GOVERNANCE OF PAHO (Barbados)
Comments by the United States of America

- The historical perspective on governance of PAHO is well-written and helpful to contextualize PAHO's current state.

- Page 6, paragraph beginning "In Latin America and the Caribbean": it is not clear what is meant by the "regional and political integration groups that arose…"

- Page 7, section beginning "In the Western Hemisphere": international partners and outside players are portrayed very negatively and as a threat. While the central point – that member states and PAHO need to clarify their interactions with these players – is appropriate, perhaps this section could be written in a more positive light.

Section V – Issues:
In general, while challenges are listed, this piece seems to be lacking a full discussion of what is working and not working in the governance process.

- Page 9, paragraph beginning "Unlike the Conference and the Council": The final sentence stating that "…the Executive Committee is making decisions for the entire organization of all Member States" is an overstatement. While the Executive Committee makes recommendations of which items should be discussed at the Directing Council or Sanitary Conference, it does not have the capacity to make decisions for the entire Organization. Resolutions emanating from the Executive Board are submitted to the Directing Council for ultimate passage.

  The paragraph that follows is somewhat confusing and does not flow from the previous paragraph discussing the EC. Both imply that Member States are excluded from the decision making process. While States may not be implicitly included in all processes, it is important that Member States actively participate where and when they can – either at a country's initiation or by invitation of the Secretary. All to often, it appears that Member States arrive ill-prepared at governing body meetings without having fully read or analyzed the documentation. Without such preparation, it is difficult to have meaningful dialogue and useful development of recommendations during the meetings.

  In order to accomplish this, however, the Secretariat must provide all relevant documentation at least 30 days prior to the meetings, if not sooner. And, PAHO Country Offices could help ensure that delegations/delegates are fully briefed on the issues beforehand. Furthermore, it would be helpful if members of the Secretariat reached out informally to consult with Member States in the development of the governing bodies papers so that they reflect the interests, concerns, and suggestions of the countries. (This is not to suggest that a country

develop the paper but rather, the Secretariat to outreach to countries for suggestions for inclusion.

- Page 10, paragraph 4: the inclusion of civil society partners is an interesting idea, but the argument for their inclusion is not fully fleshed-out. In what other venues have civil society partners been granted a voting status? Active observership seems more to be the "norm."

- There appears to be merit to the suggestion on page 11 that PAHO members "be brought into" reviewing financial auditing and evaluation of PAHO and its programs in a more comprehensive manner. Under comment #1 on page 11, a discussion of the current revision of the budget policy process may be helpful.

- Page 16, under specific issue 2, bullet 3: should read "Ministries of Foreign Affairs" (finance is repeated)

- - -