



**Chief Executives Board
for Coordination**CEB/2006/HLCM/13
7 June 2006

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

(Video conference, 18 May 2006)

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraph/s</u>
I. OPENING AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	1 – 2
II. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION	
A. Administrative Guidelines for an Influenza Pandemic Situation	3 – 5
B. Establishment of Working Groups on	
(a) Appendix D	6
(b) Long-term care	7 – 8
C. Update on UN Management Reform	9
D. Preparations for July sessions of HR Network and ICSC	10
E. Other Business	
(a) Briefing on recent meeting on staff management relations survey	11 – 15
(b) Follow-up to 10 March private session	16

ANNEXES

- I. Agenda
- II. List of Participants

I. OPENING AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1. The spokesperson from UNDP chaired the meeting. He pointed out that this was the first of the intersessional videoconferences the Network had decided to convene in support of its efforts to enhance its functioning. Noting the full agenda, he proposed to maximize time management and a process of follow-up actions and consultations by email.
2. The agenda as adopted is attached as Annex I. The list of participants is in Annex II.

II. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

A. Administrative Guidelines for an Influenza Pandemic Situation

3. At its eleventh session in March 2006, the Network had reviewed a draft of the Administrative Guidelines for an Influenza Pandemic Situation, prepared by the New York based organizations and applicable to New York based staff. The Network agreed that the modalities and arrangements should be applicable to all staff at all duty stations, subject to adaptation for local requirements and conditions. Three organizations had expressed reservations with regard to some modalities, notably the SLWFP modality for non-critical staff. The Network requested the CEB Secretariat to prepare a generic framework, based on the New York model that could be used by all organizations and duty stations. These generic guidelines were circulated prior to the videoconference.
4. The chairperson recalled that the guidelines had already been agreed to and that the purpose of this discussion therefore was to (a) finalize the document, (b) determine how the guidelines should be disseminated and (c) hear from the organizations that had expressed reservations whether they wished to maintain them. Under (a), a number of comments were made which will be reflected in the final version. The representative of the UN pointed out that the framework was to be seen as a “living” document which could be revised periodically. Under (b), two possibilities were discussed: The guidelines could be sent to all organizations by the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chairman of the CEB, or organizations could disseminate them internally. The first option was not considered feasible by the specialized agencies. It was therefore agreed that the Secretary-General would transmit the guidelines to the executive heads of all organizations and that the executive heads would ensure the appropriate internal dissemination.
5. With regard to the reservations, FAO announced that it had agreed to lift all three reservations. UPU stated that they were also willing to lift them; however, with regard to compensatory time off, the organization would need to apply a flexible approach, given the small number of staff. ILO maintained its reservations with regard to the modalities for implementing SLWFP and CTO.

Required follow-up:

- ✓ CEB Secretariat to finalize guidelines
- ✓ CEB Secretariat/UN to draft letter for SG

B. Establishment of Working Groups

(a) Appendix D

6. The spokesperson of UNDP announced that UNDP stood ready to take the lead on the revision of Appendix D. In addition, the United Nations, FAO, UNICEF and IAEA volunteered to participate.

Required follow-up:

✓ UNDP to convene working group with UN, FAO, UNICEF IAEA and ILO

(b) Long-term care

7. The Secretary of the HR Network explained that only a few medical insurance schemes made provision for long-term care. Long-term care was required in cases where a person had suffered a stroke or was diagnosed with dementia and required full time care, either at home or at a nursing facility. Costs for such care were extremely high – in New York, for example, it might cost as much as \$15,000 to \$20,000 per month – and were therefore not affordable, especially for retired staff. She recalled that several years ago, the then CCAQ had negotiated a system-wide insurance proposal, which however was not accepted in the end. The main reason was that in order to be affordable, contributions would have had to be mandatory for all, including the younger staff. The time had come to make a renewed effort.

8. The representative of ILO announced that the Executive Secretary of the Staff Health Insurance Fund was willing to lead the working group. IAEA and UNESCO volunteered to participate.

Required follow-up:

✓ ILO to convene working group with UNESCO and IAEA

C. Update on UN Management Reform

9. The representative of the United Nations briefed the Network on the status of the UN's management reform efforts. While the resolution of the General Assembly had not been very favourable with regard to some of the proposals made by the Secretary-General in his report "Investing in the United Nations", the General Assembly had given clear instructions what they wanted to receive in terms of further information by the fall. The papers for the GA would first go to the SMCC, which would take place from 12 to 22 (27??) June. They focused on recruitment, mobility, contractual arrangements, career development, leadership, harmonization of conditions of service in the field and the buy-out programme. The representative noted that many of the reform initiatives in these areas did not require approval by the General Assembly but that, given the links between those that did and those that did not require approval, the entire package would be given to the General Assembly.. The documentation would be shared with the funds and

programmes initially and would also be made available on the UN website. A team of twenty UN staff was planning to visit twenty duty stations in the coming weeks to discuss the proposals with staff.

D. Preparations for July sessions of HR Network and ICSC

10. The chairperson drew attention to the agenda of ICSC, contained in document ICSC/63/R.1. With regard to the dates and venue for the Network meeting, he noted that HLCM might meet with HLCP and possibly, members of the high-level panel on system-wide coherence in early July in Geneva, in which case the Network might meet in Geneva as well. The Secretary was requested to provide further information at the beginning of the following week.

Required follow-up:

✓ CEB Secretariat to consult and advise on HR Network venue and dates

E. Other Matters

(a) *Briefing on meeting on staff management relations survey*

11. The HR Network Secretary recalled the proposal made by FICSA to establish a task force that would develop a framework for staff management relations in the UN system and promote a better understanding and working relationships between the administrations and staff representatives. In addition, CCISUA had endorsed this initiative. At a videoconference held on 27 September 2005, organizations did not agree to the establishment of a task force, which was considered premature at that stage. Instead, the Network requested the CEB Secretariat and the staff representatives to conduct a survey on current “best practices” in organizations with regard to staff management relations and support provided for staff representative functions¹. This request was reiterated by the Network at its eleventh session in March 2006.

12. The Secretary informed that a first meeting with FICSA and CCISUA had taken place on 15 May in Geneva. The meeting had been productive and useful and progress had been made in that agreement had been achieved on the parameters for the exercise. The survey should be simple and proposed respondents would be the staff unions and heads of HR. The group had also reviewed a first draft of a survey model prepared by FICSA. In the course of this review, the group arrived at the conclusion that it might be more useful to secure the advice of external expertise that could provide “neutral” guidance on the survey process, including questionnaire construction and results analysis. One possible external source would be the “Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service” (ACAS). ACAS was a publicly funded service located in the UK which was highly experienced in working collaboratively with employers and employees, including in the UN context. The Secretary proposed that the next meeting include representatives of three to five organizations.

¹ CEB/2005/HLCM/30 dated 25 October 2005 refers

13. The FICSA representative reiterated the HR Network Secretary's assessment that the working group's meeting had been productive, useful and cordial. It was agreed that the questionnaire should not be too long and written answers should be kept to a bare minimum. Sight should not be lost of the objective which was to provide sufficient accurate information so as to decide on the most appropriate course of action to enhance staff management dialogue and relations.

14. In response to the briefing by the CEB Secretariat and FICSA, some Network members requested clarification on the purpose of the survey. It was recalled that a survey had been conducted some time ago under the auspices of HLCM and it was not clear how the results of this new survey would be used. It was proposed that in order to move forward, it would be useful to summarize the history to the current initiative so as to clarify its purpose. With regard to the proposed respondents to the survey, the suggestion was made that these should not be limited to staff union representatives and heads of HR but include staff at large.

15. In his summary, the Chairperson expressed concern over the timeframe of the exercise. He recalled that the current initiative went back to a proposal made by FICSA at the HR Network in July 2004, i.e. two years ago. The survey had been agreed to by the Network in 2005 and it was therefore important to move ahead quickly.

Required follow-up:

- ✓ CEB Secretariat to prepare a summary of the history to the survey initiative
- ✓ Progress on survey development to be reported to the July session of the HR Network

(b) Follow-up to 10 March private session

16. The Chairperson requested the CEB Secretariat to re-circulate the proposal on the functioning of the HR Network for comments and suggestions. These should include proposals for topics that would be discussed at the Network's meeting in July 2006.

Required follow-up:

- ✓ CEB Secretariat to re-circulate proposal on HR Network functioning for comments
- ✓ HR Network members to provide comments and suggestions for topics to be discussed at July session of the Network

Annex I – Agenda

- I. Adoption of the Agenda
- II. Items for discussion:
 - A. Administrative Guidelines for an Influenza Pandemic Situation
 - B. Establishment of Working Groups on
 - (a) Long-term care
 - (b) Appendix D
 - C. Update on UN Management Reform
 - D. Preparations for July sessions of HR Network and ICSC
 - E. Other Business:
 - (a) Briefing on recent meeting on staff management relations survey
 - (b) Follow-up to 10 March private session

Annex II – List of Participants

Organizations	Name and title
UN	Martha Helena Lopez Chief, Staff Development Services
	Regina Pawlik Deputy Chief, Conditions of Service Section
ILO	Susan Hudson Policy Advisor
FAO	Julio Camarena-Villaseñor Director, HR Management Division
	Gregory Flood Chief, HR Systems and Social Security Service
	Serge Nakouzi HR Officer, HR Policy, Planning and UN Common System Group
UNESCO	Dyane Dufresne-Klaus Director, Bureau of Human Resources Management
WHO	Alejandro Henning Managing Director, HR Services & Policy Development
	Mercedes Gervilla Coordinator, Human Resources Policy Dev't
UPU	Jean-Pierre Valtot HR Classification, Evaluation and Training Expert
WIPO	Thérèse Dayer Assistant Director, HRM Department
	Lise Ezana Senior Staff Welfare Officer
IFAD	Jessie Sisto Human Resources Officer
UNIDO	Sotiria Antonopoulou Officer-in-Charge, Human Resource Management Branch Programme Support and General Management Division
	Paul Maseli Officer-in-Charge and Deputy to the Director HR Planning and Development Unit, HRM Branch
	Paula Nenonen Human Resource Specialist (Social Security) Staff Services and Employee Relations Unit, HRM Branch
IAEA	Doug Northey Director, Division of Personnel (MPTR)
	Brigitte Bin-Humam Chief of Human Resources Planning
	Catherine Monzel Head, Recruitment and Staff Development Section, MPTR
	Angela Jackson Head, Staff administration Section, MTPR
	John Doherty Medical Director, MTPR

Organizations	Name and title
UNCTAD	Annie Tanmizi Chief, HR Management Section
UNDP	Brian Gleeson Director, Office of Human Resources, Bureau of Management
	Duncan Barclay HR Adviser, Policy Unit, Office of Human Resources
UNON	Suleiman Elmi Chief, Human Resources Management Service
UNHCR	Marta Leichner-Boyce Head, HR Policy Unit, Division of HRM
UNICEF	Mieko Tarui Deputy Director, Division of Human Resources
	Ruth de Miranda Chief, Policy and Administrative Law Section
UNFPA	Sean Hand Director, Division of Human Resources
WFP	Rebecca Hansen Director, Human Resources
	Ana Luiza Thompson-Flores Chief, Policy Monitoring Branch
ITC	Jay Wormus Chief, Human Resources Section

Other representatives	
FICSA	Robert Weisell President
CCISUA	Oleg Kiiamov President
	Christian David Deputy Executive Secretary
IOM	Martine Grigis Head Occupational Unit
	Maria Garcia-Lopez HRM Senior Assistant

CEB Secretariat
Kristiane Golze , Acting Secretary, High-Level Committee on Management