

**Committee of Senior Representatives (CSR)
Twenty Second Meeting
Reykjavik, Iceland
16-17 October 2013**

Reference	CSR 22/6/2
Title	Evaluation Team's views regarding the Evaluation Consultant's recommendations and other issues
Submitted by	Evaluation Team
Summary / Note	This document lists the Evaluation Team's views regarding the Evaluation Consultant's recommendations. The Evaluation Team's views and recommendations extending beyond the Evaluation Consultant's recommendations are also included in the separate table at the end of the document.
Requested action	For discussion and decision

No.	Evaluation Consultant's recommendations/placement (page #) in the report	Evaluation Team's views	
		Comments	Main responsibility ¹
Development of a new strategy			
1	If activities planned are dependent on external actors – like funding agencies – no targets and indicators should be formulated without explicit knowledge of the conditions laid down by these external actors and without pointing out the challenge that the target is depending on external funding and that this involves a risk (e.g. insert a clause “subject to available funding” (pp 16, 28)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Strategy Working Group
2	In the new strategy, indicators chosen should be time-bound within the mandate of the strategy (like up until 2020) and should not go beyond that time-frame (pp 27, 29)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Strategy Working Group
3	In setting up the new strategy, first the political leadership of the partnership has to define needed health areas, set priorities and general goals based on a variety of inputs; afterwards the Expert Groups deal with the development of an operational plan (pp 28-29, 32-33)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Partnership Annual Conference Committee of Senior Representatives Strategy Working Group
4	Every target and indicator has to be strictly connected to resources. Targets without a resource analysis attached to it should not be formulated. Resources include time, expertise and money. Resource-demands by external obligations – especially the role of NDPHS within the EUSBSR – have to be defined beforehand (pp 13, 31-32)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation and proposes an additional recommendation When discussing the new strategy, and more specifically the project-based activities, it is necessary to properly address the issue of the NDPHS' own co-financing. The Evaluation Consultant	Strategy Working Group

¹NDPHS structure(s) to bear the main/direct responsibility for the implementation of a given recommendation. Involvement/contribution(s) of other structure(s) may be necessary.

		touched upon this to some extent in recommendation 4, but did not raise the issue of own-co-financing for projects when NDPHS structures apply for, e.g., EU funds.	
5	Every target should have one specific and responsible Expert Group in the lead, with other Expert Groups as secondary contributors (p 13, 31-32)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Strategy Working Group
6	In order to have sufficient time for the development of the new strategy, the mandate of the current strategy should be extended into 2014 (p 28)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation in principle. It suggests the following approach: To focus on the development of the Expert and Task Groups' Work Plans for 2014 and the extension of their mandates, rather than on the extension of the mandate of the current NDPHS Strategy that includes some Operational Targets, which are either not anymore prioritized or a given group will not be able to implement during 2014.	Committee of Senior Representatives
7	A strategy working-group should be formed, consisting of CSR-members, the leadership of Expert Groups and, if needed, external expertise in planning methods (p 28, 30-31)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Committee of Senior Representatives Partner Countries
8	The proposed process is as follows: 1. EGs are asked to provide input into the development of goals. 2. The strategic working group compares input with the ideas from the CSR and with relevant strategies (EUSBSR, WHO, relevant Russian strategies), 3. Strategy working group provides first documents with vision and goals and prioritization of health-areas, 4. Relevant EGs develop operational plan including indicators, 5. Operational plan is reviewed by strategy	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation The proposed process and timeline is provided in doc.	Committee of Senior Representatives Strategy Working Group

	working group, changes are asked for or made as needed, 6. Resulting comprehensive document is put to the PAC for final decision (p 29)	CSR 22/8.1/1	
9	The second strategy should, alongside with the EU Vision 2020, last up until the year 2020 (p 29)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Committee of Senior Representatives Strategy Working Group
10	Important international organizations associated with the NDPHS should explicitly be invited into the strategy-development process (p 38)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation The Evaluation Team will invite the CSR to explicitly invite the respective international organisations.	Committee of Senior Representatives
11	The new strategy should only include goals, targets, indicators and, as an annex, operational plans. It should not include anything in regard to statutes (terms of reference, procedures, administrative issues) (p 28)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Strategy Working Group
12	Targets should be formulated clearly, short and without description of activities, they should not include many targets in one sentence and shouldn't mix targets and connected sub-targets (p 30)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Strategy Working Group
13	Indicators should clearly reflect the target and should have a target-value (p 30)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Strategy Working Group
14	In order to implement their part of the strategy-development, Expert Groups need to have the capacity and competence to implement a logframe-planning-process according to the professional standards, to develop indicators which are SMART and to have the necessary resources in time (pp 30-32)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Expert/Task Group Chairs Lead Countries
15	The secretariat should have its own operational plan in regard to targets and goals of the partnership (p 13)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Strategy Working Group
16	Do not add new health areas to the strategy. Review if the current ones are all needed (p 33)	The Evaluation Team does <u>not</u> support the recommendation Partner Countries react to changing health threats;	

		this is an evolving process.	
17	Aspects of social-wellbeing in projects should be encouraged, if e. g. funding opportunities allow. Aside from that, if the partnership doesn't want to put additional resources in this topic, the significance of this area should be presented more diligently in the reporting, but additional and specific activities should not be planned (p 33)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation Aspects of social-wellbeing shall be encouraged in the Partnership's work in all aspects and on all levels, not only projects.	Strategy Working Group
18	Projects and networking/policy advise should continue to be balanced in the new strategy. The definition of project should include the development of reports or documents, not only direct implementation of methods with the target-group. The minimum requirement should be one flagship project per Expert Group, any additional amount should correspond closely with funding opportunities (pp 34-35)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation with an additional recommendation: It is suggested that the CSR would adopt a clear-cut definition of a "NDPHS project" (NB. The CSR has already adopted a NDPHS-labelled project" label that can be given to any organization to demonstrate a project's quality).	Strategy Working Group
19	Decide upon the future of Expert Groups based on a common strategy, not based on individual interests of individual member-states (pp 35-36)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation in general, but prefers a positive wording in line with the already existing process, therefore "Not based on individual interests" shall be replaced with "based on shared	Committee of Senior Representatives

		interests”.	
20	In regard to the AMR group, the growing importance and public anxiety about the topic calls for a continuation of the group’s activities (pp 35-36, 46)	The Evaluation Team will not provide a view on this recommendation, as this is an issue to be decided upon exclusively by the CSR/PAC	Committee of Senior Representatives
21	In regard to the IMHAP group, the consultant recommends to formally end the operation (pp 36, 46)	The Evaluation Team will not provide a view on this recommendation, as this is an issue to be decided upon exclusively by the CSR/PAC	Committee of Senior Representatives
22	In regard to the PPHS group, the CSR should carefully discuss whether the continuation of the Prison Health topic is worthwhile vis-à-vis existing resources (pp 32, 36)	The Evaluation Team will not provide a view on this recommendation, as this is an issue to be decided upon exclusively by the CSR/PAC	Committee of Senior Representatives

Organizational issues in general			
23	In order to avoid apprehension about information regarded as too unnecessary, presentations held during EG meetings by representatives of the secretariat should be prediscussed with the chairpersons (p 39)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation The recommendation shall be addressed bilaterally between the Expert Groups’ Chairs and the Secretariat	Secretariat Expert Groups’ Chairs
24	Internal information should be better structured, more targeted towards the potential recipient and, if many documents are attached, provided with a short summary (p 39)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	All actors involved in the Partnership
25	If documents for CSR- or other meetings are expected to be late and therefore attending participants will most likely not be able to digest them in time, adjustments in the agenda	The Evaluation Team supports the	Committee of Senior Representatives

	should be made to reflect this issue, as far as possible (p 39-40)	<p>recommendation and proposes additional recommendation:</p> <p>It is proposed that the Committee of Senior Representatives would agree on deadlines for submission of documents to the meetings (can be different deadlines for decision papers and information papers), as well as on the applicable procedures if the deadlines are not respected</p>	
26	Efforts should be intensified to reduce the permanent workload of the secretariat in order to increase sustainability of the secretariat's work. The CSR should furthermore, as the employer of the secretariat, through the chair of the partnership take its responsibility of oversight in this matter seriously (pp 40-41)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Strategy Working Group (in the context of developing the operational plan of the Secretariat)
27	If Expert Groups are involved in projects, they should concentrate on initiating a project, to a lesser degree in planning and finally in evaluation. Planning is only important as far as in a given area a suitable implementing organization which is also competent in developing a good proposal is missing (p 44)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Expert Group Chairs Lead Countries
28	ITAs should be well trained and experienced in current project-planning methods and the demands of the quality of project-funding organizations. If ITAs do not meet these criteria, they have to be either retrained or replaced (pp 44-45)	<p>The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation</p> <p>The Evaluation Team has agreed on the recommended general scope of ITA's responsibilities and qualifications required of an ITA (cf. Annex 1)</p>	Expert Group Chairs Lead Countries
29	Designate new groups only as task groups, if the task is very specific – like monitoring of a given regulation, the completion of a given project – and doesn't have any wider implications which can't be taken up by other Expert Groups. Once the scope of the group widens, these	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation with	Committee of Senior Representatives

	should rightly be described as Expert Groups (p 46)	one addition: Designate <i>and establish</i> new groups as task groups, only if a given task is very specific – like monitoring of a regulation, implementation of a project – and it doesn't have any wider implications, which can't be taken up by an Expert Group(s). Once the scope of a group widens, it should rightly be transformed to an Expert Group	
30	It is recommended, at least in the long term, to provide NDPHS with a centralized and consolidated budget run by the secretariat covering all income and all expenses (p 48)	The Evaluation Team does <u>not</u> support the recommendation although it recognizes its merit	
31	All current targets and indicators should be regularly included in all reports made by the partnership where ongoing activities are discussed, including the minutes of the respective Expert Groups (p 48)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	All actors involved in the reporting
32	Aspects of social wellbeing in the activities and projects of the partnership should be continuously highlighted specifically (pp 33, 49)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	All actors involved in the Partnership
33	The annual report needs a more stringent structure, closely following the new strategy, and needs to be less convoluted and repetitive (p 49)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation	Secretariat
34	Annual reports should only be published in a completely edited state, ready for public scrutiny. Draft versions are only for internal consumption (p 49)	The Evaluation Team supports the recommendation with an additional recommendation as spelled out in item 41.	Secretariat

Evaluation Team's recommendations extending beyond the Evaluation Consultant's recommendations

No.	Recommendation	Responsibility
35	The concept of side events should be revised. A side-event-programme should be targeted at a wider audience and should also serve as a public-relations-event and inclusion of media-representatives should be considered.	Committee of Senior Representatives
36	Partner Countries should try to promote the Health in All Policies approach within their governments also concerning the NDPHS' work	Partner Countries
37	Further strengthen the NDPHS' relations with other relevant actors in the region	Chair Country Committee of Senior Representatives
38	Develop new approaches for future collaboration within the NDPHS, in order to maximize the benefits and added value of the cooperation within the network	Strategy Working Group
39	Renew the NDPHS mid-term vision	Strategy Working Group
40	Develop new approaches to ensure that the relevant results and recommendations from the Expert Groups' work are conveyed to the policy level, both within the NDPHS and nationally, and taken into account in policy development processes.	Strategy Working Group
41	Decide on the establishment of password-protected area on the NDPHS website to, e.g., publish/discuss/work on draft documents. Decide which sections on the NDPHS website shall be available for the general public and which only for the members of the network. The latter should be used for posting of, e.g., draft/incomplete documents. Upgrade the website accordingly.	Committee of Senior Representatives (decision) Secretariat (implementation)

Proposed general scope of ITA's responsibilities (the list to be completed with specific issues of relevance to a given EG):

- Providing analytical and secretarial support to the EG in collaboration with the EG Chairperson;
- Drafting of EG's documents, including, but not limited to: (i) documents for EG meetings (e.g. discussion papers, work plans and progress reports, policy documents), (ii) meeting minutes; (iii) briefing notes;
- Assisting in monitoring the overall progress of activities relevant to his/her EG, stipulated in the operational plan of the NDPHS;
- Facilitating the periodic assessments of the EG performance and its functions;
- Leading and/or providing assistance for development and implementation of log-frame-planning processes;
- Assisting in (i) either initiating and evaluating projects or planning and developing projects, (ii) facilitating applications for project financing and, finally, (iii) implementing projects, if needed;
- Networking with other individuals and organizations to ensure wide participation in issues that the Partnership addresses;
- Promoting and encouraging the involvement of external actors in the regional health and social well-being activities in collaboration with the EG Chair and members;
- Liaising with other relevant regional actors operating in the area covered by the EG to help avoid duplication of efforts between the EG and those actors, as well as to help make proper use of data and material generated by them, where appropriate;
- Assisting the EG Chair in arranging EG meetings;
- Keeping in contact with EG members in-between the meetings;
- Maintaining continuous dialogue with the NDPHS Secretariat and other NDPHS expert-level structures to ensure coordination of activities within the Partnership;
- Participation in other relevant meetings and conferences related to the substance areas of the EG.

Proposed qualifications required of an ITA (the list to be completed with specific issues of relevance to a given EG):

- Advanced university degree (a degree in the area of relevance to the EG will be considered an advantage);
- Sufficient and relevant professional experience of which some at the international level and/or a national level with links to the international processes on public health or social issues in the Northern Dimension area (preferably in the areas relating to the EG);
- Knowledge and good understanding of the EG's mandate and activities;
- Knowledge and good understanding of the work of the EG and the NDPHS in the context of regional and international health initiatives and processes;
- Very good co-ordination, networking and organisational skills and experience;
- Reliable and able to work in an environment with challenging workload and deadlines;
- Highly-motivated and determined to achieve tangible results;
- Capacity to work independently and as part of a team;

- Strong communications skills;
- Proficiency in project development, facilitation/implementation as well as in fund-raising;
- Knowledge of and experience in using logical framework or similar planning tools, including for identification of problem areas and development of goals, targets, outputs and correct formulation of SMART indicators;
- Excellent command of oral and written English with several years of practical experience. Excellent drafting skills in English;
- Computer literacy – very good user skills in Internet as well as word processing software and hardware.