

CONFIDENTIAL

COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Meeting 76/7
July 27, 1976

A. Kafka, Chairman

Executive Directors

J. de Groote
S. Jagannathan
B. Kharmawan
W. S. Ryrie
R. J. Whitelaw

Alternate Executive Directors

K. F. Magurn, Secretary

Also Present

S. Y. Cross

B. J. Drabble
H. R. Monday

A. W. Yameogo

J. H. Kjaer

E. O. de Toledo

L. F. Vilches, Temporary
J. Foglizzo

Secretary's Department: B. J. Owen, E. C. Shina. Technical
Assistant to Executive Director: J.-M. Bisson.

1. EXECUTIVE BOARD TRAVEL

The Committee considered a request by Mr. Monday for approval of travel by one of his technical assistants to Addis Ababa to attend a meeting of the Working Party of the African Group of Governors (EB/CAM/76/15, 7/26/76).

Mr. Monday explained that the Chairman of the African group was the Minister of Finance of Kenya, a member of his constituency. It would be helpful if his office could be represented at the meeting of the forthcoming working party in Addis Ababa, inter alia, to prepare the draft speech of the African Governors at the Annual Meeting. As Committee members were no doubt aware, for the past few years African members had presented one speech on behalf of the Governors of the Fund and the Bank for all the African countries.

Mr. Whitelaw commented that the request before the Committee seemed to him to raise the essential issue of whether or not technical assistants should travel. Whenever the Alternate Executive Director was not available, either because of his absence elsewhere or because, as in the present case, there was no Alternate, the question would arise whether the technical assistant should travel or sit in the Executive Board. If other Executive Directors felt that the policy on the travel of technical assistants should be changed, he would not object. Agreement to the present request would in any event probably lead to agreement to travel for technical assistants in general.

Mr. Ryrie remarked that he would prefer to review the position with respect to travel by technical assistants on a general basis rather than with reference to a particular request. Requests for such travel had been turned down in the past, and it might be a little unfair to approve the present request without reviewing the matter in principle. He wondered whether it would be in accordance with present procedures for Mr. Monday to appoint a technical assistant as a temporary Alternate.

The Chairman commented that the appointment of an Alternate Executive Director was of course a matter for the constituency as a whole.

Mr. Monday stated that in exercising his authority under Article XII, Section 3(e) to appoint an Alternate, he had been undertaking consultations with his authorities since the departure of his Alternate a month before. Since he had 17 countries to consult, he had not yet been able to make the appointment.

Mr. Kharmawan said that he would opt for maintaining the decision reached at an earlier Committee meeting (Meeting 76/1, 1/21/76) on the travel of technical assistants, while dealing with Mr. Monday's request on an ad hoc basis. The suggestion of Mr. Ryrie to appoint the technical assistant as an Alternate on a temporary basis might lead to the erosion of the present policy on travel by technical assistants, because whenever an Executive Director wished his technical assistant to travel, he could appoint him as a temporary Alternate. Mr. Monday had a good case for travel by his technical assistant under the present policy, because he was for the moment without an Alternate and had to send someone to the meeting in Addis Ababa. It was not for the Committee to judge what priority Mr. Monday should give to the use of his own time in the Executive Board and in the field. Therefore, he could agree to Mr. Monday's request because of the special circumstances, but on an ad hoc basis.

Mr. Jagannathan noted that his position was similar to that of Mr. Kharmawan. He understood that the Committee had decided earlier that each request for travel by a technical assistant would have to receive the approval of the Committee. He agreed with Mr. Kharmawan that there were disadvantages to appointing a technical assistant as a temporary Alternate. As far as Mr. Monday's request was concerned, however, the special circumstances warranted approval of the request on its own merits and without there being any need to consider such alternatives.

Mr. de Grooté stated that he also supported Mr. Monday's request, but for somewhat different reasons. The distinction between principle and ad hoc cases was artificial, as all requests were ad hoc; but in supporting the present ad hoc request, he believed that there would be a change in the principles applying to such travel. His support was therefore based on the expectation that future requests by an Executive Director for travel by a technical assistant to a member country or to an international meeting would be viewed with equal sympathy whenever the Executive Director felt that such travel would be of help to his office. He would be against the appointment of technical assistants as temporary Alternates because that would be a roundabout way to achieve an end that could be reached by a decision in the Committee. Such a procedure might even be illegal. As for the argument that approval of Mr. Monday's request would be inequitable because other requests had been turned down, he took the view that equity would argue in favor of improving the policy on technical assistants' travel.

The Chairman commented that he would have no hesitation in turning the request down if he felt that it would create a precedent, because he personally thought that it was not proper for technical assistants to be allowed to travel. However, the position of Mr. Monday was different from that of other Executive Directors who had so far submitted requests for travel by technical assistants, because Mr. Monday's office was short of one mobile member, namely, his Alternate Executive Director. He would not feel bound to agree to travel by any other technical assistant unless the office of the Executive Director concerned was also short of one mobile member.

Mr. Yameogo supported the request of Mr. Monday, especially because he understood the difficulties of handling a 17-member constituency. The suggestion for the appointment of an Alternate temporarily was not really an improvement over allowing the technical assistant to travel in his own right, on an ad hoc basis. Mr. Monday would be well advised to defer the appointment of a new Alternate until he had been able to consult his authorities.

Mr. de Grooté inquired whether the Chairman's view of the absence of a mobile member of an Executive Director's office could be interpreted to cover not only occasions when there was no Alternate but times when the Executive Director and his Alternate were both fully occupied in the preparation and attendance of Board meetings, for instance, and were unable to participate in consultations or meetings in a member country.

The Chairman stated that, for him, the distinguishing characteristic of Mr. Monday's position was that his office was short of a member who was entitled to travel.

Mr. Ryrie commented that while he was still a little concerned about establishing a new principle in such an ad hoc manner, he would be prepared to approve the request on the basis of the limited grounds accepted by the Chairman.

Mr. Jagannathan said that he too agreed with the request before the Committee and with the Chairman's view of the position.

Mr. Cross considered that it was important to maintain the principle that travel by technical assistants should be kept to a minimum. Mr. Monday's request was sui generis because he did not have an Alternate and seemed unlikely to be able to appoint one in time. It merited ad hoc approval because it was essential for his office to be represented at a meeting in anticipation of the Annual Meeting that could not be postponed. Of course, concurrent travel by two eligible members of an Executive Director's office would not by itself justify approval of a request for travel by a technical assistant.

Mr. Whitelaw asked for confirmation that Mr. Monday's request, if approved on the lines suggested by the Chairman, would not change the established policy, so that if a similar situation arose in another Executive Director's office, his technical assistant would not automatically be entitled to travel.

The Chairman confirmed that no new rule was being established. Mr. Monday's request would be submitted to the Executive Board by the Committee for an ad hoc decision in accordance with the agreement reached by the Committee at Meeting 76/1 on arrangements relating to travel by technical assistants. The recommendation to the Executive Board would mention the reasons why the request had been considered reasonable, so that no precedent would be established.

Mr. Foglizzo said that he could agree with the Chairman's conclusion.

Mr. Drabble considered that Mr. Monday's request was reasonable; he was prepared to accept the Chairman's solution.

The Committee agreed to recommend to the Executive Board that it approve the request by Mr. Monday on a lapse-of-time basis.

The Committee adjourned at 9:40 a.m.

APPROVED: October 19, 1976