

## Good Practice: Selection and Evaluation of Executive Directors, Alternates and Advisors

The effectiveness of Board members—Executive Directors, Alternates and their advisors—is strongly determined by the skills and experience of the individuals selected to fill those positions. Beyond what is contained in the Fund’s Articles of Agreement and By-Laws, there is currently no standardized job description for Executive Directors or Alternates. In 2003, an attempt was made by the Committee on Executive Board Administrative Matters (CAM) to lay down minimum basic responsibilities and qualifications for the professional staff in Executive Directors’ offices in order to “help authorities identify fully qualified candidates.”<sup>43</sup> However, agreement among Executive Directors could not be reached, even for voluntary guidelines. As a result, job criteria and selection processes are still determined exclusively by processes internal to each constituency and by the discretion of individual member-country authorities.

Given the importance of having appropriately qualified and experienced staff in the Board, the IEO evaluation team sought to identify examples of good practice in the selection of Board members. These involve clearly specified qualifications, a transparent process that encourages the selection of the best-qualified candidates, and a transparent process for evaluating performance. Policies and practices vary widely from constituency to constituency. Some constituencies do not have clear rules for staff selection, while others, such as the Nordic-Baltic constituency, maintain detailed job descriptions for each position in the Office of the Executive Director. Duties and

qualifications (such as macroeconomics and political economy expertise, language ability, and familiarity with the IMF’s policies and procedures) are clearly spelled out.

In terms of good practice in the selection of Directors and other officials, the guidelines adopted in 2003 by the constituency representing Anglophone Africa offer a good benchmark. These are described in detail in a publication prepared by their office.<sup>44</sup> The constituency has a rotation system under which each country has a turn nominating candidates for the position of Alternate. Immediately after completing his or her term as Alternate, each will also serve as Director for one term. Three nominees are put forward to be considered by a panel of six Governors from the constituency. If none of these are deemed suitable, the nominating country is given a “second and final chance” to present three candidates. If none these are deemed suitable, that country forfeits its turn in favor of the next country in the line. Successful candidates are then recommended to the full constituency.

In terms of evaluation, the constituency currently headed by the Director from Australia offers a good benchmark. The constituency has an informal performance evaluation framework in place for all professional staff. The framework is tailored by job position and based on the IMF’s Annual Performance Review template. Appraisals prepared by the Director can be shared with the evaluatee’s authorities. The Director has also agreed to be subject to a review based on input from his staff.

<sup>43</sup>“Capacity Building Measures for the Offices of Executive Directors,” EB/CAM/03/5, June 26, 2003.

<sup>44</sup>Africa Group I Constituency (2003).