



UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

**CEB**

**Chief Executives Board  
for Coordination**

CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/35  
27 September 2010

# **CONCLUSIONS OF THE MEETING OF THE HUMAN RESOURCES NETWORK**

20th Session

**(PAHO, Washington, D.C. 20-22 July 2010)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraph/s</u>
<b>PART I – OPENING SESSION AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA .....</b>	1 – 4
<b>PART II – CLOSED MEETING FOR HR NETWORK MEMBERS</b>	
A.    AIIC Negotiations in 2011 .....	5 – 7
B.    Election of Spokespersons .....	8 – 9
C.    Other Business .....	10 – 11
<b>PART III – ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION BY ICSC</b>	
A. <b>Conditions of service applicable to both categories of staff:</b>	
(a)    Inter-Agency Mobility: a comprehensive assessment of issues and practices .....	12 – 14
(b)    Performance management framework.....	15 – 16
(c)    Education grant: review of the level.....	17 – 26
(d)    Review of pensionable remuneration: road-map and issues to be considered .....	27 – 30
(e)    Separation payments: termination indemnity .....	31 – 32
B. <b>Conditions of service of the Professional and higher categories:</b>	
(a)    Base/floor salary scale .....	33 – 34
(b)    Evolution of the United Nations/United States net remuneration margin .....	35 – 36
(c)    Report of the WG on mobility/hardship scheme .....	37 – 40
(d)    Establishment of grade equivalencies between US federal civil service and the UN system.....	41 – 42
(e)    Total compensation comparison methodology.....	43 – 44
(f)    Survey and reports on gender balance in the UN common system .....	45 – 46
(g)    Children's and secondary dependant's allowances: review of the level .....	47 – 48
(h)    Assessing the implementation of the revised job evaluation standard for the Professional and higher categories .....	49 – 50
C. <b>Conditions of service of the General Service and other locally recruited staff:                 review of the General Service headquarters and non-headquarters                 salary survey methodologies.....</b>	51 – 52
D. <b>Conditions of service in the field: harmonization of conditions of service for                 staff serving in non-family duty stations .....</b>	53 – 54
E. <b>Other business: proposed agenda for the 33<sup>rd</sup> session of ACPAQ .....</b>	55 – 56

**PART IV – ISSUES FOR THE HR NETWORK:**

A.	Update on HR-related projects included in the HLCM Plan of Action for Harmonization of Business Practices .....	57 – 70
B.	Safety and Security of Staff, discussion on the consolidated proposals for HLCM:	
(a)	Update on the work undertaken by the leading Agencies and the CEB Secretariat .....	71 – 80
(b)	New Security Level .....	81 – 83
(c)	Rapid Response Team .....	84 – 85
C.	Personal Status/Domestic Partners.....	86 – 89
D.	Briefing by the Finance and Budget Network.....	90 – 94
E.	Dual Career and Staff Mobility.....	95 – 98
F.	Inter-Agency Mobility Accord.....	99 – 102
G.	Guidance note on Knowledge Management .....	103
H.	Update on UN Cares Programme.....	104 – 106
I.	Disability Policy.....	107 – 109
J.	Staff Stress Counsellors .....	110 – 111
K.	Staff Management Relations .....	112 – 118
L.	AOB .....	119

**ANNEXES**

- Annex I – List of Participants  
Annex II – Proposed list of representative schools for all country/currency zones  
Annex III – Proposed revisions of education and boarding cost levels  
Annex IV – Salary scale for the Professional and higher categories showing annual gross salaries  
Annex V – Comparison of average net remuneration of UN officials in the Professional and higher categories in New York and US officials in Washington, D.C., equivalent grades  
Annex VI – Hardship Allowances  
Annex VII – SOA/EMSEA Implementation Plan  
Annex VIII – Rest and recuperation framework

## **PART I – OPENING SESSION AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**(CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/20/Rev.1)**

1. The Human Resources Network held its 20<sup>th</sup> session from 20-22 July 2010 at the Pan-American Health Organizations (PAHO) Headquarters in Washington, D.C. The meeting was co-chaired by the Network's Spokespersons Mr. Sean Hand, Director of Human Resources, UNFPA and Ms. Ruth de Miranda, Chief, Human Resources Policy Service, United Nations.
2. All session documents are available on the HR Network website at:  
<http://www.unsceb.org/ceb/mtg/hr/july-2010/>
3. Marta Leichner-Boyce, Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) Secretariat welcomed the HR Network members and new participants. The Agenda was adopted as reflected in the table of contents.
4. The list of participating organizations and their representatives at the meeting are provided in Annex I.

## **PART II – CLOSED MEETING FOR HR NETWORK MEMBERS**

### **A. International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) Negotiations in 2011**

**(CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/25)**

5. The CEB secretariat briefed the Network on the upcoming negotiations of the AIIC Agreement. The Agreement covers the contractual relationship between UN organizations of the CEB and short-term interpreters. Short-term interpreters are short-term officials when under contract with the UN system. Only the UN Secretariat has a significant number of permanent interpreters, most organizations use only freelancers.
  - The Agreement is negotiated for five years, the last negotiations were concluded in April 2006 and the agreement entered into force on 1 January 2007.
  - At the core of the 2006 negotiations was the determination of a daily rate for the headquarters locations and of a world rate.
  - A mid-term review took place in April 2009.
  - Full negotiations are to take place in April 2011.
  - Organizations should meet in the Fall of 2010 to finalize the issues for discussion, arrive at a common agreement and nominate one additional (deputy) co-chair.
  - The UN Secretariat Division of Conference Services has nominated the co-chair for the organizations; a second (deputy) co-chair from HR Network should be nominated.

6. The CEB secretariat proposes to hold a preparatory meeting with all organizations in late October or early November 2010 in Geneva to prepare and agree on issues and on a common position. A co-chair from the HR side should be nominated by the organizations.

7. The Network:
  - Thanked the CEB secretariat for the update and proposed some issues to be included in the negotiations, such as how to deal with contracts of interpreters in situations of natural disasters or pandemics (IMO); revisit agreement on medical assessments (ICAO);
  - Agreed to hold the preparatory meeting in the fall and requested the CEB secretariat to propose and circulate dates;
  - Agreed that organizations would revert with names for a co-chair by September 2010.

## B. Election of Spokesperson

8. The current HR Network Spokespersons are from the UN Secretariat and the UN Funds and Programmes. Sean Hand's two year term ends in July 2010, however he has indicated his willingness to remain until the end of 2010. The specialized agencies were invited to nominate a Spokesperson.

9. The Network:

- Expressed their appreciation and welcomed Sean Hand remaining until the end of 2010;
- Accepted the nomination from the specialized agencies of Ana Luiza Thompson-Flores (UNESCO) as a Spokesperson for a period of one year.

## C. Any other issues

10. IMO requested to discuss the cost-sharing of the FICSA General Secretary, given that the matter had still not been resolved. Network members sympathized with the problem, but were reluctant to raise it again at HLCM given its strongly negative response at the Spring session.

11. The Network:

- Agreed to await the JIU report on staff management relations and use that opportunity to address the topic again.

# PART III – ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION BY ICSC

## A. Conditions of service applicable to both categories of staff:

### (a) *Inter-agency mobility: a comprehensive assessment of issues and practices* (ICSC/71/R.2)

12. In 2001, the General Assembly requested that the ICSC conduct a comprehensive review of mobility in the United Nations common system, including its implications on the career development of staff and make recommendations. Consequently, the secretariat reported on the matter in 2002 and 2003. Document ICSC/70/CRP.5 updates the 2002/2003 studies to determine what progress has been made by organizations. This update also focuses on current opportunities and constraints for inter-agency mobility based on a new survey of the mobility policies and practices of the organizations of the common system. In addition, the document provides details on mobility developments in comparable institutions.

13. The document provides 3 options: i) work to make the One UN concept a reality by allowing system-wide workforce planning to manage talent across the organizations and to identify gaps in talent; 2) continue with the current approach of stressing inter-agency mobility, but recognizing the current extent of organizational autonomy with respect to human resources management; and 3) work towards greater harmonization of human resources management policies in order to remove as many barriers as possible to inter-agency mobility.

14. The Network:

- Thanked the ICSC secretariat and took note of the update;
- Continues to stress that inter-agency mobility is a valuable opportunity for staff development;
- Recognizes that there are some impediments to inter-agency mobility and further studies are needed, the document is a good start, however deeper causes are not addressed;
- Does not support in their entirety any one of the options as presented in the document. Elements of all three merit further consideration.

**ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided to:

- (a) Review its Human Resources Management Framework (2000) with respect to *inter alia* inter-agency mobility, recruitment systems and other human resources elements under its purview;
- (b) Urge organizations to:
  - (i) Remove existing administrative barriers to inter-agency mobility;
  - (ii) Develop strategies to change organizational culture with regard to mobility;
  - (iii) Integrate inter-agency mobility into their human resource management policies;
  - (iv) Implement a more structured approach to inter agency mobility with an emphasis on the staff development aspect;
  - (v) Promote consistency in application of secondments; and
  - (vi) Develop appropriate solutions for spouse employment such as negotiating agreements with host countries through the Resident Coordinators and removing restrictions on spouses being employed in the same organization as long as there is no reporting relationship between the spouses.
- (c) Request organizations to adhere to the criteria stipulated in the ICSC Framework for Contractual Arrangements in the United Nations common system (A/60/30, Annex IV) in granting continuing contracts; and
- (d) Request its secretariat to conduct a barrier-analysis by compiling all barriers to harmonization of human resources management policies in the common system and also identify areas where actions had been taken and/or action would be necessary, and report on its finding at seventy-third session.

**(b) Performance management framework (ICSC/71/R.3)**

15. The document introduces a framework on Performance Management which focuses on transforming behavior, rather than on changing existing processes. The main features of the framework are: a) to define performance management as an ongoing process starting on the first day of employment of a staff member and ending when s/he separates from the organization; b) it is grounded on the ICSC Framework for Human Resources; c) setting out the organizational requirements that must be in place – such as performance management culture, good governance, useful and reliable data, effective processes, a capable workforce, the roles of management and staff.

16. The Network:

- Thanked the ICSC secretariat for the document and supports the updated framework;
- Is of the view that some issues could be addressed in more detail such as how to deal with underperformance, with linkages to the new system of administration of justice.

**ICSC Decision**

The Commission took note of the effort that had gone into preparing the elements of a performance management framework, which it saw as a work in progress at this stage. The Commission decided to request its secretariat to fine-tune the elements in the framework and present the updated framework in a format that was more accessible and user-friendly at its seventy-second session.

It further decided to request its secretariat to conduct further studies on the use of step increments in the common system for recognition and rewards and to report thereon at its seventy-second session.

*(c) Education grant: review of the level (ICSC/71/R.4)*

17. The review of the Education grant level was undertaken by the CEB secretariat on behalf of the HR Network.

18. The CEB secretariat provided Network members with a briefing on the review. This is the 10<sup>th</sup> review of the level of the education grant using the methodology approved by ICSC and endorsed by the GA in 1992. For the 2010 exercise, the CEB secretariat was able to spend more time on the data analysis and some additional refinements and data validations were identified which will be built into the CEB's claims' system for the next exercise. Nonetheless, about 3,600 claims were excluded from the final analysis; most of these were partial year claims.

19. The proposal for increasing the ceilings in the eleven currency areas which met all three criteria for a review of the level is summarized in Table 5 of the document. As in previous years, the approach to develop proposals for increasing the Maximum Allowable Expenses (MAE) ceiling is a pragmatic one, taking into account the movements in tuition fees since the previous review, the increases needed to ensure that the proportion of claims remaining above the MAE ceiling is no more than 5%; and the fact that the claims reported relate to 2008-2009 – that is 2 years before the academic year to which the new ceilings will apply.

20. The paper also makes recommendations regarding the lump sum for boarding. Table 4 of the document shows the current and proposed flat rates for boarding.

21. Other proposals for the Commissions considerations were put forth in the document as follows.

22. **Special measures:** It was proposed that the existing special measures in China, Hungary, Indonesia, Romania and the Russian Federation be retained. It was also proposed that the special measures for the 8 designated schools in France continue, but that two more schools be added, namely the International Schools in Nice and Monaco. It was further proposed that special measures be applied to Thailand, where over 35% of claims were above the standard ceiling.

23. **Capital Assessment Fees:** A separate 75% reimbursement of capital assessment fees, which would not count towards the "standard" MAE ceiling was proposed.

24. **Claims in respect of disabled children:** In order to provide additional and equitable support for parents with disabled children, the document set out four options for the Commission's consideration: 1) Waive the ceiling altogether for disabled children; 2) Establish special measures for affected schools; 3) Increase the existing special ceiling by 50% or 100%; 4) Reimburse claims above the existing special ceiling at 75%. The HR Network recommended Option 4, which would maintain the principle of staff members contributing to the cost of their children's education.

25. UNHCR informed that they had sent a separate request to ICSC to consider the establishment of a specific ceiling for Belgium or for the International School of Brussels.

26. The Network:

- Thanked the CEB secretariat for the document and all the work undertaken on behalf of the HR Network;
- Recalled that the Education Grant allowance provided to international staff members should be seen as a major benefit in attracting and retaining high quality staff, especially highly mobile staff.

### **ICSC Decision**

#### **Review of the grant methodology**

The Commission requested its secretariat to expand its upcoming review of education grant methodology issues and, in particular, include the following additional items:

- (a) The underlying philosophy of the education grant;
- (b) Review the list of country/currency zones: large countries like Canada may be managed separately and smaller countries/zones like Sweden and Ireland may be regrouped;
- (c) The list of admissible expenses should be streamlined and harmonized using work done in the working group that last reviewed the grant;
- (d) Special education grant:
  - (i) In addition to the list in (c) above, review the list of admissible expenses as it relates to disabled children also referring to the conclusions reached by the last working group on the matter;
  - (ii) Review the education grant ceilings for special education grant taking into consideration the cost involved in educating disabled children and based on the four options presented by the CEB/ Human Resources Network;
- (e) The reimbursement policy relating to one-time capital assessment fees taking into consideration the proposal made by the CEB/ Human Resources Network during the current review;
- (f) In determining the level of the grant, revise the methodology and state clearly procedures used in proposing adjustments to the level namely, triggers, the role of cost and fees, including representative schools used in determining the MAE;
- (g) Explore various methods for establishing the MAE for the United States dollar area outside the United States;
- (h) Review the list of representative schools based on the experience during this review taking into account paragraph 64 (see A/65/30);
- (i) Review the criteria for special measures taking into consideration factors such as distance of schools from the duty station and the availability of adequate schools within commuting distance of any given duty station.

To reiterate the Commission's request at the seventieth session, the secretariat will update the methodology to reflect all changes in the current education grant methodology and present it to the Commission at its seventy-fourth session.

#### **Review of the level of the grant**

The Commission decided to recommend to the General Assembly that:

- (a) For Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the United States dollar area outside the United States, the maximum admissible expenses and the maximum education grant be adjusted (see attached annex III, table 1);
- (b) For Belgium, Ireland, Japan and Sweden the maximum admissible expenses and maximum education grant remain at the current levels (see attached annex III, table 2);
- (c) For Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States and the United States dollar area outside the United States, the normal flat rates for boarding taken into account within the maximum admissible educational expenses and the additional amount for reimbursement of boarding costs over and above the maximum grant payable to staff members at designated duty stations be revised (see attached annex III, table 3);
- (d) For Ireland and Japan the normal flat rates and the additional flat rates for boarding be maintained at current levels (see attached annex III, table 4);
- (e) The special measures for China, Hungary, Indonesia, Romania, the Russian Federation as well as the eight specific schools in France be maintained;
- (f) The special measures for Bulgaria be discontinued;
- (g) All of the above measures be applicable as from the school year in progress on 1 January 2011.
- (h) As regards all other proposals, the Commission agreed to defer its decisions and requested its secretariat to take them into consideration in the context of the next methodology review.

**(d) Review of pensionable remuneration: road-map and issues to be considered (ICSC/71/R.5)**

27. The Commission, in cooperation with the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board, will undertake a comprehensive review of the methodologies for the determination of the pensionable remuneration of staff.

28. The items proposed for the review by ICSC are: 1) the common scale of staff assessment; 2) income replacement ratio; 3) actuarial comparison of the USA/UN pension schemes; 4) cost comparison of the USA/UN pension schemes.

29. The UN Pension Board proposed the following: 1) non-pensionable component; 2) double taxation; 3) impact of devaluation of local currency and/or high inflation; 4) small pensions.

30. The Network:

- Welcomed the long overdue review of pensionable remuneration;
- Supports the items proposed for review, in particular the income replacement ratio and the issue of double taxation.

**ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided that the following items be reviewed:

- (a) The common scale of staff assessment;
- (b) Income replacement ratios;
- (c) Cost comparisons of the United States/United Nations pension schemes;
- (d) Double taxation;
- (e) Non-pensionable component;
- (f) Impact of the steep devaluation of local currency and/or high inflation;
- (g) Small pensions.

In addition, the Commission decided:

- (a) To approve the work schedule as outlined in paragraph 85 of the Annual Report to the General Assembly (A/65/30):

*"The Board was in agreement with the proposed working arrangements which, inter alia proposed that documents on the review would be first discussed during the Commission's seventy-second session in spring 2011 where a representative of the Board would be present; additional work would be conducted and a final report would be discussed at the UNJSPB fifth-eighth session and later presented to the Commission at its seventy-third session in summer 2011 for final approval. This would be followed by a joint report of the Commission and the UNJSPB which would be submitted to the General Assembly."*

That the secretariats of the UNJSPF and the ICSC would meet informally and as necessary in order to complete the review in accordance with the working arrangements proposed in the document. The recommendations will be presented to the Commission at its seventy-second session, in spring 2011.

**(e) Separation payments: termination indemnity (ICSC/71/R.6)**

31. The General Assembly requested the Commission to review the application of the termination indemnity and to report back at its 65<sup>th</sup> session. The document provides statistics on staff separations from 2007 to 2009, in which termination indemnity was paid. The analysis of the available data did not demonstrate that there had been any inappropriate application of the scheme and the overall termination indemnity base-separation trends appear to be driven by the operational needs of the organizations.

32. The Network:

- Thanked the ICSC secretariat for the excellent paper and took note of the data;
- Supported the conclusions;
- Wished to signal the issue of an End of Service Grant and requested the ICSC to include it again in its report to the General Assembly.

#### **ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided to report to the General Assembly that:

- (a) It had reviewed about 1,200 cases of termination indemnity paid by common system organizations during the three-year period 2007-2009;
- (b) The termination indemnity was used on a limited basis and covered approximately 1 per cent of the total General Service and Professional staff and about 14 per cent of all separations;
- (c) While some fluctuations in termination indemnity numbers did exist among the organizations and contract types, the analysis of the available data did not demonstrate that there was inappropriate application of the scheme and the overall termination indemnity-based separation trends appeared to be driven by the operational needs of the organizations.

### **B. Conditions of service of the Professional and higher categories:**

#### **(a) Base/floor salary scale (ICSC/71/R.7)**

33. In order to maintain the base/floor scale in line with the General Schedule levels of the comparator, the document proposes that the Commission may recommend to the General Assembly an adjustment of the common system base/floor salary scale by 1.37 per cent effective 1 January 2011. The revised base/floor salary scale may be implemented by means of the standard method of consolidation of post adjustment into base/floor salary, namely, by increasing the base salary while commensurately reducing post adjustment multiplier points.

34. The Network:

- Took note of the document and supported the 1.37 percent adjustment of the base/floor salary scale effective 1 January 2011.

#### **ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the current base/floor salary scale for the Professional and higher categories be increased by 1.37 per cent through the standard consolidation procedure, i.e., by increasing base salary while commensurately reducing post adjustment levels, with effect from 1 January 2011. The proposed base/floor salary scale is shown in annex IV (see attached).

#### **(b) Evolution of the United Nations/United States net remuneration margin (ICSC/71/R.8)**

35. The document provides an estimate of the margin for 2010 which is estimated at 112.8 and the average of the margin over a five year period (2006-2010) which currently stands at 113.9.

36. The Network:

- Noted the estimated margin level for the period 1 January to 31 December 2010;
- Reiterated its concern that the average margin level for the past five years remained below the desirable level of 115.

**ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided to report to the General Assembly that the margin forecast between the net remuneration of officials in the Professional and higher categories of the United Nations in New York and officials in comparable positions in the United States federal civil service in Washington, D.C., for the year 2010 was estimated at 113.3. It also decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that the current average margin level for the past five years (2006-2010) was estimated at 114.0, which remained below the desirable midpoint of 115. Details of the margin calculation are contained in annex V (see attached).

The Commission decided that its secretariat should commence work on the review of the net remuneration margin methodology in 2011 and to report on its findings at the seventy-fifth session of ICSC.

**(c) Report of the Working Group on the mobility/hardship scheme (including additional board for education grant) (ICSC/71/R.9)**

37. The Commission established a working group comprising members of the Commission, its secretariat, the CEB secretariat, organizations and staff to provide the Commission with an overall assessment of the scheme as it functions today, as well as some options for dealing with the specific changes which the Commission has already identified.

38. The WG held two meetings in 2010 and made four main recommendations: 1) on the review of the relationship between hazard pay and the security factor under the hardship classification; 2) determination of relative levels of hardship for the classification of duty stations; 3) fourth assignment requirement for Mobility at "H" duty stations; 4) additional boarding costs at designated duty stations.

39. The ICSC secretariat highlighted the low level of responses from duty stations in completing the questionnaires on conditions of life and informed that there are other means to classify a duty station if staff do not participate.

40. The Network:

- Noted the report of the Working Group and supported this work in progress;
- Further supports the recommendations and the proposed timeline for completing the review.

**(d) Establishment of grade equivalencies between the United States federal civil service and the United Nations system (ICSC/71/R.10)**

41. The document provides the results of the grade equivalency study between the US federal civil service and the UN common system. A consulting firm was engaged to conduct the 2009/2010 study. The consultants encountered significant difficulties in obtaining the required information. Samples were collected from less than half the number of designated agencies, however they maintained that the analysis of data suggests that the results do not vary significantly among US agencies. The consultants made a number of recommendations such as for data collection to be spread over a number of years focusing on different occupational groups each year and assessment is made at the end of a 5- or 10 year period.

42. The Network:

- Thanked the ICSC secretariat for the report and was pleased that this review has taken place after a ten year gap.
- Expressed its concerns about the difficulties encountered in undertaking this study and strongly recommended that the underlying principles be revisited, as the situation has changed significantly since the establishment of the methodology.

**ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided:

- (a) To approve and accept the results of the new grade equivalency study;
- (b) To request ACPAQ to review statistical methods recommended in the current report to determine their appropriateness for establishing equivalencies and calculating the net remuneration margin, and report to the Commission at its seventy-second session;
- (c) To request its secretariat to review the methodology for determining the grade equivalencies with the comparator with a view to simplifying it.
- (d) To report to the General Assembly that it had conducted a new grade equivalency study as part of its regular review.

**(e) *Total compensation comparison methodology (ICSC/71/R.11)***

43. The document provides an overview of the methodology to compare total compensation packages. With a view to complete the review of the application of Noblemaire principle in 2012, the Commission may a) reassess the usefulness of conducting reference checks with other international organizations (WB, OECD); b) proceed with Phase I of the Noblemaire study and present potential comparators for Phase II; c) commission an external consultant to conduct a study of the US Pension scheme; d) commission an external consultant to conduct a comparative study of health insurance and life insurance benefits; and decide whether a total compensation comparison between the UN and US would be necessary if the US is retained as the comparator.

44. The Network:

- Welcomed the work on the total compensation methodology and strongly supported this very important review;
- Supported the continuation of conducting reference checks with other international organizations, given that these organizations are the main competitors for talent.

**(f) *Survey and report on gender balance in the United Nations common system (ICSC/71/R.12)***

45. The document provides an update on the status of women in the UN common system, including the implementation of the Commission's recommendations as well as gender improvement plans and policies.

46. The Network:

- Thanked the ICSC secretariat for the very detailed report;
- Noted some slight improvement in gender balance, however efforts need to continue throughout the UN system;
- Expressed its commitment to sharing best practices among organizations.

### **ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided to:

- (a) Express concern that the goal of 50/50 gender balance, especially at the D-1 level and above, remained unmet without any noticeable progress;
- (b) Note with disappointment that the organizations had not implemented all its previous recommendations;
- (c) Recall its previous recommendations outlined in A/61/30, A/63/30 and A/64/30;
- (d) Urge organizations to enforce existing gender balance policies and measures including the Commission's previous recommendations and conduct regular monitoring on the level of implementation;
- (e) Urge organizations to incorporate diversity policies such as geographical balance into gender strategies and policies;
- (f) Request organizations to hold managers accountable through their annual performance appraisal for achieving established annual gender targets;
- (g) Request its secretariat to coordinate with other entities in the United Nations common system on monitoring and reporting on the gender balance and explore the feasibility of establishing a common data depository for future data collection; and
- (h) Henceforth monitor future progress in achieving gender balance in the organizations of the United Nations common system every four years, and request its secretariat to provide a report on this issue at its 2014 summer session.

#### **(g) Children's and secondary dependant's allowances: review of the level (ICSC/71/R.13)**

47. Under the revised methodology, the children's allowance is established as a global flat-rate amount. The tax abatements and payments under the national social legislation in respect of dependent children have increased slightly in most Headquarters locations. The ICSC Secretariat is proposing a new flat amount of \$2,929 for the child allowance.

48. The Network:

- Noted the proposed new flat amount for the child allowance and the rates for the transitional measures in the two duty stations concerned.

### **ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided to recommend to the General Assembly that, as of 1 January 2011:

- (a) The children's allowance be set at US\$ 2,929 per annum and the disabled children's allowance at US\$ 5,858 per annum;
- (b) The secondary dependant's allowance be set at US\$ 1,025 per annum;
- (c) The United States dollar amount of the allowance, as established in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above, be converted to local currency using the official United Nations exchange rate as of the date of implementation and remain unchanged until the next biennial review;
- (d) As a transitional measure, where, at the time of implementation, the revised flat-rate allowance were to be lower than the one currently in effect, the allowances payable to currently eligible staff be equal to the higher rate reduced by 50 per cent of the difference between the two rates;
- (e) The dependency allowances be reduced by the amount of any direct payments received by staff from a Government in respect of dependants.

**(h) Assessing the implementation of the revised job evaluation standard for the Professional and higher categories (ICSC/71/R.14)**

49. The document provides a progress report on the implementation of the Job Evaluation Master Standard for Professional Staff.

50. The Network:

- Welcomed the positive news that all organizations of the UN common system are now implementing the standard.

**C. Conditions of service of the General Service and other locally recruited staff: review of the General Service headquarters and non-headquarters salary survey methodologies (ICSC/71/R.15 and Add. 1-2)**

51. This Agenda item was cancelled. However the ICSC secretariat mentioned that a lot of work has been accomplished by the Working Group. The main obstacle was the long procurement process. The final report from the Working Group will be presented to the Commission at the 72<sup>nd</sup> session and by 1 July 2011 both methodologies – field and Headquarters should come into effect.

52. The Network:

- Expressed its disappointment in the lack of a report and wished to be kept informed of the progress on this long standing issue.

**D. Conditions of service in the field: harmonization of the conditions of service for staff serving in non-family duty stations in the common system (ICSC/71/R.16)**

53. In line with the Commission's decision at its 70<sup>th</sup> session, the document provides 5 options for an allowance to compensate staff assigned to non-family duty stations for the costs of maintaining second households, while harmonizing the conditions of service for staff in non-family duty stations in the UN common system.

54. The Network:

- Thanked the ICSC secretariat for all their efforts and the comprehensive document;
- Recognized the difficulty of the task to arrive at a common harmonized approach;
- Supported a harmonized approach provided that that Option 2, HOME 2, would be approved as a suitable approach to compensate staff in non-family duty stations for the additional expenses of maintaining a second household;
- Supported the proposed common system framework for rest and recuperation.

**ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided to recommend to the General Assembly:

- (a) **Harmonization of designation of duty stations:** That the United Nations harmonize the designation of non-family duty stations based on a security assessment, as currently applied by the rest of the common system.
- (b) **Staff assigned to non-family duty stations:**
  - (i) Recommend a change to the existing hardship allowance whereby staff assigned to non-family duty stations would receive an additional amount in recognition that such service represents an increased level of financial and psychological hardship in terms of:

- Involuntary separation from families
  - Additional costs related to such service.
- (ii) For staff paid at the dependency rate, the additional measure would be 100 percent of the applicable dependency rate of the hardship allowance for category E - the most difficult duty stations - and the hardship matrix would be amended to reflect this (see attached, annex VI).
- (iii) For staff paid at the single rate, the additional measure would be equivalent to 50 percent of the applicable single rate of the hardship allowance in category E - the most difficult duty stations - and the hardship matrix would be amended to reflect this (see attached, annex VI).
- (iv) Staff would continue to receive the normal hardship allowance at the level applicable to the duty station to which they are assigned.
- (v) Recommend that such a change will be implemented six calendar months after a decision by the General Assembly, in order that organizations might prepare for the implementation.
- (vi) For organizations which currently use the SOA or the EMSEA, the following transitional measures would apply (see attached, annex VII which provides an overview of the implementation plan for the transitional arrangements):
- a. Establishing Unified SOLA rates: Within six months after implementation (refer paragraph 49(b)(v) above) of a decision by the General Assembly, location-specific SOLA amounts will be harmonized by the Commission as a unified SOLA rate for each duty station currently designated as an Administrative Place of Assignment, in consultation with the organizations and the staff federations. Such amounts will be promulgated by the ICSC. Such unified SOLA rates will take effect one year after the implementation of a decision by the General Assembly, unless as provided in (d) below.

Existing staff currently performing duties in a non-family duty station:

- b. For staff currently assigned to an Administrative Place of Assignment (APA): Staff assigned to an APA for service in a non-family duty station at the time of implementation of the decision by the General Assembly will initially continue to receive the SOLA they receive at the time of implementation of the new scheme. One year after the implementation of the decision by the General Assembly, and for the duration of their assignment to the same APA, they will receive the unified SOLA rate for that APA, as established by the Commission;
- c. For staff currently in receipt of EMSEA: Staff assigned to a non-family duty station at the time of the implementation of the decision by the General Assembly will receive EMSEA at the current rate for the duration of their assignment to that non-family duty station, or five years after the implementation of the decision of the General Assembly, whichever is the shorter.

Existing staff reassigned to perform duties in a non-family duty station within one year of the implementation of the decision by the General Assembly:

- d. For staff reassigned to an Administrative Place of Assignment (APA): Staff reassigned to an APA for service in a non-family duty station within one year of implementation of the decision by the General Assembly will initially receive the SOLA applicable to the APA at the time of implementation of the new scheme. One year after the implementation of the decision by the General Assembly, and for the duration of their assignment to the same APA, they will receive the unified SOLA rate for that APA, as established by the Commission, provided that there remains at least six months between the reassignment and the one year anniversary of the implementation of the decision by the General Assembly: if the period between the reassignment and the anniversary date is less than six months, the staff member will receive the unified SOA-specific SOLA amount immediately on reassignment.
- e. For staff reassigned to a non-family duty station and in receipt of EMSEA: Staff reassigned to a non-family duty station within one year of the implementation of the decision by the General Assembly will receive EMSEA at the current rate for the duration of their assignment to that non-family duty station, or five years after the implementation of the decision by the General Assembly, whichever is the

shorter.

Existing staff reassigned to perform duties in a non-family duty later than one year after implementation of the decision by the General Assembly:

- f. Staff assigned to an APA for service in a non-family duty station will receive the unified SOLA rate for that APA, which one year after implementation of the decision by the General Assembly would in each of the ensuing four years be reduced by one-quarter of the difference between:
  - (i) the applicable SOLA rate plus the normal hardship allowance at the APA; and
  - (ii) the normal hardship allowance plus the additional non-family hardship element at the POD (i.e. equivalent to what the United Nations Secretariat staff receive).
- g. Staff reassigned to a non-family duty station and in receipt of EMSEA will receive the difference between:
  - (i) the applicable EMSEA rate; and
  - (ii) the additional non-family hardship element.

All organizations would convert to the new non-family hardship element no later than five years after the General Assembly decision, at which time full harmonization would have been achieved. Organizations which currently used SOA or EMSEA would retain the option of adopting the new additional non-family hardship element at any time prior to the five year deadline, subject to discontinuing the use of EMSEA or SOLA.

- h. For newly recruited staff: Newly recruited staff who join the organization on or after a date six months after implementation of a decision by the General Assembly will be assigned under the non-family hardship element as approved by the General Assembly, and should not be offered the option of being assigned under SOA or with EMSEA.
  - i. Full harmonization five years after implementation of the non-family hardship element: All assignments under SOA, as well as the payment of EMSEA, as applicable, will be discontinued effective five years after implementation of the non-family hardship element. This would, inter alia, require that the provisions governing the applicability of EMSEA in cases of staff being assigned, or re-assigned, to a non-family duty station as contained in sub-paragraphs I.10 (b) and (c) of annex I to the Field Security Handbook be removed with effect from five years after the implementation of the General Assembly's decision. Five years after the implementation of the General Assembly decision the ICSC will discontinue the unified SOLA rates and organizations are expected to base the staff members entitlements on the place of duty and all staff should fall under the provisions of the non-family hardship element.
- (c) **Harmonization of rest and recuperation:**
- (i) To recommend the proposed harmonized Rest and Recuperation Framework (see attached, annex VIII).
  - (ii) To encourage organizations to the extent possible to absorb additional costs imposed by the framework within existing resources.

**E. Other business: proposed agenda for the thirty-third session of the Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions (ICSC/71/R.17)**

55. The proposed Agenda for the 33<sup>rd</sup> session of ACPAQ is dedicated to a review of the analysis of the data collected from the baseline place-to-place surveys to be conducted by the ICSC secretariat at Headquarters duty stations and Washington D.C.

56. The Network:

- Noted the proposed agenda for the thirty-third session of ACPAQ and looks forward to participating at its next meeting in early 2011 to review the results of the baseline place-to-place surveys.

**ICSC Decision**

The Commission decided:

- (a) To approve the revised list of items together with their specifications, subject to further minor revisions prior to its finalization before the launch of the 2010 round of surveys;
- (b) To approve that the secretariat continue to use the existing method for averaging price ratios of regular and organic/biological brands of food-and-beverage items for the 2010 round of surveys and to conduct experiments during the 2010 round aimed at testing the impact on the calculated post adjustment indices, of treating organic/biological products as separate items;
- (c) To take note of the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the revised data-collection forms to be used in the 2010 round of surveys;
- (d) That the secretariat should conduct censuses of expenditures for all baseline surveys at headquarters duty stations and Washington, D.C., and use the data collected for the derivation of common weights, on the basis of the guidelines provided by the Advisory Committee;
- (e) That the secretariat should continue to explore further the feasibility of using Eurostat/Interorganization Section (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) Family Budget Survey results as a source of external data for the derivation of common weights;
- (f) That the contingency plans proposed in the event of insufficient response rates were adequate and that, whenever available and feasible for use, anonymized microdatasets from the Eurostat/Interorganization Section Family Budget Surveys should be used as a preferred source of external data. Otherwise, weights of relevant national consumer price indices should be used;
- (g) To call for the active cooperation of organizations and staff federations through the formation of local survey committees responsible for the coordination of all activities designed for the successful conduct of the surveys, in collaboration with the secretariat;
- (h) To call on organizations to facilitate the completion of the expenditures surveys questionnaires by their staff members;
- (i) To approve the proposed procedures and guidelines for data collection for the baseline place-to-place surveys at headquarters duty stations, as recommended by the Advisory Committee;
- (j) To note the results of further testing of both the new approach to cost-of-living measurement based on real-time comparisons with New York and the new basket of countries used in the calculation of the out-of-area index;
- (k) That the post adjustment classification review cycles, of group I duty stations and the five-year duration of survey rounds should remain unchanged;
- (l) To request the secretariat to continue its study of the possible modifications to the calculation of the post adjustment index based on New York prices that were updated on a regular basis, using the relevant consumer price index disaggregated series published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics;
- (m) To request the secretariat to review the post adjustment classification of Geneva in view of Switzerland's recent entry into the Schengen area;
- (n) To approve the schedule of the 2010 place-to-place surveys, as recommended by the Advisory Committee.

## PART IV – ISSUES FOR THE HR NETWORK

### A. Update on HR-related projects included in the HLCM Plan of Action for Harmonization of Business Practices (CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/26)

57. Georgette Miller, Senior Advisor who has been recruited to undertake the review of contractual arrangements, Staff Regulations & Rules, policies and practices, provided the Network with a briefing of the work undertaken from the end of February 2010 to the present.

58. The review focused on contractual arrangements, recruitment/promotion (of particular relevance for the internal/external candidate question), grading and classification, and performance appraisal.

59. Of special importance was the opportunity to be part of the High-Level UNDG-HLCM Mission on *Addressing country-level bottlenecks in business practices* which, in March 2010, visited Mozambique and Malawi (“Delivering as One” pilot country and self-starter country, respectively) and Vietnam (another pilot country) in April 2010. This provided the opportunity to gain a more concrete appreciation of the HR issues, as well as of their ramifications and connections to larger political and technical issues, notably in the area of budget and finance.

60. Remo Lalli, Secretary, HLCM, thanked the organizations that had provided information. This review reflects the great commitment at the highest management level in organizations. Funding has been received from donors and they expect conclusions. Organizations therefore must plan and be ready to put recommendations in place and implement them.

61. He further stated that this is an interim report and that the views and guidance of the Network are needed in order to complete the report for HLCM. The HR Network will be consulted before the report is finalized in October.

62. UNFPA thanked Ms. Miller for her report on this important UN reform issue, in particular relating to Delivering as One at country level. The report contains some recommendations that are consistent with the ICSC paper on inter-agency mobility (issue of internal candidates, etc.) and includes some actions/practices already in place in some DaO country office (e.g., joint interview panels, shared learning activities like UN Cares, orientation/induction).

63. From the UNFPA and UNICEF perspective, staff from the Division for Human Resources participate in different working groups that deal with issues facing DaO countries, including participation over the last few years in HR-related missions to a number of DaO countries:

- to advise on office restructuring efforts
- to address issues faced by co-located teams
- to help with streamlining and harmonization of business practices.

64. The will to streamline and harmonize and to Deliver as One exists at country level. The recent high-level mission to three DaO countries was intended to address bottlenecks at country level, but it appears that many of the bottlenecks are present at Headquarters level rather than in the field.

65. It is worth noting that much progress toward harmonization has taken place in areas like IT, finance and common premises, but various reports and the RCs themselves tell us that HR departments are slow in addressing the HR issues. Work has been ongoing in this area but broader Agency participation in the various working groups is needed. For example, there is a Task Team on HR in the UNDG Working Group on Country Office Business Operations, but only two agencies (UNICEF and UNFPA) are represented in that task team. In various HR missions, there has not been consistent Agency participation.

66. Country offices are begging for “best practices” that can be replicated. For example, as some offices move toward a “One UN House”, they are thinking of creating common teams (e.g., in IT). However, regardless of the functional area (whether IT, programme coordination groups, etc.), the HR issues are similar: contractual status of personnel; job classification; performance appraisal; staff development. Many of these are highlighted in the report.

67. UNFPA proposed to discuss what concrete actions can be committed to – so that this is not just an interesting document that is ‘noted’ but not actioned. It suggested that the Network reflect on the recommendations and make a plan to act on some – perhaps identify some quick wins as well as those that will take more time to work out.

68. UNAIDS commented that it “lives the differences” since their international staff are administered by WHO while national staff are administered by UNDP – for example, there are differences in contracts, insurance, separation payments. UNAIDS supports development of an action plan to establish priorities.

69. UNHCR expressed the need for more clarity on the recommendations.

70. The Network:

- Thanked Ms Miller for the report and the update;
- Expressed its commitment to review the full report once it is completed in October 2010 and provide further comments before the final report is submitted to HLCM.

## **B. Safety and Security of Staff, discussion on the consolidated proposals for HLCM:**

### **(a) Update on the work undertaken by the leading Agencies and the CEB Secretariat**

71. HLCM at its Spring 2010 session requested the three working groups of the HR Network, in ongoing consultation with other Networks, to continue their work on staff safety and security and submit a comprehensive plan, with costing, to HLCM for consideration at its Fall 2010 session.

72. To start the process, the CEB secretariat initiated a comprehensive mapping of all current UN benefits/entitlements/insurance related to service-incurred injury, illness, death and disability.

73. Dyane Dufresne-Klaus has been recruited as a consultant to work in consultation with the three working groups in order to identify the current gaps in coverage and develop a consolidated report which will be presented to HLCM at its Fall session in September 2010.

74. WFP presented three proposals for the Network’s consideration: a) Death grant for Employees in the non-staff category due to a Malicious Act; b) Transitional Malicious Acts Education Benefit for dependent children of deceased UN staff and locally recruited employees; c) Provident Fund for locally recruited employees on non-staff contracts.

75. Network members welcomed the work conducted on the three proposals and discussed them in detail. Opinions varied widely and questions were raised regarding the definition of non-staff, the misuse of non-staff contracts and the responsibility of third parties for their staff in case of malicious acts.

76. UNDP presented a Work Plan on Improvement of Security Measures for National Staff in case of malicious acts, but also for natural disasters. Some of the measures are already contained in the FSH, so the Working Group focused on the gaps.

77. Network members thanked the Working Group and expressed their support for addressing the massive safety and security issues national staff are faced with. A policy analysis will be done on the rationale for these kinds of entitlements and the Network should agree on what will ultimately be presented to HLCM in September. Real and hidden costs must also be analyzed

78. The UN Secretariat presented an update on the work undertaken to review Appendix D, in which the main principles are agreed. The text is now ready for comment by the various Networks (FB, HR). The SMCC has already approved the two main changes in benefits at its June 2010 session before it is presented to the General Assembly at its 65<sup>th</sup> session. Once it has been approved it will immediately become applicable to the UN, Funds and Programmes.

79. HR Network members asked a number of questions, including whether there had been an assessment of the impact on the specialized agencies, although ultimately these will need to decide for themselves whether they accept the revised Appendix D, or not.

80. The Network:

- Agreed that all comments be sent to the Working Group for consideration by late August, with copy to the consultant. It welcomed the consultant and looked forward to receiving the results of her work in September.

#### **(b) New Security Level System (SLS)**

81. The Chair of the Task Group briefed the Network on the group's work up to date. The Task Group was formed to review the HR implications of the new Security Level System. The group is represented by UNAIDS (Chair), UNHCR, WHO, UNRWA, UNDP, the CEB and ICSC Secretariats. The Group is preparing proposals on the following: a) Relocation and Evacuation decisions after the introduction of the SLS; b) Designation of "non-family" duty stations under the SLS, c) Updates to the three Brochures on security related entitlements. The Task Group will need to complete the review by the end of October 2010, following which there will be two months to communicate the changes prior to the implementation of the new SLS on 1 January 2011.

82. A discussion ensued on the various HR implications of the new Security Level System, especially the issues around who decides whether or not a duty station is safe for families, DSS or HRN and the matter of the new hazard pay criteria.

83. The Network:

- Agreed that the new Hazard pay criteria would be circulated in mid September and members should send further comments on this and other topics to the Working Group by August 30<sup>th</sup> 2010.

#### **(c) Rapid Response Team (CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/32)**

84. The CEB secretariat provided an update on the progress made regarding the implementation of the Rapid Response mechanism. In April 2010 organizations were requested to confirm their participation and to nominate staff for the Roster. Up to date four organizations have responded: UNFPA, UNICEF, UNHCR and WFP. A lead agency should be identified urgently.

85. The Network:

- Agreed to focus on sharing practices between organisations so that RRT members would be informed about processes in all agencies;
- Agreed to present a briefing note focusing on achievements to date to HLCM's Fall 2010 session.

### C. Personal Status/Domestic Partners (CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/27)

86. At the June 2009 HR Network session UNAIDS proposed that organizations consider more equitable recognition of personal status by expanding the current criteria to allow for recognition of all legally established unions irrespective of the nationality of the staff member.

87. At this session, following a request from the HR Network, UNAIDS presented the results of a survey conducted among the member organizations in support of the proposal and requested that those organizations willing to revise or expand the current basis for the recognition of personal status be able to do so in accordance with their respective governance.

88. The HR Network affirmed that respect for diversity is a core value of the UN Common System and that a diverse workforce enhances our capacity to deliver our mandate. In order to encourage diversity it is necessary to create a fair and safe environment where everyone has equitable access to opportunities and benefits.

89. The Network:

- Proposed to further develop this within a ‘non-discrimination framework’ so that more organizations can move forward in the future;
- Recommended that discussion of this issue continue;
- Agreed to request HLCM to endorse the proposal that the organizations that are willing and ready to proceed further with this issue may move ahead in accordance with their own governance procedures;
- Endorsed the continuation of discussions at its meetings and the proposed solution for HLCM to endorse those organizations that can and wish to move forward on this matter.

### D. Briefing by the Finance and Budget Network

90. The Chair of the Finance and Budget Network, Jay Karia, briefed the HR Network on activities of mutual concern to both Networks, such as ASHI, Long Term care, Appendix D and IPSAS.

91. Regarding progress on IPSAS implementation, there has been good response and compliance from organizations. However, not all organizations will be IPSAS compliant by the end of 2010 due to ERP issues.

92. On the issues of Staff Safety and Security, the Chair of the FB Network mentioned that it is not yet clear on how the additional costs would be borne. The non-staff issue is also very complex from a legal perspective and has high financial implications, especially regarding death and education benefits. In extending benefits to non-staff, the HR Network was urged to use caution. The financial pressure from Member States is great and this should be kept in mind when making HR proposals.

93. Network members asked whether additional data or analyses would be needed before the FB Network could make a full cost assessment of the Safety and Security proposals. Jay Karia explained that a database would be set up containing all the data and that some analysis methods would need to be developed.

94. The Network:

- Agreed to send the proposals on national staff and Appendix D to the FB Network for comments.

#### **E. Dual Career & Staff Mobility (CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/30 and Add.1)**

95. The Dual Career & Staff Mobility (DC&SM) Secretariat staff presented the report on the programme, as well as the implementation of the Obtaining the Right to Work strategy regarding the negotiation of work permits. Attention was drawn to the fact that participating organisations are not paying their full cost-share which has led to the development of an exit strategy for the programme that may need to be put into place in as early as 2011, should the financial difficulties persist.

96. The Network was informed that less than 50% of staff are in duty stations with access to special work permits for their spouses/partners. Of those 50%, only 3% are in field duty stations. In order to eliminate this hurdle to spouse employment, a proposal was made for a common approach to negotiating work permits with host governments with the RC's, the individual organizations or the DC&SM secretariat leading the discussions on behalf of all organizations. The programme proposed to pilot this approach and its accompanying Joint Negotiation Position in 2-4 countries this biennium.

97. Network members fully recognized the lack of access to work permits becoming an increasingly serious problem in the recruitment, retention and mobility of their staff members and impinging on desired organizational demographics. There was a keen interest in negotiating better access to permits, recognizing that it is vital to provide UN families with the tools to have a fair chance at finding employment in the local market. Whether or not actual employment is secured then depends on the skills and capacities of the spouse and relieves the organizations of the perceived obligation to find or provide spouse employment.

98. The Network:

- Concluded that it supports the proposed approach and agreed to the pilots in Italy (with FAO as the lead); and in one or two further duty stations in the field (Malaysia has since been confirmed as the second pilot, with WHO as the lead).
- Indicated its concern regarding the financial situation and requested those organizations that have not yet contributed to urgently do so.

#### **F. Inter-Agency Mobility Accord**

99. FAO reported that many meetings and discussions had taken place since 2008 with legal offices and the Legal Network and that three difficult areas remained: a) Article 4.5 on Return Rights; b) Article 4.12 on Termination of exchange; Article 4.15 on Disciplinary action. A revised text taking into account comments from legal officers had just been shared with OLA.

100. HLCM has requested the HR Network to conclude the matter as soon as possible, and though there is more common ground than before, the Legal Network members have very outlying positions on the three contentious articles which could thwart the entire effort.

101. The Network discussed the matter at length and suggestions ranged from dropping the Accord, requesting HLCM endorsement for a system-wide return to the Agreement; requesting a review of the need for the Accord and waiting for the JIU report on staff mobility, which will soon be completed.

102. The Network:

- Agreed that the JIU report and the final opinion from OLA would be awaited, after which time the issue would be discussed in the HR Network for a final and definitive conclusion.

#### **G. Guidance note on Knowledge Management (CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/33)**

103. This Agenda item was postponed to the Spring 2011 session due to time constraints.

#### **H. Update on UN Cares Programme (CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/29)**

104. The Interim Global Coordinator reported on the current status of the programme and the strategy for the next biennium. She advised that UN Cares will receive a Special Commendation in the context of the UN21 Awards by the Secretary General on 29 July 2010. Although UN Cares is regarded as a “model programme” in the context of harmonization and best business practices, the financial situation for the programme is very tenuous as some organizations have not yet paid their full share for the biennium. So far, only 45 percent of the approved budget (50% scenario) has been pledged for the biennium. The United Nations Secretariat, which accounts for 26% of the total UN Cares budget, has made no contribution for the biennium, and was requested to do so. Both UNIDO and ICAO pledged their full share during the meeting, leaving the UN as the sole organization which has not paid its dues. The Interim Global Coordinator also requested organizations who contribute in-kind to also provide monetary support, and those who paid less than the full share of the indicative apportionment to find ways to mobilize additional funds. A decision was requested as to whether the Network supports the recommended strategy of the global UN Cares Task Force for the continuation of UN Cares into the next biennium at the same budgetary level (the 50% scenario) adjusted by 5% for anticipated cost increases.

105. Several organizations expressed their commitment and full support for the continuation of UN Cares and agreed to pursue options with their management for funding or resources for the current and the next biennium, including the possible loaning of qualified staff to support the regions without UN Cares staff. WHO offered to make several interns available to UN Cares and UNAIDS pledged continued support to UN Cares budget from its Unified Budget and Workplan (UBW) resources.

106. The Network:

- Unanimously supported the strategy for the continuation of the UN Cares programme and praised its good work and the well-deserved Special Commendation in the context of the UN 21 Awards;
- Urged all organizations that had not yet provided their contributions for the 2010-2011 biennium to do so at the earliest possible time.

#### **I. Disability Policy (CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/28/Rev.1)**

107. The CEB secretariat reported that it had undertaken a survey in April 2010 on the implementation of a Disability Policy by organizations. Most organizations reported that they have implemented a policy or are in the process of developing a policy during 2010.

108. WHO presented some best practices from organizations outside the UN system. WHO further suggested that it may be timely to reconvene the Network’s Working Group on Disability to look at the next steps for implementation.

109. The Network:

- Agreed to reconvene the Working Group on Disability to look at implementation issues and make further concrete recommendations;

- Further agreed to share any good practices and report back to HLCM on the progress of implementation.

#### **J. Staff Stress Counsellors (CEB/2010/HLCM/HR/31)**

110. The Confidentiality Guidelines for UN System Stress Counsellors were presented by a member of the group from the World Bank. The Guidelines are a means to promote consistent practice and professional standards, both during and outside times of crisis. Network members discussed the additional value of these guidelines for staff like Ombudspersons and HR Officers, who are oftentimes also involved in counselling. These guidelines are also used by UNDSS.

111. The Network:

- Thanked the representative from the Staff Stress Counsellors for taking this work forward and endorsed the guidelines.

#### **K. Staff-Management Relations**

112. FICSA informed the Network that, due to IMO's stated inability to fund the release of the FICSA General Secretary for a third year, the officer had been placed on Special Leave Without Pay (SLWOP) effective 1 February 2010.

113. At its 19<sup>th</sup> session HLCM rejected the proposal of the HR Network for an ad hoc cost-sharing arrangement which had prevented a satisfactory solution of the issue. FICSA recalled that an agreement in principle was recorded in the CCAQ report in 1982 with recognition of possibly relying on a cost-sharing basis, particularly when the officers came from small organizations.

114. In its note on the subject, FICSA recalled that the CCAQ had repeatedly recognized the responsibility of the organizations to fund the release, the cost-sharing being indicated as the alternative to be considered if the releasing organization could not absorb the relative costs.

115. FICSA sought a reformulation of the proposal, for submission at the 20<sup>th</sup> session of the HLCM.

116. FICSA further suggested establishing a consultative mechanism to elaborate a sustainable, long-term solution for presentation at the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the HR Network, as a follow-up to the agreement at the 19<sup>th</sup> HR Network that "*a long-term solution needs to be found in collaboration with the Legal Network*".

117. The Network agreed to continue the ongoing discussion through contacts between the CEB secretariat, the spokespersons and the Federation. A videoconference among the organizations concerned would be convened if needed (Strategy 4, points 6-8).

118. The Network:

- Concluded that it would take the FICSA status report under consideration and requested organizations to review the paper and convey their views to the CEB secretariat.

#### **L. AOB**

119. The CEB secretariat informed that the Strategic HR Directors meeting would take place in Amman, Jordan, hosted by UNWRA on 27 and 28 January 2011. Further details would be forwarded to Directors in October-November 2010.

## ANNEX I – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Spokespersons:** **Sean Hand (UNFPA)**  
**Ruth de Miranda (UN)**  
**Marta Leichner-Boyce (CEB Secretariat)**

<b>UN</b>	<b>Ms. Ruth de Miranda</b> Chief, Human Resources Policy Service/OHRM	<a href="mailto:demiranda@un.org">demiranda@un.org</a>
	<b>Mr. Paul Johnson</b> Officer-in-Charge, Field Personnel Division/Department of Field Support	<a href="mailto:johnsonp@un.org">johnsonp@un.org</a>
	<b>Mr. Jay Karia</b> (by videoconference) Deputy Comptroller	<a href="mailto:karia@un.org">karia@un.org</a>
	<b>Mr. Raj Rikhy</b> Deputy Director Accounts Division, OPPBA/DM	<a href="mailto:rikhy@un.org">rikhy@un.org</a>
	<b>Mr. Christophe Monier</b> Chief Insurance and Disbursement Service	<a href="mailto:monier@un.org">monier@un.org</a>
	<b>Mr. Enrique Martinez</b> Team Leader, Conditions of Service Unit, HRPS/OHRM	<a href="mailto:martinez@un.org">martinez@un.org</a>
<b>ILO</b>	<b>Ms. Telma Viale</b> Director, Human Resources Division	<a href="mailto:viale@ilo.org">viale@ilo.org</a>
<b>FAO</b>	<b>Mr. Serge Nakouzi</b> Principal Officer, HR Management Division	<a href="mailto:serge.nakouzi@fao.org">serge.nakouzi@fao.org</a>
<b>UNESCO</b>	<b>Ms. Ana Louisa Thompson-Flores</b> Director, a.i., Bureau of HR Management	<a href="mailto:al-thompson-flores@unesco.org">al-thompson-flores@unesco.org</a>
	<b>Ms. Annick Grisar</b> Chief, Policy and Planning Section	<a href="mailto:a.grisar@unesco.org">a.grisar@unesco.org</a>
<b>WHO</b>	<b>Ms. Monika Altmaier</b> Director, HR Management	<a href="mailto:altmaierm@who.int">altmaierm@who.int</a>
	<b>Ms. Eva Lustigova</b> HRM, Policy and Administration of Justice	<a href="mailto:lustige@who.int">lustige@who.int</a>
	<b>Ms. Josiane Sidibe-Pimpie</b> HR Specialist, Compensation	<a href="mailto:pimpiej@who.int">pimpiej@who.int</a>
<b>PAHO</b>	<b>Ms. Dianne Arnold</b> Human Resources Manager	<a href="mailto:arnolddi@paho.org">arnolddi@paho.org</a>
	<b>Ms. Nancy Machado</b> HR Policy and Administration of Justice	<a href="mailto:machadon@paho.org">machadon@paho.org</a>
	<b>Cynthia Rowe</b> HR Specialist, HR Policy & Administration Justice, HRM	<a href="mailto:rowecynt@paho.org">rowecynt@paho.org</a>
<b>UPU</b>	<b>Mr. Jelto Stant</b> Acting Director of HR HR Strategy and Planning Programme Manager	<a href="mailto:jelto.stant@upu.int">jelto.stant@upu.int</a>
<b>WMO</b>	<b>Mr. Shuibao Liu</b> Chief, Human Resources	<a href="mailto:sliu@wmo.int">sliu@wmo.int</a>
<b>IMO</b>	<b>Mr. Christian Dahoui</b> Head, Human Resources Services	<a href="mailto:dahoui@imo.org">dahoui@imo.org</a>
<b>WIPO</b>	<b>Mr. Michel Ciampi</b> HR Officer, HRM Department	<a href="mailto:michel.ciampi@wipo.int">michel.ciampi@wipo.int</a>
<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>Mr. Konstantin Ivanov</b> Chief, Staff Services and Employee Relations, PSM/HRM	<a href="mailto:k.ivanov@unido.org">k.ivanov@unido.org</a>
<b>IAEA</b>	<b>Ms. Angela Jackson</b> Head, Staff Administration Section, Division of Human Resources	<a href="mailto:a.jackson@iaea.org">a.jackson@iaea.org</a>
<b>UNWTO</b>	<b>Ms. Carmen Molina</b> Chief, Human Resources Section	<a href="mailto:cmolina@unwto.org">cmolina@unwto.org</a>
<b>UNICEF</b>	<b>Ms. Christine Lloyd</b> Director, Division of Human Resources	<a href="mailto:clloyd@unicef.org">clloyd@unicef.org</a>
	<b>Mr. Peter Frobel</b> HR Policy Specialist	<a href="mailto:pfrobel@unicef.org">pfrobel@unicef.org</a>

<b>UNDP</b>	<b>Ms. Cihan Sultanoglu</b> Director, Office of Human Resources	<a href="mailto:cihan.sultanoglu@undp.org">cihan.sultanoglu@undp.org</a>
	<b>Ms. Henrietta de Beer</b> Chief, HR Policy and Compensation	<a href="mailto:henrietta.debeer@undp.org">henrietta.debeer@undp.org</a>
	<b>Ms. Christine Bendel</b> HR Specialist on Staff Well Being	<a href="mailto:Christine.bendel@undp.org">Christine.bendel@undp.org</a>
<b>UNHCR</b>	<b>Mr. Shelly Pitterman</b> Director, Division of HR Management	<a href="mailto:pitterma@unhcr.org">pitterma@unhcr.org</a>
<b>UNFPA</b>	<b>Mr. Sean Hand</b> Director, Division of Human Resources	<a href="mailto:shand@unfpa.org">shand@unfpa.org</a>
	<b>Ms. Florence Sykes</b> Chief, Planning and Policy Branch	<a href="mailto:sykes@unfpa.org">sykes@unfpa.org</a>
<b>WFP</b>	<b>Ms. Diana Serrano</b> Director, Human Resources Division	<a href="mailto:diana.serrano@wfp.org">diana.serrano@wfp.org</a>
	<b>Ms. Ruth Grove,</b> Deputy Director, HR Policy & Career Management Service	<a href="mailto:ruth.grove@wfp.org">ruth.grove@wfp.org</a>
	<b>Ms. Camilla Dupont</b> HR Officer, HR Policy Branch, HR Division	<a href="mailto:camilla.dupont@wfp.org">camilla.dupont@wfp.org</a>
<b>UNAIDS</b>	<b>Ms. Nancy Raphael</b> Chief, Human Resources Management	<a href="mailto:raphaeln@unaids.org">raphaeln@unaids.org</a>
	<b>Ms. Sigrid Kranawetter</b> Head, Compensation and Benefits, HRM	<a href="mailto:kranawetters@unaids.org">kranawetters@unaids.org</a>
<b>UNOPS</b>	<b>Mr. Pierre Moreau-Peron</b> Director, Human Resources	<a href="mailto:pierrepe@unops.org">pierrepe@unops.org</a>
<b>ITC</b>	<b>Ms. Michelle Khodara</b> Sr. HR Officer, Division of Programme Support	<a href="mailto:Khodara@intracen.org">Khodara@intracen.org</a>
<b>UN Cares</b>	<b>Ms. Anne Gunning</b> Global Coordinator	<a href="mailto:gunning@unfpa.org">gunning@unfpa.org</a>
<b>UNSSC</b>	<b>Mr. Paolo Ceratto</b> Deputy Director	<a href="mailto:p.ceratto@unssc.org">p.ceratto@unssc.org</a>
<b>ICAO</b>	<b>Dr. Fang Liu</b> Director, Bureau of Administration and Services	<a href="mailto:fliu@icao.int">fliu@icao.int</a>
	<b>Ms Linda Comeau-Stuart</b> Acting Chief, Recruitment, Establishment & Studies Section	<a href="mailto:lcomeau-stuart@icao.int">lcomeau-stuart@icao.int</a>
<b>World Bank</b>	<b>Mr. Jim Striker</b> Head, Personal & Work Stress Counseling Unit	<a href="mailto:jstriker2@worldbank.org">jstriker2@worldbank.org</a>

<b>OBSERVERS AND OTHER REPRESENTATIVES:</b>		
<b>ICC</b> International Criminal Court	<b>Ms. Kristiane Golze</b> Chief, Human Resources	<a href="mailto:Kristiane.Golze@icc-cpi.int">Kristiane.Golze@icc-cpi.int</a>
	<b>Mr. Floris Kist</b> Snr. Human Resources Assistant (Policy & Legal)	<a href="mailto:floris.kist@icc-cpi.int">floris.kist@icc-cpi.int</a>
<b>IOM</b>	<b>Mr. Xavier Hennekinne</b> Chief, HR Operations & Administration Services Manila Administrative Centre	<a href="mailto:xhennekinne@iom.int">xhennekinne@iom.int</a>
<b>CTBTO</b>	<b>Ms. Yeshiareg Mekonnen</b> Chief, Personnel Section	<a href="mailto:yeshiareg.mekonnen@ctbto.org">yeshiareg.mekonnen@ctbto.org</a>

<b>ICSC Secretariat</b>		
<b>ICSC</b>	<b>Mr. Duncan Barclay</b> Chief, HR Policies Division	<a href="mailto:barclay@un.org">barclay@un.org</a>
	<b>Mr. Yuri Orlov</b> Chief, Salaries and Allowances Division	<a href="mailto:orlov@un.org">orlov@un.org</a>

<b>STAFF ASSOCIATIONS (FICSA, CCISUA, UNISERV)</b>		
<b>FICSA</b>	<b>Mr. Mauro Pace</b> President	<a href="mailto:mauro.pace@fao.org">mauro.pace@fao.org</a>
	<b>Ms. Valérie de Kermel</b> General Secretary	<a href="mailto:vdekermel@unog.ch">vdekermel@unog.ch</a>
	<b>Ms. Véronique Allain</b> Member of Executive Committee	<a href="mailto:veronique.allain@cbd.int">veronique.allain@cbd.int</a>
<b>CCISUA</b>	<b>Ms. Rita Wallace</b> President	<a href="mailto:rwallace@unicef.org">rwallace@unicef.org</a>
	<b>Mr. Ridha Zargouni</b> Executive Secretary, UNOG Coordinating Council	<a href="mailto:rzargouni@unog.ch">rzargouni@unog.ch</a>
<b>UNISERV</b>	<b>Mr. Claude Jumet</b> Vice-President	<a href="mailto:jumet@un.org">jumet@un.org</a>

<b>CEB Secretariat</b>		
<b>Ms. Marta Leichner-Boyce</b> Senior Inter-Agency Advisor, Human Resources Management		<a href="mailto:mleichner-boyce@unog.ch">mleichner-boyce@unog.ch</a>
<b>Mr Remo Lalli</b> Secretary, HLCM		<a href="mailto:rlalli@unog.ch">rlalli@unog.ch</a>
<b>Ms. Petra ten Hoope-Bender</b> Human Resources Programme Coordinator Dual Career and Staff Mobility		<a href="mailto:phoope@unog.ch">phoope@unog.ch</a>
<b>Mr. Filip Borkowy</b> Researcher/Writer, Dual Career and Staff Mobility		<a href="mailto:fborkowy@unog.ch">fborkowy@unog.ch</a>
<b>Ms. Georgette Miller</b> Special Advisor		<a href="mailto:gmillier@unog.ch">gmillier@unog.ch</a>
<b>Ms. Dyane Dufresne-Klaus</b> Consultant		<a href="mailto:ddufresneklaus@gmail.com">ddufresneklaus@gmail.com</a>

## ANNEX II

### **Proposed list of representative schools for all country/ currency zones**

#### **AUSTRIA (4 primary/secondary schools)**

Vienna International School  
Lycée français de Vienne  
American International School  
Vienna Christian School

#### **BELGIUM (1 primary/secondary and 1 post-secondary school)**

International School of Brussels  
Université libre de Bruxelles

#### **DENMARK (2 primary/secondary schools)**

Copenhagen International School  
Rygaards International School

#### **FRANCE (3 primary/secondary schools and 1 post-secondary school)**

École active bilingue Jeannine Manuel  
École alsacienne  
Cité scolaire internationale de Lyon  
University of Paris-Sorbonne

#### **GERMANY (2 primary/secondary schools and 1 post-secondary school)**

Bonn International School  
Independent Bonn International School  
International University of Applied Sciences

#### **IRELAND (1 primary/secondary and 1 post-secondary school)**

Saint Columba's College  
University College of Dublin

#### **ITALY (4 primary/secondary schools)**

Ambrit Rome International School  
St. George's British International School  
Southlands English School  
Marymount International School

#### **JAPAN (1 primary/secondary and 1 post-secondary school)**

St. Mary's International School  
Waseda University

#### **NETHERLANDS (1 primary/secondary and 1 post-secondary school)**

The British School in The Netherlands  
University of Groningen

**SPAIN (1 primary/secondary and 1 post-secondary school)**

The American School of Madrid  
Complutense University of Madrid

**SWEDEN (1 primary/secondary and 1 post-secondary school)**

Sigtunaskolan Humanistiska Läroverket  
Stockholm School of Economics

**SWITZERLAND (4 primary/secondary schools)**

International School of Geneva  
Collège du Léman  
Institut International de Lancy  
Institut Florimont

**UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND**

**(1 primary/secondary school and 4 post-secondary schools)**  
University of Warwick  
University of Nottingham  
University of Manchester  
University College London  
Marymount International School

**UNITED STATES DOLLAR INSIDE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**(3 primary/secondary and 3 post-secondary schools)**  
United Nations International School  
Lycée français de New York  
Horace Mann School  
New York University  
Pace University  
University of Virginia

**UNITED STATES DOLLAR OUTSIDE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**10 primary/secondary and 2 post-secondary schools)**  
Egypt: Cairo American College  
Ethiopia: International Community School of Addis Ababa  
Ghana: Ghana International School  
Kenya: International School of Kenya  
Senegal: Lycée Français Jean Mermoz  
Bangladesh: American International School Dhaka  
India: American Embassy School  
Lebanon: American University of Beirut  
Thailand: International School Bangkok  
Canada: McGill University  
Chile: Nido de Aguilas  
Panama: Balboa Academy

### ANNEX III

#### Proposed revisions of education grant and boarding cost levels

Table 1

##### Proposed increases for maximum admissible expenditures and education grant

Country/zone	Currency	Percentage increase	Maximum admissible expenditure	Maximum education grant
Austria	Euro	5.0	17 555	13 166
Denmark	Danish krone	5.0	113 554	85 166
France	Euro	7.0	10 981	8 236
Germany	Euro	3.0	19 563	14 672
Italy	Euro	10.0	20 830	15 623
The Netherlands	Euro	6.0	17 512	13 134
Spain	Euro	10.0	16 653	12 490
Switzerland	Swiss franc	11.0	31 911	23 933
United Kingdom	Pound sterling	10.0	24 941	18 706
US\$ in the United States	United States dollar	10.0	43 006	32 255
US\$ outside the United States	United States dollar	7.0	20 663	15 497

Table 2

##### Zones where the maximum admissible expenditures and education grant are maintained

Country/zone	Currency	Maximum admissible expenditure	Maximum education grant
Belgium	Euro	15 458	11 593
Ireland	Euro	17 045	12 784
Japan	Yen	2 324 131	1 743 098
Sweden	Swedish krona	157 950	118 462

Table 3

**Proposed ceilings for boarding costs**

Country/zone	Currency	Percentage increase	Normal flat rate for boarding	Additional flat rate for boarding at designated duty stations
Austria	Euro	1.8	3 776	5 664
Belgium	Euro	1.9	3 518	5 277
Denmark	Danish krone	3.9	27 242	40 863
France	Euro	1.9	3 052	4 578
Germany	Euro	1.0	4 221	6 332
Italy	Euro	0.6	3 147	4 721
The Netherlands	Euro	0.8	3 875	5 813
Spain	Euro	0.3	3 162	4 743
Sweden	Swedish krona	5.6	26 034	39 051
Switzerland	Swiss franc	1.5	5 540	8 310
United Kingdom	Pound sterling	5.8	3 690	5 535
US\$ in the United States	United States dollar	5.3	6 083	9 125
US\$ outside the United States	United States dollar	1.5	3 746	5 619

Table 4

**Zones where ceilings for boarding costs are maintained**

Country/zone	Currency	Normal flat rate for boarding	Additional flat rate for boarding at designated duty stations
Ireland	Euro	3 112	4 668
Japan	Yen	607 703	911 555

## Annex IV

### Salary scale for the Professional and higher categories showing annual gross salaries and net equivalents after application of staff assessment, effective 1 January 2011

(United States dollars)

<i>Level</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>VI</i>	<i>VII</i>	<i>VIII</i>	<i>IX</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>XI</i>	<i>XII</i>	<i>XIII</i>	<i>XIV</i>	<i>XV</i>
USG Gross	<b>204 391</b>														
Net D	145 854														
Net S	131 261														
ASG Gross	<b>185 809</b>														
Net D	133 776														
Net S	121 140														
D-2 Gross	<b>152 231</b>	<b>155 592</b>	<b>158 954</b>	<b>162 315</b>	<b>165 675</b>	<b>169 035</b>									
Net D	111 950	114 135	116 320	118 505	120 689	122 873									
Net S	102 847	104 691	106 528	108 359	110 186	112 002									
D-1 Gross	<b>139 074</b>	<b>141 896</b>	<b>144 710</b>	<b>147 532</b>	<b>150 371</b>	<b>153 320</b>	<b>156 272</b>	<b>159 222</b>	<b>162 171</b>						
Net D	103 070	104 989	106 903	108 822	110 741	112 658	114 577	116 494	118 411						
Net S	95 270	96 936	98 600	100 258	101 915	103 567	105 212	106 857	108 497						
P-5 Gross	<b>115 134</b>	<b>117 532</b>	<b>119 934</b>	<b>122 331</b>	<b>124 732</b>	<b>127 129</b>	<b>129 531</b>	<b>131 929</b>	<b>134 329</b>	<b>136 729</b>	<b>139 129</b>	<b>141 528</b>	<b>143 929</b>		
Net D	86 791	88 422	90 055	91 685	93 318	94 948	96 581	98 212	99 844	101 476	103 108	104 739	106 372		
Net S	80 629	82 079	83 524	84 969	86 412	87 849	89 286	90 720	92 152	93 581	95 008	96 431	97 853		
P-4 Gross	<b>94 268</b>	<b>96 456</b>	<b>98 642</b>	<b>100 876</b>	<b>103 194</b>	<b>105 507</b>	<b>107 825</b>	<b>110 140</b>	<b>112 456</b>	<b>114 768</b>	<b>117 087</b>	<b>119 399</b>	<b>121 715</b>	<b>124 032</b>	<b>126 349</b>
Net D	72 373	73 948	75 522	77 096	78 672	80 245	81 821	83 395	84 970	86 542	88 119	89 691	91 266	92 842	94 417
Net S	67 395	68 829	70 263	71 691	73 120	74 548	75 975	77 399	78 822	80 244	81 664	83 083	84 502	85 918	87 334
P-3 Gross	<b>77 101</b>	<b>79 125</b>	<b>81 150</b>	<b>83 172</b>	<b>85 199</b>	<b>87 222</b>	<b>89 244</b>	<b>91 272</b>	<b>93 296</b>	<b>95 319</b>	<b>97 346</b>	<b>99 367</b>	<b>101 476</b>	<b>103 618</b>	<b>105 759</b>
Net D	60 013	61 470	62 928	64 384	65 843	67 300	68 756	70 216	71 673	73 130	74 589	76 044	77 504	78 960	80 416
Net S	56 018	57 358	58 701	60 040	61 382	62 721	64 060	65 403	66 741	68 082	69 418	70 755	72 089	73 426	74 762
P-2 Gross	<b>62 856</b>	<b>64 668</b>	<b>66 476</b>	<b>68 289</b>	<b>70 100</b>	<b>71 908</b>	<b>73 721</b>	<b>75 528</b>	<b>77 340</b>	<b>79 153</b>	<b>80 961</b>	<b>82 774</b>			
Net D	49 756	51 061	52 363	53 668	54 972	56 274	57 579	58 880	60 185	61 490	62 792	64 097			
Net S	46 669	47 853	49 032	50 214	51 394	52 576	53 778	54 975	56 178	57 377	58 574	59 776			
P-1 Gross	<b>48 627</b>	<b>50 199</b>	<b>51 933</b>	<b>53 678</b>	<b>55 414</b>	<b>57 154</b>	<b>58 896</b>	<b>60 638</b>	<b>62 374</b>	<b>64 114</b>					
Net D	39 388	40 643	41 892	43 148	44 398	45 651	46 905	48 159	49 409	50 662					
Net S	37 154	38 309	39 465	40 618	41 773	42 926	44 081	45 222	46 356	47 491					

## Annex V

### Comparison of average net remuneration of United Nations officials in the Professional and higher categories in New York and United States officials in Washington, D.C., equivalent grades (margin for calendar year 2010)

Grade	Net remuneration (United States dollars)		United Nations/United States ratio (United States, Washington, D.C. = 100)	United Nations/United States ratio adjusted for cost-of-living differential	Weights for calculation of overall ratio <sup>c</sup>
	United Nations <sup>a,b</sup>	United States			
P-1	68 276	52 116	131.0	116.2	0.4
P-2	88 625	66,681	132.9	117.9	7.3
P-3	109 613	85 707	127.9	113.5	22.9
P-4	131 303	103 842	126.4	112.2	32.7
P-5	153 368	120 249	127.5	113.1	25.6
D-1	176 542	138 661	127.3	112.9	8.4
D-2	189 831	145 827	130.2	115.5	2.8
Weighted average ratio before adjustment for New York/Washington, D.C., cost-of-living differential					127.7
New York/Washington, D.C., cost-of-living ratio					112.7
Weighted average ratio, adjusted for cost-of-living differential					113.3

<sup>a</sup> Average United Nations net salaries at dependency level by grade at multiplier 63.5 on the basis of the salary scale in effect from 1 January to 31 December 2010.

<sup>b</sup> For the calculation of the average United Nations salaries, personnel statistics of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination as at 31 December 2009 were used.

<sup>c</sup> Weights correspond to the United Nations common system staff in grades P-1 to D-2, inclusive, serving at Headquarters and established offices as at 31 December 2009.

## Annex VI

### A) Current Hardship Allowances:

#### Group 1 (P-1, P-2, P-3)

Hardship Classification	<i>With Dependent</i>	<i>Single</i>
<b>H</b>	-	-
<b>A</b>	-	-
<b>B</b>	473	354
<b>C</b>	851	638
<b>D</b>	1,134	851
<b>E</b>	1,418	1,063

#### Group 2 (P-4, P-5)

Hardship Classification	<i>With Dependent</i>	<i>Single</i>
<b>H</b>	-	-
<b>A</b>	-	-
<b>B</b>	567	425
<b>C</b>	1,039	780
<b>D</b>	1,323	993
<b>E</b>	1,701	1,276

#### Group 3 (D-1, D-2)

Hardship Classification	<i>With Dependent</i>	<i>Single</i>
<b>H</b>	-	-
<b>A</b>	-	-
<b>B</b>	662	496
<b>C</b>	1,228	922
<b>D</b>	1,512	1,134
<b>E</b>	1,890	1,418

### B) Proposed Additional Hardship for Service in Non-Family Duty Stations (US Dollars/month)

	Group 1 (P-1, P-2)	Group 2 (P-4, P-5)	Group 3 (D-1, D-2)
<i>With dependent</i>	1,418	1,701	1,890
<i>Single</i>	532	638	709

## Annex VII

### Implementation plan

Time after implementation of a decision by the General Assembly	United Nations Secretariat staff in non-family duty stations	Organizations currently using SOA or EMSEA		
		Staff currently assigned (and reassigned within the first year of implementation) for service in non-family duty stations	Staff re-assigned for service in non-family duty stations	Newly recruited staff
Immediately upon implementation (recommended to be six months after a decision by the General Assembly)	Receive additional non-family hardship element paid at POD	SOA users: Continue to receive the current SOLA amounts at APA. <sup>1</sup>  EMSEA users: Continue to receive the current EMSEA amounts.	SOA users: Continue to receive the current SOLA amounts at APA.  EMSEA users: Continue to receive the current EMSEA amounts.	All staff assigned to POD and receive Additional Non-Family Hardship Element paid at the POD.
1 <sup>st</sup> year				
2 <sup>nd</sup> year		Receive the “unified SOLA rates” published by the ICSC and applicable EMSEA rates, for the duration of their current assignment.	Receive the “Unified SOLA rates” published by the ICSC and applicable EMSEA rates	
3 <sup>rd</sup> year			Receive the “Unified SOLA rates” published by the ICSC and applicable EMSEA rates, with a reduction of 25% of the difference*	
4 <sup>th</sup> year			Receive the “Unified SOLA rates” published by the ICSC and applicable EMSEA rates, with a reduction of 50% of the difference*	
5 <sup>th</sup> year			Receive the “Unified SOLA rates” published by the ICSC and applicable EMSEA rates, with a reduction of 75% of the difference*	
6 <sup>th</sup> year		All staff assigned to POD and receive additional Non-Family Hardship Element paid at the POD.  SOA and EMESEA discontinued.	All staff assigned to POD and receive “Additional Non-Family Hardship Element” paid at the POD.  SOA and EMESEA discontinued.	

<sup>1</sup> If reassigned less than six months prior to first year after implementation, receive unified SOLA amount from beginning of reassignment

\* For SOA users: the difference is between (i) the applicable SOLA rate plus the normal hardship allowance at the APA and (ii) the normal hardship allowance plus the additional non-family hardship element at the POD.

\* For EMSEA users: the difference is between (i) the applicable EMSEA rate and (ii) the additional non-family hardship element at the POD.

**Example of how implementation of reduced amounts would be arrived at:**

Assuming implementation on 1 July 2011.

On implementation: 1 July 2011: No effect - SOLA rates paid as they are today

Year One: 1 July 2012: SOLA harmonized by Commission for every APA location. Assume an amount of \$100 for the combined harmonized SOLA and the APA hardship (rate A).

Year Two: 1 July 2013: Difference between rate (A) and (Non-Family Hardship + POD hardship = rate B) reduced by 25% = 75% of difference is payable, resulting in a reduced amount is \$75

Year Three: 1 July 2014: Difference between rate A and rate B reduced by a further 25%, in this case a total of 50% of difference, resulting in a reduced amount payable of \$50

Year Four: 1 July 2015: Difference between rate A and rate B reduced by a further 25% in this case a total of 25% of difference, resulting in a reduced amount payable of \$25

Year Five: 1 July 2016: Difference between rate A and rate B reduced by a further 25% in this case a total of 0% of difference, resulting in a reduced amount payable of \$0

## **Annex VIII**

### **Rest and Recuperation Framework**

1. Effective 1 July 2011, a harmonized common system rest and recuperation scheme will consist of four elements:

- (a) Time off, not charged to annual leave;
  - (b) Travel time;
  - (c) Contribution towards accommodation at designated place of rest and recuperation;
  - (d) Paid travel from place of duty to designated rest and recuperation location.
2. With regard to time off, the standard model is five consecutive working days. For historical reasons, the time off period for the Secretariat staff had slight variations. The harmonized approach will remain five consecutive working days, and all organizations will adjust their scheme accordingly.
3. With regard to travel time, the specifics of each location dictate the appropriate amount of time granted. Travel time is defined as the actual time spent travelling from the place of duty to the designated rest and recuperation location, by the fastest means and the most direct route. Since, in most cases, staff are obliged to travel on rest and recuperation, the organization will help meet the additional costs incurred by the staff member in finding temporary accommodation at the designated place. The accommodation portion of the daily subsistence allowance is considered the best reflection of the additional costs incurred. A calculation of an average of the accommodation portions of the daily subsistence allowance applicable to currently designated places of rest and recuperation produces an amount of \$677.57 for five days. This amount is rounded up to a flat lump sum of \$750 to include a small consideration for terminal expenses. This amount is payable only if the individual travels for rest and recuperation. It is to be paid in a flat amount, irrespective of duty station, designated place of rest and recuperation or grade of the individual.

4. With regard to paid travel, the organization will pay for the cost of travel by the cheapest and most direct route from the place of duty to the designated place of rest and recuperation. This payment can be in the form of the organization purchasing the ticket, or by providing an equivalent lump sum in order that the staff member may make his or her own arrangements. In the latter case, proof may be required that travel has actually taken place. Whenever United Nations transportation is available it will be provided free of charge, and no payment for travel costs will apply.