Management Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning Unit</td>
<td>HGF/HGS and HGF/HEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Plan</td>
<td>Organization-wide biennial evaluation workplan 2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Responsible for providing the management response</td>
<td>HGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Management Response:**

1. The report was well received.
2. Most of the recommendations are relevant.
3. We have to notice that given the complexity (number of areas of work, number of countries and number of activities) the task of the evaluation team was difficult.

**Management Response Status**

| Date | In progress |

**Recommendations and Action Plan**

**Recommendation 1**

In most WCOs, HF and HSS expertise is scarce, therefore the provision of full-mode technical assistance on these two areas from the UHC-P could be beneficial.

**Management response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status March 2018</th>
<th>Comments March 2018</th>
<th>Status March 2019</th>
<th>Comments March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional support with HQ and RO backstopping on HF matters.</td>
<td>HEF</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More advisors with a HF profile might be recruited in the following phase of the UHC-P.</td>
<td>HEF</td>
<td>2019 onwards</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status**

| Date | In progress |

**Recommendation 2**

WCO could be the natural lead in Development Partners alignment.

**Management response**

| Date | Accepted |

---

Note: The table structure is designed to enhance readability and clarity of the management response and recommendations.
Since 2017, the transformation of IHP+ into UHC 2030 positions WHO in the wake of recent orientations for SDGs and UHC. This is supported by the agenda of the new DG. There is an increasingly robust perception of, and commitment to, health coordination at country level. Aid coordination has been put at the centre of the roadmap in each country that needs it.

**Status**  
Implemented

**Recommendation 3**  
EU and Luxembourg delegations at country level should be involved more to be more efficient – but also to give legitimacy to the programme and create more visibility.

**Management response**  
Partially accepted  
WCO actors at country level are recommended to be proactive with the EU delegations and Luxembourg’s representations at country level.

**Status**  
In progress

**Key actions** | Responsible | Timeline | Status March 2018 | Comments March 2018 | Status March 2019 | Comments March 2019
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Organize meetings with EU delegations and Luxembourg representation at country level. | All countries | 2018 | In progress |  | In progress |  

**Recommendation 4**  
At country office level, strengthening of health systems (and then health financing) expertise is needed – probably best as “full-mode”.

**Management response**  
Accepted  
This corroborates what has been recommended by other evaluations or actors who have looked at the UHC-P. Nevertheless, it should remain a choice made at country level according to needs. In the last year, most of the countries newly integrated in the UHC-P have or will benefit from a long-term technical advisor. Three countries (Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Sudan) have evolved from light to full mode.

**Status**  
In progress

**Key actions** | Responsible | Timeline | Status March 2018 | Comments March 2018 | Status March 2019 | Comments March 2019
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Consider the long term technical assistance in new countries. | HGF | 2018 and onwards | In progress |  | In progress |  

**Recommendation 5**  
Regional Offices are a key intermediary between the global programming and day to day activities.

**Management response**  
Accepted  
All relevant ROs are involved systematically in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the UHC-P.

**Status**  
In progress
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status March 2018</th>
<th>Comments March 2018</th>
<th>Status March 2019</th>
<th>Comments March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The annual technical meeting of the UHC-P gives more room to the ROs in designing and facilitating</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 and onwards</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>The meeting will take place 11-13 June 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of the coordination committee of the UHC-P in May 2018 will involve all relevant regions</td>
<td>HGF</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-donor coordinating committ for UHC has held 3 meetings so far (May and September 2018 plus February 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 6**
The program is administratively burdensome.

**Management response**
Partially accepted
This has been perceived by the UHC-P managers for a long time. The burden of the administrative tasks have been seriously reduced for countries with the recruitment of a professional administrative officer (2015), with better utilization of the GSM and the acceptance by the EU to simplify the budget (Phase III 2016-2018).

**Status**
Implemented

**Key actions**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status March 2018</th>
<th>Comments March 2018</th>
<th>Status March 2019</th>
<th>Comments March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplification of the budget for Phase III (2016-2018).</td>
<td>HGF</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 7**
What is often needed at country office level is increasing expertise for health system strengthening, making WHO-CO less disease-control specific expertise.

**Management response**
Accepted
This is the whole purpose of the programme. In some countries, one person is not enough.

**Status**
In progress

**Key actions**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status March 2018</th>
<th>Comments March 2018</th>
<th>Status March 2019</th>
<th>Comments March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommendation 8**
The collaboration at headquarters level between the three units in charge of the UHC-P implementation is less visible than at country level.

**Management response**
Partially accepted
There is good collaboration between the 3 units at country level. The arrival of the new HGF Director pushed the team in the right direction, especially with the creation of the teams. The transformation that led to the creation of UHC 2030 brought the UHC-P and UHC 2030 closer to each other.

### Status
In progress

### Key actions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status March 2018</th>
<th>Comments March 2018</th>
<th>Status March 2019</th>
<th>Comments March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHC 2030/HGF</td>
<td>2017 onwards</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities along coordination of development aid is still among the most important at country level.

### Recommendation 9
The countries’ roadmaps were often too ambitious for the limited timeframe of the programme and the complexity that policy dialogue entails.

#### Management response
Partially accepted
The roadmaps are key in the process of implementation of the UHC-P activities at country level. All newly integrated countries should have one. Flexibility is key in implementation.

### Status
In progress

### Key actions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status March 2018</th>
<th>Comments March 2018</th>
<th>Status March 2019</th>
<th>Comments March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HGF/ROs</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation 10
At country level, it was recommended to make a clearer link between UHC being one of the SDGs, so different stakeholders may be more convinced on the importance of NHPSP.

#### Management response
Accepted
This is in line with the new GPW and the strategic direction of the new Director-General.

### Status
In progress

### Key actions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status March 2018</th>
<th>Comments March 2018</th>
<th>Status March 2019</th>
<th>Comments March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HGF</td>
<td>Continuous effort in countries</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In progress. The new phase of the Programme puts more emphasis on health security and SDGs.
Development of recent technical document to support and guide implementation at country level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management response</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Support to countries must be tailored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommendation 11**

(...) some countries need more support than others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status March 2018</th>
<th>Comments March 2018</th>
<th>Status March 2019</th>
<th>Comments March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a plan for support to countries.</td>
<td>HGF ROs</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>Not initiated</td>
<td>According to the GPW13 each country has to develop a country support plan. This plan exists already in the 66 supported countries and will be developed late 2019 – early 2020 in the new supported countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>