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### ANNEXES

I. Agenda  
II. List of Participants
I. ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND WORK PROGRAMME

1. The agenda and work programme as adopted is in annex I and the list of participants in annex II.

II. ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION BY ICSC

A. Resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the legislative/governing bodies of the other organizations of the common system (ICSC/56/R.2 and Add.1)

2. The Network:

- Noted the information contained in the document. It anticipated that as appropriate representatives of individual organizations would intervene in the debate in ICSC on matters affecting their organization.

The Commission noted the information.

B. Framework for Human Resources Management

(a) Review of the pay and benefits system (ICSC/56/R.3)

(i) Validation and promulgation of the Master Standard (ICSC/56/R.3/Add.1)

3. The Network:

- Expressed appreciation for the work accomplished to date and thanked the ICSC secretariat’s team for the collaborative manner in which the validation workshops had been undertaken;
- Noted that two other workshops were scheduled to take place in Vienna and in Rome and that consultations were also envisaged with field staff;
- Welcomed the plan to develop briefing programmes for staff and managers;
- Decided to request that the Chairman of ICSC formally submit the final version of the Standard along with a brief description of the development and testing process to the organizations before its promulgation so as to facilitate the consultative and approval process within each organization.

The Commission welcomed the progress made in the development and validation of the new Standard. It looked forward to the completion of the validation process and the standard’s final development which should be ready for its review at its 57th session. It also decided to request its secretariat to provide it at its 57th session with a document which would address the issues that would be involved in the revision of the job classification system currently applicable to the General Service and related categories along the lines of those considered for the new system of job design and evaluation for the Professional and higher categories.
4. The Network:

- Noted that some assertions contained in the ICSC document on organizations’ performance management systems was too categorical and lacked nuance, as for example the statement that “only a few staff members are rated unsatisfactory”; there were also concerns about the nomenclature because organizations were moving away from using terms such as “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory”.

- Agreed with the recommendation that a combination of the traditional approach to performance management with a competency component should be developed and tested in the pilot studies;

- Noted that since client feedback surveys had not yet been instituted it was not likely that survey results would be available for the pilot study; nevertheless, UNDP’s offer to share their experience in the conduct of client surveys was welcomed;

- With respect to the recommendation concerning the number of reward categories to be used in the pilot studies, emphasized the importance of considering the strategic (performance levels) issue of the impact of the amounts of the pay rewards and of the need for flexibility in the number of categories; if necessary the number of reward categories could be delinked from the number of performance rating in an organization’s current appraisal system;

- Agreed that pay for performance should be pensionable, noting that organizations were already free to move forward with the payment of non pensionable bonus schemes for individuals or teams and that ICSC had already issued guidelines for these;

- As regards the different performance pay matrix models (i.e. movement through the band), organizations could accept, for the purpose of the pilot studies, the model whereby increases were based on both the performance rating and position in the salary grade in a manner which would slow down salary progression at the top of the range; it was noted however that organizations often recruited from different labour markets which in some instances obliged them to appoint staff very high in the current ranges; and this could complicate the matter;

- Agreed that guidelines on the distribution of performance ratings would be helpful but emphasized that any forced distribution system would be considered as arbitrary;

- Reiterated that past resolutions of the General Assembly had made no reference to cost neutrality and that this should therefore not be considered as a sine qua non for the introduction of performance pay.
The Commission decided that:

(a) A minimum of 3 and no more than 5 rating categories should be used in assessing performance;

(b) It would test both fixed and variable percentage salary increases related to the rating categories, ranging from no increase for performance requiring improvement to variable increases;

(c) A staff member’s position in the salary range would not be used in determining salary increases;

(d) Forced rating distributions, that is, a predetermined percentage of staff in each rating category, would not be used in determining salary increases. Rather, guidelines in the form of narrative descriptions would be developed to include safeguards against cost inflation;

(e) The adjustment of salary to recognize performance should represent pensionable increases to salary in a fully functional pay for performance system linking performance to salary adjustment. In the context of the pilot study, it decided that such adjustments should not be pensionable;

(f) It would provide the organizations with general guidelines on the process that should be followed in determining overall ratings and salary increase decisions. The guidelines would address the role of committees to review overall ratings and salary increases in order to ensure equity of treatment;

(g) The operational pay for performance system, in combination with the three models chosen for pilot testing should be designed to be cost neutral. Additional resources would need to be left in the hands of the General Assembly and other legislative bodies based on effectiveness of new system, efficiency gains, greater recognition of performance or some other basis;

(h) In order to maintain cost neutrality, it was estimated that 2.5 per cent of salary on an annual basis could be applied in the context of Models 1 and 2, while 2 per cent could be applied in the case of Model 3 (see also decisions following paragraph 5);

(i) It would establish a working group consisting of the ICSC secretariat and representatives of the organizations and staff to:

- recommend criteria that could be used to determine the degree of success of the pilot study, and
- consider, in detail, the issues that need to be addressed in order to proceed with the pilot study, particularly those identified in section VIII of document ICSC/56/R.3/Add.3.

(ii) Broad-banding/performance pay pilot study (ICSC/56/R.3/Add.3)

5. The Network:

➢ Reiterated that it should be up to each organization to determine its readiness to participate in the pilot;
Understood the necessity to operate the pilots as a “virtual” system, but emphasized that conditions governing the pilot study should simulate the real situation as closely as possible so as *inter alia* to be able to assess the impact on behaviour, both of staff members and managers;

Recalled its decision to advocate in ICSC the imperative of testing two banded options in the pilot studies and each in more than one organization so as to make a proper assessment before selecting one model for application across the common system;

Reaffirmed that those band options should be P1/P2, P3/P5, D1/D2, and P1, P2/P4, P5/D1, D2;

Agreed with the proposal to maintain only one net salary line for those staff members participating in the pilot studies but requested further information on how single versus dependency status might be treated at the end of the pilot phase and before the launch of the new system;

Called for the establishment of critical success factors by which the pilot studies would be evaluated.

The Commission decided that the following models could be tested:

**Model 1**

(a) Salary structure:  
Band 1  P-1, P-2  
Band 2  P-3, P-4, P-5  
Band 3  D-1 and D-2

(b) Evaluation for determining pay: Confluence of factors: performance, competency development and client feedback

(c) Evaluation and pay decisions: The evaluation of performance will be done annually with pay decisions to be made every two years with fixed and variable percentage increase applying to relevant rating categories

**Model 2**

(a) Salary structure:  
Band 1  P-1, P-2  
Band 2  P-3, P-4, P-5  
Band 3  D-1 and D-2

(b) Evaluation for determining pay: Current appraisal system enhanced to the extent possible to take into account competencies and client feedback

(c) Evaluation and pay decisions: To be made in accordance with the current evaluation cycle of the organizations, with a fixed and variable percentage increase applying to relevant rating categories

**Model 3**

(a) Salary structure: Retain the current 7 grade structure with no step increments

(b) Evaluation for determining pay: Current appraisal system enhanced to the extent possible to take into account competencies and client feedback

(c) Evaluation and pay decisions: To be made annually in accordance with the organizations' current evaluation cycle with a fixed and variable percentage increase applying to relevant rating categories
(b) Contractual arrangements (ICSC/56/R. 4)

6. Before addressing the proposals in the document, the Network recalled that:

- The ICSC Statute represented a carefully crafted balance between the authority of the central organs of the common system and that of the autonomous organizations that had voluntarily entered into the common system compact;

- Some articles of the ICSC’s Statute gave the Commission itself decision-making authority, others conferred *de facto* decision-making powers on the UN General Assembly on behalf of the common system; whereas others gave the Commission the role of advocating best practice which, historically, had been the case for contractual arrangements;

- Many organizations, but by no means all, had work requirements that operated at three different levels that could be broadly characterized as strictly short-term, medium/limited term and ongoing; to recruit and retain the workforce needed to perform assignments at those three levels, different contractual arrangements with attendant benefit schemes were used;

- While it was only reasonable to assume certain basic minimum standards were adhered to, there was not always an ideal fit between work performed and contractual arrangements used; difficulties, for example, could arise with the predictability of continued funding;

- In the context of developing the ICSC Framework for Human Resources Management, contractual arrangements had been recognized as core “to the extent that the compensation package is common across organizations”; this did not imply that contractual arrangements should be dealt with under a different article of the Statute, it simply recognized that different organizations should not be employing people in broadly similar situations and paying them markedly differently.

7. Turning to the ICSC document, the Network:

- Expressed appreciation for the extensive consultations and the visits to organizations which had been undertaken by the ICSC secretariat in connection with the review of contractual arrangements;

- Noted that there was no reference in the document to the linkage with compensation which was the rationale for considering contractual arrangements as a core element in the HR Framework adopted by ICSC;

- Noted further that organizations’ choices as to the type of contractual arrangements reflected their particular needs and constraints which were in turn governed by programme priorities established by their legislative organs as well as by funding realities;

- Noted that while the revised document prepared since the fifty-fifth session, responded to some of the organizations’ concerns, the conclusions in the document remained unduly prescriptive in that they stated that all organizations should use “three types of
appointments which would be common to all organizations of the common system”; this would run counter to the Commission’s stated intention of recognizing “the need for flexibility in contractual arrangements”;

- Noted with appreciation the inclusion of a set of minimum standards, as earlier proposed by the organizations, but felt that these were – more in the nature of their practice guidelines – as such, the organizations would welcome them, subject to certain adjustments (e.g. inclusion of congruence with organizations’ mandates, structures and practices)

- Opposed the establishment of a maximum five year timeframe for conversion to indefinite appointments because such decisions were within the prerogative of governing bodies and executive heads, as are the conditions under which appointments should be granted;

- Decided to request the Commission to –
  
  i) reaffirm the principles stated in the Framework for Human Resources Management that contractual arrangements should be:

  (a) responsive to organizational needs,
  (b) for those longer-term staff who may be expected to have a career in the international civil service, be compatible across organizations in the area of compensation and benefits to facilitate inter-organizational mobility and
  (c) for those without career expectations in the international civil service, recognize the need for compensation equity;

  ii) subject to (b) and (c) above, confirm the validity of the existing contractual tools;

  iii) revert to the issue of contractual arrangements as necessary in the context of the revision of the pay and benefits package.

The Commission deferred consideration of this item.

C. Conditions of service of the Professional and higher categories

(a) Base/floor salary scale (ICSC/56/R.5)

8. The Network noted that:

- In light of the movement of federal civil service salaries (the General Schedule) in the United States, the comparator, the current US level was 7.3 per cent higher than the current United Nations levels; the 7.3 percent was comprised of the 3.1 per cent increase granted to the United States federal civil service in January 2003, tax changes in 2003 and the increase which was not granted by the General Assembly in 2003;
The secretariat in document R.5 was proposing to realign the base/floor salary scale with that of the comparator’s nationwide General Schedule salary scale excluding locality payments particular to Washington, D.C.

9. The Network recalled that:

- The base floor was introduced with effect from 1 July 1990 as part of the ICSC’s Comprehensive Review of the Conditions of Service of the Staff of the Professional and Higher Categories;
- Since 1990, the base/floor has been adjusted annually in light of the changes in the changes in the US federal civil service salaries in Washington, D.C. and the relevant rates of taxation;
- In 1989-90 there existed only one scale for the US federal civil service salaries nationwide; locality pay was introduced only in 1994;
- Changes which were introduced as part of the Comprehensive Review were seen as simplifying and regularizing elements of the pay system; for example, the mobility and hardship scheme which replaced the assignment allowance with or without a mobility element, financial incentive for service at hardship duty stations, installation grant and pre-departure allowance which heretofore had been subject to separate reviews and adjustments by the General Assembly on a less regular basis;
- The mobility and hardship matrix, moreover, was based on the comparison made by the ICSC in respect of emoluments under the comparator’s (US federal civil service) package, and the then current (pre-1990) and the proposed mobility and hardship package for the capital cities of 42 countries in which the UN common system had 50 or more international staff and where the comparator was also represented.

10. In light of the above, the Network:

- Considered that any review of the base/floor which would also affect the mobility/hardship matrix would have to be much more thorough and robust. It should include comparisons of the UN and US field packages along the lines of those carried out in 1988/1989. It should, moreover, include “client-surveys” of the impact which the mobility/hardship scheme had had on the work of the organizations, as well as on the recruitment and mobility of their staff;
- Decided to request its secretariat to prepare a conference room paper for presentation to ICSC to recall this background;
- Decided to inform ICSC that it could not accept the methodological changes proposed inter alia without a more detailed analysis.

The Commission decided to recommend to the General Assembly that it revert to the procedure used when the base/floor salary was established in 1989 and to use the nationwide General Schedule, excluding locality pay, of the US federal civil service as a reference point for the UN base/floor salary scale. It requested that its secretariat provide more detailed information at its 57th session regarding the linkage with the mobility and hardship scheme.
11. The Network:

- Expressed appreciation for the productive and positive work that had been accomplished during the last session of ACPAQ;
- Congratulated the secretariat on improvements in computerization for processing cost-of-living survey data and revisions to the cost-of-living manuals;
- Agreed to urge the Commission to support the proposal to hold in 2004 a meeting of ACPAQ in order to resolve outstanding technical issues before the commencement of the new round of headquarters surveys which were expected to commence in 2005.

The Commission endorsed the recommendations of ACPAQ and the proposal to hold its next meeting in 2004 prior to the next round of place-to-place surveys.

D. Conditions of service of the General Service and other locally recruited staff

12. The Network considered the report of the tripartite working group on the review of the methodology for surveys at headquarters duty stations which was conducted every five-years. The main issues in the review were reluctance of some outside employers to participate, a code of confidentiality not to divulge survey-related data to outside sources, the need for a main and reserve list of employers to be surveyed, consistency in survey job descriptions across headquarters duty stations, a simplified questionnaire for data collection, use of electronic means for data collection, weight given in job matching to duties and responsibilities versus qualifications, treatment of changes in local taxes for interim adjustments and application of the methodology in full to other locally recruited categories (e.g. language teachers’ category).

The Network:

- Noted that the periodic fine-tuning of the methodology was necessary in order to align it with technological developments and evolutions in outside labour markets;
- Reiterated the importance it attached to upholding the Flemming Principle;
- Expressed appreciation for the constructive collaboration that characterized the group’s work;
- Thanked the representatives on the working group for their hard work and supported their positions as presented in the report of the working group.

The Commission confirmed the Flemming Principle in its current formulation and interpretation as the basic principle of the General Service salary survey methodology and decided upon a number of specific methodological issues.
Review of the methodology for surveys of best prevailing conditions of employment at non-headquarters duty stations (ICSC/56/R.8)

13. The Network considered the report of the tripartite working group on the review of the methodology for surveys at non-headquarters duty stations which was conducted every five-years. The main issues of the review were differentiation of labour markets, definitions of economic sectors, representation of the public/not-profit sectors, alternative methods of data collection, effective date of salary scales, interim survey methodology, use of common weights, benchmark job descriptions and elimination of the restriction to single incumbent jobs in job matches. The Network concluded that:

- The methodology which was applied in over one hundred sixty duty stations with a wide range of economies worked well but as with the headquarters’ methodology periodic fine-tuning was necessary in order to align it with technological developments and the evolution of outside labour markets;

- Experience had been useful with the application of the criteria for the differentiation of labour markets which had been introduced at the time of the last methodological review;

- While some members agreed with its further refinement by expanding the number of surveyed employers in Category I duty stations to fifteen from twelve, others preferred to retain twelve because of concern that this could lead to problems in identifying enough survey employers, and thereby compromising the surveys at these duty stations;

- There was appreciation for the effort and constructive spirit which had characterized the review and therefore generally supported the proposals; however, the hope was expressed that every effort should be made to avoid the methodology from becoming overly complex.

The Commission decided on a number of refinements to the methodology.

E. Administrative and budgetary matters: proposed programme and budget for the biennium 2004-2005

14. The Network:

- Noted that the ICSC budget for the next biennium was already being reviewed by the UN Budget Division;

- Decided to express its concern of the low level of financing for staff training and development.

The Commission took note of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005.
III. SENIOR MANAGEMENT SERVICE (SMS): A WAY FORWARD
(CEB/2003/HLCM/11)

15. At its fourth session (January 2003), the Network had decided that because ICSC had excluded the possibility of a special pay and benefits scheme for a SMS, the matter might equally well be dealt with under the CEB machinery; organizations could in any case continue to work on the criteria for inclusion into the SMS and the core competencies, especially as these could serve as an underpinning to the UN Staff College’s management development programme. It had therefore requested the CEB secretariat to prepare a roadmap for moving the matter forward at the next meeting of the HR Network. This was contained in document HLCM/11.

- Decided to recommend that work on the establishment of an SMS continue under auspices of CEB;
- Agreed to establish a working group to develop the modalities for such a service, including further refinement of the criteria for inclusion and validation of core competencies for a SMS;
- Noted that work should build upon that already underway in a number of organizations;
- Noted that the modalities for the establishment of the SMS would not impinge upon the current managerial prerogatives of executive heads;
- Supported the approach whereby an inter-agency team would implement in full the validation process; each organization would identify its sample of jobs and job holders, provide administrative support and ensure the presence of selected job holders during workshops and/or interviews;
- Agreed to report thereon to the High Level Committee on Management so as to seek its endorsement and thereby the support of top management;
- Decided that the working group would report back to the Network’s summer session with a proposal on the methodology and time-frame for carrying forward the project as well as the extent to which consultant support might be required;
- Agreed and thanked UNCTAD’s Chief of Human Resources for agreeing to lead the group which would initially comprise representatives of UN, ILO, WHO, UNESCO and WFP.

The Commission noted that the organizations were moving forward with further developmental work on the Senior Management Service. The Commission was of the view that it would, at a minimum, need to be informed of the progress made by the organizations in that regard. The Senior Management Service was seen by the Commission as an inter-organizational component of the common system for which it would accordingly need to be responsible. It did not feel that the consideration of the Senior Management Service would need to be undertaken in the context of the pay and benefits review. However, some members were of the view that early establishment of a Senior Management Service would facilitate the reform of the human resources management system. The Commission requested the organizations to report to it at its fifty-seventh session on progress made in further developing the Senior Management Service in order for it to be able to report to the General Assembly at its fifty-eighth session.
IV. MATTERS RELATED TO THE AGENDA OF HLCM

A. General briefing on the work of HLCM

16. The Secretary of HLCM briefed the Network on the Committee’s work over the past 12 months.

B. Greater commonality in health insurance arrangements (CEB/2003/HLCM/8)

17. Further to the discussion at the Network’s meeting in April 2002, the High Level Committee on Management at its fourth session in October 2002 “considered that the provision of adequate health insurance coverage was a system wide issue which had implications for a number of HR policies inter alia in respect of mobility …[and]…invited the HR Network to make recommendations for those areas in which a more coherent approach might be feasible.” It had also stated that “a more coherent approach should be pursued on two levels (a) globally, by the HR Network and (b) duty station by duty station beginning urgently with New York; and that within these frameworks attention should be given (a) to introducing provisions for long term care comprehensively across the UN system and (b) to review the provisions of the MIP.”

18. Recalling that when reviewing the analysis and recommendations of a consultant on this issue at its meeting in April 2002, it had concluded that the establishment of a single worldwide HIS was neither desirable nor possible, the Network:

- Noted that a working group of those organizations using the MIP was carrying out a comprehensive review of the MIP upon completion of its 15 years of operation and that some organizations were considering outsourcing its administration;

- Agreed that once the findings of this working group were available, it would consider at its next (summer) meeting constituting an inter-agency task force to analyze the main discrepancies existing between the various schemes and propose strategies and practical measures which could be undertaken to achieve a more coherent approach;

- Encouraged organizations in the meantime vigorously to pursue solutions at the field level on health insurance arrangements for their contingent work force;

- Requested the CEB secretariat to obtain information from each organization on the level of coverage of long term care provided for under their current health insurance schemes and to report thereon to the next meeting.
V. FOLLOW UP TO PREVIOUS DECISIONS TAKEN AT THE INTER-AGENCY LEVEL

A. Progress report on the work of the Task Force on HIV/AIDS
(CEB/2003/HLCM/9 and Addenda)

19. Reviewing a progress report on activities undertaken by its Task Force on HIV/AIDS in the UN System Workplace and on the implementation of its personnel policy on HIV/AIDS since March 2002, the Network:

- Expressed its appreciation for the dedication of the members of the Task Force to this important issue;
- Endorsed the new terms of reference for the Task Force and its work plan for 2003;
- Reviewed the IAAG recommendations and requested that in the future its Task Force coordinate and provide its guidance to the Network on the recommendations of other groups working in this area in order to steer activities in an effective way;
- Noted that a human resources policy specialist from the ILO would be closely associated with the work concerning monitoring the ILO’s Code of Practice on HIV/AIDS so as to avoid duplication especially when requesting information from organizations.

B. Residential Security Measures (CEB/2003/HLCM/10)

20. The Network:

- Recalled that at its second session in 2002 it had inter alia (i) agreed - in principle - that organizations should assume responsibility for bearing the entire cost of the determined minimum residential security measures for internationally recruited staff; (ii) requested UNSECOORD to provide additional information regarding the approximate cost of these measures;
- Noted that in response to a request of UNSECOORD to all designated officials a total of 90 duty stations had replied regarding costs associated with guards, alarms, bars and safe havens;
- In view of the financial considerations, agreed to recommend to the High Level Committee on Management that it endorse the recommendations of the working group on Minimum Operating Residential Security Standards (MORS) which would form a distinct yet integral part of the Minimum Operating Security Standards (MORS) for a duty station as laid out in the Report of the Working Group of the Inter-agency Security Management Network.
C. Outcome of the meeting of the Inter-agency Network on Women and Gender Equality

21. The Network:

- Thanked the spokesperson from the UN for representing the HR Network in the Meeting of the Inter-agency Network on Women and Gender Equality;
- Agreed that it should have a substantive discussion of gender issues in 2004.

VI. UPDATE ON THE ASSOCIATION FOR HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (AHRMIO)

22. The Network:

- Noted with appreciation that the membership of the Association continued to grow and that its training and development activities which were of very high calibre continued to flourish; these provided HR specialists of the UN System with the opportunity to network with those from a broader range of international not-for-profit organizations;
- Noted that with the growth in sponsorship of the Association, activities and tools - such as the AHRMIO web site - were available to HR specialists from the UN system which would not otherwise have been the case.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Spouse employment

23. WFP informed the Network that a new spouse employment policy had been developed by UNDG and requested that this item be considered at the next meeting. In the meantime, it would provide a copy of the policy to the CEB Secretariat along with the implementation plan and the budget. The Network:

- Decided to place this item on the agenda of its next meeting so as to review arrangements across all organizations since not all organizations were part of the UNDG;
- Noted the interest of the UNDG members to implement the policy with the understanding that could later be adjusted to accommodate other organizations’ views;

B. Coordination of issues

24. The Network:

- Noted that there was the need for improved coordination on human resources management issues which were currently being discussed in a number of forums, including the issues of mobility and spouse employment which were on the agenda of HLCM.
Agreed that coordination issues with the UNDG should be a standing item on the agenda of future meetings of the HR Network.

C. Rental Costs in Luanda

25. In response to a request of the WHO with respect to concerns on the housing situation in Luanda, the Network:

- Noted that in view of the fact that the post adjustment was adjusted for Luanda in March (based on the four months’ rule), and that the ICSC Secretariat indicated that an additional post adjustment increase was expected in April, this matter was considered closed.
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