

Follow-up of the report of the Working Group on the Election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization

Report by the Director-General

1. The Sixty-fifth World Health Assembly, in resolution WHA65.15, decided to revise the process for the nomination and appointment of the Director-General. In particular, the Health Assembly adopted revised criteria that the nominated candidate should fulfil and decided that the Executive Board will nominate three candidates for the post of Director-General for the Health Assembly's consideration, paying due regard to equitable geographical considerations, except in exceptional circumstances where the Board may decide to nominate fewer than three candidates, such as in the case where there are only one or two candidates.
2. The Health Assembly decided that it will consider at the Sixty-sixth World Health Assembly, through the Executive Board, the following measures to be developed by the Secretariat:
 - (a) a code of conduct, which candidates and Member States should observe and respect;
 - (b) a candidates' forum as a non-decision-making platform for candidates to make themselves and their vision known to Member States on an equal basis, and the modalities of that forum;
 - (c) appropriate tools to enhance the Board's effective application of the revised criteria.
3. The Health Assembly also requested the Board to submit a report on the implementation of the resolution to Sixty-sixth World Health Assembly, and requested the Director-General to propose to the Board amendments to its Rules of Procedure in order to implement the foregoing decisions.
4. The present report explores the issues decided upon by the Health Assembly for the Board's consideration and also examines possible amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the World Health Assembly that may be necessary in order to implement fully the Health Assembly's decisions.

CODE OF CONDUCT

5. The Working Group on the Process and Methods of the Election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization expressed support for a code of conduct to promote transparency and enhance ethical behaviour throughout the election process with particular regard to electoral campaigns, in line with the recommendation of the Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations system. As there was no precedent for a code of conduct applicable to elected officials within the United Nations system, it considered various issues and principles submitted by the Secretariat on the basis of

existing national and international codes. The Working Group highlighted several principles that appeared particularly relevant for a code of conduct on the election of the Director-General.

6. It should also be considered, for the purpose of the present report, that the Regional Committee for the Western Pacific at its sixty-third session in September 2012 adopted a Code of Conduct for the Nomination of the Regional Director.¹ The Code was adopted as a non-legally binding political understanding among Member States of the Western Pacific Region as to desirable behaviour by Member States and candidates in order to increase the fairness, openness and transparency of the nomination process and thus its legitimacy as well as that of its outcome. Member States and candidates are expected to follow the Code as a matter of good faith and shared commitment and expectation. The Code of Conduct is based on principles and considerations largely similar to those discussed in the Working Group. It follows the steps of the nomination process in a holistic way, including notably the electoral campaign, which falls outside the statutory process regulated under the Rules of Procedure of the Regional Committee.

7. In view of the previous reports by the Secretariat and the discussions that have taken place in the Working Group about the guidance provided by the latter and the important precedent of the Code of Conduct for the Nomination of the Regional Director of the Western Pacific Region, the Executive Board may wish to consider the draft code of conduct contained in Annex 1 to the present report. The draft text largely follows that adopted by the Regional Committee for the Western Pacific² and is based on the same assumptions and principles but has been revised to take into account the decisions in resolution WHA65.15 as well as comments made by the Working Group.

CANDIDATES' FORUM

8. The Secretariat, in formulating options for a candidates' forum, has built on the specific modalities for a candidates' forum³ submitted to the third session of the Working Group and has taken into account best practices, including the candidates' forums recently held by the Pan American Health Organization, the International Labour Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization⁴ (see Annex 2). Based on its previous report³ and with a view to facilitating a final decision on this point, the Secretariat submits the following proposals to the Board for its consideration.

Convening and conduct of the forum

9. As agreed by the Working Group, the candidates' forum will be convened by the Secretariat at the request of the Executive Board and chaired by the Chairman of the Board, using the Bureau structure, as a self-standing event preceding the Board.⁵ The Board could formally convene the candidates' forum and decide its date at the May session preceding the January session at which the nomination will take place.

¹ Resolution WPR/RC63/R.7.

² Resolution WPR/RC63/R.7, Annex.

³ See document EB/EDG/WG/3/3.

⁴ See document A65/38 (paragraph 10).

⁵ See documents EB/EDG/WG/3/3 and EB130/29 Corr.1 (paragraphs 7–9).

Timing

10. The options considered by the Working Group were holding the candidates' forum either some weeks in advance of, immediately before, or at the margins of the Executive Board's session. Every option has advantages and drawbacks, but it should be recalled that the Health Assembly has decided that interviewing of short-listed candidates by the Board, *inter alia*, should be continued. The candidates' forum will not therefore replace the Board's interviews and would play a different and complementary role.

11. The Board may wish to consider two options: (1) to hold the candidates' forum about two months in advance of the Board session at which the nomination will take place in order to provide all candidates visibility earlier in the process and to give Member States time for reflection and consultations before the nomination; or (2) to hold the candidates' forum immediately preceding the Board's session, while taking into account the fact that the Programme, Budget and Administration Committee normally meets on the Wednesday to Friday preceding that session.

12. Option (1) would require anticipating the deadlines provided for in Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board. For example, the Director-General could inform Member States that they may propose persons for the post of Director-General nine months before the Board's session instead of six months (*i.e.* in April instead of July). The deadline for receipt of proposals could be set four months before the Board's session, and the deadline for the dispatch of the proposals to Member States three months instead of two months as is the currently the case. This sequence would enable Member States to familiarize themselves with the profiles of the candidates before the candidates' forum. The proposed amendments to Rule 52 prepared by the Secretariat reflect this approach, whereas option (2) does not require a change in the existing sequence. Option (1) would also slightly increase the foreseeable costs as compared to holding the forum immediately before the Board. A breakdown of the cost of the two options, assuming travel support for 10 candidates and a meeting lasting two days, is provided in Annex 3.

Duration

13. The duration of the candidates' forum would depend on the number of candidates and the time allotted to them. In order to contain the costs of the forum, the Board may wish to consider a maximum of two days, with the time available to each candidate depending on the number of candidates and an assumption of six candidates interviewed each day.

Format

14. The format of the session could consist of presentations by each candidate and the opportunity for questions and answers. Each candidate would be given an equal amount of time, *e.g.* a maximum of 60 minutes. Options in this regard include:

- (1) to decide in advance how the time would be divided between the presentation and questions and answers, with equal time for each segment or more time devoted to questions and answers;
- (2) to allow candidates to decide how to divide their time between the presentation and questions and answers;
- (3) to allot a certain amount of time to each candidate for his or her presentation, which would be followed by a single question-and-answer session including all candidates.

15. Option (1) is similar to the existing interview procedures in the Executive Board and some regional committees and Member States may be more familiar with that format. To ensure fairness, it is proposed that the order of the presentations be determined by drawing lots.

Process for questions and answers

16. There are at least five options for the process of providing questions and answers, including the following:

- (1) Member States would formulate questions in advance and submit them through their respective regional groups, with each regional group providing the same number of questions (based on an agreed number) and with the questions being drawn at random and posed by the Chairman;
- (2) during the forum, each regional group would have, in rotation, the opportunity to ask one question through its regional coordinator or other designated representative;
- (3) the officers of the Executive Board would formulate a set of questions to be asked of all candidates and they would be provided to the candidates in advance of the forum;
- (4) a mixed approach would be used, involving both questions provided in advance to the candidates and questions that are unknown to the candidates until they are posed to them at the candidates' forum;
- (5) Member States participating in the candidates' forum would be invited to prepare questions for the candidates. The Member States that can ask questions for each candidate would be drawn by lot by the Chairman one by one.

17. Even though each option has its advantages, in view of the Secretariat option (2) has the advantage of giving equal opportunities to each regional group, whereas option (5) is the simplest to manage and its randomness ensures an element of fairness.

Participation

18. Participation in the candidates' forum could be limited to Member States and Associate Members, or also open to other participants such as intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations, the media and the public.

19. In view of the sensitive nature of the nomination process and in order to respect the dignity of the candidates as well as to ensure a more candid interaction between candidates and Member States, the Board may wish to consider limiting participation to Member States and Associate Members. Virtual participation options could be explored, so as to provide an opportunity for Member States and Associate Members that are unable to attend the candidates' forum in-person to participate nonetheless.¹

¹ See section on participation in Annex 2 with regard to the use of web conferencing services by PAHO.

Documentation

20. The curricula vitae of candidates would have already been provided to Member States in line with Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board. Presentations by the candidates would be made available electronically in the language versions provided to the Secretariat.

Outcome

21. Given the informal nature of the candidates' forum, it is proposed that there be no report of the candidates' forum.

TOOLS TO ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVE APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA FOR THE NOMINATED CANDIDATES

22. The Working Group noted that the process by which the Board performed an initial screening of the candidates against the criteria to be fulfilled by the candidate(s) to be nominated for the post of Director-General tended to be superficial and recommended that the Health Assembly consider the use of enhanced tools to render that screening more rigorous as a way to assess more credibly whether and how candidates fulfil the applicable criteria. The Health Assembly requested the Secretariat to develop appropriate tools for consideration at the Sixty-sixth World Health Assembly through the Board.

23. Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board provides that all members of the Board shall have the opportunity to participate in an initial screening of all candidatures in order to eliminate those candidates not meeting the criteria proposed by the Board and approved by the Health Assembly. The Board thus far has proceeded on the basis of whether there was consensus that any candidate did not meet the criteria contained in resolution EB97.R10 in light of the curriculum vitae and other supporting information provided by nominating Member States. By resolution EB120.R19, the Board clarified the procedure for assessing one of the criteria, namely, whether candidates possess the good physical condition required of all staff members of the Organization. The Board had no other tools to assess the qualifications of candidates or to compare them with one another.

24. The Secretariat proposed at the third session of the Working Group various options to facilitate comparability of the qualifications of the candidates against the criteria and to provide some form of confirmation of the statements contained in their supporting material. Such tools have to be seen in the context of the intergovernmental nature of the nomination process, where candidates and their supporting information are submitted by Member States in the exercise of their rights of membership in WHO.

25. In the light of the foregoing, the Board may wish to consider the introduction of a **standard form for the curriculum vitae** of candidates, or of a questionnaire to be used in addition to the curriculum vitae and other supporting information. The use of a standard form would facilitate a comparative assessment of the candidatures. A questionnaire would enable nominating Member States to provide specific evidence or corroboration of how their candidates fulfil each of the criteria set forth by the Health Assembly. The standard form or questionnaire could also require each candidate to provide a statement on specific aspects of his or her vision of priorities and strategies, again with a view to comparing candidatures. It should be noted, in this connection, that the Executive Board in resolution EB120.R19 decided that the curriculum vitae should address the criteria and include a statement on the vision of the candidate on priorities and strategies. A possible draft standard form of curriculum vitae, based on the practice of a Regional Committee, is attached in Annex 4 for the consideration of the Board.

26. As to the conduct of the screening from a procedural point of view, it could be continued on the basis of whether there is a consensus in the Board – on the basis of the enhanced information available to its members – that any candidate does not meet the criteria as a whole. An alternative could be to eliminate the initial screening and pass immediately to the next steps, notably the short-listing, on the argument that the additional information available to the Board would enable it to make a proper selection of the candidates that best meet the criteria. The latter option would require the deletion of the fifth paragraph of Rule 52 of the Board's Rules of Procedure.

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

27. Rule 52 of the Board's Rules of Procedure should be amended, first of all, to reflect that the Board shall henceforth nominate three candidates for the Health Assembly's consideration. Moreover, depending on a final decision by the Health Assembly, the introduction of a candidates' forum and of enhanced screening criteria could be incorporated in Rule 52. However, in the view of the Secretariat, Rule 52 should provide the broad framework of the nomination process while leaving the details of its implementation to separate decisions by the Board. This approach would avoid further amendments of the Rule in case specific aspects are later adjusted by the Board. The proposals set forth below reflect this approach.

28. The Health Assembly decided that the Board may decide to nominate fewer than three candidates in exceptional circumstances where nominating three candidates is not practicable, such as where there are only one or two candidates. The fact of there being one or two candidates was provided by way of example in the resolution and there could be other situations – difficult to anticipate for the Secretariat – in which the Board may wish to nominate fewer than three candidates. Consequently, it is proposed to leave the assessment of such situations and the modalities for addressing them to ad hoc decisions of the Board should such situations arise.

29. It should also be recalled that the Health Assembly has decided that some of the existing procedures, such as those involving secret ballot, short listing, voting and interviewing of candidates have proven to be useful and effective and should be continued. Those aspects of Rule 52 and of the separate decisions implementing them in details should therefore remain as they currently stand.

30. With regard to the nomination of three candidates, the Working Group considered three options raised by the Secretariat, namely: (1) rounds of voting in which the candidate receiving the least number of votes would be dropped until the number of candidates reached three; (2) selection of the three candidates who obtained the highest number of votes in a single round of voting; and (3) rounds of voting whereby those candidates receiving a majority of votes would receive the nomination, as outlined in Rule 51 of the Board's Rules of Procedure. The Board may wish to consider option (1), which corresponds to the current procedure for nominating one candidate.

31. The Board may wish to consider the proposed amendments to Rule 52 contained in Annex 5 to the present report.

AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE HEALTH ASSEMBLY

32. The main revision that resolution WHA65.15 requires for the Rules of Procedure of the World Health Assembly concerns the modalities of selecting one candidate out of the three that the Board would normally nominate. Resolution WHA65.15 requests the Board to consider that the Director-General should be appointed by a clear and strong majority.

33. Rule 70 of the Health Assembly's Rules of Procedure currently requires a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting for the appointment of the Director-General. Rule 108 provides that "the Health Assembly shall consider the Board's nomination at a private meeting and shall come to a decision by secret ballot." Although this provision shall remain in light of the decisions taken by the Health Assembly with regard to existing procedures, the Rule will have to be amended to reflect the specific modalities for appointing the Director-General out of three candidates.

34. The modalities should balance the decision of the Health Assembly that the Director-General shall be appointed by a clear and strong majority with the need to avoid a stalemate in cases in which no candidate receives the required majority. Consequently, the Board may wish to consider a sliding-majority approach, where the Health Assembly would first attempt to appoint the Director-General by a high majority, resorting to a lower majority in case that proves impossible.

35. A possible application of this approach to three candidates would be to vote first with the decision being made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting. In case all Member States are present and there are no invalid votes or abstentions, that would mean 130 votes in favour. If no candidate obtains that majority, the candidate with the least number of votes would be dropped and the remaining two candidates would proceed to the next ballot. The Health Assembly could then vote again with the decision being made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting between the two remaining candidates; if no candidate obtains that majority, there could be a new ballot decided by a lower but still strong majority, for example a majority of the Member States of WHO rather than a majority of the Members present and voting. That would mean having to obtain 98 votes in favour with the current membership of 194 Member States. If neither candidate obtains such a majority, the Health Assembly could vote again with the decision being made by a lower but still high majority by fixing a threshold of votes in favour (e.g. 80 votes) and providing that the candidate who reaches such a threshold or, in case both candidates reach it, the candidate who obtains the highest number of votes, would be appointed Director-General. If neither candidate reaches such a threshold, as a last resort the Assembly could vote with the decision being made by a majority of the Members present and voting.

36. In case the Board nominates only two persons, the foregoing procedure would apply with the exception of the first step. In case the Board nominates only one person, the current procedure whereby the appointment would be made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting could be maintained. However, taking into account comments by Member States about the effective use of the limited time available to the Health Assembly and the fact that the executive heads of other international organizations are appointed in practice without a vote (notably in the case of the Secretary-General of the United Nations), the Board may wish to consider recommending to the Health Assembly that the Director-General be appointed without a vote in the absence of any objection if only one candidate is nominated by the Executive Board.

37. If the Board concurs with the approach proposed above, it may wish to consider the proposed amendments to Rules 70 and 108 of the Rules of Procedure of the World Health Assembly in Annex 6 to the present report. In the view of the Secretariat, no other amendment is strictly necessary for the Rules of Procedure of the World Health Assembly. The references to the Board's "nomination" may also refer to more than one person as previously advised by the Secretariat.

ACTION BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

38. The Board may wish to consider the proposals and options contained in the present report with a view to recommending their adoption to the Health Assembly, as appropriate, or to providing further guidance to the Secretariat. The Board may also wish to consider the following general points.

(1) Appointing the Director-General out of three candidates may prove a long and time-consuming process by secret ballot. This may affect the time available for the rest of the Health Assembly's agenda, given the short duration of the Health Assembly and the fact that the two main committees would not meet during the private meeting on the appointment of the Director-General. The Board may wish to recommend that the Health Assemblies that appoint the Director-General be always a day longer than the others. Alternatively, the Board may consider the introduction of electronic voting in the Health Assembly, at least for the appointment of the Director-General, which would greatly reduce the time spent on this item. The Secretariat could inquire about options to procure electronic voting facilities and related costs and report to the Health Assembly thereon.

(2) With the future adoption of some of the measures dealt with in this report, the details of some of which will be adopted through a dedicated resolution by the Board or the Health Assembly rather than through an amendment to the Rules of Procedure, the overall process for the election of the Director-General will be increasingly scattered through several documents. This situation is not desirable as it makes it difficult for both Member States and the Secretariat to reconstruct easily the various steps. The Board may wish to recommend that the Health Assembly request the Director-General to consolidate the overall process in a single document to serve as the single reference for the election of the Director-General.

ANNEX 1

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

In resolution WHA65.15 concerning the report of the Working Group of Member States on the Process and Methods of the Election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization, the Health Assembly decided, *inter alia*, that “a code of conduct, in line with Recommendation 7 of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit “Selection and Conditions of Service of Executive Heads in the United Nations System Organizations”,¹ which candidates for the post of Director-General of the World Health Organization and Member States should undertake to observe and respect, will be developed by the Secretariat for consideration by the Sixty-sixth World Health Assembly through the Executive Board.”

This code of conduct (the “code”) aims at promoting an open, fair, equitable and transparent process for the election of the Director-General of the World Health Organization. In seeking to improve the overall process, the code addresses several areas, including the submission of proposals, the conduct of electoral campaigns by Member States and candidates, as well as funding and financial matters.

The code is a political understanding reached by the Member States of the World Health Organization. It recommends desirable behaviour by Member States and candidates with regard to the election of the Director-General in order to increase the fairness, credibility, openness and transparency of the process and thus its legitimacy as well as the legitimacy and acceptance of its outcome. As such, the code is not legally binding but Member States and candidates are expected to honour its contents.

A. General requirements**I. Basic principles**

The whole election process as well as electoral campaign activities related to it should be guided by the following principles that further the legitimacy of the process and of its result:

due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representation
fairness,
equity,
transparency,
good faith,
dignity, mutual respect and moderation,
non-discrimination, and
merit.

¹ Document JIU/REP/2009/8.

II. Authority of the Health Assembly and the Executive Board in accordance with their Rules of Procedure

1. Member States accept the authority of the Health Assembly and the Executive Board to conduct the election of the Director-General in accordance with their Rules of Procedure and relevant resolutions and decisions.
2. Member States that propose persons for the post of Director-General have the right to promote those candidatures. The same applies to candidates with regard to their own candidature. In the exercise of that right, Member States and candidates should abide by all rules governing the election of the Director-General contained in the Constitution of the World Health Organization, the Rules of Procedure of the World Health Assembly, and the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board as well as in relevant resolutions and decisions.

III. Responsibilities

1. It is the responsibility of Member States and candidates for the post of Director-General of the World Health Organization to observe and respect this code.
2. Member States acknowledge that the process of election of the Director-General should be fair, open, transparent, equitable and based on the merits of the individual candidates. They should make this code publicly known and easily accessible.
3. The Secretariat will also promote awareness of the code in accordance with the provisions of the code.

B. Requirements for the different steps of the election process

I. Submission of proposals

When proposing the name of one or more persons for the post of Director-General, Member States should include in their proposal a statement to the effect that they and the persons proposed by them pledge to observe the provisions of the code. The Director-General will remind Member States accordingly when inviting Member States to propose persons for the post of Director-General in accordance with Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board.

II. Electoral campaign

1. This code applies to electoral campaign activities related to the election of the Director-General whenever they take place until the appointment by the Health Assembly.
2. All Member States and candidates should encourage and promote communication and cooperation among one another during the entire election process. Member States and candidates should act in good faith bearing in mind the shared objectives of promoting equity, openness, transparency and fairness throughout the election process.
3. All Member States and candidates should consider disclosing their campaign activities (for example, hosting of meetings, workshops and visits) and communicate them to the Secretariat. Information so disclosed will be posted on a dedicated page of the WHO web site.

4. Member States and candidates should refer to one another with respect; no Member State or candidate should at any time disrupt or impede the campaign activities of other candidates. Nor should any Member State or any candidate make any oral or written statement or other representation that could be deemed slanderous or libellous.
5. Member States and candidates should refrain from improperly influencing the election process, by, for example, granting or accepting financial or other benefits as a quid pro quo for the support of a candidate, or by promising such benefits.
6. Member States and candidates should not make promises or commitments in favour of, or accept instructions from, any person or entity, public or private, and should avoid any other similar action, when that could undermine, or be perceived as undermining, the integrity of the election process.
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.
8. Member States that have proposed persons for the post of Director-General should facilitate meetings between their candidate and other Member States, if so requested. Wherever possible, meetings between candidates and Member States should be arranged on the occasion of conferences or other events involving different Member States rather than through bilateral visits.
9. Travel by candidates to Member States to promote their candidature should be limited in order to avoid excessive expenditure which 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.
10. Candidates, whether internal or external, should not combine their official travel with campaigning activities. Electoral promotion or propaganda under the guise of technical meetings or similar events should be avoided.
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 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, as well as their contact information. The web site will also provide links to individual web sites of candidates upon request. Each candidate is responsible for setting up and financing his or her own web site.
12. The Secretariat will also post on WHO's web site, at the time referred to in the first paragraph of Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board, information on the election process and the applicable rules and decisions, as well as the text of this code.

III. Nomination and appointment

1. The nomination and appointment of the Director-General is conducted by the Executive Board and the Health Assembly, respectively, in accordance with their Rules of Procedure and relevant resolutions and decisions. As a matter of principle in order to preserve the serenity of the proceedings, candidates should not attend those meetings even if they form part of the delegation of a Member State.
2. Member States should abide strictly by the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board and of the World Health Assembly and other applicable resolutions and decisions and respect the integrity, legitimacy and dignity of the proceedings. As such, they should avoid behaviours and actions, both inside and outside the conference room where the nomination and appointment take place, that could be perceived as aiming at influencing its outcome.
3. Member States should respect the confidentiality of the proceedings and the secrecy of the votes. In particular, they should refrain from communicating or broadcasting the proceedings during the private meetings through electronic devices.
4. In view of the secret nature of the vote for the nomination and appointment of the Director-General, Member States should refrain from publicly announcing in advance their intention to vote for a particular candidate.

IV. Internal candidates

1. WHO staff members, including the Director-General in office, who are proposed for the post of Director-General, are subject to the obligations contained in the WHO Constitution, Staff Regulations and Staff Rules as well as to the guidance which may be issued from time to time by the Director-General.
2. WHO staff members who are proposed for the post of Director-General must observe the highest standard of ethical conduct and strive to avoid any appearance of impropriety. WHO staff members must clearly separate their WHO functions from their candidacy and avoid any overlap, or perception of overlap, between campaign activities and their work for WHO. They also have to avoid any perception of conflict of interest.
3. WHO staff members are subject to the authority of the Director-General, in accordance with the applicable regulations and rules, in case of allegations of breach of their duties with regard to their campaign activities.
4. The Health Assembly or the Executive Board may call upon the Director-General to apply Staff Rule 650 concerning special leave to staff members who have been proposed for the post of Director-General.

ANNEX 2

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF CANDIDATES' FORUMS HELD BY PAHO, ILO AND WIPO

Candidates' forum: current practices		
PAHO ¹	ILO ²	WIPO ³
Timing and duration		
Held on the margins of the Executive Committee session preceding the session of the Pan American Sanitary Conference	Before the election by the Governing Body	One day informal meeting one month before the meeting of the Coordination Committee which would nominate a candidate
The June 2012 forum lasted for one day (8.5 hours)	The time allocated to candidates for making their presentation and responding to questions shall be determined by the Officers; equal time is allocated to each candidate.	The April 2008 informal meeting lasted for one day.
	The March 2012 interviews lasted for two days. ⁴	
Chairman		
The forum is conducted by the President of the Executive Committee.	The interviews are conducted by the Chairperson of the Governing Body.	The informal meeting was conducted by the Chair of the Coordination Committee.
Participation		
All Member States, Participating States and Associate Members could attend in-person or via a virtual session using PAHO's web conferencing service. The virtual session is available in English and Spanish. The forum is closed to the public.	Special, private sitting of the Governing Body, ⁵ only regular and deputy Members and their substitutes would be entitled to participate. A separate facility with video link was provided for observation of the proceedings.	Member States only. Video-conferencing was not used.

¹ Document CE150/INF/1 on Process for the Election of the Director of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau and Nomination of the Regional Director of the World Health Organization for the Americas.

² See Annex III to the Compendium of rules applicable to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office (revised revision); adopted by the Governing Body at its 240th Session (May–June 1998) and amended at its 312th Session (November 2011).

³ At WIPO, there has been one Candidates' Forum, held in April 2008, before the election of the present Director-General. It was organized at the discretion of the Coordination Committee, which nominates a candidate for appointment by the General Assembly. For more information see: Press Room, WIPO, 14 April 2008, PR/2008/548, http://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/articles/2008/article_0020.html (accessed 4 December 2012).

⁴ See Programme of hearings of the candidates to the post of ILO Director-General (http://www.ilo.org/gb/about-governing-body/appointment-of-director-general/WCMS_175731/lang--en/index.htm; accessed 4 December 2012).

⁵ The Governing Body is the Executive Body of ILO and is composed of 56 titular Members (28 Governments, 14 Employers and 14 Workers) and 66 Deputy Members (28 Governments, 19 Employers and 19 Workers). See: <http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/how-the-ilo-works/governing-body/lang--en/index.htm> (accessed 4 December 2012).

Format		
Each candidate is allowed no more than 30 minutes to make an oral presentation, including on the candidates' platform outlining his or her vision, proposed policy priorities and financial and programmatic direction for the Organization. The presentation is followed by a 60 minute question-and-answer session. The time limit is strictly enforced using a lighting system.	During the March 2012 interviews, 10 minutes were allocated for an introduction by candidates, which was followed by two rounds of questions and answers. If the candidate did not use the full 10 minutes for his or her introduction, any unused time was added to his or her time for response in the second round. ¹	During the April 2008 informal meeting, 25 minutes were allocated for the presentation and questions and answers. Each candidate managed their time allotment between the presentation and questions and answers. Each candidate made a presentation, which was followed by questions and answers.
Order of candidates		
The order of the candidates is determined by lot. They are called on one at a time.	The order of candidates is determined by a random drawing by the Governing Body Chairperson; candidates are informed of the date and approximate time of their hearing at least one week before the hearing.	They appeared one at a time with no other candidate present. The first candidate was chosen randomly and then alphabetical order followed.
Process for questions and answers		
60 minutes is allotted for questions and answers. At the beginning of the oral presentation, each Member State, Participating State and Associate Member present receives a piece of paper on which they may write a single question, which is then given to the President of the Executive Committee. Those participating via the virtual session may also submit questions to the President using the "chat area". The President counts all the questions so that everyone knows how many questions may be asked. Then the questions are put in a bag and read one at a time. Candidates have three minutes to respond to each question.	In the first round of questions and answers, the following allocations of time are observed: Workers' questions: 5 minutes Employers' questions: 5 minutes Governments' questions: 10 minutes Candidate's response: 20 minutes In the second round of questions and answers, the following allocations of time are observed: Workers' questions: 3 minutes Employers' questions: 3 minutes Governments' questions: 12 minutes Candidate's response: 12 minutes ²	Each regional group of Member States formulated three questions each. Questions were provided to candidates in advance. The Chair of the informal meeting selected the questions by random and posed them to the candidates.

¹ See Programme of hearings of the candidates to the post of ILO Director-General (http://www.ilo.org/gb/about-governing-body/appointment-of-director-general/WCMS_175731/lang--en/index.htm; accessed 4 December 2012).

² See Format of the hearings of candidates for the post of Director-General of the ILO (http://www.ilo.org/gb/about-governing-body/appointment-of-director-general/WCMS_175732/lang--en/index.htm; accessed 4 December 2012).

Documentation		
Verbatim transcripts of the presentations and discussions at the forum are sent to each Member State, Participating State and Associate Member	Candidates are invited to provide (in English, French and Spanish) their curriculum vitae and a statement of no more than 2000 words describing their vision and the strategic direction they would pursue if elected. Only statements received at the same time as the candidatures shall be receivable. These documents are distributed to the Members of the Governing Body and Member States not represented in the Governing Body.	Candidates provided their own promotional literature, which was distributed by the Secretariat. The Secretariat did not translate any documentation. No transcripts or records were made.
Interpretation		
English, French, Portuguese and Spanish	English, French and Spanish	English, French and Spanish
Costs		
Nominated candidates, Member States, Participating States and Associate Members are responsible for all expenses related to their participation in the forum. In June 2012, the Secretariat covered interpretation costs, which totalled US\$ 6480 at the time of the forum in June 2012.	Equivalent to a regular one-day governing body session (a three-day session costs about US\$ 390 000, which includes the travel and per diem costs of some governing body Members)	30 000 Swiss francs, of which 25 000 Swiss francs was for interpretation and 5000 Swiss francs for logistics.

ANNEX 3

BREAKDOWN OF FORESEEABLE COSTS FOR THE CANDIDATES' FORUM

	Immediately before the Executive Board	Two months before the Executive Board
Executive Board Chairman	1 701	4 500
10 Candidates (estimate)	40 000	40 000
Executive Board room hire	0	0
Interpretation	22 836	22 836
Conference staff costs (three ushers and one operator)	1 600	1 600
Overtime	2 000	2 000
Total	68 137	70 936

ANNEX 4

PROPOSED STANDARD FORM FOR CURRICULUM VITAE**WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION****FORM FOR CURRICULUM VITAE***

Family name (surname): First/other names:	Attach recent photograph
Gender:	
Place and country of birth:	Date of birth (Day/Month/Year):
Citizenship:	
If you have ever been found guilty of the violation of any law (except minor traffic violations) give full particulars:	
Civil status:	Number of dependants:
Address to which correspondence should be sent:	Telephone: Mobile phone: Fax: E-mail:

*This form, along with the response to the written statement included within (page 22), should be submitted along with the names of the candidate, to the Director-General, not later than [-----].

Degrees/certificates obtained:

(Please indicate here the principal degrees/certificates obtained, with dates and names of institutions. Additional pages may be added.)

Knowledge of languages		Mother tongue	Speak	Read	Write
<p>For languages other than mother tongue, enter appropriate number from code below to indicate level of your language knowledge. If no knowledge, please leave blank.</p> <p>CODE: 1. Limited conversation, reading of newspapers, routine correspondence.</p> <p>2. Engage freely in discussions, read and write more difficult material</p> <p>3. Fluent (nearly) as in mother tongue</p>	Arabic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	French	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Spanish	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Russian	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Others (please specify)				

Positions held

Please indicate here the positions and work experience held during your professional career, with the corresponding dates, duties, achievements/accomplishments and responsibilities. Additional pages may be added.

Please state any other relevant facts that might help in the evaluation of your application. List your activities in civil, professional, public or international affairs.

Please list here a maximum of 10 publications - especially the main ones in the field of public health, with names of journals, books or reports in which they appeared. An additional page may be used for this purpose, if necessary. (Please feel free also to attach a complete list of all publications.) Do not attach the publications themselves.

Please list hobbies, sports, skills and any other relevant facts that might help in the evaluation of your application:

WRITTEN STATEMENT (your response to each question should be no longer than [----]words).

1. Please evaluate how you meet each of the “Criteria for candidates for the post of the Director-General of the World Health Organization” (see attached sheet). In so doing, please make reference to specific elements of your curriculum vitae to support your evaluation. The criteria adopted by the Health Assembly in resolution WHA65.15 are the following:

- (1) a strong technical background in a health field, including experience in public health;
- (2) exposure to and extensive experience in international health;
- (3) demonstrable leadership skills and experience;
- (4) excellent communication and advocacy skills;
- (5) demonstrable competence in organizational management;
- (6) sensitivity to cultural, social and political differences;
- (7) strong commitment to the mission and objectives of WHO;
- (8) good health condition required of all staff members of the Organization; and
- (9) sufficient skill in at least one of the official working languages of the Executive Board and the Health Assembly.

2. Please state your vision on priorities and strategies for the World Health Organization.

ANNEX 5

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO RULE 52 OF THE
RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

EXISTING TEXT	PROPOSED REVISED TEXT
1. At least six months before the date fixed for the opening of a session of the Board at which a Director-General is to be nominated, the Director-General shall inform Member States that they may propose persons for nomination by the Board for the post of Director-General.	At least nine months before the date fixed for the opening of a session of the Board at which a nomination for the post of Director-General has to take place, the Director-General shall inform Member States that they may propose persons for nomination by the Board for the post of Director-General.
2. Any Member State may propose for the post of Director-General one or more persons, submitting with the proposal the curriculum vitae or other supporting information for each person. Such proposals shall be sent under confidential sealed cover to the Chairman of the Executive Board, care of the World Health Organization in Geneva (Switzerland), so as to reach the headquarters of the Organization not less than two months before the date fixed for the opening of the session.	Any Member State may propose for the post of Director-General one or more persons, submitting with the proposal the curriculum vitae or other supporting information for each person. Such proposals shall be sent under confidential sealed cover to the Chairman of the Executive Board, care of the World Health Organization in Geneva (Switzerland), so as to reach the headquarters of the Organization not less than four months before the date fixed for the opening of the session.
3. The Chairman of the Board shall open the proposals received sufficiently in advance of the session so as to ensure that all proposals, curricula vitae and supporting information are translated into all official languages, duplicated and dispatched to all Member States one month before the date fixed for the opening of the session.	<p>The Chairman of the Board shall open the proposals received sufficiently in advance of the session so as to ensure that all proposals, curricula vitae and supporting information are translated into all official languages, duplicated and dispatched to all Member States three months before the date fixed for the opening of the session.</p> <p>Immediately after the dispatch to Member States of the proposals, curricula vitae and supporting information, the Director-General shall, in consultation with the Chairman of the Board, convene a candidates' forum open to all Member States and Associate Members, to which all candidates will be invited to make themselves and their vision known to Member States on an equal basis. The candidates' forum shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Board and shall be held not later than two months before the opening of the session. The Board shall decide on the modalities of the candidates' forum. The candidates' forum shall not be convened in case only one person has been proposed for the post of Director-General.</p>
4. If no proposals have been received by the deadline referred to in the second paragraph of this Rule, the Director-General shall immediately inform all Member States of this fact and that they may propose persons for nomination in accordance with this Rule, provided such proposals reach the Chairman of the Board at least two weeks prior to the date fixed for the opening of the session of the Board. The Chairman shall inform Member States of all such proposals as soon as possible.	<i>[No change]</i>

5. All members of the Board shall have the opportunity to participate in an initial screening of all candidatures in order to eliminate those candidates not meeting the criteria proposed by the Board and approved by the Health Assembly.	[No change]
6. The Board shall decide, by a mechanism to be determined by it, on a short list of candidates. This short list shall be drawn up at the commencement of its session, and the selected candidates shall be interviewed by the Board meeting as a whole as soon as possible thereafter.	[No change]
7. The interviews should consist of a presentation by each selected candidate in addition to answers to questions from members of the Board. If necessary, the Board may extend the session in order to hold the interviews and make its selection.	[No change]
8. The Board shall fix a date for the meeting at which it shall elect a person by secret ballot from among the candidates on the short list.	The Board shall fix a date for the meeting at which it shall nominate three persons by secret ballot from among the candidates on the short list. In exceptional circumstances where the nomination of three candidates is not practicable such as where there are only one or two candidates, the Board may decide to nominate fewer than three candidates.
9. For this purpose each member of the Board shall write on his ballot paper the name of a single candidate chosen from the short list. If no candidate obtains the majority required, the candidate who obtains the least number of votes shall be eliminated at each ballot. If the number of candidates is reduced to two and if there is a tie between these two candidates after three further ballots, the procedure shall be resumed on the basis of the short list originally established at the commencement of the balloting.	For the purpose of nominating three candidates, each member of the Board shall write on his ballot paper the names of three candidates, chosen from the short list. Those candidates obtaining in the first ballot the majority required shall be elected. If the number of candidates obtaining such majority is less than the number of places to be filled, the candidate having received the least number of votes shall be eliminated at each ballot. If two candidates tie for the least number of votes, a separate ballot shall be held between them and the candidate receiving the least number of votes shall be eliminated. The same mechanism shall apply, mutatis mutandis, when the Board decides to nominate fewer than three candidates.
10. The name of the person so nominated shall be announced at a public meeting of the Board and submitted to the Health Assembly.	The names of the person or persons so nominated shall be announced at a public meeting of the Board and submitted to the Health Assembly.

ANNEX 6

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY¹***Rule 70*

Decisions by the Health Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting. These questions shall include: the adoption of conventions or agreements; the approval of agreements bringing the Organization into relation with the United Nations and with intergovernmental organizations and agencies in accordance with Articles 69, 70 and 72 of the Constitution; amendments to the Constitution; ~~appointment of the Director-General~~; decisions on the amount of the effective working budget; and decisions to suspend the voting privileges and services of a Member under Article 7 of the Constitution.

Rule 108

The Health Assembly shall consider the Board's nomination at a private meeting and shall come to a decision by secret ballot.

If the Board nominates three persons, the following procedure shall apply:

- (a) **If in the first ballot a candidate obtains a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, he or she will be appointed Director-General. If no candidate obtains the required majority, the candidate having received the least number of votes shall be eliminated. If two candidates tie for the least number of votes, a separate ballot shall be held between them and the candidate receiving the least number of votes shall be eliminated.**
- (b) **In the subsequent ballot, a candidate will be appointed Director-General if he or she obtains a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting.**
- (c) **If no candidate receives the majority indicated in subparagraph (b), a candidate will be appointed Director-General if he or she receives in the subsequent ballot a majority of the Member States of the World Health Organization.**
- (d) **If no candidate receives the majority indicated in subparagraph (c), a candidate will be appointed Director-General if he or she receives in the subsequent ballot at least 80 votes. In case both candidates receive at least 80 votes, the candidate obtaining the highest number of votes shall be appointed as Director-General.**
- (e) **If no candidate receives the majority indicated in subparagraph (d), a candidate will be appointed Director-General if he or she receives in the subsequent ballot a majority of the Members present and voting.**

If the Board nominates two persons, the procedure provided in the preceding paragraph shall apply with the exception of subparagraph (a).

If the Board nominates one person, and in the absence of any objection, the Health Assembly may decide to appoint that person without taking a ballot. If a ballot is required, the Health Assembly shall decide by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting.

¹ Deletions are shown with strikethrough; insertions are shown in **bold** type face.