

Modalities for the independent evaluation of the WHO reform: stage two

Report by the Director-General

CONTEXT

1. As part of the WHO reform process, the Executive Board, at its special session in November 2011, requested an independent evaluation of the WHO reform proposals as the first of a two-stage process.¹ The evaluators were also tasked with proposing the terms of reference of the second stage of the evaluation. In decision WHA65(9), under managerial reforms, the Sixty-fifth World Health Assembly decided to note the proposed terms of reference of the second stage of the independent evaluation as outlined in the report of the External Auditor and to request the Director-General to provide a paper on the specific modalities of this evaluation for consideration by the Executive Board at its 132nd session.
2. The purpose of the present report is to provide information on the specific modalities of this evaluation for consideration by the Executive Board at its 132nd session. The structure follows the approach and requirements stipulated in the evaluation policy that was approved by the Board in May 2012.²
3. In deciding on the terms of reference, it is important to note that stage two of the evaluation should also consider the findings of the relevant work performed under existing Secretariat initiatives and as a consequence of other decisions taken by the Executive Board. For example, consideration needs to be given to the Organization's evaluation policy and to the work conducted by the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit in its updated reports on: (a) Decentralization of Organizations within the United Nations System – Part III: the World Health Organization; and (b) Review of management and administration in the World Health Organization.³

ORGANIZATION OF THE EVALUATION

Commissioner

4. The Executive Board will be the commissioner and owner of stage two of the evaluation.

¹ See decision EBSS2(3).

² See decision EB131(1) and EB131/2012/REC/1, Annex 2.

³ See document EB132/5 Add.6.

Objective

5. The first stage of the evaluation focused on whether the WHO reform proposals had identified a sufficient range of issues that needed to be dealt with in the reform process and made recommendations on the roadmap for the second stage of the evaluation. Those recommendations have informed the work of the Secretariat concerning the coherence between and functioning of the three levels of the Organization.

6. The objective of the second stage of the evaluation is to assess the WHO reform implementation strategy and the Organization's preparedness to implement the reform process. In particular, this stage of the evaluation is designed to assess whether change management issues and barriers to implementation have been appropriately considered and addressed.

Scope, criteria and key questions

7. In the report, the External Auditor made a number of suggestions for the scope of work in the terms of reference for the second stage of the evaluation.¹ Within the reform agenda, these can be categorized into five broad themes on which the evaluation could focus: (a) strategy; (b) structures, roles, instruments and processes; (c) internal governance; (d) accountability and transparency; and (e) barriers to change.

8. Given the scope and broad themes, and the fact that complementary work is being carried out in the managerial and governance areas by external parties such as the Joint Inspection Unit, the Secretariat suggests that the evaluation focus on the Organization's readiness to move the reform forward. Using the criteria of effectiveness, the evaluation will address the key issues recommended in the first stage evaluation report, relating to the preparedness of WHO to fully implement the reforms through assessing the following:

- (i) Status of action taken on the recommendations of stage one.
- (ii) Modalities of implementing the reform proposal and the sufficiency of the change management strategy including:
 - Prioritization of various components of the reform proposal
 - Identification of change agents
 - Capability of accountability structures to support the reform process
 - Resource requirements for the reform proposal
 - Timelines defined for the implementation of the reform proposal
 - Performance indicators defined to measure movement towards reform process
 - Strategy to deal with hindrances, enablers and dependencies
 - Changes in internal procedures and structures to implement the reform process.

¹ See document A65/5 Add.2.

Evaluation management group

9. An evaluation management group will be convened to assist in the selection of consultants and the direction and quality control of the evaluation. It will have responsibility for approving the terms of reference and providing comments on the draft report. The evaluation management group will be kept informed of progress and should be available to respond to queries from the evaluation team and should provide suggestions for consideration. The evaluation management group will consist of the Officers of the Executive Board and will be supported by the Secretariat in the conduct of its work.

Evaluators

10. The evaluation team should consist of independent external consultants with an appropriate knowledge and skill mix of the subject of the evaluation, as well as experience in performing evaluations involving organizational reform. It is proposed that the consultants will be selected through a request for proposal, which will invite leading consultants to submit proposals on the conduct of the evaluation in accordance with the approved terms of reference. The proposals will be examined against criteria that are based on a combination of technical competence and cost, and which have been approved by the evaluation management group. The evaluation team will be supported by the Secretariat in the conduct of the evaluation.

Timeline (January 2013 to January 2014)

11. The timeline is as follows:

- Establishment of the evaluation management group by the Executive Board at its 132nd session: January 2013;
- Finalization of the outline terms of reference by the evaluation management group: February 2013;
- Issuance of the request for proposals: March 2013;
- Selection of the evaluation team by the evaluation management group: May 2013; and
- Presentation of the final report for consideration by the Executive Board at its 134th session: January 2014.

Budget

12. Depending on the final terms of reference and the evaluation team composition, it is estimated that the consulting fees for the evaluation will range from US\$ 120 000 to US\$ 300 000. This takes into account variations in consultants' rates, for example, from US\$ 1000 to US\$ 2500 per day for a two-member team, with a duration of approximately 60 working days. Additional resources would also need to be allocated for overhead, travel and other direct costs, estimated to be in the region of US\$ 50 000.

Deliverable

13. The final report of the evaluation will be disseminated to Member States, partners and other stakeholders, and will be made available to the general public on the Internet site of the Organization. It will be discussed, together with the response of the Secretariat, by the Executive Board at its 134th session in January 2014.

ACTION BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

14. The Executive Board is requested to note the report, endorse the modalities and establish the evaluation management group.

= = =