



International Oil Pollution  
Compensation Funds

<b>Agenda Item 7</b>	IOPC/JUL21/7/1	
<b>Date</b>	29 June 2021	
<b>Original</b>	English	
<b>1992 Fund Assembly</b>	92AES25	●
<b>1992 Fund Executive Committee</b>	92EC76	
<b>Supplementary Fund Assembly</b>	SAES9	●

## APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR

### PROCEDURES

#### Note by the Director

**Summary:**

At its March 2021 session, the 1992 Fund Assembly decided that in the event that it was possible to hold an in-person meeting in full in November 2021, that the appointment of the next Director should take place in accordance with established practice, as set out in document IOPC/MAR21/7/3.

However, the governing bodies noted that, 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 and that, in that case, the usual ballot procedure applicable for the appointment of the Director would need to be adapted accordingly on an exceptional basis.

The governing bodies, therefore, considered and provided feedback on four possible options for alternative ballot procedures that could be organised in the event that the November 2021 meeting is held remotely. The 1992 Fund Assembly decided that it should continue its discussions at an extraordinary session in July 2021 and instructed the Director to update the information contained in document IOPC/MAR21/7/3 and to provide background information on the experience of the UN and other international organisations when they conduct an election for similar senior official positions for consideration at the July meeting.

Since the meeting in March, the IMO building has reopened to external visitors by appointment and has piloted a return of a limited number of delegates to the conference hall. The IMO Secretariat has also issued a document for consideration at the next session of the IMO Council, proposing that the appointment of members of the Council be carried out by voting in person, by appointment. At the time of issuing this document, the outcome of the Council discussions was not known. However, the 1992 Fund Assembly may wish to take into account the IMO Council decision when confirmed, as well as the experience of other UN bodies using this ballot procedure, given that it could provide a new option (option (e) voting in person, by appointment) that is close to the IOPC Funds established practice.

**Action to be taken:**

1992 Fund Assembly

- (a) Take note of the updated information provided in this document;
- (b) 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

- (c) decide which ballot procedure to adopt and instruct the Director to organise the election of the next 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.

**1 Introduction**

- 1.1 Circular IOPC/2021/Circ.3, calling for the nomination of candidates for the position of the Director by 1992 Fund Member States, was issued in the three official languages in April 2021. The deadline for nominations is 30 June 2021, and the names of the candidates will be circulated to Member States in a circular in July 2021, in preparation for the appointment of the Director in November.
- 1.2 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 meeting of the governing bodies will be held in person, as usual, and, as confirmed by the 1992 Fund Assembly in March 2021, the appointment of the Director will take place by secret ballot in the meeting in line with the IOPC Funds established practice (see IOPC/MAR21/9/2, paragraph 7.3.36 and Annex I).
- 1.3 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. With this in mind, and since the IMO building was closed to external visitors at the time, the Director identified four possible alternative options for the ballot procedure, namely:
  - (a) exclusively via an online voting system;
  - (b) exclusively by postal voting;
  - (c) via a hybrid solution that offers both voting in person at the meeting or online voting; or
  - (d) via a hybrid option that offers both voting in person at the meeting or postal voting.
- 1.4 While the governing bodies did provide feedback on these options at their March 2021 meeting, no conclusions were reached. Instead, the 1992 Fund Assembly decided that it should continue its discussions at an extraordinary session in July 2021, which would enable States to take into account the status of the global pandemic at that time and the decisions of IMO both in respect of their own election process and their plans for the format of meetings in the IMO building later in the year.
- 1.5 The Assembly also decided to instruct the Director to update the information in respect of the options set out in document IOPC/MAR21/7/3, and to provide background information on the experience of the UN and other international organisations when they conduct an election for similar senior official positions for consideration at the July meeting.
- 1.6 Since the meeting in March, the IMO building has reopened to external visitors by appointment and has piloted a return of a limited number of delegates to the conference hall. The IMO Secretariat has also issued a document on possible ballot procedures for the appointment of members of the IMO Council to be considered by the Council at its 125th session during the week of 28 June 2021 (document C 125/16(b)/2). That document contains a proposal to elect members of the Council by

organising for States to vote in person, by appointment. At the time of issuing this document, the outcome of the Council discussions was not known. However, the 1992 Fund Assembly may wish to take into account the IMO Council decision when confirmed, as well as the experience of other UN bodies using this ballot procedure, given that it could provide a new option (option E) that is close to the IOPC Funds established practice.

- 1.7 Taking into account the documents presented on this subject, the Director will invite the 1992 Fund Assembly to decide on the alternate ballot procedure to be used in the event that the November 2021 meeting cannot be held fully in person. 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.

## **2 Development of pandemic since March 2021 and planned format of meetings in the IMO building**

- 2.1 Since the March 2021 meeting of the governing bodies, while there has been a gradual improvement to the situation in the United Kingdom and its vaccination programme is now at an advanced stage, there remain many uncertainties in respect of how the pandemic will develop in the coming months, both in the UK and in the different Member States.
- 2.2 Information on the status of the IMO building and a pilot return of meeting delegates was issued in IMO Circular Letter No.4220/Add.7, which confirmed that the building is now open to external visitors by appointment only for the time being. In addition, the forty-fifth session of the Facilitation Committee, held from 1 to 4 June and on 7 June 2021, piloted a return of delegates (up to a maximum of 50 people) to the IMO building to follow and participate in its remote session.
- 2.3 While it is clear that the situation may allow for usual practices to be followed, it is highly possible that in November 2021, the meeting of the governing bodies may still be held partly or fully remotely. Therefore, it is important to plan for the next Director to be appointed, under these exceptional circumstances, through an alternative ballot procedure than the IOPC Funds established practice.

## **3 Alternative options for ballot procedure considered in March 2021**

- 3.1 Annex I contains the established practice for the appointment of the Director, which has been followed on previous occasions. Annex II contains the information originally presented at the March 2021 meeting of the governing bodies for each of the four options for alternative ballot procedures, together with a summary of the feedback provided by the governing bodies at that meeting and possible timetables for each of the options in the event that multiple ballots are required (see table in Annex II).
- 3.2 While no conclusions were reached in terms of a preferred option in March, the Assembly noted that it was clear from the discussions that, if it was not possible to vote in person in November 2021, many delegations were in favour of option (a) under which the appointment of the Director would be carried out exclusively via an online voting tool. It was noted, however, that the majority of States were flexible, open to finding pragmatic solutions and happy in principle to adopt a hybrid approach in some format, possibly with the use of an online tool and in-person voting (option (c)), to accommodate those States who had expressed concerns regarding online voting.

## **4 New alternative option E – Voting in person, by appointment**

- 4.1 Further to the 1992 Fund Assembly's instructions in March 2021, the Director has carried out further research into the practices and experience of the UN and other international organisations in recent times when conducting an election for similar senior official positions. The results of that research are set out in document IOPC/JUL21/7/1/1. However, one of those practices has been employed by both the UN General Assembly and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and is also being

proposed by the IMO Secretariat for the appointment of members of the IMO Council, namely voting in person, by appointment.

- 4.2 Under this option, one representative for each Member State would be allowed to vote in person in a designated room in the IMO building during a specific time slot during the November 2021 meeting week. This practice is closely aligned with the IOPC Funds established practice and could accommodate multiple ballots if required (see section 5 below).
- 4.3 If the IMO building remains open to visitors and there is the possibility of a hybrid meeting, with at least some delegations permitted to follow the remote meeting from the conference hall, as described in section 2 above, then the organisation of a ballot under which delegations vote in person, by appointment could be a practical solution.
- 4.4 The Secretariat has noted that of the 118 States who will be Members of the 1992 Fund at the time of the November meeting, only 10 do not have official representation in the United Kingdom to enable them to send someone physically to vote if they are unable or prefer not to travel to London at the time (see Annex I of document IOPC/MAR21/7/3). However, as also proposed by IMO in document C 125/16(b)/2, those 10 States, or any other Member State without official representation in London at the time of the election, could accredit to their delegation a trusted agent (such as a member of a London law firm or other agency), not accredited to another delegation, for the purpose of casting their ballots. This would not require any changes to the Rules of Procedure of the 1992 Fund Assembly.
- 4.5 Further practical information on this option, together with a possible timetable, is set out in Annex III.

## **5 Timing of ballots**

- 5.1 As set out in Annex I, containing the established practice for the appointment of the Director, 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.
- 5.2 It should be noted that the limited time available during a remote meeting would make it very difficult to accommodate several separate ballots, in particular with some of the ballot procedure options presented in March.
- 5.3 Provided the voting appointments were kept outside of the meeting hours, but still on the day of the meeting, with the cooperation of those voting, it could be practical, however, to organise multiple rounds of ballots when voting in person, by appointment (option E).
- 5.4 As requested by the 1992 Fund Assembly at its March 2021 session, the Director has considered possible timetables for each option above. These are set out in Annex II.

## **6 Director's considerations**

- 6.1 The Director notes that the situation with regard to the development of the pandemic across Member States remains unpredictable, and the planned format of meetings in the IMO building is still unconfirmed. The 1992 Fund Assembly must therefore find a solution to enable the appointment of the Director to proceed within a remote meeting if necessary.
- 6.2 However, the Director remains of the view that a pragmatic solution can be found either among the options considered in March, or, under the new option E, since, in light of the recent lifting of restrictions in the United Kingdom (UK), and the gradual reopening of the IMO building since the

March 2021 meeting, it may now be possible to organise voting in person by appointment. This would be very close to the IOPC Funds established practice.

- 6.3 The Director, therefore, invites Member States to consider the alternative options for the ballot procedure, including the new option E, and decide which of them should be considered the most feasible and suitable for the appointment of the Director under the current circumstances. He also invites the 1992 Fund Assembly to discuss the timeline for voting of the chosen procedure and all other necessary practicalities relating to the appointment of the Director and instruct him accordingly.

## **7 Action to be taken**

### **7.1 1992 Fund Assembly**

The 1992 Fund Assembly is invited to:

- (a) take note of the information provided in this document;
- (b) 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
- (c) decide which ballot procedure to adopt and instruct the Director to organise the election of the next Director accordingly.

### **7.2 Supplementary Fund Assembly**

The Supplementary Fund Assembly is invited to:

- (a) take note of the information contained in this document; and
- (b) decide which ballot procedure to adopt and instruct the Director to organise the election of the next Director accordingly.

\* \* \*

## ANNEX I

### Established practice for the appointment of the Director

#### 1 Ballot procedure

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 the 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, they 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 receives the least number of votes in the intermediate ballot 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.

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 Adhering to established practice in November 2021

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 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 of document IOPC/MAR21/7/3.

### 3 Timing of ballots

- 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.
- 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

### 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).

### 5 Private meetings

- 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.
- 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.

### 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.

## ANNEX II

### General overview of options considered in March 2021

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

- 1.1 This ballot procedure involves the use of an online voting system organised by the third-party provider, UK Engage<sup><1></sup>. It was used, on an exceptional basis, to successfully elect members of the joint Audit Body at the December 2020 meeting, which was also held remotely. The procedure applied to that meeting 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.
- 1.2 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 meeting. That list, containing the name of the delegate, the Member State represented, and their email address, will be sent to UK Engage.
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 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.
- 1.5 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.
- 1.6 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.
- 1.7 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.
- 1.8 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 meeting 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.
- 1.9 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.

---

<1> For background information on UK Engage see document IOPC/MAR21/7/3, Annex II.

## 2 Option B – Election takes place exclusively via postal voting

- 2.1 Under this ballot procedure, Member States could opt to send their vote by post in advance of the meeting. The 1992 Fund Assembly did consider using this option 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.
- 2.2 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.
- 2.3 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.
- 2.4 The deadline for receipt of postal votes would be clearly indicated. In order to maintain the secrecy of the ballot, 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.
- 2.5 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 meeting. 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.
- 2.6 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.
- 2.7 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.
- 2.8 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 and the difficulty of organising several ballots if multiple rounds of voting are required.

## 3 Option C – Hybrid – In-person and online voting

- 3.1 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.

3.2 Member States will need to confirm at the opening of the sessions 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 Annex I. In-person voting would be conducted following the guidelines given by IMO, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the UK Government at the moment of holding the meeting.

3.3 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 delegations of all Member States participating in the meeting as described in detail in section 1 above.

#### 4 Option D – Hybrid – In-person and postal voting

4.1 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.

4.2 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 Annex I. In-person voting would be conducted in accordance with the guidelines given by IMO, WHO and the UK Government at the moment of holding the meeting.

4.3 For those Member States wishing to cast a postal ballot, voting would be conducted as described in section 2 above. Those Member States who have submitted a postal vote will not be issued a ballot paper to vote in person at the meeting.

#### 5 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.

Option	Rules of Procedure affected	Feedback of governing bodies in March 2021	Possible ballot timetable
<p style="text-align: center;">A Online voting</p>	<p>Temporary suspension required of Rule 38 on the appointment of scrutineers from Member States present. Instead, scrutiny is provided via the third-party provider that is not related to the Secretariat.</p>	<p>Some delegations stated that they would be happy to proceed with this option exclusively which would enable all States to vote in a uniform manner regardless of their physical presence at the meeting. However, those States confirmed that they would also agree to option (c) (a hybrid of both online and in-person voting) in order to accommodate the different preferences and concerns of other States. Those delegations expressed their satisfaction with the previous experience using the online voting system.</p> <p>A number of delegations expressed concern about the security and secrecy of online voting and reiterated that the decision to elect the members of the joint Audit Body in December 2020 using the online voting tool was for the purposes of that election only and should not be used as a precedent for the appointment of the Director. One delegation stated that it remained highly uncomfortable with the use of online voting for the purposes of the appointment of the Director.</p>	<p><i>First ballot:</i> Wednesday, 3 November, 11 am</p> <p><i>Second ballot (if required):</i> Wednesday, 3 November, 2 pm</p> <p><i>Third ballot (if required):</i> Thursday, 4 November, 11 am</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">B Postal voting</p>		<p>When this option was discussed at the March 2021 meeting, several delegations expressed their concerns, some with regard to the risk of delays or lost postal votes and others with regards to the management of multiple ballots under this system if required. The possibility of ranking candidates in order of preference in one single ballot paper was discussed but discounted as an option on the basis that it departed too far from established practice. One delegation stated its preference for option (b) postal voting only and suggested that online voting could be used as a contingency in the event that further ballots were required.</p> <p>One delegation stated multiple ballots could be accommodated within the postal voting system. That delegation considered that options (c) and (d) could be refined and developed further. It insisted, however, that any postal vote should be managed by the Secretariat and not by an external provider. Another delegation requested the Secretariat to develop a possible timetable and further details on the practicalities of using such a system for multiple ballots. In that regard, one delegation suggested that</p>	<p><i>First ballot:</i> Deadline for receipt of votes: Friday 29 October Vote count: Monday, 1 November, 2 pm</p> <p><i>Second ballot (if required):</i> Deadline for receipt of votes: Monday, 8 November, 2.30 pm Vote count: Monday 15 November, 11 am</p> <p><i>Third ballot (if required):</i> Deadline for receipt of votes: Friday, 19 November Vote count: Monday 22 November, 11 am</p>

Option	Rules of Procedure affected	Feedback of governing bodies in March 2021	Possible ballot timetable
		the use of postal voting should require States to use a courier service to return votes to reduce the risk of delays.	
C Hybrid – In-person and online voting	Temporary suspension required of Rule 38 on the appointment of scrutineers from Member States present. Instead, scrutiny of the online voting is provided via the third-party provider that is not related to the Secretariat.	When this option was discussed in March 2021, many delegations considered it to be the preferred option. Several delegations expressed the view that this option would allow for many States to vote in person, in line with established practice, while still offering the possibility to those States who may be unable to travel to London, to vote in a secure, confidential and efficient manner.	<p><i>First ballot:</i> Wednesday, 3 November, 11 am</p> <p><i>Second ballot (if required):</i> Wednesday, 3 November, 2 pm</p> <p><i>Third ballot (if required):</i> Thursday, 4 November, 11 am</p>
D Hybrid – In-person and postal voting		When this option was discussed in March 2021, one delegation considered that it could be refined and developed further. At the March 2021 meeting, one delegation suggested a hybrid option of the three voting systems (in-person, online and by post) to accommodate the preferences of all States. Another delegation highlighted that with any hybrid option it would be important to safeguard ballot secrecy while ensuring that each State could only vote once.	<p><i>First ballot:</i> Deadline for receipt of votes: Friday 29 October Vote count: Monday, 1 November, 2 pm</p> <p><i>Second ballot (if required):</i> Deadline for receipt of votes: Monday, 8 November, 2.30 pm Vote count: Monday 15 November, 11 am</p> <p><i>Third ballot (if required):</i> Deadline for receipt of votes: Friday, 19 November Vote count: Monday 22 November, 11 am</p>

\* \* \*

### ANNEX III

#### **Option E – Election takes place exclusively by voting in person, by appointment**

Under this option, one representative for each Member State would be allowed to vote in person in a designated room in the IMO building during a specific time slot during the November 2021 meeting week.

It will be essential for the credentials of the voting 1992 Fund Member States to be in order in time for review by the Credentials Committee on the first day of the meeting. The member of the delegation designated to vote on behalf of the Member State must be clearly indicated on the credentials.

That member of the delegation will be invited to arrive at the designated voting room at a specific time, where they will be required to provide identification, confirming that they are indeed the person authorised to vote as indicated on the credentials.

A possible timetable for the voting is set out below.

First ballot	Appointments between 2.15 pm and 5.30 pm, Tuesday 2 November and 9.15 am, and 10.45 am Wednesday, 3 November.
Second ballot (if required)	Appointments between 2.15 pm and 5.30 pm, Wednesday, 3 November and 9.15 am, and 10.45 am Thursday, 4 November.
Third ballot (if required)	Appointments between 2.15 pm and 5.30 pm, Thursday, 4 November and 9.15 am, and 10.45 am Friday 5 November.