The Executive Committee reviewed the outputs from the retreat and from the hosting review report to determine a way forward to a hosting decision.

The Executive Committee reviewed information from multiple sources…

- Agreed-upon board principles
- Hosting review report
- Board retreat discussions
- Analysis provided from external consultancy

…to make a recommendation to the Board for the path to reaching a hosting decision.

Recommendations include:

1. Criteria for assessment
2. Proposed options for further exploration
3. Timeline
The Board approved a set of principles in Ottawa which was requested to negotiate a hosting arrangement with WHO

- Board authority to make decisions on the Partnership’s strategic direction as well as human and financial resources against the strategy, to be implemented by the Secretariat

- Board authority for oversight and performance assessment of the Executive Secretary including decision-making on hiring and termination

- A clear identity and mandate for the Stop TB Partnership that is recognizable to all stakeholders

- Ability of the Board, directly and through the Secretariat, to communicate with its partners

- Efficient, flexible, and accountable administrative processes to enable the Partnership Secretariat to implement board decisions expeditiously and in the full spirit of those board decisions

- Flexibility to attract a diverse set of donor resources to support the Secretariat and activities
| **Board authority** to make decisions on the **Partnership’s strategic direction** as well as human and financial resources against the strategy, to be implemented by the Secretariat | ▪ Independence and authority of the Board to set Partnership strategy and manage performance  
▪ Ability¹ to retain operational independence without representing a liability to the host  
▪ Independence of the Executive Secretary in HR decisions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board authority for oversight and performance assessment of the Executive Secretary</strong> including decision-making on hiring and termination</td>
<td>▪ Independence and authority of the Board including its ability to recruit, assess performance, and terminate contract of the Executive Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **A clear identity and mandate** for the Stop TB Partnership that is recognizable to all stakeholders | ▪ Ability to demonstrate clear (non-conflicting) identity as the Stop TB Partnership²  
▪ Ability to clearly brand as the Stop TB Partnership |
| **Ability of the Board, directly and through the Secretariat, to communicate with its partners** | ▪ Ability to access and engage with diverse range of partners: Affected communities, countries, donors, private sector |

¹ Ability (in all instances) encompasses capacity and freedom  
² Includes recognition of mandate
Criteria for assessment of hosting criteria (2/2)

Efficient, flexible, and accountable administrative processes to enable the Partnership Secretariat to implement board decisions expeditiously and in the full spirit of those board decisions

- Long-term stability of the administrative environment
- Ability to choose location/presence in priority geographies
- Ability and authority of the Executive Secretary to implement board decisions
- Ability to attract, recruit and retain the talent required to deliver against the partnership’s mission
- Ability to promote innovation quickly
- Ability to easily access technical expertise
- Ability to deliver high quality efficiently (through strong infrastructure, e.g., grant management infrastructure, and with minimal administrative burden)\(^1\)
- Overall cost of hosting arrangement (incl. labor cost, admin cost…)
- Tax and customs benefits
- Cost transparency and ability to influence cost
- Ability to attract/receive funds from donors

Flexibility to attract a diverse set of donor resources to support the Secretariat and activities

- Includes: Ability to effectively engage and support partners (e.g., private sector, civil society, community and activists)
Last March, the hosting review team presented nine options for exploration to the EC, who chose the three most viable for an in-depth review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considered for hosting report?</th>
<th>In-depth review?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ UNOPS</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ UNDP</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ UNICEF</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-UN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other int’l organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ World Bank</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ IFRC</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The Union</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Global Fund</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ MSF</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ KNCV</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine options were presented for consideration to the EC; they chose to explore three of them in-depth based on feasibility, capacity, interest in hosting.

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine options</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in-depth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options for consideration

Why?

**UNOPS**

- Based on the Ottawa principles, UNOPs is most viable alternative UN host
- Provides similar status/protections as provided by current host and offers UN brand
- Provides flexible administrative policies to meet the needs of the Partnership
- Operates as a service provider in hosting partnerships (“this is their business)"

**Independence**

- In the changing TB landscape and based on retreat conversations around vision in the coming years, independence could be viable way to achieve future vision
- “Independence” refers to a spectrum of options that must be explored in greater detail to understand status which could be gained, advantages and disadvantages, costs
Proposed timeline

January 31 - Board decision on criteria and options to study

February 6 - Staff briefing by Vice-Chair to Stop TB Partnership Secretariat

Week of March 10 –
- One day in person/VC EC meeting for consultants to present analysis on options with aim of EC being able make a recommendation
- EC issues communication to Board

Mid-March – May - Transition planning (if required)

Mid June –
- One day in person/VC EC meeting to review transition planning (if required) and prepare recommendation to the Board
- EC issues communication to Board

Early July – Board meeting to make final decision based on EC recommendation with costed, transition plan