



## **WHO reform**

### **Prioritization of proposals for additional items on the provisional agenda of the Executive Board**

1. The Director-General has the honour to transmit to the Executive Board for its consideration the report by the Officers of the Board (see Annex) on the use, on a trial basis, of the set of criteria and list of factors and the tool for the prioritization of proposals for additional items on the provisional agenda of the Executive Board, as requested by the Board in decision EB141(8) (2017).

#### **ACTION BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

2. The Board is invited to consider the report by the Officers of the Board contained in the Annex and the draft decision contained in paragraph 7 of the report.

ANNEX

**REPORT BY THE OFFICERS OF THE BOARD ON THE SET OF CRITERIA  
AND LIST OF FACTORS AND THE TOOL FOR THE PRIORITIZATION  
OF PROPOSALS FOR ADDITIONAL ITEMS ON THE  
PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

1. The Executive Board in decision EB141(8) requested the Officers of the Board to apply, on a trial basis, the set of criteria and list of factors and the tool for the prioritization of proposals for additional items, as set out in Annexes 1 and 2 to document EB141/5, for the preparation of the provisional agenda of the 142nd session of the Executive Board in January 2018, and to report thereon at that session.<sup>1</sup> With a view to ensuring transparency, the Board also requested that this report include the scores resulting from the application of the tool for prioritization of proposals.<sup>2</sup>
2. The Officers were provided with the tool for prioritization of proposals for additional items before the meeting at which the provisional agenda of the 142nd session of the Board was prepared. The Officers considered the 10 proposals for additional items received from Member States by 21 September 2017 in light of the above-mentioned criteria and factors. For each proposal, the Officers assigned scores corresponding to their assessment.
3. The scores assigned by the six Officers were compiled by the Secretariat in order to determine the average score for each proposal. As requested by the Board in decision EB141(8), the scores resulting from the application of the prioritization tool are contained in Appendix 1. While the scores were helpful in informing the discussion between the Officers and the Director-General, they were not the only or the determining factor for recommending inclusion, exclusion or deferral of the corresponding proposal.
4. The Officers acknowledged the utility of a scoring system in principle. However, they noted that they had all faced challenges in applying the prioritization tool. In particular:
  - (a) Some of the criteria and/or factors, for example factors D.4, E.3 and E.4, are worded in negative form. This might be a source of confusion.
  - (b) There might be benefit in reducing the number of criteria, thereby also minimizing the risk of redundancies among the various criteria and factors.
  - (c) The wide range of scores that can be assigned to each factor may constitute an additional source of complexity. For example, the maximum score that can be assigned to factor A.1 is 9; to factor A.2 is 11; to factor A.3 is 10; and to factor A.4 is 15.
5. To address these challenges, the Officers were of the view that fewer criteria and a simpler scoring system would better assist the Officers in their assessment of proposals for additional items for the provisional agenda of the Board. In light of this, the Officers discussed and consensually

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision EB141(8), operative paragraph 1.

<sup>2</sup> Decision EB141(8), operative paragraph 2.

developed a proposal for an amended prioritization tool. This proposal is contained in Appendix 2 to the present report, for the Board's consideration.

6. Finally, the Officers noted that face-to-face meetings of the Bureau are useful in that they facilitate meaningful discussions and consensus-building among the Officers.

7. In light of the above, the Officers recommended that the Executive Board consider the following draft decision:

The Executive Board, having considered the report by the Officers of the Board on the set of criteria and list of factors and the tool for the prioritization of proposals for additional items on the provisional agenda of the Executive Board,<sup>1</sup> decided:

- (1) to request the Officers of the Executive Board to apply, on a trial basis, the proposed amended prioritization tool, as set out in Appendix 2 to the Annex to document EB142/6, for the preparation of the provisional agendas of the 143rd and 144th sessions of the Executive Board;
- (2) to report on the use of the proposed amended prioritization tool to the Executive Board at its 144th session.

---

<sup>1</sup> See document EB142/6, Annex.

## Appendix 1

**SCORES RESULTING FROM THE APPLICATION OF THE TOOL  
FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROPOSALS**

Title of proposal	Range of scores assigned by the Officers
(a) Implementation of the commitments of the First WHO Ministerial Conference “Ending TB in the Sustainable Development Era: a Multisectoral Response”	Between 94 and 183 (average: 147.6)
(b) Global action on patient safety	Between 135 and 173 (average: 144.1)
(c) Engagement framework for private sector in health care delivery towards universal health coverage	Between 107 and 143 (average: 126.6)
(d) Follow-up of resolution WHA60.26 Workers’ Health: Global Plan of Action in the context of the SDGs	Between 112 and 160 (average: 131.5)
(e) Workers’ Health: Follow-up of the WHO global plan of action 2008–2017	Between 112 and 160 (average: 137.75)
(f) Accelerated action for global drowning prevention	Between 88 and 163 (average: 129)
(g) World Chagas Disease Day	Between 72 and 136 (average: 109)
(h) Establishment of a World Food Safety Day	Between 87 and 171 (average: 133.4)
(i) Role of regional cooperation in the regulatory reforms for NCD prevention and control	Between 71 and 150 (average: 108)
(j) Health and human resources	Between 80 and 141 (average: 113.3)

## Appendix 2

**PROPOSED AMENDED TOOL FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROPOSALS****ESSENTIAL CRITERIA**

The four essential criteria below would be graded “Yes”, “Partially agree” or “No”, and would support a recommendation for inclusion, deferral or exclusion of a proposal.

Any Officer of the Board assigning a rating of “Partially agree” to any of the essential criteria would be invited to indicate what, if any, changes would be needed in order to assign a rating of “Yes” to the criterion concerned.

The WHO Secretariat should provide information in support of these criteria if the proponent has not provided it or has provided incomplete information.

Ratings for the essential criteria would be discussed and moderated by the Officers of the Board as a guide to a final recommendation.

<b>Essential criteria</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Partially agree</b>	<b>No</b>
1. The proposal is not already covered under an item on the provisional agenda of the Board’s session			
2. The issue covered by the proposal is not already addressed by a WHO programme area workplan or mandate, in line with the General Programme of Work and/or a governing body resolution or decision which is deemed to be active or ongoing			
3. The issue has implications for global health and, if addressed, will contribute significantly to reducing or understanding the global burden of disease			
4. WHO, as the United Nations specialized agency for health, has a clear and well defined comparative advantage in addressing the issue (i.e. WHO has a key role to play that cannot be performed solely by others within and/or outside the United Nations system)			

## RANKING CRITERIA

The maximum score for the ranking criteria is 18.

The WHO Secretariat should provide information on these factors if the proponent has not provided it or has provided incomplete information.

<b>Criterion A</b> <b>The proposal addresses an urgent health threat</b>	<b>Range of score (0–3)</b>	<b>Score by the Officer</b>
The proposal addresses an urgent health issue, where “urgent” is defined as posing an immediate global public health threat.	0 = no/ insignificant threat 1 = low urgency/threat 2 = moderate urgency/threat 3 = very urgent/serious threat	
<b>Criterion B</b> <b>The proposal is relevant to the General Programme of Work</b>		
The proposal clearly articulates linkages with the priorities of the Organization as reflected in its General Programme of Work.	0 = none 1 = limited/not clearly articulated 2 = several linkages/well articulated 3 = many linkages/well articulated	

<b>Criterion C</b> <b>The proposal is evidence-based and proposes cost-effective interventions</b>	<b>Range of score (0–3)</b>	<b>Score by the Officer</b>
Factor C.1 The evidence submitted by the proponent is sound.	0 = inexistent/no evidence 1 = fair 2 = good 3 = excellent	
Factor C.2 The proponent provides evidence on the cost–effectiveness of the actions/interventions proposed to address the public health issue.	0 = inexistent/no evidence 1 = fair 2 = good 3 = excellent	
Factor C.3 The actions/interventions proposed show the potential for using knowledge and innovative science and technology to address the subject.	0 = inexistent/no potential demonstrated 1 = fair 2 = good 3 = excellent	
Factor C.4 The proposal can be met within the existing financial and human resources of the Organization.	0 = no; 1 = likely not; 2 = possibly; 3 = very likely	
	<b>Total SCORE (out of 18)</b>	

= = =