



International Oil Pollution
Compensation Funds

Agenda Item 7	IOPC/MAR21/7/3	
Date	15 March 2021	
Original	English	
1992 Fund Assembly	92AES24	●
1992 Fund Executive Committee	92EC75	
Supplementary Fund Assembly	SAES8	●

APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR

PROCEDURES

Note by the Director

Summary:

The post of Director will become vacant on 31 December 2021 on the expiry of the current Director's term of office.

The 1992 Fund Assembly will therefore be invited, at its 26th session in November 2021, to appoint a new Director who will, *ex officio*, also be Director of the Supplementary Fund.

This document sets out the established practice for the appointment of the new Director, namely by a secret ballot held in person, in a private meeting, overseen by two scrutineers appointed by the 1992 Fund Assembly. Full details of the established practice are set out in section 2.

However, due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the November 2021 meeting of the IOPC Funds' governing bodies may be held at least partly, if not fully, remotely. In this case, the usual ballot procedure applicable for the appointment of the Director would need to be adapted accordingly on an exceptional basis.

This document, therefore, also sets out four alternative options which could be considered by the governing bodies in the event that the November 2021 meeting is held remotely. The alternative options to elect the Director are: (a) exclusively via an online voting system; (b) exclusively by postal voting; (c) via a hybrid solution which offers both voting in-person at the meeting or online voting; or (d) a further hybrid option which offers both voting in-person at the meeting or postal voting. Full details of these four options are set out in section 3.

Action to be taken:

1992 Fund Assembly

- (a) Take note of the information provided in this document;
- (b) note the established practice of the appointment of the Director, as set out in section 2;
- (c) consider the alternative options for the ballot procedure which could be followed for the appointment of the Director in the event that the November 2021 meeting is held partly or fully remotely, and it is therefore not possible to follow established practice; and

(d) provide feedback and instruct the Director accordingly.

Supplementary Fund Assembly

(a) take note of the information contained in this document; and

(b) note any decisions taken by the 1992 Fund Assembly in respect of the various aspects of the procedures to be followed.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 At its 21st session in October 2016, the 1992 Fund Assembly reappointed Mr José Maura as the Director of the IOPC Funds for a second five-year term. His second term of office will expire on 31 December 2021. The Director is, *ex officio*, also the Director of the Supplementary Fund.
- 1.2 The appointments of Mr Willem Oosterveen in 2005 and of the current Director, Mr José Maura, in 2011 and 2016 were conducted pursuant to established practice for the appointment of directors (see document 92FUND/A/ES.9/28 and Resolution 9). In the event that in November 2021, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) building is fully open for meetings and restrictions on international travel have been lifted, the sessions of the governing bodies will be held in person, as usual, and the appointment of the Director could take place by secret ballot in the meeting in line with the IOPC Funds' established practice (see section 2).
- 1.3 The Director considers that, to the extent possible, the same procedures should be applied to the appointment of the new Director in November 2021. However, due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the November 2021 meeting of the IOPC Funds' governing bodies may be held at least partly, if not fully, remotely. Since the established practice of the Assembly for the election of a new Director presupposes in-person meetings, the ballot procedure may need to be adapted accordingly.
- 1.4 With this in mind, the Director has identified four possible alternative options for the ballot procedure and will invite the 1992 Fund Assembly to consider them and provide feedback (see section 3). Depending on the option selected by the Assembly, the temporary suspension of or amendment to certain Rules of Procedure of the 1992 Fund Assembly may be required to enable the election of the Director to take place.
- 1.5 Whether the appointment is carried out in line with established practice or through another option, a circular will be issued in the three official languages in April 2021 calling for the nomination of candidates by 1992 Fund Member States. The deadline for nominations will be 30 June 2021, and the names of all candidates will be circulated to Member States in a circular in July 2021.
- 1.6 Should the 1992 Fund Assembly consider that any adaptation of the established ballot procedure is not practical or agreeable, it may wish to delay its consideration of the matter until after discussions at the IMO Council have taken place in June 2021, when it will be considering ballot procedures for the appointment of members of the Council. In this case, the 1992 Fund Assembly could meet during July to discuss further details on the appointment process and facilitate planning. Alternatively, the Assembly may wish to postpone the appointment of the Director until it is possible to do so using the established practice set out in section 2.

2 Established practice for the appointment of the Director

2.1 Ballot procedure

2.1.1 At its 9th extraordinary session held in March 2005, the 1992 Fund Assembly decided on the voting procedure set out below to be followed for the election of the Director at the October 2005 sessions (document 92FUND/A/ES.9/28, paragraph 23.2.20).

- (a) Voting concerning the appointment of Director shall be by secret ballot.
- (b) Before holding each ballot, each Member State present shall receive a list of the names of all candidates standing in that ballot in alphabetical order.
- (c) In each ballot each delegation of the Member States present shall indicate the candidate it supports by ticking the relevant box. If a list indicates support for more than one candidate, the vote is invalid.
- (d) A candidate who obtains two-thirds of the votes of the Member States present at the meeting at the time of the vote shall be declared appointed as Director.
- (e) If, in any ballot in which more than two candidates participate, no candidate is appointed in accordance with paragraph (d), a number of successive ballots shall be held in accordance with the following rules:
 - (i) The candidate who receives the least number of votes in the previous ballot, including the first ballot, shall not be included in the list of candidates for the subsequent ballot.
 - (ii) If a candidate obtains two-thirds of the votes of the Member States present at the meeting at the time of the vote, he/she shall be declared appointed as Director.
 - (iii) The ballots will continue until a candidate is appointed under subparagraph (ii) above.
- (f) If, in any ballot in which more than two candidates participate, two or more candidates receive the same number of votes so that the candidate to be excluded from the next ballot cannot be determined, an intermediate ballot shall first be held among those candidates to determine which of them should not be included in the next ballot. The candidate who in the intermediate ballot receives the least number of votes shall be excluded from the next ballot. If in an intermediate ballot there is a tie between any of the candidates, the Chair shall draw lots between them and the last one to be drawn shall be excluded from the next ballot.

2.1.2 The above practice was followed in 2005 and 2011. In addition, during those appointment processes, ballot papers were issued to each Member State physically present at the meeting, and a representative of each State was invited, by roll call, to deposit their ballot paper into a physical ballot box.

2.2 Adhering to established practice in November 2021

2.2.1 In the event that in November 2021, the IMO building is fully open for meetings and restrictions on international travel have been lifted, the sessions of the governing bodies will be held in person, as usual, and the appointment of the Director could take place by secret ballot in the meeting in line with the IOPC Funds' established practice described above.

2.2.2 It should be noted that, even if some overseas delegations remain unable, or would prefer not to travel to London for the meeting, out of the 118 Member States of the 1992 Fund, 108 have official

diplomatic representation in the United Kingdom in the form of an Embassy or High Commission. Eight States have Embassies in Brussels or Paris or honorary consulates in London. The 10 States without Embassies or High Commissions in London are listed in Annex I.

2.3 Timing of ballots

2.3.1 As set out above, if no candidate obtains a two-thirds majority in the first ballot, one or more further ballots would be required. At the March 2005 session, it was suggested that if multiple ballots were to take place, there should be a certain interval between consecutive ballots to allow delegations time for consultations.

2.3.2 In order to give the Credentials Committee the possibility to examine the credentials submitted by delegations and report to the 1992 Fund Assembly as well as to provide a certain interval between consecutive ballots, the following timetable would be proposed for the November 2021 election:

First ballot	Wednesday, 3 November, 9.30 am
Second ballot (if required)	Wednesday, 3 November, 2.30 pm
Third ballot (if required)	Thursday, 4 November, 9.30 am

2.4 Presentations by candidates

During the 2005 and 2011 election processes, the 1992 Fund Assembly invited candidates to make a short oral presentation of approximately 10 minutes' duration in support of their candidature prior to the election. This was held in a private meeting. A question and answer session was held with each candidate immediately following their presentations. In November 2021, presentations could be made on Tuesday, 2 November (i.e. on the day before the first ballot).

2.5 Private meetings

2.5.1 At its March 2005 session, the 1992 Fund Assembly had noted that Rule 54 of the 1992 Fund's Rules of Procedure for the appointment of the Director required that the 1992 Fund Assembly should vote in secret at a private meeting but did not indicate who should be allowed to be present at such a private meeting. It had also noted that in accordance with the practice of the IOPC Funds, only 1992 Fund Member States would be allowed to be present at the private meeting.

2.5.2 The following procedures could be followed in 2021:

- the presentations (and any question-and-answer sessions) should also take place in a private meeting at which only the delegations of 1992 Fund Member States would be present;
- the Director would be present, but other members of the Secretariat would be excused from attending the meeting;
- the presentation of each candidate (and any following question and answer session) should be held without the other candidate being present; and
- the presentations by the candidates and the question-and-answer sessions (if any) at the private meeting would not be recorded electronically or by other means.

2.6 Election of scrutineers

Under Rule 38 of the 1992 Fund Assembly's Rules of Procedure, the Assembly shall, on the proposal of the Chair, appoint two scrutineers from Member States present at the meeting, who shall scrutinise the votes cast. Any delegations whose credentials are not in order at the time of the vote will not be entitled to participate in the election of the Director of the IOPC Funds. This same practice should be followed in November 2021.

3 Alternative options for ballot procedure

3.1 Given the uncertainties on how the pandemic will develop in the coming months in the different Member States and the possibility that in November 2021, the sessions of the governing bodies may be held partly or fully remotely, it may not be possible to follow the established practice set out above in its entirety. Four different possible ballot procedures are therefore considered below, namely (A) online voting; (B) postal voting; (C) in-person and online voting; and (D) in-person and postal voting.

3.2 Option A – Election takes place exclusively via an online voting system

3.2.1 At its December 2020 meeting, which was also held remotely, the 1992 Fund Assembly decided, on an exceptional basis, to elect members of the joint Audit Body using an online voting system organised by the third-party provider, UK Engage. However, it was noted that the decision to adopt that procedure applied to that session only and was for the sole purpose of the election of the members of the joint Audit Body in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

3.2.2 On that occasion, the online election of the members of the Audit Body did prove to be a successful and efficient process, and the new members were appointed without issue.

3.2.3 Given the uncertainty on the way the meeting will have to be convened, and on the basis of the previous experience, the Assembly may want to consider using this option again in November 2021, which would ensure that the voting for the appointment of the Director can be conducted even if restrictions relating to in-person meetings and international travel are still in place. This option would also facilitate the practicalities involved in conducting an election under the time restrictions and inherent challenges of a remote meeting.

3.2.4 The advantages of online voting are that it allows for votes to take place in a secure and timely manner and can also make it possible to carry out multiple rounds of ballots if required. Importantly, all States would be able to formally cast a vote in a uniform manner regardless of their physical presence at the meeting, and the entire appointment process could be completed within the November 2021 sessions of the governing bodies. A disadvantage of this system is that States may have concerns over the security and secrecy of voting online and may prefer a more traditional approach of physically depositing a ballot paper.

3.2.5 In practice, under the online system, an email would be sent shortly before the voting opens, unless otherwise requested formally by the Member State, to the Heads of delegations of all Member States participating in the meeting. That email will contain a link to the voting platform and a unique one-time-use password, as well as instructions on how to access the voting system and cast a vote.

3.2.6 A more detailed explanation of the practicalities involved in the online voting system and background information on the third-party provider UK Engage is set out in Annex II. As in December 2020, a trial version of the online voting could be provided to interested Member States in advance of the sessions to ensure that voting conditions are the same for all Member States.

3.3 Option B – Election takes place exclusively by postal voting

- 3.3.1 Under Option B, Member States could opt to send their vote by post in advance of the meeting once all nominated candidates have been announced by the Director in the circular to be issued in July 2021.
- 3.3.2 The 1992 Fund Assembly did consider the option of postal voting at the time of the election of members of the joint Audit Body in December 2020. At that time, it noted the experience of the International Hydrographic Organization's (IHO), where Member States had been offered a choice of electing the Director by both postal and digital voting options. The IHO Secretariat had informed the Member States that should a second round of voting be necessary, it would be conducted online.
- 3.3.3 The advantage of using a postal voting system is that all States would be able to formally cast a vote regardless of their physical presence at the meeting. The disadvantage of such a system is the risks of lost or delayed votes. Under this Option, voters will have to rank the candidates in order of preference in one single ballot paper. The option to abstain from any of the rounds is possible by choosing not to rank one or more of the candidates.
- 3.3.4 In practice, under this system, a letter containing a ballot paper, instructions and an addressed return envelope would be sent to the London Embassies or High Commissions, or closest official diplomatic representation, of all 1992 Fund Member States. Should a Member State wish for the ballot paper to be sent to a different address, a formal request should be sent to the Director. The Secretariat has noted that of the 118 Member States, only 10 do not have official representation in the United Kingdom (see Annex I). The deadline for receipt of postal votes would be the Friday before the meeting, and a letter of acknowledgement would be sent to the Member State upon receipt of the return envelope.
- 3.3.5 Additional practical information on a possible postal ballot procedure is set out in Annex III.

3.4 Option C – Hybrid – In-person and online voting

- 3.4.1 In the event that in November 2021 the IMO building is fully open for meetings, but some restrictions on international travel are still in place, or some delegations would prefer not to travel, the sessions of the governing bodies could be held partly in person and partly remotely. In this case, Member States could opt to cast their votes in person or by using an online voting system as described above.
- 3.4.2 Member States will need to confirm at the opening of the session whether they wish to cast their vote in person or online. For those Member States wishing to cast their votes in person, voting would be conducted by secret ballot during the meeting in line with the established practice set out in section 2. In-person voting would be conducted following the guidelines given by IMO, the World Health Organization and the United Kingdom (UK) Government in force at the moment of holding the meeting.
- 3.4.3 For those Member States that opt to use the online voting system, an email would be sent shortly before the voting opens, unless otherwise requested formally by the Member State, to the Heads of Delegation of all Member States participating in the meeting as described in detail in Annex II.

3.5 Option D – Hybrid – In-person and postal voting

- 3.5.1 Under this Option, Member States could opt to either vote in-person at the meeting or send their vote by post in advance of the meeting, once all nominated candidates have been announced by the Director in the circular to be issued in July 2021.

- 3.5.2 For those Member States wishing to cast their votes in person, voting would be conducted by secret ballot during the meeting in line with the IOPC Funds' established practice set out in section 2. In-person voting would be conducted in accordance with the guidelines given by IMO, the World Health Organization and the United Kingdom Government in force at the moment of holding the meeting.
- 3.5.3 For those Member States wishing to cast a postal ballot, voting would be conducted as set out in paragraph 3.3.4 and described in detail in Annex III. Those Member States who have submitted a postal vote will not be issued a ballot paper to vote in person at the meeting.

3.6 Hybrid options – Advantages and Disadvantages

The advantage of using hybrid options is that they account for the fact that the preferences and circumstances of Member States may differ. However, under such hybrid solutions, it may be difficult to carry out in-person voting by roll call within a remote meeting timetable, particularly if there is more than one ballot. However, a possible solution to this last point is set out in sections 3.7 and 3.8 below.

3.7 Timing of ballots

- 3.7.1 As set out in sections 2.1 and 2.3, if no candidate obtains a two-thirds majority in the first ballot, one or more further ballots would be required. At the March 2005 session of the 1992 Fund Assembly, it was suggested that if multiple ballots were to take place, there should be a certain interval between consecutive ballots to allow delegations time for consultations.
- 3.7.2 It should be noted that the limited time available during a remote meeting would make it very difficult to accommodate several separate ballots. In the event that option C above is followed, it would be very time-consuming to carry out several rounds for those voting in person and, even if 1992 Fund Member States were to opt for option A and exclusively use an online voting system, there would be significant time constraints.
- 3.7.3 Furthermore, it would be difficult to organise several separate ballots for anyone opting to use a postal ballot under options B or D since the votes for the first round could not be counted or announced until after the opening of the session, when all credentials have been reviewed and those States present and eligible to vote have been confirmed. If further rounds are required at that stage and States wish to continue to use the postal method to cast their vote, a sufficient amount of time would need to be allocated for the process to be repeated and it would not be possible to appoint the Director during the session. As reported above, the experience of the IHO was that any additional rounds of voting should not take place by post.

3.8 Ranking candidates

- 3.8.1 In the event that a postal ballot under options B or D is chosen by Member States and that various ballots are required but there is no time available, the process of reducing the candidates through voting until the required majority is achieved must somehow remain. A possible solution could be to have one ballot in which voters rank the candidates in order of preference. Essentially, the various rounds of voting are still undertaken but in one ballot paper/form. The option to abstain from any of the rounds is possible by choosing not to rank one or more of the candidates. While the application of this system would be a departure from established practice in one part, it would nevertheless enable all Member States to participate in all rounds in exactly the same way.
- 3.8.2 In light of the time constraints during remote sessions (five three-hours days instead of five full working days), the Assembly may wish to consider this method of ranking candidates for all options A (online voting), B (postal voting), C (in person and online voting) and D (in person and postal voting).

- 3.8.3 Further information and an example ballot paper/form under this system are set out in Annex IV. Member States may also wish to access an online example by clicking the below link. Please note that this is a generic test page and in order to access the example you must type 'STV' when prompted at the login: https://ballot.ukevot.uk/aoe-stv/sign_in

4 Director's considerations

- 4.1 In the Director's opinion, it is possible and practical to proceed with the appointment of the new Director in November 2021. While it would be preferable that the appointment of the Director took place by secret ballot in the meeting in line with the IOPC Funds' established practice, the Director is conscious that this may not be possible. The 1992 Fund Assembly must therefore find a pragmatic solution to enable the appointment of the Director to proceed within a remote session if necessary.
- 4.2 Against this background, four alternative voting options are presented to ensure that the appointment of the Director is conducted, to the extent possible, in line with the established practice. However, should the 1992 Fund Assembly consider that the proposed adaptation of the ballot procedure is not practical or agreeable, it may wish to delay the decision until after discussions at the IMO Council have taken place in June, when it may be considering ballot procedures for the appointment of members of the Council. Alternatively, the Assembly may wish to postpone the appointment of the Director until it is possible to do so using the established practice.
- 4.3 The Director invites Member States to note the information regarding the established practice and to consider the four proposed alternative options for the ballot procedure. He also invites the 1992 Fund Assembly to provide feedback on which of the ballot procedures could be considered the most feasible and suitable for the appointment of the Director under the current circumstances.
- 4.4 The Director hopes that it will be possible to discuss the issue in full during the upcoming sessions in March. However, given the complexity of the issue, he is aware that the Assembly may wish to hold an additional meeting in July in order to make a final decision and discuss the timeline for voting and all other necessary practicalities relating to the appointment of the Director.

5 Action to be taken

5.1 1992 Fund Assembly

The 1992 Fund Assembly is invited to:

- (a) take note of the information provided in this document;
- (b) note the established practice of the appointment of the Director, as set out in section 2;
- (c) consider the alternative options for the ballot procedure which could be followed for the appointment of the Director in the event that the November 2021 meeting is held partly or fully remotely, and it is therefore not possible to follow established practice; and
- (d) provide feedback and instruct the Director accordingly.

5.2 Supplementary Fund Assembly

The Supplementary Fund Assembly is invited to:

- (a) take note of the information contained in this document; and
- (b) note any decisions taken by the 1992 Fund Assembly in respect of the various aspects of the procedures to be followed.

* * *

ANNEX I

List of Member States that do not appear to have diplomatic representation in London

State	Nearest representation	Notes
Benin	No Embassy or Consulate in London	Embassy in Paris
Cabo Verde	Honorary Consulate in London	Embassy in Brussels
Comoros	Honorary Consulate in London	Embassy in Paris
Congo	Honorary Consulate in London	Embassy is in Paris
Djibouti	No Embassy or Consulate in London	Embassy in Paris
Kiribati	Honorary Consulate in London	
Niue	No Embassy or Consulate in London	Pending confirmation of nearest representation
Palau	Honorary Consulate in London	Embassy in Brussels
Samoa	Honorary Consulate in London	Embassy in Brussels
Tuvalu	Honorary Consulate in London	Embassy in Brussels

All other Member States have Embassies or High Commissions in London.

Please note that this list was compiled using the IMO ERO Contact Points Database and the London Diplomatic List dated March 2021. Please contact the Secretariat at conference@iopcfunds.org to report any errors in this list.

* * *

ANNEX II

Online voting in detail

Additional practical information on how the vote would take place

In the event that the 1992 Fund Assembly were to decide to appoint the Director using an online voting process, in accordance with Rule 37 of the Rules of Procedure of the 1992 Fund Assembly, the secrecy of the vote would be maintained at all times, as neither Member State delegations nor the Secretariat would have access to any information related to the vote.

To comply with Rule 33, which states that each Member shall have one vote, only the Heads of delegations of each State present in the remote session would be allowed to vote. A specific period of time will be given to allow for votes to be cast, which should enable Heads of delegations to cast their vote, even if they are unable to participate at the time of the discussion due to technical difficulties or for other reasons.

The list of all delegates eligible to vote will be established by the Secretariat as soon as possible after the opening of the meeting based on submitted credentials that were found to be in order and verified presence in the remote session. That list, containing the name of the delegate, the Member State represented, and his/her email address, will be sent to the third-party service provider, UK Engage (see below for background information).

Once the Assembly begins to address the relevant agenda item, the online voting platform will open, and Heads of delegations will receive an email from the following sender (Vote@ukevote.uk) containing a link to the voting platform and a unique one-time-use password.

Heads of delegations will be able to use the link to access the voting platform, which will be branded as an IOPC Funds page in order to provide reassurance that voters are in the right virtual location. There, they will be prompted to enter their unique one-time-use password. They will then have access to the online voting ballot, which will be presented as a list of the candidates eligible for election.

It will be possible to choose one name on the ballot by selecting the boxes next to each name. Once the vote is submitted via a validation command, an additional prompt will provide a recap of the vote, allowing for changes if required before a final validation.

All votes will be compiled anonymously via the online voting system, and the result will be made available directly to the Chair shortly after the end of the voting period. That result will comprise the number of votes for each candidate and the total number of voters against the number eligible to vote.

In the event that no candidate achieves the required two-thirds majority, it will be possible to promptly organise a second vote following the same procedure. In such case, a new email with the link and a new unique one-time-use password will be sent to all eligible voters, and the procedure will follow the same steps. However, depending on the remaining time available during the sessions, the voting window might be reduced to a one-hour slot only.

Alternatively, in order to avoid the risk of several rounds of voting and to maximise the time available for discussion in the meeting, a single ballot could be organised under which voters rank the candidates in order of preference as set out in Annex IV.

Rules of procedure requiring temporary suspension or amendment

Should the 1992 Fund Assembly decide to proceed with an online voting tool to appoint the Director, Rule 38 of the Rules of Procedure would need to be temporarily suspended as it will not be possible to appoint two scrutineers from the Member States present to scrutinise the votes cast. Instead, scrutiny is provided via the third-party provider that is not related to the Secretariat.

Furthermore, should the 1992 Fund Assembly decide to hold one single ballot using the ranking method described above, Rules 39 and 40 which set out the processes for conducting additional ballots, would need to be temporarily suspended.

Requirement for departure from established practice

The use of the service provided by UK Engage would allow the Assembly to follow established practice with only minimal changes, i.e. the use of an independent third-party scrutineer instead of appointed scrutineers from Member States. This would be in the spirit of retaining the established practices of in-person meetings to the extent that is reasonably possible.

Background information relating to UK Engage

UK Engage is one of the UK's leading provider of democratic services, operating in numerous market sectors and specialised in the administration of transparent, impartial and trusted processes, including elections, ballots and polls for private and public sector organisations. UK Engage has a number of accreditations and complies with the latest industry standards. These include ISO 9001 (Quality Management System), ISO 27001 (Information Security Management System) and Cyber Essentials (accredited data security, handling and retention). It is also fully GDPR compliant.

UK Engage has worked or is currently carrying out projects for a range of clients, at an international level, such as the International Water Association elections and the Guernsey Parliamentary elections; at government level for the UK Department for Education and many local councils; for non-governmental organisations such as the British Red Cross; and for private companies including banks, insurers, energy providers and others. It also provides ballot printing services to many local government authorities administering Parliamentary, European Parliamentary, local government and mayoral elections, which exceeded 9 million ballots in 2019.

The cost of the online voting service is reasonable and well within the budget allocation for the meeting.

* * *

ANNEX III

Postal voting in detail

Additional practical information on how the vote would take place

In the event that the 1992 Fund Assembly were to decide to appoint the Director using postal voting, in accordance with Rule 37 of the Rules of Procedure of the 1992 Fund Assembly, the secrecy of the vote would be maintained at all times, as neither Member State delegations nor the Secretariat would have access to any information related to the vote, which would be contained within a sealed envelope.

A letter containing a ballot paper, ballot envelope, instructions and separate return envelope would be sent to the London Embassies or High Commissions, or closest official diplomatic representation, of all 1992 Fund Member States. Should a Member State wish for the ballot paper to be sent to a different address, a formal request should be sent to the Director.

In order to comply with Rule 33 which states that each Member shall have one vote, only one ballot paper will be dispatched to each State.

The deadline for receipt of postal votes would be clearly indicated. The ballot paper would need to be completed by the recipient of the letter, sealed in the ballot envelope and returned by post with an accompanying cover letter on official headed paper. A letter of acknowledgement would be sent to the Member State upon receipt of the return envelope.

The list of all delegates eligible to vote will be established by the Secretariat as soon as possible after the opening of the meeting based on submitted credentials and verified presence in the remote session. That list will be published for transparency. In order to comply with Rules 32 and 33 which provide that decisions are taken by a majority of the Members present and voting, only those votes received from the States listed as eligible, i.e. with credentials in order and present at the remote meeting, will be accepted.

Under Rule 38 of the 1992 Fund Assembly's Rules of Procedure, the Assembly shall, on the proposal of the Chair, appoint two scrutineers from 1992 Fund Member States present at the meeting, who shall scrutinise the votes cast. In the event that multiple postal ballots are required, for practical purposes, the scrutineers would need to be delegates permanently based in London.

All sealed ballot envelopes will be compiled by the Secretariat after the end of the voting period, after which the scrutineers will be invited to come to the offices of the Secretariat to count the votes. Their presence in the office would be organised in strict observance of the social-distancing rules applicable at the time. The scrutineers will confirm the results of the vote to the Chair of the 1992 Fund Assembly, and the results will be announced to the 1992 Fund Assembly during the session. That result will comprise the number of votes for each candidate and the total number of voters against the number eligible to vote.

In order to avoid the risk of several rounds of voting and to ensure a final result is achieved during the session, a single ballot could be organised under which voters rank the candidates in order of preference as set out in Annex IV.

Rules of procedure requiring temporary suspension or amendment

Should the 1992 Fund Assembly decide to proceed with the system of ranking candidates on one ballot paper, Rules 39 and 40 which set out the processes for conducting additional ballots, would need to be temporarily suspended.

Requirement for departure from established practice

Carrying out the election through Member States submitting their votes by correspondence would require the Assembly to depart from established practice in so far as it would not be possible to hold a number of successive ballots within the session if required.

Instead, the ballot paper issued to Member States could take a different format than under usual practice and allow for the ranking of candidates by order of preference rather than indicating support for one candidate per ballot.

* * *

ANNEX IV

Ranking of candidates

A possible solution to the issue of holding multiple ballots in one session could be to use what is known as the Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) system. Under this system, there is only one ballot in which voters rank the candidates in order of preference. An example online ballot form and an example ballot paper are set out below.

Example online ballot form

Demo

Demo site

This election will close on:


**1st December 2021
at 17:00**

For further information, please email
UK Engage at:

enquiries@uk-engage.org

For any technical queries, please
email

support@uk-engage.org


To view our Privacy Policy, click [here](#).

To vote:

This election uses the Single Transferable Vote method. This means that you rank the candidates in order of preference. You may rank as many or as few as you wish.

- Click the box next to the candidate who is your first preference.
- Click the box next to the candidate who is your second preference; and so on.
- Once you have made your selection(s) please scroll down to the bottom of the page and click the 'Submit vote' button located in the bottom right hand corner.
- The system will then display the candidate(s) you have selected in the order you have ranked them. If you are happy with your choice, click the 'Confirm vote' button which will then cast your vote, or 'Cancel' to go back to the ballot.

Rank between 1 and 5 options

Candidate A

Info

Candidate B

Info

Candidate C

Info

Candidate D

Info

Candidate E

Info

The following ballots have not been filled out correctly:

Election of Directors

ELECTION OF DIRECTOR

Rank the candidates in order of preference by entering numbers 1 to 5 in the appropriate box, with 1 being your preferred choice.

To abstain from ranking a specific candidate, do not enter any number in the box next to that candidate.

You may abstain from the vote altogether by entering an X next to the box marked 'Abstain'.

Candidate A	
Candidate B	
Candidate C	
Candidate D	
Candidate E	
Abstain	