

ITTC- FIFTY-THIRD SESSION
27 NOVEMBER – 2 DECEMBER 2017
LIMA, PERU

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP TO CONSIDER
ROTATION IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE SELECTION OF THE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

ESTABLISHED PURSUANT TO DECISION 9(LII)

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WORKING GROUP

- **Producer Members:**

- Ms. Victoire Eheth, Cameroon
- Mr. Jorge Pedro Flores Marker, Mexico
- Mr. Richard Gbadoe Edjedomélé, Togo
- Mr. Jorge Malleux, Peru
- Mr. Samson Yabon, PNG
- Mr. Mad Zaidi Mohd. Karli, Malaysia

- **Consumer Members:**

- Ms. Yealim Chae, Republic of Korea
- Ms. Jill Hanna, European Union
- Ms. Marjukka Mähönen, Finland
- Mr. Hiroyuki Nishiura, Japan
- Mr. Luke Thompson, USA
- Mr. Zhang Zhongtian, China

MANDATE

- “To examine options for rotation in the appointment of the Executive Director (ED) of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) and to present the results of its work to the Council for consideration at its 53rd Session”.

CO-CHAIRS OF THE WORKING GROUP

- Jorge Malleux (Peru) and
- Zhang Zhongtian (China).

AGENDA

- Scope and Mandate of the Working Group:
 - Respected the precise language of Decision 9(LII), which required it to examine options and to present the results of its work to Council for consideration
 - The paramount consideration in the appointment of the Executive Director was to secure the highest standard of efficiency, competence and integrity.
- Examples of rotation in other organizations and implications
 - The Working Group could not find rotation included as a formal principle In legal documents relating to appointment
- Review of previous Council discussions regarding rotation:
 - The Working Group noted the potential usefulness of the Council further defining the criteria for appointing an ED well before the vacancy next arises in order to provide legal certainty and avoid misunderstandings among members
- Elaboration of options taking into account principles, criteria and practicalities

It was confirmed by the UNCTAD Legal Advisor that implementing these options and term limits would not require any amendment to the ITTA 2006.

	Option	Description	Implementation	Advantages	Disadvantages
1a	Between Caucuses	Alternate between consumer and producer caucuses with no sub-divisions	Option would need to be explicit in vacancy notice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduces probability of future ED election deadlock - Provides equal opportunities for both caucuses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Puts potential candidates from the other caucus at a disadvantage - May cause difficulties within the priority caucus
1b		Alternate between consumer and producer caucuses and within sub-divisions in each caucus in a sequence agreed by the Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council will need to set the sequence to start rotation - Option would need to be explicit in vacancy notice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduces probability of future ED election deadlock - Provides equal opportunities for both caucuses and sub-divisions - Provides clarity on sub-division sequence in each caucus 	Puts all potential candidates except from the priority sub-division at a disadvantage thereby lowering the choice of ED
2a	Among Regions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Producers split into 3 regions - Consumers split into two regions which could be EU & non-EU 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council will need to set the sequence to start rotation - Option would need to be explicit in vacancy notice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Producer regions as defined in ITTA 2006; - Reduces polarization between producers and consumers 	Puts all potential candidates except from the priority region at a disadvantage thereby lowering the choice of ED
2b		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Producers split into 3 regions - Consumers are one group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council will need to set the sequence to start rotation - Option would need to be explicit in vacancy notice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Producer regions as defined in ITTA 2006; 	Likely to be seen as unbalanced by consumers
3	Among individuals (no predetermined rotation)	Status quo, with potential to change term limit options	Option would have no effect in vacancy notice	Treats all potential candidates (100% of member countries) equally, highest probability of obtaining highest quality leadership for ITTO	Potential to create deadlock between caucuses in future ED selection

Table 2: Term Options

ED term limits	Advantages	Disadvantages
3 year term, renewable once (or 4 year term + 2 year extension)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fairly frequent rotation - More opportunity for new ideas than 4+4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ITTO Biennial Work Programme and budget cycle run for two years - If 3 year term not renewed would entail change in ED in the middle of planning - May mean not enough continuity
4 year term, non-renewable	More frequent rotation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less time for ED to implement his/her vision - Reduces stability for ITTO - More time & resources spent on selection - Difficult to attract highest quality applicants
4 year term, renewable once	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reflects current arrangement under Decision 3(XXV) and common practice in many other organizations - More time for a successful ED to implement his/her vision 	Would mean a complete cycle would take 48 years under Option 1b and 40 years under Option 2a if all terms were renewed
5 year term, renewable or non-renewable	Slightly more attractive for applicants than 4 year options	ITTO Biennial Work Programme and budget cycle run for two years, so would entail change or renewal of ED in the middle of planning
6 year term non-renewable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Term sufficient to implement vision - Avoids conflict on extensions - Maximum practical for Option 1b (36 years) and Option 2a (30 years) 	Non-renewable is not as attractive to applicants
6 year term renewable once	Attractive to applicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would mean a complete cycle would take 72 years under Option 1b and 60 years under Option 2a if all terms were renewed - A single ED with renewal would last longer than the term of ITTA