



WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION
REGIONAL OFFICE FOR EUROPE
COPENHAGEN

REGIONAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE
Fifty-first session, Madrid, 10 – 13 September 2001

Provisional agenda item 5

EUR/RC51/3
+ EUR/RC51/Conf.Doc./2
+ EUR/RC51/Conf.Doc./3
21 June 2001
10129M
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONAL COMMITTEE

This document contains a report on the work done by the Standing Committee of the Regional Committee (SCRC) since the fiftieth session of the Regional Committee. It covers sessions held in September and December 2000 and in April and May 2001. The report of the September 2001 session will be contained in a separate addendum to this document.

The Regional Committee's attention is drawn to the paragraphs in bold text at the end of a number of sections, which describe the follow-up action to be taken.

Two draft resolutions are attached, for the Committee's consideration: one to endorse this report, and the other to adopt changes to the Rules of Procedure of the Regional Committee and the SCRC.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1
The role of the SCRC	1
Policy items	1
The European Health Report	1
Poverty and health	2
The programme budget for 2002–2003	2
The European Alcohol Action Plan	3
Food and nutrition	4
Poliomyelitis eradication	4
External evaluation of the Health care reform programme	5
Report of the SCRC subgroup on bioethics	5
Support to countries that are candidates for accession to membership of the European Union	5
Procedural items	6
Criteria for membership of the Executive Board from 2003	6
Regional Search Group	6
Nominations for membership of various bodies in 2001	7
Election of officers of the Regional Committee	7
Other matters	7
Address by a representative of the EUR Staff Association	7
Review of the work of the Regional Office's centres	8
Annex 1 Membership of the eighth SCRC, 2000–2001	9
Annex 2 Proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Regional Committee and the Standing Committee of the Regional Committee	11
Annex 3 Report of the SCRC subgroup on criteria for membership of the Executive Board	14

INTRODUCTION

1. The eighth Standing Committee of the Regional Committee (SCRC), as constituted following decisions taken by the Regional Committee at its fiftieth session (RC50), met for the first time at the WHO Regional Office for Europe (EURO) in Copenhagen on Thursday 14 September 2000, with Professor Ayse Akin as Chairperson. Professor Frantisek Kölbl was elected Vice-Chairperson at the second session, held in Prague on 30 November and 1 December 2000. The third and fourth sessions were held at EURO from 4 to 6 April 2001 and at the Palais des Nations in Geneva on 13 May 2001, respectively.

2. A fifth and final session will be held in Madrid on 9 September 2001, just before the start of RC51; the report of that session will be contained in an addendum to this document. The members of the eighth SCRC are listed in Annex 1.

The role of the SCRC

3. In the course of the year, the Regional Director set out his views concerning the role of the SCRC. He considered that it would most usefully function as a support group, reviewing and commenting on issues or drafts of papers that would subsequently be reworked before being presented to the RC. Its agenda should include space for free discussion, as had been the case at the SCRC “retreat” in Iceland the previous year.

4. The SCRC wholeheartedly endorsed the view that the SCRC should support the Regional Director by expressing its opinions in open and “strategic” discussion, but it acknowledged that it also had a function to perform as a governing body *per se*, acting for and representing the RC between its sessions, as laid down in its Rules of Procedure. In so doing, it served as a channel for transmitting the Member States’ views to the Secretariat on a regular basis, notably on questions of relations with other intergovernmental organizations. Conversely, it offered a way for Member States’ representatives to become more closely acquainted with the work of the Regional Office.

5. At its second session, the SCRC agreed, as an experiment, to place the reports of its sessions on the EURO Web site, in the working languages of the European Region, once they had been approved by its members at the subsequent session.

POLICY ITEMS

The European Health Report

6. At its second session, the SCRC was informed that one required agenda item for RC51 concerned the public health report in the European Region, and that an exercise was already under way to collect the necessary information in the Member States. In answer to questions raised at its third session, the SCRC emphasized the importance of the Regional Office continuing to disseminate reliable and validated data, and it accordingly advocated an evolutionary approach, whereby the current key health indicators should be maintained while work was done on new concepts and indicators. A resolution on the subject would be presented to RC51.

7. On the question of periodicity, the SCRC recommended a three-year reporting cycle to give sufficient time for the identification of trends, although the proposed “information warehouse” would enable information to be updated on a regular basis (annually) and made available over the Internet.

8. Lastly, the SCRC advised that the Regional Office and Member States should be actively involved in preparations for the next World Health Report, to ensure that it took account of concerns that were common to the whole Region.

Action by the Regional Committee

Review the paper on the European Health Report (EUR/RC51/7)

Consider the corresponding draft resolution (EUR/RC51/Conf.Doc./4)

Poverty and health

9. When discussing possible agenda items for RC51 at its second session, the SCRC recognized that poverty and health was an issue of relevance to all European countries. At the third session, the Director, Technical Support accordingly gave a slide-based presentation illustrating the vicious circle of poverty and ill health and outlining the changing scope of poverty in the European Region and throughout the world. The SCRC then confirmed that it was timely to discuss the subject of poverty and health at RC51 and called on the Secretariat to elaborate in more detail proposals for activities that WHO could help countries to carry out.

10. At the fourth session, the Director, Technical Support presented an outline of the RC paper on poverty and health, which took account of the comments made by the SCRC at its previous session. The paper (and the accompanying draft resolution for RC51) outlined a possible role for EURO in four areas:

- helping countries to reduce poverty by improving access to health services and addressing the most important diseases and health determinants related to poverty;
- identifying the data required and improving the information base;
- strengthening the commitment of the international community to investing resources in poverty reduction;
- using the newly established WHO European Office for Investment for Health and Development in Venice as a platform for future work within a coherent regional programme.

11. The SCRC recommended that the paper should be further expanded and illustrated with graphs and tables. It should cover the question of research and pay particular attention to population groups such as the unemployed, the homeless, women, children and the elderly. It might usefully give examples of the wise investment of resources in programmes of skilful social support. Lastly, the conclusions of the paper should be more sharply focused, with the proposed activities of the Venice Centre clearly described.

Action by the Regional Committee

Review the paper on poverty and health (EUR/RC51/8)

Consider the corresponding draft resolution (EUR/RC51/Conf.Doc./6)

The programme budget for 2002–2003

12. At its second session, the SCRC was briefed on recent developments with regard to the proposed programme budget 2002–2003. EURO's initial budget submission had been revised in the light of discussion at RC50, with the level of country funds set at US \$11.7 million, intercountry funds at US \$3.6 million and salaries at US \$30.1 million. The managerial process and mechanisms for planning, monitoring and evaluation were also reviewed. The SCRC recommended that the Regional Director should obtain the views of RC51 on the proposed use of country funds, and that he should raise the issue of consultation with Member States on preparations for the 2004–2005 programme budget.

13. The main question before the SCRC at its third session was how the Regional Committee should be consulted on the allocation of country funds, particularly the additional US \$2.5 million that had been transferred from intercountry funds to “priority public health initiatives”. The SCRC felt that the issue demanded a separate item on the agenda of RC51, together with clear guidance from the SCRC on how the funds should be allocated. Such guidance would not need to detail the amounts allocated to specific countries, in line with resolutions EUR/RC48/R9, EUR/RC49/R5 and EUR/RC50/R4, but could simply be concerned with the process by which allocation would be determined.

14. At its fourth session, the Regional Director informed the SCRC that the main item on the agenda of WHA54 was the proposed programme budget for 2002–2003. A number of points needed to be made in that connection.

- The budget was consistent with WHO’s mission and the expected outcomes of its work. However, as it was the first to be presented in truly global terms, there was acknowledgment that the consultative process would have to be further developed to better reflect the countries’ and regions’ priorities for the next biennium (2004–2005).
- The amount of funds to be transferred to the European Region under the provisions of resolution WHA51.31 was to be reduced from US \$2.2 million in 2000–2001 to US \$1.1 million in 2002–2003.
- The budget clearly showed that considerable funds were being moved from intercountry activities to country programmes in the European Region.

15. The SCRC expressed concern that while objective instruments, such as the Human Development Index as calculated by the United Nations Development Programme, had been used when deciding on the transfer of funds between regions, this had not been done to the extent to which resolution WHA51.31 would require.

16. At the same session, the Director, Administration and Management Support confirmed that Member States would be requested to make known to the Regional Director, by October 2001, their views on priorities for the 2004–2005 programme budget so that the consultation process for the next programme budget would be improved. She also informed the SCRC that the Director-General had approved the country allocations for the European Member States in March as part of the global budgetary process. Country allocations had been calculated fully in line with the model adopted by RC49 in resolution EUR/RC49/R5 and confirmed by resolution EUR/RC50/R4. Lastly, she notified the SCRC that the planning process had started for using country funds in the European Region in 2002–2003 under all three components: US \$6 million for medium-term programmes of cooperation; US \$3.2 million for the Liaison Offices and US \$2.5 million for priority public health initiatives.

Action by the Regional Committee

Review the paper on the programme budget 2002–2003 (EUR/RC51/9) and the presentation of country allocations by subject area

The European Alcohol Action Plan

17. At its third session, the Regional Adviser for Alcohol and Drugs informed the SCRC that the WHO European Ministerial Conference on Young People and Alcohol, held in Stockholm from 19 to 21 February 2001, had been a very successful event, attended by nearly 40 ministers or deputy ministers of health and almost 500 participants. There had been close partnership with many intergovernmental organizations and extensive involvement of young people themselves. Media coverage had been excellent. The conference had concluded with the unanimous adoption of a Declaration on Young People and Alcohol, which set a number of broad targets for Member States to achieve by 2006.

18. The SCRC was asked to advise on the follow-up measures to be taken. The SCRC recommended that the subject should be considered by RC51 under the heading "Policy items for discussion". The RC paper could usefully build on the Declaration, proposing a methodology for follow-up in countries and outlining evidence-based activities that could be carried out by the Regional Office. The SCRC also recommended that the Declaration should be endorsed by RC51 – that would help ministries of health to use it as a tool when dealing with other ministries and lobbies of alcohol producers. The draft resolution to that effect should also make reference to the need for continued monitoring of implementation of the European Alcohol Action Plan at two-year intervals.

19. On the question of relations with the alcohol industry, the SCRC advised that they would no doubt vary from country to country, so it was difficult to advocate a uniform approach. The principle to be followed, however, was that such relations could be taken forward if they would help countries to attain the targets set out in the Declaration. The SCRC confirmed that public health policy with regard to alcohol should be made by the public health sector alone, independent of the alcohol industry.

20. The SCRC was pleased to hear that it was planned to submit the Declaration to the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on Children in September 2001. It urged that the continuity of the programme at the Regional Office should be ensured, and it called for the initiative of involving young people in programme activities to be extended to other fields.

Action by the Regional Committee

Note the progress report on the European Alcohol Action Plan (EUR/RC51/10)

Consider the corresponding draft resolution (EUR/RC51/Conf.Doc./7)

Food and nutrition

21. The Regional Adviser for Nutrition and Food Security briefed the SCRC at its third session on work done by the Secretariat since September 2000, when the Regional Committee had endorsed the first Food and Nutrition Action Plan for the European Region of WHO. However, despite the fact that the Regional Committee had strongly supported the establishment of a European Task Force on Food and Nutrition, its design and *modus operandi* had not found favour with the constituent organizations. The SCRC agreed that it would be regrettable if the Task Force became an obstacle to enhanced cooperation. In view of the success of the subregional workshops that had been held, it might be possible to reconfigure the Task Force along subregional lines. The Regional Director was asked to make reference to the issue in his statement to RC51. A formal progress report would be submitted to RC52.

Poliomyelitis eradication

22. The SCRC was informed at its third session that the process of certifying the European Region as poliomyelitis-free was proceeding as planned, with certification scheduled for early 2002, although there was concern that laboratory containment issues might cause some delay. It would none the less be necessary to maintain high-quality surveillance for a period of up to three years after that. While the amount of regular budget funding allocated to the programme was relatively small, there were good prospects of receiving extrabudgetary contributions in 2002.

23. The Secretariat was urged to ensure continued close cooperation with the Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean (through the MECACAR programme) on preventing the importation of poliomyelitis.

24. A formal progress report would be submitted to RC52.

External evaluation of the Health care reform programme

25. At its first session, the SCRC agreed that, in view of experience gained from the external evaluation of the EUROHEALTH programme in 1999/2000, it would not be feasible to submit to RC51 a report on such an evaluation of the Office's activities in the field of health care reform. The SCRC therefore requested the Secretariat to prepare a discussion paper for its April 2001 session, setting out proposals for a methodology and plan of action for undertaking an external review of WHO's impact on health care reform in countries.

26. Having reviewed the paper at its third session, the SCRC was of the opinion that the evaluation should assess the impact of the Regional Office's activities on the implementation of appropriate health care reforms in a limited number of countries. The proposed evaluation should not try to go further, to judge the impact on people's health of the reforms initiated by individual governments. On the question of methodology, the SCRC noted that it should be feasible to design the evaluation in such a way that it assessed whether WHO had had an impact on government action and had used the available resources efficiently. The details of the methodology (including specific indicators) would need to be worked out by the external evaluators themselves.

27. At its fourth session, the SCRC agreed to abide by the decision it had taken in April 2000, namely to choose external evaluators on an ad hoc basis for each evaluation. The Chairperson would contact members to obtain their nominations and the SCRC would select the evaluators at its September session. The SCRC accordingly recommended that the external evaluation should be carried out in time for reporting to RC52 in 2002.

Report of the SCRC subgroup on bioethics

28. At its third session, the SCRC welcomed the report of its subgroup's meeting, held in Warsaw on 2 March 2001. It confirmed that the Regional Office had a role to play in the area of bioethics in so far as it impacted on health policy and health care systems. Broader ethical issues should continue to be taken up in the context of the Council of Europe, with whom cooperation should be intensified. In that connection, WHO might offer to be associated with the Council's forthcoming Conference on Human Rights (Oslo, 2003).

29. The SCRC decided that Dr S.M. Furgal would replace Dr Nikolaj N. Fetisov on the subgroup. It would review the composition of the subgroup at its post-RC51 session and confirmed that the subject of bioethics should be on the agenda of RC52.

Support to countries that are candidates for accession to membership of the European Union

30. The SCRC welcomed the attention that was being paid to the issue of accession to membership of the EU, noting that the lessons learned would be useful not only for the candidate countries themselves but also for all other countries in the European Region. However, a differentiated approach was essential: each country had different needs, and the best way to meet them would be through country-specific planning and a bilateral country cooperation strategy. That approach would also avoid giving the impression that attention was being focused on one group of countries at the expense of others. The SCRC accordingly recommended that appropriate selections should be made from among the various options for WHO's role in support of candidate countries, including bilateral arrangements where appropriate.

31. Lastly, it agreed that the matter might usefully be the subject of a panel discussion at RC51.

PROCEDURAL ITEMS

Criteria for membership of the Executive Board from 2003

32. At its first session, the SCRC agreed that the subgroup it had established the previous year should continue with the same membership. At its second session, however, the SCRC decided to appoint Dr Mircea Popa as replacement for Dr Anca Dumitrescu on that subgroup. At the third session, the focal point of the subgroup informed the SCRC that she had requested Dr Jarkko Eskola to take the place of Dr Mircea Popa.

33. The subgroup's proposed criteria distinguished between those regarding the Member State and those applicable to each individual candidate. The former included various options for grouping countries to ensure equitable geographical distribution. The SCRC endorsed the criteria for individual candidates while noting that, since Board members were now formally representatives of Member States, they should not be presented as a separate category.

34. On the question of geographical grouping of countries, some members of the SCRC considered that it was logical to present the results of such an exercise, if only to show how difficult it would be to ensure a fair distribution. Others preferred merely to state the criterion, without specifying how it was to be met.

35. While the effect of applying the proposed criteria would be to preclude semi-permanent membership of the Board in the future, the SCRC considered that specific reference should be made to that question. It should be made clear that the SCRC had discussed the questions of semi-permanent membership and geographical grouping but was unable to make any firm recommendation. The subgroup was asked to revise its report in the light of the discussion, ensuring that the issue was presented in a way that fostered consensus.

36. The report submitted to the SCRC at its fourth session accordingly noted that members of the Executive Board were formally representatives of Member States, and that the SCRC had discussed (but was unable to make firm recommendations on) the two issues of semi-permanent membership and geographical grouping.

37. The SCRC recommended that the fifth criterion regarding the Member State should be amended to read "All the countries in the Region have an equal right to a seat on the Executive Board".

38. The SCRC recalled that, under the terms of the agreement reached at RC49, it was required to report back to RC51 on the matter. The report of the subgroup is contained in Annex 3 and the Regional Committee is asked to take note of it. Further consultations are required with European Member States on the issues of semi-permanent membership and geographical grouping, and the SCRC will report back to RC52 on the outcome of such consultations.

Action by the Regional Committee

Take note of the report of the SCRC and of its subgroup

Regional Search Group

39. The SCRC subgroup on the Regional Search Group (RSG) process had been set up the previous year in response to two issues, in particular, that had caused concern during the period leading up to RC49: the question of membership of the RSG, and the possibility of its producing a ranked list of candidates.

40. When considering the subgroup's report at its third session, the SCRC confirmed that it would be preferable for the RSG to remain an impartial and independent body. At its fourth session, it stated that it wished to propose a six-person composition, consisting of three members and three alternates. In order to

separate the functions of the two bodies, the Chairperson of the SCRC should no longer be ex officio a member of the RSG. Members and alternates should be elected at the same time. In years when an RSG was to be constituted, Member States would be asked to put forward names; those nominations would be reviewed by the SCRC at its April session, and its recommendations submitted to the Regional Committee in September. Members of the Regional Committee should have the possibility of amending the list of recommended RSG members.

41. The SCRC also endorsed the proposed addition of a new Rule of Procedure (Rule 47.8), to allow for all candidates for the post of Regional Director to give an oral presentation at a meeting to which all Member States of the Region were invited.

42. On the other hand, the SCRC did not wish to suggest any amendment to the current Rule 47.8, which provided for the Chairperson of the RSG to submit its evaluation report together with an unranked short-list of not more than five candidates.

43. In the light of those discussions, the Secretariat was asked to draw up a set of proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure (see Annex 2).

Action by the Regional Committee

Consider the draft resolution on amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Regional Committee and the SCRC
(EUR/RC51/Conf.Doc./3)

Nominations for membership of various bodies in 2001

44. At its third session, the SCRC decided to continue the previous year's practice of sounding out all European Member States' representatives at the World Health Assembly on their views concerning candidates for membership of various bodies. It also confirmed the continuing applicability of the agreement reached at RC49 concerning an interim arrangement (to 2003) for semi-permanent membership of the Executive Board. It further noted that the proposed criteria (see paragraphs 32–39 above) would only apply once the Regional Committee had endorsed them as part of a new system. Lastly, it recommended that, as had been done at RC50, its short-list of candidates (together with an explanation of the reasons for its choices) should be distributed under confidential cover to heads of delegations at RC51. The Organization's Legal Counsel advised that this would not require suspension of Rule 14.2.2(c) of the RC Rules of Procedure.

Election of officers of the Regional Committee

45. The SCRC agreed with a proposal to amend Rule 10.2 of the Rules of Procedure of the Regional Committee (see Annex 2).

Action by the Regional Committee

Consider the draft resolution on amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Regional Committee and the SCRC
(EUR/RC51/Conf.Doc./3)

OTHER MATTERS

Address by a representative of the EUR Staff Association

46. The President of the EUR Staff Association addressed the SCRC at its third session, noting that a recent visit to the Regional Office by members of the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit had again proved the closeness of the staff/management partnership in EURO, with the staff exercising to the full their right of consultation. Their partnership with Member States was more complex, however: the latter

were, at various times, both clients and employers, supporters and critics, challengers and champions. In their latter role, the President appealed to members of the SCRC for help in setting the record straight. The fact was that United Nations staff were falling behind in conditions of employment.

47. She drew attention to the welcome fact that the Executive Board had recently approved the strategic framework proposed by the Organization's Task Force on Human Resources Management Reform. The framework recognized the need for WHO to put in place policies and practices that would help staff respond to the often conflicting demands of professional and personal life (the so-called "work/life agenda"); it also envisaged the allocation of more funds for staff development and training. Unfortunately, however, the Board had deferred until 2002 its consideration of that part of the framework concerned with contractual arrangements. In view of the fact that more than half of the staff at the Regional Office were currently on short-term contracts, the Staff Association and management were looking to draw up an action plan in that area as soon as possible.

48. In conclusion, she emphasized that it was important to keep alive the ideals of international civil service, building on the loyalty of a committed workforce and proper conditions of service.

49. The SCRC confirmed the importance of good staff/management relations and agreed to do all it could to uphold the prestige (and working conditions) of staff in the United Nations system. It acknowledged that the impact of the Staff Association's annual address largely depended on the follow-up action taken by each of its members. While recognizing the Staff Association's difficulties involved in maintaining contact with outposted personnel, it paid particular tribute to those staff who were working away from the Regional Office under difficult and hazardous conditions.

Review of the work of the Regional Office's centres

50. Professor Vittorio Silano, Director-General for International Relations and Community Policies at the Italian Ministry of Health, had been asked by the Regional Director to make a review of the Regional Office's centres (or "geographically dispersed offices"). His report, reviewed by three external experts, was submitted to the SCRC for consideration at its third session. The SCRC recognized that the report was primarily a valuable management tool, but it also had implications for the policy followed by the Regional Office. It therefore suggested that it should consider the report in more detail at its May 2001 session. At that session, however, owing to a lack of time, the SCRC deferred detailed consideration of the report until its session on the eve of RC51.

Action by the Standing Committee

**Review Professor Silano's report at its
September 2001 session**

Annex 1

MEMBERSHIP OF THE EIGHTH SCRC, 2000–2001

Members

Czech Republic

Professor Frantisek Kölbl¹
Department of International Relations
Ministry of Health

Finland

Dr Jarkko Eskola
Director-General, Department of Preventive Health and Social Policy
Ministry of Social Affairs and Health

Ireland

Dr James Kiely
Chief Medical Officer
Department of Health

Luxembourg

Dr Danielle Hansen-Koenig
Director-General of Health
Health Directorate

Poland

Dr Jacek Antoni Piatkiewicz
Deputy Minister
Ministry of Health and Social Welfare

Romania

Dr Anca Dumitrescu²
Institute of Public Health
Ministry of Health

Dr Mircea Popa³
Director-General, General Department of Public Health
Ministry of Health

Dr Radu Constantiniu
Adviser to the Minister of Health
Ministry of Health

Russian Federation

Dr Nikolaj N. Fetisov⁴
Director, External Relations Board
Ministry of Health

¹ Vice-Chairperson of the SCRC

² First session

³ Second session

⁴ First and second sessions

Dr S.M. Furgal
Director, Department of International Cooperation
Ministry of Health

Spain

Dr Isabel de la Mata-Barranco
Deputy Director of Health Planning
Ministry of Health and Consumer Affairs

Dr Julia Gonzalez Alonso⁵
Deputy Director-General of Health Promotion and Epidemiology
Ministry of Health and Consumer Affairs

Tajikistan

Dr Alamkhon Akhmedov
Minister of Health
Ministry of Health

Turkey

Professor Ayse Akin⁶
Department of Public Health
Hacettepe University School of Medicine

Observers

Professor Vilius Grabauskas⁷
Rector
University of Medicine
Kaunas

Dr Jeremy S. Metters⁸
H.M. Inspector of Anatomy
Department of Health
London

Dr Godfried Thiers⁹
Director
Louis Pasteur Public Health Research Institute
Brussels

⁵ Second session

⁶ Chairperson of the SCRC

⁷ Third session, as a member of the Executive Board from the European Region

⁸ As Executive President of the fiftieth session of the Regional Committee

⁹ Fourth session, as a member of the Executive Board from the European Region

Annex 2

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE REGIONAL COMMITTEE AND THE STANDING COMMITTEE
OF THE REGIONAL COMMITTEE

Proposed deletions are shown in “strikethrough” (e.g. ~~nominations~~), proposed insertions are underlined (e.g. consultation).

PART 1

RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE
REGIONAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE

~~V~~. OFFICERS OF THE REGIONAL COMMITTEE

Rule 10

10.1 The Regional Committee, at each annual session convened under Rule 4, shall elect as its officers a President, an Executive President and a Deputy Executive President. It shall also elect a Rapporteur. The officers and the Rapporteur shall hold office until their successors are elected.

10.2 ~~The outgoing President~~ Standing Committee established under Rule 14.2 below shall submit, after appropriate consultations, submit a one nomination each for President, and a nomination for Executive President. The outgoing Executive President shall submit a nomination for and Deputy Executive President. The aforementioned nominations shall be made after appropriate consultations, including in the case of the office of Deputy Executive President with the Standing Committee established under Rule 14.2 below. Additional nominations for President, Executive President and Deputy Executive President may be made by the Members of the Regional Committee.

XI. VOTING

Rule 47

47.1 At its session preceding the one at which a person is due to be nominated as Regional Director, the Regional Committee shall appoint a Regional Search Group composed of ~~the Chairperson of the Standing Committee ex officio and~~ three members chosen from delegations of the Members attending the Regional Committee, based on equitable geographical representation, to make a preliminary evaluation of candidates for nomination in the light of the criteria specified by the Regional Committee and to perform related functions as set out in this Rule. The Regional Committee shall also appoint three alternates to the Regional Search Group.

47.2 The rules set forth below shall apply for determining the composition of the Regional Search Group.

(a) The selection of the members and alternates of the Regional Search Group shall be carried out, mutatis mutandis, in accordance with the procedure set forth in Rule 14.2.2, provided however that no person who represents a Member State on the Standing Committee shall be so selected. Furthermore, in the event of an election being held pursuant to Rule 43, the allocation of seats for members and then

~~alternates shall be made in accordance with the order in which members received the majority votes. The Executive President and the Deputy Executive President of the Regional Committee shall present to the Regional Committee for approval a list of three members and three alternates drawn from delegations of Members attending the Regional Committee, having due regard to the need for geographic representation. Any Member of the Regional Committee may propose additions to such list. On the basis of such list, as amended by any additions proposed, the Regional Committee shall, in accordance with the provisions of Rule 43, determine the composition of the Regional Search Group.~~

(b) The members and alternates shall cease to serve on the Regional Search Group if a candidate is presented by the Member on whose delegation they served at the Regional Committee when they were appointed. Alternates appointed to the Regional Search Group shall replace members when the latter are unable to complete their term for any reason.

47.3 Not less than eleven months before the date fixed for the opening of a session of the Regional Committee at which a person is due to be nominated as Regional Director, the Director-General shall inform each Member of the Region that he or she will receive proposals of names of candidates for nomination by the Regional Committee as Regional Director. Copies shall be sent to the Regional Office's list of official contacts, as well as to the Chairperson of the Regional Search Group.

47.4 Any Member of the Region may propose the name or names of one or more persons, each of whom has indicated willingness to act as Regional Director, submitting with each proposal particulars of the person's qualifications and experience. Such proposals shall be sent to the Director-General so as to reach him or her not less than seven months before the date fixed for the opening of the session. This time limit may be extended by the President of the Regional Committee on the proposal of the Regional Search Group. Any such extension shall be communicated by the Chairperson of the Regional Search Group to the Director-General, who shall promptly inform the Member States of the Region.

47.5 A person holding office as Regional Director for the Region shall, if he or she is eligible and has so requested within the time limit referred to in Rule 47.3, be a candidate for nomination without being proposed under the preceding paragraph.

47.6 From the outset of its work, the Regional Search Group shall search actively for suitable candidates who meet the criteria agreed to by the Regional Committee. The candidature of such persons shall be submitted in accordance with the procedure set out in Rule 47.4.

~~47.6~~ Not later than two weeks after the expiration of the time limit referred to in Rule 47.3, the Director-General shall transmit a list of names and all particulars of candidates received to the Chairperson of the Regional Search Group.

47.8 The Regional Search Group may, if it deems it desirable, make arrangements for all candidates to give an oral presentation at a meeting to which all Member States of the Region are invited.

~~47.7~~ The Director-General shall, not less than ten 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 or her within the period specified to be sent to each Member of the Region and shall indicate to each Member whether or not the person holding the office is a candidate for nomination. Copies shall be sent to the Regional Office's list of official contacts, as well as to the Chairperson of the Regional Search Group.

~~47.8~~10 At the same time, the Chairperson of the Regional Search Group shall send, under confidential cover, the evaluation report of the Search Group on all candidates, and an unranked short-list of not more than five candidates who in its opinion most closely meet the criteria laid down, to the President, the Executive President and the Deputy Executive President of the Committee, to each Member State of the Region according to the Regional Office's list of official contacts, and to the Director-General.

~~47.9~~ From the outset of its work, the Regional Search Group shall search actively for suitable candidates who meet the criteria agreed to by the Regional Committee. The candidature of such persons shall be submitted in accordance with the procedure set out in Rule ~~47.4~~.

~~47.40~~11 In the event that the post of Regional Director unexpectedly falls vacant, the Director-General shall:

- (a) designate a person to act as Regional Director until the appointment of a new incumbent;
- (b) decide, in consultation with the President, whether a special meeting of the Regional Committee should be convened as set out in Rule 5.

~~47.41~~12 The nomination of Regional Director shall take place at a private meeting of the Regional Committee. The Regional Committee shall make a selection by secret ballot from among the persons who are candidates under this Rule, in the following manner:

- (a) at each ballot, each representative entitled to vote shall write on his or her ballot paper the name of a single candidate chosen from those who are candidates under this Rule;
- (b) if a candidate obtains at any ballot the majority required under Rule 39, he or she 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 or she 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 Regional 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.

~~47.42~~13 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.

~~47.43~~14 The name of the person or persons so nominated shall be announced at a public meeting of the Regional Committee and submitted to the Executive Board.

~~47.44~~15 The Regional Committee may also inform the Executive Board of the name of another candidate considered suitable for the case where the person first nominated is not available.

~~47.45~~16 The appointment of the Regional Director shall be for five years and he or she shall be eligible for reappointment once only.

Annex 3

REPORT OF THE SCRC SUBGROUP ON CRITERIA FOR
MEMBERSHIP OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

BACKGROUND

1. The Regional Committee, at its forty-eighth session, had requested the SCRC to continue the work on the question of semi-permanent membership of the Executive Board.
2. An ad hoc meeting of the SCRC was held on 15 and 16 July 1999. A compromise had been recommended that provided a reasonable balance between the need to see some meaningful change immediately, while allowing sufficient time to work out a better arrangement for the future.
3. The Regional Committee, at its forty-ninth session, adopted the SCRC's recommendation, as set out in document EUR/RC49/2 Add.1:
 - to retain the present practice of agreeing each year in a private meeting of the Regional Committee which countries will submit their candidatures for the Executive Board to the subsequent World Health Assembly;
 - to introduce a new system in 2003 whereby agreement on candidates will be guided by objective criteria relative to geographical distribution and other elements, in line with the principles of solidarity and transparency adopted in HEALTH21; to this end the SCRC will present proposals for consideration by the Regional Committee at its fifty-first session in 2001.
4. The Rules of Procedure of the Regional Committee for Europe (2000) stipulate:

Rule 14.3

“Selections of Members to be represented on bodies not covered by Rules 14.1 and 14.2 shall be carried out, *mutatis mutandis*, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Rule 14.2.2.”

Rule 14.2.2 (b)

“The Officers of the Standing Committee ... shall seek consensus among Member States submitting nominations. In so doing the Standing Committee shall seek to achieve the criteria enumerated in Rule 14.2.1 ...”

Rule 14.2.1

“... the need for equitable geographical distribution, adequate representation of the interests of the Region, the opportunity for all Member States of the Region to participate over time in the work of the Standing Committee and other considerations relevant to maximizing the effectiveness of the work of the Standing Committee.”

The SCRC discussed the question of:

1. Semi-permanent membership of the Executive Board for some countries:

- (i) the discussion about criteria for membership of the EB began with the discussion of semi-permanency because the geopolitical situation of the Region has changed since 1948 and the number of countries of the WHO European Region has increased to 51.
- (ii) No explicit reference is found in the Rules of Procedure about semi-permanency.
- (iii) All countries of the Region should have equal right to seat at the Executive Board.
- (iv) Whether the practice of semi-permanency should discontinue.

2. Geographical grouping:

- (i) An adequate geographical representation is essential, but difficult to achieve by grouping the countries in fixed groups. Several alternatives are presented below.

The SCRC is unable to make a firm recommendation on these two issues.

The recommendation presented below is that of the majority of members of the SCRC and is proposed to be introduced in 2003 for agreement on candidates to the Executive Board guided by objective criteria and in line with the principles of solidarity and transparency.

List of criteria which might be considered by the Member States when proposing candidates for the Executive Board and by the SCRC for choosing candidates for the shortlist:

CRITERIA REGARDING THE MEMBER STATE

- 1. Unranked list of criteria regarding previous representation in the Executive Board:
 - country never represented in the Executive Board;
 - country represented in the Executive Board, but a long time ago;
 - country from a group currently under-represented in the Executive Board.
- 2. Having already been a member of the SCRC could be an asset.
- 3. No country should be a member of the Executive Board and the SCRC at the same time.
- 4. Equal geographical distribution is not merely desirable but essential.
- 5. All countries in the Region have an equal right to a seat on the Executive Board.

It is difficult to group countries, however, the following groupings are proposed:

- Central and Eastern European countries
- Newly Independent States
- Other European countries

or

- North
- South
- East
- West

or

- Seven groups of approximately seven countries which could agree to be represented as a group by one Member State

or

- Voluntary grouping (problems may arise if more than seven groups and if groups are of different size)

or

- Any other agreed grouping

If grouping is not accepted, geographical distribution will be taken into account without mathematical division.

CRITERIA REGARDING THE CANDIDATE

In accordance with the new rules of the Executive Board (Article 24) “the members are entitled to designate a person to serve on the Board”, the persons are formally representatives of Member States.

It should be desirable, that candidates/persons fulfil most of these criteria:

- technically qualified in the field of public health;
- current position in the health administration in his/her country (or the position held in the near past), close to the political decision-making level;
- experience in working with international organizations, WHO or other United Nations organizations;
- ability to collaborate, coordinate and communicate within the country and between the countries;
- experience in coordinating high-level political and/or technical programmes, nationally (interregional, interministerial) or internationally (bilateral or intercountry);
- age (candidate should be in service);
- gender (female candidates encouraged);
- availability (no reservations which may restrict activities expected at Executive Board).