

How the IMF can battle gradual irrelevance

These days, the International Monetary Fund's policy recommendations – especially as they pertain to the advanced economies – have little impact. Although this is partly a consequence of more inward-looking national politics in richer countries, the Fund itself is not blameless, **writes Mohamed A. El-Erian**



Source: Wikipedia Commons

Stark contrast to the past

This year, I didn't attend the October annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Washington, DC. Instead, I paid close attention to reports of the gathering and talked to people who were there whom I respect. What emerged is depressing for the wellbeing of the global economy. In particular, the prospect of continued weakness and fragmentation pressures will compound the challenges to the credibility and effectiveness of multilateral institutions.

The convening power of the IMF and the World Bank is unquestionably strong, if not unique. Every year, their annual meetings attract top economic and financial officials from more than 180 countries, as well as a far larger number of private-sector representatives. It's an exceptional global

gathering, not only for officials to exchange views but also for corporate networking.

I couldn't find a single person who had paid much attention to a key policy output of the meetings

Over the last few years, the official meetings have increasingly been overshadowed by the ever-growing number of parallel events, notably diminishing the gathering's contribution to better policymaking. In fact, this year, I couldn't find a single person who had paid much attention to a key policy output of the meetings – the communiqués issued by the two institutions' top policymaking committees.

This is in stark contrast to the past. I vividly remember the days, not so long ago, when officials prepared diligently for these policy discussions. Private-sector participants would eagerly await their outcome in the hope of gaining a better understanding of the global economic outlook and the prospects for key national and international policy initiatives. Markets were known to move on particular remarks, which is why officials would spend hours refining the communiqués, lest they be misinterpreted.

Insights fall on deaf ears

The charitable reading of this change is that the substance has shifted to the parallel events. Consider the IMF. The communiqué of the International Monetary and Financial Committee (IMFC), the Fund's top member-country policymaking panel, is preceded by the release of two flagship IMF publications on economic and financial trends (respectively, the World Economic Outlook and the Global Financial Stability Report). These are supplemented by press conferences and speeches involving many Fund officials. The themes are then picked up in a host of seminars, as well as in presentations by national officials. As a result, many policy implications are covered well before the IMFC meets.

Many policy implications are covered well before the IMFC meets

Yet, as much as I respect and admire the multilaterals, and I have done so for decades, I fear that this explanation is too partial. Yes, the IMF maintains an impressive analytical edge, owing to its talented and dedicated staff as well as its unique links to countries. Yes, it has made important strides in improving its understanding of the relationship between financial markets and the real economy. And, yes, it has bravely taken the lead in shining more light on the economic impact of gender inequality and climate change. But its forward-looking analyses have too often proved to be backward-looking, and its quantitative projections have consistently been subject to considerable revisions.

Even more worryingly, the Fund's policy recommendations – especially those pertaining to the advanced economies – have little impact (to put it politely). One need only look at the widening gulf between what IMF officials have said and the bland, repetitive language of the IMFC communiqués. The policy insights fall on more deaf ears when finance ministers and central

bankers are back in their national capitals, underscoring the current ineffectiveness of what once was a key opportunity for improving win-win policies.

IMF are not blameless

Many of the key reasons for this diminished influence have little to do with the multilateral institutions themselves. Politics in many advanced economies has turned increasingly inward, amplifying disdain for policies advocated by the Fund. Years of low and insufficiently inclusive growth have narrowed the scope for international policy cooperation, instead fueling disrespect for global norms and the international rule of law. And even the inclination to use the Fund in pursuit of national interests has waned: the US has simply opted to weaponize its own economic tools directly.

They have been too slow to implement internal reforms

But the IMF and the World Bank are not blameless. For starters, they have been too slow to implement internal reforms. Both institutions also could be quicker to own their recent mistakes, such as those concerning Argentina's latest financial debacle, the excessive growth of debt among the least developed economies, and the failure to foresee the aftermath of the 2007-08 financial crisis.

In addition, the cherished principle of uniformity of treatment of member countries has been visibly stretched, often in a way that has further dented the standing and credibility of institutions whose governance is still informed by the past. In particular, Europe has long been overrepresented relative to emerging economies, and Europe and the US retain a monopoly over the leadership of the IMF and World Bank, respectively.

New window for beneficial change

These shortcomings raise broader concerns. They increase the tendency toward beggar-thy-neighbor policies at the national level and intensify pressures for fragmentation and disorderly deglobalization. They also expose the global economy to the risk of financial disruptions that would further undermine already fragile and insufficiently inclusive growth dynamics.

Multilateral organizations often complain that major governments' weak appetite for institutional reform limits the scope for improvement. After all, these countries are not only the largest shareholders but also have sometimes blocked initiatives supported by the vast majority of other member states.

Let's hope that last month's disappointing annual meetings can serve as a wake-up call

Admittedly, the IMF and World Bank are constrained by the world in which they operate. But their managements also have tended to shy away from embracing reform initiatives and making them

their own. Rather than acting as a catalyst by underwriting the considerable reputational risk involved with approaches that inevitably face resistance, they often have been pushed to the sideline.

With both institutions now under new management, there is a new window for launching a process of beneficial change for the global economy. Let's hope that last month's disappointing annual meetings can serve as a wake-up call. There is no worse fate for these organizations than gradual irrelevance.

[This article first appeared in Project Syndicate on 19 November, 2019](#)

Author

Alissa Lefebvre

Economist

alissa.lefebvre@ing.com

Deepali Bhargava

Regional Head of Research, Asia-Pacific

Deepali.Bhargava@ing.com

Ruben Dewitte

Economist

+32495364780

ruben.dewitte@ing.com

Kinga Havasi

Economic research trainee

kinga.havasi@ing.com

Marten van Garderen

Consumer Economist, Netherlands

marten.van.garderen@ing.com

David Havrlant

Chief Economist, Czech Republic

420 770 321 486

david.havrlant@ing.com

Sander Burgers

Senior Economist, Dutch Housing

sander.burgers@ing.com

Lynn Song

Chief Economist, Greater China

lynn.song@asia.ing.com

Michiel Tukker

Senior European Rates Strategist

michiel.tukker@ing.com

Michal Rubaszek

Senior Economist, Poland

michal.rubaszek@ing.pl

This is a test author

Stefan Posea

Economist, Romania

tiberiu-stefan.posea@ing.com

Marine Leleux

Sector Strategist, Financials

marine.leleux2@ing.com

Jesse Norcross

Senior Sector Strategist, Real Estate

jesse.norcross@ing.com

Teise Stellema

Research Assistant, Energy Transition

teise.stellema@ing.com

Diederik Stadig

Sector Economist, TMT & Healthcare

diederik.stadig@ing.com

Diogo Gouveia

Sector Economist

diogo.duarte.vieira.de.gouveia@ing.com

Marine Leleux

Sector Strategist, Financials

marine.leleux2@ing.com

Ewa Manthey

Commodities Strategist

ewa.manthey@ing.com

ING Analysts

James Wilson

EM Sovereign Strategist

James.wilson@ing.com

Sophie Smith

Digital Editor

sophie.smith@ing.com

Frantisek Taborsky

EMEA FX & FI Strategist

frantisek.taborsky@ing.com

Adam Antoniak

Senior Economist, Poland

adam.antoniak@ing.pl

Min Joo Kang

Senior Economist, South Korea and Japan

min.joo.kang@asia.ing.com

Coco Zhang

ESG Research

coco.zhang@ing.com

Jan Frederik Slijkerman

Senior Sector Strategist, TMT

jan.frederik.slijkerman@ing.com

Katinka Jongkind

Senior Economist, Services and Leisure

Katinka.Jongkind@ing.com

Marina Le Blanc

Sector Strategist, Financials

Marina.Le.Blanc@ing.com

Samuel Abettan

Junior Economist

samuel.abettan@ing.com

Franziska Biehl

Senior Economist, Germany

Franziska.Marie.Biehl@ing.de

Rebecca Byrne

Senior Editor and Supervisory Analyst

rebecca.byrne@ing.com

Mirjam Bani

Sector Economist, Commercial Real Estate & Public Sector (Netherlands)

mirjam.bani@ing.com

Timothy Rahill

Credit Strategist

timothy.rahill@ing.com

Leszek Kasek

Senior Economist, Poland

leszek.kasek@ing.pl

Oleksiy Soroka, CFA

Senior High Yield Credit Strategist

oleksiy.soroka@ing.com

Antoine Bouvet

Head of European Rates Strategy

antoine.bouvet@ing.com

Jeroen van den Broek

Global Head of Sector Research

jeroen.van.den.broek@ing.com

Edse Dantuma

Senior Sector Economist, Industry and Healthcare

edse.dantuma@ing.com

Francesco Pesole

FX Strategist

francesco.pesole@ing.com

Rico Luman

Senior Sector Economist, Transport and Logistics

Rico.Luman@ing.com

Jurjen Witteveen

Sector Economist

jurjen.witteveen@ing.com

Dmitry Dolgin

Chief Economist, CIS

dmitry.dolgin@ing.de

Nicholas Mapa

Senior Economist, Philippines

nicholas.antonio.mapa@asia.ing.com

Egor Fedorov

Senior Credit Analyst
egor.fedorov@ing.com

Sebastian Franke

Consumer Economist
sebastian.franke@ing.de

Gerben Hieminga

Senior Sector Economist, Energy
gerben.hieminga@ing.com

Nadège Tillier

Head of Corporates Sector Strategy
nadege.tillier@ing.com

Charlotte de Montpellier

Senior Economist, France and Switzerland
charlotte.de.montpellier@ing.com

Laura Straeter

Behavioural Scientist
+31(0)611172684
laura.Straeter@ing.com

Valentin Tataru

Chief Economist, Romania
valentin.tataru@ing.com

James Smith

Developed Markets Economist, UK
james.smith@ing.com

Suvi Platerink Kosonen

Senior Sector Strategist, Financials
suvi.platerink-kosonen@ing.com

Thijs Geijer

Senior Sector Economist, Food & Agri
thijs.geijer@ing.com

Maurice van Sante

Senior Economist Construction & Team Lead Sectors
maurice.van.sante@ing.com

Marcel Klokk

Senior Economist, Netherlands
marcel.klokk@ing.com

Piotr Poplawski

Senior Economist, Poland

piotr.poplawski@ing.pl

Paolo Pizzoli

Senior Economist, Italy, Greece

paolo.pizzoli@ing.com

Marieke Blom

Chief Economist and Global Head of Research

marieke.blom@ing.com

Raoul Leering

Senior Macro Economist

raoul.leering@ing.com

Maarten Leen

Head of Global IFRS9 ME Scenarios

maarten.leen@ing.com

Maureen Schuller

Head of Financials Sector Strategy

Maureen.Schuller@ing.com

Warren Patterson

Head of Commodities Strategy

Warren.Patterson@asia.ing.com

Rafal Benecki

Chief Economist, Poland

rafal.benecki@ing.pl

Philippe Ledent

Senior Economist, Belgium, Luxembourg

philippe.ledent@ing.com

Peter Virovacz

Senior Economist, Hungary

peter.virovacz@ing.com

Inga Fechner

Senior Economist, Germany, Global Trade

inga.fechner@ing.de

Dimitry Fleming

Senior Data Analyst, Netherlands

Dimitry.Fleming@ing.com

Ciprian Dascalu

Chief Economist, Romania

+40 31 406 8990

ciprian.dascalu@ing.com

Muhammet Mercan

Chief Economist, Turkey

muhammet.mercan@ingbank.com.tr

Iris Pang

Chief Economist, Greater China

iris.pang@asia.ing.com

Sophie Freeman

Writer, Group Research

+44 20 7767 6209

Sophie.Freeman@uk.ing.com

Padhraic Garvey, CFA

Regional Head of Research, Americas

padhraic.garvey@ing.com

James Knightley

Chief International Economist, US

james.knightley@ing.com

Tim Condon

Asia Chief Economist

+65 6232-6020

Martin van Vliet

Senior Interest Rate Strategist

+31 20 563 8801

martin.van.vliet@ing.com

Karol Pogorzelski

Senior Economist, Poland

Karol.Pogorzelski@ing.pl

Carsten Brzeski

Global Head of Macro

carsten.brzeski@ing.de

Viraj Patel

Foreign Exchange Strategist

+44 20 7767 6405

viraj.patel@ing.com

Owen Thomas

Global Head of Editorial Content

+44 (0) 207 767 5331

owen.thomas@ing.com

Bert Colijn

Chief Economist, Netherlands

bert.colijn@ing.com

Peter Vanden Houte

Chief Economist, Belgium, Luxembourg, Eurozone

peter.vandenhoute@ing.com

Benjamin Schroeder

Senior Rates Strategist

benjamin.schroeder@ing.com

Chris Turner

Global Head of Markets and Regional Head of Research for UK & CEE

chris.turner@ing.com

Gustavo Rangel

Chief Economist, LATAM

+1 646 424 6464

gustavo.rangel@ing.com

Carlo Cocuzzo

Economist, Digital Finance

+44 20 7767 5306

carlo.cocuzzo@ing.com