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

RESULTS OF THE WEB-BASED PUBLIC SURVEY

15 November 2017
Personal affiliation and background

What is your affiliation?

Total number of responses
- Public institution: 6
- NGO: 6
- General public: 5
- Multilateral organization: 5
- Private sector: 4
- Other: 3
- Academia: 2
- Total: 31

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

- Very little: 10%
- Moderate: 10%
- High: 35%
- Very high: 45%
**Code of conduct**

Have you read the code of conduct?

- Yes: 29%
- No: 71%

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

- Poor: 8%
- Fair: 21%
- Good: 63%
- Excellent: 8%

**Proposal of candidates and publication of related information**

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

- Yes: 13%
- No: 87%

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

- Not at all useful: 3%
- Hardly useful: 17%
- Moderately useful: 31%
- Very useful: 48%
Candidates’ forum

Did you follow the candidates’ forum?

- Yes: 39%
- No: 61%

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall usefulness of the candidates’ forum</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shortlisting and nomination by the Executive Board

Were you aware of the shortlisting and nomination process at the 140th session of the Executive Board in January 2017?

- Yes: 77%
- No: 23%

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall usefulness of the shortlisting and nomination process at the Executive Board</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Strongly disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Agree**
- **Strongly agree**

Please indicate how the duration should be adapted:

- **Timing was adequate**
- **Increase time**
- **Decrease time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Not at all satisfied**
- **Hardly satisfied**
- **Moderately satisfied**
- **Very satisfied**

Please rate your satisfaction with the overall election process: