
Evaluation of the election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization

Report by the Secretariat

1. The Executive Board, at its 142nd session, requested the Secretariat to bring forward a proposal, informed by the report by the evaluation management group¹ and the Board's deliberations, for adjustments to the election process for the Director-General, and any necessary revisions to the code of conduct, to be presented for consideration by the Board at its 144th session in January 2019. The present report addresses the findings contained in the report by the evaluation management group on the evaluation of the election of the Director-General, which were considered by the Board at its 142nd session, as well comments formulated by Member States at that session. It presents proposals and options for consideration by the Board. The present report also proposes adjustments to the code of conduct for the election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization with a view to improving its practical implementation. Proposals and options with a predominant information technology component are contained in Annex 1 to this report.

A. Code of conduct for the election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization

2. The World Health Assembly adopted, in resolution WHA66.18 (2013), the code of conduct for the election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization. As stated in its preamble, the code of conduct aims at promoting an open, fair, equitable and transparent process for the election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization. Although the code of conduct was generally welcomed as a means of articulating expectations for the conduct of candidates and Member States, a number of issues in relation to its implementation were raised in the context of the evaluation of the election process:

(a) Extent of travel during the campaign period

3. While paragraph B.II.9 of the code of conduct requests Member States and candidates to use "as much as possible existing mechanisms (sessions of the regional committees, Executive Board and Health Assembly) for meetings and other promotional activities linked to the electoral campaign", no quantitative limitation regarding the extent of travel is provided, nor is reference made to the use of new technologies. To address this, a number of exclusive or cumulative options are available:

- (i) the code of conduct could be amended to specify a maximum number of trips permitted during the campaign period and to request that information on those trips should be communicated

¹ Document EB142/26.

in a timely manner to the Secretariat. Information so disclosed would then be posted on a dedicated page of the WHO website;

(ii) use of new technologies, including interactions through video and/or other available technology means, could be promoted.

With regard to expanding the range of opportunities for discussion with candidates under the auspices of WHO, see section B(c) below.

(b) Amounts and sources of funding

4. Paragraph B.II.7 of the code of conduct requests Member States proposing persons for the post of Director-General to consider disclosing grants or aid funding to other Member States during the previous two years, but does not provide for the disclosure of amounts and sources of funding during the campaign period. The code of conduct could therefore be amended to require, in addition, that amounts and sources of funding during the campaign period also be disclosed and communicated to the Secretariat.

5. In addition, in relation to grants or aid funding to other Member States during the previous two years, the wording of paragraph B.II.7 of the code of conduct could be strengthened by stipulating that Member States should disclose, and not simply consider disclosing, such information.

(c) Compliance with the code of conduct

6. The current version of the code of conduct does not provide for any mechanisms to assess compliance with the code by candidates and/or Member States. If Member States wished to include a mechanism for the consideration of communications of alleged non-compliance, a body tasked with receiving and considering such communications could be established. One option based on peer review would be for the Board to empower its Officers to consider such communications. They would be supported by the Secretariat and report to Member States both during and at the end of the campaign, and would be empowered to address concerns directly with candidates and Member States. This function could also extend to the provision of guidance in advance to candidates regarding compliance with the code of conduct in relation to certain activities.

(d) Web forum and publication of information on candidates

7. Options and proposals to increase the interactivity of the web forum by revising its technical design are contained in Annex 1 to this report.

8. Paragraph B.II.11 of the code of conduct requires that candidates who wish to participate in the web forum and/or to have their curricula vitae and particulars of their qualifications posted on the web should expressly inform the Secretariat of their request. In past elections, this has proven to be administratively cumbersome for both candidates and the Secretariat, both at the global and regional levels, and has been of limited utility given that candidates invariably consent to both actions.

9. It is therefore proposed that the code of conduct should be amended to provide that consent to participation in the web forum and posting of candidates' particulars should be assumed unless the contrary is indicated at the time the candidature is proposed.

10. Proposed amendments reflecting the above-mentioned proposals and adjustments to the code of conduct are contained in Annex 2 to this report.

B. Candidates' forum

11. The Health Assembly, in resolution WHA66.18, also established a candidates' forum "as a non-decision-making platform for candidates". The general modalities for the candidates' forum are set out in Annex 2 to resolution WHA66.18. They were complemented by more detailed arrangements for the conduct of interviews with candidates, which were decided upon by the forum itself, upon a proposal of the Chairperson of the Board.

12. The evaluation management group reported that Member States considered the candidates' forum to be fair, well-timed and beneficial and that holding a second forum after the nomination of candidates by the Board would improve Member States' access to candidates and potentially reduce the pressure on candidates to travel to countries to further articulate their positions. The evaluation management group also identified as beneficial the holding of additional similar events organized under the auspices of WHO.

13. Member States and candidates considered that improvements could be made to the more detailed arrangements for the conduct of interviews at the forum, in particular to reduce the risk of duplication of questions and to allow more time for questions and answers. This would require an adjustment to the modalities set out in Annex 2 to resolution WHA66.18 and to the more detailed arrangements for the conduct of interviews as agreed by Member States.

14. In the light of the above, the Board may wish to consider the following options to refine the candidates' forum:

(a) Avoiding duplication of questions

15. In the context of the candidates' forum that was held in November 2016, the Chairperson drew and read the names of the Member States wishing to ask a candidate a question and then invited them to ask the question. While Member States were encouraged to refrain from posing a question to a candidate which seemed identical or substantially similar to one already addressed to that candidate, there was no mechanism in place to ensure that this recommendation was in fact followed.

16. To minimize the risk of duplication of questions, one option would be to invite Member States wishing to ask a question to do so by submitting their question in writing on a paper previously distributed by the Secretariat in the room. The papers would be collected by the Secretariat and handed to the Chairperson. The Chairperson (or an interpreter from the Secretariat, as needed) would then draw questions at random, one by one, and read each one to the candidate. The Chairperson would not read those questions which appear to be identical or substantially similar to one already addressed to that candidate. Should this option be acceptable, the modalities of the candidates' forum could be modified accordingly and submitted to the Chairman of the Board.

(b) Devoting more time to the question-and-answer session

17. The current modalities for the candidates' forum provide that "[e]ach candidate shall make a presentation of up to 30 minutes, which will be followed by a questions and answer session so that the overall duration of each interview shall be 60 minutes". One option would be for interviews to consist exclusively of a question-and-answer session for the duration of 60 minutes for each interview, to the

exclusion of any oral presentation by the candidates. This option has been reflected in Annex 3 to this report.

18. Alternative options include: that the overall duration of each interview could be extended to a maximum of 75 minutes to be divided between a presentation by each candidate of up to 30 minutes and a question-and-answer session for the remaining 45 minutes; or that the period allotted to the presentation by candidates could be decreased to a maximum of 15 minutes, which would allow 45 minutes for questions and answers.

(c) Expanding the range of opportunities for discussion with candidates under the auspices of WHO

19. To expand the range of opportunities available to Member States to engage in discussions with candidates under the auspices of WHO, alternative non-exclusive options include the following. The Secretariat could be requested to:

(i) convene a second candidates' forum, following the same format as the first candidates' forum, in the period between the nomination of candidates by the Board and the session of the Health Assembly at which the appointment takes place;

(ii) convene a "moderated debate session", following a different format, in the period between the nomination of candidates by the Board and the session of the Health Assembly at which the appointment takes place. This format might, for example, involve moderation by an appropriate journalist or other independent person;

(iii) co-organize or support debates and other similar events with candidates outside of WHO headquarters, including at the regional level; and/or

(iv) convene formal meetings with candidates in the margins of each regional committee meeting preceding the session of the Board at which the nomination takes place.

(d) Broadcasting of the forum

20. Under the current normative framework, the candidates' forum is broadcast by the Secretariat through a password-protected website for those Member States and Associate Members of WHO who are not able to attend.

21. To improve transparency and electronic access to meetings concerning the process for the election of the Director-General, live broadcasting of future fora could be introduced. This would be accessible to all Internet users through a link on the WHO website.

22. Proposed amendments reflecting the above-mentioned considerations are contained in Annex 3 to this report. The Board is invited to choose between the different options proposed in the draft text that appears in Annex 3.

C. Nomination of candidates by the Executive Board

(a) Shortlisting

23. In accordance with the relevant Rules of Procedure and relevant decisions and resolutions of the governing bodies, the Executive Board processes proposals for the post of Director-General in several steps. The process begins with an initial “screening” of proposed candidates against a list of criteria approved by the Health Assembly and a report from the Chairperson of the Executive Board on the results of the candidates’ medical examination. If more than five candidates are proposed by Member States, as was the case in the most recent election, the Board must draw up a shortlist of five candidates through successive secret ballots. The Board then interviews the five shortlisted candidates and nominates three of them by secret ballot.

24. The evaluation management group reported that the step of shortlisting five candidates “was queried”, but acknowledged that it was required by the current applicable normative framework.

25. Through shortlisting, the number of candidates is narrowed to a manageable figure for further assessment by the governing bodies. Given the possibility for large numbers of candidatures to be proposed and the impracticality of interviewing significantly more than five candidates, mainly due to time constraints, some form of shortlisting process would seem to be desirable.

26. For these reasons, it is proposed that the shortlist phase should be maintained and that, as a matter of principle, the shortlist should continue to be composed of five candidates. At the same time, some flexibility around the number of candidates shortlisted may be introduced, in particular by allowing the Officers of the Board to decide on a greater number of shortlisted candidates, if the circumstances (such as the overall number of candidatures received) so warrant.

27. A decision point to this effect is contained in the draft decision presented at the end of this report for consideration by the Executive Board.

(b) Modalities of the interview

28. The evaluation management group reported that “survey results suggest that a number of Member States would have found it useful to devote more time for the question-and-answer session with candidates”.

29. Under the current rules, the question-and-answer session forms part of the candidates’ interviews that follow the shortlisting step. Under Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board, the interviews should consist of a presentation by each selected candidate in addition to answers to questions from members of the Board. In decision EB100(7) (1997), the Board further decided that interviews of candidates on the shortlist should be limited to 60 minutes and be divided equally between (i) an oral presentation of the candidate’s vision for the future priorities of the Organization, with an analysis of current problems facing it and suggestions as to how those should be addressed; and (ii) a question-and-answer session.

30. To make the debate more interactive, and considering that campaigning material is usually already available to Member States prior to the interview, while maintaining a duration of 60 minutes for each interview, 20 minutes could be devoted to an oral presentation and 40 minutes to a question-and-answer session.

31. A decision point to this effect is contained in the draft decision presented at the end of this report for consideration by the Executive Board.

D. Voting process

32. In accordance with their Rules of Procedure, the Executive Board, at its 140th session, and the World Health Assembly, at its Seventieth session, respectively, held secret ballots at private meetings to nominate three candidates and select one candidate for appointment to the post of Director-General.

33. The report by the evaluation management group included a focus on the following two aspects with regard to the voting process: alternatives to secret ballot; and options to accelerate the voting process, in cases where no secure electronic voting system is available.

34. The issue of secure electronic voting and related options are addressed in Annex 1, point 2. Proposals and options to limit communications during the voting process are contained in Annex 1, point 3.

(a) Alternatives to secret ballot

35. The report by the evaluation management group noted that some concerns had been “expressed that the use of secret ballots by both the Executive Board and the Health Assembly could reduce accountability either on the part of the individual casting a Member State’s vote or, potentially, a Member State which might have undertaken to support a particular candidate” and invited the Secretariat to identify alternative solutions to the secret ballot.

36. If the governing bodies wished to move away from the current use of secret ballots for the election of the Director-General, a recorded vote/roll-call could be used instead, subject to the necessary amendments to the Rules of Procedure. A recorded vote/roll-call is characterized by the creation of an open country-by-country voting record. The official records of the Health Assembly reflect how delegations have voted in recorded votes/roll-calls held at public meetings, but not at private meetings such as those for the election of the Director-General.

37. An open recorded vote/roll-call, as opposed to a secret ballot, would have the advantage of:

- (i) facilitating electronic voting for the election and thus being much quicker;
- (ii) significantly improving transparency, allowing the vote to take place in a public meeting if Member States so wished;
- (iii) significantly improving accountability and contributing to improved confidence in the integrity of the system, both in terms of the integrity of the vote and also of the campaign;
- (iv) avoiding the need to consider measures to restrict communications during voting.

38. Show-of-hands voting would not appear to be suitable when holding an election, mainly for practical reasons as the Secretariat would be required to establish a record of the vote while it is ongoing in order to ensure the correctness of the vote and that no invalid vote is cast. This would slow down the voting procedure.

(b) Options to accelerate the voting procedure, in cases where no secure electronic voting system is available

39. One option that may save time could be the introduction of a “transferable vote”/“ranked choice” system. In such a system, delegations would, at the Health Assembly, rank their preferences on the ballot paper, marking a first-choice candidate, a second-choice candidate and a third-choice candidate. If no candidate obtained the required simple majority, then all votes cast for the candidate with the lowest number of first choices would be redistributed to the remaining candidates based on who is ranked next on each ballot. If this resulted in no candidate receiving a majority, further rounds of redistribution would occur. At the Board, where more than one seat has to be filled (five during the shortlisting phase under the current system and three during the nomination phase) any candidates that achieved the required majority would be elected and their surplus votes (beyond the required majority) would be redistributed to the next-choice candidate as ranked by delegations. Once this exercise was completed, and if some places on the shortlist or list of nominees had not been filled, then the candidates with the lowest number of votes would be eliminated, and their votes would be redistributed to the next choice of delegations. This whole process would be repeated until all seats were filled.

40. A “transferable vote”/“ranked choice” voting system would be an innovative option that could save time by eliminating the need for multiple ballots in cases where there is no outright winner on the first ballot. Further research would be necessary to identify the best version of the transferable vote system and to what extent the Rules of Procedure would have to be amended to implement such a system. Furthermore, it would have to be evaluated whether the additional time taken in identifying and counting the redistribution of votes would result in a significant reduction in the time saved from avoiding multiple rounds of voting.

E. Role of the Secretariat in the election process

41. The Secretariat organizes the election process for the post of Director-General. Where, for example, the incumbent Director-General is standing for re-election, issues might arise as to the need for measures, such as ethical walls or the establishment of an independent unit within the Secretariat, so as to avoid any possibility of the appearance of lack of impartiality arising from the fact that the Secretariat reports to the Director-General. It is proposed that the Secretariat should put in place appropriate measures, depending on the circumstances.

F. Overall duration and organization of the election process**(a) Length of the electoral campaign period**

42. A number of proposals were made in the report by the evaluation management group, namely to: (a) shorten the campaign period in order to reduce the resources that candidates and Member States have to invest in the process; (b) provide a longer transition period to provide sufficient time for the appointee to prepare; and (c) ensure that all candidates attend all the regional committee meetings.

43. The concerns expressed focused on the lengthy campaigns conducted by potential candidates and the Member States nominating them, the resources required for such campaigns and the fairness of the election process. Currently, the election process officially begins at least nine months before the session of the Executive Board at which the candidates are to be nominated (i.e. in around April). In practice, campaigning may start even earlier than this. The final date for receiving proposals of candidates is four months before the session of the Board (i.e. in around September). Candidates whose candidature has been submitted early have the opportunity to campaign at the Health Assembly in May as well as at

the early regional committee meetings in August and September; however, those candidates proposed later may miss the opportunity to campaign at the Health Assembly and some regional committee meetings, thereby raising the concern that they may be at a disadvantage.

44. One option to ensure that all candidates can attend all the regional committee meetings, could be to bring forward the date on which the names of the candidates are announced to mid-August, before the start of the first Regional Committee. This change would require an amendment to Rule 52 of the Board's Rules of Procedure. It would also run counter to the suggestion to reduce the overall length of the campaign period, as such a reduction implies deferring the date of announcement of candidates.

(b) Transition period between appointment and start of the contract

45. The period between the appointment and the start of the contract of the incoming Director-General is not part of the election process itself. Nonetheless, some candidates and Member States expressed concerns during the evaluation process that it is currently too short.

46. The current position is that the Director-General's contract starts on 1 July after he or she has been appointed. With the Health Assembly taking place in late May, this means that the incoming Director-General has around four or five weeks to prepare after being appointed.

47. Expanding the transition period would imply deferring the start date of the contract of the incoming Director General, currently set at 1 July of the year of appointment. Options would include a start date in mid-August, before the regional committee meetings are held, or one at the beginning of the following year, depending on the length of the transition period deemed desirable.

ACTION BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

48. In respect of **sections A, B and C (code of conduct for the election, candidates' forum, nomination of candidates by the Executive Board)** of this report, the Executive Board is invited to consider adopting the following draft decision, subject to the Board's consideration of and choice between the proposed amendments contained in Annex 3 to this report:

The Executive Board, having considered the report on the evaluation of the election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization:¹

(1) recommended to the Seventy-second World Health Assembly the adoption of the amendments to Annexes 1 and 2 to resolution WHA66.18 (2013) relating to the code of conduct for the election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization and the candidates' forum, as set out in Annexes 2 and 3 to document EB144/35;

(2) decided, with respect to the shortlist of candidates to be established in accordance with Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board, that:

(a) the shortlist should, as a matter of principle, be of five candidates. The Officers of the Board may, however, decide that the shortlist be of more than five candidates if so warranted by the number of candidates;

¹ Document EB144/35.

(b) the interviews of candidates shortlisted for the post of Director-General should be limited to 60 minutes divided between: (i) an oral presentation of no more than 20 minutes on the candidate's vision for the future priorities of the Organization, with an analysis of current problems facing it and suggestions as to how those should be addressed; and (ii) a question-and-answer session of no more than 40 minutes.

49. In respect of **point 1 of Annex 1** (technical design of the web forum), the Executive Board is invited to provide guidance on whether commercially available off-the-shelf solutions with enhanced interactivity features for the web forum should be investigated further by the Secretariat.

50. In respect of **section D** (voting process), and **points 2 and 3 of Annex 1** (secure electronic voting, enforceability of limiting communications during the vote), the Executive Board is invited to provide guidance on the following matters:

(a) In respect of section D(a), should the election of the Director-General continue to be conducted by secret ballot or should the Secretariat prepare draft amendments to the Rules of Procedure to provide for a recorded vote instead?

(b) In respect of section D(b), should the Secretariat research and evaluate options for conducting the election of the Director-General by a "transferable vote" or "ranked choice" voting system and, if appropriate, prepare draft amendments to the Rules of Procedure for the consideration of the Board?

(c) In respect of point 2 of Annex 1, should the election of the Director-General continue to be conducted by paper-based voting, and, if so, should the Secretariat research and evaluate options for counting votes by means of an optical scanner and, if appropriate, prepare draft amendments to the Rules of Procedure for the consideration of the Board?

(d) In respect of point 3 of Annex 1, should the current practice of asking delegates to switch off their electronic devices and leave them switched off for the duration of the vote be continued?

51. In respect of **section E** (role of the Secretariat in the election process), the Board is invited to provide guidance to the Secretariat on the option presented.

52. In respect of **section F** (overall duration and organization of the election process), the Board is invited to provide guidance on the options outlined in connection with points (a) and (b), respectively.

ANNEX 1

PROPOSALS AND OPTIONS WITH A PREDOMINANT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMPONENT

Point 1. Technical design of the web forum

1. The report by the evaluation management group on the evaluation of the election of the Director-General indicated that suggested improvements focus on improving the interactivity of the web forum tool, limiting the number of questions submitted and extending the period over which the forum is available.

2. A more interactive web forum tool could be provided by using customizable off-the-shelf solutions, available from social media companies specializing in such products, at a relatively low level of cost. In contrast, replicating the interactive functionality of such popular collaboration platforms in the existing web forum tool is likely to be cost-prohibitive. Users may be familiar with the design and functionality of commercially available off-the-shelf solutions and such solutions could enable restricted access for candidates and Member States only. There may, however, be potential issues concerning the availability of such solutions in all Member States.

3. The use of an interactive off-the-shelf tool to conduct the web forum would have further implications that Member States may wish to consider. While issues concerning the categorization of questions could potentially be overcome by enabling users to “tag” questions and answers, the Secretariat’s role in moderating a more interactive web forum may have to be different from the one during the previous election, due to the spontaneity and speed with which candidates and Member States could post questions and answers on a more interactive web forum tool. It would be technically possible to limit the number of questions that delegations may put to candidates. If it was intended to make use of the built-in machine translation capacity that off-the-shelf tools may provide, Member States should be informed that such translations could happen very quickly but may not be carried out with the same thoroughness and skill as the translations provided during the previous web forum. It should also be noted that such a tool is likely to increase the demands on candidates to participate in the web forum, which may already be regarded as significant.

4. If the Executive Board wishes to pursue the idea of a more interactive tool to carry out the web forum part of the election process, commercially available off-the-shelf solutions could be investigated further.

Point 2. Secure electronic voting

5. The benefits in terms of time saved through an electronic voting system for the election of the Director-General are self-evident. The challenge is to find an electronic solution that: can ensure a safe and secure vote, free from risk of error or interference; is both secret and verifiable in the case of challenge; and is cost-effective. As evidenced by the study commissioned by the Secretariat in 2016, current solutions have inherent flaws, are expensive, and pose substantial risks to the voting process. Alternatively, new and emerging technologies are not yet proven to be reliable and cost-effective.

6. In any event, the level of confidence and transparency provided by a paper-based voting system conducted at the Health Assembly cannot at present be replicated by an electronic voting system. Nor

do electronic voting systems allow for verification of results in the event of a challenge in the way that a paper-based system does.

7. The Secretariat has benchmarked the use of electronic voting against the voting systems used by other United Nations and related organizations. Among the bodies that responded, only WMO seems to have used an electronic voting system to elect its executive head. A system that is broadly similar to the one used by WMO in the past was rejected following the 138th session of the Executive Board in January 2016 (at which the system was tested) because it was not considered to be sufficiently user-friendly. None of the other entities that responded uses an electronic voting system for the election by secret ballot of their executive head, even if the entity uses electronic voting for other decisions. The bodies that responded were: the International Criminal Court (in respect of the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute), the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, FAO, IAEA, ICAO, IFAD, ILO, IOM, the United Nations, UNESCO, UNIDO, UPU and WMO.

8. It is the secret nature of the vote for the Director-General that creates the particular difficulties. If a recorded vote or roll-call vote were used instead (see paragraphs 36 and 37 of document EB144/35), an electronic solution is likely to be more feasible.

9. If the Executive Board wishes to retain a secret ballot for the election of the Director-General, the option of using an optical scanner to count paper votes could be investigated further. An optical scanner combined with paper-based voting would provide a secure and end-to-end verifiable election process. It would also be likely to provide savings in terms of time with respect to counting of votes and could probably be combined with a “transferable vote” or “ranked choice” paper-based voting system (see paragraphs 39 and 40 of document EB144/35) to provide significant savings in time.

Point 3. Enforceability of limiting communications during the vote

10. Two options were reviewed by the Secretariat to limit communications during the vote from within the voting venue:

(a) to ask representatives of Member States to leave their electronic devices outside the voting premises. This option would require logistical arrangements for the Secretariat to coordinate with Member States before, during and after the voting process. Aside from creating logistical challenges, this option relies on an “honour-based” system, unless delegates are subjected to a search upon entry to the room. It is unlikely that such an honour-based system would be any more effective than the current “honour system” of asking delegates to switch off their electronic devices and leave them switched off for the duration of the vote;

(b) installation of jammers or “blockers” of communications signals within the voting premises. This option is deemed infeasible as the installation of such devices is strictly prohibited in Switzerland (and many other Member States) except for specific use by government authorities.¹ These devices block all communications by mobile telephones and could pose substantial dangers during times of emergencies.

In the light of these considerations, it is recommended that the current practice of requesting delegates to switch off all their electronic devices should be maintained.

¹ For further information on jammers or “blockers”, see <https://www.bakom.admin.ch/bakom/en/homepage/equipments-and-installations/particular-equipment/jammers.html> (accessed 19 November 2018).

ANNEX 2

**CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE ELECTION OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF
THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION**

Proposed deletions appear in strikethrough and proposed additions appear in bold text.

B. Requirements for the different steps of the election process

...

II. Electoral campaign

...

3. All Member States and candidates should ~~consider disclosing~~ their campaign activities (for example, hosting of meetings, workshops and visits) **in advance, together with the amount and source of all funding for campaign activities**, and communicate them to the Secretariat. Information so disclosed will be posted on a dedicated page of the WHO website.

...

7. Member States proposing persons for the post of Director-General should ~~consider disclosing~~ grants or aid funding to other Member States during the previous two years in order to ensure full transparency and mutual confidence among Member States.

...

9. **With the exception of events organized under the auspices of WHO,** ~~Travel~~ by candidates to Member States to promote their candidature should be limited **to [number] of trips during the campaign period** in order to avoid excessive expenditure that could lead to inequality among Member States and candidates. In this connection, Member States and candidates should consider using as much as possible existing mechanisms (sessions of the regional committees, Executive Board and Health Assembly) for meetings and other promotional activities linked to the electoral campaign. **Use of new technologies, including video messages, interactions through video and other electronic means, is encouraged.**

...

11. After the Director-General has dispatched all proposals, curricula vitae and supporting information to Member States in accordance with Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board, the Secretariat will open on the WHO web site a password-protected forum for questions and answers, open to all Member States and candidates, **unless candidates request not** ~~who request~~ to participate in such a forum. The Secretariat will also post on the WHO web site information on all candidates ~~who so request~~ including their curricula vitae and other particulars of their qualifications and experience as received from Member States **within the deadline provided in the second paragraph of Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board**, as well as their contact information, **unless candidates request that this information should not be posted**. The website will also provide

links to individual websites of candidates **if any and** upon request. Each candidate is responsible for setting up and financing his or her own website.

...

V. Compliance

Expressions of concern regarding possible non-compliance with the code of conduct by a candidate, Member State or any other person or entity may be received by the Officers of the Board, through the Office of the Legal Counsel of the World Health Organization.

Communications so received will be reviewed by the Officers of the Board who will report to Member States thereon. Additionally, the Officers of the Board may address concerns directly with candidates and Member States.

Upon request, the Officers of the Board may provide guidance in advance to candidates as to compliance with the code of conduct in relation to proposed campaign activities.

ANNEX 3

Proposed deletions appear in strikethrough and proposed additions appear in bold text.

CANDIDATES' FORA AND OTHER EVENTS WITH CANDIDATES

A. CANDIDATES' FORA

Convening and conduct of the ~~fora~~

1. ~~Two~~ **Two** The candidates' ~~fora~~ will be convened by the Secretariat at the request of the Executive Board as a self-standing events: **one** preceding the **session of the Board at which candidates will be nominated for the post of Director-General and one prior to the session of the Health Assembly at which the appointment will take place.** ~~Both candidates' fora,~~ **and** will be chaired by the Chairman of the Board, with the support of the Officers of the Executive Board. The Board will ~~formally convene the candidates' forum and~~ **decide its the dates of the fora** at the session preceding the session at which the nomination will take place.

Timing

2. The candidates' ~~fora~~ shall be held not later than ~~two~~ **one** months in advance of the sessions of the Board **and the Health Assembly session** at which the nomination **and appointment** will take place, **respectively.**

Duration

3. The duration of the candidates' ~~fora~~ will be decided by the Officers of the Board depending on the number of candidates. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the maximum duration of the ~~fora~~ shall be three days **each.**

Format

4. ~~[The first of the two]~~ **[Both]** ~~fora will consist of interviews with the candidates. Each candidate interview will consist of a question-and-answer session for a maximum duration of 60 minutes~~ shall make a presentation of up to 30 minutes, which will be followed by a questions and answer session so that the overall duration of each interview shall be 60 minutes. The order of the interviews shall be determined by lot. **Member States and Associate Members participating in the candidates' fora will be invited to prepare questions for each candidate during the initial presentation. Questions to be asked to each candidate will be drawn by lot by the Chairman. [The second of the two fora will consist of a moderated debate between the nominated candidates.]** ~~The forum shall decide, upon the proposal of the Chairman, on detailed arrangement for the interviews.~~

~~5. Member States and Associate Members participating in the candidates' forum will be invited to prepare questions for each candidate during the initial presentation. Questions to be asked to each candidate will be drawn by lot by the Chairman.~~

5. **Detailed arrangements for the interviews [and moderated debate] may be decided either by the Board at its session preceding the event or by the forum upon the proposal of the Chairman of the Board.**

Participation

6. Participation in the candidates' ~~forum~~ will be limited to Member States¹ and Associate Members of the World Health Organization.
7. ~~For those Member States or Associate Members which are not able to attend,~~†The candidates' ~~forum~~ will be broadcast by the Secretariat through a **link on the WHO website accessible to all Internet users** ~~password-protected web site~~.

Documentation

8. The curricula vitae of candidates and other supporting information provided in line with Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Board **within the deadline set out in the second paragraph thereof** will be made available electronically to all Member States and Associate Members in the language versions provided on a password-protected web site.

B. OTHER EVENTS WITH CANDIDATES

9. **Following consultation with the Chairman of the Board, the Secretariat will support or co-organize one or more debates or discussions or other similar events with the candidates, which will be organized and moderated by appropriate external entities outside of WHO premises.**
10. **The Secretariat will, at the request of, and in a format decided upon by the Executive Board, convene events for all the candidates in the margins of each regional committee session preceding the Board session at which the nomination takes place.**

= = =

¹ And, where applicable, regional economic integration organizations.