UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

CEB

**Chief Executives Board
for Coordination**

CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/13

20 June 2012

Report of the 24th Session of the Human Resources Network

**21-23 February 2012
United Nations, Geneva**

CONTENTS

I.   ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Opening of the Session and Adoption of the Agenda

1. The Human Resources Network held its 24th session from 21-23 February 2012 at the United Nations Office in Geneva. The meeting was co-chaired by Ms. Catherine Pollard, ASG for Human Resources Management, United Nations, Ms. Ana Luiza Thompson-Flores, Director, Human Resources Management, UNESCO, Ms. Ruth de Miranda, Chief, HR Policy Service, United Nations and Mr. Shelly Pitterman, Director, Division of HR Management, UNHCR.

2. The agenda was adopted as reflected in the table of contents.

3. The list of participating organizations and their representatives at the meeting is provided in Annex 1. All session documents are available on the HR Network website at:

<div align="center">

www.unsceb.org/ceb/mtg/hr/february-2012

</div>

II.   CLOSED MEETING FOR HR NETWORK MEMBERS

(a) Outcome/follow-up to HR Directors Strategic meeting

4. The Fourth HR Directors' Strategic Meeting was held from 19 to 20 February 2012, at the Château de Penthes, Geneva, Switzerland, facilitated by the UN System Staff College. The Agenda and Report are attached as Annexes 2 and 3 for further information.

5. The topics on the agenda were:

> ➤ talent management in a resource constrained environment;
> ➤ incentives for mobility;
> ➤ professionalization of the HR function;
> ➤ cross-cutting topic of diversity in all its forms.

6. A keynote speaker - Alex Aleinikoff, Deputy High Commissioner from UNHCR - was invited to address the group. The key messages of his speech included:

> *Things are not going to get easier.*
> 1. *Performance management is critical to the functioning of the organizations.*
> 2. *Workforce planning – we need to do it, and we cannot (20% of the people take 80% of time).*
> 3. *Flexibility – especially for field-based systems.*
> 4. *Entitlements have to be able to be explained to constituents.*
>
> *There is an integrity gap in our system. We don't hold people accountable enough.*

7. The key messages or recommendations that the meeting wished to bring to the attention of the HR Network were:

   ➢ Build a project (under HBP) on the professionalization of the HR function to develop common HR standards (such as competencies, job profiles and skills) and to build a framework for application across the organizations;
   ➢ As regards inter-agency mobility, it was suggested that an exchange or swap programme be developed for HR professionals, for limited periods of up to two years at the same grade level, (lateral move);
   ➢ Examination of methodologies and focused training on workforce planning;
   ➢ Development of a hybrid system for mandatory and optional mobility (no one size fits all): explore best practices in those organizations with a high mobility turnover;
   ➢ A Working Group to develop an exit strategy framework: this would be applicable in situations where organizations were not in a position to place staff members (in-between-assignments or unassigned);
   ➢ Revival of the Bulletin Board, and a Community of Practice;
   ➢ Opening organizational HR training to participants from other agencies.

8. As regards the proposal to develop an exit strategy framework, it was decided that UN and UNHCR would work together to collect good practices from within the organizations. It was felt that an exchange/swap programme should be handled by the HR Mobility Officers, and CEB Secretariat was requested to ensure that the list of these staff members is placed on the CEB website.

9. The HR Network decided to immediately move forward with the project on the professionalization of the HR function. The proposal should be approved at the Summer Session of the Network, for subsequent submission to the HLCM for endorsement. WFP volunteered to take the lead, with the following participating organizations: IAEA, UN, UNDP, UNFPA, UNOPS and UNRWA.

   (b) Payment of fees by organizations with observer status at the HR Network -
      CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/5

10. In February 2010, the Network had decided that observer organizations should be requested to pay USD 10,000 per biennium for participation in HR Network meetings and access to documents. However, none of these organizations had been invoiced to date, as the Secretariat had no budgetary mechanism for receiving the funds.

11. It was agreed that observer organizations would not be given access to the Field Group, as had been requested.

12. The HR Network decided that (a) the UN would examine the possibility, with the Controller, of having a dedicated budget line under the CEB Secretariat for receiving these funds, but if this was not possible, (b) the funds would be credited to the Harmonization of Business Practices budget, under HR Activities.

   (c) Statement on cost-sharing principles, for endorsement - *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/2*

13. At previous Network meetings, organizations and programme managers had discussed the difficulties that arise if organizations voluntarily participate in a programme or activity, but then

do not contribute their cost share to the programme budget. To address this issue, the CEB Secretariat prepared a document outlining the issues and requesting Organizations to give the same priority to contributions to voluntary programmes as to statutory obligations.

14. The CEB Secretariat was requested to provide a list of activities categorized as statutory and long-term temporary.

15. The HR Network endorsed the principle that once a commitment has been made to contribute to a voluntary activity, the obligation to honour that commitment is as binding as in the case of statutorily mandated activities. However, it was noted that in times of financial crisis, an Organization may be obliged to suspend payment for a limited period. In this case, as much advance warning as possible should be given, to allow for programme adjustment and if possible the amount would be made up in a subsequent year.

(d) Any Other Business

(i) Consolidation of the CEB Secretariat

16. The HR Network held informal discussions on a decision adopted by the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly[1] in which the Fifth Committee "*Recalls paragraph X. 24 of the ACABQ report (A/66/7(supp)) and requests the Secretary-General, in his capacity as the Chairman of the CEB, to consult all the participating organizations on consolidating the CEB Secretariat in the United Nations Headquarters in New York and report thereon to the General Assembly at its sixty-seventh session.*"

17. The Network noted the current dual-location arrangements of the CEB Secretariat, with the Geneva Office supporting the administrative coordination and efficiency agenda of the High Level Committee on Management (HLCM), and the New York Office supporting CEB and the High Level Committee on Programmes (HLCP).

18. The Network also noted that the majority of CEB organizations are located in Europe, including most of the Specialized Agencies, and that, within Europe, most organizations are based in Geneva.

19. The Network unanimously acknowledged the value of maintaining the currently dual-location structure of the CEB Secretariat, as it greatly contributes to the sense of ownership by all CEB member organizations in the work of CEB, and to the fair and neutral representation of the interests of all CEB's paying members. The HR Network agreed to send such a message to HLCM.

(ii) Pay freeze

20. The CEB Secretariat informed the HR Network that a message on the potential pay freeze had been sent to all members of HLCM, seeking their opinion. A compilation of responses would be made available to the Network. Attention was also drawn to the memorandum from the ICSC Secretariat to the Office of Legal Affairs, requesting an opinion on the authority of the ICSC to implement a pay freeze. The OLA opinion would be critical in allowing the work of the ICSC to move forward.

---

[1] Adopted on 23 December 2011. A/C.5/66/L.18, paragraph 111, referring to Section 32 (Jointly financed administrative services).

21. The HR Network recalled that the organizations have been facing serious budgetary constraints for many years, and are fully in tune with the present economic situation. Prior to August 2011, staff in New York received their last salary increase in 2008, despite increases in the comparator civil service in 2008, 2009 and 2010. The organizations have nevertheless implemented a series of austerity measures in order to manage with limited resources to cut costs and to streamline. These measures include – but are not limited to - cutting posts, organizational restructuring, massive reductions in document production, and savings under travel conditions. In addition, conservative and pragmatic decisions have been taken by the ICSC for several years now, when adjusting allowances and benefits.

22. The HR Network agreed that it should not enter the political arena, but this would be at the risk of the General Assembly taking its own decisions. There was consensus, however, that human resources concerns must be highlighted, as the impact of a pay freeze would severely compromise the Organizations' ability to attract and retain highly-qualified staff and to replace a large number of forthcoming retirees. The compensation package of the UN common system organizations is already less attractive than that of organizations such as the World Bank and the European Union. Executive Heads understand the pressure being brought to bear by Member States in demanding that organizations be transformational and deliver on results, but are concerned about the long-term impact on staff and Organizations.

III.   OTHER ISSUES FOR THE HR NETWORK'S CONSIDERATION

23. The staff federations and the observer organizations were welcomed to the meeting. FICSA had just finished its 65th Council, where the Secretary-General had addressed the meeting. The Network congratulated Mauro Pace on his re-election as President. Both FICSA and CCISUA indicated their keen interest in many of the important items on the HR Network agenda, including Standards of Conduct and danger pay.

   (a) **Dual Career and Staff Mobility Programme -** *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/9*

24. As the Programme Coordinator would be leaving at the end of March 2012 and the Network had requested the functions of the programme be mainstreamed into the HR Officer role, the presentation focused on the actions to be completed before the end of the biennium.

25. While some Local Expatriate Spouse Associations (LESAs) are very strong (notably in the headquarters duty stations and Latin America), it must be remembered that the LESAs are staffed by voluntary workers who often move on once they have found employment themselves. The establishment of the Global Expatriate Spouse Association (GESA) would relieve the pressure on the LESAs. The GESA would however need to be supported by a network of HR Officers with mobility in their portfolios, so as to secure organizations' inclusion of UN family issues at all duty stations.

26. The Network was informed that although the issue of work permits was a difficult one, the Toolkit was being used by Resident Coordinators, and progress was being made.

27. As regards the financial situation, a larger roll-over than expected resulted from the departure of the Legal Officer. Website costs will be reduced as a result of working with UNDP Teamworks, which should be completed before the summer. Funding looked to be assured until the foreseen closure of the programme at the end of 2013.

28. CCISUA expressed disappointment at the closure of the programme, and felt that mainstreaming into the HR function would not be as effective. Several Organizations indicated that the mainstreaming effort was critical. Networking was very important, as was the involvement of spouses and partners.

29. The HR Network thanked the Programme Coordinator for her energy and constancy since the inception of the DC&SM Programme and wished her well for the future. The Network felt that from now to the end of 2013, it should not be "business as usual" but rather that an orderly wind-down should take place while the GESA and the network of HR Officers with mobility roles are built up. There were still many issues to be addressed, such as same-sex and domestic partnerships, and continuity of the Programme should be maintained in its new form.

(b) Work-Life Balance - *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/3*

30. The CEB Secretariat presented the document, which set out an analysis of a survey undertaken amongst the Organizations. It drew attention to the fact that there was an 82 per cent compliance rate with Standard I, and 68 per cent with Standard II. Requests for facilities under the heading of work-life balance were being received more and more from younger staff. Staff associations had a key role to play, and could contribute greatly to the communications effort.

31. Several Organizations requested that in future updates, more measurable indicators of impact and success be included. The Secretariat recalled that it was only possible to analyse information provided by the Organizations – more detailed data was required to proceed with a more in-depth analysis.

(c) Harmonization of Business Practices

32. **General update by HBP Coordinator:** a meeting with donors was held on 1 December 2011. While the donors were pleased with progress being made they wished to see more performance indicators and results-based work. Of the budget of USD 10.5 million, USD 4.6 million had already been allocated, and another USD 2.5 million was about to be allocated. The projects on vendor eligibility and treasury services had been completed (with anticipated savings of USD 10-20 million per year). Collaborative procurement of vehicles was likely to produce savings of USD 30 million per annum. ICT harmonization was about to start in Mozambique and Tanzania; the financial statistics database project was on track and should be online by June 2012. Collaboration was underway with UNSSC to integrate HBP into staff training programmes. The Coordinator looked forward to working with the lead agency on the proposed project on professionalization of the HR function.

33. UNESCO indicated that it was still keen to take the lead on the project regarding **recruitment and selection processes for local staff in the field**. Given that Organization's particular circumstances, the start of work had been delayed, but was now scheduled for April 2012. UNESCO may need to request some funding from the HBP project.

34. In response to a question about the status of the report on **non-staff personnel**, the Secretariat indicated that the report was still being edited. The Organizations wished to see the final version before it was posted on the web or transmitted elsewhere.

35. **Working Group on performance appraisal systems:** as lead agency, UNOPS presented document *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/6*. Each Organization believes its own performance appraisal

system to be unique, but the Working Group is looking for common elements. The work of the Group is on track: three teleconferences have been held; a questionnaire has been developed and circulated to Organizations – 24 responses have been received. Further analysis of the responses will be completed by the end of February; the objectives for senior managers will be completed by the end of March, and the final report will be available by April. Working Group participants were thanked for their participation and enthusiasm.

36. FICSA indicated that its Council had requested a similar piece of work, and wondered why the staff had not been included in the HR Network Working Group. FICSA was informed that, at this stage, staff participation went beyond the mandate of the Group.

(d) Security Staff Screening and Vetting Policy - *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/12*

37. In presenting this document, the UN Secretariat indicated that there had been problems with persons currently working for the UN system. It would be desirable for Governments to indicate whether their national security staff had been screened, before starting work with the UN. However, vetting for human rights violations did not normally involve individuals, but rather national entities.

38. Several organizations indicated that they were carrying out screening/vetting processes but that they would like to be more rigorous, and learn more from the experiences of others.

39. Outsourcing, with possible economies of scale, was also discussed briefly, but questions were raised about the accountability of those conducting the screening/vetting.

40. The HR Network would be interested in participating in a working group to develop a policy on security staff screening and vetting. It was felt that this work could also be useful for staff other than security staff.

(e) UN Stress Counsellors - *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/8*

41. The representative of the UN Staff/Stress Counsellors Special Interest Group (UNSSCG) highlighted the fact that the Group works without a budget, and thanked those Organizations who were willing to release colleagues to participate in activities of the Group. She offered to provide either information sessions or training on specific topics which might be of interest to the Network.

42. In response to questions on the Abuja tragedy, the representative indicated that Counsellors had reported the usefulness of the link with human resources departments, in explaining the next steps to staff and their families. As regards outsourcing of the counselling function, this was not a practical solution for "deep field" locations as a sound understanding of the work and mandate of the organization are crucial. If needed, however, staff in need of long-term care are referred to other sources although "medicalization" of cases should nevertheless be avoided. The representative agreed that the development of success indicators, as well as consistent reporting to the Network on impact and costs would be a positive move.

43. Organizations and staff federations expressed great appreciation for the work of the UNSSCG. The CEB Secretariat confirmed that the Confidentiality Guidelines that had previously been agreed, could be published forthwith.

(f) HR Network Workplan - *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/11/Rev. 1*

44. Despite the fact that the Workplan format presented had been in use for several years, the HR Network decided that it no longer served a useful purpose in helping the Network to achieve its deliverables.

45. The CEB Secretariat agreed to re-work the Workplan and circulate it to Network members as soon as possible.

(g) Update from Field Group – *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/10*

46. UNDP, as Chair of the Field Group, presented the document and stressed that it had been a very challenging year as regards crisis responses. The Group was also extremely disappointed by the way in which drawing up the list of non-family duty stations for the new safety and security system had been handled – it had expected far more guidance in this regard from DSS. The implementation of the new R&R framework, particularly the four-week cycle, was proving to be more problematic than anticipated and appeared to be causing operational difficulties.

47. Some field-based Organizations highlighted problems encountered with R&R locations and visas for family members, and counted on the support of Member States in this regard.

48. CCISUA's statement supported many of the points made by the Organizations: administrative decisions which lag behind conditions on the ground cause major problems for staff members and their families. Financial implications and cost-savings should not be the compelling factor in deciding on the administration of conditions of service. Staff welfare and morale should be the primary consideration. CCISUA expressed concerns about the implementation of R&R. It also requested that staff representatives be included in discussions on these issues, whenever appropriate.

49. UNDP circulated some initial baseline staffing data indicators in non-family duty stations and called for Field Group members to give their feedback on these indicators as soon as possible.

50. The HR Network approved the recommendation that ICSC be approached with a request for more flexibility and less automaticity in the implementation of the new R&R framework.

51. It was also agreed that Field Group members would make contact with the ICSC Secretariat during the forthcoming ICSC session to clarify processes and procedures, particularly on the declaration of non-family status for duty stations. The outcome of that collaboration, hopefully in the form of a work-flow, would then be documented for the record.

52. The CEB Secretariat indicated that the report on non-staff personnel would soon be available in final form, although it was having difficulty identifying a suitable resource person to carry out phase II (financial implications). It was decided that a day would be added to the next Field Group meeting with a view to discussing non-staff personnel and ironing out some of the inconsistencies of treatment between Organizations. The HR Network requested the CEB Secretariat to ensure that phase II was completed and ready for submission to the Summer session of the Network.

53. The HR Network agreed that the Terms of Reference of the Field Group must be finalized as soon as possible.

54. The HR Network also agreed that work should move forward as quickly as possible on the unintended consequences of the new security provisions.

  (h) **UN Cares -** *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/4*

55. The CEB Secretariat presented the document, on behalf of the UN Cares Programme Coordinator.

56. In response to questions, the Secretariat indicated that the final version of the evaluation report would be submitted to the HR Network at its Summer Session. As regards the indicative apportionment of the budget, it was noted that the percentages were based on 2009 personnel statistics. In case of a budgetary shortfall, staff positions would not be filled.

57. UNICEF drew attention to its project, being piloted in 10 countries, to provide full insurance coverage for HIV. With a view to achieving economies of scale, UNICEF called upon other Organizations to join this initiative. Several Organizations indicated their interest, but it was acknowledged that the different health insurance plans in existence could complicate their participation. A set of options would be prepared by UN Cares for discussion at the Network's Summer session.

  (i) **Inter-organization Mobility Agreement -** *CEB/2012/HLCM/HR/7*

58. The document was presented by the UN Secretariat on behalf of the Working Group. Even the smallest substantive changes had been difficult to approve, due mainly to legal and compliance concerns. The document submitted was therefore limited to editorial changes, with the exception of two changes: "summary dismissal" had been replaced by "separation" in paragraph 9, and the notion of administrative leave, or special leave, had been introduced in paragraph 10.

59. It was agreed that commitments entered into under the Accord would be honoured, but that the revised Agreement would be implemented as of 1 January 2012. In addition, because of the need for clarification by the UN Secretariat as to application to UN sub-entities, the Agreement would be put forward without the list of signatories. The CEB Secretariat would proceed with a formal ratification process, once HLCM's endorsement had been received.

60. The HR Network approved the document for submission to HLCM.

61. The HR Network unanimously agreed that inter-agency mobility was a positive element of international civil service. However, the "devil was in the detail" and the operational modalities were causing the biggest problems. The HR Network proceeded to a substantive debate, in a closed session, on the barriers to inter-agency mobility. The issues which appeared to be of key concern to the majority of Organizations were:
    ▪ the unwillingness of some Organizations to agree to secondments, mainly because of the "right of return" concept;
    ▪ recognition of higher grade and contractual status;
    ▪ internal status of mobile staff.

62. The HR Network agreed to organize a video-tele-conference open to all Organizations, under the leadership of the UN Secretariat, followed by a smaller Working Group if necessary. In

preparation for these events, the CEB Secretariat was requested to assemble a maximum amount of documentation on mobility policies in the Organizations.

(j) Any other business:

63. The meeting welcomed two Inspectors and the Executive Secretary of the Joint Inspection Unit, who made very interesting presentations.

64. *JIU Draft report on "The management of sick leave in the United Nations system" (JIU/REP/2012/A362).* Inspector Chulkov said that 23 of the 34 responding Organizations had indicated that sick leave was not an issue; however, only 10 Organizations were able to provide supporting data. The HR and FB Networks would be requested to develop a methodology for determining both the direct and indirect costs of sick leave. In this context, it would also be necessary to enable reporting on the family-related emergency leave taken within the uncertified sick leave entitlement, in order to limit conclusions on financial impact to sick leave only.

65. Given that medical services in the Organizations did not deal with sick leave management, a separate function was recommended – probably in HR departments – to deal with this issue. One of the main aims would be to gain deeper understanding of the health and mental problems in different duty stations and what can and should be done to prevent/treat them.

66. It was suggested that benchmarks be established with entities outside the UN system, to measure the extent of absenteeism.

67. To the extent possible, comments from Organizations would be incorporated in the final report, which would become available in April 2012.

68. Inspector Chulkov also informed the meeting that there would shortly be a study on lump sum practices. A questionnaire would be sent out to Organizations in March of this year.

69. *JIU draft report on "Staff Recruitment and Selection in United Nations system organizations: A comparative analysis and benchmarking framework" (JIU/REP/2012/A365).* Inspector Fall introduced this report, clarifying that it would not be touching upon placement and promotion. The draft report would be available for formal comment within the next two to three months, but he urged Organizations to provide their comments on the benchmarks and recommendations as soon as possible, in anticipation of the report.

70. One Organization noted that recruitment is one of the most strategic responsibilities within the HR function, as bad recruitment is costly and damages the reputation of the Organization. Organizations were encouraged to forge stronger links amongst themselves to share rosters, reference checks, etc. E-recruitment systems could be used to better effect, although Inspector Fall warned against possible misuse of technology.

71. The HR Network thanked the JIU Inspectors for the useful interaction on these topics.

IV.   ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION BY ICSC

1.   Conditions of service applicable to both categories of staff: Education grant: review of the methodology for determining the grant (ICSC/74/R.5)

72. The HR Network welcomed Mr. Orlov from the ICSC Secretariat. In presenting the document, he indicated that the review had mushroomed into a major exercise, although this had not been the original intention. Depending on the outcome of the Commission's consideration of this item, the methodology would be re-written.

73. Several Organizations requested additional information on the impact of the proposals both on staff and on the Organizations. The issue of special measures was of great concern. Mr. Orlov indicated that the Chairman had the delegated authority to approve special measures only in case of an exceptional increase in fees in between two reviews. The revised proposed ceilings and country groupings should reduce the number of special measure duty stations.

74. Organizations did not agree generally on the proposals made in the document regarding zoning, or grouping of countries. There was no consensus on the suggestion to create a separate zone for Canada. If this were to be done, how could one justify not doing the same for Thailand, for example, where the number of claims was much higher than in Canada.

75. A suggestion was made that more attention be given to a possible lump-summing solution. However, Mr. Orlov pointed out that there would be winners and losers in that solution too , and that there did not appear to be a strong will to move in this direction.

76. The Organizations felt that there was no real equity in the present system, particularly as regards staff covered by the "USD outside the US" ceiling.

ICSC Decision:

The Commission took the following decisions on the methodology to determine the education grant:

   (a)   The underlying philosophy of the grant should be maintained;

   (b)   The list of admissible expenses under education grant claims should be revised to include the following items:

      i.   Tuition certified by the schools;

      ii.   Mother-tongue tuition certified by the schools;

      iii.   Transportation costs to and from the place of education for the primary/secondary levels;

      iv.   Registration/admission fees including examination fees required for the admission certified by the schools; and

      v.   Books/textbooks, computer usage fees and laboratory fees.

   (c)   In principle, a global lump-sum, applied to all currency/country zones, should be introduced for reimbursement of books/text books, computer usage and laboratory fees mandatory in the school curricula with the specific level to be determined at the seventy-fifth session of ICSC;

   (d)   Capital assessment fees;

   (e)   Flat rate for boarding;

   (f)   The list of admissible expenses for special education grant cases should be expanded to include transportation, counselling fee, orientation fee, visual education and alternative modes of communication;

   (g)   Currency/country zone-specific flat rates should exclusively be used to reimburse the boarding costs when the eligibility for boarding reimbursement is verified by the organizations, with the specific level of the flat rates to be determined at the seventy-fifth session of ICSC;

(h) The list of representative schools should be revised to exclude the post-secondary institutions which would be replaced by the following primary/secondary in the following country/currency areas:

   (i) Japan - Seisen International School;

   (ii) United Kingdom - Felsted Preparatory School, Royal Russel School, Cranleigh School, Saint Margaret School;

   (iii) United States - Washington International School, Thornton Donovan School, Sacred Heart School;

   (iv) Chile - San Cristobal;

   (v) Lebanon - American Community School;

   (vi) Canada - Lower Canada College.

The Commission deferred its consideration of other proposals relating to the review of the methodology to determine the education grant and requested its secretariat to collect, in coordination with the CEB secretariat, additional information, conduct further study and make proposals on the following items at the seventy-fifth session of ICSC:

   (i) Criteria for grouping countries and currency areas;

   (ii) Determining and adjusting flat rates for boarding;

   (iii) Financial implications of separating the reimbursement of one-time capital assessment fees;

   (iv) Feasibility of determining the maximum admissible expenses based on the tuition fees of representative schools;

   (v) Criteria for the implementation of special measures.

2. **Conditions of service of the Professional and higher categories: United Nations/United States net remuneration margin: review of the methodology (ICSC/74/R.6)**

77. The HR Network wished to discuss ICSC/74/R.6 and CRP.8 (see agenda item below) together, as the two subjects could not be separated.

78. In presenting document R.6, the ICSC Secretariat indicated that this was a technical and conceptual document. As regards the grade equivalency study, obtaining data was problematic following changes in the pay structures of the comparator. It was not necessary to carry out such a study every five years – a study could be undertaken at the time of changes in specific areas. At present 23 jobs were being compared – these could be grouped. Corporate bonuses are currently included whereas individual bonuses are excluded. The levels of bonuses, which had increased when locality pay was removed, would certainly decrease in the light of the present financial situation. As regards weights, these could either be fixed, or a sliding average could be developed, which would have a less radical impact. Attention was drawn to the fact that the ratio between dependency and single rates had changed.

79. In response to a question concerning the use of the Foreign Service for comparison purposes, it was recalled that the Commission had systematically refused this in the past. The margin incorporates an expatriate element. A note of caution was raised regarding a total compensation comparison. Such a comparison includes *all* elements of the compensation package (social security, leave etc.) and the outcome may not be favourable for the UN system.

ICSC Decision:

The Commission decided to keep the United Nations/United States net remuneration margin methodology under review by requesting its secretariat to explore further alternative approaches to establishing the grade equivalencies, which were of fundamental importance to the comparisons, and to report back to it at a later session.

---

3. **Resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its sixty-sixth session of concern to the Commission (ICSC/74/R.2)**

4. **Feasibility and suitability of reflecting the pay freeze of the comparator civil service in the administration of the post adjustment system (ICSC/74/CRP.8)**

80. The ICSC Secretariat informed the meeting that a questionnaire to Organizations will shortly be circulated, to obtain information on HR initiatives.

81. In addressing CRP.8, the ICSC Secretariat indicated that technically a pay freeze was possible. As regards compensation, the UN and US systems do not move in parallel. The US system looks at the private sector (cost of labour) whereas the UN system looks at purchasing power parity (cost of living). The link between these two systems is made through the margin. If the margin moves outside the 110-120 range, an adjustment is made through the post adjustment system. Any change in the margin range or desirable mid-point of 115 is the prerogative of the General Assembly.

82. In response to questions as to the impact on the European duty stations, which were due for review in April 2012, the ICSC Secretariat explained that the movement in the post adjustment index for New York would be measured over the period August 2011 (date of last post adjustment increase in New York) and April 2012. That percentage movement would be deducted from any increase due to the European duty stations, and the review date for New York would be reset.

83. The greatest concern of the Organizations was that whatever solution was decided upon by the ICSC, it must be implemented in a way that would be possible to reverse at the end of the freeze. Austerity measures have already been in place in the Organizations for quite some time; any additional irreversible measures would severely compromise the Organizations' ability to attract and retain highly-qualified professional staff.

84. FICSA stated that the present economic situation is not an overnight phenomenon. Methodologies should not be bypassed in order to fix a potentially short-term problem. Temporary problems cannot be fixed through long-term structural changes. The independence of the General Assembly's advisory bodies is being compromised.

85. CCISUA warned that there would probably be a strong staff reaction to any decision which does not respect the general principles and technical soundness of the existing methodologies.

ICSC Decision:

The International Civil Service Commission decided to report to the General Assembly that:

(a) The Commission did not have the authority to take measures in the administration of the

post adjustment system that were not consistent with the United Nations/United States margin methodology, as established by the General Assembly;

(b) The existing mechanisms for adjusting United Nations salaries were working well and it was therefore not convinced of the suitability of introducing additional measures to reflect, in the administration of the post adjustment, the pay freeze in the comparator civil service;

(c) If the General Assembly decided that such additional measures were necessary, it would be technically possible to implement them in the post adjustment system on the basis of the margin management arrangements already in place. In that case, it would be desirable that any such measure be a one-time event, with a finite duration.

5. Conditions of service applicable to both categories of staff: Performance management: performance rewards and recognition (ICSC/74/R.3)

86. The document was presented by Ms. Leichner-Boyce from the ICSC Secretariat, who explained that it aimed to provide guidance to organizations on rewards and recognition within the broader framework of performance management and sought to provide options for using salary step increments as a means of rewarding exceptional performance.

87. The HR Network felt that progress had been made and that the document contained several valuable ideas. It was recalled, however, that performance management was the prerogative of each Organization, and that the ICSC's document would serve as guidelines and recommendations for implementation, according to each Organization's culture.

88. The Network was surprised that several of the options proposed were based on the use of within-grade steps, as this was contrary to previous advice from the Commission, and were felt to resemble previous initiatives to implement pay for performance, which had been unsuccessful. The options generally were felt to be too prescriptive.

89. Further elaboration on intrinsic rewards would be welcome, as financial incentives were felt to be ineffective. The suggestions for decentralization of performance rewards and recognition to line managers were welcomed, although a monitoring function would be required to ensure equitable application. Additional measures for dealing with under-performance should be examined.

90. Above all, any performance management system must be credible, before rewards and recognition could be introduced.

ICSC Decision:

The Commission decided:

(a) To encourage the organizations to use the existing recognition and reward framework, including both cash and non-cash awards;

(b) It would take up the matter again when the Human Resources Network had shared the report of its upcoming working group on this issue with the Commission; in the meantime, the secretariat of the Commission would work closely with the Human Resources Network to identify means of recognizing exceptional performance.

---

6. Conditions of service in the field:

(a) Review of security evacuation allowance and extended monthly security evacuation allowance (ICSC/74/R.7)

91. In presenting the document, the ICSC Secretariat drew attention to the proposal for one universal rate of SEA which was based on the average DSA of safe-haven locations. The amount had been increased from USD 160 to USD 200 two years ago, and the proposal recommended the *status quo*, with a review of the level in three years' time, in the light of current financial constraints. It was recommended that the USD 500 shipping allowance be maintained.

92. The Organizations noted that while the methodology indicated that USD 249 would be the appropriate level, with USD 235 if Dubai were excluded, the recommendation nevertheless maintained the current level of USD 200. The integrity of the methodology was therefore questioned. Dubai remains a major hub for evacuations. The Organizations and staff federations could not understand the logic for excluding that city from the calculations, simply for cost considerations, all the more so since this would pose practical difficulties for staff members who are forced to be evacuated there. The position of the ICSC Secretariat was extremely difficult for the Organizations to support and justify to their staff.

93. Many concerns were expressed at the recommended discontinuation of EMSEA, which had been done for reasons of simplicity according to the ICSC Secretariat. The lack of clarity in the new procedures for declaring non-family status meant that there could potentially be a gap between the end of SEA payment and declaration of non-family status (and payment of EMSEA). Delays - conceivably due to political considerations - in declaring non-family status would not only add to the already high stress levels of staff, but could lead to *ad hoc* and non-harmonized agency-specific solutions.

ICSC Decision:

The Commission decided to defer its discussion of the security evacuation allowance until its seventy-fifth session, to be held in the third quarter of 2012.

(b) Danger pay for General Service staff: possibility of de-linking pay from salary scales (ICSC/74/R.8)

94. In introducing this document, the ICSC Secretariat recalled that Hazard Pay would stop on 1 March 2012 in favour of Danger Pay and the new criteria for its application. The list of duty stations to which Danger Pay would apply was still awaited.

95. The Organizations and staff federations expressed disappointment at the content of this document. Local staff were just as vulnerable, if not more so, as international staff. In the interests of equity, local staff should receive increases similar to those of international staff. The solution to this would be to maintain the link to the mid-point of the local scales, and calculate Danger Pay at 30 per cent of that mid-point, with an adjustment at the time of each revision of the salary scale.

96. FICSA stated that the proposal to delink seemed to arise solely from financial considerations. The number of staff who would be eligible for Danger Pay was greatly reduced. The cost of the increase granted to Professional staff should not be offset to the detriment of local staff.

97. UNRWA wished it to be noted for the record that UN common system security provisions do not apply to nationals employed by UNRWA, and that the Organization has its own provisions.

98. The HR Network concluded that none of the options included in the document were acceptable. The HR Network could not accept either a global amount or a freeze for local staff, but wished to insist on Danger Pay for local staff being set at 30 per cent of the midpoint of the salary scale.

99. Another issue of extreme concern was the fact that the list of duty stations to which Danger Pay would be applicable was still not available at the time of the meeting. With an implementation date of 1 March 2012, this gave little or no time for Organizations to communicate with their staff on the new provisions. They would propose to the Commission that implementation be deferred to 1 July, in line with the implementation of other security provisions, to allow time for proper communication with staff.

ICSC Decision

The Commission decided:

(a)   To extend hazard pay until 31 March 2012 and to implement danger pay as of 1 April 2012 for both internationally recruited and locally recruited staff;

(b)   To increase the level of danger pay effective 1 January 2013 to 30 per cent of the net midpoint of the applicable 2012 General Service salary scales of those duty stations qualifying for danger pay;

(c)   To subsequently delink danger pay effective 1 January 2013 from the applicable General Service salary scales;

(d)   To review the level of danger pay for locally recruited staff at the same time as the level for internationally recruited staff is reviewed;

(e)   To request its secretariat to put forward options to address the methodology for adjustment of danger pay for both categories of staff at its seventy-fifth session.

---

7.   Conditions of service applicable to both categories of staff : Standards of conduct (ICSC/74/R.4)

100. In presenting this report of the Working Group on Standards of Conduct, the ICSC Secretariat indicated that standards of conduct were a core element of ICSC's work. New elements included clauses on whistleblowing and accountability. However, there was no consensus in the Working Group on paragraph 37 of the document, which is why it was still bracketed.

101. CCISUA presented a revised text for paragraph 37.

102. The ICSC Secretariat explained that as the text was the result of the Working Group's deliberations, it was not possible to make changes to the document. If approved by the Commission, the document should be implemented in January 2013. Individual codes of ethics could be developed, based on the Standards of Conduct.

103. Noting that the text would have to be approved by each Organization's governance structure before implementation, the HR Network took note of the document and thanked the Working Group for its work.

ICSC Decision

The Commission decided to submit to the General Assembly for its approval the revised standards of conduct for the international civil service as contained in the annex:

1. Request organizations to implement the revised standards of conduct as of 1 January 2013;

2. Request organizations to reflect the revised standards of conduct in their legal framework as well as reinforce them through staff regulations and rules;

3. Request its secretariat to monitor implementation of the revised standards in the organizations of the United Nations common system and provide a status report thereon at the 2015 summer session;

4. Highlight the importance of developing and implementing a set of common post-employment policies in the organizations of the United Nations system and CEB to prevent any conflict of interest.

V.   DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS AMONG HR NETWORK MEMBERS ON MAIN ICSC ISSUES

104. The HR Network dedicated this session to finalization of its statements to the ICSC.

Annex 1 - List of Participants

Org.	Name	Title
UNNY	Ms. Catherine POLLARD	ASG for HR Management
UNNY	Ms. Ruth DE MIRANDA	Chief, HR Policy Service
UNNY	Mr. Patrick VOIGT	HR Officer, Policy & Conditions of Service Section
ILO	Mr. Paulo BARCIA	Director, HR Development Department
ILO	Mr. Juan LLOBERA	Chief of the HR Policies and Development Branch
FAO	Mr. Tony ALONZI	Director, HR Management Division
UNESCO	Ms. Ana Luiza THOMPSON-FLORES	Director, HR Management
ICAO	Ms. Kamini BALRAM	Chief, Staff Services Section
WHO	Monika ALTMAIER	Director, HR Management
UPU	Mr. Marc DETTMAR	HR Expert of HR Strategy and Planning
UPU	Ms Rasyidah ABDOERRACHMAN	HR Expert, HR Department
ITU	Ms. Julia WATT	Chief, HR Management Department
WMO	Mr. Shuibao LIU	Chief, HR Division
IFAD	Mr. Michael GEHRINGER	Director, HR Division
IFAD	Ms. Giorgia SALUCCI	Team Leader, HR Operations
WIPO	Ms. Thérèse DAYER	Acting Director, HRM Department
WIPO	Ms. Adelaïde BARBIER	Head, Org. Design, Workforce Planning/Resourcing Section
UNIDO	Ms. Okusitina BULAVAKARUA	Chief, HR Planning and Development Unit
IAEA	Mr. Doug NORTHEY	Director, Division of HR
UNDP	Ms. Cihan SULTANOGLU	Director, Office of HR, Bureau of Management
UNDP	Ms. Henrietta DE BEER	Chief, Policy and Compensation Unit, OHR
UNHCR	Mr. Shelly PITTERMAN	Director, Division of HR Management
UNHCR	Ms. Duda SUZIC	Chief, Staff Services Section, DHRM
UNICEF	Ms. Sally FEGAN-WYLES	Director a.i., Division HR
UNICEF	Mr. Peter FROBEL	Senior HR Policy Specialist
UNFPA	Ms. Sarah ROSE	HR Policy and Planning Specialist
UNOPS	Mr. Pierre MOREAU-PERON	Director, HR
UNOPS	Mr. Nasser SHAMMOUT	Deputy Director, HR
WFP	Ms. Ruth GROVE	Acting Director, HR Division
WFP	Ms. Nana Yaa NIKOI	Chief, HR Policy and Staff Relations
UNAIDS	Ms. Nancy RAPHAEL	Chief, HR Management
UNAIDS	Ms. Sigrid KRANAWETTER	Senior Adviser (HR Policy and Legal), HR Management
PAHO	Ms. Kate ROJKOV	Manager, HR Management
PAHO	Mr. Paul DE LA CROIX-VAUBOIS	Advisor, Compensation and Entitlements Mgt, HRM
UNRWA	Ms. Cornelia MOUSSA	Director, HR
ITC	Mr. Carl ROGERSON	Chief, HR
IOM	Mr. Michael EMERY	Director, HR Management
IOM	Ms. Daniela KABILJO	HRM Advisor
OSCE	Ms. Françoise NOCQUET	Director, HR
WTO	Mr. Bernie SHEEHAN	Head, Staff Administrative Services
CEB	Mr. Remo LALLI	Secretary, High Level Committee on Management
CEB	Ms. Sue HUDSON	Acting Senior Inter-Agency Advisor, HR Management
CEB	Mr. Ronny LINDSTROM	Senior Advisor on Harmonization of Business Practices

CEB	Ms. Petra TEN-HOOPE BENDER	HR Programme Coordinator, Staff Mobility, Work/Life Balance and Staff Wellbeing
ICSC	Ms. Marta LEICHNER-BOYCE	Chief, HR Policies Division
ICSC	Mr. Yuri ORLOV	Chief, Salaries and Allowances Division
JIU	Mr. Nikolay CHULKOV	Inspector
JIU	Mr. Papa Louis FALL	Inspector
JIU	Ms. Susanne FRUEH	Executive Secretary
JIU	Ms. Maria GOMEZ	Senior Evaluation and Inspection Officer
JIU	Mr. Ruvan DE ALWIS	Evaluation and Inspection Officer
FICSA	Mr. Mauro PACE	President
FICSA	Ms. Marie Thérèse CONILH DE BEYSSAC	General Secretary
FICSA	Mr. Edmond MOBIO	(Regional and Field Issues)
FICSA	Ms. Leslie EWART	Research Officer
CCISUA	Mr. Christopher LAND-KAZLAUSKAS	Chairperson, Staff Union Committee of ILO

Annex 2

**Agenda of the HR Directors' Strategic Meeting
Geneva, 19-20 February 2012**

Sunday 19 Feb 2011

Times	Sessions
17:00 – 18:30	**Registration, welcome and meeting opening**
19:30	**Dinner**, with **key note speaker**, **Deputy High Commissioner Mr. Aleinikoff, UNHCR** *Strategic management of talent, diversity and mobility in the UN and other international entities – transforming HR to meet challenges of the times*

Monday 20 Feb 2011

9:00 – 9:30	**1.1 Day 2 Opening** – with **Ms. Catherine Pollard, ASG for HR Management, UNNY**
9:30 – 10:30	**1.2 Experience with *diversity,* and links with *mobility and talent management*** with **Ms. Nancy Raphael, Division Chief, HR Management, UNAIDS**
11:00 – 12:00	**1.3 Mobility** with **Ms. Petra Ten Hoope-Bender, HR Programme Coordinator, CEB Secretariat,** and **Debaters**

12:00 – 12:30	**1.4 Introduction to force-field analysis, working groups on meeting themes**
	
	Meeting themes – participants self-select working groups
	
	    A) talent management in a resource-constrained international environment (UN)
	
	    B) diversity considerations, influence on talent management and mobility in UN
	
	    C) mobility as an aspect of talent and career management in international systems / UN
	
	    D) professionalizing the HR function – grooming leaders for the UN now and future

13:30 – 15:00	**1.4 Force-field analysis of four meeting themes**
15:00 – 15:30	*Break and viewing by participants of posted "gallery" visuals from first part of session 1.4*
15:30 – 16:00	**1.4 Force-field analysis** *continuing*
16:00 – 17:00	**1.5 Report-backs and discussion on main themes from 1.4 analysis**
17:00 – 17:30	**1.6 Distilling key conclusions and recommendations to HR Network**
17:30 – 17:45	**1.7 Closing and evaluation**

Note on "Diversity": broad scope for "diversity" is to be set and requested of all resource people and participants, encompassing sex, age, nationality, disability, religion, domestic partnership status, geography.

Note on "Professionalization of HR leaders": within talent management, a strategic priority for discussion for all groups.

Annex 3

CEB HR Directors' Strategic Meeting

Château de Penthes, Geneva
19-20 February 2012

SUMMARY RECORD

PART I – INTRODUCTION

1. The fourth annual HR Directors meeting was held in Geneva, Switzerland, facilitated by Jafar Jafan, Deputy Director and Head of Programmes, and Patricia Keays, Lead Facilitator both of the United Nations System Staff College, in close coordination with the CEB Secretariat. The list of participants is attached as Annex A.

2. The underlying aim of the meeting was to provide a forum in a semi-informal setting, for HR Directors to discuss strategic issues pertaining to their work as well as the many challenges they face.

3. The format of this fourth meeting was different in that it took the form more of a workshop; for the first time, the Directors were given the possibility of being accompanied by a senior deputy.

4. The meeting was informed that in view of its non-statutory status, an *informal* summary record would be produced by the CEB Secretariat.

5. Three main themes were proposed as part of the Agenda, allowing for flexibility as the discussions took shape:
   i) Talent management in a resource constrained environment;
   ii) Incentives for mobility;
      ➢ Cross-cutting topic: diversity in all its forms;
   iii) Professionalization of the HR function.

6. A keynote speaker - Alex Aleinikoff, Deputy High Commissioner of UNHCR - was invited to address the group. His provocative presentation elicited a lively question and answer session. The key messages of his speech were:

> **Things are not going to get easier.**
>   5. **<u>Performance </u>has to be critical.**
>   6. **<u>Workforce planning </u>– we need to do it, and we cannot (20% of the people take 80% of time).**
>   7. **<u>Flexibility </u>– especially for field-based systems.**
>   8. **<u>Entitlements</u> have to be able to be explained to constituents.**
>
> **There is an integrity gap in our system. We don't hold people accountable enough.**

PART II – INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS

7. In his introductory remarks, Jafar Javan said that the reason for the gathering was exactly what the College is all about – the repository of interagency knowledge and its business of knowledge management. The College identifies, generates, codifies and shares knowledge and through its learning events, applies it. The College is a partner to the Organizations, to help them go through this cycle, and whenever help is required, the College will gladly organize training and/or learning events so that new knowledge, lessons or good practices can be shared amongst staff responsible for the HR function.

8. The College's Director, who unfortunately could not be present, had two messages he wished to share: firstly, the challenges that are faced by the organizations are multi-faceted challenges. They cannot be addressed in the context of an isolated one-institution mandate, or through a single lens. Organizations must be more strategic and think from the point of view of the system as a whole. The Director's challenge to colleagues in Geneva: what kind of incentives can be put into place so staff begin to think "system-wide" not "my agency".

9. Secondly, how can organizations modernize and professionalize the HR function, so that staff begin to think in terms of inter-agency cooperation and the UN system as a whole, rather than just a particular agency's angle on an issue.

10. In her "kick-off" remarks, Catherine Pollard, ASG for HRM at UN New York, touched *inter alia* on the substantive themes on the agenda: talent management, and mobility as part of it; in order to deliver the ongoing and new mandates, we need to retain our ability to attract talent, and for those of us with field operations in difficult places, this is more of a challenge, because it's about delivering results. We can't assume the best and brightest are going to continue to beat a path to our door. Some developing countries are making strides, joining OECD, offering tempting lucrative opportunities for most qualified nationals. The assumptions under which we have been operating for the past 60 years may be changing in terms of economic shifts and stakeholders around the world.

11. In that context, how do we make ourselves appealing? Our strength is our message and the UN brand. Secretariat research shows that the UN brand is unique and highly motivating, especially for the current generation of young people, who are driven more by values and the appeal of the UN, and much less by the salary. In the context of mobility, building a global, adaptable workforce is a priority for the Secretary General. The benefits for staff and organizations are obvious – better skilled and fresher staff, more opportunity to gain experience, helping organizations respond effectively to mandates. The appeal to many potential new recruits is a career that offers an opportunity to serve around the world. A recent UN survey showed that a significant percentage of staff - regardless of their length of service overall or at a particular duty station, had an expectation, on joining the organization, that they would be able to serve in different parts of the world. This is one of the attractions of international service with the UN. It gives us an advantage, and we need to promote it.

12. The benefits of mobility are not new to us. Many of us are looking at different ways of renewing our organization and that part of our ethos. Mobility is not only geographic; there have to be opportunities for functional mobility and undertaking something different

at the same duty station. This also takes account of staff concerns such as "love to go but not quite ready".

13. Different opportunities exist – management is looking at setting up service centres. UNHCR and WHO have done this, as well as others around the table. The Secretariat is embarking on this road to support our field operations. Field centres also offer opportunities for mobility and career development, especially for management and administrators.

14. If the UN brand, rather than salary, is going to be the motivating factor for the new generation, the old paradigm of a career may not be the trend of the future. New staff will come into the organization for a while, then move on with a mid-career move to something different. As Organizations, we will have to adapt to this situation.

15. Performance management systems, whether complex or simple, need more work if we are to realize all these investments for the future. But it is not the tool that delivers effective performance management – how do we change the management culture to deal with this and provide support to managers? In our organizations we have rights-based rules and regulations; it is a very heavy process to hold people accountable and show that bad performance won't be sanctioned. Managers take the easy road, making bland comments and giving "satisfactory" ratings.   We know we have higher levels of weak performance than figures indicate, but how do we support managers to make that change?

16. As regards the issue of professionalization of the HR function, we need to ask ourselves what do we really want of our HR managers in the future? It is becoming increasingly difficult to fill positions at senior levels, P5 and above, without a broad group of strong candidates.   We need to look at how we identify talent and provide development opportunities.   What is the professional HR profile at the P3 level compared to the director level? What role do we play in HR certification? We need an in-depth strategic vision and global leadership skills.

17. Private sector trends show more strategic HR activity, and a shift towards a business advisory function at the leadership level, with HR serving as the internal consultant to senior management. Are we really ready to embark on that approach? Will we be ready, and what do we need to do to get there?

18. Throughout all this, we also have a duty of care for families, particularly when building new mandates in difficult locations. We have seen the impact on duty stations of overnight political turmoil.

19. Nancy Raphael, Division Chief, HR Management at UNAIDS, gave a presentation on her experience with diversity, and links with mobility and talent management. The presentation is attached as Annex B.

20. Petra Ten Hoope-Bender, HR Programme Coordinator, CEB Secretariat, also gave a presentation on mobility. The presentation is attached as Annex C.

PART III – DISCUSSION OF THE THEMES

21. The discussions were based on a force-field analysis exercise. Four groups were formed, and facilitators nominated. Two groups chose to discuss mobility, one group chose to discuss professionalizing the HR function, and one group chose talent management.

TALENT MANAGEMENT

22. *VISION/STATEMENT:* **Create an agile and competent global workforce which meets the evolving organizational strategic priorities and purpose, and is managed in an integrated way.**
    PROs:
    - UN brand, highly motivated, engaged workforce; attractive to outside recruits.
    - Pressure for change from donors and from within the organization/senior leadership (leading to expectation of support for proposals to develop enhanced talent management).
    - Demographics in the market. The workforce is aging but capable, and there are many opportunities to attract talent.
    - Internal leadership – depends on level of sustained commitment.
    - Definition of an HR strategy – links to professionalization; what are the objectives to move forward?
    - Extensive tool kits available: contracts, performance management, skills inventories, policies and procedures (the latter are sometimes extremely complicated, but they provide opportunities to trigger change).

    CONs:
    - Challenges of identifying and articulating the purpose and priorities of the organization, long-term (multi-year) rather than short-term (one year to the next).
    - Relating to organizational culture and resistance to change.
    - Importance of sustained resource commitments to talent management issues and being able to move ahead on a long-term basis.

    KEY MESSAGES:
    - Think ahead – what direction are we going in? Link to organizational strategy.
    - Make system credible .
    - Focus on performance (motivate top performers).
    - COMMUNICATE about strategy, results, monitoring.
    - Holistic approach – show linkages across organizations and across functions as well as within an organization.
    - Demonstrate return on investment without talking about human capital.

MOBILITY #1

23. *VISION/STATEMENT:* **Create an agile and competent global workforce which meets the evolving organizational strategic priorities and purpose, and is managed in an integrated way.**

24. *VISION/STATEMENT:* **Create a working mobility framework that responds to the strategic vision of the organization.**

PROs:
- Support from member states and executive heads – more likely to ensure the success of a mobility programme.
- Clear organizational mandate.
- Staff motivation.
- Incentives, not necessarily financial.

CONs:
- Lack of career management (lack of tools for talent management; job insecurity, individual expectations, overly rigid posting systems; lack of strategic succession and workforce planning).
- Personal constraints (family situation).
- Financial implications.
- Contractual arrangements.

COULD GO EITHER WAY:
- Legal issues.
- Position of staff representatives.

MOBILITY #2

25. *VISION/STATEMENT:* **Create an agile and competent global workforce which meets the evolving organizational strategic priorities and purpose, and is managed in an integrated way.**

26. *VISION/STATEMENT:* **A dynamic organization values and supports mobile staff – both benefit from varied experience and knowledge (tie the two together).**

*PROs***:**
- We have missions and visions which support mobility – we are a global organization and we must promote this view to our staff.
- Policies that would underpin mobility, as a positive statement. Staff must see that these are implemented transparently and equitably across the board.
- Mobility assignments create career development opportunities, adding to competencies staff gain by undertaking these assignments.

CONs:
- Family and personal constraints – staff have a private life, families, their own commitments, whether spouse employment or children in school.
- Weak support from the organization – both in the mechanics of mobility, and training for new jobs. Is sufficient time allocated to allow staff to carry out their duties effectively from the start of the assignment?
- Changing country conditions – radical overnight changes in the conditions of the duty station.

COULD GO EITHER WAY:
- Leadership (good or poor can determine whether mobility is successful or a failure).
- Performance management (mobility becomes a facet for the performance management system. If there is inequitable application, an opportunity is lost).

GAPS:
- Career plans
- Exit strategies for non-mobile staff.

PROFESSIONALIZING AND MODERNIZING THE HR FUNCTION

27. *VISION/STATEMENT:* **Create an agile and competent global workforce which meets the evolving organizational strategic priorities and purpose, and is managed in an integrated way.**

28. *VISION/STATEMENT:* **Create a transformational HR, moving from personnel to human resources management. Become a strategic business partner and provide solutions based on best practice, both within the UN and outside. Develop integrated workforce planning, including finance, and translate this into an implementable context.**
PROs:
- Recognition of the need for transformational HR
- HR directly supports results-based management
- There is a business case to be made for having HR as a strategic partner rather than back office pushing paper
- Professional satisfaction, and attractive career path
- Should build common competencies that apply to all HR professionals
- Should look at external HR profiles for benchmarking
- Support of senior management

CONs:
- Resistance to change
- Organizations are risk averse
- Staff culture doesn't necessarily support a transformational HR
- Low expectations – expect personnel rather than human resources
- Perception that HR deals with minutiae, and has a bad reputation
- Legal constraints – need for caution

PART IV – CONCLUSIONS

29. The key messages/recommendations that the meeting wished to bring to the attention of the HR Network were:

➢ A suggested project (under HBP) on the professionalization of the HR function: this would develop common HR standards (such as competencies, job profiles and skills) and would build a framework (with the help of a consultant and the CEB Secretariat). Ideally, this should be approved at the HR Network Summer Session for subsequent submission to HLCM for endorsement. The timeline for conclusion of work would be 12 months from the time of approval. *A leader for this project will be required.* This item received the most

support in the meeting. The UN System Staff College indicated their willingness to participate in this – and other – training intitiatives.

➢ As regards inter-agency mobility, it was suggested that an exchange or swap programme be developed for HR professionals, for limited periods of up to two years at the same grade level, (lateral move).

➢ Methodologies and focused training on workforce planning should be examined.

➢ Development of a hybrid system for mandatory and optional mobility (no one-size-fits-all): explore best practices in those organizations with a high mobility turnover.

➢ A Working Group to develop an exit strategy framework: this would be applicable in situations where organizations were not in a position to place staff members (in-between-assignments or unassigned).

➢ Other implementable suggestions included the revival of the Bulletin Board, or a Community of Practice and opening organizational HR training to participants from other agencies.

30. Offers were made to hold next year's meeting either in Turin or in Copenhagen.

Annex A

HR Directors' Strategic Meeting, 19-20 February 2012
List of Participants

Org.	Name	Title
UNHCR	Alexander ALEINIKOFF	Deputy High Commissioner
UNNY	Catherine POLLARD	ASG for HR Management
UNNY	Ruth DE MIRANDA	Chief, HR Policy Service
ILO	Paulo BARCIA	Director, HR Development Department
ILO	Suzanne PEDERSEN	Chief, Talent Management Branch, HR/Talent
FAO	Tony ALONZI	Director, HR Management Division
UNESCO	Ana Luiza THOMPSON-FLORES	Director, HR Management
ICAO	Kamini BALRAM	Chief, Staff Services Section
WHO	Monika ALTMAIER	Director, HR Management
UPU	Alexander Thern-Svanberg	Director Human Ressources a.i.
ITU	Julia WATT	Chief, Human Resources Management Department
ITU	Eric DAHLEN	Head, HR Planning and Policies Division
WMO	Shuibao LIU	Chief, HR Division
IMO	Christian DAHOUI	Deputy Director of Administration & Head of HR
IFAD	Michael GEHRINGER	Director, HR Division
IFAD	Giorgia SALUCCI	Team Leader, HR Operations
WIPO	Thérèse DAYER	Acting Director, HRM Department
WIPO	Adelaïde BARBIER	Head, Org. Design, Workforce Planning/Resourcing Section
IAEA	Doug NORTHEY	Director, Division of Human Resources
UNDP	Cihan SULTANOGLU	Director, Office of HR, Bureau of Management
UNDP	Henrietta DE BEER	Chief, Policy and Compensation Unit, OHR
UNHCR	Shelly PITTERMAN	Director, Division of HR Management
UNHCR	Barbara KALEMA-MUSOKE	Deputy Director, Division of HR Management
UNICEF	Sally FEGAN-WYLES	Director a.i., Division of Human Resources
UNICEF	Peter FROBEL	Senior HR Policy Specialist
UNOPS	Pierre MOREAU-PERON	Director, Human Resources
UNOPS	Nasser SHAMMOUT	Deputy Director, Human Resources
WFP	Ruth GROVE	Acting Director, HR Division
WFP	Nana Yaa NIKOI	Chief, HR Policy and Staff Relations
UNAIDS	Nancy RAPHAEL	Chief, HR Management
UNAIDS	Sigrid KRANAWETTER	Senior Adviser (HR Policy and Legal), HR Management
PAHO	Kate ROJKOV	Manager, HR Management
PAHO	Paul DE LA CROIX-VAUBOIS	Advisor, Compensation and Entitlements Mgt, HRM
UNRWA	Cornelia MOUSSA	Director, Human Resources
UNRWA	Patrick CRONIN	Chief, Personnel Services Division
UNSSC	Jafar JAVAN	Deputy Director and Head of Programmes
UNSSC	Patricia KEAYS	Facilitator
IOM	Michael EMERY	Director, HR Management
IOM	Daniela KABILJO	HRM Advisor
OSCE	Françoise NOCQUET	Director, Human Resources
CEB	Remo LALLI	Secretary, High Level Committee on Management
CEB	Sue HUDSON	Acting Senior Inter-Agency Advisor, HR Management
CEB	Petra TEN-HOOPE BENDER	HR Programme Coordinator