

Selection of the Global Fund Executive Director: Voting Procedures 54th Board Meeting

GF/B54/11C
12 – 13 February 2026, Geneva, Switzerland

Board Information

Purpose: This paper describes the voting procedures for the Executive Director selection. The procedures were presented to the Ethics and Governance Committee at their 29B meeting on 29 January 2026.

1. Report

Context

1. The term of the Executive Director (ED) is currently scheduled to conclude in 2026. Preparing for, and overseeing, this high-level selection process to appoint the next ED is a strategic priority for the for the organization throughout 2026. Timely and robust preparations are paramount ahead of the launch of each selection process.
2. A number of steps have been completed to date, namely, the appointment of the search firm, the approval by the Board of the Executive Director Nomination Committee's (EDNC) terms of reference,¹ the approval by the Board of the membership of the EDNC,² the finalization of the Executive Director Terms of Reference, and the holding of an initial EDNC meeting on 17 December 2025.
3. Prior to the formal launch of the ED selection process, this paper serves to ensure that the Board is fully briefed on the voting procedures that will be used to move from the 4-5 finalist candidates put forward by the EDNC, to a single final ED candidate for appointment by the Board. Early socialization of the voting procedures aims to ensure understanding and comfort, and provide space for any questions or comment.
4. The voting procedures described in this paper, which is submitted to the Board by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board, were presented to the Ethics and Governance Committee in their January 2025 meeting and there were no requests for clarification from the committee following the presentation by the Secretariat.

What is the voting process for selecting the ED?

5. At the 36th Board Meeting, the Board approved the voting procedure for the selection of the ED (set forth in Annex 2 to GF/B36/07 entitled *Executive Director Selection Summary of Voting Process*, which is also attached as Annex 1 to this electronic report for information).³ Minor editorial changes, as can be seen in Annex 1, were made to the Executive Director Summary of Voting Process, mainly to reflect the update in the name of the Legal and Governance Department and the terminology used in relation to the voting groups of the Global Fund Board.
6. The voting procedure incorporates the "straw poll" technique and weighted voting cycles. The underlying objective is to identify the "most preferred" candidate through a series of rounds of voting before holding the final affirmative vote consistent with the standard voting thresholds envisaged in the Bylaws for Board decisions.

¹ [GF/B53/EDP08](#)

² [GF/B53/EDP19](#)

³ The voting procedure approved in 2016 included very minor changes to the procedure first endorsed by the Board in November 2012. The procedure was subsequently discussed during a Board consultation held in 2016 and the input received at the time noted that the process had worked very well in the previous ED recruitment process and should thus be maintained.

- a. **Straw Poll.** According to the voting procedure, before the start of formal voting, the presence of consensus will be tested through an informal process referred to as a 'straw poll'. This straw poll will occur through weighted voting where Board members will be asked to allocate points to candidates by order of preference. Unless a very clear consensus exists following the straw poll, voting will proceed through rounds of weighted voting.
 - b. **Weighed voting.** During the weighted voting rounds, Board members rank candidates by points in the same manner as the straw poll. With each cycle, the candidate with the least number of points will be removed from consideration. Ultimately, the weighted voting cycles will result in a single "most-preferred" candidate.
 - c. **Final affirmative vote.** Following identification of the most-preferred candidate, the Board will formally vote (i.e. yes/no) on that candidate. In order for the vote to pass, pursuant to the Bylaws, there must be an affirmative two-thirds majority vote of each of the donor and implementer groups.
7. The voting procedure worked well in the 2017 ED selection process leading to the appointment of the current ED.
 8. As the voting procedure continues to be in force, it will be used for the purposes of the current ED recruitment process.

What are the contingency voting procedures?

9. While affirmative voting reduces the possibility of ties or deadlock throughout the voting process, this remains a risk. For example, two candidates could be tied for the lowest number of votes during a round of weighted voting. Additionally, it is possible that the Board could fail to reach an affirmative two-thirds majority vote from each of the donor and implementer groups with respect to the vote on the most-preferred candidate.
10. In order to further mitigate the risk of ties or deadlock, the voting procedures indicated that contingency procedures, which would be used in the event of ties/deadlock, would be approved by the Board.
11. Accordingly, in October 2017, the Board approved the following contingency voting procedures:
 - a. In the event of a tie during the weighted voting cycles:
 - i. the more-preferred candidate will be allowed to proceed (i.e., the candidate with the higher number of first and second place points will move forward);

- ii. if the tie persists after applying the previous paragraph, the Board shall repeat the voting cycle; and
 - iii. except in the cycle with the final two candidates, if the tie continues to persist, both candidates will be removed from consideration.
- b. In the event of deadlock in the final affirmative vote (i.e., if the final candidate is not selected with an affirmative two-thirds majority vote of each of the donor and implementer groups), the voting thresholds for the selection of the final candidate will be gradually lowered as follows, so that the final candidate will be appointed to the position of ED with the approval of a:
- i. Qualified Two-Thirds Majority vote: Two-Thirds Majority of the full Board and Simple Majority (i.e., over one-half) in each of the donor and implementer groups;
 - ii. Simple Two-Thirds Majority vote: Two-Thirds Majority by the full Board, without regard to groups, if the final candidate is not selected through the Qualified Two-Thirds Majority vote described in (i) above; or
 - iii. Simple Majority vote: Over 50% of the vote by the full Board, without regard to groups, if the final candidate is not selected through the Simple Two-Thirds Majority vote described in (ii) above.
12. As the contingency voting procedures outlined in paragraph 11 above of this report continue to be in force, they will, if needed, be used for the purposes of the upcoming ED selection process.

Annexes

The following items can be found in Annex:

Annex 1: Executive Director Selection Summary of Voting Process

Annex 2: Relevant Past Board Decisions

Annex 3: Links to Relevant Past Documents & Reference Materials

Annex 1

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SELECTION Summary of Voting Process

1. Background

1.1 This paper summarizes the Board-endorsed voting process for selection of the next Executive Director (ED). It largely reproduces the Summary of Voting Procedure endorsed by the Board at its ~~thirty-sixth~~~~twenty-eight~~ meeting on ~~14-15~~~~16-17~~ November 201~~7~~~~2~~ in Board decision GF/B~~2836~~/DP0713.

2. The Voting Procedure

Generally

2.1 Throughout the process, all votes will be done anonymously. All ballots will be collected and counted by the Global Fund's Legal and ~~Compliance~~~~Governance~~ Department, and subsequently held under confidential file. Consequently, each Board member may be assured that his/her vote will not be revealed to anyone. All Board members will be required to sign a confidentiality undertaking ~~on the first day of~~~~before~~ the Board Meeting, which will govern all executive sessions. In order to further safeguard confidentiality, use of any communications technology (e.g., mobile phones, computers, iPads) will not be allowed during executive session.

2.2 Unless a very clear consensus exists following an initial 'straw poll' described below, voting will proceed through three rounds of weighted voting, ultimately producing the most preferred candidate. The Board will then formally vote on that candidate.

Straw Poll

2.3 Before the start of the formal voting process, the presence of consensus will be 'tested' through an informal process referred to as a 'straw poll'. The results of the straw poll will be purely for information and non-binding. The straw poll will occur by weighted voting, which asks Board members to allocate points to candidates by order of preference, as follows:

- First preference: 5 points
- Second preference: 3 points
- Third preference: 1 point
- Fourth preference: 0 points

2.4 Board members are encouraged to rank all candidates by order of preference. However, Board members are not required to allocate points to all candidates,

and can instead provide points to a subset. For example, a Board member could rank only one candidate in the straw poll, instead of all four. In this example, the Board member's ballot would provide five points to the selected candidate, and the remaining points (3 and 1) would be unused.

- 2.5 The points given to each candidate will be added together, and the final tally will be announced by the Board Leadership. The voting ballot for the straw poll will follow the same form as the one enclosed below.

Weighted Voting Cycles

- 2.6 Unless a very clear consensus for a single candidate exists after the straw poll, the 'most preferred' candidate will be identified through multiple weighted voting cycles.
- 2.7 Board members will be asked to rank candidates by points in the same manner as the straw poll as described above (using substantially the same voting ballot).
- 2.8 With each cycle, the candidate with the least number of total votes will be removed from consideration. Ultimately, the weighted voting cycles will result in a single 'most-preferred' candidate.

Final Affirmative Vote

- 2.0 Following identification of the most-preferred candidate, he/she receives an up-or-down vote by the Board (i.e., Yes/No). Consistent with the Bylaws, in order for the vote to pass, there must be an affirmative two-thirds majority vote of each of the donor and implementer [groups](#).¹ With such affirmative vote, the candidate will be selected as the next Executive Director of the Global Fund.

3. Contingency Procedures in the Event of Ties/Deadlock

- 3.0 While the affirmative voting process reduces the possibility of ties between Board votes or deadlock, the risk nevertheless exists. Two candidates could be tied for the lowest number of votes. In addition, during the final vote, the Board could fail to reach a two-thirds affirmative vote from both [voting groups](#). In order to steer the Board through such situations, the Board Leadership will be regularly advised by the Legal and [Compliance Governance](#) Department of general voting patterns and trends. Such patterns and trends will not be constituency or [voting group](#) specific as all votes remain anonymous.

¹ As described in the Operating Procedures of the Board and Committees of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria ("BCOP"), the donor [group](#) (or Donor Voting Group) refers to the group encompassing the eight donor country representatives, one private sector representative and one private foundation representative; the implementing [group](#) (or Implementer Voting Group) refers to the group encompassing the seven developing country representatives, the two nongovernmental organization representatives, and the representative of a nongovernmental organization who is a person living with HIV/AIDS or from a community living with tuberculosis or malaria.

3.1 Contingency procedures will be approved by the Board in advance of any voting. Advance approval ensures the procedures are reviewed and approved on their merits alone. This is by contrast to an approach that addresses ties/deadlocks as they arise, which has the potential of allowing purely procedural decisions to be influenced by the substance of the Board's deliberations. Set out below are the two contingency procedures proposed for Board approval by the Board Leadership.

3.2 Contingency Procedure #1. In the event of a tie during the weighted voting cycles, the tie will be resolved through the following process: (i) allowing the more-preferred candidate to proceed (i.e. pass forward the candidate with the higher number of 1st and 2nd -place points); (ii) if the tie persists, repeating the voting cycle; and (iii) if the tie continues to persist, removing both candidates from consideration.

3.3 Contingency Procedure #2. In view of the risk of deadlock in the final affirmative vote, the Board will be asked to approve the gradual lowering of the voting threshold until the final candidate is approved, as follows:

- Qualified Two-Thirds Majority vote: Two-Thirds Majority by the full Board and Simple Majority in each of the donor and implementer [blesgroups](#).
- Simple Two-Thirds Majority vote: Two-Thirds Majority by the full Board, without regard to [blesvoting groups](#).
- Simple Majority vote: Over 50% of the vote by the full Board, without regard to [voting groupsbles](#).

Indicative Voting Ballot

VOTING BALLOT

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SELECTION PROCESS

Points	Candidate Name
5	
3	
1	
0	

Annex 2 – Relevant Past Board Decisions

Relevant past Decision Point	Summary and Impact
GF/B37/EDP04: Selection of the Global Fund Executive Director: Contingency Voting Procedures (October 2017) ¹	The Board approved the contingency procedures in the event of ties/deadlock during the ED selection process voting process.
GF/B36/DP07: Executive Director Selection Process (November 2016) ²	The Board approved the voting procedure for the selection of the Executive Director, as presented in Annex 2 to GF/B36/07.

Annex 3 – Relevant Past Documents & Reference Materials

[Board Direct Report Selection Process](#)

[Selection of the Global Fund Executive Director: Contingency Voting Procedures](#)

[Board Leadership and Executive Director Selection Processes \(2025-2026\)](#)

¹ [GF/B37/EDP04](#)

² [GF/B36/DP07](#)