/analysis versus **proximity** to decision makers in order to frame the right research questions
- » offer **opportunities** and **incentives** for capacity building and research to retain the talent and ensure institutionalization

© Department of Health - Philippines, 2018

The content of this publication does not reflect the official opinion of the Department of Health or Philippine Council for Health Research and Development. Responsibility for the information and views expressed in this publication lies entirely with the author(s). Reproduction is authorized provided the source is acknowledged.


Advancing Health through Evidence-Assisted Decisions with Health Policy and Systems Research (AHEAD-HPSR)

operationalizes FI+ for Health's commitment to instill a culture of research and strengthen internal analytic capacity in the Department of Health and build health policy systems research capacity within the sector.

AHEAD is a collaboration between the Department of Health and the Philippine Council for Health Research and Development

To access the full text of this article or other research projects funded by the DOH, contact:

**Research Center for Health System Development
(RCHSD)**

 rlc.rchsd.doh@gmail.com
 651-7800 loc 1326

Research Division - Health Policy Development and
Planning Bureau
Department of Health
Building 3 2/F San Lazaro Compound,
Rizal Avenue, Sta. Cruz, Manila

Advisory Board

Usec. Mario Villaverde, MD, MPH, MPM, CESO I
Dir. Kenneth Ronquillo, MD, MPH, MPM, CESO III

Editors

Beverly Lorraine Ho, MD, MPH
Barbara Michelle de Guzman, MSN, RN

Publication Manager

Juanita Valeza

Creative Director

Creative Director:
Jake Matthew Kho

