
FICSA /C/73/HRM/R.1

London, 13 February 2020

Agenda item 11(b)

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Officers

Co-Chairs	Marina Appiah (WHO/HQ), Jesús García Jiménez (ILO-ITC)
Rapporteur	Kiranjeet Kaur (WHO/GSC)
Members, FICSA Executive Committee	Véronique Allain (SCBD), Diab El Tabari (UNRWA/ASA)

Participants

AP-in-FAO	Juan José Coy Girón
FAO/WFP-UGSS	Paola Franceschelli, Silvia Mariangeloni, Susan Murray
IARC	Cécile Le Duc
ICAO	Andrew Brown, Sanya Dehinde, Viera Seben
IFAD	Fabio Tarricone
ILO ITC	Rute Mendes
IMO	Shereen Barry, Nowsheen Bhatti Mahfuz, Alfredo Parroquin Ohlson, Elene Sarria
ITU	Christian Gerlier
OSCE	Ilknur Ozturk
UNAIDS	Andrea Palazzi
UNESCO	Andrea Gisele Burbano Fuertes, Rosa Maria Gonzalez
UNFCCC	Ambretta Perrino Santhosh Thanjavur Prakasam
UNGSC	Cosimo Chimienti, Cosimo Lunedi

UNIDO	Steve Eales
UPU	Frank Landauer
WHO/AFRO	Guy Parfait Elenga
WHO/EMRO	Tonia Rifaey
WHO/EURO	Antonella Biasiotto
WHO/HQ	Lianne Gonsalves
WHO/SEARO	Ritesh Singh
WHO/WPRO	Priya Mannava

Members with Associate status

IDLO	Margarita Meldon
OPCW	Romina CATERA, Alberto Fernandez

Guest

WMU	Anne Pazaver
-----	--------------

Adoption of the Agenda (agenda item 1)

1. The Standing Committee adopted the following agenda:
 1. Adoption of the agenda
 2. Election of the rapporteur
 3. Conditions for dismissal through the performance appraisal/assessment/evaluation (FICSA/C/73/HRM/Summary Sheet 3) – *Marina Appiah, Vice-Chair*
 4. Increase in use of non-staff (FICSA/C/73/HRM/Summary Sheet 4) – *Jesus Garcia Jimenez, Vice-Chair*
 5. Officially recording SA duties in the performance evaluation workplan (FICSA/C/73/HRM/Summary Sheet 5) – *Veronique Allain, Field Issues*
 6. Organizational Restructuring - (FICSA/C/73/HRM/Summary Sheet 6) – *Marina Appiah, Vice-Chair*
 7. Any other business
 8. Nomination of Standing Committee officers and core group members

Election of the rapporteur (agenda item 2)

2. The Standing Committee elected Ms Kiranjeet Kaur (WHO/GSC) as rapporteur.

Conditions for dismissal through the performance appraisal/assessment/evaluation (agenda item 3)

3. The Co-Chair (WHO/HQ) explaining how WHO staff are supposed to be evaluated. The reference document was the promulgated policy on “Managing Underperformance”, in order to stimulate discussion, encourage members to share experience with performance evaluations and performance improvement plans (PIPs), and to collectively identify what could be done to improve existing policies so that the individual policies are implemented in their intended spirit: aiming to nurture staff to give their best through their tenure of office in an organization, and to ensuring the appropriate use of impartial and transparent process(es) to dismiss consistently underperforming staff. That would ensure a win-win situation for staff and organization.
4. At UNIDO staff performance/PIP was similar to the WHO/HQ experience. Further, staff who were considered to be underperforming were considered culpable before the fact. In summary, the policy was theoretically positive towards staff but usually negative in its implementation.
5. ICAO had a two-tier process that determined whether or not a staff member should be put on a PIP. Initially, an advisory group was established, comprised an individual chosen by the supervisee, another chosen by the supervisor and a third chosen by both – usually at the same or higher grade than the supervisor to review the process and give an assessment on whether or not a PIP is needed. This process allowed transparency and fairness, and in most cases, the process stopped there. When the advisory group recommended a PIP, however, the supervisor could initiate one at any time, and supervisors did not wait for an evaluation cycle to elapse before initiating a PIP in most cases.
6. At WHO/EMRO, the Performance Management and Developmental System (PMDS) if used correctly was one of the greatest tools. Staff whose performance was wrongfully evaluated had sought assistance from the Ad hoc Ombudsman, who in turn, had relied on Human Resources (HR) for support in resolving those issues amicably in the interest of both staff and WHO. HR consistently proffered the use of a developmental plan, and the outcome in most cases was unfavourable, especially for those on short-term contracts. Similarly to WHO/HQ, staff with fixed-term contracts stood a better chance of keeping their jobs than their colleagues with temporary contracts. Given the manner of handling most cases of underperformance, staff seemed to be taking too much sick leave, and Member States wanted an analysis of this matter. To mitigate the potential harm to staff, the staff association concurrently informed the Ombudsman of the unhelpful consequences of putting staff on a development plan and advised staff not to agree to their proposal. In addition, effectively used PMDS was useful in WHO/WPRO. when used
7. At UNFCC performance evaluation was done electronically using a performance

device called “ePAS”. The policy allowed the organization to take appropriate measures when a staff member received three negative performance appraisals consecutively. At the end of 2019 a working group on performance management, composed of staff members of different grades who fulfilled the terms of reference, was established. Its mandate included ensuring consistency in performance management rating across the secretariat and increasing compliance to performance management processes. The group recognized that responsibility for the performance appraisal process was shared and the poor performance of a staff member could also be considered a reflection of poor supervision. In general, an informal PIP could be implemented at any time during the annual performance cycle when a performance shortcoming is identified, and other support measures, such training and coaching, could be put in place.

8. ICAO enquired whether existing policies on performance appraisal gave consideration to staff with disabilities by lowering the bar for performance. Feedback from WHO/HQ indicated that WHO’s disability policy was driven by equality of access to employment, advancement and retention for people with disabilities. This meant that WHO would hire the best person for the job, regardless of disability. People with disabilities should be provided with reasonable accommodation: that is, necessary and appropriate measures to ensure that they had access to participate and advance in employment and to training or other career development opportunities, on an equal basis with others.

9. To address the misuse of the PMDS and PIPs, members proposed that staff associations/unions consider advocating at their organizations, including:

- having a clear strategy for performance management that covers expectations, empowering of employer–employee, providing valuable feedback, setting goals, career path, etc.;
- insistence that people with supervisory roles undergo face-to-face focused training on leadership and supervision, including policies on management under performance;
- policies on managing underperformance that have a checklist for the supervisor on the processes that must be followed before a PIP is made, also require that the checklist also be completed by the supervisee.
- introducing 360 performance review.

10. Members of the Standing Committee saw value in the 360 performance review as an evaluation tool, worth pursuing in spite of the possibility malicious use by subordinates and peers, and of a supervisor of a small team being able to identify his/her reviewers, and retaliate in cases where the review discredit him or her.

Increase in the use of non-staff (agenda item 4)

12. Research on the prevalence of non-staff in the UN workforce could affect future workforce trends. According to the 2014 Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) report, the UN workforce comprised 45% non-staff contracts globally, and over 70% at the level of individual organizations. Action to address this trend was imperative that so that staff associations do not become extinct or staff with contracts the minority.

13. Members of the HRM Standing Committee described the numbers and status of non-staff personnel in their workplaces, policies governing their use and whether or on what terms such personnel were covered by their staff associations or unions. A concern was expressed that, if non-staff personnel organized outside a broader staff association, there would be two competing voices negotiating with management.

As to the increasing use of non-staff personnel, the Standing Committee recommended that staff associations:

- work towards increasing labour rights for any co-worker; and
- hold their administration accountable on the use and misuse of consultancy contracts and/or demand that they align the provisions of recruitment and consultancy policies to current practice.

The Standing Committee requests the Executive Committee to raise the issue of the use of non-staff at the upcoming ICSC session and to call on organizations to establish guidelines to ensure that the use of consultants is only for a limited period for projects in specialized areas, where the requisite expertise, skills or knowledge is not readily available within the organizations.

Officially recording staff association duties in the performance evaluation workplan (agenda item 5)

14. A Member of the FICSA Executive Committee (SCBD) encouraged the inclusion of work as staff representatives in performance evaluation workplans even though one's immediate supervisor would probably not have any oversight on staff committee deliverables. As members shared their experience on that issue, it became clear that practices varied widely between organizations, including practices related to release of staff to do staff association work.

15. The Standing Committee agreed that staff representatives should reflect their work in their evaluation reports. Although supervisors had no way of evaluating the stated objectives, that practice enabled staff representatives to showcase their competencies.

Organizational restructuring (agenda item 6)

16. A number of Standing Committee members worked in agencies undergoing

organizational restructuring. Structures varied to ensure fair outcomes for staff whose position might change as a result, as did the involvement of staff associations and unions.

The Standing Committee recommends that the FICSA Executive Committee approach OneHR to understand the principle that it applies to organizational redesign and to share that information with its membership, to help staff associations determine in advance whether they will accept guidance from OneHR during restructuring.

The Executive Committee should facilitate the process of information exchange among members undergoing any form of restructuring; agencies' documents would be shared on request for reference purposes only using the FICSA SharePoint (and not circulated outside FICSA). The SharePoint should also include the sharing of standard practices across organizations, prevailing policies in their agencies, to serve as a point of reference/basis for discussions with management.

Any other business (agenda item 7)

Benefits/entitlements of P/staff applied differently, especially concerning change of residence or nationality

19. Various members described examples of the differential application of benefits/entitlements of P staff. For example, at WHO/EMRO P staff must remain in the office for 42.5 hours per week, whether or not they take a thirty-minute lunch break. As IARC faced difficulties in identifying who should sign as the guarantors for rental contracts of internationally recruited staff; IARC therefore requested other organizations to share the practices, rules and solutions available to them. UNFCCC requested the membership to share prevailing practices in their agencies relating to travel, payment of overtime and separation by mutual agreement (SMA). Delegates requested members to send documents to the FICSA Secretariat for uploading.

The Standing Committee recommended that FICSA:

- **ExCom to conduct a research on the practices of other organizations (including those outside the UN) with regards to working hours and paid break, taking into account ILO rules in place in the 40-working hour convention.**
- **pursue with the relevant bodies, based on the health and wellness of staff, the inclusion of a thirty-minute lunch break within the eight-hour work day (so lunch breaks are paid);**

Training

20. Staff representatives who had participated in the workshop on reclassification in 2019 commended it to the HRM Standing Committee. Members therefore request the Executive Committee to include that in its training catalogue for 2020. IMO would like to

offer to host the classification training workshop on the understanding that FICSA would pay for the trainer.

Nomination of Standing Committee officers and core group members (agenda item 8)

21. To carry on the work of the HRM Standing Committee during the year, members nominated the following:

- Lianne Gonsalves (WHO/HQ) as Chair
 - Ambretta Perrino (UNFCCC) as Vice-Chair
 - Steve Eales (UNIDO) as Vice-Chair.
-