

# IEO

Independent Evaluation Office  
of the International Monetary Fund

## BACKGROUND PAPER

---



BP/08/07

### **Lessons from Private Sector Governance Practices**

Dalberg Global Development Advisors

**IEO Background Paper**  
Independent Evaluation Office  
*of the International Monetary Fund*

Lessons from Private Sector Governance Practices

Prepared by Dalberg Global Development Advisors

May 2007

**Abstract**

Though the IMF differs from private for-profit organizations in its constitution, purposes, and accountability, the underlying rationale for corporate governance is the same in both private and multilateral organizations, as reflected in the similar functions of their boards. For an evaluation of IMF corporate governance, therefore, insight can be gleaned from a review of principles and good practices used in the private sector to address some of the same fundamental issues as those faced by the Fund. This paper examines corporate governance principles and practices that have become widely accepted in the private sector. It identifies 14 principles seen to be of greatest relevance for the governance of the IMF and, for each principle, identifies relevant questions for the IMF. It also outlines processes and indicators used by the private sector for evaluating governance systems, and draws out potentially relevant processes and indicators for the Fund.

The views expressed in this Background Paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the IEO, the IMF or IMF policy. Background Papers report analyses related to the work of the IEO and are published to elicit comments and to further debate.

JEL Classification Numbers:

Keywords: IMF, corporate governance, executive board, private sector

Author's E-Mail Address: [andrew@dalberg.com](mailto:andrew@dalberg.com); [sonila@dalberg.com](mailto:sonila@dalberg.com); [feedback@ieo-imf.org](mailto:feedback@ieo-imf.org)

	Contents	Page
Abbreviations.....		4
I. Context.....		5
A. Relevance of Lessons from the Private Sector .....		5
B. What We Hope to Contribute with this Paper .....		6
II. Methodology .....		7
A. Reviewing Governance Codes and Guidelines to Identify Core Governance Areas .....		7
B. Narrowing the List of Areas Looked at Based on the Scope of the Evaluation .....		8
C. Identifying Private Sector Principles Relevant to the IMF .....		8
D. Reviewing Private Sector Approaches to Measuring Governance .....		9
III. Governance Principles and Practices in the Private Sector .....		10
A. Strategy and Mission.....		10
B. Accountability.....		12
C. Oversight.....		16
D. Stakeholder Interests.....		19
E. Principles that Cut Across Governance Areas .....		21
IV. Measuring Governance in the Private Sector.....		28
V. Conclusion .....		31
Boxes		
Box III.1 Case Study: Banco Santander’s Board Involvement in Strategy-Setting .....		11
Box III.2. BP: Director Induction and Training .....		13
Box III.3. Toyota: Separating Oversight from Management, Without Independent Directors.....		17
Figures		
Figure II.1. Fourteen Governance Principles in the Private Sector .....		9
Figure IV.1. Governance Criteria Tracked by Rating Agencies .....		30
Figure IV.2. A Potential Governance Scorecard for the IMF .....		31
References.....		33
Annexes		
Annex 1. Sources of Research for Private Sector Governance Principles .....		36
Annex 2. Toyota Case Study .....		37
Annex 3. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., Board Candidate Guidelines.....		38
Annex 4. Typical CEO Selection Process .....		40
Annex 5. Sample Board Evaluation Questionnaire .....		41
Annex 6. Average Number of Board Committees in Europe, 1999–2005.....		42
Annex 7. Ten Questions for Assessing Board Behavior .....		43

**ABBREVIATIONS**

ASX	Australian Stock Exchange
DMD	Deputy Managing Director
ED	Executive Director
GMI	Governance Metrics International
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMFC	International Monetary and Financial Committee
ISS	Institutional Shareholder Services
MD	Managing Director
NYSE	New York Stock Exchange
TSE	Tokyo Stock Exchange

## I. CONTEXT

1. To provide input to the evaluation by the IMF's Independent Evaluation Office of the corporate governance of the International Monetary Fund, this study reviews governance practices and lessons from the private sector. It identifies the good corporate governance principles and practices in the private sector most relevant to the IMF and suggests a set of indicators that may be appropriate for measuring the performance of the Fund's Executive Board.

2. The study does not provide a gap analysis between current IMF governance practices and the good practices in common use in other organizations. As such, it does not provide recommendations to close the gap, nor does it propose a specific set of indicators and benchmarks to measure performance against any such recommendations.

### A. Relevance of Lessons from the Private Sector

3. Highly publicized corporate scandals—of which the most infamous include Enron, WorldCom, Arthur Andersen and Tyco—have made governance a priority issue in the private sector. As a result, governance in the private sector has moved away from norms of practice and towards a body of widely discussed, codified, and tested practices. In particular, governance codes are increasingly converging on a number of key principles and good practices.

4. While the Fund can look to corporations in the private sector for lessons, some fundamental differences in constitution, purposes, and accountability call for a careful and customized approach to thinking about governance reform at the Fund:

- The IMF's governance system is determined by its articles alone, whereas private sector governance requirements are laid out by national laws and court systems.
- The Fund's main functions—surveillance, financial assistance, and technical assistance—as well as its mission to “ensure the stability of the international monetary system”<sup>1</sup> do not lend themselves to performance-based measurement in the same way as activities in the private sector. As such, the decentralized management structures commonly found in the private sector (where maximizing shareholder value is the main governance concern, and the performance of business units can more easily be measured) are not a feasible alternative for the Fund. This feature is reflected in the frequency of IMF Board meetings. The Fund's Board meets in continuous session to engage directly on most major decisions whereas in the private sector, boards meet from time to time to focus on oversight and strategic direction.

---

<sup>1</sup> From IMF (2006), which summarizes the purposes of the International Monetary Fund as laid out in Article I of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund.

- The Fund’s ownership structure makes it accountable to the governments of its 185 member countries as opposed to shareholders or private owners. As a result, executive directors’ responsibilities and appointment process at the Fund are quite different from those typical of the private sector:
  - *Responsibilities:* Directors at the IMF have dual responsibilities, to the countries they represent and to the Fund. This creates challenges, because the interests of countries are not aligned, particularly with the emergence of a “creditors vs. debtors” dynamic.
  - *Appointment process:* Board members are nominated or elected by the countries they represent, whereas in listed companies, they are elected democratically by shareholders based on competencies or relationships. While the directors of the Fund are representatives of countries, directors in the private sector are personally liable to shareholders.
- The fourth major difference is in the IMF’s weighted voting system, which is based on a quota formula measuring the relative size of each country in the world economy. In the private sector, voting rights are derived directly from share ownership (and in some instances the characteristics of shares owned).

5. All of these peculiarities must be kept in mind when considering the relevance of any lessons from the private sector to the Fund’s governance structures.

6. That said, the underlying rationale for corporate governance is the same in both the private sector and multilateral organizations, as reflected in the similarities in functions of the boards. As such, much insight can be gleaned from a review of good practices—on a global level—that have emerged in the private sector in dealing with some of the same fundamental issues as those faced by the Fund.

### **B. What We Hope to Contribute with this Paper**

7. By bringing relevant private sector principles and practices to bear, we hope to propose structures and processes that might strengthen the IMF’s corporate governance. Some of these might be considered as they are, while many would need to be adapted to the Fund’s unique situation.

8. What do we mean by *principles* of good governance versus *good practices*? *Principles* refer to the fundamental rules of governance: rules that have garnered broad consensus and recognition in governance codes across the world. *Good practices* refer to structures and processes that private sector corporations are adopting to improve their governance structures. These practices are often mandated by law in rules-based governance

frameworks such as that of the United States, but are not mandatory in the “comply or explain”<sup>2</sup> principles-based frameworks that are more prevalent in Europe.

9. In addition to identifying relevant private sector principles and practices, we have looked at private sector trends in assessing governance performance to identify potentially relevant processes and indicators by which the IMF can track its progress against the key principles of corporate governance.

10. This paper is structured as follows: Section II presents our approach to identifying the relevant governance areas as well as the 14 relevant principles associated with those areas. Section III explores each of these 14 principles in more detail, clarifies their application in practice, and identifies the questions raised for the IMF by each principle. Section IV outlines private sector processes and indicators for evaluating governance systems, and draws out potentially relevant processes and indicators for the Fund.

## **II. METHODOLOGY**

11. The methodology deployed is quite basic in order to enable us to reach practical insights and provide a sample of metrics that could be useful for the IMF. It is important to emphasize that no gap analysis was conducted as part of this study and as such the methodology is largely based on an external review of private sector practices, guided by close consultation with the IEO governance evaluation team. The adoption of any of the good practices or indicators by the IMF or their adaptation to the IMF would require further analysis and consideration.

12. With that in mind, the review comprised four main steps:

- Reviewing governance codes and guidelines to identify core governance areas;
- Narrowing the areas looked at, in keeping with the scope of the IEO evaluation;
- Identifying those private sector principles relevant to the IMF; and
- Reviewing private sector approaches to measuring governance.

### **A. Reviewing Governance Codes and Guidelines to Identify Core Governance Areas**

13. As a first step, this paper draws on previous Dalberg project work<sup>3</sup> with desk research as well as selected interviews with private sector board members. Our desk research was

---

<sup>2</sup> The principle of “comply or explain” is clarified in European Corporate Governance Forum (2006).

<sup>3</sup> This includes a report on “Governance and Oversight Principles and Practices,” which informed the United Nations’ Independent Steering Committee Report on Governance and Oversight and was presented to the UN Secretary-General in July 2006.

informed by a comprehensive survey of widely recognized corporate governance codes (Annex 1) carefully chosen to provide a representative sample of corporate cultures. To that end, governance codes were considered from countries with unitary vs. two-tiered board structures, rules-based vs. principles-based legal frameworks, and shareholder-driven vs. society-driven corporate cultures. Through this work, we were able to identify the main developments and emerging consensus around what constitutes good governance practices.

14. This resulted in the identification of five fundamental areas of good governance:

- Honest endeavor to set and fulfill overall *strategy and mission*. This addresses the organization's duty to achieve its purpose and manage risk through planning, evaluation, and overall direction setting.
- Governance structures and processes that ensure *accountability to stakeholders*. This focuses on ensuring clear roles and responsibilities across the governance structure as well as ensuring that the board is held accountable to stakeholders.
- Independent *oversight and audit* of management.
- *Stakeholder interests* ensured through disclosure and transparency and voice. This specifies the need for transparency and disclosure to stakeholders as well as ensuring that the voices of shareholders are heard.
- *Good people management*, ensuring that the right incentives are in place for management and staff. This focuses on the key human resource policies that drive the management and staff of the organization.

#### **B. Narrowing the List of Areas Looked at Based on the Scope of the Evaluation**

15. All of the above areas touch upon critical aspects of good governance in both the private and public sectors. However, given the scope of the IEO evaluation, good people management is addressed only as it relates to the Board and Management (but not staff).

#### **C. Identifying Private Sector Principles Relevant to the IMF**

16. Considering the four areas identified above, two filters were used to identify the private sector principles most relevant for this study. The first limits the principles to areas that represent the most critical concerns at the IMF, identified in close consultation with the IEO evaluation team. The second looks at where the most innovative thinking is in the private sector.

17. Through this approach, we were able to identify eight principles that directly address each of the four areas of strategy and mission, accountability, oversight, and stakeholder



rights. We also identified six principles that simultaneously address all of these areas. This results in 14 governance principles (Figure II.1).

Figure II.1: Fourteen Governance Principles in the Private Sector

<b>A. Strategy and Mission</b>	1. Boards should be involved in the process for setting strategy
<b>B. Accountability</b>	2. Directors are responsible for representing the interests of shareholders 3. Directors should be selected in a transparent fashion and based on objective criteria 4. The board should engage in CEO succession planning
<b>C. Oversight</b>	5. The board should have an adequate mix of independent and executive directors 6. The board should exert sufficient control over management
<b>D. Stakeholder interests</b>	7. Corporations should adhere to disclosure and transparency requirements 8. Minority shareholders' and stakeholders' interests should be respected

Principles that cut across governance areas
9. The board should have a leader who is not the CEO 10. Boards and their members should be evaluated on an annual basis 11. There should be a process for managing conflicts of interest 12. Board structures need to ensure the separation of management and control 13. Board operations should be effective and efficient 14. Committees should be used to further board effectiveness and efficiency as well as provide independence

18. For each of these principles, we also explored trends in practice, drawing from press searches, academic papers, and research by executive search consulting firms. The latter, which included Spencer Stuart and Egon Zehnder International, provided particularly rich sources of data on trends in governance structures and practices.

#### **D. Reviewing Private Sector Approaches to Measuring Governance**

19. Through desk research and interviews with private sector board members, we also identified trends in measuring good governance in the private sector. We gathered the types of indicators—qualitative and quantitative—used in the private sector, and from that inventory created a shortlist of potentially relevant metrics for the IMF.

20. It is important to note that while this methodology allows us to make some suggestions as to which indicators may be relevant for the Fund, it does not allow us to recommend what indicators should actually be used. The final list of indicators should ultimately be driven by the recommended actions resulting from a comprehensive gap analysis, and should be based on an in-depth review of the Fund's current situation and priorities.

### III. GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

21. All the 14 principles identified above are founded in the emerging consensus in corporate governance codes. The U.S. rules-based approach to governance implies that these principles will be directly linked to trends in practice, while the European principles-based approach leaves more room for companies to deviate from the dictums of corporate governance codes.

Where applicable, we explored both the trends in governance codes and trends in practice for each of the 14 principles and/or illustrated them with appropriate case studies. As the lessons from the private sector often need to be “translated” to the context of the IMF, in what follows we also lay out the questions raised on the applicability of each principle and good practice to the IMF. The 14 principles are organized by each of the four relevant areas of good governance, followed by a discussion of the principles that cut across these areas.

#### A. Strategy and Mission

**Principle 1: Boards should be involved in the process for setting strategy.** Boards are expected to fulfill strategic thinking and decision-making functions, taking into account the interests of shareholders. Boards’ involvement is considered beneficial to their organizations because board members bring a wealth of experience and expertise that can help management in developing strategy.

#### Governance codes

22. Responsibility for setting strategy is explicitly referred to across governance codes. The OECD Principles of Corporate Governance (OECD, 2004) highlight reviewing and guiding corporate strategy, major plans of action, and business plans as a key function to be performed by a board. In France, the Viénot Report (AFEP/CNPF, 1995) stipulates that the board of directors has a four-fold function which includes determining the company’s strategy. Likewise, in Italy, the Preda Code (Italian Stock Exchange, 1999) charges boards with providing strategic and organizational guidance to their organizations. These are just a few of many examples.

23. While governance codes do mandate a role for the board in setting strategy, they do not specify *how* the board should play such a role. Thus, in principle, boards have a large degree of flexibility in defining their involvement as well as in determining how much of this role to delegate to management.

#### Private sector practices

24. In practice, private sector boards are constrained by their level of expertise and knowledge of the organization, as well as time—particularly since they are non-resident boards, generally meeting only a few times per year. As a result, it is generally

management's role to define strategy, while the board is in charge of approving that strategy and/or providing advice as well as monitoring management's performance.

25. While too few data are available to be certain, it appears that only a minority of boards contribute proactively to strategy setting (rather than simply being engaged in approving management's strategy). Business academics suggest that boards' over-involvement in strategy can lead to tensions with management and that strategy committees can take away from the desired board-level focus on strategic decisions (Carter and Lorsch, 2004).

26. Boards that play an active role in setting strategy should be appropriately equipped. Banco Santander is an example of a board that proactively contributes to strategy-setting, and has set up structures and processes to help it perform this role (Box III.1).

#### **Box III.1. Case Study: Banco Santander's Board Involvement in Strategy-Setting**

Banco Santander's board of directors is involved in formulating and approving the bank's strategy and clearly lays this out in its mission statement. The board is supported in that role by two structures. First, an International Committee, made up of four executive and four non-executive members, meets twice a year and is responsible for monitoring the development of the bank's strategy, analyzing business opportunities, and reviewing the performance of the Bank's investments. Like all committees at Santander, the International Committee does not have decision-making rights; its role is to provide information, advice, and proposals. Second, an International Advisory Board, made up of members with distinguished business and political backgrounds, provides input and advice to the board.

In the case of Banco Santander, this level of involvement is consistent with an approach to governance whereby management constantly leverages the expertise of an experienced set of board members who are very knowledgeable about, and heavily engaged with, the organization. While the board of directors as a whole meets about nine times per year, the executive committee meets weekly, and the risk committee bi-weekly.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>According to Banco Santander's "Informe anual de gobierno corporativo correspondiente al ejercicio 2005," the executive committee met 53 times and the risk committee met 100 times in 2005.

Source: Banco Santander's website, which quotes the Deminor Rating/ISS "Corporate Governance Rating & Investor Report" for 2006.

#### **Questions raised for the IMF**

27. The IMF can first ask itself whether its Executive Board's role in the strategy-setting process is clearly delineated in its mission statement, such that there is a clear owner of strategy. Second, the IMF should consider whether the Board has the skills and is appropriately equipped to play an approval role—taking account of whether Board members have the political capital (as country representatives) and whether they have the appropriate information and capabilities (as representatives of the IMF's interest).

28. The Board might also consider its current role in strategy setting, and ask whether it is playing the best role that it can. Is there benefit in the Board being more involved? If yes, should it be involved through a strategy committee and an advisory board such as Santander's? Or, following the practice of most private sector boards, is the bulk of strategy

setting best left to management while the Board provides direction and approves or disapproves the proposed strategy?

## B. Accountability

**Principle 2: Directors are responsible for representing the interests of shareholders.** Directors in listed entities are responsible for increasing their companies' value to shareholders. This ensures that there is a visible focal point within each organization that is primarily concerned with, and accountable to, shareholders/

### Governance codes

29. Many codes allude directly to directors' responsibility to represent the interest of shareholders—which is generally taken to mean maximizing shareholder value (e.g., the codes of the OECD, Japan, and the U.K.). In continental Europe, it is more common for governance codes to couch this responsibility within a broader responsibility towards stakeholders in general, on the assumption that meeting this responsibility will raise the value of the company. The French and German codes are examples of this interpretation of director responsibility.

30. Governance codes recommend practices in selection, evaluation, reappointment, and orientation/training to ensure that the best directors are selected and that their talent is appropriately leveraged on the board. The present discussion focuses only on reappointment and orientation/training processes (we explore the topics of director selection and evaluation under principles 3 and 10, because those principles address a broader set of issues than director responsibility).

31. Some governance codes address both reappointment and orientation/training processes. In the UK, the Cadbury Report (London Stock Exchange, 1992), for example, mandates that “non-executive directors should be appointed for specified terms and reappointment should not be automatic,” thus ensuring the need for shareholders' consent at regular intervals. As regards orientation/training, the OECD and New York Stock Exchange codes (OECD, 2004; NYSE, 2003) refer to such processes as ways to help board members quickly and fully understand their responsibilities and perform their duties.

### Private sector practices

32. Selection, evaluation, reappointment, and orientation/training processes are in place in the private sector to ensure that directors fulfill their responsibilities to shareholders. Good practice requires companies to allow shareholders to give their opinions at regular intervals about directors' continuation on the board, and requires companies to invest in induction and training to ensure that directors have a full and consistent understanding of their responsibilities.

33. Reappointment processes require a formal review of each director at regular intervals. In practice, nomination committees are responsible for leading this process. For example, the charter of Nokia's nomination committee lays out the "responsibility to prepare the proposal to the shareholders for the election or re-election of the members of the Board."

34. While corporate governance codes refer to director education programs, they intentionally leave flexibility to define appropriate induction and training processes. Some boards, like BP's, make this a priority in their governance processes (Box III.2).

#### **Box III.2. BP: Director Induction and Training**

BP's induction and training are disclosed on the company's website as a matter of good governance practice.<sup>1</sup> The Chairman, with the support of BP's Secretary's office, is accountable for the induction of new directors. The induction process is tailored to directors' needs and includes training on (1) the operations and activities of BP and (2) the role of the board, its decision-making powers, and its structures and processes (including the tasks and membership of the committees and the powers delegated to them). Beyond training on BP operations and governance structures, new Board members are also educated on their legal and other duties and obligations. Training is provided on an ongoing basis, and is customized depending on which committees directors are involved in and what skills and information can help enhance their effectiveness in the tasks that they perform.

<sup>1</sup>BP Website, "Serving as a director: induction, training and evaluation" available via internet <<http://www.bp.com/sectiongenericarticle.do?categoryId=9014835&contentId=7014802>>.

#### **Questions raised for the IMF**

35. At the Fund, there exists an inherent conflict in the dual role of directors as country representatives and representatives of the Fund. With the understanding that this conflict will continue to exist, what can the board do to emphasize the latter role of executive directors? Could directors benefit from induction processes that emphasize Board members' responsibility as representatives of the Fund? This would be particularly relevant if executive directors serve on the Board for only a few years and are thus less familiar with their responsibilities.

36. Induction processes alone cannot guarantee that board members have the requisite integrity and competence to perform their dual roles. The Fund can consider what types of background and degrees of independence have allowed directors to play the most effective role in intermediating between country and Fund interests. For example, are more senior and politically connected directors better able to communicate the Fund's interests back to their countries? Should these profiles be encouraged for directors?

37. Finally, today, if the Fund's directors are evaluated, it is only by the countries that they represent. Can directors be made more accountable to the Fund while remaining accountable to their countries through a dual evaluation process?

**Principle 3: Directors should be selected in a transparent fashion and based on objective criteria.** Private sector trends increasingly involve formal, rigorous, and transparent procedures for the appointment of new directors to the board. These procedures are intended to ensure the fairness of the process and maximize the competence and integrity of directors elected to the board.

### **Governance codes**

38. The OECD governance code considers ensuring a formal and transparent board nomination process to be one of the board's key functions. Most codes, including the Viénot Report (France), the Japanese Corporate Governance Forum Principles (Corporate Governance Forum of Japan, 2001), the UK's Combined Code (Financial Services Authority, 2003) and the NYSE's Listed Company Manual (NYSE, 2003) also recommend that a nomination committee be set up to effectively and independently design and implement the selection process. The nomination committee is required to make its terms of reference available, and to make explicit its role and the authority delegated to it by the board. Per NYSE requirements, at a minimum, this committee needs to "identify individuals qualified to become board members, consistent with criteria approved by the board, and to select, or to recommend that the board select, the director nominees for the next annual meeting of shareholders."

### **Private sector practices**

39. The selection of directors is becoming more transparent in the private sector, with nomination committees increasingly leading the process based on a set of criteria (independence, age, and skill sets) to guarantee an adequate mix on the board.

40. In practice, companies across the world have instituted nomination committees; all top 150 largest UK companies have nomination committees (Spencer Stuart, 2006a), as do all listed US companies, per mandatory Stock Exchange requirements. In two-tiered board structures, a growing number of companies are adopting equivalents to the nomination committee; in the Netherlands, 61 percent of companies had a selection and appointment committee in 2006 versus fewer than 20 percent in 1996 (Spencer Stuart, 2006b).

41. Nomination committees have laid out guidelines for evaluating candidacies to their boards. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. for example, defines suitable candidates as those possessing: (1) "management and leadership experience" in business, education, or public service; (2) "skilled and diverse background" to bring the desired range of skills and diverse perspectives to the Board; and (3) "integrity and professionalism" including a desire to serve the interests of all stockholders (see Annex 3).

### Questions raised for the IMF

42. The IMF Board is composed of 24 executive directors, some of whom represent only one country and others of whom represent multi-country constituencies. Executive directors' appointments are determined by the country or countries they represent.

43. With the understanding that Director appointments to the Board ultimately lie with member countries, to what extent can the Board play a role in defining the requisite skill sets and criteria for Board membership? Can and should the Board go as far as recommending individuals for member countries to consider or approving nominees for director positions, based on objective criteria defined by the Board? Could a nomination committee play a constructive role in designing and facilitating a selection process? Does the resident status of the Board impede access to the best candidates? As private sector boards are non-resident, and only meet an average of eight times a year, this allows them to tap into a skilled and high-caliber talent pool that may not be available full-time.

**Principle 4: The board should engage in succession planning.** Oversight of CEO succession planning is seen as an important responsibility of the board. The CEO selection process, however, does not require the same degree of transparency as that for director succession planning.

### Governance codes

44. The OECD Corporate Governance Code, the NYSE Listed Company Manual, and the Viénot Report (France) include the oversight of CEO succession planning as a key functions of the board. Many corporate codes, however, do not address CEO succession explicitly; this group includes the Preda Report (Italy), the Corporate Governance Forum Principles (Japan), the Combined Code (UK), and the Peters code (Netherlands) (Committee on Corporate Governance, 2003).

45. Codes that require boards to have selection processes in place do not require boards to be transparent about these processes. The NYSE specifically stipulates that “succession planning should include policies and principles for CEO selection and performance review, as well as policies regarding succession in the event of an emergency or the retirement of the CEO” (Rule 303A.09). The Viénot Report (France) recommends that the selection committee be involved in examining the chairman’s proposals but specifically notes that there is a need for confidentiality in the CEO succession process: “it should be the permanent responsibility of the selection committee to be in a position to propose successors at short notice, although clearly this would require confidentiality” (AFEP/CNPF, 1995).

### Private sector practices

46. According to Spencer Stuart data, CEO succession planning increasingly occupies the attention of boards in the US, where 94 percent of S&P 500 organizations discussed CEO succession on an annual basis in 2006, up from 87 percent in 2005. Further, 69 percent of the

boards that were surveyed in 2006 had an emergency succession plan. In 38 percent of cases, the CEO led his or her succession planning, while in the majority of cases both CEO and board were involved at intermediate steps, for instance in the management and evaluation of internal candidates.

47. Business academics recommend a four-step selection process: (1) establish criteria, setting goals and objectives of the search; (2) structure the process, establishing a committee to run a clearly defined search process; (3) identify candidates, defining the candidate pool broadly and assessing thoroughly; and finally (4) execute selection, choosing candidates on the basis of goals and objectives. These are detailed in Annex 4.

### **Questions raised for the IMF**

48. Today, according to an unwritten rule, the Managing Director (MD) at the IMF is a western European put forward by western European governments. Procedural guidelines for the selection of the MD have been developed by Executive Board working groups from the IMF, suggesting a process for arriving at a shortlist of able candidates.

49. Private sector practices raise a number of similar questions for the IMF: Can Directors be more involved in setting and implementing the MD selection process? Should a committee be involved in drawing up shortlists? Does it make sense for the Board to be involved in succession planning on an annual basis? Does it make sense to develop an emergency succession planning process?

50. The last two questions underlie the likelihood of change of leadership in the private sector. That is, if governance codes pay relatively little attention to CEO selection, it is because constant performance evaluation, coupled with the power to compensate and dismiss, are the preferred private sector practices to ensure CEO competence. If serious and consequential MD evaluation were instituted at the Fund, the questions of annual succession planning and emergency succession plans would become more relevant.

### **C. Oversight**

**Principle 5: Corporate boards should have an adequate mix of independent and executive directors.** Boards across the world are expected to have a majority of independent directors, due to the belief that these directors can bring external expertise to the organization as well as allow enough independence to effectively and objectively oversee management activities. An independent director is loosely defined as an individual who has no relationship that may compromise his or her objectivity and loyalty to shareholders (i.e., individuals who have no material relationship with the company, whether as a partner, employee or of an affiliate, paid advisor, or consultant of the firm, or immediate family member of a partner or employee of the company). The definition of independence itself has become stricter and limited to individuals who have no *recent* relationship to the company.



## Governance codes

51. Most codes do not mandate a majority of independent directors but rather recommend a mix of executive and independent directors such that the board may operate independently of management. Codes that allow companies to determine the adequate mix of directors include the OECD Principles, Viénot Report (France), Preda Report (Italy), Peters Code (Netherlands), and the Combined Code (UK). More stringent codes such as those of the Australian Stock Exchange (ASX, 2003) and NYSE require a majority of independent directors who hold regular meetings without management.

52. Even the less stringent Japanese Corporate Governance Forum Principles recommend that the board of directors include independent, non-executive directors but allow for a transitional measure whereby companies may appoint a “management advisory committee” (Corporate Governance Forum of Japan, 2001). The latter is in place to allow companies to transition from Japanese governance structures, which traditionally had no independent directors on the board.

## Private sector practices

53. US boards are complying with regulations and ensuring that independent directors make up a majority of board members. Of the average S&P 500 board of eleven directors, 81 percent of directors were independent in 2006 up from 77 percent in 2001. The same applied in countries with two-tiered board structures; in the Netherlands, more than 50 percent of directors are independent (Spencer Stuart, 2006b: 9). In Japan, where companies have freedom to decide, a not-insignificant 4 percent of companies including Sony, Hitachi, and Mazda have adopted a US-type model with outside directors to ensure the separation of board and management interests (Egon Zehnder International). Toyota has taken a different approach (Box III.3 and Annex 2.).

### **Box III.3. Toyota: Separating Oversight from Management, Without Independent Directors**

Toyota, which is seen as one of Japan’s corporate gemstones and has surpassed General Motors to become the world’s largest carmaker, did not go the same route as its national rival Mazda. Instead of adopting the US-type of model, Toyota (along with 5 percent of other Japanese companies) has adapted the traditional Japanese model, separating the task of oversight from that of management, while introducing no independent directors. Toyota created an independent board of corporate auditors as well as reduced its board size and scope to clearly separate monitoring and management functions—keeping executive directors focused on a monitoring role and meeting on a monthly basis, while creating a set of senior managing directors clearly accountable for management,

## Questions raised for the IMF

54. In the absence of being able to bring in “independent” directors, the Fund could consider ways in which it could effectively separate the oversight and management functions on the Board. Today, the Board is heavily involved in management activities while the International Monetary and Financial Committee (IMFC) exercises a very “light-touch” in

oversight. Would a clear split of oversight and management activities such as Toyota's make sense? Alternatively, could certain functions of the Board be handled by independent members? In the case of internal audit functions, for example: could the Fund create an independent internal audit committee to monitor both the Board and management, and report directly to the Board of Governors? The UN has such an independent Audit Advisory Committee that reports directly to the General Assembly.

**Principle 6: The board should exercise sufficient control over management.** Boards need to exert adequate control to effectively perform their oversight of management.

### **Governance codes**

55. Governance codes unanimously emphasize the board's responsibility to monitor management effectively and to ensure that the strategic objectives of their organizations are being achieved. This role is reiterated in the OECD Principles, the Viénot Report (France), the Preda Report (Italy), the Corporate Governance Forum Principles (Japan), the Peters Code (Netherlands), and the Cadbury Report (UK).

### **Private sector practices**

56. In practice, private sector boards exert influence over management primarily through their ability to motivate (including through compensation) and, if necessary, replace the top layer of management. The power to determine management compensation is used on an ongoing basis to exert influence over management: based on the recommendations of compensation committees, private sector boards determine top executives' compensation and incentive plans at regular intervals.

57. Situations where private sector boards generally step in more visibly arise when the company runs into difficulties, or if the board lacks confidence in management's ability to set strategy or execute its plans. In those instances, the board can challenge the CEO and go as far as replacing him/her. More and more boards are not hesitating to use these powers; the past years have seen a flurry of such CEO replacements including at Ford, Viacom, Home Depot, McAfee, Disney, Sovereign Bancorp, and CNET Networks.

58. Business academics suggest that, in a more regular state of affairs, a constructive board will perform its oversight of management without over-interfering or micromanaging. This is for two reasons: first, boards have limited time and should focus on the most strategic decisions and oversight functions and second, over-interfering boards run the risk of undermining management, making it difficult to hold the latter accountable for results that it did not fully own. A best-practice board will maintain its independence and strive to achieve a balance between control and micromanagement. Within those parameters, Carter and Lorsch (2004) suggest that there is significant room for variation in the private sector

depending on company specificities, including the complexity of the business and when a new CEO has yet to earn the trust of the board.

### **Questions raised for the IMF**

59. As mentioned previously, the Board is very heavily involved in management activities while the IMFC exercises a “light-touch” in oversight. This raises challenges as to whether the Board has sufficient independence and is sufficiently distant from management to be able to hold management accountable. Furthermore, the Board today is not involved in evaluating management, and only discusses management compensation in aggregate as opposed to on an individual basis. One can ask whether the Board should be involved in selecting, evaluating, compensating, and potentially replacing the MD, DMDs, and next layer of management.

### **D. Stakeholder Interests**

**Principle 7: Corporations should adhere to disclosure and transparency requirements.** There is widespread acceptance of the need for financial and non-financial disclosure, and governance codes are increasingly converging towards similar requirements. Disclosure of corporate governance practices in particular is seen as a way to build trust with shareholders by allowing better transparency around how boards ensure the performance of their duties to shareholders.

### **Governance codes**

60. Corporate governance codes are aligned in calling for timely disclosure of financial and operating results, with the emphasis no longer simply on providing the data but on making them digestible and user friendly for shareholders and stakeholders. On the non-financial disclosure front, governance codes are nearly unanimous in calling for disclosure of compensation for board member and key executives as well as of corporate governance practices.

61. Disclosure of corporate governance practices is highly relevant for the IMF. The OECD Principles, ASX listing requirements, Viénot Report (France), and the Peters Code (Netherlands) all require such disclosure in general terms. Other codes do not require disclosure in general terms but rather mandate disclosure of specific practices; for example, the NYSE requires disclosure of practices relating to the selection of directors.

62. Beyond the strict legal financial disclosure requirements, boards are expected to follow the “comply or explain” principle if they do not meet local code requirements. The UN’s Guidance on Good Practices in Corporate Governance Disclosure (UNCTAD, 2006) states that “where there is no local code on corporate governance, companies should follow recognized international good practices.”

### Private sector practices

63. Even in legal environments that do not explicitly require companies to disclose their main principles of corporate governance (such as those of the US), companies have opted to provide information on their governance practices. For example, since 1992, the Campbell Soup Company has published its corporate governance standards in a Proxy Statement, the 2007 version of which can be accessed on the company's website.<sup>4</sup>

### Questions raised for the IMF

64. The Fund may consider whether it should or can become more transparent about its structures and processes. Also, is the IMF effectively prioritizing substance over form by effectively using web updates, newsletters, annual reports, and other means of communication?

**Principle 8: Minority shareholders' and stakeholders' rights should be respected.** Minority shareholder rights have been emphasized in the movement for "one-share-one-vote," whose goal is to ensure that minority shareholders are protected from majority shareholder decisions that could harm them. Protecting the rights of stakeholders (such as employees, suppliers, customers, and communities) is also recognized as part of good governance

### Governance codes

65. Corporate governance codes encourage corporate democracy. The issue of "one-share-one-vote" (1S1V) is explicitly addressed by most European governance codes. The German code, for example, states that "in principle each share carries one vote. There are no shares with multiple voting rights, [...] golden shares or maximum voting rights" (German Government Commission, 2006). While the NYSE agrees to list companies with dual-class shares (i.e., those that do not respect the 1S1V principle), the Listed Company Manual states that it is concerned with arrangements that grant special rights to a shareholder or group of shareholders.

### Private sector practices

66. In practice, the majority of European companies apply the 1S1V principle, but there are wide variations among countries; in Belgium, Germany, and the UK almost all companies adhere to 1S1V while in the Netherlands, Sweden, and France only 14 percent, 25 percent, and 31 percent respectively do so (Deminor Rating, 2005).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> <[http://www.campbellsoupcompany.com/governance\\_standards.asp](http://www.campbellsoupcompany.com/governance_standards.asp)>

<sup>5</sup> "Application of the one share – one vote principle in Europe." Commissioned by the Association of British Insurers.

## Questions raised for the IMF

67. The vast ongoing debate on corporate democracy has a strong parallel in the world of multilateral organizations. The Fund's ownership structure is not within the scope of the IEO evaluation. However, the issue of 1S1V raises an interesting question for the IMF: what is the Fund's equivalent to "one share"? Has that definition changed with the shift of the IMF's focus away from lending activities and towards a more diverse mix of surveillance, crisis prevention, crisis management, monitoring, and lending activities? Does the Fund adequately represent and give sufficient voice to smaller shareholders?

### E. Principles That Cut Across Governance Areas

**Principle 9: The board should have a leader who is not the CEO.** Good practice requires a leader for the board who is not the CEO, in order to increase the CEO's accountability to the board and strengthen the board's independence. In a combined chairman/CEO model with no CEO-independent leadership for the board, the CEO would have control over the board's agenda, the information provided to directors, and the conduct of board meetings, thus dominating decision making. This would render it difficult for the board to exercise independent judgment or to meet without the presence of the CEO to objectively evaluate his or her performance or identify and discuss potential CEO conflicts of interests. Overcoming the combined chairman/CEO impediment to board independence can take place either through a split between chairman and CEO positions or through the designation of a "lead" or "presiding" director. In the latter models, a director is designated from among independent board members and charged with convening and leading independent directors' meetings as well as reviewing the board meeting agenda with the CEO.

### Governance codes

68. Two-tiered boards by definition require a split between chairman and CEO, whereas unitary boards offer the option of split or combined positions. As laid out in the OECD Principles (OECD, 2004), in unitary boards, governance codes usually propose the separation of roles. The Combined Code (UK) is particularly clear on the issue, stating that "There are two key tasks at the top of every listed company – the running of the board and the executive responsibility for the running of the company's business" and that these two roles should be split between two individuals. The Japanese Corporate Governance Forum Principles also require separation and mandate an explanation to shareholders when a combination is unavoidable. U.S., French, and Italian corporate governance codes do not explicitly require splitting the positions.

69. Whether the chairman and CEO positions should be split or combined has been subject to endless debate with no clear winner. One can see advantages and disadvantages to both models. Combined roles offer a centralized leadership and more agile structure but can put management interests above those of shareholders. Split roles allow the CEO to focus on running the company and permit further board independence, but can result in power struggles and confusion about company leadership.

### Private sector practices

70. While two-tier board structures—common in continental European countries such as Germany, the Netherlands, and Austria—by nature require a split between the leaders of the supervisory and management boards, unitary boards allow for either model. In the world of one-tiered boards, almost all British companies have split the roles, versus only 33 percent of US companies. The “lead director” model has been on the rise in the US, where 96 percent of companies had a lead or presiding director in 2006 (Spencer Stuart, 2006c: 12).

71. A relevant trend in two-tiered structures is the increase in companies with non-executive chairs. Having a non-executive chair reinforces the latter’s independence from the CEO and thus ability to effectively disagree with the CEO. In the Netherlands, for example, 95 percent of companies had a non-executive chair in 2006 up from 86 percent the previous year (Spencer Stuart, 2006b: 9).

### Questions raised for the IMF

72. The consensus around having a leader on the board who is not the CEO and the rise of the “lead director” model beg the question of how the Fund can succeed in both alleviating the MD’s workload and putting checks and balances on his/her power. Is it possible or desirable to extend the responsibilities of the current DMDs or Dean of the Board? Under what circumstances is it desirable for the Board to meet without the MD? Such sessions may be beneficial for the purpose of discussing the performance of the CEO or of management, for example.

73. Finally, the MD is currently responsible for two distinct aspects: the political and the technical. Can and should the Fund consider a clearer split of those responsibilities between individuals?

**Principle 10: Boards and their members should be evaluated annually.** Boards are urged to conduct annual self-evaluations (at both the board and committee levels) and CEO evaluation. Board evaluations, in particular, are used as a tool to raise issues, increase the board’s ownership and accountability, and identify and track improvements. Individual director evaluations are less common but are on the rise as a way to promote positive behavior and continued learning by board members.

### Governance codes

74. Many corporate codes recommend annual evaluations to gauge whether the board and its committees function effectively. The NYSE requires that boards and their committees conduct self-assessments at least annually but makes no such demands for director self-evaluation. The UK Combined Code recommends that the board should undertake annual evaluations of the board as well as its committees and individual directors. Other codes make vaguer recommendations. In Germany, the Supervisory Board is expected to “examine the efficiency of its activities on a regular basis” (German Government Commission, 2006: 20).

The TSE simply mandates the “development and improvement of a mutual monitoring system by directors” (Tokyo Stock Exchange, 2004).

### **Private sector practices**

75. Practically all (96 percent) of US S&P 500 boards have institutionalized an annual process to evaluate the CEO’s performance, and this process is increasingly becoming the responsibility of the entire board rather than of a specific committee. A large majority (81 percent) also conduct full board evaluations (see Annex 5 for a sample questionnaire) while around 73 percent conduct committee evaluations and around 40 percent perform individual director evaluations (Spencer Stuart, 2004). Individual evaluations can be conducted in a variety of ways; self- and peer-evaluations are the most common, and use of committees is less so. In the Netherlands, supervisory boards are increasingly performing assessments of their own boards and management boards; around 92 percent of the supervisory boards assessed their own performance and around 85 percent assessed that of the management board (Spencer Stuart, 2006b).

### **Questions raised for the IMF**

76. The IMF Board is very different from private sector boards in that it conducts no evaluations. Given that evaluating Board performance is less politically sensitive than evaluating the MD and/or individual directors, can the Fund easily implement Board evaluations as a tool to promote positive change? Such evaluations need to be well planned and require Board commitment to address issues raised. Would the Fund be better off with an internal evaluation process? Or would an external consultant be a better option to ensure a transparent process and voicing of tricky issues? For MD or individual director evaluations, the Fund could choose among self-evaluation, peer-evaluation, or evaluation by a committee.

**Principle 11: There should be a process for managing conflicts of interest.** The issue of conflicts of interests is minimized by the trend towards more independent directors who are able to provide independent oversight of management activities. Good practice requires board members to disclose any personal interests in a transaction conducted by the company in order to protect the organization’s interests.

### **Governance codes**

77. Governance codes require board members to act with integrity and disclose to other members if they have any personal financial interests in a transaction conducted by the company or the possibility of personally exploiting an opportunity that rightfully belongs to the company. This requirement is laid out clearly in various codes including the German and UK codes. The Dutch Corporate Governance Code (Tabaksblat Code) specifically defines conflicts of interest and how to deal with them. It mandates, for example, that “a management board member shall immediately report any conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest [...] and shall provide all relevant information, including information

concerning his wife, registered partner, or other life companion, foster child and relatives by blood or marriage up to the second degree” (Committee on Corporate Governance, 2003). The same code specifies that the supervisory board should decide if there is a conflict of interest without the concerned board member’s presence.

78. Codes generally identify nomination, remuneration, and audit as those where potential conflicts of interest are high, and so prescribe committees staffed by independent directors to monitor and regulate these areas.

### **Private sector practices**

79. Good practice involves the elaboration of codes of ethics that clearly define conflicts of interest as well as the process for dealing with them. Nokia makes such information available to the public in the form of a three-page document, the Nokia Code of Conduct (revised 2005), available on the company’s website in 31 different languages.<sup>6</sup>

80. Business academics recommend that directors be explicit with the CEO/chairman as well as board members about any conflicts of interest they may have, as well as excusing themselves from discussions where conflicts of interest may arise. Carter and Lorsch (2004) identify CEO evaluation and management compensation and succession as the most obvious areas where private-sector board members may have conflicts of interest.

### **Questions raised for the IMF**

81. The Fund may want to consider whether it has sufficiently clear policies and procedures to deal with personal conflicts of interest when they arise. Do all Board members understand what constitutes a conflict of interest? Is there a procedure in place for reviewing and managing conflicts?

**Principle 12: Board structures need to ensure the separation of management and control.** One- and two-tiered structures are the two main models, each based on underlying cultural dimensions. The unitary or one-tiered board structure has a single board that is both the supreme executive body and the supervisory organ. This model emphasizes the role of non-executive and independent directors to ensure control over management. The two-tiered model, on the other hand, assigns the executive and supervisory functions to two separate boards: the supervisory board, which is generally made up of shareholder and employee representatives, and the management board, which manages the company. Both unitary and two-tiered structures can work, provided there is a commitment to establishing clear distinctions between management and control such that there can be control over management.

<sup>6</sup> <[http://www.nokia.com/link?cid=EDITORIAL\\_64678](http://www.nokia.com/link?cid=EDITORIAL_64678)>



### **Governance codes**

82. Codes vary in their recommendations on board structures, but they share the common goal of ensuring the separation of management and control. Corporate laws in countries such as Germany and the Netherlands mandate two-tiered board structures that allow employees and shareholders to directly oversee management's actions. Conversely, unitary board structures in countries such as the U.K., U.S., and Spain require a balancing of executive, non-executive, and independent directors to ensure that no one group can dominate the board's decision making. Both Japan and Italy have been rethinking traditional structures, with one alternative model emphasizing the need for independent internal audit. In Italy, the 2004 reform of governance law requires that the main board be supplemented by a board of auditors elected by shareholders, or by a German-style two-tiered structure, or by a US-style independent unitary board structure.

### **Private sector practices**

83. Whether companies have unitary or two-tiered boards depends largely on the local cultural environment, and has not evolved significantly over time. What has evolved is board size. Unitary board structures seem to be converging to about 10-12 board members, on average, down from about 16 in 1980. There are significant variations by industry, however. US banks have an average of 17 board members; some factors that explain this bigger board size include larger firm size, complex organizational structures (subsidiaries, etc.), and predominantly friendly versus hostile acquisitions (Adams and Mehran, 2003). German law mandates that 20 members should sit on the supervisory board of companies with 2,000+ workers; these larger boards stay efficient by delegating to committees and ensuring that the concerned members meet with management separately before board meetings. Deutsche Bank's supervisory board, for example, has its employee representatives and shareholder representatives meet separately with management to consider issues relevant to each before the full board meeting.

### **Questions raised for the IMF**

84. The Fund's structure, when compared with the private sector, raises questions about the separation between management and control. With the Board so involved in management and the IMFC exerting no official power over the Board, there is a clear gap in oversight. How can the Fund overcome this gap? Should it consider strengthening the IMFC, giving it power over the Board? Would it help to convene the IMFC more often? Could an independent audit committee bring some (albeit partial) improvements in oversight?

85. The size of the Board raises questions about effectiveness and efficiency (including use of committees) which are addressed in the two principles discussed below.

**Principle 13: Board operations should be effective and efficient.** Regular and sufficient board meetings, appropriate board size, effective use of committees, and adequate and timely supply of material to the board are some private-sector tools used to promote effective and efficient board operations. Efficiency is a particular concern in the private sector given that boards are non-resident and have extensive responsibilities.

### **Governance codes**

86. In all matters related to effectiveness and efficiency, governance codes leave a large degree of flexibility to boards. For example, the issue of regular and sufficient meetings is frequently brought up in governance codes, even though no specific recommendations on frequency are made. The Viénot Report specifically explains why: “the frequency and duration of meetings are not amenable to the definition of general rules and should be left up to each board to decide” (AFEP/CNPF: 11).

87. Many codes also comment on the adequacy of material supplied to the board. The UK’s Combined Code notes that the “board should be supplied in a timely manner with information in a form and of a quality appropriate to enable it to discharge its duties (Financial Services Authority, 2003: 22). French, German, and Italian codes likewise emphasize this matter.

### **Private sector practices**

88. The trend towards smaller boards is seen as a major source of board effectiveness and efficiency. Other measures include shorter meetings and increased delegation to committees.

89. The frequency of board meetings varies between 3 and 30+ meetings a year across the S&P 500 (Carter and Lorsch, 2004). However, there is a general convergence around an average of about eight board meetings of about half a day each. Annual averages in Europe are lower in some countries (five in Germany, six in Switzerland and France) and higher in others (10 in Italy and 12 in the UK) (Carter and Lorsch, 2004).

90. Board practices vary widely, but good practice suggests that directors must be both supportive and challenging of management, and reach consensus while encouraging dissent. As regards the material they receive, most directors say they are overwhelmed with volume and unimpressed by content. Carter and Lorsch (2004) recommend that directors carefully define the information that the board needs.

### **Questions raised for the IMF**

91. Unlike in the private sector, the Fund’s Board is a resident board and is extremely involved in management activities. As such, the norms for the frequency of private-sector board meetings are more applicable to a body such as the IMFC that is not involved in management. Should the IMFC meet more often than twice a year to exercise its functions properly? Can the Board define more clearly what information it really needs?

**Principle 14: Committees should be used to further board effectiveness and efficiency as well as provide independence.** There is a strong trend towards having three main committees staffed by board members to ensure efficient use of time and expertise as well as sufficient independence—particularly in functions such as audit and compensation.

### Governance codes

92. Governance codes increasingly advocate a standard set of three committees: audit, compensation, and nomination/governance. The NYSE (2003) clearly defines the composition and responsibilities of these three committees:

- *Nominating/corporate governance committee*: made up entirely of independent directors and responsible for (1) identifying qualified individuals to serve on the board; (2) recommending corporate governance guidelines; (3) overseeing board and management evaluation.
- *Compensation committee*: made up entirely of independent directors and responsible for evaluating the CEO and recommending non-CEO executive compensation to the board.
- *Audit committee*: made up of at least three financially literate members, and responsible for assisting board oversight of (1) the company's financial statements; (2) compliance with legal and regulatory requirements; (3) independent auditor's qualifications and independence; (4) performance of internal and independent auditors.

93. The UK Combined Code suggests having three similar committees. The German code leaves more flexibility, requiring only an audit committee. The TSE code allows a choice between having a separate board of corporate auditors or the three committees.

### Private sector practices

94. Most companies have the three standard committees. In Europe, almost all companies had committees in 2005, with the average number trending towards three (Heidrick and Struggles, 2005, and Annex 6). The most common committees were much as defined by the NYSE, with around 94 percent of companies having audit and remuneration committees and around 71 percent having a nomination committee. It is common practice for each committee to have well defined terms of reference as to its responsibilities and authorities as delegated to it by the board. Committees generally meet in closed session and are led by a small number of board members (good practice advocates four or five) who are selected by the nomination committee. In the German two-tiered model, where the supervisory board is

made up of employee and shareholder representatives, committees maintain that same 50/50 ratio to ensure fair representation.<sup>7</sup>

95. Beyond the standard three committees, some organizations create additional committees to address company-specific topics. Resources and chemical companies may have environment committees, for example, while financial services companies are likely to have risk committees. Indeed, 70 percent of the top ten Fortune 100 universal banks have risk committees monitoring issues such as credit, market, interest rate, liquidity, and reputational risk.<sup>8</sup>

### **Questions raised for the IMF**

96. The Fund's committees differ from private-sector committees in that they are sometimes chaired by management rather than board members and are conducted in open session rather than only with the presence of committee members. Looking at the private sector use of committees raises many questions for the Fund. Should the Fund continue to have committees chaired by management or should they be run entirely by board members? The size of IMF committees also raises effectiveness concerns: Are they too large to be effective? Should they be run in closed session? How can the Fund ensure that the right people are selected to sit on each committee, while ensuring that they are representative of the board as a whole?

97. Having explored the 14 private sector principles, we now turn our attention to how the private sector thinks about measuring governance.

## **IV. MEASURING GOVERNANCE IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR**

98. Internal company practices do not generally include rigorous governance tracking but rather rely on board evaluations as a barometer for the health of governance structures. External ratings agencies have filled the information gap for shareholders and investors using a plethora of qualitative and quantitative metrics.

### **Internal company practices**

99. Most companies do not conduct rigorous internal tracking of governance practices. They use evaluations and self-reporting metrics instead of indicators, mainly in order to permit continuous improvement rather than for the purpose of evaluation per se. In evaluating board and individual performance, companies do collect information to understand and improve upon their governance structures and policies. From talking to board

---

<sup>7</sup> Interview with German Bank board member

<sup>8</sup> Of the top ten Fortune 100 universal banks, only Morgan Stanley, Merrill Lynch, and Goldman Sachs do not have a separate committee looking at risk.

members we found that these evaluations, done annually or biennially, can provide strong baselines for evaluating improvements over time. At each evaluation, the board goes back to the previous evaluation and is able to see whether there have been improvements.

100. These evaluations have the dual role of allowing the board to track improvements as well as galvanizing the board into action; each evaluation is followed by a distillation of feedback and delegation of the responsibility to change structures and processes. The types of issues that are uncovered range from operational complaints about meeting length, number of executive sessions, or types of documents received, to more complex issues around the role of the board in strategic decision making and gaps in the skill sets of the members of the board. Qualitative and quantitative metrics can be developed around any one of these issues to assess performance over time.

101. The private sector performs these evaluations either internally or with the help of outside consultants. Deutsche Bank's supervisory board chose to recruit external consultants for its first evaluation, and then repeated the same type of evaluation internally, through the Chairman's Committee, in 2006. Whether internal or external, successful evaluations require a lead director to champion the process.

102. Best practice also requires a combination of well thought out questionnaires and one-on-one discussions to fully bring out each director's concerns as well as candid board-wide discussions to increase the ownership and commitment of the entire board. The types of questions addressed in the course of board evaluations must probe directors' perceptions around a full checklist of the board's responsibilities. Annexes 5 and 7 provide examples of questions asked in the private sector.

### **External ratings agencies**

103. While there are no internationally recognized standards and benchmarks as far as corporate governance metrics are concerned, a number of companies assisting shareholders and investors have developed corporate governance ratings. The most recognized rating agencies include Institutional Shareholder Services (ISS), Governance Metrics International (GMI), Deminor Rating (sold to ISS in 2005), Standard & Poor's, and Audit Integrity. These companies use different methodologies but generally develop hundreds of qualitative and quantitative criteria to evaluate companies based on securities regulations, listing requirements, and corporate governance codes, as well as perceptions of governance experts.

104. These criteria generally have a number of governance components. For example, Standard & Poor's Corporate Governance Score has four: (1) ownership structure; (2) financial stakeholder relations; (3) financial transparency and information disclosure; and (4) board structure and process. Governance Metrics International has a slightly broader scope; it looks at six components that include the four above plus remuneration and interactions with non-financial stakeholders, including employees and suppliers. Figure IV.1 illustrates some of the criteria tracked by ratings agencies, including GMI, Deminor/ISS, and

Audit Integrity. Most of these criteria consider whether or not the company adheres to selected practices, as opposed to tracking performance indicators using a particular metric.

Figure IV.1. Governance Criteria Tracked by Rating Agencies

Areas	Metric	Rationale
Strategy and mission	Caliber of board members based on ensuring mix of relevant academic and professional expertise that reflects the needs of the organization (criteria include gender, nationality, functional experience) as well as mix of senior experts and younger more action-oriented members	High caliber and appropriate diversity of board members are considered strong asset for providing valuable direction and advice to management
Accountability	Percent change in number of company shares held by the senior management	Shares held by board members are seen as a proxy for commitment to the company
	Board attendance e.g. whether or not all directors attended at least 75 percent of meetings	Directors' attendance is seen as a critical component of accountability
	Whether or not training and orientation are required for new board members	Training and orientation are seen as a way to ensure that directors are fully cognizant of their responsibilities
Oversight	Whether or not the remuneration committee seeks professional advice from external consultants	Performance-based remuneration of management is seen as a key component of effective oversight
	Number of directors serving on the board for more than 15 years	Belief that directors who have served on board for too long get too friendly with management at the expense of shareholders
	Whether or not there is a policy for non-executive directors to meet before or after every board meeting	Board independence from management is facilitated by non-executive sessions
	Percent of independent directors on the board	Board independence is considered a critical element enabling independent oversight of management
Stakeholder interests	Whether or not training is required for audit committee members	Ensuring that audit committee members have the requisite skill-sets
	Whether or not the company has a policy for selection of auditors that includes either periodic rotation of the outside audit firm or competitive procurement	This metric stresses the importance of continually evaluating and refreshing auditors
	Number of restated earnings within the past years	Seen as indicator of poor auditing processes
	Disclosure of criteria used by the board or a board committee to formally evaluate CEO	Disclosure of non-financial criteria signals transparency to stakeholders
	Whether or not all shares are one-share-one-vote	Ensuring that there are no special privileges granted to any shareholders, or restrictions imposed on minority shareholders
	Whether or not minority shareholders (e.g. 10 percent of shareowners) can convene an extraordinary general meeting	This metric is seen as a proxy for minority shareholder voice
Structures and processes	Whether or not the company complies with established workplace codes	Seen as an indicator for employee relations
	Whether or not the company discloses its environmental performance in its annual report, on its website, or in a special environmental report	Metric to assess environmental risk management
	Size of the board (e.g. around 12 seen as good practice)	Smaller boards seen as more efficient
	Adequate size of committees (e.g. around 5 members seen as good practice) as well as composition	Smaller committees seen as more effective. Independence of committee is seen as critical for certain committees such as audit and nomination
	Whether or not executives take part in committee deliberations	Independence of committee's decision making as key element of good governance

### Suggestions for the IMF in creating a governance scorecard

105. To develop a scorecard for good governance, the Fund could draw on comprehensive annual Board evaluations and internal organization metrics similar to those tracked by external ratings agencies in the private sector. Such a process should be run in close coordination with the Board and ensure Directors' understanding and commitment to the evaluation process.

106. Figure IV.2 is an example of a potential scorecard, with the understanding that it is neither a comprehensive list of metrics that could be tracked, nor one that necessarily reflects the priorities of the Fund, which have not been systematically evaluated. Given the uniqueness of the Fund, many of the benchmarks would need to be focused on continuous improvement and thus on comparative historical metrics rather than on external benchmarks.

Figure IV.2. A Potential Governance Scorecard for the IMF

Principle	Indicator	Description / Observation	Objective	Source
Strategy & Mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average years of experience of EDs (and distribution across EDs)</li> <li>% of board meeting time <b>attended</b> by all Executive Directors</li> <li>% of new directors receiving <b>training and orientation</b></li> <li>Number of board sessions where MD and DMDs not present</li> <li>Disclosure of criteria used by board or committee to <b>evaluate MD</b></li> <li>Whether or not executives take part in committee deliberations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Years should be defined as total of "relevant" professional experience</li> <li>% of hours out of total official board time during which all EDs present</li> <li>This metric implies training and induction are formalized</li> <li>Executive board sessions where management does not take part</li> <li>This metric implies evaluation of MD's performance is formalized</li> <li>This metric implies switch to board-member led and run committees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assesses caliber of board members and is proxy for relevance of IMF</li> <li>Measures engagement and accountability of board members</li> <li>Assesses effort of the board in promoting accountability</li> <li>Tracks ability of board to independently deliberate on management</li> <li>Assesses degree of accountability of the MD to the board and the Fund</li> <li>Assesses degree of independence between management and board</li> </ul>	Visible / traceable metrics
Accountability				
Oversight				
Stake interests				
Structures and processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability of board members to <b>speak up</b> in board meetings</li> <li>Transparency of procedures for <b>contact between management and directors</b> outside board meetings</li> <li>Involvement in determination of Fund's <b>long-term strategy</b></li> <li>Level of detail and quality of <b>committee reports</b> to the board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aggregate of director satisfaction scores when answering these questions in annual board evaluation survey                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E.g. on a scale of 1-5 from very dissatisfied to very satisfied</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gauge whether MD is encouraging contributions on the board</li> <li>Measure to what extent information flowing to the board takes place in a symmetrical/transparent way</li> <li>Assess whether the board is focused on the right mix of activities</li> <li>Gauge whether directors feel that committees are providing appropriate info.</li> </ul>	Board / self-evaluation

107. Many of the benchmarks shown in Figure imply changes to current IMF Board structures and process, and should be seen as potential examples of what a scorecard might look like. As mentioned, any final list of indicators should be driven by the recommended actions resulting from a comprehensive gap analysis, and should be based on an in-depth review of the Fund’s realities.

## V. CONCLUSION

108. This initial phase of work provides a solid fact base that raises important questions for the Fund to consider as it seeks to improve its governance structures and the performance of its Board. To assist in starting the transformation that would be necessary to adopt and adapt these good practices and indicators, subsequent phases of work might include: (1) inducting a gap analysis of current IMF governance practices with good practice; (2) outlining a

transition/implementation plan with recommendations to close the gaps—ranging from “light touch” improvements to fundamental structural change; and (3) establishing a set of indicators to track improvements in governance structure over time.



## REFERENCES

- Adams, Renée, and Hamid Mehran, 2003. "Is Corporate Governance Different for Bank Holding Companies?" *FRBNY Economic Policy Review*, April: 123-42.
- Association Française des entreprises Privées et Conseil National du Patronat Français (AFEP/CNPF), 1995. *Le conseil d'administration des sociétés cotées* (or Viénot I Report). Rapport du groupe de travail. <[http://www.ecgi.org/codes/code.php?code\\_id=42](http://www.ecgi.org/codes/code.php?code_id=42)>
- Association of Chartered Certified Accountants, 2001. "Corporate Governance: The Stakeholder Challenge." Available via Internet: [www.ifac.org/Credibility/ViewPoints\\_PubDL.php?PubID=00020](http://www.ifac.org/Credibility/ViewPoints_PubDL.php?PubID=00020)
- Audit Integrity, 2005. *Measuring Accounting and Governance Risk in Public Corporations*.
- Australian Stock Exchange, 2003. *Corporate Governance in Australia: Principles of Good Corporate Governance and Best Practice Recommendations*. Available via Internet: <<http://www.shareholder.com/visitors/dynamicdoc/document.cfm?documentid=364>>
- BusinessWeek*, 2004. "One Share, Many Votes." 29 March.
- Carter, Colin B., and Jay W. Lorsch, 2004. *Back to the Drawing Board*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- CNN Money*, 2007. "Companies Splitting CEO, Chairman Roles." 31 January.
- Colley, John L. Jr., Jacqueline L. Doyle, George W. Logan, and Wallace Stettinius, 2003. *Corporate Governance*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Executive MBA Series.
- Committee on Corporate Governance, 1997. *Peters Report & Recommendations, Corporate Governance in the Netherlands* (Peters Code). Available via Internet: <<http://www.commissiecorporategovernance.nl/Information%20in%20English>>
- Committee on Corporate Governance, 2003. *The Dutch Corporate Governance Code: Principles of Good Corporate Governance and Best Practice Provisions* (Tabaksblat Code). Available via Internet: <[corpgov.nl/page/downloads/CODE%20DEF%20ENGELS%20COMPLEET%20III.pdf](http://corpgov.nl/page/downloads/CODE%20DEF%20ENGELS%20COMPLEET%20III.pdf)>
- Corporate Governance Forum of Japan, 1997. "Corporate Governance Principles: A Japanese View (Interim Report)."
- Corporate Governance Forum of Japan, Corporate Governance Committee, 2001. *Revised Corporate Governance Principles*. Available via Internet: <[www.ifac.org/Credibility/ViewPoints\\_PubDL.php?PubID=00046](http://www.ifac.org/Credibility/ViewPoints_PubDL.php?PubID=00046) >
- Deminor Rating, 2003. Research and Rating Service Methodology.
- Deminor Rating, 2005. "Application of the One Share – One Vote Principle in Europe." Commissioned by the Association of British Insurers.
- Deminor Rating, 2006. "Corporate Governance Rating and Investor Report—Banco Santander Central Hispano SA."

- Egon Zehnder International [nd], "The Changing Face of Japanese Corporate Governance – a Farewell to Tradition."
- European Corporate Governance Institute, 2004. *Board Models in Europe: Recent Developments of Internal Corporate Governance Structures in Germany, the United Kingdom, France, and Italy*. Law Working Paper No. 18.
- European Corporate Governance Forum (2006). "Statement of the European Corporate Governance Forum on the Comply-or-Explain Principle."  
<[ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/company/docs/ecgforum/ecgf-comply-explain\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/company/docs/ecgforum/ecgf-comply-explain_en.pdf)>
- Financial Services Authority, 2003. *The Combined Code on Corporate Governance*.  
<[www.fsa.gov.uk/pubs/ukla/lr\\_comcode2003.pdf](http://www.fsa.gov.uk/pubs/ukla/lr_comcode2003.pdf)>
- German Government Commission, 2006. *German Corporate Governance Code*, as amended on June 12, 2006. Available via Internet:  
<<http://www.corporate-governance-code.de/eng/kodex/index.html>>
- Goldman Sachs, 2006. *The Goldman Sachs Energy ESG Index – Integrating Environmental, Social and Governance Factors into Energy Industry Analysis*. Greenleaf Publishing. <[www.greenleaf-publishing.com/greenleaf/abstractpopup.kmod?productid=654](http://www.greenleaf-publishing.com/greenleaf/abstractpopup.kmod?productid=654)>
- Governance Metrics International, 2007. GMI Research Categories and Sample Metrics.
- Heidrick and Struggles, 2005. *Corporate Governance in Europe: What's the Outlook?*  
<[www.heidrick.com/NR/rdonlyres/B1A816CD-0E51-4605-B22C-40CB1B50561D/0/HS\\_EuropeCorpGovOutlook.pdf](http://www.heidrick.com/NR/rdonlyres/B1A816CD-0E51-4605-B22C-40CB1B50561D/0/HS_EuropeCorpGovOutlook.pdf)>
- International Monetary Fund (IMF), 2006. *What is the International Monetary Fund?* Available via Internet: [www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/exrp/what.htm](http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/exrp/what.htm)
- Italian Parliament, 2001. "Riforma organica della disciplina delle societa' di capitali e societa' cooperative," *Attualazione della legge 366* (3 October).
- Italian Stock Exchange, Committee for the Corporate Governance of Listed Companies, 1999. *Report & Code of Conduct* (Preda Code). Available via Internet:  
<[http://www.ecgi.org/codes/code.php?code\\_id=67](http://www.ecgi.org/codes/code.php?code_id=67)>
- Japan Ministry of Justice, 2002. *Commercial Code Revisions in Japan*.
- Knowledge@Warton, 2004. "Splitting Up the Roles of CEO and Chairman: Reform or Red Herring?" 2 June.
- London Stock Exchange, Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance, 1992. *The Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance* (Cadbury Report). London: Gee and Co. Available via Internet: <[http://www.ecgi.org/codes/code.php?code\\_id=132](http://www.ecgi.org/codes/code.php?code_id=132)>
- Lorsch, Jay W., and Andy Zelleke, 2005. "Should the CEO be the Chairman?" *MIT Sloan Management Review* 46 (2).
- McKinsey & Co., 2004a. "A New Era in Corporate Governance?" *McKinsey Quarterly*. Available via Internet:  
<[http://www.mckinseyquarterly.com/Governance/Boards/A\\_new\\_era\\_in\\_corporate\\_governance\\_1414\\_abstract](http://www.mckinseyquarterly.com/Governance/Boards/A_new_era_in_corporate_governance_1414_abstract)>

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004b. "How to Separate the Roles of Chairman and CEO," *McKinsey Quarterly*. Available via Internet:  
 <[www.mckinseyquarterly.com/Governance/Boards/How\\_to\\_separate\\_the\\_roles\\_of\\_chairman\\_and\\_CEO\\_1512\\_abstract](http://www.mckinseyquarterly.com/Governance/Boards/How_to_separate_the_roles_of_chairman_and_CEO_1512_abstract)>
- Mercer Delta, 2003. "Board Assessment – Laying the Foundation for Better Governance."
- New York Stock Exchange, 2003. *Listed Company Manual*. Available via Internet:  
 <[www.nyse.com/regulation/listed/1182508124422.html](http://www.nyse.com/regulation/listed/1182508124422.html)>
- New York Times*, 2007. "Move Over G.M., Toyota is No. 1." 25 April.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 2004. *OECD Principles of Corporate Governance*. Paris: OECD.
- Sonnenfeld, Jeffrey, 2004. "Good Governance and the Misleading Myths of Bad Metrics," *Academy of Management Executives* 18 (1).
- Spencer Stuart, 2004. "Taking a Closer Look: The Board Evaluation."
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2006a. "2006 UK Board Index – Current Board Trends and Practices at Major UK Companies."
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2006b. "The Netherlands Board Index – Board Trends and Practices at 100 Leading Companies," Ninth Edition.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2006c. "The Changing Profile of Directors."
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2006d. "Five-Year Trends Reveal a Changing Boardroom and Greater Independence."
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2006e. "Spencer Stuart Board Index – Osservatorio del Consiglio di Amministrazione delle Società Italiane."
- Tokyo Stock Exchange, 2004. *Principles of Corporate Governance for Listed Companies*. Available via Internet: <[www.ethosfund.ch/pdf/Code\\_Japan\\_principles.pdf](http://www.ethosfund.ch/pdf/Code_Japan_principles.pdf)>
- Toyota, 2006. *Annual Report*.
- United Nations, 2006. *Comprehensive Review of Governance and Oversight within the United Nations, Funds, Programs, and Specialized Agencies*. Available via Internet:  
 <<http://www.un.org/reform/governance/report.html>>
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2006). *Guidance on Good Practices in Corporate Governance Disclosure*. New York, NY: United Nations.
- United States Senate and House of Representatives, 2002. Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
- Van Houtven, Leo. 2002. *Governance of the IMF – Decision Making, Institutional Oversight, Transparency, and Accountability*. Pamphlet Series. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.


## ANNEX 1. SOURCES OF RESEARCH FOR PRIVATE SECTOR GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES

Sources were identified across a diverse set of countries and organizations:

Country/Organization	Document
Australia	Australian Stock Exchange (2003), "Corporate Governance in Australia"
Canada	Canadian Coalition of Good Governance (2005), "Corporate Governance Guidelines for Building High Performance Boards"
France	Association Française des entreprises Privées et Conseil National du Patronat Français (1995), « Le conseil d'administration des sociétés cotées » (or Viénot I Report), Rapport du groupe de travail
Germany	German Government Commission (2006), "German Corporate Governance Code"
Italy	Italian Parliament (2001), "Riforma organizza della disciplina delle società di capitali e società cooperative, in attuazione della legge 3 ottobre 2001, n. 366" Committee for the Corporate Governance of Listed Companies, Borsa Italiana (1999), "Report & Code of Conduct" (or the Preda Code)
Japan	Corporate Governance Forum of Japan (1997), "Corporate Governance Principles – A Japanese View (Interim Report)" Ministry of Justice (2002), "Commercial Code Revisions in Japan" Tokyo Stock Exchange (2004), "Principles for Corporate Governance for Listed Companies"
Netherlands	Committee on Corporate Governance (1997), "Peters Report & Recommendations, Corporate Governance in the Netherlands" Corporate Governance Committee Chaired by Morris Tabaksblat (2003), "The Dutch Corporate Governance Code" (or the Tabaksblat Code)
OECD	OECD (2004), "OECD Principles of Corporate Governance"
United Kingdom	Financial Services Authority (2003), "The Combined Code on Corporate Governance"
United States	New York Stock Exchange (2003), "Listed Company Manual" United States Senate and House of Representatives (2002), "Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002"
Other	Goldman Sachs (2006), "The Goldman Sachs Energy ESG Index – Integrating Environmental, Social and Governance Factors Into Energy Industry Analysis" Heidrick & Struggles (2005), "Corporate Governance in Europe: what's the outlook?"

## ANNEX 2. TOYOTA CASE STUDY

As shown in the figure below, Toyota's 2003 adaptation of the Japanese model does not involve any independent directors.



### ANNEX 3. MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC., BOARD CANDIDATE GUIDELINES

The Board of Directors should be composed of individuals who have demonstrated notable or significant achievements in business, education, or public service. In addition, the director candidate should possess the requisite intelligence, education and experience to make a significant contribution to the membership of the Board of Directors and bring a range of skills, diverse perspectives and backgrounds to the deliberations of the Board of Directors. Importantly, the director candidate must have the highest ethical standards, strong sense of professionalism and dedication to serving the interests of all the shareholders and be able to make himself or herself available to the Board of Directors in the fulfillment of his or her duties. For those director candidates who are also employees of the Corporation, he or she should be members of the executive management of the Corporation who have or are in the position to have a broad base of information about the Corporation and its business.

The overall ability and experience of the individual should determine his or her suitability. However, the following attributes and qualifications should be considered in evaluating the candidacy of an individual as a director for the Board of Directors:

**Management and leadership experience—The Board candidate must have extensive experience in business, education, or public service.**

The experience of candidates from the different fields of business, education, or public service should be measured as follows:

*Candidates from the Field of Business:* The Board candidate is or has been the Chief Executive Officer, Chief Operating Officer or Chief Financial Officer of, or holds or has held a senior managerial position in, a major public corporation, recognized privately held entity or recognized money or investment management firm.

*Candidates from the Field of Education:* The Board candidate holds or has held either a significant position at a prominent educational institution comparable to the position of university or college president and/or dean of a school within the university or college or a senior faculty position in an area of study important or relevant to the Corporation.

*Candidates from the Field of Public Service:* The Board candidate has held one or more elected or appointed senior positions in the US federal government or agency, any US state government or agency or any non-US governmental entity or holds or has held one or more elected or appointed senior positions in a highly visible nonprofit organization.

**Skilled and diverse background—The Board candidate must bring a desired range of skills, diverse perspectives and experience to the Board.**

The following attributes should be considered in assessing the contribution that the Board candidate would make as a member of the Board of Directors:

*Financial Literacy:* Board candidates having a sufficient understanding of financial reporting and internal control principles or financial management experience bring desirable knowledge and skills to the Board.

*International Experience:* International experience is a significant positive characteristic in a Board candidate's profile. Having an understanding of the language and culture of non-English speaking countries will also be considered beneficial.

*Knowledge of the Duties of Director:* The Board candidate's aptitude and/or experience to understand fully the legal responsibilities of a director and governance processes of a public company is an essential factor.

*No Interlocking Directorships.* The Board candidate should not have any prohibitive interlocking relationships.


**Integrity and professionalism—The Board candidate must have the highest ethical standards, a strong sense of professionalism, and be prepared to serve the interests of all the stockholders.**

*Personal Experience:* The Board candidate should be of the highest moral and ethical character. The candidate must exhibit independence, objectivity and willingness to serve as a representative of the Corporation's stockholders. He or she should have a personal commitment to the Corporation's Principles of Client Focus, Respect for the Individual, Teamwork, Responsible Citizenship and Integrity.

*Individual Characteristics:* The Board candidate should have the personal qualities to be able to make a substantial active contribution to Board deliberations. These qualities include intelligence, self-assuredness, high ethical standards, inter-personal skills, independence, courage, a willingness to ask difficult questions, communication skills and commitment. In considering candidates for Board membership, the diversity of the communities in which the Corporation conducts its business should be considered in looking at the composition of the Board.

## ANNEX 4. TYPICAL CEO SELECTION PROCESS

Good-practice CEO selection in the private sector typically involves four steps:



Source: Dalberg analysis and research of sources including: "Find the Right CEO: Why Boards Often Make Poor Choices" MITSloan Management Review; "Hire the Right CEO" collection of articles in HBR OnPoint



**ANNEX 5. SAMPLE BOARD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**


From Bryan Cave, LLP:

BOARD STRUCTURE				Comments			
Does the Board as a whole possess the right skills and background to help guide management and the Company through the current issues facing the Company?	Y	N		Do you feel that you are easily able to place items on the agenda or to raise issues that are not on the agenda?	Y	N	
Does the Board have the right number of Directors? Are there are enough Directors to fulfill the Board's responsibilities without burdening the Directors?	Y	N		Are you satisfied with the allocation of time for the different agenda items and feel that all important matters are thoroughly discussed and analyzed?	Y	N	
The Board has _____ inside Directors and _____ outside Directors. Should there be more outside Directors?	Y	N		Are you satisfied with the quality of the presentations to the Board?	Y	N	
Is the process for selecting new Directors and re-nominating current directors appropriate?	Y	N		Is there sufficient time at Board meetings for the presentation and full discussion of the subjects covered? And to address all of your questions?	Y	N	
Should significant investors in the Company or other outsiders have an ability to nominate directors?	Y	N		Is the time at Board meetings utilized effectively?	Y	N	
The Board does not have a mandatory retirement/resignation age for Directors. Is this policy appropriate?	Y	N		Does the Board have open and constructive deliberations?	Y	N	
The Company does not limit the length of service of Directors. Is this appropriate?	Y	N		Are the Directors well prepared for Board meetings?	Y	N	
Does the Board have the right Committee structure? At present, it has the following committees: [List committees]	Y	N		Is there any business now handled by the full Board which should be delegated to a Committee?	Y	N	
Is the annual review of Committee memberships and Chairmanships appropriate and adequate?	Y	N		Is there any business now handled by a Committee which should be handled by the full Board?	Y	N	
Should the Board appoint a lead outside Director?	Y	N		Do the Committee reports give the appropriate amount of information to the Board? Do you feel like you know what each Committee is working on?	Y	N	
BOARD MEETINGS				Comments			
Does the Board have the appropriate number of meetings per year?	Y	N		Is there sufficient time/opportunity for outside Directors to meet independently, either in a formal "executive session" or otherwise?	Y	N	
Does the Board receive adequate materials in advance of meetings of the Board? If delivery of materials can be improved, please provide input.	Y	N		Is the frequency in which the Board meets with members of senior management alone sufficient?	Y	N	
Are you satisfied with the content of Board meetings? Does the agenda include what is important (rather than mere formalities)?	Y	N		KEY BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES			
				Is the Board adequately and properly involved in determination of the Company's long-term strategy?	Y	N	
				Is the Board effective in monitoring the implementation of the Company's long-term strategy?	Y	N	

Source: Bryan Cave LLD; Dalberg Research & Analysis

**ANNEX 6. AVERAGE NUMBER OF BOARD COMMITTEES IN EUROPE, 1999–2005**

Average number of board committees in Europe (1999-2005)



Note: Heidrick & Struggles study based on 300 of Europe's top companies from the following countries: UK, Switzerland, Netherlands, France, Sweden, Spain, Belgium, Portugal, Germany, Italy  
Source: Heidrick & Struggles 2005 Study, Corporate Governance in Europe: what's the outlook?, Dalberg Research & Analysis

**ANNEX 7. TEN QUESTIONS FOR ASSESSING BOARD BEHAVIOR**

From *Back to the Drawing Board*, by Colin B. Carter and Jay W. Lorsch (Harvard Business School Press, 2004):

1. Is the chairman's leadership style effective?
2. Do the chairman (or lead director) and CEO have a good working relationship?
3. Do the chairman (or lead director) and CEO understand their respective roles?
4. Does the CEO encourage contributions from the board?
5. Is the relationship between directors and management a constructive one?
6. Are there agreed procedures for contact between management and directors outside board meetings?
7. Can individual directors raise issues for discussion without difficulty-is dissent OK?
8. Do directors express their views to each other and to management in ways that are constructive?
9. Having reached decisions, are directors cohesive in supporting the board's decision?
10. Is bad news communicated quickly and openly by management to the board?