

# 4.1 WHO Reform: Governance

## Contents

- [In focus](#)
- [Background](#)
- [PHM Comment](#)
- [Notes of discussion](#)

## In focus

The Director-General submits three reports on this matter.

The first ([EB143/2](#)) provides proposals to improve the efficiency of the governing bodies and their focus on strategic issues.

The Board will also consider a second report ([EB143/3](#)) that provides an analysis of, and proposals relating to, the Rules of Procedure of the Governing Bodies with a view to adopting, or recommending adoption of, amendments thereto, as necessary.

Lastly, the Board will consider a third report ([EB143/4](#)) that sets out the evaluation of the Officers of the Board of their experience in using the criteria and prioritization tool in respect of proposals for additional agenda items.

## Background

See [Tracker links](#) to previous discussions of Methods of Work including EB142 from which some of these issues were bounced.

## PHM Comment

No comment.

## Notes of discussion at EB143

### Meeting 1

Documents to be considered on this agenda item

[http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf\\_files/EB143/B143\\_2-en.pdf](http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB143/B143_2-en.pdf)

[http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf\\_files/EB143/B143\\_2Add1-en.pdf](http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB143/B143_2Add1-en.pdf)

[http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf\\_files/EB143/B143\\_3-en.pdf](http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB143/B143_3-en.pdf)

[http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf\\_files/EB143/B143\\_4-en.pdf](http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB143/B143_4-en.pdf)

**Romania on behalf of EU and its MS:**

Longstanding supporters of WHO reform

Full transparency

Better preparation of EB sessions, and web-based balance are important

Visibility: focus on more important issues, and accompanied by financial assessment

Informal documents, need more clarity on how to provide.

Does not support to the draft resolution EB143/2

Statements of NSAs should be handled another way of contributing for NSA needs to be considered

**Tanzania:**

On behalf of 47 MS on item 4.1 WHO reform

Maintaining the inclusion of all MS in governing organization is necessary

We encourage non EB members for their comprehensive participation in their respective regions. But time limitation was good.

We support for inclusion of regional coordinator to engage in board meeting

**Bahrain:**

NSA can express themselves and needs to be find the way

Important to find the necessary time

We need to adopt the resolutions based on expenditures. So we need more time for this.

Strengthen the role of women in the WHO EB governing bodies

Need to use the internet website for the documents

**Finland:**

Aligns with EU statement by Romania

We have formed a culture in governing bodies for setting agendas and work further. For this we need documents on time for robust preparation. Discussion should focus on what is expected.

Group statements can also be prepared.

**US:**

Supports the efforts to WHO reform

NSA have to participate in the discussion

We should focus on individual MS, not based on geographical basis

Support and collecting info for gender balance in governing bodies

Agenda management should be exercised

Cost about additional meetings in regional/country offices

US not support official process of WHO reform, informal consultation process should be taken to form governing bodies

we should have deadlines to submit resolutions

**Jamaica:**

We appreciate the need to reform. EB should be different from WHA. We should be flexible regarding submission of resolutions to non members.

We recommend for the former information about the number of agendas, cost implications of resolutions.

Transparency, inclusive and multistakeholders views should be maintained in every process

**Australia:**

challenges to the rules and the challenge in long-term reform

Improve MS and governing bodies

Determining manageable agendas is important  
EB should have the capacity to direct WHA  
Modalities of participation should be determined for members and non members  
Has concern about financial implications  
Expert working group is complex  
welcome a white paper and support further consultation  
Prioritization: Australia thanks the report, require the continued use of decision-making use to improve transparency  
Consultations should be done as broadly as possible  
Time frame for agendas and proposals

**Iraq:**

Reaffirms on following points:  
Well prepared and efficient agendas setting is important.  
The prepared agendas should be submitted within deadline with the flexibilities to change little bit  
Feedback mechanisms should be there  
Gender based issue should be considered  
Effective and sustainable communication after the end of the EB meetings  
Synchronization of EB and WHA for better outcomes

**Germany:**

Aligned with the EU statement  
We should function well as EB  
We should act as executive organ and should be able to oversee the WHO. We should not do micro management  
Regarding the issues that are in the agenda, it is important to know where they need our guidance  
Unclear that in what areas secretariat needs our oversights. They are not being able to summarize our statements  
WHO governance believe that regulatory changes  
Regarding board meetings in WHO national offices, they welcome the idea.

**Mexico:**

Noted the DG report to measure efficiencies of the governing bodies  
We are happy to work on global health priorities issues  
we need to choose the expert in the sense they take into account the opinion of member states  
We welcome the fact that choice of experts will be based on geographical, gender balance, representation of experiences and specialities.  
We should monitor the compliance with the resolutions.

**Chile:**

We focus on 143/2:  
We agree to improve the  
We support the limitations to 1 minute for NSA  
We should focus on strategic issues like transparency and efficiency. Both MS and non members should be given equal time.

We support the proposal of secretariat meeting more frequently  
MS can make joint statements  
Consider the ways to think of the financial implications of draft resolutions.  
Consideration of agenda items to be discussed  
support electronic documentation  
The WHO reform must be consulted

**Brazil:**

Support the idea of participation of women in meetings  
Further debates on following points  
We need to clarify the role of officers on board  
Time limit for submission of draft resolution and financial implications should not restrict MS to bring out the real problems  
Gender-neutral language, electronic voting are necessary  
Provision of written statements by MS should be made  
Summary of records and statements based on multilingualism

**Israel:**

In favor of EB143/2  
support 3 min for MS and 2 min NSAs  
role of EB should be discussed separately

**Colombia:**

We agree on establishment of experts group taking into consideration of cost  
Question: Do we already have experts among us which meets the relevant characteristics? or will be the MS who choose the experts?  
Time frame should be limited  
We can use electronic methods to encourage NSAs

**Sudan:**

Nobody represent the country here but they are technical people for EB

**Algeria:**

Raised the issue of gender equity and  
We support to limit the pages of report of the se

**China:**

Recommend to use option B. EB in accordance to its relevant constitution is to draft the WHA agenda and the roadmap  
Important to be inclusive with non-EB members  
Develop mechanisms so that non EB members can be allowed to include their voices  
Support the secretariat timing of resolutions and official documents  
Cautions with the experts group  
More flexible participation of MS for EB

**Djibuti:**

Let's concentrate on essential agenda items and limit its number  
We support for limiting time for each item (all items are not equal important)  
We could have better representations by each country based on regions

**Turkey:**

Aligns with EU statement

Agree with Chinese delegate mention about the inclusion as official document

Space and/or time dedication for NSA: maybe serpentine area or committee C is more suitable for deliver their statements.

**Japan:**

Draft resolutions should be discussed more in EB meetings than in WHA

WHA should be under the umbrella of EB

**Burundi:**

Aligned with the African region

MS should have enough time to express themselves

We can have another mechanisms for NSA interventions

**Chile:**

Statement for the EB143/3 document

Important to eliminate ambiguities

Written statements shouldn't restrict the floor statements and right to reply

Electronic means are important and voting by electronic means is important but it's important to have pre-written rules

Important gender-neutral language

EB should also give flexibilities to MS to discuss

Support for deadlines to submit draft resolutions

**Vietnam:**

WHA has been successfully organized

Supports the amendment for time allocation to non EB members.

Cost implications of draft resolutions should be on time and with transparency before the election of chairperson

**Algeria on behalf of African region:**

Regarding limiting time, it should not be limited

The WHA has become successful not because of time limit but due to well preparation of agendas

Women participation and rules of multilingualism should be focused.

**US:**

More time for EB meeting

In terms of prioritization, I agree that not all topics are equally imp. So priority agendas should be given more time

Written statements should be considered

Role of NSAs: I agree for different mechanism, but we have not identified alternatives yet.

**Chair responded as:**

Prioritizing agendas based on importance of the item is very political and can be subjective.

**Fiji:**

Prior information on the time limits needed.

Information on the expert group formation.

**Finland:**

Aligns with EU delivered by Romania

Prior information to change statement based on time. We had wide consultations to develop statements. To change is not easy.

Global health is not linked to medicine alone, many other issues have to be considered. Agendas are so varied and therefore one expert can not cover all. People with different expertise should represent EB

Analysis should be based on all resources as staffing too beside financing

#### **Now, comments of non-members of the EB on item 4.1**

##### **Monaco:**

Key role of EB

Intergovernmental group can have informal consultation

Intersectoral work important, not in favor of an experts group ruling the EB but reporting to the EB

##### **Switzerland:**

Welcomes about governance reform for more effectiveness

Role of EB in preparing WHA is essential and can't be diminished

Include democratic and transparent to prepare the document and all members should be communicated well about the progress of the report

##### **Peru:**

Addressing the three documents at the same time.

No share the idea of retrieving the non members of EB

Timing: ideas to improve provided

Open to an experts groups or working groups through the governing bodies of WHO

##### **Algeria :**

More discussions and consultations at national, regional and global levels

##### **Thailand:**

Limitation of non EB members need more discussions

Support option A of document EB143/2 (or 3)

##### **Korea:**

WHA should be operated in a more efficient manner with few agenda items

Establish expert groups to suggest ideas for effective governance reforms

We support the draft decision presented in EB 143/2

We urge for gender specific languages

##### **UK:**

Aligned with EU

EB143/2: does not support the idea of only allowing member of EB to speak

Require clarity of experts group selection and methodology

Governance issues of WHO and take account

EB143/3 and EB143/4 cannot be supported in the way we support EB143/2 option A

##### **Norway:**

We focus on governance reform

Primary role of MS is there

We support for reduce time for non members

Make sure that organization proceeds as per the principle of consensus

Written statements should be there to understand how we will proceed ahead.  
How to limit agenda items? We need to discuss more on this.

**Canada:**

Supports the reform agenda of WHO  
Welcome the ideas of WHO report and white paper  
Issues for consideration: strengthen the EB in countries  
Strategic priorities matters should be discussed with more time.  
EB143/3 prefer option A

**Russia Federation:**

We support for the WHO governance reform  
Ensure multilingualism and rights to vote through formal and informal consultations

**Uruguay:**

EB143/3 we prefer option A  
The statements in website cannot be a substitute for oral interventions, website might be for registry of the countries  
Flexibility important  
FENSA language we would like to talk more on that  
EB143/2 we don't see the need to create a limited group and it's important to preserve the decision-making important to preserve open consultation  
Equal right to members and non-members to speak in order to maintain the WHO democratic.  
Important not to restrict the time in relation to the type of members. Other ideas can be explored to track the WHA on time and make our program effective.  
Less time to adopt the resolution.  
We can think of contents of interventions to make it short.  
EB members don't represent all regions and should be able to reflect country positions

**Dominican Republic:**

No opposition (in principle) to establish an expert group, but cost and participants number based on gender balance, geographical and expertise reflections are equally important  
May negatively affect the participation of non members if we restrict time only to them  
Gender balance in governing bodies: Lets walk the talk in this issue

**New Zealand:**

Support implementation of the identified low-hanging fruits  
Virtual statements are ok  
Experts also ok  
Financial implications to be considered  
Welcome members and non members of EB to be included via a secure app  
We agree with Germany and others about timely information

**Spain:**

Supports to Romania on behalf on EU  
Should work on the working languages because translations are not always perfect

**Iran:**

Process should be inclusive and democratic  
Members states must have the chance to express themselves

Inclusive solution has to be found

**Panama:**

We do not agree on differentiation of time limits to non members.

Ensure transparency regarding the cost of adopted draft resolutions

Women participation is must in governing bodies

There should be guidelines for the delegations to prepare prior to WHA

**Monaco:**

EB 143/3 - Annex 1 would like to amend article 20 of rules of procedure, and consider multilingualism

**Chairperson** has expressed that she will categorize her response under following categories after lunch:

- Issues of low hanging fruits
- Issues that need more clarification
- Issues that need more discussion

### **Meeting 3**

The board has amended the rules of procedure of WHO governance based on discussion yesterday and now they are again discussing on the draft revised decision on WHO reform

Some of the amendments made are:

Board may decide to conduct any vote by electronic means.

During the discussion on any matter, a member may move the suspension of the debate. Such motions shall not be debated, but shall immediately be put to a vote and suspension will be until later in the same session.

Open meeting with MS not represented on the board and associate members and the secretariat has been reworded as Private meeting.

They are now discussing on the points. Which amendments are to put in which point!!

When the health assembly conducts a recorded vote without using electronic means, the vote shall be conducted by roll call, which shall be taken in english or french alphabetical order of the names of members. The name of the Member to vote first shall be determined by lot.

Brazil has provided feedback to structure all the resolutions in such a way so that we can track progress to move ahead

**US:** There should be more clarification about the opportunities for consultations. All these revisions are to be completed by January so that we can approve in Jan EB.

**Turkey:**

Set time limits for items

Consider the cost implications of electronic voting

**Chile**

Agrees with the proposal of paperless

**Algeria**

Has some concerns about IT security issues regarding paperless and electronic voting

**New zealand:**

Role and mandates of governing bodies should be made very clear, and date and mode of reporting should also be made very clear



**Canada:**

Achieving health equity should be at the core for health reform rather than only cost.  
Inter-consultation process should be established.

**DG**

Shared story of turkey and oven to focus on the use of technology if situation and time demands  
Proposal from secretariat need for significant changes because we don't have a board  
Minister from Sudan said very nicely, we need to distinguish, division of work between  
Assembly, EB and officers. We have to balance advantages and disadvantages.  
Important to balance the technology and the modernization of WHO, he propose to continue the  
talks with MS and members of EB

**Secretariat:**

Thanking all the MS for their inputs, she agreed on the feedback provided.

**The discussion has been closed now.**

Decided for gender neutral languages, electronic voting, time limits for resolutions, FENSA  
terminologies and so on

The document is not available in soft copy now

The EB members are discussing about a white paper on governance Reform

EB members are introducing changes regarding the participation of NSAs:

Secretariat decided that there will be consideration of possible changes in the way how NSAs  
participate in the WHA. The languages and modality will be worked on further.

also will affect the participation in the EB

In order to take action, there will be informal discussions (at least three meetings) to be held in  
Geneva before January meeting of EB.

All members of EB agreed on this methodology of work

Now, discussions on prioritization of proposals for additional items on the provisional agenda of  
the Executive Board (document EB143/4)

[http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf\\_files/EB143/B143\\_4-en.pdf](http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB143/B143_4-en.pdf)