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Personal affiliation and background

Which country do you represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of the Americas</th>
<th>European Region</th>
<th>African Region</th>
<th>Eastern Mediterranean Region</th>
<th>Western Pacific Region</th>
<th>South-East Asia Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Togo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis includes Member State submissions received up to 15 November 2017.

How would you generally describe your involvement in the election process?

- Very little: 0%
- Moderate: 12%
- High: 47%
- Very high: 41%
Code of conduct

Have you read the code of conduct?

![Pie chart showing 95% Yes, 5% No]

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

- The code of conduct was clearly formulated
  - Strongly disagree: 2%
  - Disagree: 61%
  - Agree: 37%
  - Strongly agree: 0%

- The code of conduct facilitated an open, fair, equitable and transparent election process
  - Strongly disagree: 0%
  - Disagree: 25%
  - Agree: 50%
  - Strongly agree: 25%

- To my knowledge, all Member States respected the principles and requirements formulated in the code of conduct during the entire election process
  - Strongly disagree: 5%
  - Disagree: 75%
  - Agree: 20%
  - Strongly agree: 0%

- To my knowledge, all candidates respected the principles and requirements formulated in the code of conduct during the entire election process
  - Strongly disagree: 13%
  - Disagree: 66%
  - Agree: 21%
  - Strongly agree: 0%

Please rate your opinion about the overall value of the code of conduct:

- Overall value of the code of conduct
  - Poor: 10%
  - Fair: 69%
  - Good: 21%
  - Excellent: 0%

Should the code of conduct continue to be a regular feature of the election process in the future?

![Pie chart showing 26% Yes, 74% Yes, but with adjustments]

Yes
Yes, but with adjustments
No
Member States and candidates encouraged and promoted communication and cooperation among one another during the entire election process. Member States and candidates acted in good faith bearing in mind the shared objectives of promoting equity, openness.

Member States and candidates considered disclosing their campaign activities (for example, hosting of meetings, workshops and visits) and communicated them to the Secretariat. Information so disclosed was posted on a dedicated page of the WHO web site.

Member States and candidates referred to one another with respect; no Member State or candidate disrupted or impeded the campaign activities of other candidates at any time. Nor did any Member State or any candidate make any oral or written statement or o

Member States and candidates refrained 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.

Member States and candidates did not make promises or commitments in favour of, or accept instructions from, any person or entity, public or private, and avoided any other similar actions, when that could have undermined, or be perceived as having underm

Member States that proposed persons for the post of Director-General considered 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.

Member States that proposed persons for the post of Director-General facilitated meetings between their candidate and other Member States, if so requested. Wherever possible meetings between candidates and Member States were arranged on the occasion of co

Member States refrained from publicly announcing in advance their intention to vote for a particular candidate.

Candidates did not combine their official travel with campaigning activities, and avoided electoral promotion or propaganda under the guise of technical meetings or similar events.

Travel by candidates to Member States to promote their candidature were limited in order to avoid excessive expenditure which could have led to inequality among Member States and candidates. In this connection, Member States and candidates considered usi

Member States abided strictly by the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board and of the World Health Assembly and other applicable resolutions and decisions and respected the integrity, legitimacy and dignity of the proceedings. As such they avoided beh

WHO staff members who were proposed for the post of Director-General clearly separated their WHO functions from their candidacy and avoided any overlap, or perception of overlap, between campaign activities and their work for WHO.

Please indicate the extent to which you consider the following requirements, as laid down in the code of conduct, were observed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member States and candidates encouraged and promoted communication and cooperation among one another during the entire election process.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States and candidates considered disclosing their campaign activities (for example, hosting of meetings, workshops and visits) and communicated them to the Secretariat. Information so disclosed was posted on a dedicated page of the WHO web site.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States and candidates referred to one another with respect; no Member State or candidate disrupted or impeded the campaign activities of other candidates at any time. Nor did any Member State or any candidate make any oral or written statement or o</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States and candidates refrained 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.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States and candidates did not make promises or commitments in favour of, or accept instructions from, any person or entity, public or private, and avoided any other similar actions, when that could have undermined, or be perceived as having underm</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States that proposed persons for the post of Director-General considered 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.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States that proposed persons for the post of Director-General facilitated meetings between their candidate and other Member States, if so requested. Wherever possible meetings between candidates and Member States were arranged on the occasion of co</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States refrained from publicly announcing in advance their intention to vote for a particular candidate.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates did not combine their official travel with campaigning activities, and avoided electoral promotion or propaganda under the guise of technical meetings or similar events.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel by candidates to Member States to promote their candidature were limited in order to avoid excessive expenditure which could have led to inequality among Member States and candidates. In this connection, Member States and candidates considered usi</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal of candidates and publication of related information

Have you seen the information on candidates which was published on the WHO website?

- Yes: 95%
- No: 5%

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

- The process for proposal of candidates was adequate: 53% Agree, 47% Strongly agree
- The process for proposal of candidates was timely: 51% Agree, 47% Strongly agree
- The process for proposal of candidates was fair and duly executed: 48% Agree, 52% Strongly agree
- The information published on candidates was adequate: 60% Agree, 39% Strongly agree
- The information published on candidates was timely: 51% Agree, 49% Strongly agree
- The information published on candidates was useful and informative: 47% Agree, 51% Strongly agree

Please rate your opinion about the overall usefulness of the information published on candidates:

- Not at all useful: 0%
- Hardly useful: 25%
- Moderately useful: 50%
- Very useful: 75%
- Very useful: 100%

Overall usefulness of the information published on candidates: 29% Not at all useful, 71% Very useful

Should the current process for the proposal of candidates and the publication of related information be maintained in the future?

- Yes: 86%
- Yes, but with adjustments: 14%
- No: 0%

Overall usefulness of the information published on candidates: 29% Not at all useful, 71% Very useful
Web forum

Did you look at the web forum?

- Yes: 25%
- No: 75%

Did you post a question or comment on the web forum?

- Yes: 50%
- No: 50%

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

The web forum was easy to understand and use

- Strongly disagree: 2%
- Disagree: 13%
- Agree: 59%
- Strongly agree: 26%

The web forum was planned at an appropriate stage during the election process

- Strongly disagree: 2%
- Disagree: 7%
- Agree: 65%
- Strongly agree: 26%

The duration of the web forum (24 October to 13 November 2016) was adequate

- Strongly disagree: 2%
- Disagree: 17%
- Agree: 61%
- Strongly agree: 20%

The web forum was adequate as an additional platform for exchange with candidates

- Strongly disagree: 2%
- Disagree: 17%
- Agree: 63%
- Strongly agree: 17%

The web forum was a useful, informative component of the election process

- Strongly disagree: 2%
- Disagree: 20%
- Agree: 56%
- Strongly agree: 22%

Please rate your opinion about the overall usefulness of the web forum:

- Not at all useful: 2%
- Hardly useful: 10%
- Moderately useful: 41%
- Very useful: 47%

Should the web forum continue to be a regular feature of the election process in the future?

- Yes: 29%
- Yes, but with adjustments: 71%
- No: 0%
Candidates' forum

Did you attend the candidates’ forum?

- Yes: 30%
- No: 46%
- No, another representative attended it: 23%

Did you watch the candidates’ forum webcast on the WHO website?

- Yes: 29%
- No: 50%
- No, another representative watched it: 21%

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements based on your personal experience or that of another representative of your country:

- The candidates’ forum was a fair event and duly executed: 92%
- The candidates' forum was a useful, informative component of the election process: 56%
- The candidates’ forum was adequate as an additional platform for exchange with candidates: 35%
- The allocated time (30 minutes each) for candidates’ presentations was adequate: 25%
- The allocated time (30 minutes each) for the question and answer sessions following candidates’ presentations was adequate: 50%

Please indicate how you would suggest to adapt the time for candidates’ presentations:

- Timing was adequate: 8%
- Increase time: 92%

Please indicate how you would suggest to adapt the time for the question and answer sessions:

- Timing was adequate: 25%
- Increase time: 75%

Please rate your opinion about the overall usefulness of the candidates’ forum:

- Not at all useful: 4%
- Hardly useful: 12%
- Moderately useful: 82%

Should the candidates’ forum continue to be a regular feature of the election process in the future?

- Yes: 24%
- Yes, but with adjustments: 50%
- No: 26%

The candidates' forum was a fair event and duly executed
The candidates’ forum was a useful, informative component of the election process
The candidates forum was adequate as an additional platform for exchange with candidates
The allocated time (30 minutes each) for candidates’ presentations was adequate
The allocated time (30 minutes each) for the question and answer sessions following candidates’ presentations was adequate
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Agree
Strongly agree
Timing was adequate
Increase time
Decrease time
Not at all useful
Hardly useful
Moderately useful
Very useful
0% 25% 50% 75% 100%
0% 25% 50% 75% 100%
0% 25% 50% 75% 100%
Shortlisting and nomination by the Executive Board

Did you attend the Executive Board?

- Yes 63%
- No 18%
- No, another representative attended it 19%

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements based on your personal experience or that of another representative of your country:

- The shortlisting of candidates was a fair process and duly executed
  - Strongly disagree 0%
  - Disagree 2%
  - Agree 38%
  - Strongly agree 66%

- The shortlisting of candidates was an adequate process to reduce the number of candidates for further consideration
  - Strongly disagree 4%
  - Disagree 2%
  - Agree 36%
  - Strongly agree 58%

- The allocated time (30 minutes each) for the interviews of candidates was adequate
  - Strongly disagree 2%
  - Disagree 4%
  - Agree 26%
  - Strongly agree 68%

- The allocated time (30 minutes each) for the question and answer sessions following the interviews of candidates was adequate
  - Strongly disagree 4%
  - Disagree 2%
  - Agree 44%
  - Strongly agree 51%

- The nomination of candidates was a fair process and duly executed
  - Strongly disagree 2%
  - Disagree 4%
  - Agree 26%
  - Strongly agree 68%

- The nomination of candidates was an adequate process to reduce the number of candidates for further consideration
  - Strongly disagree 4%
  - Disagree 2%
  - Agree 36%
  - Strongly agree 66%

Please indicate how you would suggest to adapt the time for the interviews of candidates:

- Timing was adequate 92%
- Increase time 8%
- Decrease time 0%

Please indicate how you would suggest to adapt the time for the question and answer sessions:

- Timing was adequate 87%
- Increase time 13%
- Decrease time 0%

Please rate your opinion about the overall usefulness of the shortlisting and nomination process at the Executive Board:

- Not at all useful 0%
- Hardly useful 2%
- Moderately useful 19%
- Very useful 78%

Should the current shortlisting and nomination process at the Executive Board be maintained in the future?

- Yes 81%
- Yes, but with adjustments 17%
- No 2%
Voting and appointment by the World Health Assembly

Did you attend the Seventieth World Health Assembly?
- Yes: 7%
- No: 93%

Did you participate in the ballot process?
- Yes: 20%
- No: 80%

Please rate your opinion about the overall efficiency of the voting process at the World Health Assembly:
- Not at all efficient: 4%
- Hardly efficient: 36%
- Moderately efficient: 61%

Please indicate how you would suggest to adapt the time for the candidates’ statements:
- Timing was adequate: 35%
- Increase time: 65%

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements based on your personal experience or that of another representative of your country:

- The presentation of final statements at the World Health Assembly was fair and duly executed: 35%
- The allocated time (15 minutes each) for the candidates’ statements was adequate: 7%
- The voting process at the World Health Assembly was fair and duly executed: 36%
- The voting process by secret ballot was clearly explained: 32%
- The voting process should continue to be secret: 5%
- The voting process should be done through a secure electronic voting system: 12%

Please rate your opinion about the overall efficiency of the voting process at the World Health Assembly:
- Not at all efficient: 4%
- Hardly efficient: 36%
- Moderately efficient: 61%

Should the presentation of final statements and the voting process at the World Health Assembly be maintained in the future?
- Yes: 28%
- No: 2%
- Yes, but with adjustments: 70%
Regarding the role of the Secretariat, please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

Throughout the election process...

- The overall election process took 13 months (from April 2016 to May 2017). Would you say that the duration of the process was appropriate?

- Please indicate how the duration should be adapted:

Respondents answering for a Member State which proposed a candidate:

Throughout the election process...

- The support provided to candidates by the Secretariat was sufficient
Please rate your satisfaction with the overall election process:

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: Overall, the election process was...

- ... well-designed
- ... well-organized
- ... efficient
- ... done with due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representation
- ... fair
- ... equitable
- ... transparent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... well-designed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... well-organized</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... efficient</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... done with due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... fair</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... equitable</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... transparent</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with the overall election process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with the overall election process</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>Hardly satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>