1. The Executive Committee at its 132nd Session in June 2003, adopted Resolution CE132.R9 which calls for an evaluation protocol to be proposed by the Director of PASB, and reviewed by the present members of the Standing Committee on Nongovernmental Organizations, in order to be submitted to the 133rd Session in September 2003.

Proposed Protocol

2. Article 5 of the Principles Governing Relations between the Pan American Health Organization and Nongovernmental Organizations, as amended by Executive Committee Resolution CE126.R15 (2000), establishes a procedure for the review of collaboration with Inter-American and national NGOs. This procedure calls for the Standing Committee on Nongovernmental Organizations to review collaboration with each NGO with which PAHO has official working relations every four years. This review should be based on a critical evaluation of the organization’s performance on the prior work program as well as an appraisal of their proposed program of work. Based on this review, the Standing Committee shall make a recommendation to the Executive Committee on the desirability of maintaining these relations.

3. In order for the members of the Standing Committee to make their recommendation, the Director of PASB provides a background document to the Standing Committee that includes the following:
• Brief background on the NGO in question;

• Report by the NGO on activities undertaken during the period in question (normally four years, but in some cases this may only be one or two years);

• A proposed program of work for the forthcoming four year period; and

• A critical commentary of brief background and the report by the NGO (mentioned above) by the appropriate technical unit of PASB.

4. It is recommended that the Standing Committee on NGOs consider the following three criteria when reviewing the background document prepared by the PASB:  
   a) Has the NGO in question and the relevant technical unit at PAHO agreed upon a general four-year program for collaborative activities, with a more specific two-year work plan for the period under review?;  
   b) Has the NGO submitted a report on activities which specifically refers to the previous two-year work plan?;  
   c) Has the technical unit found the performance of the NGO to be satisfactory, according to the agreed upon two year collaborative work plan?

5. If all of the four questions are answered in the affirmative, then the members of the Standing Committee will be in the position to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee on its findings based on the review of the past work plan, the future work plan, as well as the recommendation of the technical unit of PAHO.

6. In reviewing the background document regarding an NGO, it is suggested that the Standing Committee rate the activities of the NGO on a high–to-low basis according to the following criteria:

• Public health significance of the NGO activities,

• Utility and sustainability,

• Practicality,

• cost/time (in this case “low” would be the preferred score).

7. Should the response to any one of the three criteria questions in section four be negative, then the Standing Committee will not be in a position to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee.
8. If the response to any of the three criteria 4a), 4b), and 4c) is negative, then Article 5 of the *Principles Governing Relations between the Pan American Health Organization and Nongovernmental Organizations* will no longer be considered acceptable. The NGO in question would be required to re-apply in accordance with Article 4.3 which establishes the content of an application by a new NGO asking to be admitted into official working relations with PAHO.