

WHO Watch Notes of Discussion at EB129

Item 3.2: Concerning WHO Reform

DG opened the discussion. It is clear that the WHA has endorsed the WHO Reform Agenda. Critical to making WHO strong, inclusive, transparent, member state (MS) driven. EB important part of governance of WHO. WHO reform will be MS driven. Issues for consideration include:

1. Proposed World Health Forum
2. Independent evaluation of the work of WHO, perhaps starting with health systems strengthening (HSS)
3. Future of financing of WHO and in particular assessed versus voluntary contributions; priorities of WHO not to be determined by donors and foundations;
4. Internal managerial reform

Need to have multiple platforms for consultation including online consultation as well as an open EB. Planning further consultation. Need to negotiate existing working groups (WGs) and Regional Committee meetings.

DG proposes three WGs:

- WHO governance
- World Health Forum
- Independent evaluation

Barbados. Proposes special EB in November after the RC meetings. Expresses concern about WHF being funded by private sector. He who pays piper calls tune.

Canada. Supports open EB as forum for further consideration. Effectively a WG.

India. Intergovernmental consultation rather than WG. Four stages:

- 1) Secretariat documentation of the three issues raised by DG
- 2) These papers to go to regional committees
- 3) One or more meetings of EB perhaps an extra meeting before or after Jan
- 4) WG of MS within the EB itself; need to ensure full participation.

Uzbekistan. Support.

China. Regional Committees important venue for further discussion. Country offices to extend the consultation to civil society and the private sector. Agree with open EB as WG.

Syria. Support. RC important part of the process

Switzerland. Reform process should be funded by the MSs. Support 3 WGs as proposed. Discussion papers to be ready by end of June. Maximum involvement of MSs.

Norway. Support DG. Need more clarity with respect to time lines, objectives and outcomes. Not clear what the role of the proposed in-depth evaluation is. Not clear what will be included in the focus on WHO Governance. Participation important; also speed. Financing of the reform process must be independent; come from MSs.

Japan. Back to the idea of three WGs. Plus special EB before or after Jan EB. Process must be supported by MSs; not the private sector.

Timor Leste. Thanks you. Support.

France. Questions about the proposed in-depth evaluation. How will MSs be involved? Need an interim report. More questions about the financial implications of WHF and role of outside funders.

Estonia. Web based consultation followed by development of papers by officers of EB.

Germany. In-depth evaluation should look at internal governance and should inform the reform. Must be MS financed.

Senegal. Support. Involvement of MSs critical.

USA. Importance of having documents for consideration of RCs. Evaluation must be totally funded by MSs. Governance issues a top priority. Support focusing evaluation on HSS or MCH. WHF not as urgent as other issues.

Mexico. Back to the use of WGs including web meetings.

Armenia. Support for special meeting of EB in Nov.

Non EB members also spoke: Algeria, South Africa, Zimbabwe, UK, Turkey, Zambia, Brazil,

Long discussion followed. Outcome of which was: [EB129\(8\)](#).