THE CASE AGAINST
IMF SURCHARGES

What are Surcharges?

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) is an international financial institution that makes loans to countries experiencing economic difficulties, among other roles. First introduced in 1997, IMF surcharges are additional payments, on top of regular interest payments and other fees, that countries are required to pay to the Fund if they have high levels of IMF debt (exceeding 187.5 percent of their quota share at the IMF), or if they have three or more years of outstanding debt to the IMF. What does this mean in practice? Surcharges significantly increase countries' borrowing costs to the IMF, and are generally paid by countries facing balance of payments difficulties and often other financial problems.

Surcharges can add an additional 2 to 3 percentage points to the standard interest rate of a loan. For surcharge-paying countries, these fees constitute 28 percent of all non-principal payments.

Top 5 Countries Impacted by Surcharges Pay:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>$1.9 Billion</td>
<td>In 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINE</td>
<td>$8.5 Billion</td>
<td>From 2024 to 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINE</td>
<td>$2.9 Billion</td>
<td>Alone will pay $2.9 billion from 2024 to 2033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surcharges Cause Further Harm to Countries in Crisis

Surcharges extract significant amounts of hard currency from countries already in crisis, further jeopardizing their economic recovery.

The five largest current borrowers from the IMF — Argentina, Ecuador, Egypt, Pakistan, and Ukraine — are all experiencing serious economic and non-economic challenges. Collectively, they will pay an estimated $8.5 billion.

Surcharge payments are forcing these countries to use large quantities of already scarce liquid resources for additional IMF payments rather than for critical domestic expenditures.

Ukraine — which is in the midst of a war — will pay the IMF $2.9 billion in surcharges from 2024 to 2033. In the same period, Pakistan — a third of which was recently underwater as a result of climate change-driven flooding — will pay $445 million, and Egypt — one of the countries hardest hit by soaring food prices — will pay $699 million. From 2020 to 2022, Argentina spent $2.6 billion on surcharges, enough to buy a full course of COVID-19 vaccines for its entire population nearly seven times over.

Surcharges Conceal High Interest Rates on IMF Loans

The IMF publishes interest rates charged for country loans, but surcharge fees — which are not made fully public — significantly raise the actual rate that countries pay. For example, while today's published lending rate is about 5 percent, some countries face an effective lending rate exceeding 8 percent as a result of surcharges and other fees.
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The increased cost of borrowing for the top 5 surcharge-paying countries.
The IMF claims surcharges reduce credit risk, incentivize countries to pay back loans early, and limit the need for IMF assistance. In fact, surcharges significantly increase countries' debt burdens and, as the Fund’s own debt sustainability analyses show, the probability of timely repayment and sustainable financing tend to decrease as debt burdens rise. Furthermore, it's highly improbable that any government would choose to extend the repayment of an IMF loan any longer than necessary, given that IMF programs come with intrusive conditions that greatly limit sovereign economic policymaking. For this reason, and because of the reputational risks associated with borrowing money from the IMF, countries generally only turn to the Fund when they are unable to obtain the funding they need from other international lenders. Lastly, surcharges are particularly harmful in an environment of profound exogenous shocks that impact all countries: from Covid-19 to the war in Ukraine to the climate crisis.

The IMF does not need the income from surcharges in order to build its precautionary balances.

The IMF has claimed that it requires income from surcharges in order to maintain its precautionary balances, or liquid reserves kept to protect against potential financial losses. However, the Fund’s precautionary balances target has been met, and will continue to grow above target levels even without surcharges. More importantly, it is unfair and absurd to rely on countries facing extreme financial distress to maintain and replenish these reserves. It is also counterproductive as these surcharges adversely impact debt sustainability, thereby necessitating larger precautionary balances! The IMF should find other, more fair and rational methods for funding for its precautionary balances — for example, by seeking relatively small contributions from high-income countries.

Surcharges violate Article 1(v) of the IMF Articles of Agreement.

Surcharges unnecessarily funnel scarce resources away from countries in crisis and thus violate Article 1 of the IMF Articles of Agreement which requires the Fund to make temporary funding available to member countries “without resorting to measures destructive of national or international prosperity.”
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