WHO results framework: an update

Report by the Director-General

INTRODUCTION


2. The Secretariat is continuing its work to strengthen transparency and accountability for results across the Organization. As part of efforts to monitor the implementation of the Programme budget 2020–2021, it developed the output scorecard, a new methodology for measuring the Secretariat’s contribution to outcomes and impacts.

3. The innovative output scorecard approach represents a significant shift in measuring and reporting on the work of the Secretariat and is unique within the United Nations system.

4. The main aim of the methodology is to measure the Secretariat’s performance in terms of its (i) leadership; (ii) technical support; and (iii) normative and data work (global public health goods). These three dimensions are complemented by additional elements such as delivering value for money and impactful integration of gender, equity and human rights, which describe how these considerations have been incorporated into the delivery of outputs. An additional dimension, “achievement of results in ways leading to impacts” has been added to capture the leading indicators of the respective output. It has been designed to provide a quantitative aspect to the reporting and to connect the achievements of the outputs with the related health outcomes.

5. Based on qualitative self-reporting of achievements across the budget centres and various process indicators, the Secretariat has adopted an approach that:

   • uses a **standard and structured** methodology to ensure consistency in assessing progress towards achieving the outputs;

   • is **multidimensional** so that the Secretariat can measure what is strategically important to WHO when it comes to achieving results for which it is accountable;

   • uses a **common scoring scale** to identify gaps more easily in order to be able to understand and address the corresponding issues fully;
• encourages the **participation of staff** across the Organization to assess how the various teams and departments are contributing towards the outcomes;

• is **sequential and stepwise** to allow staff and managers to engage in the process and better identify the actions needed at each level and who will be responsible for them;

• provides the **opportunity for joint assessment** among those who are accountable for the delivery of the outputs across the three levels of the Organization; and

• fosters **interaction between management and staff** during the monitoring and assessment process in order to identify issues needing urgent management attention.

6. This approach is a major step forward in strengthening the assessment of the Organization’s performance in delivering its outputs. The outputs form part of the results framework of the Thirteenth General Programme of Work, 2019–2023, and represent the results for which the Organization is accountable.¹ A detailed copy of the output scorecard containing the full set of six dimensions, along with their attributes, criteria and scoring scale, is provided on the WHO Programme Budget Web Portal.²

---

¹ See document A74/28 for the full list of outputs.

² [https://open.who.int/2020-21/home](https://open.who.int/2020-21/home) (accessed 5 May 2021).
ROLL-OUT OF THE NEW APPROACH

7. After two years of consultations with both Member States and WHO staff, as well as pilot testing across WHO headquarters, regional offices and several country offices, the scorecard process was launched for use during the mid-term review of the Programme budget 2020–2021. The two years leading up to this roll-out were used to develop, refine and raise awareness of the instrument, implement change management and increase buy-in among staff.

8. The application of the output scorecard is a bottom-up process that starts with assessment discussions in individual units/teams and extends all the way up to the three-level output delivery teams tasked with consolidating the assessment of each output globally. A step-by-step overview of the scorecard roll-out process is outlined in the Box below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box. Process for the output scorecard roll-out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Units/teams</strong> – The scorecard process started with discussions at the team/unit level on implementation progress made and achievements on the outputs for which each team or unit is accountable. These discussions were mandatory and involved the input of all staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Departments</strong> – The findings of the team/unit scorecards formed the basis of the subsequent scorecard discussions at the department/division level. These discussions were mandatory and involved the senior managers of the Organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Budget centres</strong> – The department/division scorecards formed the basis of the mandatory budget centre scorecard discussions. Budget centres are divisions in headquarters, regional offices and country offices that are responsible for budget management and allocation of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Major offices</strong> – These include headquarters and regional offices. The major office scorecard discussions served to aggregate the scorecard by output. They also addressed high-level strategic issues raised by the budget centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Three-level output delivery teams</strong> – These teams comprised headquarters, regional office and country office staff. The mandatory, three-level output delivery team discussions consolidated the scorecard for each output globally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Senior management strategic discussions</strong> – After completion of the scorecard at the global level, the Deputy Directors-General and Executive Directors conducted discussions with each of the budget centres to review the findings and decide on required actions and next steps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The implementation of the output scorecard methodology was widespread across the Organization, with every organizational group being encouraged to develop a scorecard for every output to which they contribute. About 4000 scorecards were completed during the process across the three levels of the Organization. The number of organizational groups completing a scorecard for at least one output is shown in the Table below.
Table. Number of organizational groups completing a scorecard for at least one output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational groups</th>
<th>Number that completed a scorecard for at least one output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units/teams</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget centres (other than country offices)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country offices</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major offices</td>
<td>All seven major offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Every assessment discussion followed the same format:

- The output achievements were assessed using the scorecard. A global tool was developed to accompany this process and helped to guide and record the results of the discussions.
- Key achievements, challenges and risks were identified and discussed.
- Any management input required was flagged and escalated to the next organizational group level.

11. The findings of the scorecard output assessments have been presented as a summary in document A74/28, and as a detailed output assessment in the Results Report for the Mid-Term Programme Budget 2020–2021 published on the WHO website.¹

12. Initial feedback on the output scorecard exercise has shown that:

- Most staff found the methodology useful since it generated discussions within teams and budget centres about (i) implementation challenges and how to address them; (ii) coordination issues across the three levels of the Organization; and (iii) gaps to be addressed by senior management.
- The process provided an opportunity for strong staff engagement across the three levels of the Organization and through the three-level output delivery teams. The engagement of senior management, particularly via the strategic discussions, proved to be an excellent means of reviewing the findings and identifying any actions required.
- The use of the web-based tool facilitated the process, lessened the reporting burden and provided greater internal transparency during the roll-out of the scorecard.
- There were some issues surrounding the functioning of the instrument and the applicability of some of its criteria and attributes to certain types of work to achieve the outputs, particularly in respect of the delivering value for money and impactful integration of gender, equity and human rights dimensions. Further improvements in how these dimensions are measured will be needed in order to reflect WHO’s achievements better.

¹ Available at https://www.who.int/about/accountability/results/2020_MTR.
• The process took a significant amount of time to complete at the management level and should be further simplified. Striking the right balance between the staff time required, the rigour of the discussions and the complexity of the instrument will be crucial to refining and strengthening the methodology and process.

• Further action is needed to better reflect the richness of the scorecard findings. Aggregation of the outcomes of the team/unit and budget centre discussions, especially at the global level, inevitably entailed the loss of some important findings. Taking stock of the findings from units/teams and budget centres, including from country offices, will be invaluable for monitoring and reporting.

13. A structured process for identifying the lessons learned from the first roll-out of the output scorecard will be defined following the Seventy-fourth World Health Assembly. All staff across the three levels of the Organization will be engaged in the process and the findings will be used to improve the overall scorecard system, including the instrument itself, the methodology, and the validation and reporting of the outcomes. Any improvements will be applied for the final assessment of the Programme budget 2020–2021 at the end of 2021.