



WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

**PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD
Tenth meeting**

**EBPDC10/7
19 January 2004**

Report of the tenth meeting of the Programme Development Committee of the Executive Board

1. The tenth meeting of the Programme Development Committee was held in Geneva on 16 January 2004 under the chairmanship of Dr M.M. Dayrit (Philippines). The list of participants is annexed. The Committee adopted the provisional agenda.¹

Agenda item 3 Programme evaluation

- **Evaluation activities in 2003** (Document EBPDC10/2)
- **Proposed evaluations for 2004** (Document EBPDC10/3)

2. The Committee was reminded that, as part of WHO's management reforms and in response to the need to be more efficient, accountable and transparent, the Organization had introduced results-based budgeting in the biennium 2002-2003. To do so involved an improved process of planning, monitoring and evaluation of programme budgeting by which the Secretariat would be accountable for achieving specific expected results. To facilitate this process a framework had been designed that envisaged four types of assessment: evaluation of end-of-biennium programme budget performance, for which a simulation exercise was carried out during 2003 in order to assess readiness, to analyse weaknesses and to fine-tune the methodology; programmatic and thematic evaluations to provide in-depth assessment of WHO's work over more than one biennium; and country evaluations, for which pilot evaluations were expected to start early in 2004.

3. The Director-General had assigned responsibility for this function to the Office of Internal Audit and Oversight, which would coordinate the evaluations. Planned activities for 2004-2005 included two Organization-wide evaluations, one programmatic and the other thematic, plus one programmatic or thematic evaluation in each of the six regions and one in headquarters. During the biennium there would also be three country evaluations, conducted as pilots, which would set the basis for future country evaluations. The terms of reference for the proposed evaluation of WHO's Fellowship Programme were under discussion with the regional offices and the relevant programme director at headquarters. The final report of this evaluation was expected to be available in January 2005.

¹ Document EBPDC10/1.

4. In general members wanted more detailed information on the results of the evaluations and specifically asked for copies of the evaluation framework, which could be provided at once. The Committee was informed that the Office of Internal Audit and Oversight now maintained two units, one for standard audits and one for programmatic and other evaluations; synergies and differences in the two functions continued to be elucidated. Members were also informed that an underlying goal was to increase accountability and stimulate learning within WHO. The performance assessment report for 2002-2003 will feed into the work on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (see agenda item 5), and members agreed that the draft report could, if ready, be presented to the Executive Board in May 2004, without first having been discussed in the Committee.

Agenda item 5 Eleventh General Programme of Work and Proposed programme budget 2006-2007 (Document EBPDC10/4)

5. The Committee recognized the importance of the Eleventh General Programme of Work as a road map for the coming years. WHO's Constitution does not specify a duration for a general programme of work, and the Committee considered the proposed 10-year time frame for the Eleventh General Programme of Work to be ambitious; however, it considered it logical that the next such programme should extend to the deadline for attainment of the Millennium Development Goals, namely 2015. Nevertheless, the general programme of work must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate changing conditions. In a global context in which attaining health objectives increasingly needs intersectoral work, it was considered important to clarify the role of Member States, the Secretariat and WHO's partners, including those in non-health sectors, towards achieving the objectives to be laid out in the Eleventh General Programme of Work. WHO's contribution should be based largely on its advantage compared to other organizations. The Committee noted that the General Programme of Work can also be valuable to Member States to consider with respect to their own national health objectives; its usefulness will depend on Member States and WHO's partners having a stake in it. In response to a question from one member about the target percentages proposed for the programme budget for 2006-2007 for regions and countries (75%) and headquarters (25%), it was noted that the figures were 70% and 30% for the present biennium and that a further shift to 80% and 20% was intended for 2008-2009. Finally, the aim to strive for greater transparency with respect to extrabudgetary sources of financing the budget was welcomed.

Agenda item 2 Proposed resolutions: streamlining of procedures (Document EBPDC10/6)

6. The Committee supported the general principle that all resolutions should be considered first by the Executive Board before submission to the Health Assembly, with exceptions only when imperative (e.g. emerging health emergencies). Members stressed the importance of full compliance with the Rules of Procedure of the World Health Assembly as regards draft resolutions submitted to the latter, in particular the "two-day rule" provided for in Rule 52. The Committee supported a recommendation by the Secretariat that draft resolutions should be submitted before the start of the Executive Board at which they were intended to be debated. The draft resolutions would be issued in the form of conference papers after the adoption by the Board of its agenda.

Agenda item 4 Evaluation of the Coordinating Committee on Health (Document EBPDC10/5)

7. The Committee considered the report of the evaluation of the Coordinating Committee on Health that that Committee had requested at its last meeting in 2001. Members underlined the importance of effective coordination between agencies, including that at country level. It supported the

recommendation that the secretariats of WHO, UNICEF and UNFPA continue to strengthen coordination among the organizations. The increasing number of other mechanisms for ensuring coordination and effective collaboration among organizations in the United Nations system was also noted. The Committee concluded, however, that it was advisable to request the full Executive Board to discuss and decide on the recommendations contained in the review, as was foreseen in the provisional agenda of the Board.

ANNEX
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MEMBERS, ALTERNATES AND ADVISERS

Philippines

Dr M.M. Dayrit (Chairman)

Mrs E.L. Maaghop (Attaché)

Colombia

Dr J. Boshell (Member)

Guinea

Dr M. Camara (Member)

Russian Federation

Dr S.M. Furgal (alternate to Professor Y.L. Shevchenko)

Dr A.V. Pavlov (Adviser)

Dr N. Fetisov (Counsellor)

OTHER EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS, ALTERNATES AND ADVISERS

Dr J. Larivière (Canada)

Mr D. MacPhee (Canada)

Ms Liu Guangyuan (China)

Mr D.E. Hohman (United States of America)

MEMBER STATES NOT REPRESENTED ON THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Mr M. Sawers (Australia)

Ms S. Mangan (Ireland)

Ms S. Cullen (Ireland)

Ms M. Middelhoff (Netherlands)

Ms D. Mafubelu (South Africa)

= = =