



REGIONAL COMMITTEE

SEA/RC18/7

Provisional Agenda item 11

26 July 1965

PROCEDURE FOR THE NOMINATION OF REGIONAL DIRECTORS

Article 52 of the Constitution reads as follows: "The head of the regional office shall be the Regional Director appointed by the Board in agreement with the regional committee." Article 49 of the Constitution reads: "Regional committees shall adopt their own rules of procedure". The procedures adopted by the Regional Committee for South-East Asia for the nomination of the Regional Director are laid down in Rule 49 of the Committee's Rules of Procedure.

The Executive Board at its nineteenth session, in January 1957, first considered the desirability of making a change in the method of appointing regional directors. The Director-General was asked to make a study of this question, taking into account any comments which should be invited from the regional committees (resolution EB19.R61). At its tenth session, in 1957, the Regional Committee for South-East Asia considered this matter, expressed its satisfaction with the existing method of appointing the regional directors and recommended no change (resolution SEA/RC10/R3). The resolution and relevant excerpts from the report and minutes of the Regional Committee are attached as Annex 1.

The Executive Board at its twenty-third session, in January 1959, decided that at that time it was not necessary to make any change in the practice being followed (resolution EB23.R51).

However, at its thirty-first session, in January 1963, the Board had before it a proposal for amendments to the procedure for nomination which had been referred to it by the Regional Committee for Europe. After discussion, the Executive Board requested the Director-General to study the question and to report back to the Board at a future session (resolution EB31.R17).

At its thirty-third session, in January 1964, the Executive Board considered the Director-General's report on the subject and adopted a resolution (EB33.R42) inviting further consideration by regional committees. (The resolution and the Director-General's report, including the amendments being considered by the Regional Committee for Europe, are attached as Annexes 2 and 3).

The Regional Committee for Europe last year postponed action on the subject, pending further study by the Director-General (EUR/RC14/11 Rev.1,p.12). However, the Regional Committee for the Western Pacific at its fifteenth session, in September 1964, considered the question and decided to amend its rules of procedure in order to provide for a change in the method of nominating the Regional Director. At the thirty-fifth session of the Executive Board, in January of this year, the Director-General brought this decision to the attention of members of the Board, transmitting to them the text of the resolution adopted by the Regional Committee for the Western Pacific (resolution WP/RC15.R2 attached as Annex 4). The Executive Board, in resolution EB35.R22 (see Annex 5), noted this and again invited the attention of the other regional committees to its resolution EB33.R42, mentioned above.

It is now for the Regional Committee to decide whether, in the light of the foregoing, it wishes to reconsider its previous decision made at the tenth session (see Annex 1) or whether it is still satisfied with the current procedure for making such nominations.

In the event that it decides to amend this previous decision, it is suggested that there will be two major considerations in revising the Rules of Procedure (Rule 49), viz., (1) the establishment of a list of candidates, by inviting proposals, with details of each candidate, from Member Governments in advance of the Regional Committee's session, and (2) the number of candidates to be nominated for presentation to the Executive Board.

Consideration (1) is straightforward and presents no special problems. If the Committee should agree with this principle, it may wish to revise Rule 49 on the lines of the revision made by the Regional Committee for the Western Pacific.

Consideration (2) is really the major problem: whether to present one, two or three names to the Executive Board. If it is decided to present more than one, it will mean that it will be the Board which will make the final selection of the Regional Director but from a panel submitted by the Regional Committee. It is for the Committee to decide whether it wishes to make such a change. Again, if it is agreed that more than one candidate will be nominated, there is the question of whether these names should be presented in order of preference to the Executive Board so that the Board may know more accurately the mind of the Committee with regard to each candidate. Is it likely that two candidates of equal merit can be nominated, i.e., candidates who are equally good and will be equally acceptable to the Regional Committee? If not, the establishment of an order of preference would seem to be inevitable.

There is one further consideration: that the Regional Committee might not be able to nominate more than one acceptable candidate. To provide for this eventuality, the Committee would probably need to ensure that its Rules of Procedure were flexible enough to permit it to submit only one name in such circumstances.

It is suggested that all these considerations be generally discussed in plenary session and that in the light of the discussions, if it is decided to make a change, a Sub-Committee on Rules of Procedure be appointed to draft concrete revisions to the existing Rule 49 for consideration by the Regional Committee.

Previous Action by the Regional Committee for South-East Asia

The item "Method of Appointing Regional Directors" formed part of the agenda of the tenth session of the Regional Committee for South-East Asia, held in Rangoon from 16 to 20 September 1957.

At this session, the Regional Committee adopted the following resolution (SEA/RC10/R3):

"The Regional Committee,

"Taking into account the request of the Executive Board for comments from the Regional Committees on a proposed change in the method of appointing regional directors,

1. EXPRESSES its satisfaction with the present method;
2. RECOMMENDS that there should be no change in the existing procedures regarding the method of appointing regional directors."

This subject also formed a part of Part IV of the Regional Committee's report on this session (SEA/RC10/22 page 15), item (4) of which reads as follows:

"(4) Method of Appointing Regional Directors

"The Regional Committee had been invited to express its opinion on a proposal, which was before the Executive Board, to revise the existing procedure for the selection of Regional Directors. It was not in favour of this revision, which calls for the initial selection of Regional Directors to be made by the Board and then confirmed by the Regional Committee (see document SEA/RC10/8). It was agreed that the present method of appointing regional directors was proving entirely satisfactory and should continue unchanged (resolution SEA/RC10/R3).

"The Committee was not in favour of a further suggestion made in the Board that a regional director might be recruited from a region other than the one in which he would be serving. It felt that a person from the Region was more suitable both technically and administratively to serve the Region, as he would be fully familiar with regional conditions and would have the confidence of the governments with which he would work."

The following is the relevant excerpt from the minutes of this

session (SEA/RC10/Min.4 Rev.1, page 1):

1. Method of Appointing Regional Directors  
(item 13 of the agenda)

The REGIONAL DIRECTOR gave a brief introduction to the document on this subject (SEA/RC10/8). The Regional Committee had been invited to express its comments on a proposal which was before the Executive Board: to change the existing procedure of the selection of regional directors by regional committees and confirmation by the Board to that of selection by the Board and confirmation by regional committees.

DR MG MAUNG GYI (Burma) said that since the present method of appointing regional directors was proving entirely satisfactory, he failed to see where the advantage lay in reversing the procedure. This Regional Committee had expressed the opinion that the system of regionalization was working to the complete satisfaction of the governments in the Region and should not be changed. There had also been a suggestion in the Board that a regional director need not necessarily be recruited from the region in which he would be serving. He did not agree with this view. A person from the region was more suitable, both technically and administratively, to serve the region, as he would be fully familiar with regional conditions. The Committee should express itself clearly on this matter.

Supporting the views of the Burmese delegate, DR JUNGALWALLA (India) stressed that the initiative and responsibility for nominating regional directors should be primarily that of the regional committees, as this would ensure that a regional director had the confidence of the governments in the region in which he was to work. The system of decentralization and regionalization of WHO had been commended by other international organizations, and the method of appointing regional directors had worked satisfactorily for the last ten years and should be continued.

It was suggested by DR SULIANTI (Indonesia) that deputy regional directors might be appointed by regional committees and eventually be made regional directors.

The REGIONAL DIRECTOR replied that the post of deputy regional director did exist but was filled by appointment by the Director-General, in consultation with regional directors and not by the regional committees. However, the regional committees had the right and the opportunity to nominate deputies or any other senior officers of the regional offices as regional directors if they were considered suitable.

The Committee agreed to recommend that the present arrangement for the nomination of regional directors should continue unchanged, and asked that its comments be placed before the Executive Board.

Text of the Executive Board's Resolution on the Procedure  
for the Nomination of Regional Directors (EB33.R42)  
(Resolution adopted at its thirty-third session, in January 1964)

"The Executive Board,

"Having considered the report of the Director-General on the procedure for the nomination of regional directors; and

"Believing that adoption of the proposal transmitted by the European Regional Committee at its twelfth session as well as of the additional suggestion of the Director-General might facilitate the consideration of candidacies for the important post of regional director,

"INVITES the attention of regional committees to the Director-General's report and requests them to consider the suggestions contained therein in regard to the procedure for the nomination of regional directors."

Procedure for the Nomination of Regional Directors

Report by the Director-General<sup>1</sup>

1. Introduction

1.1 The Executive Board, at its thirty-first session in January 1963, having considered a proposal dealing with the procedure for the nomination of regional directors, referred to the Board by the Regional Committee for Europe at its twelfth session, adopted resolution EB31.R17. The proposal is described in the excerpt from regional committee document EUR/RC12/4, Addendum 2, of 16 August 1962, reproduced in Appendix 1. A summary of the action of the Regional Committee is reflected in the minutes of the sixth meeting of the thirty-first session of the Executive Board (Appendix 2). In its resolution the Board requested the Director-General "to study this question and to report to the Executive Board at a future session". The Director-General in the following paragraphs submits certain suggestions which he believes the Board may wish to consider.

2. Regional Procedure for Suggesting Candidates

2.1 Although it was appropriate for the Regional Committee for Europe to refer this matter to the Executive Board because of its implications for other regions, the proposal itself deals with an element of procedure of the regional committees which it is within the competence of each regional committee to decide. For the practical reasons adduced by the sponsors of the proposals, it would appear that the advance notice envisaged would facilitate the consideration by the regional committee of candidates for the post of regional director. As to the recipient of suggested candidacies, it would be the correct arrangement to provide that they be invited by, and forwarded to, the Director-General, since, in accordance with the provisions of Article 32 of the Constitution, he is ex officio secretary of all committees of the Organization.

2.2 Provision for advance suggestion of candidate(s) by a Member government, and circulation of the names, together with curricula vitae, would not apply to an incumbent, who would, of course, be considered, if eligible, unless he had declared himself not interested in further service.

2.3 Should the Board agree that the proposal, originating in the Regional Committee for Europe, is a useful one for general application, it may wish to recommend to all regional committees that they consider its adoption.

---

<sup>1</sup>Off. Rec. Wld Hlth Org. 132, Appendix 19

### 3. Consideration of Candidates by the Executive Board

3.1 In addition to dealing with this first part of the proposal, submitted to it by the Regional Committee for Europe, the Board may wish to take the occasion to consider another aspect of the procedure for nominating regional directors. As the Board is aware, under arrangements up to this time the provisions of Article 52 of the Constitution are implemented by the regional committee's forwarding to the Executive Board a single name for its consideration. The Board is thus in the position of either having to accept or reject the sole candidate presented to it. Should the Board on some occasion not concur in the recommendation of a regional committee, a request for the submission of another name would need to be made.

3.2 Since it would appear from the text of Article 52 of the Constitution that its framers intended the major responsibility for decision to rest with the Executive Board,<sup>1</sup> it would appear reasonable that the Board request regional committees normally to submit the names of more than one candidate (for example, three) so as to permit the Board to exercise its responsibilities of making the appointment. Should the regional committee decide to propose the reappointment of the current incumbent to the exclusion of any other candidate, it could in this case put forward a single name.

3.3 The proposal contained in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 is in addition to the suggestions transmitted to the Board by the Regional Committee for Europe. Should the Board agree that this suggestion might enhance the proper discharge of its responsibilities, the Board may wish to transmit it to the regional committees with the recommendation that they follow such a procedure in the future.

3.4 In accordance with the provisions of Rules 18 and 19 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board, the Director-General would expect to make available to the Board any information in his possession relevant to the Board's consideration of the candidates presented, including such information as was available to him from the retiring regional director.

#### Appendix 1

Extract from European Regional Committee Document EUR/RC12/4  
Addendum 2, Dated 16 August 1962

#### Amendments<sup>2</sup>

Rule 46: Substitute the following for the present rule:

1. At each of its sessions, other than sessions convened under Rule 5, the Committee shall elect a person to act as nominations officer for the purposes

---

<sup>1</sup>The record of the discussion of this matter when the Constitution was framed at the International Health Conference, which appears in Official Records No.2, pp.63-66, is reproduced as Appendix 3.

<sup>2</sup>These amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Regional Committee were proposed by the Government of Ireland in a document presented to the Regional



of this rule and a person to act as deputy for the nominations officer in the event of his being unable to act. The nominations officer and his deputy shall hold office until the election of their successors. Any subsequent reference in this rule to the nominations officer shall be construed as including a reference to the deputy acting in place of the nominations officer.

2. Not less than three months before the date fixed for the opening of a session of the Committee at which a person is due to be nominated as regional director, the nominations officer shall inform each Member of the Region that he will receive at a specified address proposals of the names of persons for nomination by the Committee as regional director.

3. Any Member of the Region may propose the name of a person, who has indicated his willingness to act as regional director, submitting with the proposal particulars of the person's qualifications and experience. Such proposals shall be sent to the nominations officer, so as to reach him not less than six weeks before the date fixed for the opening of the session.

4. The nominations officer shall, not less than four weeks before the date fixed for the opening of the session, cause copies of all proposals for nomination as regional director (with particulars of qualifications and experience) received by him within the period specified to be sent to each Member of the Region. Copies shall also be sent to each representative appointed to attend the session of the Committee.

5. The nomination of regional director shall take place at a private meeting of the Committee. The Committee shall make a selection by secret ballot from amongst the persons proposed in accordance with this rule, in the following manner:

(a) at each ballot, each representative entitled to vote shall write on his ballot paper the name of a single candidate chosen from those proposed in accordance with this rule;

(b) if a candidate obtains at any ballot the majority required under Rule 39, he shall be declared nominated;

(c) if at a ballot no candidate obtains the required majority and one candidate obtains a lesser number of votes than any other candidate, he shall be eliminated and a further election ballot held;

(d) if at any ballot no candidate obtains the required majority and two or more candidates obtain the same lesser number of votes than other candidates, the Committee shall decide by ballot as to which of the candidates, obtaining such lesser number of votes shall be eliminated and, such candidate having been eliminated, a further election ballot shall be held.

6. If the number of candidates is reduced to two and if there is a tie between those two candidates after three further ballots, the names of both those candidates shall be forwarded, for selection, to the Executive Board.

7. The name of the person or persons so nominated shall be announced at a public meeting of the Committee and submitted to the Executive Board.

#### Comments

Under the amended Rule 46, some changes would be made in the procedure antecedent to the nomination by secret ballot of the regional director. It is considered that the changes made would effect an improvement in the procedure.

Under the present Rule 46, candidates for nomination as regional director are proposed at the meeting at which the balloting takes place. It can thus readily happen that some of the candidates proposed may not be known to all those who are voting. The main object of the changes proposed in the rule is to introduce a procedure under which there will be advance nomination of candidates, thus affording the representatives an opportunity of assessing their comparative qualifications and experience in advance.

Briefly, the revised rule would provide that the Committee would appoint a nominations officer and that it would be his duty to invite nominations three months before the date of the appropriate session and transmit particulars of the nominations which he had received to the representatives at least four weeks before the opening of the session. The revised rule would not make any substantial change in the present procedure for balloting, the only modification made being that in paragraph 5 (d), which clarifies the position which might arise on a ballot where two candidates tied for bottom place.

Under the present rule it is provided that where there is a tie in the election which cannot be resolved by three further ballots, the whole procedure for nomination and balloting is recommenced. This would not be appropriate under the revised procedure suggested. Paragraph 6 of the revised rule accordingly provides that, where a deadlock is reached, the two names will be forwarded to the Executive Board for selection of the appointee.

#### Appendix 2

Extract from the Minutes of the Sixth Meeting of the Thirty-First Session of the Executive Board, Held on Friday, 18 January 1963<sup>1</sup>

2. Report on the Twelfth Session of the Regional Committee for Europe.

DR VAN DE CALSEYDE, Regional Director for Europe, (said that)....

---

<sup>1</sup> ECU/Min/6 Rev. 1.167-168.

among other proposals the (Regional) Committee (for Europe) had had before it the amendment proposed by the Government of Ireland concerning the procedure for the nomination of a Regional Director. The proposal was, briefly, that nominations for the post of Regional Director should be submitted before the opening of the Committee's session and not, as at present, at the time of election. Moreover, it was suggested that should it prove impossible to reach a decision, the names of the two remaining candidates should be submitted to the Executive Board for final decision. The Regional Committee had considered that those proposals were outside the competence of the Regional Committee for Europe and that since the matter concerned other regions and the Executive Board it would be preferable to refer the matter to the Board. The Regional Committee had indicated that it was favourably disposed in principle towards the adoption of the proposed amendment and that it desired to reconsider it at a later session.

### Appendix 3

#### Extract from the Minutes of the Eleventh Meeting of the International Health Conference, Held on Tuesday, 16 July 1946<sup>1</sup>

1. Resumption of Discussion on the Report of Committee V: Regional Arrangements

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the tenth plenary meeting discussion on sub-sections (b) and (c) of Article C, Section XII (Regional Arrangements) had been postponed.

These sub-sections read:

(b) The head of the regional office should be the regional director, appointed by the regional committee subject to the approval of the Executive Board.

(c) The regional director should appoint the staff of the regional office in accordance with the staff regulations to be approved by the regional committee and the Director-General.

MR SANDIFER (United States of America) said that, if the World Health Organization were to be capable of dealing with health problems throughout the world, it must be an organization which all the delegations could support. The attainment of that objective would require mutual concessions, made in a spirit of collaboration.

---

<sup>1</sup>Off. Rec. Wld Hlth Org.2,63-66

The United States delegation felt it especially important that all, or practically all, the members of the Conference should be in agreement on the provisions contained in sub-sections (b) and (c), and for that reason he moved that the text of those sub-sections be replaced by the following text:

(b) The head of the regional office should be the regional director, appointed by the Executive Board in agreement with the regional committee.

(c) The staff of the regional office should be appointed in a manner to be determined by agreement between the Director-General and the regional director.

DR BUSTAMANTE (Mexico) said that the amendment of sub-section (b) proposed by the delegate of the United States of America was in essence what the Mexican delegation had been insisting upon, and the new wording suggested for sub-section (c) was likewise satisfactory. The Mexican delegation therefore seconded the motion.

DR VALLARINO (Panama) supported the proposal by the United States delegation on the ground that it was just, and tended towards co-operation and co-ordination in the best sense of those words.

DR URIBE AGUIRRE (Colombia) also supported the proposal, for the reasons advanced by the delegate of Mexico.

MR KAUNIZE (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that the United Kingdom delegation was actuated by the principle of supporting a single World Health Organization. Its view on regional arrangements had been governed by the necessity of welding health organizations throughout the world into a single whole. He considered that the amendments proposed by the United States delegation met very well the United Kingdom delegation's wishes in that respect, and also provided the contact with the regional committees which would enable them to take their share in the selection of the regional officers.

DR KROTKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered the motion of the United States delegation the best of all the proposals that had been presented. The formula could be fully and certainly accepted by the Soviet delegation. It did not in any way oppose the democratic principles of the structure of the Organization, and would eliminate the danger of the Organization's becoming a gathering of members who, while respecting themselves, would have no common discipline. He therefore fully supported the proposal.

DR BUSTOS (Chile) added the support of his delegation, which considered the proposal very just, and one that would make for the best co-operation and co-ordination.

DR DE PAULA SOUZA (Brazil) felt that the motion made on the previous day to postpone discussion on sub-sections (b) and (c) had proved its value in saving time. There seemed to be general agreement with the amendments proposed by the United States delegation and he moved that they be accepted and the debate closed.

DR GINES (Paraguay) requested the delegate of Brazil to withdraw the motion for closure, as he wished to state his views.

DR DE PAULA SOUZA (Brazil) said that his intention in proposing closure of the debate had been the sound one of avoiding the expression by different delegates of virtually the same opinions. However, he did not wish the motion to have the effect of preventing anyone from bringing in new ideas.

DR GINES (Paraguay) regretted that he had to oppose the proposal of the United States delegation. The Latin American delegates had unanimously expressed their agreement on the necessity of creating a World Health Organization. They had, on the other hand, repeatedly pointed out that there existed in the Americas a health office that had been doing excellent work for a very long period, and which had even greatly contributed to the growth of pan-American consciousness and solidarity.

It must be borne in mind that that health office (the Pan American Sanitary Bureau) had come into being through legal action, through international agreements among the American nations, and it was specified in its rules that any agreement arrived at by nations signatory to the Pan American Health Agreement must be concluded through the Pan American Sanitary Bureau.

The Paraguayan delegation, therefore, had originally proposed that the nations represented in the Pan American Sanitary Bureau should join the World Health Organization by special agreement, but through the common act of the Bureau. On that basis they would all agree even to merging with the World Health Organization, even though that should reduce the efficiency and scope of the Bureau.

The Conference had a great responsibility, both from the point of view of the vast amount of work done in the past by the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, and from the point of view of the enormous future possibilities to be envisaged through the co-operation of all the peoples of the world.

The Paraguayan delegation was responsible for notifying the authorities of its country of any contemplated decisions, and must make clear that the spirit underlying the Pan American Sanitary Bureau would continue.

Although, basically, the Latin American delegations, like other delegations, wished to see a fraternal co-operation of all nations in the health field, he proposed that the Pan American Bureau should remain in their hands. It was intertwined in the happiness of a whole continent, and some change in the situation would profoundly affect the health of all the pan-American countries. An arbitrary termination of the Bureau would lead to all kinds of difficulties; and he was sure that other regional offices that might be in existence would also hold the principle that an organization could not be brushed aside without due regard to the basis on which it had been created under international agreements.

The Paraguayan delegation maintained that the director of a regional office should be appointed by the regional committee, and supported the proposal in the text as it stood, on the ground that it would assure the autonomy necessary to the regional offices for sound and efficient functioning.

DR THOMEN (Dominican Republic) agreed with the United States delegation's proposal for sub-section (b). The proposal for sub-section (c), however, might lead to difficulties if there should not be agreement between the Director-General and the regional director. He suggested, therefore, the insertion of a provision that, if the Director-General and the regional director could not come to agreement as to the appointment of subordinate personnel, the Executive Board should have the last word in the matter. Specifically, he proposed the addition to sub-section (c) of the words:

In a case where this agreement between the Director-General and the regional director cannot be established, the Executive Board will resolve the issue.

DR VASQUEZ (Ecuador) supported the proposal of the delegate of the Dominican Republic.

In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, MR SANDIFER (United States of America) said that he had no objection to the amendment proposed by the delegate of the Dominican Republic.

DR SANTAMARINA (Cuba) supported the United States proposal and expressed the hope that the democratic spirit underlying it would prevail in the future and lead to the establishment of a balance between the regional authorities on the one hand and the central organization on the other. He hoped that, in the future, the regional committee would not be favoured to the disadvantage of the central organization, and, by the same token, that special favour would not be given to the Executive Board and the Director-General.

The Cuban delegation felt, however, that the appointment of the subordinate personnel of a regional office should be made by agreement between the Director-General and the regional director, without any provision to the effect that the last word might be with the Executive Board. If such a provision were added, it was possible that a principle underlying the United States proposal would be forfeited if, at some time in the future, a Director-General - not maliciously, but simply in an endeavour to extend his powers somewhat - should decide to oppose the regional director, because then the Executive Board would automatically have the last word in the matter. The Cuban delegation did not like that possibility, and therefore could not accept the motion of the delegate of the Dominican Republic.

The CHAIRMAN asked those who had supported the amendment proposed by the delegate of the United States of America whether they concurred in the proposal of the delegate of the Dominican Republic.

The delegates of Mexico, Panama and Colombia did not concur; the delegate of the United Kingdom said that he had no objection.

DR THOMEN (Dominican Republic) withdrew his motion, as it was not supported by the delegates who had supported the original motion by the delegate of the United States of America.

At this point the CHAIRMAN stated that because of a commitment made some months previously it would be necessary for him to turn the Chair over to one of the Vice-Presidents. He invited Dr Krotkov to take the Chair,

The CHAIRMAN (Dr Krotkov) thanked the delegates for the applause with which they had endorsed his taking of the Chair. As he wished to take part in the discussion, however, he asked Dr Shen to assume the chairmanship.

DR SHEN (China) said that he also wished to take part in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN (Dr Krotkov) said he would therefore continue to preside.

DR EVANG (Norway) felt that the text proposed for sub-section (b) by the delegate of the United States of America was perhaps the best compromise text that could be found in the circumstances. He was, however, much more reluctant to accept the text proposed by that delegation for sub-section (c). He himself advocated effective and strong regional offices, and he wondered whether the text, in its present form, was clear enough for that purpose. He felt it desirable to have on record an interpretation of the text, which he would endeavour now to give.

The international public health service provided by the World Health Organization must be honoured and of high degree, the highest service of its type, and one that would draw to it the best administrators, hygienists and scientists from all over the world.

Therefore, the expert staff - he was speaking only of the expert staff - must be built up in such a way as to utilize the experts who were available. For both the central and regional offices, there must be no discrimination of colour, country or religion. The only things to count should be the qualifications of the man - his gifts, education, character, personality; in fine, his potentiality to fulfil an important function in the central office or one of the regional offices of the Organization. He felt sure that such an interpretation was in accordance with the spirit of a single World Health Organization.

DR SHOUSHA PASHA (Egypt) opposed the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America and supported acceptance of the text as it stood in the report. He felt that the latter text would not impair in any way the solidarity of the Organization - the collaboration of the regional offices within the central office.

The Egyptian delegation felt also that the regional committee was the adequate and appropriate authority to nominate, in agreement with the Executive Board, the regional director.

DR ZWANCK (Argentina) supported the proposal of the United States delegation. It must be clear that the regional offices should play a harmonious role with the central organization within the World Health Organization.

Furthermore, the Argentine delegation heartily approved the principle that the best experts should be chosen for the staff, on the basis previously outlined.

He felt that a definite decision should now be taken.

Replying to a question by the CHAIRMAN, Dr ZWANCK said he was formally moving the closure of the debate. He added that he was doing so not in order to restrict freedom of speech, but because he was under the impression that the discussion had been exhausted and no new viewpoint could be expected to be put forward.

The CHAIRMAN declared the motion for closure seconded and, there being no objection, declared it carried.

He then put to a vote the amendment of sub-sections (b) and (c) proposed by the delegate of the United States of America.

The amendment was adopted by 41 votes to 7.

The CHAIRMAN then put to a vote Article C as a whole, as amended.

Article C, as amended, was adopted without a dissentient voice.



Text of the Resolution Adopted by the Regional Committee for  
the Western Pacific, in 1964, on Amendments to its Rules  
of Procedure (WP/RC15.R2)

"The Regional Committee,

"Considering Article 52 of the Constitution;

"Considering Article 49 of the Constitution;

"Considering Rule 53 of the Rules of Procedure of the Regional  
Committee;

"Having considered the report of the Sub-Committee appointed in  
accordance with Rule 53 of the Rules of Procedure,

"DECIDES to replace the present Rule 51 of the Rules of Procedure  
by the following text:

Rule 51

Not less than six months before the date fixed for the opening of a  
session of the Committee at which persons are due to be nominated for the  
post of Director, the Director-General shall inform each Member that he  
will receive proposals for the names of persons for nomination by the  
Committee for the post of Director.

Any Member may propose the name of one or more persons for the post  
of Director, submitting with the proposal particulars of each person's  
qualifications and experience. Such proposals shall be sent to the Director-  
General, so as to reach him at the Headquarters of the Organization at Geneva,  
Switzerland, not less than twelve weeks before the date fixed for the  
opening of the session.

The Director-General shall, not less than ten weeks before the date  
fixed for the opening of the session of the Committee, cause copies of all  
proposals for nomination for the post of Director (with particulars of  
qualifications and experience) received by him within the period specified  
to be sent to each Member.

If no proposals have been received by the Director-General in time for  
transmission to Members in accordance with this Rule, Members shall be  
informed accordingly not less than ten weeks before the opening of the  
session of the Committee. The Committee shall itself establish a list of  
candidates composed of the names proposed in secret by the representatives  
present and entitled to vote.

If the Director in office is available for reappointment, the Director-General shall inform each Member accordingly at the time when he invites proposals for names of nominees for the post of Director. The name of the Director in office thus available shall automatically be submitted to the Committee and shall not require a proposal from any Member.

The nomination of persons for the post of Director shall take place at a private meeting of the Committee. The Committee, unless provided otherwise by this Rule, shall elect not less than two and not more than three candidates by secret ballot from amongst the persons proposed in accordance with this Rule.

Separate voting shall be taken for each of the candidates to be elected.

For this purpose each representative entitled to vote shall write on his ballot paper the name of a single candidate chosen from amongst the persons proposed. 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, there shall be as many ballots as are necessary in order to secure a majority for either candidate. In the event of a tie between the remaining candidates after three such ballots, the whole voting procedure established by this paragraph shall be recommenced.

The same procedure shall be repeated for the election, among the persons proposed, of a second and then of a third candidate, unless, after the election of the second candidate, the Committee at the request of any representative decides by secret ballot not to proceed further.

The names of the persons so nominated shall be submitted to the Executive Board in the order of preference as indicated by the order of their election.

If the Director in office is available for reappointment the Committee may decide by secret ballot to submit his name to the Executive Board to the exclusion of any other candidate."

Text of the Executive Board's Resolution on the Procedure for  
the Nomination of Regional Directors (EB35.R22)

(Resolution adopted at its thirty-fifth Session, in January 1965)

"The Executive Board

"1. NOTES the report of the Director-General on the decision taken by the Regional Committee for the Western Pacific in regard to the procedure for the nomination of Regional Directors;<sup>1</sup> and

"2. INVITES the attention of the other regional committees to its resolution EB33.R42.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Document EB35/17.

<sup>2</sup>Off. Rec. Wld Hlth Org., 132, 23.