
Evaluation: annual report

1. The Executive Board approved the amended WHO evaluation policy at its 143rd session in 2018.¹ The policy requires the Secretariat to report annually to the Executive Board on progress in the implementation of evaluation activities. The present annual report: (i) provides information on the progress made in implementing the WHO evaluation policy, including the Organization-wide evaluation workplan for 2018–2019;² (ii) presents summaries of two recent evaluations for which management responses were available, in order to document organizational learning linked to the findings and recommendations; and (iii) outlines, for consideration by the Board, terms of reference and a proposed approach for the initial evaluation of the Framework of Engagement with non-State actors.

PROGRESS MADE BY THE SECRETARIAT IN IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION POLICY

Strengthening the capacity to implement the corporate³ evaluation function

2. The Evaluation Office continues to implement the framework for strengthening evaluation and organizational learning in WHO⁴ presented to the Programme, Budget and Administration Committee of the Executive Board at its twenty-first meeting in January 2015.⁵ The framework has six key action areas: (i) establishing an enabling environment and governance; (ii) evaluation capacity and resources; (iii) evaluation workplan, scope and modalities; (iv) evaluation recommendations and management response; (v) organizational learning; and (vi) communicating evaluation work.

3. Regarding establishing an enabling environment and governance, the independent Evaluation Office is actively engaged in both corporate evaluations and providing support to decentralized evaluations. With regard to evaluation capacity and resources, the engagement of regional and cluster focal points of the Global Network on Evaluation in ongoing corporate and decentralized evaluations has enabled greater coordination of evaluation activities at the three levels of the Organization. Both

¹ Decision EB143(9) (2018).

² Document EB142/27, Annex, approved by the Executive Board at its 142nd session (see document EB142/2018/REC/2, summary records of the eleventh meeting, section 2).

³ Corporate or centralized evaluations are evaluations that are commissioned or conducted by the WHO Evaluation Office.

⁴ A framework for strengthening evaluation and organizational learning in WHO. Geneva: World Health Organization (http://who.int/about/who_reform/documents/framework-strengthening-evaluation-organizational-learning.pdf?ua=1, accessed 11 April 2019).

⁵ Document EB136/38, noted by the Executive Board at its 136th session (see document EB136/2015/REC/2, summary records of the fourteenth meeting, section 4).

corporate and decentralized evaluations are supported by external expertise, including from a roster of prequalified evaluation experts.

4. With regard to the workplan, scope and modalities, the workplan for 2018–2019, which incorporates both the corporate and decentralized planned evaluations, was shared with senior management, discussed with the Independent Expert Oversight Advisory Committee, and reviewed and approved by the Executive Board at its 142nd session.¹

5. As for the action areas on evaluation recommendations and management response and organizational learning, evaluations that were completed in 2018 and for which management responses were available have been reviewed and the findings are summarized in the section on organizational learning below. WHO has also established a process to firmly anchor organizational learning in its work, taking into consideration the consolidated findings and recommendations identified during audits, evaluations and reviews. In this process, the directors of the accountability functions identify a shortlist of recurring, systemic cross-cutting issues arising from findings and recommendations from various sources, and potential root causes, and establish a list of issues to embed within ongoing workstreams with key business owners, including the transformation team.

6. For communicating evaluation work, the website of the Evaluation Office² is regularly updated and includes evaluation reports and management responses as soon as they become available. In addition, a regular newsletter, *Evaluation matters*, is issued. Furthermore, the Evaluation Office provides regular briefings on ongoing and completed evaluations to Member States and internal stakeholders. It also organizes webinars for the regional and cluster focal points of the Global Network on Evaluation to share findings of corporate evaluations. Regular briefings on the evaluation function are also provided, including induction courses for senior management, heads of WHO country offices, and other staff.

7. The Evaluation Office is currently facilitating 10 reviews by the Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations, namely: (i) integration of disaster risk reduction in the work of the United Nations system entities; (ii) strengthening the policy research uptake in service of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; (iii) United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women; (iv) managing cloud computing services in the United Nations system; (v) change management in United Nations system; (vi) audit/oversight committees in the United Nations system; (vii) review of policies and contemporary practices in outsourcing of services in the United Nations system organizations; (viii) review of staff exchange programmes and similar inter-agency mobility measures in United Nations system organizations; (ix) policies, programmes and platforms to support learning in the United Nations system; and (x) review of management and administration in the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). The Director-General's report to the Programme, Budget and Administration Committee of the Executive Board at its thirtieth meeting in May 2019 on the Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit³ provides further details of the implementation of recommendations related to Joint Inspection Unit reviews.

¹ Please see footnote 3 of paragraph 1 of document EB143/6.

² The Evaluation Office website is available at <http://www.who.int/evaluation> (accessed 11 April 2019).

³ Document EBPBAC30/4.

8. The Evaluation Office also facilitates other reviews of WHO by external entities, including the 2017–2018 assessment by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network, the final report of which is expected to be released in May 2019.

9. WHO is an active member of the United Nations Evaluation Group and participates regularly in its meetings of heads of evaluation offices and its various task forces (in particular the working groups on human rights and gender equality, the Sustainable Development Goals, policy evaluation, and the interest group on humanitarian evaluation). WHO continues to participate in the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Steering Group,¹ which promotes collective accountability for results in humanitarian settings by ensuring that the lessons generated from evaluations of humanitarian action are captured and used. It is responsible for the provision of guidance for, and the conduct of, evaluations of all system-wide level 3 emergencies (most of which are also WHO grade 3 emergencies). Finally, the Organization is a participating member of the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action, a network that contributes to improving the quality of evaluation of humanitarian action and related research and learning activities across the humanitarian system.

10. Beyond its main workplan focusing on the evaluation of WHO's work, the Evaluation Office also partners with evaluation counterparts in other entities, participating in joint evaluations in select areas of shared substantive and strategic interest. The UNAIDS-commissioned mid-term evaluation of its 2016–2021 Strategy and Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework is one example of such collaboration. Together with representatives from the evaluation offices of other entities which also cosponsor the UNAIDS Framework (UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF), the Evaluation Office serves on the evaluation management group for this important midpoint assessment. In addition to contributing overall technical guidance to this evaluation, the evaluation management group is aiming to ensure that the evaluation has optimal evaluation management arrangements, independence, and an appropriate utilization-focused approach in place to ensure that it will produce the most credible, impartial and useful analysis possible for all cosponsor entities for the remainder of the Framework period and beyond.

11. The Evaluation Office was also represented on the steering committee for the Gavi-commissioned evaluation of measles campaigns and their effects on the overall immunization system, the report of which was issued in November 2018.

ORGANIZATION-WIDE EVALUATION WORKPLAN AND OTHER ONGOING WORK

12. The approved evaluation workplan for 2018–2019 provides the basis for current activities. The Annex to this report provides an overview of the status as at March 2019 of the corporate and decentralized evaluations included in the evaluation workplan for 2018–2019.

Corporate evaluations

13. The following corporate evaluations/assessments on the approved evaluation workplan for 2018–2019 were completed and the outcomes reported to the Executive Board at its 143rd session in May 2018:² (i) evaluation of the process for the election of the Director-General; and (ii) preliminary

¹ The Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Steering Group is chaired by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and comprises senior evaluation representatives of FAO, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, WHO and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

² See document EB143/6.

evaluation of the WHO global coordination mechanism on the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases.

14. The following is an update, since the last report to the Executive Board at its 143rd session in May 2018, on progress of evaluations on the Organization-wide evaluation workplan for 2018–2019.

15. The second country office evaluation undertaken by the Evaluation Office, and the first in the African Region, took place in Rwanda. Country office evaluations focus on the outcomes/results achieved by country offices, and on contributions from the regional and global levels to the country programme. The purpose of the evaluation was to identify achievements, challenges and gaps, and to document best practices and innovations of WHO in Rwanda over the period 2014–2017. The evaluation report¹ is available on the website of the Evaluation Office.

16. On 21 January 2016, the geographical mobility policy² for WHO international professionals on continuing and fixed-term appointments came into effect. During the first three years (2016–2018), the Policy was implemented on a voluntary basis. The policy stipulated that its implementation be evaluated annually during this phase. Building on the results of the evaluations already undertaken in 2016 and 2017, and taking into account relevant organizational changes that have taken place subsequent to the introduction of this policy, the final annual evaluation was framed as a summative evaluation of the implementation of the voluntary phase of the policy, in order to make relevant suggestions to inform the design and the implementation of the next phase of the policy. The evaluation report³ is available on the website of the Evaluation Office.

17. The Evaluation Office conducted an evaluation of the Eastern Mediterranean Regional Centre for Environmental Health Action. The purpose of this evaluation was to identify achievements, challenges and gaps, and to document best practices and innovations. The ultimate goal was to provide lessons learned from the efforts of the Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean to help countries address environmental and climate change-related risks to health, and to identify the most effective and efficient options for the future evolution of the Centre. The evaluation concentrated on the period 2014–2017, while taking into consideration the Centre's work since its inception in 1985. The report of this evaluation was presented to the Regional Director for the Eastern Mediterranean in January 2019.

18. The Evaluation Office has commissioned an evaluation of the Neglected Tropical Diseases Programme, with a special focus on the current neglected tropical diseases road map for implementation. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the accomplishments of the Programme and the lessons learned through implementation at the three levels of the Organization. The evaluation will document the Programme's successes, challenges and gaps during the bienniums 2014–2015 and 2016–2017 and provide lessons learned and strategic recommendations for the design and operationalization of the next steps, addressing the remaining toll of neglected tropical diseases in the context of the Thirteenth General Programme of Work, 2019–2023. The evaluation report will be available during the second quarter of 2019.

¹ See the evaluation report: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/evaluation/report-rwanda-country-office.pdf?sfvrsn=cc30cbbe_2 (accessed 12 April 2019).

² WHO geographical mobility policy. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016 (<http://www.who.int/employment/WHO-mobility-policy.pdf>, accessed 12 April 2019).

³ See the evaluation report: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/evaluation/summative-evaluation-implementation-mobility-policy.pdf?sfvrsn=21c5ad18_2 (accessed 12 April 2019).

19. An evaluation of the utilization of National Professional Officers at country level has also been commissioned by the Evaluation Office. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the role played by National Professional Officers in the effective delivery of WHO's mandate at country level in support of Member State efforts to achieve their national health targets. The evaluation will specifically focus on the role National Professional Officers play and how WHO has been utilizing them, and explore ways in which their skills and competencies could be utilized more effectively in the future. The evaluation will also document successes, challenges and best practices, and provide lessons learned and recommendations for future use by management to inform policy and decision-making. The evaluation report will be available during the second quarter of 2019.

20. Country office evaluations are also ongoing in India and Senegal. The report of the India country office evaluation should be available during the second quarter of 2019 and for Senegal it is expected to be delivered early in the third quarter of 2019. Further country office evaluations are planned for Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria and Myanmar before the end of 2019.

21. At the request of the 142nd session of the Executive Board in January 2018, the Evaluation Office has also initiated a review of 40 years of primary health care implementation at country level. The purpose of the review is to: (a) document global progress towards primary health care implementation, identifying achievements and success stories, best practices and key challenges encountered; and (b) make recommendations on the way forward in order to accelerate national, regional and global health strategies and plans for universal health care/primary health care and the Sustainable Development Goals. The review report will be presented to the Executive Board at its 146th session in January 2020.

Decentralized evaluations

22. The Evaluation Office has also been providing technical backstopping and quality assurance for decentralized evaluations, including through its participation in the evaluation management groups, as appropriate. Progress in implementing the recommendations of completed decentralized evaluations will be communicated through the annual evaluation report as management responses become available.

23. An external review of WHO online language training was carried out by an independent external consultant. The purpose of this review was to assist senior management in providing to all staff across the Organization the best possible language training, benefiting the highest possible number of staff in the most efficient way. The report was issued in November 2018.

24. The fifth external evaluation of the UNDP/UNPA/UNICEF/WHO/World Bank Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction (2013–2017), commissioned by the Programme's Policy and Coordination Committee, was completed in December 2018 and the report issued in March 2019.

25. The evaluation of the implementation of the Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases 2013–2020 has been delayed due to financial constraints. The Secretariat will convene a representative group of stakeholders, including Member States and international partners, that will work during the second quarter of 2019 to conduct a mid-point evaluation of progress on the implementation of the Global Action Plan. The results will be reported to the Seventy-third World Health Assembly, through the Executive Board.¹

¹ See document A72/19, paragraph 26.

26. In the African Region, the mid-term evaluation of the Programme Management Officer mechanism in the Region was completed in October 2018. The evaluation of the Regional Noma Control Programme was completed in January 2019 and the management response is being prepared. The evaluation of structures supporting the Expanded Special Project or Elimination of Neglected Tropical Diseases is in its final stages. Finally, the evaluations of South Sudan's preventive chemotherapy interventions in neglected tropical diseases and the mid-term evaluation of the project funded by Gavi in South Sudan are scheduled to commence during the third quarter of 2019.

27. In the Region of the Americas, PAHO's Office of Internal Oversight and Evaluation Services advises on methodology and evaluation planning for decentralized evaluations. In 2018, an evaluation of the PAHO Budget Policy was completed. Evaluations of the Regional Immunization Program and the Subregional Level of Technical Cooperation in the Caribbean are ongoing. The Brazil country office issued more decentralized evaluation reports than any other in the Region, essentially related to the Mais Médicos project. Another important regional level evaluation addressed the Revolving Fund's operating model. The regional evaluation function also coordinates with the Evaluation Office for the conduct of corporate evaluations in the Region of the Americas, participating in the evaluations of the Neglected Tropical Diseases Programme, the utilization of National Professional Officers at country level, as well as in the preliminary evaluation of the WHO global coordination mechanism on the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases. Policy development activities included the preparation of a revised evaluation policy that closely mirrors the 2018 WHO evaluation policy, adapted to PAHO's specific circumstances.

28. In the Eastern Mediterranean Region, the mid-term review of the road map for WHO's work in the Eastern Mediterranean Region (2017–2021) has been postponed due to ongoing transformation plans in the Region, with priority being given instead to the development of a new Eastern Mediterranean Region Vision 2023, launched in October 2018. This Vision builds on the previous road map and the milestone activities implemented in early 2018.

29. The South-East Asia Region continues to implement its regional evaluation workplan for 2018–2019¹ as submitted to the seventieth session of the Regional Committee for South-East Asia in September 2017. Of the 16 evaluations in this workplan, the Region has already completed an evaluation of 10 years of implementation of the South-East Asia Regional Health Emergency Fund. Six evaluations are in progress and a further four are in the planning stages. In addition, the evaluation of tobacco control through MPOWER measures in the South-East Asia Region (a roll-over evaluation from 2017) was completed in 2018 and a management response is in preparation. Finally, in early 2019 the Regional Office launched an evaluation of its eight flagship priority areas.

FROM EVALUATION TO ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING

30. In accordance with the norms of the United Nations Evaluation Group, in commissioning and conducting an evaluation there should be a clear intention to use the resulting analysis, conclusions and recommendations to inform decisions and actions. The utility of evaluation is manifest through its use in making relevant and timely contributions to organizational learning.² In order to strengthen the use of evaluation evidence in strategy development, during 2018 the Evaluation Office continued to review all new country cooperation strategies to ensure, on one hand, that evidence generated by evaluations is

¹ Document SEA/RC70/6-INF.DOC.2 subsequently updated to include three additional evaluations under family health, gender and life course.

² See the United Nations Evaluation Group's Norms and standards for evaluation, 2016: p. 10 (<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787>, accessed 12 April 2019).

explicitly referred to and used to inform priorities in new country cooperation strategies and, on the other hand, that appropriate evaluation plans are made to enable independent demonstration of results in countries and generation of evidence to inform future priorities.

31. Given the emphasis on organizational learning in WHO's evaluation framework, the findings and recommendations of completed corporate and decentralized evaluations are continuously being tracked¹ in order to improve performance and inform key decision-making and planning processes.

32. Within this perspective, evaluations completed during the course of 2018, and for which management responses were available, have been reviewed. The salient points are presented below.

Evaluation of the process for the election of the Director-General

33. The evaluation of the process for the election of the Director-General was conducted in an open meeting held during the 142nd session of the Executive Board in January 2018. The Secretariat was requested to bring forward a proposal, informed by the report of the evaluation management group² and the Board's deliberations, for adjustments to the election process for the Director-General, and any necessary revisions to the code of conduct, to be presented for consideration by the Board at its 144th session in January 2019.³ The Report by the Secretariat to the 144th session of the Board⁴ presented proposals and options for consideration by the Board and proposed adjustments to the code of conduct for the election of the Director-General, with a view to improving its practical implementation.

Summative evaluation of the WHO Rapid Access Expansion Programme⁵

34. At the request of Global Affairs Canada, an external evaluation of the summative evaluation of the WHO Rapid Access Expansion Programme was commissioned by the Evaluation Office. This Programme supported high-burden countries to increase coverage of diagnostic, treatment and referral services for the major causes of death among children under 5 years of age (diarrhoea, pneumonia and malaria) through the scaling up of integrated community case management (iCCM). The evaluation assessed the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability of the results of the Programme in order to inform policy dialogue and future design and implementation of iCCM.

35. The evaluation concluded that iCCM services, as delivered under the Rapid Access Expansion Programme, can fill important gaps in national strategies for universal health coverage by creating access to essential health services to children who need timely treatment for malaria, diarrhoea and acute respiratory infections but who do not have easy access to primary health care facilities, provided these services are sustainably funded. Recommendations centred on: (i) ensuring that the achievements of Rapid Access Expansion Programme are not lost, by working with partner governments to ensure sustainability of funding; (ii) including programme implementation through non-State actors as a

¹ A report on corporate and decentralized evaluations: findings, recommendations, actions and learning, May 2019. Available in English only on request from the WHO Evaluation Office.

² Document EB142/26.

³ See decision EB142(8).

⁴ Document EB 144/35.

⁵ See the evaluation report (available in English, French and Portuguese): [https://www.who.int/about/what-we-do/evaluation/corporate-evaluations/programmatic-evaluations/summative-evaluation-of-the-who-rapid-access-expansion-programme-\(2018\)](https://www.who.int/about/what-we-do/evaluation/corporate-evaluations/programmatic-evaluations/summative-evaluation-of-the-who-rapid-access-expansion-programme-(2018)) (accessed 12 April 2019).

possible alternative option to the established approach of direct implementation through governments; (iii) consolidating and disseminating the lessons learned by the Programme, supporting research to better understand the role and effectiveness of community engagement strategies for iCCM, and conducting a systematic review of gender equality issues in the supply and demand for iCCM in different social and cultural contexts; and (iv) focusing WHO's technical and programme support on iCCM to ministries of health and development partners towards the achievement of universal health coverage and reduction of child mortality through iCCM services.

36. In its management response,¹ the Secretariat stated that it had already advocated with the relevant countries' technical and funding partners to support iCCM scale-up under the financing of key strategies such as Child Health, Malaria Strategic Plans and new initiatives, and continues to support these countries to implement the iCCM sustainability plan. While noting that the success of the Programme was largely due to WHO's emphasis on ministry of health leadership, the Secretariat stated that WHO would play an active role in convening partners for the purpose of defining and addressing the health system gaps. The opportunities of national-level meetings are used to share periodic implementation and evaluation reports and highlight lessons learned at a national level. Research on iCCM, including community engagement strategies and gender equality issues, is in progress and a systematic review of gender equality in iCCM is planned by June 2020.

Country office evaluation – Romania²

37. The evaluation of the country office in Romania covered the Biennial Collaborative Agreements between the Government of Romania and the WHO Regional Office for Europe for the period 2014–2017. This was the first country office evaluation to be undertaken in the WHO European Region. As with all country office evaluations, its main purpose was to identify achievements, challenges and gaps, and to document WHO best practices and innovations in Romania. This included not only the results of the country office but also contributions from the regional and global levels to the country programme.

38. The evaluation concluded that, overall, during the period under review, WHO was seen as an essential partner in Romania at the policy and technical levels and its leadership was considered essential to advance elements of the national health agenda. Recommendations included: (i) the development of a longer-term 4–5 year strategic planning instrument to address the more systemic and long-term needs of Romania, the directions set by its Government, the Thirteenth General Programme of Work, the Sustainable Development Goals, and WHO's comparative advantage; (ii) ensuring that the WHO country office has the requisite capacity and resources to provide critical support to Romania as it embarks on long-term health system reform; (iii) strengthening of those core functions that would help WHO increase and sustain the effectiveness of its support to Romania; and (iv) enhancing strategic partnerships at country level.

39. In its management response,³ the country office highlighted that the new strategic planning process incorporates as a first step agreement on strategic priorities for bilateral cooperation for the period of the Thirteenth General Programme of Work, thus inherently providing the opportunity for a

¹ See the management response: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/evaluation/management-response-race.pdf?sfvrsn=84673973_2 (accessed 12 April 2019).

² See the evaluation report: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/evaluation/report-romania-country-office.pdf?sfvrsn=336f7e53_2 (accessed 12 April 2019).

³ See the management response: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/evaluation/romania-country-office-evaluation-management-response.pdf?sfvrsn=6c35aadf_2 (accessed 12 April 2019).

strategic plan that is longer than the two-year period of the biennial collaborative agreements. As part of the strategic planning process, human resource capacities in the country office are being reviewed in light of the longer-term priorities set in the country support plan. The country office is also committed to the establishment of formal engagement mechanisms with relevant stakeholders to support strengthening of its convening power and broadening its partner base in order to better contribute towards improving the health status in Romania.

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND PROPOSED APPROACH FOR THE INITIAL EVALUATION OF THE FRAMEWORK OF ENGAGEMENT WITH NON-STATE ACTORS

Context

40. The sixty-ninth World Health Assembly, in resolution WHA69.10 (2016), adopted the Framework of Engagement with Non-State Actors. Further, the Health Assembly requested the Director-General to conduct an initial evaluation in 2019 of the implementation of the Framework and its impact on the work of WHO, with a view to submitting the results, together with any proposals for revisions of the Framework, to the Executive Board in January 2020, through its Programme, Budget and Administration Committee. The biennial evaluation workplan, approved by the Executive Board at its 142nd session, thus included an initial evaluation of the implementation of the Framework of Engagement with Non-State Actors as one of the corporate evaluations to be conducted in 2018–2019. These terms of reference set forth the objective, scope and overall approach of this initial evaluation.

Objective

41. The objective of the initial evaluation is to assess the status of implementation of the Framework of Engagement with Non-State Actors and its impact on the work of the Organization. The evaluation will: (a) document key achievements, best practices, challenges, gaps, and areas for improvement in the implementation of the Framework since its adoption in May 2016; and (b) make recommendations as appropriate on the way forward to enable the full, coherent and consistent implementation of the Framework.

Scope and approach

42. The evaluation will cover the implementation of the Framework across all levels of the Organization¹ in interactions with the various groups of non-State actors covered by the Framework.²

43. The evaluation exercise will be guided by considerations of the main evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact, and provide information on:

- the implementation of the Framework, including the requirements set forth in resolution WHA69.10;
- the processes put in place and the products generated;

¹ Headquarters, regional offices and country offices, entities established under WHO, as well as hosted partnerships.

² Nongovernmental organizations, private sector entities, philanthropic foundations and academic institutions.

- enabling factors and challenges encountered; and
- the overall impact of the Framework on the work of the Organization.

44. The informed opinion of Member States and non-State actors, as primary stakeholders, is crucially important. This could be sought by means of key informant interviews and/or an online survey.

45. The evaluation will be conducted using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, including:

- a desk review of available documentation, including governing body documents such as Secretariat and Independent Expert Oversight Advisory Committee reports to the Executive Board, and of Secretariat materials related to the processes and products associated with its implementation of the Framework; and
- key informant interviews and/or online surveys (the latter available in the six official languages of the Organization) of key stakeholders, including Member States, non-State actors, the secretariat from the Department of Partnerships and Non-State Actors (PNA), WHO senior management and other relevant technical staff within the Secretariat, such as designated focal points for the Framework of Engagement with Non-State Actors.

46. The overall process and methodological approach will follow the principles set forth in the WHO Evaluation Practice Handbook¹ and the United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards for Evaluation and Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.² The review will also adhere to WHO's cross-cutting evaluation strategies on gender, equity, vulnerable populations and human rights, and include, to the extent possible, disaggregated data and analysis.

The evaluation process

47. The evaluation will be conducted by an external independent evaluation team, selected by the Evaluation Office through an open tender. The evaluation team will have appropriate knowledge of the subject of the evaluation and skills mix, as well as relevant experience in performing similar evaluations in multilateral or United Nations organizations. The evaluation team will develop the evaluation methodology, conduct the analysis and deliver a report of the findings, including recommendations.

48. The Evaluation Office will provide the necessary support to the evaluation team during the evaluation exercise (finalization of methodology, facilitation of the evaluation process, identification of relevant documentation and data).

49. The Independent Expert Oversight Advisory Committee will play a critical advisory role. It will be kept informed throughout the evaluation process and consulted on the evaluation at key junctures, which will include consideration of the terms of reference and of the findings and recommendations.

¹ WHO Evaluation Practice Handbook. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2013. (https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/96311/9789241548687_eng.pdf?sequence=1, accessed 12 April 2019).

² Norms and Standards for Evaluation. New York: United Nations Evaluation Group; 2016 and UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation, United Nations Evaluation Group Foundation Document, UNEG/FN/ETH(2008) (<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>) (both accessed 12 April 2019).

Proposed timeline

- Consideration of the terms of reference and proposed approach at the 145th session of the Executive Board: May 2019
- Issuance of the open tender (request for proposals): June 2019
- Selection of the evaluation team: July/August 2019
- Presentation of the final report for consideration by the Executive Board, through the Programme, Budget and Administration Committee: January 2020

ACTION BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

50. The Board is invited to note the report and consider the terms of reference and proposed approach for the initial evaluation of the Framework of Engagement with Non-State Actors.

ANNEX

**STATUS OF EVALUATIONS ON THE APPROVED ORGANIZATION-WIDE EVALUATION WORKPLAN
FOR 2018–2019, AS AT MARCH 2019**

| | Start date ^a | 2018 | | | | 2019 | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------|--------|-----------|----|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| CORPORATE/CENTRALIZED EVALUATIONS IN APPROVED ORGANIZATION-WIDE EVALUATION WORKPLAN 2018–2019 | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation of the process for the election of the Director-General | July 2017 | Completed | | | | | | | |
| Preliminary evaluation of the global coordination mechanism on the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases | July 2017 | Completed | | | | | | | |
| Summative evaluation of the WHO Rapid Access Expansion Programme | July 2017 | Completed | | | | | | | |
| Third annual evaluation of the implementation of the geographical mobility policy during its voluntary phase | | | | Completed | | | | | |
| Country office evaluations | | | Rwanda | Romania | | India | | Senegal | |
| Evaluation of the Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean's Regional Centre for Environmental Health Action | | | | Completed | | | | | |
| Evaluation of the neglected tropical diseases programme, with a special focus on the current neglected tropical diseases road map for implementation | | | | Ongoing | | | | | |
| Evaluation of the utilization of national professional officers at the country level | | | | Ongoing | | | | | |
| Review of 40 years of primary health care implementation at country level ^b | | | | | | | Ongoing | | |
| Evaluation of the Global strategy and action plan on ageing and health (2016–2020) | | | | | | | Planned | | |
| Framework of engagement with non-State actors – initial evaluation in 2019 | | | | | | | | Planned | |
| Evaluation of WHO's normative function at country level ^b | | | | | | | | Planned | |
| Corporate evaluation of WHO's results-based management framework | | | | | | | | | Planned |
| Evaluation of one Grade 3 emergency (to be determined) | | | | | | | | | |

Q: quarter.

^a The start date is included for evaluations that were carried over from the workplan for 2016–2017 and therefore started during the previous biennium. No start date for evaluations that started in 2018–2019. The order in which the evaluations appear is the order in which the evaluations commenced.

^b Additional evaluations requested by the Executive Board in January 2018.

DECENTRALIZED EVALUATIONS IN APPROVED ORGANIZATION-WIDE EVALUATION WORKPLAN 2018–2019**Completed**

- Evaluation of online language training
- External evaluation of the UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF/WHO/World Bank Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction (2013–2017)
- Evaluation of tobacco control through MPOWER measures in the South-East Asia Region
- Evaluation of 10 years of implementation of the South-East Asia Regional Health Emergency Fund

Ongoing

- Evaluation of the use and perceived impact of WHO guidelines on reproductive, maternal, neonatal, child and adolescent health at the country level in the South-East Asia Region

Planned/not yet started

- Evaluation of the implementation of the Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases 2013–2020
- Evaluation of the measles and rubella elimination programme in the European Region

Postponed due to ongoing regional transformation plans

- Mid-term review of the Roadmap of WHO's work for the Eastern Mediterranean Region (2017–2021)

= = =