
Review of modalities of formal and informal sessions of the Executive Board and its subsidiary bodies

Document: EB 2023/138/R.10

Agenda: 8(a)

Date: 12 April 2023

Distribution: Public

Original: English

FOR: APPROVAL

Useful references: Review of frequency and modalities of formal and informal Executive Board sessions at IFAD ([EB 2021/133/R.33](#))

Action: The Executive Board is invited to approve the recommendations contained in paragraphs 8, 16, 18 and 23 of the present document, as reflected in paragraph 24.

Technical questions:

Deirdre Mc Grenra
Secretary of IFAD, a.i.
Office of the Secretary
e-mail: d.mcgrenra@ifad.org

Katherine Meighan
Associate Vice-President and General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
e-mail: k.meighan@ifad.org

Review of modalities of formal and informal sessions of the Executive Board and its subsidiary bodies

I. Background

1. The COVID-19 pandemic obliged organizations to review and realign their governance operations to the “new normal” of virtual settings to ensure business continuity and maintain effective decision-making and oversight processes for their governing bodies.
2. Among the changes implemented at IFAD were the use of the vote by correspondence procedure to streamline approval processes in a virtual setting and the fine-tuning of the online commenting feature to better respond to governance needs and facilitate gathering of feedback. These changes, as well as the restructuring of agendas to lighten in-session discussions, gave rise to time efficiencies.
3. Cost efficiencies were also realized, as revealed by an analysis of the length, complexity and costs of Executive Board sessions convened in 2019 and 2020 with respect to the efficiency of in-presence and virtual meetings. Direct cost efficiencies in the range of US\$35,000 to US\$40,000 were realized for meetings held virtually as a result of reduced travel and hospitality costs.
4. Following a stocktake of the impact of the changes introduced, proposals for streamlining the working methods of the Executive Board were presented for the Board’s review. Additional time was deemed necessary to assess related trade-offs and benefits of the different modalities.
5. The proposed changes presented in this document are based on the findings of an informal survey of the practices of other United Nations agencies and international financial institutions (IFIs) (see annex I), a survey conducted with Board representatives in October 2022, and additional feedback gathered from Board representatives during the December Board session and through Convenors and Friends’ meetings, informal exchanges and an informal seminar held in March 2023.

II. Proposed review of modalities

A. Streamlining in-session deliberations

6. **Online review of documents.** In-session deliberations of the Executive Board have been streamlined through the increased use of the online review of documents. Through this procedure, Board representatives may submit comments through the e-board of the Member States Interactive Platform (MSIP) for certain types of documents for review, to which Management provides a written response online. Following the Executive Board session, a document containing all comments and Management responses is posted on the platform in the four official languages of the Fund.
7. Feedback on the use of the online commenting feature from Board representatives has been positive. As such, it is proposed that:
 - (a) Documents submitted for review through the online commenting feature will be:
 - (i) Standard and recurring financial reports (see annex II);
 - (ii) Progress reports (see annex II);

- (iii) Country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs);¹ and
 - (iv) Country strategy and programme evaluations¹.
- (b) The documents listed in point (a) above should not be linked to a particular Executive Board session, thus promoting a more even distribution of documentation throughout the year and allowing greater flexibility for finalization of documents and review by Board representatives.
 - (c) The commenting feature would be active for a period of four weeks for receipt of comments from Board representatives. Management would endeavour to respond to each comment within three working days of receipt of the same (in English). All comments and responses would be consolidated in a single document in the four official languages of the Fund, to be issued as soon as possible following the closure of the commenting feature.
 - (d) At the request of a member or alternate member of the Executive Board, any item shared for review through the online commenting feature will be placed on the agenda of an upcoming Board for in-session consideration. Such requests should be submitted to the Secretariat prior to the closure of the commenting feature.
8. **Recommendation.** It is recommended that the practice of considering documents for review online through the MSIP commenting feature be continued as set forth in in paragraph 7.
 9. **Approval methods.** In-session Executive Board deliberations have also been streamlined through the use of the vote by correspondence procedure to approve/confirm documents that have already been considered in other meetings (e.g. pre-Board consultations), and/or standard/procedural items. With this procedure, once the Board agenda is adopted in session, representatives are invited to take action on such items through vote by correspondence. Any of these items will be placed on the Board agenda for consideration in session at the request of a member or alternate member of the Board, provided that this request is received by the Office of the Secretary at least one week prior to the commencement of the Executive Board session.
 10. During the 137th session of the Executive Board, representatives acknowledged the positive impact that the vote by correspondence procedure had had in streamlining in-session deliberations. However, it was noted that this procedure is resource heavy as it requires significant follow-up on the part of both Board representatives and the Office of the Secretary to ensure that the majority requirements are met and that these items are duly approved/confirmed within the prescribed timeline, thus posing the risk of delays in communicating project/programme approvals to governments. Furthermore, the timing of approval for items submitted to the Executive Board at the December session through the vote by correspondence procedure is problematic given the proximity to year-end and financial account closures.
 11. In order to streamline approval processes, representatives noted that consideration could be given to adopting a rolling approach to approvals: rather than tying proposals to formal Board sessions, items for consideration could be distributed more homogeneously across governing body meetings during the year. In response, and bearing in mind that the scheduling of project and programme proposals for the Board's consideration also relies on factors beyond the Fund's control, Management will present a document on proposed revisions to the approval

¹ Given the strategic importance of country strategic opportunities programmes and county strategy and programme evaluations, and the opportunities that they present for engagement with country teams and government representatives, these will continue to be included for discussion in pre-Executive Board consultations.

procedures for project/programme and non-sovereign operation proposals for the Board's consideration at a future session.

12. Board representatives also underscored the importance of the timely posting of documentation, a principle to which Management is fully committed. In 2021 and 2022, almost 90 per cent of the documents requiring Board action (approval, review or confirmation) were posted in accordance with the timelines established by the Board. Management will continue to strive towards ensuring adherence to such timelines as per rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board. Awareness-raising is constantly ongoing with document originators to mitigate the risk of such delays. In an effort to facilitate forward planning and early identification of items for which consultations during the iterative process would prove useful, the Board will henceforth be presented with a document for information at each session, providing a preview of the draft provisional agendas of the forthcoming two sessions.²
13. To further streamline in-session deliberations and the approval methods at the Board's disposal, it is proposed that the items currently presented for the Board's action through vote by correspondence be considered by the Board at the beginning of the session through a "batch" procedure.³ This proposal is in line with the practice of other organizations, including the European Union⁴ and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).⁵ In both instances, the agenda is presented with two types of items: "A" items or points and "B" items or points. The former – type A – refers to items or points that have already been discussed in other committees or bodies and are therefore not proposed for discussion, but rather presented for approval as a group of items at the beginning of the relevant governing body meeting. The latter – type B – refers to items or points that are to be acted upon by the governing body following in-session discussion.
14. In consultation with the Chairperson of the Board, such in-session batch procedure would be applied to items considered unlikely to generate debate, including:
 - (a) Standard/procedural items, as is currently the case for items submitted for action through vote by correspondence;
 - (b) Project/programme proposals already considered at the pre-Board consultations; and
 - (c) Standard items transmitted to the Board for action (approval or confirmation) that have already been reviewed and endorsed by subsidiary bodies.

Items deemed to require discussion would not be proposed for consideration through this procedure. Examples of the types of items that could be proposed for in-session batch consideration on the basis of these criteria are included in annex III.

15. As is the case for the current vote by correspondence procedure, any item for approval/confirmation through the batch procedure would be placed on the Board agenda for in-session consideration at the request of a member or alternate member of the Board. Representatives would therefore retain their right to request that any of these items be given space for discussion during the Executive Board session, should this be considered appropriate. At the start of the session and following the adoption of the agenda, the Chairperson would seek batch consideration of these items. This procedure would streamline the work of the

² This measure has already been taken for the 138th session of the Executive Board.

³ As specified in rule 23 of the [Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board](#) voting by correspondence can continue to be used when "... action must be taken by the Board that should not be postponed until its next session but does not warrant the calling of a session of the Board ...".

⁴ See article 3, paragraph 6 of the [Rules of Procedure of the Council of the European Union](#).

⁵ <https://www.oecd.org/legal/Resolution-Governance-Decision-Making.pdf>.

Board and Management by effectively reducing the follow-up required, facilitating the year-end and financial account closures, and expediting communication of approvals to relevant parties.

16. **Recommendation.** Bearing in mind the potential efficiency gains from further streamlining approval processes, it is recommended that in-session batch consideration of items be adopted on a pilot basis for items so identified in the Board agenda, as described in paragraphs 13, 14 and 15. This pilot would cover the September and December Board sessions in 2023, and the April/May session in 2024, after which Management will report to the Board on the outcome of the pilot and seek a decision as to whether the batch procedure should continue.
17. **Time limit for interventions.** The implementation of virtual and, more recently, hybrid meetings highlighted the importance of concise and succinct interventions during governing body sessions. This is true both for meeting participants and for interpreters, whose task is rendered more difficult by the online environment, which is subject to issues related to, inter alia, connectivity, sound quality and audio devices. In order to take into consideration time zones, interpretation challenges, online platform fatigue and, more broadly, best practice in the efficient use of Board representatives' time, the implementation of a time limit for interventions is proposed.
18. **Recommendation.** In order to promote the efficient use of time and ensure that all members have equal opportunity to intervene as needed, a time limit will be set for representatives' interventions during sessions of the Executive Board and its subsidiary bodies. It is proposed that the time limits for interventions be three minutes for individual statements and five minutes for statements made on behalf of a group of Member States (e.g. List statements/constituency statements). The proposed time limits should be interpreted as a guideline, which the Chairperson of the Executive Board will have the discretion to extend or waive at each session for specific items. In addition, representatives may provide the statements they deliver in session to the Office of the Secretary for posting on MSIP.⁶

B. Participation modalities

19. The COVID-19 pandemic brought about significant changes in governing body meeting modalities across organizations. An informal survey was conducted among the governing body secretariats of United Nations agencies and IFIs in October 2022 (see annex I for the summary findings and survey questionnaire). Findings indicate that, across organizations, there has been a shift towards hybrid meetings, which, although often more demanding and costly than fully in-presence or fully virtual meetings, provide tangible benefits for meeting participants in terms of both flexibility and reduced travel costs. Notwithstanding this, responses noted the benefits of fully in-presence meetings, namely stronger interpersonal relationships and trust among members. One organization characterized these benefits as having all participants at an equal level of participation, while another organization that was moving towards a virtual or hybrid modality for all meetings noted that in 2021 it had reverted to fully in-presence meetings for its Board of Directors to rebuild a group dynamic and enhance commitment and engagement, which had suffered from one year of fully virtual and hybrid meetings. While organizations continue to encourage in-person participation, participants will have the option of connecting virtually in most organizations going forward. One organization noted that while Member States insisted on in-person meetings for negotiations, many delegates opted for virtual attendance, provided that the meeting platform was stable and easy to use – and that there was no expectation to return to fully in-person meetings, except for the rare meetings requiring voting. The survey also revealed that some organizations are adopting different meeting modalities for

⁶ Such statements would be posted as received on the publicly available Members' Platform.

different governing bodies, with some meeting in presence and others in virtual or hybrid mode.

20. At IFAD, recent sessions of the Executive Board and its subsidiary bodies have been held in hybrid format, and other meetings such as informal seminars, pre-Board consultations and meetings of Convenors and Friends have been held virtually. While there has been a distinct upward trend in in-person participation in the recent hybrid Board sessions, this has not been the case with meetings of subsidiary bodies, where reduced in-presence participation and increasing requests to participate virtually have been observed.
21. Board representatives have expressed a preference for in-person meetings, and have called for flexibility in determining the meeting modalities of the Board and its subsidiary bodies. Recognizing that physical participation may not always be possible, representatives have requested that IFAD continue to offer the hybrid modality to ensure wide participation. It was acknowledged that, in general, virtual participation should be considered a complement to rather than a substitute for in-person participation in governing body meetings. It was also noted that the virtual-only modality was not desirable for formal sessions of the Executive Board as it could limit opportunities for consensus-building and in-person interactions.
22. Table 1 summarizes the perceived advantages and disadvantages of the different meeting modalities based on IFAD's experience.

Table 1
Advantages and disadvantages of different governing body meeting modalities

	<i>Fully in presence</i>	<i>Fully virtual</i>	<i>Hybrid</i>
<i>Advantages</i>	<p>Increased opportunities for in-person interactions and consensus-building, including informal exchanges on the margins of the meeting and opportunities for building interpersonal relationships and trust among members and with Management.</p> <p>Interpretation services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation costs may be lower compared to the hybrid or virtual context as interpretation shifts can be longer; • Fewer interruptions to interpretation resulting from speakers' connectivity issues. <p>Facilitated procedures for the formal adoption of decisions should representatives request that a decision be put to a vote, compared to the virtual and hybrid modalities.</p>	<p>Reduced costs (travel, accommodation, conference services and logistics)</p> <p>Reduced environmental footprint due to limited travel.</p> <p>Facilitated participation - Additional representatives from capitals, who would not normally travel, able to attend or observe. Furthermore, increased time efficiency for meeting participants connecting virtually, with no need to commute to the meeting venue.</p> <p>Increased flexibility in case of unforeseen events that may preclude the ability to hold in-presence meetings.</p>	<p>Partly reduced costs (reduced travel costs)</p> <p>Reduced environmental footprint due to limited travel.</p> <p>Facilitated participation - Additional representatives from capitals, who would not normally travel, able to attend or observe. Furthermore, increased time efficiency for meeting participants connecting virtually, with no need to commute to the meeting venue.</p> <p>Increased flexibility in case of unforeseen events that may preclude the ability to hold in-presence meetings.</p>
<i>Disadvantages</i>	<p>Cost implications linked to travel, accommodation, conference services and logistics.</p> <p>Higher environmental footprint due to increased travel.</p> <p>Caps on number of meeting participants due to capacity of meeting venue.</p>	<p>Lack of in-person interaction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No opportunity for informal exchanges on the margins of the meeting, which are often key for consensus-building; • Lack of networking opportunities and scope for building interpersonal relationships and trust among members, particularly for new Executive Board members; • Losing touch with delegations and lack of face-to-face interaction between Management and Board representatives. <p>Interpretation services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be subject to different rules in virtual and hybrid environments, compared to in-presence meetings, leading to higher costs. Interpretation shifts are necessarily shorter given the increased difficulties posed by the virtual or hybrid environment. This may entail recruiting a higher number of interpreters for a given meeting; • Additional expenses of virtual platforms and videoconferencing tools with interpretation; • Disruption of interpretation services should participants face issues with connectivity or fail to 	<p>Increased costs (particularly in terms of human resources) given the need to service both an in-person and a virtual meeting simultaneously.</p> <p>Expectations for reduced travel costs and reduced environmental footprint due to limited travel may be partly or completely offset should members decide to participate in presence for part of the meeting and virtually for another portion.</p> <p>Limited in-person interaction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for informal exchanges are limited to participants physically present at the meeting venue, impacting consensus-building and networking opportunities among members; • Virtual participants cannot engage in "side-bar" negotiations, thus hindering inclusion and consensus-building. <p>Interpretation services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be subject to different rules in virtual and hybrid environments, compared to in-presence meetings, leading to higher costs. Interpretation shifts are necessarily shorter given the increased difficulties posed by the virtual or hybrid

	<p>comply with associated etiquette (use of headsets, adequate microphones, etc.)</p> <p>Logistical considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difference in time zones can hinder attendance; • The need to take time differences into account to the extent possible means that fewer hours can be allocated per day, thus resulting in meetings over an extended number of days; • Participants may encounter audio/video challenges based on the reliability of their connectivity. <p>Practical challenges relating to formal adoption of decisions should representatives request that a decision be put to a vote, particularly if the vote is to be by secret ballot and bearing in mind that the use of an electronic voting system at IFAD must first be approved by the Executive Board.</p>	<p>environment. This may entail recruiting a higher number of interpreters for a given meeting;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional expenses of virtual platforms and videoconferencing tools with interpretation; • Disruption of interpretation services should participants face issues with connectivity or fail to comply with associated etiquette (use of headsets, adequate microphones, etc.) <p>Logistical considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difference in time zones can hinder attendance; • The need to take time differences into account to the extent possible means that fewer hours can be allocated per day, thus resulting in meetings over an extended number of days; • Participants may encounter audio/video challenges based on the reliability of their connectivity. <p>Practical challenges relating to formal adoption of decisions should representatives request that a decision be put to a vote, particularly if the vote is to be by secret ballot and bearing in mind that the use of an electronic voting system at IFAD must first be approved by the Executive Board.</p>
--	---	--

23. **Recommendation.** Bearing in mind IFAD’s experience with the various meeting modalities, the need to accommodate participation across time zones, the trends in IFAD since piloting a return to in-presence meetings, trends in comparator organizations, and the feedback received from Board representatives, the following recommendations are proposed:
- (a) Executive Board sessions will be held fully in presence at IFAD headquarters⁷, over two to three full days, with the hybrid modality available to those unable to be in Rome for the meeting. The in-presence modality is the preferred modality for formal sessions of the Executive Board given the consideration of strategic items, in order to foster stronger interpersonal relationships among and between members and Management and, in the case of the April/May session, because of the proximity to the Executive Board retreat;
 - (b) Pre-Board consultations will be held in fully virtual format. This will facilitate adequate and cost-effective participation of IFAD country teams when needed, given the increasingly decentralized nature of the organization. Such consultations may also be held in presence if necessary. Efforts will be made to schedule pre-Board consultations in such a way as to enable sufficient time for the review of documents, provision of feedback and responses from Management;
 - (c) Informal seminars will be held in fully virtual format, with the possibility of being organized in presence should this be deemed necessary, subject to the sensitivity and/or particularities of the topic being considered⁸;
 - (d) Meetings of Convenors and Friends will be held fully in presence at IFAD headquarters, with the option of virtual meetings should time constraints or other factors preclude meeting in presence; and
 - (e) Meetings and sessions of subsidiary bodies of the Executive Board will be held fully in presence at IFAD headquarters, with the hybrid modality available to those unable to be in Rome for the meeting.

III. Recommendations

24. The Executive Board is requested to consider and approve the recommendations contained in paragraphs 8, 16, 18 and 23, which aim to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization’s governance processes.

⁷ The [Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board](#) were amended during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure business continuity ([EB 2020/130/V.B.C.1](#)). According to rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board, “Executive Board sessions may be held by virtual means when the President determines that holding a physical in-presence session is not feasible or appropriate for all representatives.”

⁸ Board representatives may request that specific informal seminars be held in presence.

Summary findings of the informal follow-up survey on governing body meeting modalities

1. The Office of the Secretary of IFAD conducted an informal survey among the governing body secretariats of United Nations agencies and IFIs in 2021 on the changes in governance modalities brought about as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. A follow-up informal survey was conducted among the same group in October 2022 (the questionnaire is reported below), and 19 responses were received (seven from the United Nations agencies group and 12 from the IFI group).
2. The main outcomes and considerations resulting from the follow-up survey can be summarized as follows:
 - (a) The majority of responses indicated a **shift towards the hybrid meeting modality**, and that this would be the preferred modality going forward. While several organizations encouraged in-person participation for governing body meetings, the possibility of connecting virtually would continue to be an option. One organization noted that while it was moving towards offering a virtual/hybrid modality for all meetings, in 2021 it had reverted to fully in-presence meetings for its Board of Directors “to rebuild a group dynamic and enhance commitment/engagement that suffered from one year of fully virtual and hybrid meetings”.
 - (b) Only four organizations reported that they would return to fully in-presence meetings, with one highlighting that this would ensure a level playing field for all participants, another noting that discontinuing the virtual modality would prevent incurring additional costs to cover additional interpretation sessions and the costs of interpretation technology, and another noting that its plans for a fully in-person modality may continue to evolve in the future. A fifth organization noted that no decision had yet been taken on whether or not to return to fully in-presence meetings.
 - (c) Respondents highlighted the **benefits of continuing to hold governing body meetings in hybrid format**. These included, among others, added flexibility for meeting participants, and reduced travel costs and environmental footprint. Some of the feedback provided on hybrid meetings included:

“This hybrid modality, as stated before, has been very efficient and flexible, considering that not all directors reside permanently in headquarters. In the case of [governing body] meetings, it has also proved to be very efficient in allowing high-level officials to partake, instead of them delegating the participations in alternate or temporary governors.”

“Hybrid has become the standard format for meetings of formal or semiformal [organization name] governing bodies, despite the fact that hybrid meetings are more demanding and costly than fully in-person or fully online meetings.”

“We have observed that while Member States insist on in-person meetings for negotiations, many delegates opt for virtual attendance, provided that the platform is stable and easy to use. There is no expectation to return to fully in-person meetings, except for the rare meetings requiring voting.”

- (d) A few organizations reported using **different meeting modalities for different governing bodies** – for example, holding their main governing body meeting in presence, while offering the virtual or hybrid modality for other committee and Board meetings. One organization noted that for some of its governing bodies, half of the meetings were planned in presence and the other half were planned virtually.
- (e) **New practices** introduced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic that organizations are planning to retain going forward related to the use of virtual voting procedures and other technological advancements such as specialized IT platforms for holding governing body meetings.

Survey questionnaire

Moving forward in the post-pandemic era,

1. Is your organization planning to return to fully in-presence governing body meetings (i.e. with no possibility for delegates to connect virtually)?
 - (a) Please specify if this will apply to all governing bodies and/or if different modalities are expected for different governing bodies and subsidiary bodies.
2. Will your organization adopt mixed meeting modalities for different governing bodies? For example, with the main governing bodies meeting in person while smaller subsidiary bodies or working groups only meeting virtually or in hybrid modality.
3. Will your organization continue to offer:
 - (a) Virtual meetings (i.e. with all delegates connecting virtually and none physically present)?
 - (b) Hybrid meetings (i.e. with some delegates physically present and others connected virtually)?
 - (c) Please provide additional details, including the reasons for continuing or discontinuing these meeting modalities.
4. Is your organization planning to retain any new practice introduced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, which may have resulted in more efficient governance methods? For example, streamlining meeting agendas by moving the consideration of certain items before or after the meeting itself. Please provide more details.

Standard recurring financial and progress reports submitted for review through the online commenting feature

1. The below list includes items that are currently submitted for the Board's review through the MSIP online commenting feature. These standard recurring financial and progress reports⁹ are proposed for the Executive Board's review through the online review procedure described in paragraphs 6 to 8:
 - Capital Adequacy Report – (biannual)
 - Asset and Liability Management Risk Report
 - Project financial management: Annual progress report, including review of the conceptual framework on financial reporting and auditing of IFAD-financed projects
 - Update on the implementation of IFAD's Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Financing of Terrorism Policy, and controllership (ad hoc reporting)
 - Progress report on IFAD Strategy on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
 - Progress report on IFAD's Grant Policy implementation (includes an annex listing grants approved by the President)
 - Update on IFAD's Engagement with the Committee on World Food Security
 - Progress report on IFAD's implementation of Food System Summit-related commitments
 - Progress report on IFAD's engagement in South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC)
 - Progress report on engagement in the reform of the United Nations Development System
 - Update on IFAD's efforts against hate speech, racism and other forms of discrimination
 - Progress report on the IFAD Partnership Framework (at the end of each replenishment cycle)
2. Any of the items proposed for review through the MSIP online commenting feature may be placed on the Board agenda for consideration in session at the request of a member or alternate member of the Board.

⁹ This list is intended for demonstrative purposes only and is not exhaustive.

Standard items that could be proposed for action through the batch procedure

1. The below list¹⁰ includes items that are reviewed and endorsed by the Board's subsidiary bodies and/or the pre-Board consultations before being submitted for the Board's approval or confirmation, as well as standard/procedural items unlikely to generate debate. These items, which are currently submitted for the Board's action through the vote by correspondence procedure, could be proposed for the Executive Board's action¹¹ through the batch procedure, and would continue to be reviewed by the relevant subsidiary body/other forum (e.g. pre-Board consultations) prior to the Board's consideration:
 - Financial matters:
 - Workplan for IFAD's Office of Audit and Oversight in YYYY [C]
 - IFAD's Investment Policy Statement YYYY [A]
 - Consolidated financial statements of IFAD as at 31 December YYYY [A]
 - Selection of the external auditors [A]
 - Operational matters:
 - Project/programme proposals already considered at the pre-Board consultations [A]
 - Governance:
 - Proposed dates for the sessions of the Executive Board to be held in YYYY [A]
 - Dates of the country visits of the IFAD Executive Board YYYY [A]
 - Draft provisional agenda for the XX session of the Governing Council [A]
 - Invitation of observers to sessions of the Governing Council [A]
 - Other business:
 - Memorandums of understanding [A]
 - Cofinancing framework agreements [A]
 - Partnership/cooperation agreements [A]
2. Any of the items proposed for action through the batch procedure may be placed on the Board agenda for consideration in session at the request of a member or alternate member of the Board.

¹⁰ This list is intended for demonstrative purposes only and is not exhaustive.

¹¹ For ease of reference, each agenda item is assigned a letter to indicate the action required of the Board, as follows: [A] = For approval; [C] = For confirmation.