



Committee on Rules for the 2020 Regular Election of Executive Directors

Meeting 20/1

June 4, 2020—4:00 p.m.

Committee on the Rules for the 2020 Regular Election of Executive Directors

Documents: EB/CREED/A/20/1

Staff: Lin and Michaels, SEC; Christopherson Puh and Blair, LEG

Length: 1 hour, 40 minutes

ISSUED: November 16, 2023

APPROVAL: November 23, 2023

CEDA OGADA
Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS¹

Attendance.....3

Discussion Record.....4

Annex.....28

- Presentation
- Constituency Codes

¹ These minutes are the official record of a meeting of the Committee on the Rules for the 2020 Election of Executive Directors, which is an ad hoc committee of the Executive Board. The minutes includes the discussion record (a verbatim transcript of the discussion lightly edited for clarity). Minutes are made public consistent with the Fund’s Open Archives Policy.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ATTENDANCE²

S. Riach, Committee Chair
G. Bauche, Committee Secretary

Committee Members

D. Mahlinza (AE)
L. Villar (CE)
S. Bhalla (IN)
T. Tanaka (JA)
J. Mojarrad (MD)
A. De Lannoy (NE)
M. Rosen (US)

Alternate Members**OTHER BOARD REPRESENTATIVES**

M. Raghani (AF)	B. Lischinsky (AG)
N. Ray (AP)	P. Sun (CC)
A. Bevilaqua (BR)	S. Benk (EC)
L. Levonian (CO)	C. Quagliarini (IT), Temporary
A. Buissé (FF)	
R. von Kleist (GR)	
H. Beblawi (MI)	
M. Poso (NO)	
M. Mouminah (SA)	
A. Mahasandana (ST)	
P. Inderbinen (SZ)	

T. Bonaker, Summing Up Officer
M. McKenzie, Verbatim Reporting Officer

Also Present

Asia and Pacific Department: O. Brekk. Legal Department: C. Blair, K. Christopherson Puh, A. Yiadom. Secretary's Department: J. Lin, E. Michaels. Office of Executive Directors: G. Preston. Executive Director: A. Andrianarivelo (AF), P. Trabinski (SZ). Alternate Executive Director: R. Alkhareif (SA), M. El Qorchi (MD), S. Geadah (MI), C. Just (EC), P. Rozan (FF), B. Saraiva (BR), F. Sylla (AF). Senior Advisors to Executive Directors: W. Abdelati (MI), S. Bah (AF), M. Choueiri (MI), R. Farber (US), M. Ismail (AE), L. Johnson (AP), S. Keshava (SA), Z. Mahyuddin (ST), M. Maida (AE), G. Vasishtha (CO). Advisors to Executive Directors: A. Arevalo Arroyo (CE), D. Fadhel (MI), J. Hanson (NE), Z. Huang (CC), H. Koh (GR), P. Mooney (CO), A. Olhaye (AF), J. Yoo (AP).

² For countries in each constituency, please see the Constituency Codes in the annex.

DISCUSSION RECORD³

The Committee Chair (Ms. Riach):

I would like to thank my fellow committee members, Mr. Bhalla, Mr. De Lannoy, Mr. Mahlinza, Mr. Mojarrad, Mr. Rosen, Mr. Tanaka, and Mr. Villar, for agreeing to serve on the committee.

The operation of the election of Executive Directors (EDs) is a critical moment in the governance machinery of the Fund. It is not only the process through which the individual Executive Directors are elected, but it is also the mechanism through which multi-country constituencies are formed. The Articles of Agreement provide that a regular election of Executive Directors should be conducted at intervals of two years. The last election was conducted in 2018 and concluded at the Bali Annual Meetings.

For 2020, the first step in the process is for the committee to consider and recommend the rules that will govern the election, which must be conducted before the end of the current Board term on October 31. These rules set out the basis on which the election will be conducted. We, obviously, have well-established precedents laid down in past years. Our hope is that, for most elements of the election, we will be able to simply follow past precedent and, therefore, move forward quickly to formulate our proposals.

Procedurally, this committee will recommend rules for the 2020 election of Executive Directors to the whole Executive Board for its approval, and then the Board will refer the rules to the Board of Governors for their approval through a formal vote.

I will ask the Secretary, Mr. Lin, to walk us through how the formal elections' rules framework operates and provide historical background. I will then open the floor to CREED members for their reactions and questions. I will ask the Secretary's Department (SEC) and the Legal Department (LEG) to answer those questions before opening up the floor to other Directors for their views.

Before handing it over to the Secretary, I have a few broader observations that I wanted to make. Firstly, and self-evidently, this election is different as it is being conducted against the backdrop of the unique circumstances of the COVID crisis; the fact that in Washington, D.C. and throughout much of the membership, we are working out of the normal office environment; and the fact that there is a question mark over how exactly the

³ Edited for clarity.

Annual Meetings will be conducted does have the potential to complicate, or, at least, slow down the conduct of the election. The Secretary will say more about this challenge and how we can help to ensure a smooth process, but we need to be conscious of this in our discussions.

Secondly, as a Board, we have discussed the challenge of gender diversity on the Board. There is an ongoing need for this Executive Board to more accurately represent our membership through increasing the number of women serving on the Board as Executive Directors and Alternate Executive Directors. We are certainly not going to solve the problem at this election. Obviously, we must not interfere with members' freedom to nominate and elect candidates as they wish; but it is worth drawing Governors' attention to the issue, particularly given the very low number of female representation at both the ED and the Alternate level. Therefore, I propose that we include language highlighting the issue in the committee's report to the Executive Board and the Board of Governors and that we attach the latest report to Governors, which was prepared by the Board's Gender Diversity Working Group. My understanding is that the latest version of the report was sent to Governors ahead of the Spring Meetings, therefore, it would not be new material; but, I see no harm in resending to highlight the issues again.

Finally, I wanted to touch on the issue of the term of elected Executive Directors which, historically, begins on November 1 of the election year and continues through October 31 of the next election year. This is longstanding practice, and it is also built into the terms of many constituency agreements. However, there have been questions raised about whether having an institutionalized start date in the middle of a school term is consistent with the Fund's role as a responsible and family-friendly employer.

This issue was first raised in the Gender Diversity Working Group. There, the group was very sympathetic to the idea that we should at least consider moving to an August start date. However, they felt that it was not really within the remit of the gender group and should be referred to the Agenda and Procedures Committee for discussion. Unfortunately, for many reasons, that has not happened. The problem we now face is that this committee, in setting both the election date and the length of term of Executive Directors, effectively ties in the timing both for this election and for the next election, meaning that no change would be possible until 2024.

Given the very long timeline, it is worth touching on this here. I would be grateful for views from this committee about whether we are happy to accept it and to come back to it at a later date or whether we should take this opportunity for a broader discussion and consider making a change to the appointment term to allow the next election to be held in the spring of 2022,

with appointments beginning in August of that year, accepting that this would not, in any sense, be a straightforward change to make.

The Secretary (Mr. Lin):

I thank all the committee members for their willingness and their time in working on this very important matter. I would also like to extend my thanks to our Legal colleagues, Ms. Christopherson Puh and Mr. Blair, who are also on the line, and my team, Mr. Bauche and Ms. Michaels. They have been working very efficiently on these materials.

Gender diversity on the Board is a very important issue, and I hope we can find a way to encourage the membership to keep this in mind when considering possible candidates for Executive Directors, as well as in appointing Alternative Executive Directors, Senior Advisors, and Advisors in the coming months. We stand ready to support this work.

As the Chair mentioned, this committee's work is critical to prepare for the EDs' election in October. Under the Articles of Agreement, all Executive Directors are now elected. The rules for conducting the election must be agreed for each election cycle. There is a good foundation already in place for this, as the Chair pointed out, based on our successful elections in the past years.

The 2020 election could be very complicated by the ongoing disruptions caused by the COVID-19 crisis. Conducting the election successfully requires all 189 member countries to vote for an Executive Director to represent them at the Board for the next two years. It is very important for every country to participate in the election process. In the event a country fails to do so, then that country will not be represented at the Board for the next two years, which, of course, is not good. We should try to avoid that.

Usually, we are able to follow up and obtain voting from many member countries in person at the time of the Annual Meetings, as they attend these meetings. However, given the very exceptional and challenging period we are facing now, it is uncertain whether the Governors will be able to come to Washington, D.C., for the Annual Meetings this year. Therefore, balloting will likely be handled entirely through electronic communications.

We have only held one fully electronic balloting process in 2010, when the election was delayed by the discussion around the quota and governance reforms. It was a very challenging task to complete that work, as we recall. It required a huge effort by staff, including all ED offices, SEC,

area departments, and resident representatives, to engage and follow up with member countries.

Our experience is that, outside of the focus of the Annual Meetings, it is very difficult to bring an election to Governors' attention, especially for smaller and more remote member countries. Given this experience, it will be prudent to build extra time into the process this year to reach out early to our member countries. We will need everyone's support at the Board to be active partners in this process.

With that, I would like to consider three issues today for the committee: First, the timeline for the CREED work and the broader election process. Second, the important features of the election rules, which are quite complex. Third, the suggested path forward for drafting the rules for this year's election.

Slide two details process and timeline. The first step is for this committee to define the rules to govern the election and to recommend the rules for the Executive Board's approval. We hope that the committee's work will be completed quite quickly, perhaps as soon as next week on Friday, June 12. If you agree to largely follow the approach of the recent years, we, as the staff, could circulate formal proposals for the committee's consideration on a lapse of time basis, without the need for a second meeting. Then the Board will need to approve them by June 19 on a lapse of time basis. We will first need your approval, then the Board's approval.

The Board will then submit the proposed rules to the Board of Governors for voting. The Board of Governors must approve the rules with an 85 percent majority. Given this high threshold, we propose to give Governors four weeks to vote, between Friday, June 19, and Friday, July 17. It would be very helpful if Executive Directors could inform their authorities about this vote in advance so they can be ready to respond quickly. I would like to highlight that we cannot conduct an election without the successful approval of the rules, therefore, it is very important that the Governors submit their vote in a timely way.

After the rules are approved by the Board of Governors, we can open the nomination phase. We suggest allowing one month for this process, between Wednesday, July 22 and Monday, August 24. We understand that many constituencies are already actively working on the election process, and a month's time would permit time for internal consultations within constituencies, while giving them a clear deadline.

It is not necessary for every member country to submit a nominee. Usually, this process is carefully coordinated within the constituencies.

Typically, and ideally, we would receive only one nomination per constituency so that there will be only as many candidates as there are EDs to be elected.

If we have 24 candidates for 24 ED positions, the election will be called uncontested. This scenario gives member countries the greatest certainty that they will be represented by their preferred candidate. This is where the operation of the rules on the minimum and maximum voting thresholds come into play. I will describe it shortly.

After nominations, we move to the last step, the election. If the election is uncontested, we will only need one round of balloting. For this year, given COVID-19, we could provide a much longer period to complete this step; that is, between Monday, August 24 and Friday, October 16. That is an eight-week period, four weeks longer than we would normally have to consider. We think this is helpful and needed to enable country authorities to take care of this essential task and cast their vote for their preferred Executive Director candidate electronically. This will also allow all of us—committee members included—to follow up with countries during the process.

If there are more candidates nominated than the 24 ED positions to be filled, the situation will become more complex, which is referred to as a contested election. If additional candidates are nominated, it may be necessary to run several rounds of balloting to eliminate a few candidates so that the total number will be 24. This will cause a great deal of uncertainty about the outcome of the election. Fortunately, it has not been necessary in the past many rounds, thanks to the very careful attention of the CREED and also consideration by the Board of Governors.

During the balloting phase, as I mentioned earlier, every member country must submit a ballot for an ED, with only one name. If a member country does not vote for a candidate during this phase, it will lose its representation at the Board for the next two years. Therefore, to ensure that we do receive a ballot from every member, we propose keeping the voting open until 6 p.m. Friday, October 16, the day of the Annual Meetings Plenary. It is very important that, during this phase, Executive Directors and all of us work very closely with the member countries to obtain their vote as soon as the process begins and not wait until the last minute. We must avoid the risk of any member country not voting. This is very important work by the committee and by all of us. Then we will be able to release the election results to the Board on Saturday, October 17.

This timeline would leave about two weeks between the close of voting and the commencement of the new term of the Executive Board on November 1. If there is any need to run additional rounds of balloting to

conclude the election, then we will be able to do so during this two-week period. At the same time, our team will work with new Executive Directors to transition to Washington, DC, in time for the new term to begin on November 1.

Now let's touch upon the rules for the 2020 election. The rules for the 2020 election are complex legal machinery, as Ms. Riach put it, and will need to include the following four aspects.

First, the number of EDs to be elected. The Articles provide for a Board of 20 elected Executive Directors. This is a default position unless the Board of Governors agrees by an 85 percent majority to increase or decrease the number of EDs. Since 1992, the Board of Governors has agreed in the rules for the elections every other two years that the Executive Board should be comprise of 24 EDs. This same commitment was also included in the 2010 governance reforms and is not scheduled to be reviewed again until 2024, eight years after the seventh amendment of the Articles was adopted in 2016. Therefore, we can assume that the rules for the 2020 election will maintain the Board at its current size of 24 EDs in total.

Second, the rules also set upper and lower limits on the size of the voting share for each constituency. These limits were reviewed in great detail in preparation for the 2012 election, following the 2010 quota and governance reforms.

Third, the rules also specify the term of office of Executive Directors, as Ms. Riach also described which, following past practice, will be two years, reflecting the requirement of the Articles that regular elections be conducted on a two-year cycle. Of course, EDs can serve more than one term, subject to an agreement by his or her constituency.

Fourth, and the final point, the rules also outline the administrative aspects of the conduct of the election, including the timeline for nominations and the election described above.

The next slide in the presentation details the maximum and minimum limits on EDs' voting share. Let me now turn to the issue of the minimum and maximum limits on the voting shares that an Executive Director must hold in order to be elected. This is perhaps the most complex area of the rules and is a key aspect of the Fund governance. Member countries can only change constituency membership every two years, at the time of the regular election. They cannot switch constituencies at any other time.

The minimum and maximum voting power thresholds for elected EDs send important signals to member countries on how to align themselves. They

define an appropriate balance between two important principles: allowing freedom of member countries to join their preferred constituency, while avoiding any sensitive concentration of voting power. Each CREED committee needs to consider where this balance should rest. Without a maximum limit, there is a risk that supersized constituencies could form, with very high voting power, crowding out the voice of smaller member countries. However, if no minimum limit is set to define a baseline for a viable constituency, there is a risk that the many candidates for EDs could be put forward by smaller members, requiring multiple rounds of voting, with no certainty about the final composition of the Board.

Let me now turn to a very technical, but an important aspect of the minimum and maximum thresholds, namely, the need to provide for flexibility in their application. A few EDs in the current Board, but also in the past, hold fewer votes than the minimum threshold of 2 percent of the total voting power or more votes than the maximum threshold of 8 percent. This was possible because the rules of the election provided flexibility, although limited, in the application of these rules.

First, the maximum threshold does not apply to single member country constituencies. However, the minimum limit applies to all constituencies. It is important to understand that within the maximum limit, priority is given to member countries, based on the size of their voting share. In cases where the votes of a member country would bring the voting share held by an Executive Director from under the maximum limit to over it, that country can be allowed to join the group. Why? Because its voting share cannot be divided.

Let me give an example. Say, there are three countries. In country A, the voting share is 6 percent. In country B, the voting share is 3 percent. In country C, the voting share is 2 percent. The rules provide that these countries can join the constituency in descending order in terms of their voting share. Constituencies cannot, by rule, pick or choose a country to be included or excluded. Entering a constituency is determined by the order of the size of the voting share, with the largest members included first. In our example of three countries, country A, with 6 percent, could join, and also country B, as its votes would raise the voting share of the ED from 6 percent now to 9 percent, which is over the 8 percent limit, which is OK. However, country C, with 2 percent voting power, cannot join this constituency anymore because that constituency with two countries, the total voting share is already 9 percent, which is above the 8 percent limit. In this case, country B, with 3 percent, cannot be divided in order to lower it to 8 percent, so it would stay at 9 percent.

The same principle of the indivisibility of country voting shares explains why, under the Articles and regulations, the maximum limit is only

applied to multiple country constituencies. A single country member can elect an ED with more voting share than the 8 percent limit because that country's voting share cannot be divided.

Let me now turn to the question of how a few Chairs can hold less than the minimum voting share, 2 percent. For example, the current minimum limit is 2 percent, but we have two Executive Director offices that are holding 1.62 percent and 1.59 percent, respectively. The minimum limit can also be waived if the election is uncontested; meaning, we have 24 positions, then 24 nominations. Therefore, in this case, the minimum limit would not apply. This provision has enabled constituencies to form with less than the 2 percent minimum. But, if it is contested, then it is a different situation.

I will move on to the next slide. I mentioned that the maximum limit is currently 8 percent of the total voting power and the minimum is 2 percent. These limits were adjusted in 2012--again, without the 2010 reforms--to permit the consolidation of advanced European country representation at the Board. It was understood then that a few constituencies would need to become larger as a result of that consolidation, which also meant that a few would get a bit smaller, given the expected redistribution of the voting share across the board. After a very careful consideration, the CREED at that time, that year, recommended increasing the maximum limit per multiple country constituency from the previous 5.5 percent to the current 8 percent. Correspondingly, the minimum limit was lowered from 2.5 percent at that time to the 2 percent now.

Now, looking at this year's election, given that the Board constituencies remain broadly stable, we would, therefore, suggest that the committee consider continuing to use 8 percent as the upper limit and 2 percent as a lower limit.

Finally, the general framework appears to still provide a good basis for this year's election. We would, therefore, appreciate the committee's discussion and confirmation in order for us to proceed on this basis. If so, we could move quite quickly to prepare draft rules for the committee's consideration. As the Chair indicated earlier on, if the CREED is comfortable with these suggestions, we will aim to have the draft rules circulated very soon for the committee's consideration on a lapse of time basis. If the committee members see a need to meet again to discuss any issues, a follow-up meeting could be scheduled for next week.

Ms. Riach also flagged the issue of the terms. If there is a need to discuss that matter, then we will need to organize another meeting later, reflecting the committee members' comments, the staff will come back and try to explain it from our point of view.

Mr. De Lannoy:

I want to say that the rules that we used in the past have been working very well, therefore, it makes sense to apply those as much as possible.

I wanted to say something about what you mentioned on the duration of the term and when we would hold the election, thinking about making the Fund a more family-friendly institution. I was also part of the Working Group on Gender Diversity. This is an issue we need to discuss. The problem now is that it is a little bit late, and I do not think every member and the Board have all the information they need to take a decision that would shorten the term to April, rather than October, in two years; but what we can do is to decide, as a board, to set out a road map to think about this issue very seriously so that, by the time we have to take that decision again in two years, we have all the information we need so that it does not come as a surprise to anyone.

Mr. Mahlinza:

I agree with Mr. De Lannoy on using the existing rules, which have worked before, as much as possible. Taking into account the period that we are in right now, it might be a little bit late to start thinking about changing the term of elected members at this time, but I agree with Chair's suggestion that, in the communication to Governors, we include language that talks about gender diversity. We should try as much as possible to ensure that it happens.

I also agree with maintaining the size of the Board at 24 Executive Directors and to continue to maintain the maximum and minimum limits, as proposed by Mr. Lin.

Mr. Mojarrad:

I agree with the previous speakers, that the 2018 rules remain appropriate. We are open to consider including language on gender diversity. My question is whether, in the rules, the Governors are legally bound to it. An explanation by the Legal Department could really clarify this point.

As the Chair mentioned, the 2020 election will be conducted against the background of the still-developing COVID-19 pandemic, and we are not sure how this year's Annual Meetings will be conducted. As was mentioned by the Secretary, the 2020 election could be complicated. Therefore, it is important for the CREED to ensure that the Governors will have adequate flexibility and time to finalize their vote. That is important. In this regard, we will support any initiative to streamline the voting process, including, for example, by allowing a governor who nominates a candidate to express his

vote for the same candidate on the nomination form. That has been used both in 2010, compressed by the time frame, and in the by-election as well.

While we hope that the pandemic subsides soon, we should also consider a scenario under which a resurgence of the virus will make it difficult for newly elected EDs to travel and settle in Washington, D.C., before the start of their term on November 1, 2020. It would be appropriate if this point could be included in the CREED work program.

I have a question on the size of the Executive Board. I understand that in the reform of 2010, there was an eight-year agreement on the size of 24 Directors; but my understanding from a previous discussion we had is that that decision or that agreement was a gentleman's agreement and is not really binding. My question for the Legal Department is on the size of 24 before, 20 to 24 still is really in place or if there is a possibility that we do not get the 80 percent majority vote for this increase in the size of the Board from 20 to 24, that could also complicate the process of the election as well.

Mr. Tanaka:

Regarding the process, timeline, and components of the rules for the 2020 election, I fully understand the contents of the issue for discussion, and I endorse the proposed approach for the 2020 process. Thus, I will try to be short.

The gender issue is a very important matter. As you know, Japan is very strongly promoting gender issues as well. But as far as EDs are concerned, the countries and constituencies' decision are highly competitive and is purely competitive in terms of the personality of the individual. Therefore, our discussion should stay informal in spirit but not a binding decision, in terms of legal matters. Having said that, I have confidence in the SEC and the chairwoman's process for this committee.

Mr. Villar:

We agree with the process, as proposed, and the timeline; that we keep the size of the Board as it is, 24 members, and with keeping the maximum and minimum limits for the constituency formation.

We also agree with the Chair, Mr. De Lannoy, and with others, in trying to adjust the periods in order to make them more family friendly, starting in 2024, such that Directors can start in August, instead of November.

I have a question about the process. What is the implication for a constituency, if one of its country members cannot vote or does not vote or if

the vote is not recognized by the membership? I would like to understand what the implications would be in that case.

Mr. Bhalla:

I have just two points. One, as stated by Mr. De Lannoy earlier: If it isn't broke, why fix it?

Second, I think any creative guidance that the IMF can provide, that EDs can provide to have greater gender diversity on the Board--whatever guidance or recommendations, we can give--we should definitely do it. It will certainly have a lot of support from my constituency and from others as well. We need to think creatively as to how, keeping individual decisions or individual country decisions aside, we can provide a framework or guidance for all member countries to try to approach this in a creative fashion.

Ms. Pollard:

We certainly support the rules, as outlined by the Secretary.

The one thing I want to comment on, though, is the issue of gender representation. I fully support the importance of increasing gender parity or moving toward gender parity on the Board.

The issue of the start date is not just an issue of gender but, as you say, it is one of encouraging a more family-friendly workplace. What I would like to ask is, how would we go about changing that? Obviously, we cannot do so for the 2020 election, but how would we go about changing that to get it done for the 2022 election?

The staff representative from the Legal Department (Ms. Christopherson Puh):

I would first like to answer the question raised by Mr. Mojarrad on the gender issue. I think his question goes to the point as to whether the CREED or the Executive Board can legally tell the Board of Governors how to vote, in terms of gender, and the answer legally is, no. The Governors are free to elect the nominees or candidates who they decide to put forward and, once the nominees are there, to vote on them.

I understand Ms. Riach's proposal is not to add any particular recommendation to the decision that is being proposed for the Governors to adopt in the resolution but, rather, to include language in the report that raises two very important issues that I hear everybody is very supportive of. First, to talk about the importance of gender equality at the Board and, second, to showcase all the work that has been done already in the Fund in terms of

gender, including by adding the report on gender to the resolution. This is the Legal Department's position on this case.

With respect to the question raised by Mr. Villar: what happens if a member does not vote in this particular election? In such a case, that member, for instance, may not be recognized at this stage, does not have an elected ED. That means that for the period of two years, that member does not have an ED representing the member during that period of the new term of the Executive Board.

A third question that I would like to answer briefly is on the nomination and balloting at the same time. This method is feasible. In fact, it is used for the by-elections. We do not use this one for the normal elections of Executive Directors. It is not a legal feasibility issue. It is by the nature of the design of the election of EDs. It is that one would like to have all the nominees first and then determine whether it is contested or uncontested. Then one will vote in the way that is necessary, depending on whether we know it is an uncontested one, because there are only 24 nominees, or whether one has to proceed with several rounds of balloting because EDs contest it as one has 25 or more nominees.

The staff representative from the Legal Department (Mr. Blair):

Mr. Mojarrad had a question about the size of the Board. I wanted to confirm that it is a political commitment, therefore, it is not legally binding. The agreement was to review that in eight years, which runs from the time that the quota and Board reform amendments entered into effect, which was 2016. The next review would take place in 2024.

The Committee Chair (Ms. Riach):

On gender, if we are going to include language in the CREED report, we will need to get Legal's advice to make sure that we get the language absolutely right because I think all of us completely respect the fact that we cannot instruct Governors on this or tell Governors what to do. Particularly for multi-country constituencies, there are a whole range of different issues that Governors are balancing in deciding who to nominate, and it is absolutely right that they should do that.

I believe our objective is simply to try to get to the stage where, when Governors are making their decisions about nominations, that they are aware of the issue of gender. What they decide to do with that is entirely up to them. We will take advice from the Legal Department to get the language right to ensure that people are aware of it as an issue.

The staff representative from the Secretary's Department (Ms. Michaels):

There was a question from Mr. Mojarrad about the implications of a resurgence in the COVID-19 pandemic, potentially disrupting the start date or the ability of incoming Executive Directors to travel to Washington, D.C. in time to take up the term on November 1. Certainly, we are hoping that by that time, the situation will have stabilized. If there were to be such a disruption, we would find practical ways to enable them to take up their terms in a timely way, perhaps from the home country. We are already seeing hiring occurring in the offices. This is typically a time in the year, starting over the summer months, where we see a lot of transitions in many Offices of Executive Directors. We have never on-boarded an Executive Director remotely before. We will shortly be working with offices to issue guidance on how they can approach the transitions that we see occurring in the run-up to the election, and that will include guidance on how incoming EDs and Alternate EDs can take up their positions, if they need to do so in the home country.

The Committee Chair (Ms. Riach):

In our office, we have on-boarded a couple of advisors in the last month, with really excellent support from SEC. We have managed to do it more successfully than I would have thought was possible. Obviously, for EDs, it will be more complicated, but I think we have established that it is possible.

I am going to open the floor for non-committee members.

Ms. Levonian:

As an aside, we have also on-boarded a colleague remotely in one of our Caribbean countries, with a few bumps along the way.

On providing gender information and getting the language right, we will work it out. It is key to ensure that this issue is on Governors' minds when they are proposing a candidate for this position. It is just to get it into their thinking, as opposed to making a decision without that in the background.

On the general information that was provided, I am in agreement with all that was said. I am in agreement with Mr. De Lannoy, Mr. Mahlinza, and others, that we want to change as little as possible, given the context. Do not fix it, if it is not broken.

On the term or the time frame, from a family-friendly perspective, I strongly think that doing something on this front is important. As the Chair of

the Working Group on Gender Diversity and someone, who has personally experienced the challenges of starting in November, I believe that amending the date will not only encourage a more diverse field of candidates but will also signal to our stakeholders that we are an organization that embraces family-friendly staffing policies.

Let me be clear. The election rules, as they stand, are not family-friendly at all. There are a lot of obstacles to overcome there. In my view, the rules do not provide a level playing field for candidates. Although this is a family issue, again, if we were to do a gender-based analysis on this, it would fall on women, more than it would fall on men. I think that it is extremely important.

I understand we want to do this in due course and make sure that everybody is aware that it is coming, but in some ways, I believe it is something we need to address now. We are here. We are able to make these changes today, however they may be in that context. I do not think the issues are insurmountable. I think shortening the time period by a very short period of time or even lengthening it by a short period of time is doable. We have had these discussions at the Working Group on Gender Diversity. I am very much in favor of trying to do something in the shortest time frame possible.

Mr. Mouminah:

I associate myself with everything that has been said. We are fully supportive of the rules, as they remain appropriate.

On the timing, on the shift of the next election to be a maximum, to be honest, by 2022, the spring of 2022 to be moved to August, it will enable more families to be able to come in within the school year. Again, I associate myself with everything Ms. Levonian said because she articulated everything that needed to be said in that context.

That brings me to including the language on gender diversity. It is extremely important that we at least nudge Governors to be able to observe it. Again, the Chair has articulated that quite well, so I will stop here and say that I associate myself with the approach proposed.

Mr. Ray:

I agree with everyone who said we should be trying to use the established procedures as much as possible because that is what our authorities are familiar with in this environment, so I have broad support for the approach that is outlined.

We should plan on the basis that we will not have a physical Annual Meeting, with 189 Governors in Washington, D.C., I strongly agree with the Secretary's remarks about needing to give as much time as possible to get this done.

I am quite worried about the possibility that a member might not vote. I know from personal experience that it can be quite difficult to get the votes, even when the Governors in the constituency are in Washington, D.C., or in Bali as I experienced last time.

Given the number of members that we are going to have on programs, we need to be alert to the risk that we could have a member whose Governor does not vote in time, who is on a program, and could end up not being represented in the Board. That does not seem to me to be a very good outcome at all, and it is something that perhaps further thinking could be done on. Is there a safety net to get that fixed? I do not have a solution. It is a hypothetical problem, but it is a hypothetical problem that I think would be undesirable.

On gender diversity, I strongly agree with the Chair's proposal. We use language like this when we are writing to Governors about appointments. There should be a way to do it which is not going to cause legal problems. We should encourage Governors to think about the issue and, as Ms. Christopherson Puh said, showcase the work that the working group has been doing in the Board.

On the question about changing the term, this would be an incredibly sensitive matter for this constituency, and it would be very difficult to do it in a short time frame. It is complicated because our constituency agreement covers both sides of the street, and it covers things like who attends IMFC meetings. Therefore, it is not trivial. I have to say, it is not intuitively obvious to me, as an Australian, that it is any more family friendly to arrive at that time of year than it is to come when we currently arrive. It may be for people in the northern hemisphere, but it is not necessarily for everyone in the world. We need to think about it. I have actually been posted to Washington, D.C. at that time of year, and I do not know that I found that move any easier than arriving when I did.

Again, it will not be my problem; but the idea that we are going to have Board meetings that are beginning at 11:00 p.m. in parts of the world, if that is the outcome, because we cannot get EDs here in November, then that is a problem. I am encouraged by Ms. Riach's comment, that she is going to be able to get people here, which I assume is what was implied.

Mr. Benk:

Turning to the issue on the timing of the election and the start date of the EDs, I fully agree with Mr. Ray that this is a very complicated issue for many multi-country constituencies. It is probably not as complicated for single countries but definitely for multi-countries. It would be a complicated issue for us, too. I believe we would need more time to prepare for such an important change. Of course, we are open to consider discussing this issue, but preferably on a longer term.

Mr. Lischinsky:

We support the proposed approach for 2020; the size of the Board, 24 elected Executive Directors; the current setting for an 8 percent maximum, 2 percent minimum; the proposed timeline for conducting the 2020 elections, the eight-week Board balloting period, and that all members must participate. On the last point, it is expected that all ballots will be submitted via electronic communication. We would add to the online voting system by email or fax, too, because a few constituencies send their ballots by fax.

We support gender diversity on the Board. With regard to being family friendly, I agree with Mr. Ray, that the whole world does not have summer at the same time. In the southern hemisphere, we have the summer in January, and the education cycle goes from March to December. Therefore, it will always be a problem to make these education cycles compatible.

With regard to the legal approach and what Ms. Christopherson Puh has said, the issue is, if a country's government is not recognized by the majority of IMF members, its vote is not recognized. I understand that. If you could clarify that point.

Mr. Inderbinen:

Like others, I fully support the rules, as presented this afternoon. We also fully support putting language in the report to Governors on gender for the same reasons that others have related.

On the election periods, I can state, as a parent with kids from the northern hemisphere, I sympathize with the intent; but similar to Messrs. Ray and Benk, for those multi-country constituencies that have rotation schemes in the chair, the issues are not straightforward. These would have to be looked at very carefully. As in Mr. Ray's case, as well as for this chair, it applies also across both institutions. The issues there are nontrivial, just to flag that from this chair as well.

Mr. Bevilaqua:

We broadly support the proposed outline. We think it can help to smooth out the process during these very uncertain times. As Mr. Ray, Mr. Inderbinen, and others, changing the term may not be a trivial issue for multi-country constituencies with multi-year and multi-institution constituency agreements. We have to be very, very careful in discussing those changes.

I have a question, perhaps for Mr. Lin. What happens if a member votes and a nominee cannot be counted because of the rule of maximum voting power? Do we get a new round of voting for everyone or just for those who were not counted before the vote?

Ms. Mahasandana:

We support the Secretary's proposal for the 2020 elections and strongly support the proposal to add the issue of gender diversity and the report to underscore the importance of gender diversity at the Board.

As for the timing of the elections, to support a family-friendly workplace, I also recognize Mr. Ray and others' comments. In our case, with a multi-country constituency, it may be quite complicated. The implications might not be that effective. In our case, we have a very long, advanced rotation scheme. That said, I would think the staff and also the committee should kick-start the discussions on this and bring it up to the whole Board for a discussion as early as possible, so we will be able to implement it in the next round of elections.

The Committee Chair (Ms. Riach):

Before I hand it over to staff, based on what we have heard on the length of the appointment period and, therefore, the timing of subsequent elections, I have a question, which I wanted to put to staff: we are hearing a mixture of views, with a significant number of Directors feeling that this is an important issue, with a few Directors wanting to push ahead but also a significant number of Directors saying that it is not a straightforward issue and that, for multi-country constituencies, it is something that we certainly should not rush into. For those people who would note that different parts of the world have summer at different times, I think that is a very valid point, but I would have thought starting at the beginning of the school year, rather than the middle of a school term, would be a positive thing, regardless of where in the world you are coming from.

My question for the staff is, the concern that I have I can completely see the case for not rushing ahead with this now, but I am concerned about a timeline which means that nothing can be done until the 2024 elections because that seems to be a very long time frame. Would it be possible for us to agree that we could have a process for looking at this and having a full and considered discussion where, if the Board decided that it was something that they wanted to make a change on, that change could, by one mechanism or another, be brought in earlier to allow a change to be made for the 2022 elections? Is there any way in which that could be a possibility?

With all of that, I am going to hand it over to staff, as we have questions both for the Legal Department and the Secretary's Department.

The staff representative from the Legal Department (Ms. Christopherson Puh):

I will start with the question raised by Mr. Lischinsky. It is very important to clarify this. I was given the example of a case in which a member may not be voting in this election; for instance, when the government of a member is not recognized at this stage and, therefore, we are not dealing with those authorities and, therefore, the governor cannot vote for that reason. I was just given this example. That is not the only case in which a member may not vote in this election. The example was also given by Mr. Ray when he spoke. He mentioned that there may be cases in which a member of any other kind may not cast a vote through the governor on time and perhaps that member will not elect an ED. That also raises the concerns that he had. That is to clarify that it was an example I was giving of a case, in which a governor may not vote or a member may not vote.

On Ms. Riach's specific question to staff on this concern, if we do not do anything right now with respect to the term of the new Board to be elected, whether nothing can really be done until 2024. The answer is that, from a legal perspective, there are things that can happen before. For instance, there is a requirement under the Articles to have an election every two years, at intervals of two years. In principle, the next election would normally be in October 2022. The term of the existing EDs at that time will end when the new election takes place. In principle, legally, provided it takes place in 2022, the election can take place in the spring. Therefore, once we have the election in 2022--instead of in the fall, you have it in the spring, and we have the newly elected EDs--the EDs that were in office at that time will cease to have office then. Legally, it is feasible to do it in 2022 and you do not need to wait until 2024, if we correctly understood your question.

The Secretary (Mr. Lin):

Continuing with Ms. Christopherson Puh's point, we need to be careful. For example, for an election to happen earlier than October 2022, that term will need to be spelled out in this resolution, and it then requires an 85 percent Board of Governors' approval now. As I shared, there are four elements in the Board of Governors resolution this year. The term is one of them. So, it has to be precise. If there is an agreement to move ahead, to open the whole thing in the spring of 2022, then this will need to be described here and will require the Board of Governors' approval by 85 percent. It cannot be open-ended then, to tackle this issue in the spring of 2022.

In my example, we have three country cases, Country A, Country B, and Country C, with voting shares of 6 percent, 3 percent, and 2 percent, respectively. In that case, the country with a 2 percent voting power could not join that constituency. That would not require the reopening of the entire election again; rather, that country will need to find a new home, meaning, it will need to find a new ED to represent that country for the next two years. We will have not a new election; rather, we will be following up with country C in this case to see which ED country C would prefer to work with for the next two years.

The Committee Secretary (Mr. Bauche):

We have to present this resolution as a package to the Governors. That is: the size of the Board, the rules, the timelines, but it is also the Board's term. If we were to present the unspecified end term for 2022 to the Governors, I think EDs would need to be very comfortable that they could explain to their Governors the rationale behind that because it might be a bit complicated and also a bit uncomfortable for the Eds, who have already planned to come here next November. Some of them might not even know whether they will be able to come to Washington, D.C., so it might be a very truncated term at the very beginning, even though they could work from their home country, but also to not exactly know what the end-term would be. This kind of uncertainty will need to be explained to the Governors so that they can vote with full knowledge. The problem for all of us is that we know we need a pretty high threshold of votes, which is 85. That is not to say that this is impossible, but it just to say that this does require a lot of explanation for the Governors.

Mr. Mojarrad:

I wanted to come back to the point mentioned by Mr. Ray, that there may be a high risk of a few Governors not being able to vote during the eight weeks which, even under normal situations--I guess Mr. Lin remembers--but

with the possibility of the Annual Meetings, all the Governors are in Washington. I know the Secretary also says that we have to chase Governors to get their votes.

With this high risk and also given some assurances that all the Governors would have the chance to vote, my proposal is to give the choice to Governors during the nomination period to indicate that they would vote for the same person that they are nominating. That would simplify the process of election and would also give assurance that they all participate in the voting.

I was not totally convinced by the legal explanation, that we want to make sure there are no contested elections. In the by-election years, there is just one period. Now we have four-and-a-half weeks of a nomination period and eight weeks of voting. That is basically going to stay the same.

My suggestion is to give flexibility for the Governor in a single shot that, during the nomination, there is a box that we say: Yes, I am going to vote for this person that I am nominating. If there are more than 24 nominees after we complete the period of nomination, then that would give them the chance to vote.

Maybe, I will discuss this next time with the Secretary. I know during 2010, we had a generic type of nomination form, which was very innovative because the election went beyond November 1. For the by-election, we also have this format for simplicity of the election process. The reason is because we are really under very special circumstances, and a lot of complications are anticipated. As Mr. Ray said, the risk of not voting is quite high. That is why I thought perhaps flexibility given to the Governors could give us an assurance that all the Governors will vote.

Ms. Christopherson Puh, could I ask you to respond to that one and to also specifically come back to Mr. Ray's question: Is there any scope for us for putting something in the rules agreed to by CREED that could provide a safety net, a kind of a second shot if someone fails to vote?

The staff representative from the Legal Department (Ms. Christopherson Puh):

I will answer the questions from the legal side, but I will have to turn back to Mr. Lin and our colleagues in SEC also from the procedural and policy perspective.

On the legal side, thank you to Mr. Mojarrad for the follow-up question, when I was giving the reason of why it is legally feasible, it is not an issue of legal feasibility, but goes beyond the legal issues. This is a policy call

and a design and whether CREED and the Board would like to follow these procedures to propose to the Board of Governors.

I was given an example of the reasons why one would prefer not to have the balloting at the same time as nominating a candidate, and it is the one that I gave before. We understood--and this is where I defer to Mr. Lin and SEC--that it actually gives one more flexibility, not having to nominate and vote at the same time because then that allows one to change their mind, in principle. One can nominate someone, but one may decide to vote for somebody else. In terms of separating them, one actually has more flexibility than just forcing the two to happen together. In terms of the procedure, I will have to defer to SEC on that.

On Ms. Riach's specific question, following up on Mr. Ray's point, I am not sure how we can do something different with respect to the question of a member not voting in an election. If a vote is not cast by the deadline, then the member does not have a representative in the new Board for the next two years. Maybe that is something that creatively we can think about more on how to avoid that from happening; but once it happens, if you do not have a member voting, then that member does not have an ED elected for the next cycle.

The Secretary (Mr. Lin):

I think this is a real risk, as Mr. Ray and Mr. Mojarrad put it. Indeed, Mr. Bauche and particularly Ms. Michaels went through so many rounds, indeed. Quite often, we have to chase after the Governors as late as 5:59 pm, waiting outside of the door of the hotel room in order to get that paper signed. The Office of Internal Audit and Inspection often conducts reviews to check the validity of these voting records, so we need to keep all the voting records.

How should we address this risk, which is real? I believe the best way is through all different forms of communication: fax, email, and IMF Connect. There is one more that is helpful: if Directors could help us obtain the cell phone number for two or three people, like a Governor, an Alternate, or his or her assistant's phone number. For us, that will go a long way to help us to follow up with the Governors to obtain their votes. In the past, we had another way of doing so; that is through resident representative offices. However, at this time, all the resident representatives are here.

Mr. Mojarrad's suggestion is good, but there may be complications. For example, a nomination is not expected by every member country. As I mentioned earlier, not all countries are expected to nominate a person. Oftentimes, the nomination only comes in by constituency. So, a group of countries nominates a person. The second complication, as

Ms. Christopherson Puh put it, if the number of nominations is greater than 24 and it becomes contested, then we have to reopen for an election one more time to the Board of Governors, even though they voted already early on, together with the nomination. There are a lot of complications there. Finally, we need to look into the issue and see how best to ensure that everybody votes. Ms. Michaels, do you have any additional suggestions on that?

The staff representative from the Secretary's Department (Ms. Michaels):

As Mr. Mojarrad was talking, I went back to refresh my memory about the 2010 experience, which was very, very tough for us. And it was tough for two reasons. First, the periods for nominations and balloting were very truncated. I did want to just double check whether we had, in fact, considered bringing the two processes together. I can see from the rules that were approved in 2010 that it might feel like that in retrospect, but we actually set two completely separate periods for nominations and balloting, but they were very short. In that case, the key to success was relentless outreach. Certainly, in subsequent elections, I absolutely agree with Mr. Ray that it can be very, very tough to engage Governors to get them to participate, even when they are physically in Washington. I have had remarkable success getting votes in via WhatsApp. I am not fussy about how they come in now, as long as they do come in. We phone Governors. I remember in 2010, making some phone calls at unfriendly hours at the Washington, D.C. end into the South Pacific to basically beg for those pieces of paper.

As Mr. Lin said, we need to engage through all possible mechanisms. We have a very nice online voting portal. We would love to be able to spend some time with EDs, helping them understand how easy it is to use. We would just push very, very hard, as we did in 2010. That was a 24-hour operation for the two-week period in which we conducted that election, and we did not miss anyone. It nearly drove us crazy, but everything came in. So, we know it can be done. It is just really hard, and we need your help.

Mr. Villar:

I am worried about a possible likely situation. I understand that there are cases, in which a country does not vote because it is an operational issue that one conducts for the Board and tries to avoid the situation. Perhaps I have to mention the case that we could have in my constituency, which is Venezuela. Venezuela is not recognized by the membership of the Fund. If they want to vote, we do not know if they can vote, if we will receive the vote. We can work toward a definition about that, but it is very likely that, from now until October, we will not have an answer for that.

In that case, I wonder what happens legally if we do not receive the vote, we do not have an ED representing Venezuela, and in January of next year, Venezuela has a government that is recognized--the current government, or another government--but they cannot come to the IMF because they do not have a channel to talk to the IMF. That is a very likely situation. We have to think about that very carefully. I do not think we can close that possibility by saying that they cannot come back to the Fund during the next two years.

The Committee Chair (Ms. Riach):

I had not thought about Venezuela, but I think you make a very good point. All of us have been very clear on Venezuela, that we want to make sure that there is always a route back to the Fund for them. It would be unfortunate if, on this technicality, we shut that off.

The staff representative from the Legal Department (Ms. Christopherson Puh):

Mr. Villar, that is a very good point, and it is good that you came back on this. I can confirm that, as of today, under the current situation, Venezuela will not be able to vote because we cannot communicate with their authorities. So, if, between now and the closing date of the election, nothing changes, we will not be able to receive that vote; therefore, Venezuela will not be voting and, therefore, Venezuela will not have an ED for the next two years. This is under the assumption that nothing changes between now and the end of the voting date.

If they do not have an Executive Director and a few months later or a week later, we recognize a government for Venezuela and they want to re-engage with us? What would happen, in practice, is the following, which is not only for Venezuela but for any other country case in which a member did not vote for an ED: this member can informally choose an ED to represent their interests in the Executive Board. And that is not only for the case that Mr. Villar is referring to, but is for any other member that would not have an Executive Director.

The most important part is that there is a provision in the Articles of Agreement that says: When a subject matter that is of interest to the member is going to be discussed at the Board, the member can send somebody. Once we have recognized a government for Venezuela, depending on the circumstances, we can deploy that Article under the Articles of Agreement, and that member may be able to send somebody to the Executive Board, even if it is not an Executive Director. There have been cases in the past in which, for instance, a minister of finance has attended a Board meeting as a representative of the member country when the issue to be discussed pertains to the member.

The Committee Chair (Ms. Riach):

Let me summarize.

Overall, there seems to be a broad support for maintaining the current settings for this election. Directors supported keeping the Executive Board at 24 Directors. They supported keeping the maximum and minimum voting shares for elected Directors at 8 percent and 2 percent, respectively and continuing to include flexibility in applying or waiving these limits under the specific circumstances, in line with past practice. Directors seem generally comfortable with the proposed one-month time frame for member countries to submit nominations for the Executive Directors and the six-week period for balloting, including on October 16, the date previously approved for the Annual Meetings.

On the issue of including language on gender and the working group's report in the material that is sent to Governors, I think there was agreement that, provided we get the wording right, everybody was happy with it. Let's have a go at drafting something with full advice from Legal. I think there was considerable concern about the challenges of ensuring that everybody votes in potentially difficult circumstances and I think a commitment from SEC and from all the Board members to work together to do whatever we can through all possible channels to try to make sure that everybody votes.

On the issue of the period of appointment and, therefore, the timing of the next election, what I heard was a lot of appetite for having a proper discussion about this issue, a general feeling that this is a discussion which could not be rushed, given that there were views on both sides about whether a change was the right thing to do.

I would like to record in the report the fact that this was something that Directors wanted to come back to for a further discussion. It would be helpful if SEC could think about the best way to do it. Frankly, it is something we should be coming back to as quickly as possible to make sure we can have a proper discussion, that we can come to a considered view, so that if a decision is taken, that this is something that we want to change, that we are able to look at all options for doing that as quickly as possible. I do not think we can be in a position where we end up coming back to this at the CREED meeting before the 2022 election. Unless anybody vehemently disagrees, I think that is where we are on that issue.

The Committee Chair (Ms. Riach) adjourned the discussion.

ANNEX

- Presentation
- Constituency Codes

2020 Regular Election of Executive Directors

A black marker with an orange tip is shown in the upper right corner, drawing red checkmarks inside blue-outlined boxes on a white surface. The boxes are arranged in a descending staircase pattern from top-left to bottom-right. The background is a light, slightly blurred white.

Framework and Timeline

Process and Timeline

Step 1

CREED
proposes
rules for 2020
ED election

By June 12

Step 2

Executive
Board
approval
(on LOT)

By June 19

Step 3

Board of
Governors
vote on rules
(85%
majority)

June 19 –
July 17
(4 weeks)

Step 4

Members
nominate
candidates
for ED

July 22 –
August 24
(4.5 weeks)

Step 5

Member
countries vote
for candidates
(voting closes at
AMs)

August 24 –
October 16
(8 weeks)

Elected Executive Directors term begins November 1, 2020

Components of the Rules for the 2020 Election

- **Size of the Executive Board:**

Following the 7th Amendment, the Articles provide for an all-elected Executive Board of 20 Executive Directors. Rules for each election will specify the number of Executive Directors to be elected above 20 chairs

- **Size of constituency voting power:**

Maximum and minimum voting shares for elected EDs

- **Term of Elected EDs**

Historically, begins November 1 of the election year and continues through October 31 of the next even-numbered year

- **Conduct of the Election**

Timeline and procedures for submitting nominations of candidates and ballots for EDs

Max/Min Limits on ED Voting Shares

- **Purpose of the maximum and minimum limits:** Balance between voluntary constituency formation and avoiding excessive concentration of voting power.

- **Maximum and minimum limits operate together** to guide efficient constituency formation.
 - Maximum limit requires member countries whose votes for a candidate would exceed the limit to find another constituency

 - Minimum limit provides incentives for small members to form constituencies

Application of the Max/Min Limits

- **Maximum threshold** does not apply to single-member constituencies
- **Minimum threshold** applies to all constituencies
- **Maximum threshold is always applied flexibly and minimum threshold is waived if the election is uncontested, i.e. the number of nominated candidates is equal to the number of chairs to be elected.**
 - **Maximum threshold:** Applied flexibly to accommodate the member whose voting share would take the constituency from below to above the limit
 - **Minimum threshold:** Waived in an uncontested election

Last Revision of Max/Min Limits (2012)

Objective: Define new maximum and minimum limits to support consolidation of advanced European chairs under 2010 governance reform objectives

- **Maximum threshold increased from 5.5 percent to 8 percent** of the total voting power
- **Minimum threshold lowered from 2.5 percent to 2 percent** of the total voting power

Proposed Approach for 2020

The CREED may wish to follow the blueprint established for 2018 election of EDs:

- **Assume size of the Board remains 24 elected Executive Directors.**
- **Current settings for 8%max/2%min thresholds** appear appropriate.
- **Timeline for conduct of 2020 election should provide sufficient time to permit all member countries to participate.**
 - **4.5 week** nomination period (must receive nominations of 24 candidates)
 - **7 week** balloting period (all members must participate)
 - It expected that **all ballots will be submitted via electronic communications** (online voting system or via email)

End

CONSTITUENCY CODES

OEDAE

Angola, Botswana, Burundi, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe

OEDAF

Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Rwanda, São Tomé & Príncipe, Senegal, Togo

OEDAG

Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay

OEDAP

Australia, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Nauru, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu

OEDBR

Brazil, Cabo Verde, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guyana, Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama, Suriname, Timor-Leste, and Trinidad and Tobago

OEDCC

China

OEDCE

Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Spain, and República Bolivariana de Venezuela

OEDCO

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Canada, Dominica, Grenada, Ireland, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines

OEDEC

Austria, Belarus, Czech Republic, Hungary, Kosovo, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, and Turkey

OEDFF

France

OEDGR

Germany

OEDIN

Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, and Sri Lanka

OEDIT

Albania, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal, and San Marino

OEDJA

Japan

OEDMD

Afghanistan, Algeria, Ghana, Islamic Republic of Iran, Libya, Morocco, Pakistan, and Tunisia

OEDMI

Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Maldives, Oman, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen

OEDNE

Armenia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Georgia, Israel, Luxembourg, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Republic of North Macedonia, Romania, and Ukraine

OEDNO

Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, and Sweden

OEDRU

Russian Federation and Syrian Arab Republic

OEDSA

Saudi Arabia

OEDST

Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Fiji, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Tonga, and Vietnam

OEDSZ

Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Poland, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan

OEDUK

United Kingdom

OEDUS

United States