

1                   How feasible is it to mobilize \$31 billion a year for pandemic  
2 preparedness and response? An economic growth modelling analysis

3  
4                   Minahil Shahid<sup>1,2</sup>  
5                   Marco Schäferhoff<sup>3</sup>  
6                   Garrett Brown<sup>4</sup>  
7                   Gavin Yamey<sup>1,2</sup>

8  
9                   <sup>1</sup> Center for Policy Impact in Global Health

10                   <sup>2</sup> Global Health Institute, Duke University

11                   <sup>3</sup> Open Consultants

12                   <sup>4</sup> University of Leeds

13  
14 **Correspondence to:**

15 Minahil Shahid

16 Duke Global Health Institute Trent Hall, Rm 009

17 310 Trent Drive, Durham, NC 27701, USA

18 Email : [shahid.minahil@gmail.com](mailto:shahid.minahil@gmail.com); [minahil.shahid@duke.edu](mailto:minahil.shahid@duke.edu)

19 Phone : 617-401-6660

20  
21 **Contributors and sources**

22 Minahil Shahid (MS) is a Research Associate at Duke University's Center for Policy Impact  
23 in Global Health, a global health policy think tank directed by Gavin Yamey (GY). Garrett W.  
24 Brown (GWB) from University of Leeds received funding from the UK Economic and Social  
25 Research Council under the project titled 'Reviewing Supranational Costs of Health Security  
26 Preparedness for WHO and G20' (REF: ES/X001482/1), and engaged Marco Schäferhoff  
27 from Open Consultants, and MS and GY from Duke University, as sub-contracts. All authors  
28 were involved in the design and analysis. Minahil Shahid wrote the first draft, which edited by  
29 all contributors.

30  
31 **Competing interests**

32 Gavin Yamey and Minahil Shahid have received a research grant from the Carnegie  
33 Corporation of New York to study future approaches to the financing and distribution of  
34 pandemic vaccines.

35

36 **Abstract**

37 (Word count: 394)

38 **Background:** Covid-19 has reinforced the strong health and economic case for investing in  
39 pandemic preparedness and response (PPR). The World Bank and World Health  
40 Organization (WHO) propose that low- and middle-income governments and donor countries  
41 should invest \$31.1 billion each year for PPR. We analyse, based on the projected economic  
42 growth of countries between 2022 and 2027, how likely it is that low- and middle-income  
43 country governments and donors can mobilize the estimated funding.

44

45 **Methods:** We modelled trends in economic growth to project domestic health spending by  
46 low- and middle-income governments and official development assistance (ODA) by donors  
47 for years 2022 to 2027. We modelled two scenarios for countries and donors – a constant  
48 and an optimistic scenario. Under the constant scenario we assume that countries and  
49 donors continue to dedicate the same proportion of their health spending and ODA as a  
50 share of gross domestic product (GDP) and gross national income (GNI), respectively, as  
51 they did during baseline (the latest year for which data are available). In the optimistic  
52 scenario, we assume a yearly increase of 2.5% in health spending as a share of GDP for  
53 countries and ODA as a share of GNI for donors.

54

55 **Findings:** Our analysis shows that low-income countries would need to invest on average  
56 37%, lower-middle income countries 9%, and upper-middle income countries 1%, of their  
57 total health spending on PPR each year under the constant scenario to meet the World Bank  
58 WHO targets. Donors would need to allocate on average 8% of their total ODA across all  
59 sectors to PPR each year to meet their target.

60

61 **Conclusions:** The World Bank WHO targets for PPR will not be met unless low- and middle-  
62 income governments and donors spend a much higher share of their funding on PPR. Even  
63 under optimistic growth scenarios, low-income and lower-middle income countries will

64 require increased support from global health donors. The donor target cannot be met using  
65 the yearly increase in ODA under any scenario. If the country and donor targets are not met,  
66 the highest-impact health security measures need to be prioritized for funding. Alternative  
67 sources of PPR financing could include global taxation (e.g., on financial transactions,  
68 carbon, or airline flights), cancelling debt, and addressing illicit financial flows. There is also  
69 a need for continued work on estimating current PPR costs and funding requirements in  
70 order to arrive at more enduring and reliable estimates.

71 **Keywords:** pandemic preparedness and response; COVID-19; low- and middle-income  
72 countries; health financing

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86           How feasible is it to mobilize \$31 billion a year for pandemic  
87       preparedness and response? An economic growth modelling analysis

88       (Word Count: 3,126, excluding tables)

89       **Introduction**

90       The covid-19 pandemic has had devastating health consequences, causing mass death,  
91       disability (e.g., from Long Covid), and orphanhood. The International Monetary Fund  
92       estimates that the economic losses caused by covid-19 will be close to US\$ 13.8 trillion from  
93       2020 to 2024 (1). Even before the pandemic, major gaps had been identified in the global  
94       health security architecture (2). Covid-19 has reinforced the strong health and economic  
95       case for investing in pandemic preparedness and response (PPR) (3). Such investments can  
96       help prevent, detect, and contain disease outbreaks, thereby reducing the broader social  
97       and economic costs of a pandemic (3,4).

98

99       How much would it cost to establish a global PPR system that is fully fit-for-purpose?

100       Despite ongoing dialogue, there is currently no consistently applied approach to calculating  
101       global PPR resource requirements. (5) Previous estimates have ranged from US\$ 1.6 billion  
102       to US\$ 43 billion per year, depending on the costing methodology used, preparedness  
103       activities considered, and countries included in the analysis. (6)

104

105       The World Bank and the World Health Organization (WHO) recently provided a new  
106       estimate of the annual PPR financing needs in a report conducted for the G20 Joint Finance  
107       and Health Task Force. (4) The international community is now coalescing around these  
108       new figures. The World Bank and WHO estimate that low- and middle-income country  
109       governments and donors need to invest US\$ 31.1 billion annually in PPR, of which US\$ 26.4  
110       billion needs to be invested at the country level and US\$ 4.7 billion at the international level.  
111       (4,7) The report also acknowledges that low- and lower-middle income countries are unlikely

112 to meet their national PPR financing requirements, estimating that there is an overall annual  
113 funding gap of US\$ 10.5 billion at global and country levels. (4)

114

115 A critical question to answer is: assuming the figure is correct, how feasible is it to achieve  
116 this annual “price tag” of US\$ 31.1 billion? We therefore set out to address this question by  
117 analysing, based on the economic growth that the International Monetary Fund projects for  
118 years 2022 to 2027 (8), how likely it is that low- and middle-income countries and donors will  
119 mobilize the estimated funding for PPR.

120

121 Considering various scenarios, we addressed two questions. First, how realistic is it for low-  
122 and middle-income governments to reach the annual country level PPR finance target of  
123 US\$ 26.4 billion from growth in domestic health spending? Second, how feasible is it for  
124 donors to support low- and middle-income countries to reach this US\$ 26.4 billion target,  
125 while at the same time financing global (international-level) PPR needs? In addition, we  
126 challenge the US\$ 10.5 billion annual funding gap identified by the World Bank/WHO,  
127 suggesting that it is based on poor assumptions, and that the funding gap is actually closer  
128 to US\$ 15.5 billion. Box 1 summarizes how we defined low- and middle-income countries  
129 and donors.

**Box 1: Definition of low- and middle-income countries and donors**

We conducted separate analyses for low- and middle-income countries and donors:

- **Low- and middle-income countries.** We used the World Bank’s classification of countries by income group (9) to identify and conduct assessment for: low-income countries (LICs), lower-middle-income countries (LMICs), and upper-middle-income countries (UMICs). In total, we included 115 countries in our analysis (Appendix 1). Seventeen countries were excluded due to lack of data.
- **Donor countries.** We identified donor countries using the Organisation for

Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Disbursements and Commitments of Official and Private Flows Statistics Database (10,11). Our analysis included a total of 43 donor countries—of which 29 are members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) (12) and 14 are non-DAC donors (Appendix 2). Five donor nations (Azerbaijan, Chinese Taipei, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, and Liechtenstein) were excluded due to lack of data.

130

### 131 **Methods**

132 Our study did not obtain an ethics approval as it does not involve human subjects and only  
133 uses publicly available national and international financial data and published secondary  
134 resources.

#### 135 *Low- and Middle-Income Countries' Analysis*

136

137 Using low- and middle-income country gross domestic product (GDP) data from the  
138 World Bank (13) for the year 2021, we projected the GDP for each country from 2022 to  
139 2027 using the annual percentage change in GDP data from the International Monetary  
140 Fund's (IMF) World Economic Outlook (WEO) database (8). We used real GDP to account  
141 for the effects of inflation across all analyses. After calculating the projected economic  
142 growth (in constant 2020 US\$) for low- and middle-income countries, we used the 'Domestic  
143 General Government Health Expenditure (GGHE-D) (also referred to as 'domestic health  
144 spending') as a percent of GDP' data from the WHO Global Health Expenditure database  
145 (14), and multiplied these values with the projected GDP data from the WEO dataset to get  
146 the projected domestic health spending by low- and middle-income countries for the years  
147 2022 to 2027. For the projected years, we calculated two different scenarios:

- 148 1. Constant Scenario: We assumed that the share of government health expenditures  
149 out of GDP remained constant (i.e. we assumed that the latest available 'GGHE-D as

150 a percent of GDP' data, which are currently for the year 2020, apply to all years from  
151 2022 to 2027). In other words, in this constant scenario, low- and middle-income  
152 countries continue to spend the same percentage of their GDP on domestic health  
153 spending between the years 2022 to 2027 as they did in 2020.

154 2. Scale-up Scenario: We increased the 'GGHE-D as a percent of GDP' ratio by 2.5  
155 percent each year up until 2027. This is a more optimistic scenario, one in which low-  
156 and middle-income countries recognize the need to marginally increase the  
157 percentage of their GDP spent on health year on year.

158

159 For both scenarios, we projected the trend in GGHE-D for each income group and calculated  
160 what share of GGHE-D would be required to meet the annual US\$ 26.4 billion PPR target  
161 (Table 1 shows the cost breakdown by income group). In addition, we examined the yearly  
162 increment in domestic health spending under the two scenarios to estimate what proportion  
163 of the increment would be needed to meet the PPR target. Our analysis focuses on the  
164 anticipated growth in GGHE-D, and it does not examine any redistribution of domestic health  
165 spending from other priority areas such as infectious disease control or maternal and child  
166 health. We used GDP data from the World Bank (13) and calculations were performed in  
167 2020 US\$.

168

169 **Table 1: Estimated national-level annual PPR target by income group**

Income Group	Cost (Billion US\$)	Cost (%)
LIC Target	2.7	10.2%
LMIC Target	13.5	51.1%
UMIC Target	10.2	38.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

170

171 *Donor Analysis*

172 We estimated the increase or decrease in official development assistance (ODA) that donor  
173 countries are projected to give between the years 2022 and 2027 using projected changes to  
174 their economic growth (i.e., changes in their gross national income [GNI]). We used GNI  
175 rather than GDP due to limitations in data availability; there is a relatively small difference in  
176 values between the two indicators (i.e., using GNI or GDP would give similar results).

177

178 We used the annual percentage change in GDP data for years 2022-2027 from the IMF's  
179 WEO database. We multiplied this percentage change with the Gross National Income (GNI)  
180 data for donor countries for the year 2021 from the OECD DAC1 (10) database to calculate  
181 the projected economic growth for DAC and non-DAC donors for the years 2022 to 2027.

182 The OECD DAC1 database provides historical data on disbursements and commitments of  
183 official and private flows from members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC),  
184 multilateral organisations and other donors.

185

186 We then used the 'Official Development Assistance (ODA) as a percent of GNI' data from  
187 the OECD DAC1 database to calculate the projected ODA flows by donors for the years  
188 2022 to 2027. We created two scenarios (similar to the country-level analyses) described  
189 below:

- 190 1) Constant Scenario: Keeping the ODA/GNI ratio constant, we assumed that donors  
191 continue to give the same percent of their GNI to ODA between 2022 to 2027 as  
192 they did in 2021; in this scenario, any increase or decrease in ODA is solely driven  
193 by changes in donors' GNI data;
- 194 2) Scale-Up Scenario: We assume that there is a yearly 2.5 percent increase in the  
195 2021 ODA to GNI ratio, compounding to a total increase of 15 percent by 2027.

196

197



198 To capture different scenarios, we varied the proportion of GNI that donor nations might give  
199 to ODA between 2022-27 using the 2021 ODA/GNI ratio as the baseline (the latest year for  
200 which ODA/GNI ratio data were available). A pessimistic scenario with a decreasing ODA-to-  
201 GNI ratio can potentially stem from budgetary pressures and ODA cuts by certain donor  
202 countries. In contrast, an optimistic view would suggest that, for example, given the  
203 economic and social losses caused by covid-19, donors find value in investing a greater  
204 proportion of their GNI towards ODA, leading to an overall increase in ODA availability. In  
205 line with our country-level GGHE-D analysis, we projected ODA growth from 2022-2027  
206 under two scenarios – a constant and a scale-up scenario.

207

208 In our analysis, we assume that donors would cover the entire global-level PPR investment  
209 of US\$ 4.7 billion, and also provide 100% of the annual PPR funding for LICs (US\$ 2.7  
210 billion per year) and 60% for LMICs (US\$ 8.1 billion per year). The assumptions on the share  
211 of funding covered by donors reflects those in the World Bank/WHO costing study. In total,  
212 we thus assume donors would need to provide an annual amount of US\$ 15.5 billion.

213

## 214 **Results**

### 215 *Low- and Middle-Income Countries Analysis Results*

216

217 Our analysis shows that LICs, under the constant scenario, would have to invest 42.2% of  
218 their total annual GGHE-D to reach the PPR target in 2022, while in 2027 they would still  
219 need to spend 31.2% of their GGHE-D on PPR (Table 3). Under the scale-up scenario, LICs  
220 would have to invest 26.9% of their GGHE-D in 2027 to meet the PPR target (Table 4). The  
221 increment in funding under both constant and scale-up scenarios is insufficient for reaching  
222 the PPR target for LICs.

223

224 For LMICs, the percentage of GGHE-D needed to meet their PPR target drops from 10.4%  
 225 in 2022 to 8.3% in 2027 under the constant scenario and to 7.1% in the scale-up scenario.

226 The increment in projected funding is also insufficient for LMICs to meet their PPR costs.

227

228 For UMICs, the annual PPR costs account for 1.0% of their total annual GGHE-D in the  
 229 constant scenario, and drop to 0.7% in 2027 under the scale-up scenario. UMICs, unlike  
 230 LICs and LMICs, would be able to cover PPR costs using a substantial share of their  
 231 incremental funding – 25.6% on average under the constant scenario and 14.1% on average  
 232 under the scale-up scenario.

233

234 A limitation of our analysis stems from the composition of the GGHE-D indicator in the WHO  
 235 Global Health Expenditure database. The indicator does not account for capital expenditures  
 236 while calculating domestic health spending (15), which leads to an overall underestimation in  
 237 projected GGHE-D. We therefore conducted a sensitivity analysis (see Appendix 3), and  
 238 included capital expenditures (reported separately in the WHO database) in our analysis.

239

240

241 **Table 2: Projected growth in domestic health spending by low- and middle-income**  
 242 **country governments under the constant scenario**

Indicator	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	Mean
GGHE-D <sup>a</sup> LIC (Billion US\$)	6.4	6.7	7.2	7.6	8.1	8.7	7.4
GGHE-D LMIC (Billion US\$)	129.6	132.1	139.5	147.2	155.2	163.5	144.5
GGHE-D UMIC (Billion US\$)	976.4	1,011.9	1,052.4	1,092.6	1,134.2	1,176.4	1,074.0
<b>Total GGHE-D (Billion US\$)</b>	<b>1,112.4</b>	<b>1,150.7</b>	<b>1,199.0</b>	<b>1,247.5</b>	<b>1,297.5</b>	<b>1,348.6</b>	<b>1,225.9</b>
PPR as a % of GGHE-D (LIC) <sup>b</sup>	42.2%	40.1%	37.7%	35.4%	33.2%	31.2%	36.6%
PPR as a % of GGHE-D (LMIC) <sup>c</sup>	10.4%	10.2%	9.7%	9.2%	8.7%	8.3%	9.4%
PPR as a % of GGHE-D (UMIC) <sup>d</sup>	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%
<b>Total PPR as a % of Total GGHE-D</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
Increment <sup>e</sup> (LIC) (Billion US\$)		0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Increment (LMIC) (Billion US\$)		2.4	7.4	7.8	8.0	8.3	6.8

Increment (UMIC) (Billion US\$)	35.6	40.4	40.3	41.5	42.3	40.0
<b>Total Increment (Billion US\$)</b>	<b>38.4</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>48.5</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>47.2</b>
PPR as a % of Increment (LIC) <sup>f</sup>	800.2%	643.4%	586.4%	535.7%	509.7%	615.1%
PPR as a % of Increment (LMIC) <sup>g</sup>	553.4%	182.7%	173.6%	169.3%	162.5%	248.3%
PPR as a % of Increment (UMIC) <sup>h</sup>	28.7%	25.2%	25.3%	24.6%	24.1%	25.6%
<b>Total PPR as a % of Total Increment</b>	<b>68.8%</b>	<b>54.7%</b>	<b>54.4%</b>	<b>52.8%</b>	<b>51.7%</b>	<b>56.5%</b>

243 <sup>a</sup> GGHE-D (domestic general government health expenditure) was retrieved from the WHO Global Health

244 Expenditure database (14)

245 <sup>b</sup> Proportion of GGHE-D that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the LIC target (targets available in

246 Table 1)

247 <sup>c</sup> Proportion of GGHE-D that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the LMIC target

248 <sup>d</sup> Proportion of GGHE-D that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the UMIC target

249 <sup>e</sup> Increment is calculated by subtracting the previous year's GGHE-D from the current year's value

250 <sup>f</sup> Proportion of increment that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the LIC target

251 <sup>g</sup> Proportion of increment that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the LMIC target

252 <sup>h</sup> Proportion of increment that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the UMIC target

253

254 **Table 3: Projected growth in domestic health spending by low- and middle-income**

255 **country governments under the scale-up scenario**

Indicator	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	Mean
GGHE-D <sup>a</sup> LIC (Billion US\$)	6.6	7.1	7.7	8.4	9.2	10.0	8.2
GGHE-D LMIC (Billion US\$)	132.9	138.7	150.2	162.5	175.6	189.6	158.3
GGHE-D UMIC (Billion US\$)	1,000.8	1,063.2	1,133.3	1,206.1	1,283.2	1,364.3	1,175.1
<b>GGHE-D Total (Billion US\$)</b>	<b>1,140.2</b>	<b>1,209.0</b>	<b>1,291.2</b>	<b>1,377.0</b>	<b>1,468.0</b>	<b>1,564.0</b>	<b>1,341.5</b>
PPR as a % of GGHE-D (LIC) <sup>b</sup>	41.2%	38.1%	35.0%	32.1%	29.4%	26.9%	33.8%
PPR as a % of GGHE-D (LMIC) <sup>c</sup>	10.2%	9.7%	9.0%	8.3%	7.7%	7.1%	8.7%
PPR as a % of GGHE-D (UMIC) <sup>d</sup>	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%
<b>Total PPR as a % of Total GGHE-D</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>
Increment <sup>e</sup> (LIC) (Billion US\$)	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
Increment (LMIC) (Billion US\$)	5.9	11.4	12.3	13.1	14.0	14.0	11.4
Increment (UMIC) (Billion US\$)	62.4	70.1	72.8	77.1	81.1	81.1	72.7
<b>Total Increment (Billion US\$)</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>82.2</b>	<b>85.8</b>	<b>91.0</b>	<b>96.0</b>	<b>96.0</b>	<b>84.8</b>
PPR as a % of Increment (LIC) <sup>f</sup>	520.7%	429.3%	385.2%	346.0%	319.9%	319.9%	400.2%
PPR as a % of Increment (LMIC) <sup>g</sup>	229.4%	118.2%	109.4%	103.2%	96.3%	96.3%	131.3%
PPR as a % of Increment (UMIC) <sup>h</sup>	16.3%	14.5%	14.0%	13.2%	12.6%	12.6%	14.1%
<b>Total PPR as a % of Total Increment</b>	<b>38.4%</b>	<b>32.1%</b>	<b>30.8%</b>	<b>29.0%</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>31.6%</b>

256

257 <sup>a</sup> GGHE-D (domestic general government health expenditure) was retrieved from the WHO Global Health  
 258 Expenditure database (14)  
 259 <sup>b</sup> Proportion of GGHE-D that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the LIC target (targets available in  
 260 Table 1)  
 261 <sup>c</sup> Proportion of GGHE-D that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the LMIC target  
 262 <sup>d</sup> Proportion of GGHE-D that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the UMIC target  
 263 <sup>e</sup> Increment is calculated by subtracting the previous year's GGHE-D from the current year's value  
 264 <sup>f</sup> Proportion of increment that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the LIC target  
 265 <sup>g</sup> Proportion of increment that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the LMIC target  
 266 <sup>h</sup> Proportion of increment that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the UMIC target  
 267

## 268 *Donor Analysis Results*

269 Our analysis shows that the US\$ 15.5 billion annual PPR target for donor government  
 270 spending would not fully be met under any scenario, even if the entire yearly increase in  
 271 ODA is used for PPR. Even under the scale-up scenario of a 15% linear increase in the  
 272 ODA/GNI ratio, and even if the entire yearly increase in ODA over the six years is directed to  
 273 PPR, it would only cover an annualised average of 61% of the US\$ 15.5 billion annual PPR  
 274 requirement (see Table 4), and 90% if the target was brought down to US\$ 10.5 billion.  
 275

276 **Table 4: Projected growth in official development assistance by donors under the**  
 277 **constant and scale-up scenarios**

	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	Mean
<b>Constant Scenario</b>							
ODA (Billion US\$)	186.2	190.5	193.7	197.0	200.2	203.3	195.1
PPR as a % of ODA <sup>a</sup>	8.3%	8.1%	8.0%	7.9%	7.7%	7.6%	7.9%
Increment (Billion US\$)	7.4	4.2	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.1	4.1
Increment as a % of PPR <sup>b</sup>	48.0%	27.4%	20.9%	21.1%	20.5%	19.9%	26.3%
<b>Scale-Up Scenario</b>							
ODA (Billion US\$)	190.9	200.1	208.6	217.5	226.5	235.7	213.2
PPR as a % of ODA <sup>a</sup>	8.1%	7.7%	7.4%	7.1%	6.8%	6.6%	7.3%
Increment (Billion US\$)	12.1	9.2	8.5	8.8	9.0	9.2	9.5
Increment as a % of PPR <sup>b</sup>	78.0%	59.6%	54.8%	57.0%	58.2%	59.6%	61.2%

278 <sup>a</sup> Proportion of ODA that would need to be directed towards PPR to meet the US\$ 15.5 billion target each year

279 <sup>b</sup> Proportion of annual US\$ 15.5 billion target that would be met if the entire increment was directed at PPR  
280

## 281 **Discussion**

282 Our analysis for the constant scenarios shows that LICs would need to invest on average  
283 37%, LMICs 9%, and UMICs 1%, of their total health spending on PPR each year to meet  
284 the World Bank WHO targets. Donors would need to allocate on average 8% of their total  
285 ODA across all sectors to PPR each year to meet their target.

286 Based on these projections, we believe it is not feasible for low- and lower-middle-income  
287 governments to reach their annual PPR funding targets from domestic spending alone. Even  
288 under the optimistic scenario, LICs would still have to allocate, on average, 34% of their total  
289 GGHE-D between 2022 and 2027 to PPR, making the target untenable. The largest PPR  
290 costs relate to LMICs – a diverse group of countries with variable abilities to pay their own  
291 PPR needs. Our analysis shows that LMICs would need to spend on average 7-10% of their  
292 GGHE-D on PPR between 2022 and 2027.

293 In terms of the increment, under the constant scenario, the increment resulting from  
294 economic growth is insufficient for LMICs to meet their PPR requirements (the increment for  
295 LMICs, on average from 2022 to 2027, is US\$ 6.8 billion, while the requirement is US\$ 13.5  
296 billion per year). One potential implication is that LMICs would need to reduce their health  
297 spending on other priorities to meet the target.

298 In addition, many LMICs will lose support from the Global Fund, Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance,  
299 and other donors in the coming years and will need to increase their domestic spending on  
300 priorities such as HIV, tuberculosis, malaria, and vaccination programs.(16) Their likely  
301 economic growth will allow them to increase their health spending, but given competing  
302 priorities it is unrealistic to suggest that more than the entire growth in projected health  
303 funding will be directed towards PPR because that would imply a reallocation from other

304 health areas. UMICs are able to finance their own PPR target, and only need to dedicate on  
305 average 1% of their GGHE-D, or 14-26% of their increment, to PPR.

306 It is clear that donors would need to support LICs and LMICs. Given the constraints of these  
307 country groups to self-finance their PPR needs, it is important to be realistic and transparent  
308 about the amount of additional donor funding required. The World Bank/WHO costing study  
309 argues that the annual priority need at country-level is US\$ 26.4 billion, of which US\$ 16.2  
310 billion or 61.3% would fall on LICs and LMICs, while the remainder is for UMICs, who,  
311 according to the World Bank, can cover those costs themselves. Because the World  
312 Bank/WHO study assumes that donors already cover 100% and 60% of the LIC and LMIC  
313 costs respectively, the annual funding gap at country level is reduced from \$26.4 billion to  
314 \$7.0 billion.

315 However, we challenge the assumption that donors already provide such a significant  
316 amount of funding for PPR to LICs and LMICs in non-pandemic times. Although health ODA  
317 significantly increased in 2020 and 2021 (from US\$ 22.2 billion in 2019 to US\$ 29.2 billion in  
318 2020 and US\$ 34.0 billion in 2021), much of this increase can be attributed to the covid-19  
319 response, especially donor funding for covid-19 vaccines. (17) In previous years, donors  
320 invested very little in PPR. (18) In addition, there is evidence that existing ODA and national  
321 level resources for health have shifted to COVID-19 and PPR activities, signalling a  
322 reallocation of scarce resources which can threaten existing Universal Health Coverage  
323 (UHC) vulnerabilities. (19) As a result, the assumptions of the World Bank/WHO study about  
324 existing donor funding appear to be unrealistic.

325 We argue that the annual donor funding needed amounts to US\$15.5 billion – US\$ 4.7 billion  
326 for global and regional PPR, US\$ 2.7 billion per year for LICs and US\$ 8.1 billion per year for  
327 LMICs. Calculating the annual gap thus requires more realistic data and assumptions on  
328 donor spending for PPR during non-pandemic times as well as a recognition that the annual  
329 funding gap is much higher than US\$ 10.5 billion.

330 How feasible is it to mobilize US\$15.5 billion in donor funding for PPR every year through  
331 2027? Donors would need to allocate 7-8% of their total ODA – across all sectors - to PPR  
332 between 2022 and 2027. In terms of the increment in total ODA, on average, the increment  
333 could cover 26% and 61% of the PPR requirement under the constant and scale-up  
334 scenarios, respectively. In other words, even if the entire increase in ODA increment is spent  
335 on PPR, which is unrealistic in itself, donors would not be able to meet this funding without  
336 sufficient increases in the percentage of ODA allocated to PPR via new funding. Ideally, this  
337 would not merely be a redistribution from other ODA commitments.

338 How might the global health community respond to these projections? One approach is to  
339 simply accept these projections and design plans for how to efficiently spend whatever  
340 financing does get mobilized by identifying and prioritising the highest value for money and  
341 PPR impact measures. Another, and potentially complementary approach, would be for  
342 donors to increase their funding beyond the 2.5% ODA/GNI ratio as a PPR investment  
343 strategy against the type of public health and economic risk experienced during covid-19.  
344 Here, there are arguments to be made from a benefit/cost perspective that could make  
345 ODA/GNI increases more palatable to donors and their constituents.

346 Moreover, aside from reprioritizing domestic health spending and ODA towards PPR,  
347 alternative sources of financing outside the usual health related sources should be explored  
348 (e.g., from national security or defence budgets) (20). For example, there is growing interest  
349 in levying a global tax on financial transactions, carbon, or airline flights to help fund PPR  
350 (21). Debt cancellation must also be on the table. Public debt in LMICs increased from 58%  
351 to 65% of GDP from 2019 to 2021. (22) The cost of borrowing for low-income countries has  
352 also increased compared to pre-pandemic levels and is projected to continue increasing as  
353 global interest rates rise. (22) If the G20 and financial institutions had cancelled all external  
354 debt payments due in 2020 and 2021 by the 76 poorest countries, it would have liberated  
355 US\$ 300 billion (23).

356 Addressing illicit financial flows (IFFs) and global tax abuses that continue to trickle wealth  
357 from low- and middle-income countries into higher-income nations could also help redirect  
358 resources from illicit channels into more productive ones such as investing in PPR.  
359 Countries with high IFFs are reported to spend 25% less on health compared to countries  
360 with low IFFs. (24) Eastern and Southern Africa lost US\$ 7.6 billion in tax revenue in 2017,  
361 equivalent to 1.6% of the region's GDP, due to only two sources of IFFs (base erosion and  
362 profit shifting to tax havens). (25) Addressing IFFs is important, since countries with high  
363 IFFs are reported to spend 25% less on health compared to countries with low IFFs. (24)  
364 Measures to tackle IFFs can strengthen LMIC financial systems and also free resources for  
365 public health purposes.

366 Reducing the cost of PPR itself is also desirable and would require strong measures  
367 including reducing constraints on intellectual property (IP) to allow equitable global access to  
368 safe and affordable medical countermeasures (MCMs). During covid-19, pharmaceutical  
369 companies partnered with certain high-income countries to hinder IP waiver negotiations,  
370 stalling progress towards equitable access to covid-19 vaccines. (26,27) If new global PPR  
371 initiatives such as the Pandemic Fund and the Pandemic Treaty are to be successful, they  
372 must facilitate technology transfer, IP waivers, and support local manufacturing of medical  
373 countermeasures to help lower PPR resource requirements.

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383



## 384 **References**

385

386 1. A Disrupted Global Recovery [Internet]. IMF. [cited 2022 Dec 7]. Available from:  
387 <https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2022/01/25/blog-a-disrupted-global-recovery>

388 2. Inaugural Global Health Security Index Finds Significant Gaps in Preparedness for  
389 Epidemics and Pandemics | Johns Hopkins | Bloomberg School of Public Health  
390 [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 16]. Available from:  
391 [https://publichealth.jhu.edu/2019/inaugural-global-health-security-index-finds-significant-](https://publichealth.jhu.edu/2019/inaugural-global-health-security-index-finds-significant-gaps-in-preparedness-for-epidemics-and-pandemics)  
392 [gaps-in-preparedness-for-epidemics-and-pandemics](https://publichealth.jhu.edu/2019/inaugural-global-health-security-index-finds-significant-gaps-in-preparedness-for-epidemics-and-pandemics)

393 3. Main Report & accompanying work [Internet]. The Independent Panel for Pandemic  
394 Preparedness and Response. [cited 2022 Aug 16]. Available from:  
395 <https://theindependentpanel.org/mainreport/>

396 4. G20-Gaps-in-PPR-Financing-Mechanisms-WHO-and-WB-pdf.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2022  
397 Aug 16]. Available from:  
398 [https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/5760109c4db174ff90a8dfa7d025644a-](https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/5760109c4db174ff90a8dfa7d025644a-0290032022/original/G20-Gaps-in-PPR-Financing-Mechanisms-WHO-and-WB-pdf.pdf)  
399 [0290032022/original/G20-Gaps-in-PPR-Financing-Mechanisms-WHO-and-WB-pdf.pdf](https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/5760109c4db174ff90a8dfa7d025644a-0290032022/original/G20-Gaps-in-PPR-Financing-Mechanisms-WHO-and-WB-pdf.pdf)

400 5. Rethinking Financial Estimates for Pandemic Preparedness and Response | Think  
401 Global Health [Internet]. Council on Foreign Relations. [cited 2023 May 17]. Available  
402 from: [https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/rethinking-financial-estimates-pandemic-](https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/rethinking-financial-estimates-pandemic-preparedness-and-response)  
403 [preparedness-and-response](https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/rethinking-financial-estimates-pandemic-preparedness-and-response)

404 6. Clarke L, Patouillard E, Mirelman AJ, Ho ZJM, Edejer TTT, Kandel N. The costs of  
405 improving health emergency preparedness: A systematic review and analysis of multi-  
406 country studies. *eClinicalMedicine* [Internet]. 2022 Feb 1 [cited 2022 Nov 29];44.  
407 Available from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-5370(21)00550-2/fulltext)  
408 [5370\(21\)00550-2/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-5370(21)00550-2/fulltext)

409 7. PPR-FIF-WB-White-Paper.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 19]. Available from:  
410 [https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/018ab1c6b6d8305933661168af757737-](https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/018ab1c6b6d8305933661168af757737-0290032022/original/PPR-FIF-WB-White-Paper.pdf)  
411 [0290032022/original/PPR-FIF-WB-White-Paper.pdf](https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/018ab1c6b6d8305933661168af757737-0290032022/original/PPR-FIF-WB-White-Paper.pdf)

412 8. World Economic Outlook Database, April 2022 [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 16]. Available  
413 from: <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/weo-database/2022/April>

414 9. World Bank Country and Lending Groups – World Bank Data Help Desk [Internet]. [cited  
415 2022 Aug 22]. Available from:  
416 [https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)  
417 [and-lending-groups](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)

418 10. Total flows by donor (ODA+OOF+Private) [DAC1] [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 16].  
419 Available from: <https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=Table1>

420 11. Technical Guide to the DAC Statistics database - OECD [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 7].  
421 Available from: [https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-](https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/dacguide.htm)  
422 [development/development-finance-standards/dacguide.htm](https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/dacguide.htm)

423 12. Development Assistance Committee (DAC) - OECD [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 24].  
424 Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/development-assistance-committee/>

425 13. GDP (constant 2015 US\$) | Data [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 16]. Available from:  
426 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD>

- 427 14. Global Health Expenditure Database [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 16]. Available from:  
428 <https://apps.who.int/nha/database/Select/Indicators/en>
- 429 15. Global spending on health: rising to the pandemic's challenges [Internet]. [cited 2023  
430 Feb 21]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240064911>
- 431 16. Yamey G, Ogbuoji O, Nonvignon J. Middle-income countries graduating from health aid:  
432 Transforming daunting challenges into smooth transitions. *PLOS Med*. 2019 Jun  
433 25;16(6):e1002837.
- 434 17. Creditor Reporting System (CRS) [Internet]. [cited 2023 Feb 21]. Available from:  
435 <https://stats.oecd.org/index.aspx?DataSetCode=CRS1>
- 436 18. Schäferhoff M, Chodavadia P, Martinez S, McDade KK, Fewer S, Silva S, et al.  
437 International Funding for Global Common Goods for Health: An Analysis Using the  
438 Creditor Reporting System and G-FINDER Databases. *Health Syst Reform*.  
439 2019;5(4):350–65.
- 440 19. Schäferhoff M, Brown GW, Blagovesta t, Shahid M, and Rhodes N. Global health  
441 financing after COVID-19 and the new Pandemic Fund [Internet]. Brookings. 2022 [cited  
442 2023 May 19]. Available from: [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-  
443 development/2022/12/07/global-health-financing-after-covid-19-and-the-new-pandemic-  
444 fund/](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2022/12/07/global-health-financing-after-covid-19-and-the-new-pandemic-fund/)
- 445 20. Can You Spare .001% For the World's Pandemic Fund? [Internet]. Center for Global  
446 Development | Ideas to Action. [cited 2022 Dec 7]. Available from:  
447 <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/can-you-spare-001-worlds-pandemic-fund>
- 448 21. Yamey G, Jamison D, Hanssen O, Soucat A. Financing Global Common Goods for  
449 Health: When the World is a Country. *Health Syst Reform*. 2019 Oct 2;5(4):334–49.
- 450 22. DESA-PB\_Ensuring-SDG-progress-amid-recurrent-crises.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec  
451 1]. Available from: [https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-  
452 content/uploads/sites/45/DESA-PB\\_Ensuring-SDG-progress-amid-recurrent-crises.pdf](https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/DESA-PB_Ensuring-SDG-progress-amid-recurrent-crises.pdf)
- 453 23. Debt media briefing ahead of G20.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 1]. Available from:  
454 [https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2020-  
455 04/Debt%20media%20briefing%20ahead%20of%20G20.pdf](https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2020-04/Debt%20media%20briefing%20ahead%20of%20G20.pdf)
- 456 24. UNCTAD, editor. Tackling illicit financial flows for sustainable development in Africa.  
457 Geneva: United Nations; 2020. 223 p. (Economic development in Africa report).
- 458 25. Loewenson R, Mukumba C. Tax justice for universal public sector health systems in East  
459 and Southern Africa. :29.
- 460 26. Who killed the COVID vaccine waiver? [Internet]. POLITICO. 2022 [cited 2022 Dec 1].  
461 Available from: <https://www.politico.eu/article/covid-vaccine-poor-countries-waiver-killed/>
- 462 27. June 2022 AG// 17. WTO finally agrees on a TRIPS deal. But not everyone is happy  
463 [Internet]. Devex. 2022 [cited 2022 Dec 1]. Available from:  
464 [https://www.devex.com/news/sponsored/wto-finally-agrees-on-a-trips-deal-but-not-  
465 everyone-is-happy-103476](https://www.devex.com/news/sponsored/wto-finally-agrees-on-a-trips-deal-but-not-everyone-is-happy-103476)

466