



**14<sup>th</sup> Executive Board**  
**5-6 July 2011**  
**Conference Centre Varembeé**  
**Geneva, Switzerland**

**Resolution n°19**

**Executive Director performance review**

Taking into account the FAC Recommendation, the Executive Board approves the process for Board input into the performance review of the Executive Director of UNITAID as set out in Document - UNITAID/EB14/2011/6.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "P. Douste-Blazy".

**Philippe Douste-Blazy**



14<sup>th</sup> Executive Board  
5-6 July 2011  
Conference Centre Varembé,  
Geneva, Switzerland

## Agenda Item 6

# Executive Director Performance Review

This note was initiated by the Vice-Chair of the Finance and Administration Committee (FAC) and discussed at the FAC meeting in April 2011. It has been revised and is now submitted to the Board for decision. It has not been reviewed by all FAC members.

For Information  For Discussion  For Decision

## Background

1. Article 2.3 of the MOU concerning the hosting of UNITAID states that:
 

*"The hosting arrangement and the operations of the Secretariat shall in all respects (including but not limited to recruitment, delegation of authority to the Executive Secretary, procurement, financial matters, management of the Trust Fund, etc.) be administered in accordance with the WHO Constitution, WHO's Financial and Staff Regulations and Rules, Manual provisions, and applicable policies, procedures and practices (the "WHO Rules") and with the terms of this MoU. "*
2. Article 4.6 of the MOU concerning the hosting of UNITAID states that:
 

*"WHO in consultation with the Board will develop a system and criteria for performance review of the Executive Secretary at specified time intervals. Such criteria will be clearly articulated to all candidates and incumbents of this position."*
3. UNITAID's Constitution (section 4) and By Laws (Article 2.1) state inter alia that:
 

*"The Executive Board (Board) is the decision-making body for UNITAID. It shall make all decisions relating to UNITAID (except for those delegated to the Secretariat), including the following:*

  - *nominate and participate in the performance review of the Executive Secretary;"*
4. In view of the foregoing, and based on previous WHO and UNITAID Board discussions on the matter, it is important for the UNITAID Board and WHO to discuss the annual performance review of the next UNITAID Executive Secretary/Director, including criteria for the performance review (recognizing WHO PMDS approach and Board input), how this information will be communicated, and to confirm how this review should be best conducted with due regard to WHO's rules and regulations.
5. In his/her capacity as head of a WHO hosted partnership with a governance organ, the UNITAID ED is accountable to the UNITAID Board. In addition, and in view of the fact that the ED is a staff member of WHO, he/she is also accountable to the WHO Director General and is subject to WHO rules, including but not limited to, the rules and procedures governing performance evaluations.
6. The purpose of this process is to support and empower the ED by increasing clarity around expectations and enabling the ED to drive delivery of results. It seeks to establish a set of clearly articulated priorities that the ED should strive to progress, which the ED can use as the basis for regular reports to the Board, and to assist the WHO in its normal management of the ED.

## Options

7. In order to fulfill the relevant requirements of the MOU and the UNITAID governing documents, the following approach relating to the Board's role in the performance review of the ED is being submitted for consideration:
  - a. The Board, once the selection of the new ED has been completed, would set out in writing, as a letter from the Chair of the Board to the new ED, its expectations of the individual's priorities for his/her time in office based on the ED's WHO approved job description.
  - b. The purpose of the letter would be to supplement and not replace, WHO's responsibilities (under the WHO PMDS) as the manager of the ED. In this regard, the letter would serve as a basis for aligning the views of the Board with its expectations in relation to the duties and responsibilities of the ED.
  - c. An ad-hoc small group of Board members (comprising the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the UNITAID committees), taking into account the priorities set out in the letter, would be tasked with developing a limited number of concrete, outcome oriented objectives based on the ED's WHO approved job description. Where possible, these objectives should be aligned with UNITAID's overall Key Performance indicator framework.
  - d. These objectives would thereafter be shared with the ED's first level supervisor who may in turn use them as a basis for discussion with the ED of his/her objectives to be incorporated in the WHO PMDS.
  - e. On the basis of these objectives, the Board committee may thereafter develop performance criteria which shall be communicated to the ED's first level supervisor to assist him/her with the PMDS review.
  - f. In parallel with step e above, WHO shall confirm the Board's process for contributing to the WHO annual PMDS cycle, including for the initial probationary period, taking into account WHO's rules, procedures and practices.

## Timing and Frequency

8. The initial term of office of the Executive Director is four years, the first year representing a probationary period. The initial term is renewable for a further three years. The ED will have an annual and mid-term performance review through the WHO PMDS.
9. In addition, the Board could, on annual basis, decide to request the Executive Director to report at the Spring Board meeting on his/her management and leadership of the UNITAID Secretariat with a specific focus on the priority areas listed in the Chair's letter referred to above.

10. Finally, the Board could request WHO, with the ED's approval, to secure the services of a professional recruitment firm to assist the Board and manage a process of gathering and analyzing feedback on performance of the ED. With the ED's consent, this feedback could be transmitted to the ED's WHO first level supervisor who would take it into account as part of the PMDS review.