



Approved on behalf of the Secretary-General.
Chef de Cabinet

[Handwritten signature]
17/01/12

REPORT

SESSION I OF THE STAFF-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Arusha
15 to 21 June 2012**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item	Subject	Paragraph	Page
I	Introduction	1-14	5
II	Organization of work	15	8
III	Staff Management Agreements/Follow-up Report	16-32	8
IV	Mobility and Career Development Framework	33-102	11
V	UN Vision 2022	103-109	19
VI	Resolution of the General Assembly on human resources management	110	21
VII	Briefing on rest and recuperation	111-112	21
VIII	Extension beyond mandatory retirement age	113-115	22
IX	Proposal on academic degrees	116-118	22
X	Update on ICSC session	119-120	23
XI	Joint Harassment Boards	121-124	24
XII	Recommendation to member states to sign and ratify the 1994 Convention on the Safety of UN and Associated Personnel and Its 2005 Optional Protocol	125-128	25
XIII	Progress report on the Working Group on Achieving a Modern, Healthy and Family-Friendly Workplace	129-131	26
XIV	Participation of staff representatives in briefings by management to member states on staff-related issues	132-137	27
XV	Flexible working arrangements (FWA)	138-140	28
XVI	Administration of Justice	141-159	29
XVII	Training of staff representatives	160-163	34

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

XVIII	Revisions to ST/AI/2010/3 on Staff Selection	164-167	35
XIX	Human Resources Issues	168-193	36
XX	Venue of SMC-II	194	41

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

Annex I - Organization of the session

Appendix 1	Agenda for SMC-I
Appendix 2	List of Documents
Appendix 3	List of Participants

Annex II – Statements

Appendix 1	Secretary-General’s Message for the Staff-Management Committee Meeting
Appendix 2	Statement of the Under-Secretary-General for Management to the Staff-Management Committee Meeting
Appendix 3	Statement of the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management to the Staff-Management Committee Meeting
Appendix 4	Opening Remarks of the President of the Staff-Management Committee
Appendix 5	Opening Remarks of the Vice President of the Staff-Management Committee
Appendix 6	Statement of the Registrar of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda

Annex III - Documents submitted to SMC I

Appendix 1	Global Joint Monitoring Group Report covering the performance cycle 2010-11
Appendix 2	Progress Report of the Working Group on Performance Management and Development (including annexes)
Appendix 3	Update on SMCC-XXXII Agreements
Appendix 4	Career Development and Mobility for locally recruited international civil servants
Appendix 5	Proposed Mobility and Career Development Framework
Appendix 6	UN Vision 2022 - Introduction to the non-paper
Appendix 7	Abolition of ST/AI/2003/8 on Retention in service beyond the mandatory age of separation and employment of retirees – paper submitted by Management
Appendix 8	Academic degrees – paper submitted by Management
Appendix 9	Rules of Procedure of the Joint Harassment Board - proposal submitted by OHRM, the Staff Association of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Staff Council of the UN Office in Vienna
Appendix 10	Position Paper on Safety and security of United Nations personnel – paper presented by the United Nations Staff Union
Appendix 11	Working Group on Achieving a Modern, Healthy & Family-Friendly Workplace - Background & Terms of Reference
Appendix 12	Flexible Working Arrangements – presentation introduced by Management
Appendix 13	Draft Terms of Reference for the Internal Justice Council - paper submitted by the Staff Council of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) with the support of the United Nations Staff Union and the Geneva Staff Coordinating Council
Appendix 14	Management report to SMC I on investigations and disciplinary matters
Appendix 15	Options for representation of staff before the internal tribunals and proposal for a mandatory staff-funded mechanism for OSLA – paper presented by the Office of Administration of Justice
Appendix 16	Staff Funded Legal Assistance Scheme - Field Staff Union Position Paper on GA

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

	Resolution A/62/228 and Subsequent Resolutions on this subject
Appendix 17	Revision of ST/AI/2010/3 on Staff selection system
Appendix 18	Part-time employment - paper presented by the Staff Coordinating Council, UNOG
Appendix 19	Harmonizing personnel policies – paper presented by the Staff Coordinating Council, UNOG, establishing procedures for consultation on gender related policy issues
Appendix 20	Continued Career deadlock of Field Staff in DPKO/DPA Missions – Field Staff Union Position Paper on GA Resolution A/62/228 and subsequent Resolutions and Reforms
Appendix 21	Recruitment Freeze in DPKO/DPA Missions - Field Staff Union Position Paper on Recruitment Freeze for DPKO/DPA Missions
Appendix 22	Recognition of personal status for entitlements – paper presented by the Staff Coordinating Council, UNOG
Appendix 23	Downsizing Guidelines - paper by OHRM and the Staff Coordinating Council, UN Office in Geneva
Appendix 24	Proposal for the reactivation of the Working Group on Conditions of Service for Local Staff - Local Salary Surveys

Annex IV-Documents generated at SMC I

Appendix 1	SMC I Agreements
------------	------------------

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

**Report of the first session of the
Staff-Management Committee**

I. Introduction

1. The first session of the Staff-Management Committee (SMC) took place from 15 to 22 June 2012 in Arusha, Tanzania.
2. On 13 and 14 June 2012, separate pre-SMC consultations were held among staff and management.
3. The President of SMC-I, Ms. Veronica Luard, formally opened the session on 15 June 2012 and welcomed participants to Arusha. She introduced Mr. Yukio Takasu, Under-Secretary-General, Department of Management, and invited him to deliver a welcome statement by the Secretary-General followed by his own.
4. In his address to participants, the Secretary-General expressed his pleasure in greeting the first full meeting of the Staff Management Committee. He congratulated the President on her re-appointment and thanked the Vice-President for her hard work and dedication. He also expressed his gratitude to the Staff Representatives for their commitment. He emphasized the priorities for his second term including reform and modernization with, at the centre of his vision, making the UN a truly global organization. He noted the many important items on the agenda, including the need to move forward on mobility. He referred to the complexity of a comprehensive mobility framework and the hard work placed in ensuring that the proposal to be submitted to the General Assembly reflects the aspirations of staff and the needs of the organization. Since policy discussions had not been finalized at Glen Cove, he urged all present to carefully think through the remaining issues relating to such a framework in order to come to final agreement. The statement of the Secretary-General is attached as SMC-I/2012/II/Add.1
5. In his own statement, the Under-Secretary-General for Management expressed great honour of being at the meeting, emphasizing the importance of the work undertaken by the Committee in realizing the vision of the Secretary-General for the future of the organization. Amongst the many practical issues and reforms needed to be considered at the meeting he listed the discussions on mobility and career development as being core to such vision. In referring to the Secretary General's recent Town Hall meeting with staff, he reminded all that mobility will enable staff to acquire new skills and have new experiences, while gaining broader knowledge of different areas of the Organization. While not every move would need to be geographic, he indicated that geographic mobility would be key to those staff wishing to move to senior levels. He also indicated that cost should not be an obstacle to the successful development of a mobility policy. In

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

referring to the General Assembly's request that such a policy proposal be presented in the 67th session this fall, Mr Takasu stressed the need to move to concrete outcomes and to finalize a framework that incorporates the important elements of functional and geographic mobility, providing the basis for a global, dynamic and adaptable organization. The statement of the Under-Secretary-General for Management is attached as SMC-I/2012/II/Add.2.

6. In her statement, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management referred to the Staff Management Committee as one of the most important opportunities for dialogue. She reiterated her readiness together with all Administration representatives to work constructively, to discuss and listen to matters of concern, and to deliberate on issues with a view to reaching agreement. She reminded all that work on mobility was particularly critical for this session, expressing her commitment to developing a policy that works for everyone. She expressed her appreciation for the openness and frankness within which discussions had taken place at Glen Cove, resulting in a broad basis of support for the principle of mobility and identification of those areas which needed special attention in order to make the policy a success. While a lot of progress had been made, she reminded everyone that the end game had been reached, with member states wanting to see a UN that is in tune with the modern realities of the world and committed to transparency, efficiency and reform. Referring to the Committee's collective responsibility to deliver a successful proposal, the Assistant Secretary-General expressed her sincere hope to reach agreements on all agenda items, which would protect the interests of both staff and the Organization, while being credible and sellable to those who take the final decisions. Her statement is attached as SMC-/2012/II/Add.3.

7. Following the statement of the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management, the President of SMC-I invited Mr. Adama Dieng, Registrar of ICTR to make a statement. On behalf of ICTR staff, Mr. Dieng welcomed all participants to Arusha and gave a brief background on the work of ICTR. Mr. Dieng expressed honour in hosting the first meeting of the SMC, wishing that landmark agreements would result from the deliberations, while noting that mobility and staff development was the main item on the agenda. He shared his own experience indicating that mobility had contributed to making him a better professional. It had enabled him to acquire diverse experience to easily adapt to emerging demands. He also noted that being mobile would need to be balanced with safeguarding the well being of families. He expressed his desire that an Arusha accord or agreement would emanate from the meeting to set pace for further development and implementation of the mobility framework. The Statement of the ICTR Registrar is attached as SMC-I/2012/II/Add.6

8. The President thanked Mr. Dieng for his kind hospitality and invited Ms Sarah Kilemi, Director of Administration of ICTR, to make a few logistics announcements.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

Following that, Ms. Kilemi in turn asked Mr. Samuel Akorimo, Chief of Security at ICTR, to brief participants on the security situation.

9. The President then proceeded with her opening remarks on the occasion of the first meeting of SMC following the promulgation of ST/SGB/2011/6 on 8 September 2011. The President was pleased to note that staff and management from the UN Secretariat and several Agencies were present, ready to engage in discussions on a number of very important issues. She indicated that high level participation would serve to further enhance the vitality of the Committee and improve dialogue and consultation. On the topic of mobility, she acknowledged the hard work of both parties in finding common ground and developing a forward looking framework. She expressed confidence that the Committee would work energetically towards finalization of a framework for adoption by member states in the fall. She then proceeded with highlighting two mechanisms that could contribute to a more effective SMC in the future. The first was the initiative taken by SMC members and other dedicated staff members to monitor the handling of issues outstanding from earlier discussions. The second was the joint work undertaken on down sizing and joint harassment boards. She expressed her desire to encourage such collaborative work wherever possible so that the SMC may also contribute meaningfully to policy development and the identification of mutually acceptable solutions to common problems. The President stressed the need for an effective SMC, especially when managing difficult issues in difficult times, so as to achieve good results. Management and staff could not afford being distracted too long by protracted differences and a well functioning Committee was a necessity. In this context, she extended her best wishes to all participants. The statement of the President is attached as SMC-I/2012/II/Add.4

10. The President then suspended the meeting to take a group photo after which the session resumed.

11. Upon return, the President presented the agenda for adoption.

12. The President then requested nominations for the Office of the Vice-President of the SMC. The staff nominated Ms. Paulina Analena, President of the United Nations Staff Council, Vienna, to become the Vice-President of SMC-I. The President congratulated Ms. Analena on her re-election.

13. In her statement, Ms. Analena conveyed her appreciation of the honour to again serve as the Vice President of SMC. Having served for six consecutive terms in this capacity, she expressed her hope to see a different Vice President elected for SMC-II. She reminded participants that at the special session held in New York in late April 2012, no agreement had been reached although important progress had been made. She stated that following the meeting, staff had spent considerable time examining the various positions and, having considered the paper submitted by management, had formulated a counter-proposal that staff considered to be practical, realistic and straightforward. She

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

expressed appreciation for management having considered the counter-proposal with a critical eye and staff were ready to provide answers. However, she reminded all that staff had their own questions as well, the biggest of which related to the financing mechanism of an increased mobility scheme. She then emphasized the importance of other items on the agenda, including building trust. She closed her statement by encouraging all to work hard during this session to move forward for the good of the United Nations and its staff. The statement of the Vice-President is attached as SMC-I/2012/II/Add.5

14. The President of SMC-I then called for the appointments of rapporteurs for this particular session. By acclamation, on the side of Staff, Mr. Stefano Berterame and Ms. Nicole Bergener-Guimaraes were appointed and, on the side of Management, Mr. Dennis Thatchaichawalit and Mr. Peter Van Laere as rapporteurs for SMC-I.

II. Organization of work

15. The President outlined the draft agenda noting that more discussions and work still needed to be done on mobility, and that there were quite a number of additional items to be discussed. Two days and a half were therefore scheduled to discuss mobility with the remaining time dedicated to other issues reflected on the agenda. The issue of mobility however required more discussion in order to reach agreement in several areas and the agenda was adjusted accordingly, attached as document SMC-I/2012/I/Add.1.

III. Staff Management Agreements/Follow-up Report

16. The SMC-I welcomed the reports of the Global Joint Monitoring Group (GJMG) and of the SMC inter-sessional Working Group on Performance Management and Career Development. Members of the GJMG commended the work of the local Joint Monitoring Groups for their valuable observations, inputs and recommendations. In addition, the GJMG expressed appreciation for the continuous professional assistance received by staff of the Learning and Development Section of OHRM.

17. The report of the GJMG (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.1) covered the performance cycle 2010-11. In total, twenty-three JMGs had submitted reports, representing approximately 37% of the expected total. The GJMG reported on the following aspects of the performance management and development system:

- 1) Compliance with timelines
- 2) Ongoing dialogue between staff and managers
- 3) Rating distribution and consistency
- 4) Personal and career development of staff
- 5) Recognition of staff
- 6) Dealing with underperformance

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

18. The GJMG report recommended circulation of its report to all stakeholders and that local JMGs inform the local senior management and staff representative bodies. In addition, it recommended close collaboration between JMGs and Human Resources/Executive Offices including that all departments/offices/missions immediately constitute a Joint Monitoring Group to begin reviews of the performance cycle 2011-2012.

19. The Chair of the inter-sessional Working Group on Performance Management and Development presented the report of the Working Group based on the agreements of SMCC XXXII (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.2). The SMCC had asked the Working Group to 1) Develop the papers on rewards and recognitions and under-performance; 2) Finalize the terms of reference for the performance management oversight bodies; 3) Issue the guidelines on rebuttal panels as an addendum to ST/AI/2010/5 (Performance Management and Development System); 4) Review the pilot multi-rater feedback experience; 5) Continue to liaise with the SMC Working Group on career development and mobility, and; 6) Assess the need for revision of ST/AI/2010/5.

20. Commenting on both reports, staff representatives stated that they contained a number of recommendations and suggestions that need to be considered carefully by the SMC. At the same time, staff wanted to highlight some issues of particular importance.

21. On monitoring of the performance management (PM) system, staff stated that Heads of Departments, Offices and Missions system-wide should be made accountable for the establishment and actual implementation of JMG, which are crucial for the monitoring of the PM system. In addition, special attention should be paid to cases where First Reporting Officers (FRO) and Second Reporting Officers (SRO) were the same person, putting thereby at great risk the implementation of a fair and consistent evaluation system.

22. On the issue of e-PAS rebuttals, staff requested amendment of para 15.2 of ST/AI/2010/5 as it refers to the constitution of the rebuttal panel. Staff suggested that the current text of the ST/AI/ 2010/5 which reads "... each of whom is equal in grade or higher than the reporting officers whose evaluation or comments are being rebutted" be replaced by "... the chairperson of the rebuttal panel should be equal in grade or higher than the reporting officers whose evaluation or comments are being rebutted."

23. In addition, it was felt that the rebuttal panel should be able to amend comments provided by the FRO and SRO. Staff requested reintroduction of the original paragraph 15.4 of the ST/AI/ 2010/5 where it stated that "In the event that an overall rating or comments should not be maintained, the rebuttal panel should designate the new rating or modify the narrative on performance evaluation." This recommendation was related to the fact that in many cases, FROs awarded a rating "Fully meeting performance" while providing a narrative that was negatively formulated.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

24. Also, given the relevance given by the GA to the highest e-PAS rating in relation to the awarding of continuing appointments, staff expressed their opinion that a rebuttal of a rating “fully meets performance expectations” should be made possible.

25. Furthermore, it was felt that any decision by the rebuttal panel or any other issues related to performance, should be part of the e-PAS document and not put in a note for the file in the personal file.

26. Staff expressed concerns about the lack of consistency in rating distributions across the Secretariat and suggested that managers be provided with clearer guidelines on rating performance while being held accountable for the proper application of these guidelines.

27. Staff also requested that more attention be given to the issue of underperformance which is almost ignored by managers (little more than 1% across the system). Clear guidelines and incentives should be given to provide a more constructive view of underperformance as part of professional development and should be seen – at least in its first occurrence - as a need for training and guidance from supervisors – for which these should also be made accountable.

28. Staff expressed concern about the low response to the multi-rater feedback in the pilot implementation of e-performance. Staff stated that the multi-rater is a useful tool but it needs to be promoted among staff by building into the multi-rater feedback tool the relevant protection for staff to enable them to provide an honest opinion.

29. Management recognized that the performance management system was far from perfect and that it needed improvement to be more credible. Management agreed that accountability of managers needed to be strengthened. In relation to rebuttal panels management proposed the establishment of a pool of staff at global level to be made available for duty stations that have difficulties in constituting the panels. At this time of the debate, a decision was made to defer finalizing the discussions on performance management to a later stage.

30. When later in the session, the discussion on performance management came to a conclusion, management reiterated that the system is far from perfect and that it needs improvement to be credible. In relation to difficulties in constituting the rebuttal panels, management noted that these occurrences were very few. While the multi-rater system did not work well in the pilot it was still a valid idea to be pursued further. On the issue of consistency between the ratings and comments provided by the FRO, management indicated that the SRO was responsible for ensuring consistency although it was recognized that not many SROs were aware of this responsibility. Therefore, it was necessary to provide further training for managers to ensure proper implementation of the policy.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

31. Management and staff could not reach agreement on the issues relating to the rebuttal procedures but there was agreement to revisit the matter in connection with the review of the applicable ST/AI. **However, the Committee agreed with the recommendations contained in the report of the GJMG and agreed with the way forward proposed by the inter-sessional WG on Performance Management and Development and tasked the WG to continue its work as indicated.**

32. Regarding follow up on the staff management agreements, the two-plus-two group reported on the implementation of earlier SMCC Agreements. The group commended the monitoring and reporting system (attached as SMC I/2012/III/Add.3) established by the Chairman of SMC and the Secretary on having considerably improved the ability to accurately monitoring implementation of the agreements. The group reported that there were still some issues pending from previous SMCC meetings, and some explanation was provided on their status. The group would transmit these pending items to the SMC Secretariat to be included in the monitoring system.

IV. Mobility and Career Development Framework

33. Introducing the item on the agenda, the President SMC-I reminded participants of the outcome of the Special Session of the Staff Management Committee on Mobility that was held in New York from 30 April to 4 May 2012. Following that meeting, Management and Staff each had prepared a paper on the topic and those two papers were now in front of the Committee for its consideration in developing a Mobility and Career Development Framework for adoption by the General Assembly at its 67th session. The President then announced that Mr. Yukio Takasu, Under-Secretary-General of the Department of Management, would take the floor.

34. In addressing the Committee, Mr. Takasu first reminded participants of the opening session of SMC-I during which the importance of building a trusting relationship between management and staff as well as with member states had been raised. In this connection, he expressed sincere thanks on behalf of the Secretary-General to management and staff for having come up with the concept papers on mobility, indicating that management was ready to work with staff in finalizing the framework.

35. Second, Mr. Takasu noted that broad areas of commonalities already existed between staff and management including the Secretary-General's position that also fixed-term appointment holders would be subject to mobility. Furthermore, he reiterated management's position that mobility does not have to be solely geographic but can also be functional. It was understood that mobility would be managed on the basis of certain job families or networks. There also was common understanding of the concept of minimum and maximum post incumbency and that there would be a standard formula to calculate these minimum and maximum post incumbency periods. It was recognized that

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

given the complexity of the UN Secretariat one single system could not be applied across the board. Furthermore, management had accepted the notion of specialist positions. As for the non-rotational posts referred to in the paper prepared by staff, management was looking forward to understand more about this concept. However, it was clear that not all posts could be non-rotational.

36. In terms of the objectives of mobility, Mr. Takasu confirmed that mobility would be an integral part of career development for staff while also meeting the overall objectives of the organization, that is, its ability to deliver on its mandates. He reminded participants that, as a global organization, we should be mindful of staff working in difficult situations. Many staff were working in duty stations away from HQs with some of them in extreme hardship conditions.

37. Mr. Takasu then invited staff to reflect and comment on the following issues: First, how would the proposal submitted by staff work? How could a self-initiated system achieve also the objectives of the management proposal of a centrally managed system? ; Second, regarding the post occupancy limits, it was noted that staff had formulated a counter proposal with occupancy limits of 1,3 and 7 years, as opposed to management's proposal of 1,2, and 5 years respectively. What would happen when the maximum occupancy limits had been reached? Third, regarding the role of hiring managers, it was noted that the staff proposed no role while management had provided for one; Fourth, the Secretary-General considered it very important that incumbents of senior managerial positions would require prior experience in different duty stations. It was the hope of management that staff appreciate the importance of senior managers needing to have a broad exposure to various work environments.

38. On the topic of transitional measures, Mr. Takasu indicated that management had been developing these measures so as to have an orderly phasing in of the policy. Management was committed to designing a workable feasible implementation plan, including the need for staff to be able to adequately prepare. Management was open to suggestions from staff on these measures.

39. Finally, regarding the cost implications of a mobility policy, Mr. Takasu indicated that the implementation of a new policy would require a major re-organization of the human resources functions carried out across duty stations. In doing so, every effort would be made to cope with the new human resources requirements without creating new posts. The current system consisted of a lot of time spent by human resources in hiring and administering staff. With new technology being phased in over the next few years, as approved by the member states, there should be considerable opportunity for achieving efficiency gains in processing functions and resources could be re-allocated towards supporting the new mobility policy. Regarding geographic moves, it was understood that these are costly and would need to be financed. However, the existing situation already incorporated considerable mobility. In addition, external recruitment was costly as well.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

In short, while the organization would need to be mindful of costs associated with a mobility policy, implementation of such policy should not be projected as being financially unreasonable and it would be the responsibility of the Secretary-General and those who advise him to identify ways by which to finance the mobility framework.

40. The President SMC-I summarized the issues raised by Mr. Takasu and, following a break in the proceedings, opened the floor for discussion.

41. A Staff Representative reminded participants of the background to the mobility papers that were on the table for consideration. He reminded all that, at the special session of the SMC held in New York late April, some agreements had been reached while some differences remained. He confirmed that, at the end of the special session, staff had requested management to develop a policy framework that reflected the outcome of the meeting, including the agreements reached while also incorporating proposals on the way forward on matters that were still outstanding. Management had done so and staff representatives had received the paper two weeks before the start of SMC-I. He acknowledged that staff had in turn developed their own paper making great strides in changing the position of staff so as to accommodate management to the extent possible. Staff had retained the issues on which there was agreement but had taken out the proposals they disagreed with. He confirmed that there was broad agreement on the overall objectives of a mobility framework. He reminded management that staff unions had conceded quite a lot. He also indicated that staff had answered questions for clarification from management and that the issues raised by Mr. Takasu in his address to SMC-I on the topic were covered in the paper submitted by staff. At the same time, however, he also indicated that some questions remained on the side of the staff who would like to see answers to them as well. In this regard, he offered his opinion that staff would be looking at management for answers to their own questions rather than the other way around. He indicated that following the most recent paper submitted by staff on the mobility topic, staff had expected that management would have formulated a (new) document in the form of a counter proposal. He indicated that staff did not wish to engage in a Q&A session at this stage. He also mentioned that, with regard to transitional measures, these could only be meaningfully discussed once all the facts of the mobility framework were clear. He further indicated that staff would still like to see more details on how mobility would be funded. In short, the staff representative proposed that management formulate a counter proposal rather than engaging in discussions at this stage.

42. In taking the floor, Mr. Takasu repeated his earlier statement that the most important issue in this process was to demonstrate trust on the side of both parties, and he confirmed, again, that he had full confidence in the efforts of staff to come to agreement. He repeated the questions he had asked earlier relating to the mechanism by which the voluntary system proposed by staff would work and what exactly the definition was of a job family.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

43. In his response, the staff representative referred to the paper produced by the staff in which it had specified the meaning of a job family. He suggested that management take over at this moment since staff had done as much as possible.

44. Mr. Takasu confirmed that management had studied every paper but that the need for further clarification remained. As an example, he listed the economist and social family groups as needing further definition to clarify what they are constituted of.

45. At that time, a different staff representative took the floor. She reminded management that her union had been waiting for quite some time now for a list of careers/jobs that are defined as being of a specialist and non-specialist nature. She asked when that list could be made available and why it had taken so long to promulgate the list. Following an inquiry from management, the staff representative explained that her request was not a new one. She reminded management that she had been promised the list many months ago and asked OHRM when the list would be distributed.

46. Several staff representatives then took the floor. They reminded management that they would like to see a new revised proposal. They suggested that the work to be done should be a joint effort, possibly in the form of a merger between the proposals of staff and management. They suggested that the way forward would be for management to develop a framework so as to be able to advance the deliberations.

47. A management representative then took the floor. He reminded all that at the end of the special session held in New York, there was agreement to put together a paper. As a result, what management considered to be an overall framework had been delivered two weeks ago. There now was a counter proposal from the staff, and what management wished to seek was a better understanding of the paper submitted by staff. He indicated that management believed a compromise could be reached but that clarifications on the paper submitted by staff would be important to move the process forward.

48. Regarding the question raised earlier about the list of specialized and non-specialized functions, a management representative confirmed that indeed discussions on the promulgation of such list had taken place. She clarified that in the process of preparing the list it had surfaced that classification experts were needed to assist in finalizing the list. OHRM had now identified such experts and was hopeful that the list would be promulgated as soon as possible in consultation with the various departments.

49. In response, a staff representative indicated that she was not sure if she could continue the negotiations without a list of specialized and non-specialized functions.

50. Mr. Takasu indicated his disappointment with the apparent breach of trust. He offered his view that if indeed trust had been lost completely, the organization would not

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

be able to function. He further stated that he was aware of the history to the deliberations on mobility and he had decided to participate in the meeting with the aim of coming to mutual agreement. The Secretary-General genuinely desired to see a mobility policy in place and he had some 3 basic principles surrounding them. Mr. Takasu had come to the meeting to find a solution and before he could outline the position of management, he wanted to hear more on the four basic issues he had raised. He indicated that management could be very flexible on many issues, but he wanted to repeat the points he had asked for clarification on.

59. The staff representative thanked Mr. Takasu for his intervention. He reiterated staff commitment to negotiate a mutual agreement and indicated that staff had put forward a proposal and that further defining issues was not the role of staff but management's instead. He reminded participants that, regarding the issue of job families, it had been explained earlier and it was now up to management to reflect on it. Regarding post occupancy, staff had included their position in the paper. As for the role of the hiring manager, staff was of the opinion that there was no role for hiring managers and it was up to management to agree or not. Staff were awaiting proposals from management as to the requirement for geographic mobility for managers as well as details on transitional measures. In summary, staff had reacted to the paper proposed by management and were now looking for management experts to flesh out the details on which staff could then reflect further. Finally, he repeated the request from staff to be provided with more details on the financing mechanism for a mobility framework. Staff did not believe that the answer that it would be up to the Secretary-General and his advisors to work out the mechanism was quite sufficient.

60. Mr. Takasu expressed his appreciation with this latest intervention which had answered his questions. He asked for a small recess in order to consult with management representatives on the way forward.

61. Upon return, Mr. Takasu clarified the general position of management indicating that many key elements were overlapping with those of the staff and that many points were flexible while others would need to be accepted:

62. First, management was thinking along the same lines as staff on implementing a mobility framework.

63. Second, management was pleased about the concept of minimum and maximum post occupancy and would be flexible in setting the thresholds.

64. Third, management was very much committed to defining non-rotational and specialist positions but it had to be understood that this was work in progress and that more work in collaboration with the job networks would be necessary since basically these would result in exemptions to mobility.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

65. Fourth, regarding the role of the hiring manager, it was not possible to assign no role at all but some role would be essential and management would reflect on this further.

66. Fifth, for senior managerial posts, prior geographic mobility would be essential. It was possible to negotiate how this would be implemented, but the principal idea was essential.

67. Sixth, for transitional measures, management was very mindful of the need to have these as long as they were reasonable. Management would be pleased to work these out with the staff.

68. Finally, since the financial implications were a clear concern, management would try to explain these as detailed as possible.

69. Following this, the session was adjourned for the day. Efforts on both sides to come to mutual agreement on a Mobility and Career Development Framework continued for the remainder of the session. At first, management submitted a revised document and staff responded to the document in writing. There were further plenary meetings on the topic and, eventually, a smaller working group was established to work out details while other items on the agenda were considered in plenary. Finally, late Thursday 21 June 2012, the Committee resumed its discussions on the topic of mobility with a view to adopting a final draft Mobility and Career Development Framework.

70. First, Report SMC-I/2012/III/Add.4 on the topic of Career Development and Mobility for locally recruited international servants was presented by the concerned Staff Management Committee sub-working group. Staff explained that the paper itself should be seen as a tool for the way forward in strengthening career development and mobility for local staff. It had been a challenge to remain focused on the topic during the development of the report. Staff felt that while they had contributed considerably to the report, management had not been as involved in the report itself. Regarding the way forward, it was suggested that now that the main Mobility Framework paper was about to be finalized, more attention be paid in future to build on the findings of the report.

71. Following the introduction of the paper, a staff representative took the floor and suggested that based on the issues that had been encountered during the proceedings of the working group on career development and mobility for local staff, one way forward would be for the working group dealing with conditions of service for locally recruited staff that had existed under the SMCC to be reactivated under the SMC. She indicated that the locally recruited staff felt insufficient attention was paid by management to the interests of this category of staff and offered to contribute towards the working of this working group. Other staff representatives took the floor indicating that indeed such a working group would be

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

important since staff in general were concerned about the well-being of their locally recruited colleagues.

72. The President summarized the discussions by indicating that two proposals had been made, that is, one to resume the proceedings of the WG on conditions of service for locally recruited international civil servants for which UNSU, ECLAC, ESCAP and ESCWA had expressed support. The second proposal was to continue the work of the WG on Career Development and Mobility for locally recruited international civil servants.

73. Management raised the question as to whether it was necessary to have two WG established dealing with locally recruited staff especially since it would appear that the topics dealt with by both groups were inter-linked. **It was agreed therefore to have a WG on conditions of service for locally hired internationally civil servants that would deal with a wide range of matters affecting the staff, including career development, mobility, conditions of service, salaries and other benefits. UNSU, ECA, ECLAC and ESCAP offered to join the WG. Management designated OHRM to also participate in the WG.**

74. The President then invited participants to move on to the next topic, that is the broader Mobility and Career Development Framework.

75. A staff representative took the floor to introduce the paper. He indicated a number of developments had taken place during the deliberations aimed at addressing many issues, such as the job networks and the role of SMC in determining the requirements for each job network, career development as opposed to assessment, performance management, geographic, functional and lateral mobility requirements, the role of the hiring manager, the role of the network staffing officer, criteria for the selection of senior managers, special constraints panels, measures to address job security concerns including measures for staff of the tribunals, project staff, staff of downsizing missions, the issuance of three-year-fixed-term appointments for staff moving to D/E duty stations, and transitional measures. He indicated that a phasing-in process was proposed since not all networks could become operational at the same time and the provision of adequate time for serving staff members to prepare for mobility. He highlighted the extension of existing eligibility requirements for promotion from P4 to P5 and P5 to D1 until the end of 2018. Regarding the financial issues, further clarifications had been obtained including the possible need for additional resources to be presented for approval by member states at the appropriate time. On the way forward, he indicated that quite a number of additional clarifications had been formulated, including the role of SMC in a number of stages in the process towards the implementation of the mobility framework.

76. Following the introduction of the paper, other staff representatives took the floor providing additional information, requesting clarification on a number of issues, and

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

suggesting a few changes to the text. The Staff Representative from UNFSU sought clarification on whether or not the FS category would be included in the policy to which management responded positively.

77. The Assistant Secretary-General, OHRM, and another management representative clarified a few issues in response to the issues raised by the staff.

78. The staff representative of the Nairobi Staff Association then suggested that the report be adopted by the Committee and be called the Arusha Agreement, which was acclaimed by staff and management representatives.

79. The President of the NY Staff Union then took the floor. She congratulated her colleagues on their achievement to coming to agreement on the Mobility Framework. She congratulated in particular her colleague from Geneva but indicated that unfortunately, she was not in a position to join her colleagues in adopting the Draft Mobility and Career Development Framework dated 21 June 2012. She requested clarification on how this matter could be treated from a legal perspective within the TOR of the SMC.

80. Upon invitation of the SMC President, the Legal Advisor to the Staff-Management Committee provided initial advice on how to treat the matter, indicating in the process that no rules of procedure had so far been promulgated for the SMC. Following her statement, a number of staff representatives took the floor making certain suggestions on how to proceed. The President of the NY Staff Union indicated that since the Legal Advisor was present, she would like to hear the legal opinion on how to treat the matter.

81. The Legal Advisor then stated the following:

“Broadly speaking, the promulgation of a mobility policy lies within the authority of the Secretary-General, as he has the authority to assign staff pursuant to Staff Regulation 1.2(c).

As for the details of the draft mobility framework, they contain elements that need to be approved by the GA. Accordingly, there are certain elements of the mobility framework that fall outside the authority of the Secretary-General.

Therefore, the adoption of the mobility framework by SMC can be governed by the second sentence of section 1.3. of ST/SGB/2011/6 on the Staff-Management Committee, which requires agreement of the SMC, but not agreement by consensus.”

82. Following the advice from the Legal Advisor, the objections of the New York Staff Union were formally recorded as follows:

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

“The United Nations Staff Union does not agree with the Draft Mobility and Career Development Framework (21 June 2012). Since it was not clear whether the matter at hand falls under the first or second sentence of paragraph 1.3, in case the first sentence was to be applied, the United Nations Staff Union has a formal objection to the draft, therefore there is no consensus. In case the second sentence would be applied: the United Nations Staff Union does not agree to the draft.”

For ease of reference, the first sentence of paragraph 1.3 of ST/SGB/2011/6 reads as follows:

“The Staff-Management Committee shall agree by consensus on those issues within the authority of the Secretary-General.”

The second sentence reads as follows:

“For matters outside the authority of the Secretary-General, the Committee shall agree on a position to be presented to the General Assembly”.

83. With the exception of the United Nations Staff Union (UNSU), remaining members of the Committee agreed with the proposed Mobility and Career Development Framework. A copy of the proposed Mobility and Career Development Framework (21 June 2012) is attached herewith as SMC-I/2012/III/Add.5.

V. UN Vision 2022

84. On Friday 15 June 2012, at the close of its deliberations for the day, the Office of Mr. Kim Won-soo, Assistant Secretary-General, made a presentation by VTC to the Staff Management Committee on UN Vision 2022. The presentation was made by Ms. Vivian Van De Pierre from the Change Implementation Team and Mr. Fernando Blasco from the EOSG. The presentation was a briefing, in the form of a non-paper, that would inform the work of the United Nations for the next decade. This vision, led by the Member States, would be supported by an agenda for implementation designed by the Secretary-General as Chief Administration Officer of the United Nations. While some actions would fall within the purview of the Secretary-General's authority and some others be proposals for Member States' review and consideration, the purpose of the non-paper was to present a comprehensive picture, the SG's vision for the future, including both these aspects.

85. The presentation was to be considered an initial document for discussion to inform the work-in-progress for the non-paper. It was made clear that the presentation did not represent the final proposal from the Secretary-General and that the non-paper would be used in future as a tool for iterative consultations with all stake holders.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

86. Committee members were informed that Vision 2022 would entail programmatic changes aligned with the fundamental purposes of the United Nations. To achieve these changes it would be necessary to have the proper enablers. These enablers would include the formulation of a stronger United Nations through enhancement and modernization of the management of world-wide resources; enhancement of human capital; financial transparency; modernization of information management and conference services; enhancement and modernization of training and research capacity, and; innovation to improve substantive work. In addition, it would be necessary to enhance the power of partnerships and to reduce the number of redundant or duplicate UN offices.

87. In the context of realizing Vision 2022, the Change Implementation Team listed some short term actions to be taken by the Secretariat and proposals for consideration by member states for enablers. On accountability, some of the initiatives proposed include changing the reporting line of the Controller/OPPBA from USG/DM to the Secretary-General and strengthening Managerial Accountability through DM leadership. On Organizational readiness and transparency, the initiatives included establishing virtual service centres, integrating and enhancing training and research, modernizing communications and conference services, and developing strong commitment from programme managers to a horizontal-working culture as opposed to a vertical, silo-structure.

88. Following the presentation, staff representatives made a few comments and requested clarification on a number of issues.

89. First, concern was expressed on the impact that some of the proposed measures could have on some functions and posts in the UN with as a consequence, possible abolition of posts. In addition, concern was raised about the lack of consultation with staff representatives on the development of this non-paper, the project as a whole, and the policies and initiatives that could have serious impact on the welfare of staff, in particular job security. Staff representatives appreciated the briefing and presentation of the planned non-paper, but expressed their views that decisions on policies affecting staff were to be negotiated in the appropriate forum, i.e. the Staff Management Committee. More specifically, concern was raised with the fact that management was planning to present a report to the GA in the fall while no formal consultative process had been established to discuss the report and its proposals. Finally, staff representatives requested clarification on whether the proposed plan would cover any outsourcing initiatives.

90. In response to the concerns raised by the staff, presenters indicated that consultations and discussions were scheduled for the months of July and August and that the need to consult staff as stated by the staff representatives would be taken into account when conducting such consultations. In response to the question on outsourcing, the presenters stated that no concrete plans for outsourcing were envisaged at present. The power point presentation presented is attached herewith as SMC-I/2012/III/Add.6.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

VI. Resolution of the General Assembly on human resources management

91. Management briefed the Committee on General Assembly Resolution 66/234 on human resources management adopted by the Assembly during its 66th session. In that resolution, the General Assembly had expressed serious concern that progress towards the goal of 50/50 gender balance in the United Nations system, especially at senior and policymaking levels, has been slow, reiterating its request to the Secretary-General to increase his efforts to attain and monitor the goal of gender parity in the Secretariat, in particular at senior levels, and in this context to ensure appropriate representation of women, especially those from developing countries and countries with economies in transition. It was stressed by the Assembly that the Secretary-General should not encourage the practice of temporarily filling posts in the Professional and higher categories with General Service staff members who have not passed the General Service to Professional category examination other than on an exceptional basis, requesting the Secretary-General to ensure that temporary occupation of such posts by the General Service staff shall not exceed a period of one year, effective 1 January 2013, and to report thereon, including on the rationale for such practice, to the General Assembly every two years, starting at its sixty-seventh session. The Assembly also decided to amend staff regulation I.2 (m) regarding conflict of interest.

VII. Briefing on rest and recuperation

92. Management provided a briefing on the revised rest and recuperation framework. During its 64th session, the General Assembly requested the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) to regulate the rest and recuperation framework in which similar cycles and destinations are applied by all organizations. In its resolution 66/235, the Assembly approved a revised rest and recuperation framework which included a four week cycle linked to danger pay. At that time, the understanding was that the number of duty stations where danger pay would apply would be substantially less than the number of duty stations with the previous hazard pay. However, based on the information provided by the Department of Safety and Security (DSS) as of April 2012 to ICSC, danger pay would be applicable in almost 150 duty stations as compared to the original estimate of 15. ICSC informed the General Assembly that the potential savings originally estimated on the basis of fewer danger pay locations would not be realized. In its resolution contained in document A/C.5/66/L.36, the Assembly approved, with effect on 1 July 2012, the revised set of criteria for the granting of rest and recuperation travel delinking the four-week cycle from danger pay and requested ICSC to report back during the 67th session. Accordingly, the administrative instruction on rest and recuperation would need to be revised. Management indicated that they would request that the fifteen duty stations that originally had the four week cycle would maintain it for the next period. The representative from UNICEF added that it was expected to have a decision from

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

ICSC shortly on the duty stations with four-week rest and recuperation cycle, and the relevant guidelines.

93. In response to a question from staff, management clarified that during its session in July 2012, ICSC would discuss lump-sum payment in respect of the accommodation portion of daily subsistence allowance in connection with rest and recuperation.

VIII. Extension beyond mandatory retirement age

94. Management presented a paper on retention in service beyond the mandatory age of separation and employment of retirees (SMC I/2012/III/Add.7). It was recalled that superannuation committees were introduced in 1998, following an agreement reached at SMCC in 1997. Given that the SG had decided that no requests for retention of staff members beyond the mandatory age of separation would be accepted, Management proposed the **abolition of these committees for this purpose**. The paper also contained criteria in employment of retirees.

95. Staff raised some questions regarding the criteria for employment of retirees, including authority in granting exception to employ retirees, remuneration limit of \$22,000 in respect of retiree, types of contract, level and time limit of appointment, and increase in mandatory retirement age. Concerns were also expressed regarding the impact of employment of retirees on career development opportunities for serving staff.

96. Management clarified that the Secretary-General made it clear that there would not be any extension beyond retirement. It would be within the purview of heads of department to employ retirees within the specific criteria described in paragraph 4 to 6 of the paper; however these would be only on Temporary Appointments as per ST/AI/2010/4. The remuneration limit of US\$22,000 existed due to the fact that above a certain amount, retirees would otherwise have to be employed on the basis of a regular contract and contribute to the pension fund. Also the US\$22,000 limit was set by the General Assembly. There had been discussions in various fora with diverse views from different organizations concerning an increase in the mandatory age of separation (from 60 to 62 for currently serving staff hired prior to 1 January 1990, and 65 for new staff). While this issue would be on the ICSC agenda during its upcoming session in July, its Secretariat however had not made any specific recommendation to the Commission. Final decision for the United Nations on this matter rested with the General Assembly.

IX. Proposal on academic degrees

97. Management introduced a paper on academic degrees (SMC I/2012/III/Add.8). A draft administration instruction (AI) on this matter had been prepared and would be circulated for consultations shortly. Management informed the Committee that, in their quest for higher education and learning, some staff members had obtained credentials

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

from institutions that provide degrees and transcripts, based on life experience, mainly over the Internet, against payment of a fee. These were generally considered to be “diploma mills” and were not considered legitimate. To accurately verify which institutions provide legitimate degrees, UNESCO maintained a database listing all accredited academic institutions. It was noted that UNESCO maintained only the database and the accreditation of educational institutions was done by national authorities. The primary elements of the AI to be issued including recognition of degrees, advice regarding obligations of staff and applicants, due process and interim measures were reflected in paragraph 4 of the paper. The interim measures that had been provided for in the AI include a request to staff to come forward within six months of the issuance of the AI if they realize that they are in possession of a degree from a non-recognized institution. In these instances staff would be able to stay in their post at current grade level and apply for lateral moves. However, they may not meet minimum requirements for higher level positions.

98. While staff expressed appreciation for this initiative, clarifications were sought regarding administrative and disciplinary actions, standards of assessment by UNESCO of academic institutions, frequency of revisions of the UNESCO list, reconciliation of different systems of degrees and diplomas and applicants’ background checks. Questions were also raised as to how management could support staff with invalid degrees in terms of training and obtaining degree from recognized institutions. A view was expressed that an institution might be included or excluded from the UNESCO list at different points in time depending on its status which could complicate matters.

99. Management clarified that UNESCO maintained a database of recognized institutions which was updated periodically. OHRM could be contacted for verification of information. Management commended staff members pursuing higher education. Reference checking and verification with academic institutions regarding information presented by candidates including those from national competitive examination continued. There had been shortcomings in the past and therefore due process and interim measures would be introduced in the administrative instruction. Management also referred to the staff regulations and rules regarding administrative and disciplinary measures.

X. Update on ICSC session

100. Management informed SMC that in preparation for the next session of ICSC in July, the HR Network would meet next week in Paris. The ICSC session would cover: mandatory age of separation; contractual arrangements, base salary scale; evaluation of the UN-US net remuneration margin; dependants and secondary dependants; report of the Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions (ACPAQ); mobility policy within organizations; the survey of best prevailing local conditions in Rome; rest and recuperation framework, review of security evacuation allowance (SEA) and extended

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

monthly security evacuation allowance ; danger pay; review of education grant levels; and report of the Working Group on Pensionable Remuneration.

101. In responding to a question regarding hardship classification review, management informed SMC that review was conducted by region on a three-year cycle and would take into account not only security factors, but also other elements such as health, housing, education facilities and isolation.

XI. Joint Harassment Boards

102. A proposal on the rules of procedure of the Joint Harassment Board which was prepared by a working group comprising of representatives from OHRM, the Staff Association of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Staff Council of the United Nations Office at Vienna (SMC I/2012/III/Add.9) was presented by management. The list of members of the Boards in various duty stations was issued pursuant SMCC agreement in Belgrade. **The rules of procedures of the Board were submitted to SMC for consideration.**

103. The Ombudsman raised the issue of potential conflict in some elements of the rules of procedures with the mandate of the Office of the Ombudsman. The Office of Administration of Justice also expressed its concern with reference to the Office of Staff Legal Assistance (OSLA). Relationship between OSLA lawyers and clients was strictly confidential.

104. Clarification was sought by staff regarding availability of the report referred to in paragraph 8 (iv) of the proposed rules of procedures, and how support service (paragraph 21 of the rules of procedures) would be provided.

105. Management indicated that the working group would work with the Office of the Ombudsman and with the Office of Administration of Justice to clarify the question raised and make adjustments to the rules of procedures as necessary. The member of the working group from ECLAC confirmed that the Rules of Procedures reflected only the role of both the Office of the Ombudsman and the Office of Staff Legal Assistance within ST/SGB/2008/5 and that there was no interference in the role of the respective offices, which would only be convened to give information on general trends and implementation of the policy on prohibited conduct should they wish to do so. It was also clarified that there was no intention to seek any confidential information from both the Office of the Ombudsman and the Office of the Administration of Justice which had important roles in this context. Management also confirmed that the annual report of the Board would be submitted to OHRM. It was also clarified that support to the Board would be provided locally.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

It was agreed that OHRM would issue the final text of the Rules of Procedures and make a follow-up of their implementation.

XII. Recommendation to member states to sign and ratify the 1994 Convention on the Safety of UN and Associated Personnel and Its 2005 Optional Protocol

106. Staff presented a paper on safety and security of United Nations personnel (SMC I/2012/III/Add.10). **It was proposed that a) member states be urged to sign and ratify the Convention and the Protocol and to strictly carry out their provisions; and b) the Standing Committee on Staff Security Issues be re-established.** Staff also emphasized that security was critical for mobility, particularly in terms of impact on staff welfare. Information was provided on countries which had not ratified the Convention.

107. While fully agreeing that it was important for staff to have a role in security matters, management indicated that the Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) comprising Security Focal Points from the United Nations Secretariat, agencies, funds and programmes also included representatives of staff from various staff federations. Security issues were normally dealt with at the inter-agency level given the presence of various organizations in a location. A common approach facilitated communications with the Department of Safety and Security (DSS). To create another working group would overlap and dilute the role of IASMN.

108. Staff expressed concern with the small number of countries signing and ratifying the Convention, and recommended that the Secretary-General urge member states to act. With regard to the proposed Standing Committee, it was clarified that there was no intention to duplicate the work of IASMN. The Standing Committee would deal with issues within the Secretariat. Staff also pointed out that sometimes it would be difficult to deal with security issues at the inter-agency level given the number of issues involved such as procurement, facility management, and other service contracts. Staff also emphasized the criticality of security issues particularly for those serving in the field; with regard to the ongoing mobility policy discussions and with regard to the role of host countries. Concern was also expressed regarding the role of staff representatives in local security arrangements, particularly in the security management team (SMT).

109. Management informed SMC that the Treaty Section of the Office of the Legal Affairs normally conducted outreach activities to member states to ratify conventions. Regarding the proposed Standing Committee, it was clarified that the matter had been raised with DSS and counterparts in other organizations, all agreed that these were global issues which should be dealt with in the IASMN to ensure consistency. It was pointed out that safety and security of staff was on the agenda of the HR Network, and the Network was usually invited to the IASMN meeting. The USG/DSS could perhaps meet with individual staff union or staff representatives. Specific issues could be brought to the attention of SMC. It was confirmed that staff representatives should be invited to

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

SMT meeting as an observer. Management assured the SMC that current inter-agency arrangements which include participation of staff federations would be sufficient in addressing security concerns.

SMC agreed to recommend to the Secretary-General to encourage member states to sign and ratify the 1994 Convention on the Safety of UN and Associated Personnel and Its 2005 Optional Protocol. On the proposed Standing Committee, SMC would resort at this time to the existing inter-agency mechanisms including the HR Network and the IASMN in addressing security concerns, with the understanding that specific security concerns could be brought to the attention of SMC.

XIII. Progress report on the Working Group on Achieving a Modern, Healthy and Family-Friendly Workplace

110. The Working Group on Achieving a Modern, Healthy and Family-Friendly Workplace presented its report (SMC I/2012/III/Add.11). It described the background on establishment of the Working Group in 2010, and the work it had undertaken to date, particularly during 2012. The paper reflected five elements for the achievement of such working environment: sport facilities, flexible working arrangements, occupational health and safety policy, working with staff members with disabilities, and child-care facilities. The Working Group agreed that financial resources would be one of the main challenges. It was agreed that checklist of what facilities currently exist would be needed. A detailed staff survey would also be conducted through OHRM and the staff unions to ensure widest distribution. The way forward would be that after a checklist and survey were completed and analyzed, recommendations would be formulated. It was also proposed that the issue of disability be moved to a new working group since it involved a wide range of considerations. The original Working Group would then focus on the other four issues. Focal points for each issue should be selected among the members of the Working Group. It was mentioned that this was work in progress given the wide areas covered by the Working Group.

111. Clarification was sought by staff on any concrete recommendation on child care facilities which were part of the staff proposals on mobility. The ECLAC staff representative confirmed their availability as the focal point for disability and occupational health and safety. She was of the view that support from a doctor would be required for the latter issue.

112. Management responded that different arrangements and demands existed in different duty stations. OHRM had taken the lead on flexible working arrangements and would continue to be involved in the Working Group. It also committed to continue to provide support to the Working Group. It was agreed that moving disability issues to a new working group was appropriate. SMC was advised to bear in mind financial constraints

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

and to be creative within existing resources. While recognizing the demands for child care facilities, the Organization would not be in a position to make specific commitments. Management also pointed out that reference was made to the work of the Working Group in the context of staff support in conjunction with mobility.

SMC thanked the Working Group for the progress report and proposals on the way forward to continue its work.

XIV. Participation of staff representatives in briefings by management to member states on staff-related issues

113. Staff expressed concern that management met with member states without staff representation present at these meetings. There had been a particular case when discussions on continuing appointments took place. At that time, management had several meetings with member states and no report from these meetings had been shared. Staff had brought this issue to the attention of the Chef de Cabinet at the recent special session of the Staff Management Committee on Mobility, held in New York (Glen Cove) from 30 April to 4 May 2012. Staff mentioned that the Chef de Cabinet had indicated that she would ensure staff were present during management's meeting with member states. Staff reminded the Committee that there was a specific General Assembly resolution regarding staff addressing member states which was applicable for formal meeting. It was proposed that, for informal meetings and briefings with member states, staff representatives would not actively participate but simply observe such meetings. Staff felt that this should not be an ad hoc arrangement and that a standing arrangement of this nature would be a good opportunity to build trust with member states. Therefore, staff proposed that SMC reflect agreement of both parties that during meetings/briefings with member states, staff representatives be present at those consultations.

114. Management recalled the particular situation referred to by staff. In that instance, while it was understood that management might have inadvertently created a situation of distrust, member states had demanded that the paper be submitted to them. They needed information and wanted access to it. Management clarified that, on that occasion, member states had been advised that the contents of the paper had not been agreed on by management or staff.

115. With reference to the discussion on this topic at the special session of the SMC, management recalled that the response of the Chef de Cabinet had been reflected in the report (*in paragraph 19 of the Report of that special session, the Chef de Cabinet had clarified, on that occasion, that member states could be informed that staff representatives wished to be present at briefing sessions by management, but that such presence would not mean that there would not be any other interaction by management with Member States*). Management reminded all that it is the prerogative of member

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

states whom to invite to meetings. While management could certainly be supportive, such matter was beyond the control of management since it is up to Member States to decide.

116. Staff reiterated their request that management confirm in the report of SMC-I that it undertakes to approach the 5th committee to observe its proceedings. Management responded that as far as informal and informal-informal consultations of the Committee are concerned, management had no right to be there. The Committee may invite management, if they so desire, to provide information and clarification, but management could not commit itself to arrange for staff representation at these sessions and, therefore, could not commit itself to write to the Bureau on this. Participation in informal meetings of the Fifth Committee would be determined by the Bureau of the Committee, and management would simply comply. Management recalled that, in the past, it had supported the participation of the Vice President of SMCC in the Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ). In addition, it was recalled that during the discussions on harmonization of contracts, representatives from funds and programmes had been requested by member states to leave. In short, since management did not have any formal status in the informal consultations it was not in a position to request staff representation at these sessions.

117. In response, staff requested through the SMC President that management consider this matter further. Staff indicated that the response from management seemed to imply that it was not supportive of the presence of staff representatives at these meetings. It was of the view that staff would be able to observe these informal meetings if management supported them in this effort. Later in the session, when the matter was discussed again, the ASG/OHRM indicated that management was very receptive to raise the issue informally with member states but that it could not commit itself to submitting an official request in writing to the Bureau of the Fifth Committee.

(b) Formal Consultations with Staff Members before Presentation of Proposals to Member States by Management on Issues related to Staff Members

118. Staff referred to a report on travel that had been presented to the General Assembly without prior formal consultations with staff. In response, management indicated that this had been an unfortunate situation where the pressure of time had caused management to accelerate the submission. There were no ill intentions on the side of management to deliberately circumvent established consultation procedures with the staff.

XV. Flexible working arrangements (FWA)

119. Management briefed SMC on the progress made in promoting, supporting and strengthening FWA across the Secretariat and a baseline survey on the use of FWA in

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

2011 in the Secretariat. (Powerpoint presentation attached as Annex SMC-I/2012/III/Add.12)).

120. Staff shared the experience of funds and programmes on FWA. Challenges in implementing telecommuting, particularly from outside the duty station, such as access to appropriate information technology support, performance issues, and appropriate entitlements were raised by staff. Staff pointed out that implementation of FWA could lead to financial implications. A view was expressed that FWA might benefit only managers. Staff requested that the results of the survey on FWA be shared.

121. Management thanked staff for sharing the information on funds and programmes. A lot of useful information would be available on the website. It was emphasized that FWA was not an entitlement. It was normal practice for managers to monitor performance of staff. Managers had been encouraged to support FWA which was part of the compact between heads of department and the Secretary-General. Trust was also important in implementing FWA. Implementation of FWA should be cost neutral, while possibly increasing efficiency. On the survey, management confirmed that results would be shared as soon as available. On information technology, management indicated that there was a concern relating to privileges and immunities.

SMC took note of the report on FWA.

XVI. Administration of Justice

(a) Internal Justice Council

122. A representative of staff on the Inter-sessional Working Group on Investigations, Disciplinary Matters and Administration of Justice issues presented draft terms of reference for the Internal Justice Council (IJC) attached as Annex SMC-I/2012/III/Add.13, and began by providing background information on the developments of the system of administration of justice over the years, and the role and activities of the Working Group. Staff was concerned with the role of and the member nomination process of the IJC due to lack of a clear mandate and guidelines from the General Assembly. Staff reiterated its views that external jurists in the IJC are not bound by any appointment within the UN and that for the performance of their functions the IJC members should not be subject to the authority of the SG in order to secure their independence. Staff also expressed their desire that staff at large be informed in due course of the new membership, the role and the independence of the IJC. Staff suggested bringing the matter to the President of the General Assembly for a request for a consultative opinion to the International Court of Justice (ICJ).

123. The Executive Director of the Office of Administration of Justice expressed her pleasure to participate in SMC and noted the draft terms of reference proposed by the

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

staff. She also welcomed the opportunity to work with the Working Group. The mandate of the IJC had been set out in a series of General Assembly resolutions on administration of justice, the latest being resolution 66/237. The Executive Director confirmed that external jurists on the IJC were paid a fee of \$550 per day. Expenses in respect of IJC were reflected in the budget of the Office. The role and responsibilities of the Office including its interaction with the IJC were clearly defined in ST/SGB/2010/3. The Office was mandated to provide administrative, not substantive support to IJC. IJC conducted its own meetings with stakeholders and role players, as part of its monitoring of the AoJ system. IJC had not expressed any dissatisfaction with the services provided by the Office. As to the composition of the Council, as was made clear to the staff in its facilitation of an exchange of views, the Office took no view on the interpretation of the Statute of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal. It was up to staff and management to resolve the matter. The Office was ready to provide assistance based on the agreement of both parties. Given the important role of the IJC in the new system, it was important to resolve this matter as soon as possible. The Executive Director suggested that there might be other options which could be faster than referring to ICJ.

124. Staff thanked the Executive Director for the clarifications. While aware of the support provided by OAJ, staff indicated that based on its report, IJC had indicated that it could not fully function under the current arrangements with limited resources. Staff expressed concern with the manner in which management handled the nomination of the external jurist representing staff in the IJC. Staff indicated that communication regarding the staff nomination was sent to the Secretary-General. While no response on the nomination had been received, staff was informed that the Secretary-General decided to renew the mandate of the current IJC by one month without consultation and justification. Staff voiced its concern with the absence of an IJC given the fact that the former members nominated by staff were not renominated. Staff also enquired who the nominees from management were.

125. Management commended staff on this initiative. It was clear that management also had some frustration with the lack of terms of reference of the IJC. However, management was of the view that matters pertaining to the role of IJC and its funding fell within the purview of the General Assembly. There were valid points and some issues of concern in the proposed ToR which needed to be further elaborated. With regard to the response to the staff nomination of the external jurist, management confirmed that the Secretary-General remained aware of the matter, and they would follow-up and try to obtain a response from the Executive Office of the Secretary-General. Management informed the SMC that the same two members were nominated to the IJC.

126. In response to questions from staff regarding the ToR, management clarified that expert bodies established by the General Assembly such as ICSC and JIU had been involved in the development of their own rules of procedures. Similarly, it was the view of management that IJC should have a role in establishing its own ToR. In light of the

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

fact that a report on administration of justice was due for the 67th session of the General Assembly, it was proposed that a need to establish the ToR could be reflected in the report. Subsequently, the IJC itself might work on the ToR with inputs from both staff and management.

127. Staff expressed its concern with the lack of the ToR of and the delay in the staff nominations in the Council. It was expected that these issues would be fully discussed in SMC. Management reiterated its support of well-defined ToR, and its view that a subsidiary body of the General Assembly should develop its own ToR. The Executive Director of the OAJ recalled that IJC was independent and reported directly to the Assembly. It would be appropriate for the IJC to decide on this matter and report to the General Assembly. Based on these clarifications, staff appreciated the situation and indicated that staff and management should communicate their concerns regarding the ToR to the IJC. Management also clarified that several offices would be involved in the work on the ToR. It was added, however, that for reason of its independence, it would be more appropriate for the IJC to formulate its own ToR. Management would be in a position to provide input when invited. In this light, staff would prefer to submit its proposed ToR to the IJC directly when the new members are in place.

128. It was concluded that management would follow-up on the response to the nomination of the staff representative and the external jurist representing staff in the IJC. It was acknowledged that the draft ToR contained valid points and some areas of concerns. Staff would proceed to convey its draft ToR directly to the IJC when the new members are in place.

**b) Progress report of the Intersessional Working Group on Investigation,
Disciplinary Matters and Administration of Justice**

129. A staff representative on the Intersessional Working Group explained the way in which the work of the Intersessional Working Group had been divided, approaching Administration of Justice issues as such on one side and Investigations and Disciplinary matters on the other. Staff were ready to start working with the Office of Administration of Justice on these issues. She highlighted outstanding issues regarding the mandate of the Office of Staff Legal Assistance (OSLA) and its independence, a staff funded legal assistance scheme, incentives for staff volunteering legal assistance, and codes of conduct of legal practitioners. She pointed out that the investigation and disciplinary matters segment of the Working Group had proceeded very well.

130. A management representative on the Intersessional Working Group presented a paper (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.14) on the work of the Sub-Working Group on investigations and disciplinary matters and the Nairobi Pilot Project. It is suggested that the issues of the relationship between the Sub-Working Group and the Intersessional Working Group be discussed in SMC with a view to finding a way forward.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

131. Staff added that a lot of work had been done on investigation and disciplinary matters by the Sub-Working Group. There was also concern regarding due process rights of staff under investigation. It was pointed out that the revision of ST/AI/371 remained outstanding.

132. Management clarified that the new internal justice system prompted a need to review some disciplinary proceedings. The current revision of ST/AI/371 would address certain immediate needs. Once the work of the Sub-Working Group was completed, a further revision of the administrative instruction would be drafted and circulated for consultations. Management proposed that the work of the Sub-Working Group which comprised various stakeholders should continue independently of the Intersessional Working Group.

It was agreed that the Sub-Working Group would continue its work on investigation and disciplinary matters independently. Once agreement was reached on necessary changes, there would be revisions to ST/AI/371. It was also concluded that the Office of the Administration of Justice would be a main counterpart of the Intersession Working Group working on several outstanding issues such as OSLA mandate, staff funded scheme, incentives for volunteers, and code of conduct for legal practitioners.

c) Options for representing staff before the internal tribunals, and proposal for a mandatory staff funded mechanism for OSLA

133. The Executive Director of the Office of Administration of Justice presented a paper setting out options for a mandatory staff-funded scheme (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.15). It was noted that the General Assembly had seized on this matter since the establishment of the internal justice system. She welcomed the timely opportunity for consultation on this matter at SMC. While supporting OLSA, the Assembly continued to revert to the questions of funding and mandates of that office. The Executive Director noted as well the ACABQ recommendations (as contained in its report A/66/7/Add.6) to the General Assembly. A review of the relevant resolutions suggested that the Assembly had contemplated for some time that there be some type of staff funded mechanism. It might not be inclined to approve additional resources for OSLA without a contribution by staff.

134. The Executive Director briefly outlined the components of the proposed options for representing staff and for a mandatory staff funded scheme as described in the paper. She looked forward to feedback from SMC. She also asked whether there might be other options beside those presented in the paper.

135. Staff thanked the Executive Director for her presentation. Staff reminded SMC that this matter had been discussed in the past. Staff were opposed to the arrangement

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

where the Organization removed the rights of staff to resort to national justice systems and replaced it with an internal system without also providing legal assistance. In many national jurisdictions, those rights also included access to legal representation at no costs. While the internal justice system was devised by member states, the concept of equality of arms should have been instituted, and staff legal representation properly funded by member states. It was inappropriate to request staff to fund legal assistance. Staff proposed that management together with staff should jointly present this view to member states. Staff also raised questions on the role and the mandate of OSLA, and its decision not to represent staff. Questions were raised regarding the input from staff in the report on administration of justice. It was pointed out in Geneva, OSLA was provided with funding and office space, and the report on the use of such resources remained pending for three years. Staff also noted that many contributed voluntarily services and that this constituted in-kind contribution already. Staff also proposed looking at additional options at augmenting the capacity of OSLA by reaching out for example to other renowned legal institutions or higher education bodies and try to obtain pro-bono legal representation from accredited representatives.

136. The Executive Director of the Office of Administration of Justice thanked staff for their feedback and comments on the proposals. Regarding the preparation of the report to the General Assembly, she informed SMC that the report had not yet been drafted. Views expressed during the present consultation would be conveyed to the Secretary-General. She expressed her appreciation for the funding and office space provided to OSLA in Geneva, and would follow-up regarding the query raised in relation to the report. She noted that legal aid to indigent persons was provided in a number of national justice systems. There was reference in the paper to a waiver of fees or a sliding scale to reduce fees.

137. Staff presented a position paper on staff funded legal assistance scheme (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.16). It was emphasized that this matter had been discussed since the inception of the new internal justice system. For the first time, information on costs of the scheme was presented. A view was expressed that mandatory payments from staff associations and unions could pose difficulty for those with small numbers of dues-paying members.

138. Management indicated that the General Assembly, by its resolution 66/237, requested the Secretary-General to submit the options presented by the Executive Director of the Office of Administration of Justice. Management had some concerns about the proposal before the Committee. It was felt that data on the number of instances where staff were represented by OSLA should be included. From the experience of management in its role as the representative of the Secretary-General, it was noted that OSLA represented staff in only one-third of the cases. Pros and cons of each option presented in the proposal should also be presented to the General Assembly for its informed decision. Comments were made that in a mandatory scheme, a large number of

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

population might fund legal assistance for a small number of staff, and the arrangement could be challenged by staff thus potentially also increasing the number of cases.

139 . The Executive Director confirmed her belief in the internal justice system and assured staff that she would do her utmost to make it work as best as it could be. She took note that staff objected in principle to the concept of a mandatory staff funded scheme and that staff indicated that financial costs should be borne by the Organization. She took note of concerns expressed regarding particular options. She invited suggestions on any other ways to support OSLA. She also thanked FSU for its position paper and proposals for incentives for volunteers.

140 . Suggestions from staff on other ways to support OSLA, which it considered to be a vital component of the new system of administration of justice, included in-kind services, outreach activities by OSLA, tapping into existing resource particularly legal expertise among staff unions, and better use of in-house legal resources.

Based on the consultations and the views expressed on the paper presented by the Office of Administration of Justice, it was clear that a mandatory staff funded mechanism for OSLA was considered not acceptable to staff.

XVII. Training of staff representatives

141 . Staff introduced a paper prepared by the Working Group on Training of Staff Representatives which was jointly supported by both staff and management. Staff indicated that since the submission of the paper, further work had been done to refine the projections for training so as to develop the cost figures. It appeared that the initial number of representatives to be trained was in the region of 200, with a biannual turnover rate of 20% as new representatives were elected. Based on standard cost figures, it was estimated that a class of 20 could cost about \$4,000. By taking the approach of offering part of the curriculum via on-line delivery, it was thought that the instructor-led element of the course costs could be minimized. In addition, the idea of geographic consolidation and cost-sharing was raised.

142 . Staff indicated that it would be possible to have the curriculum validated by an accredited educational institution such as the Open University, and with additional voluntary coursework at additional cost, attendees could potentially obtain a post-graduate certificate in Industrial Relations. A view was expressed that management representatives involved in staff management relations could also participate in some of the training.

143 . The office of the Ombudsman offered assistance in both the development of the substantive curriculum as well as potentially the delivery, depending on requirement, availability and cost.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

144 . Management expressed its appreciation for the work of the working group. It was of the view that this represented a very positive step which enjoyed full support of management.

As a way forward, SMC agreed that the Working Group should provide the updated figures on projected participants to OHRM so that more concrete estimates could be developed, with a view to determining if costs could be absorbed into existing training resources, either centrally or in part locally by each office. The ICTY indicated its intention to start with a limited implementation, and welcomed interested participants.

XVIII. Revisions to ST/AI/2010/3 on Staff Selection

145 . Management presented a paper on revision to ST/AI/2010/3 on staff selection (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.17). The intention was to explain the proposed changes to the administration instruction, before the circulation of the draft revision next week for consultation.

146 . Staff thanked management for the proposals. Clarifications were sought regarding the use and management of the roster of candidates. Staff were also pleased with the recognition of experience of staff in the FS, GS and related categories. A question was raised on how such experience would be taken into account in the selection process. Staff also sought clarification on the decision of the General Assembly to delete the special procedures for the selection of external candidates from the staff selection system, and confirmation as to whether staff placement authority particularly regarding those serving in downsizing operations would be maintained in the revised administrative instruction. Staff enquired about the exclusion from the ST/AI of entry levels in the FS, GS and related categories. There were also questions on how these revisions would fit into the mobility policy currently under discussion. It was suggested by staff that there should be an outreach campaign to staff when changes were introduced to the staff selection system.

147 . Management clarified that only the relevant professional experience at the GS-6 and above and FS-4 and above would be taken into account. The decision of the General Assembly on external candidates had been implemented since January 2011. In that context, it should be noted that the provisions of staff regulations 4.4 regarding due consideration to all serving staff members had been kept. It was clarified that the roster of candidates would be frequently updated and maintained. Rostered candidates as from 22 April 2010 would be maintained in the roster. Inspira would send a job alert to roster candidates when a similar position was available. Staff would simply express their interest. Management indicated that provisions pertaining to downsizing operation would be included in the revised ST/AI. A separate ST/AI would be issued in respect of entry

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

levels in the FS, GS and related categories. It was clarified that while mobility policy would result in changes to the staff selection system, the proposed changes were for the current system as long as it remained in force. Management confirmed that an outreach campaign would be conducted when changes to the staff selection system were introduced.

148. It was concluded that the paper introduced by management was shared for comments. The draft revision of the ST/AI would be circulated next week for consultations in accordance with established procedures.

XIX. Human Resources Issues

(a) Staff part-time employment

149. Staff introduced a paper on part-time employment (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.18), as a fifth pillar to FWA.

150. Management indicated that the proposal was worth further exploration, while cautioning that its implementation might be challenging. Matching part-time arrangements would need to be identified. Furthermore, financial mechanics and applicable entitlements would need to be carefully reviewed, both in terms of equality among staff serving under different arrangements and financial implications to the Organization.

It was agreed that a contact group comprising representatives from staff and management would be formed to follow-up on this matter.

(b) Establishing procedures for consultation on gender related policy issues

151. Staff presented a paper on establishing procedures for consultation on gender related policy issues (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.19). In this context, staff was of the view that departmental gender focal points sometimes tended to enter into policy discussions with administration, in addition to monitoring policy implementation. Clarification was sought regarding the role of UN Women. The paper proposed that gender related personnel policies should be brought on the auspices of SMC.

152. Management informed SMC that a solution to this issue had been contemplated since the inception of UN Women. With the creation of UN Women a complex entity had been formed where normative and operational roles had been merged. The Focal Point for Women which formed part of UN Women coordinated the network of gender focal points. UN Women recently developed overarching policy applicable to all heads of departments and offices to be reflected in their compacts with the Secretary-General. Management would continue to work with UN Women. Internally, there was still a need

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

for a Secretariat-wide gender focal point. A lot remain to be done on gender balance, particularly in the field. Until we had dedicated capacity, the Focal Point for Women in UN Women would continue to support us. Currently, the role of departmental gender focal points was described in ST/SGB/2008/12 which might be due for review given current circumstances.

It was concluded that a contact group should be formed to look into this matter and review the ST/SGB, and to bring any policy issues back to SMC.

(c) Continued Career deadlock of Field Service staff

153. Staff presented a paper on career deadlock for Field Service staff (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.20).

154. Management shared the view that the Organization needed to do more to provide clarity to the career prospects of the Field Service staff. This was a unique category of staff in field missions, making up about 60% of our international staff in field missions. It was recognized that there were two factors contributing to limited career prospects. One was the limited spread of positions, with the bulk at the FS-4 and FS-5 levels and few at the FS-6 and FS-7 level. In addition, there was the academic degree requirement in order to be eligible to apply for Professional posts, and only staff at FS-6 and FS-7 level could apply for such posts. Management informed that FPD would undertake a comprehensive review of the FS category with a view to identifying potential for career development, and in line with the recent GA request, to explore the issue of nationalization of posts. This exercise would be initiated in the latter part of this year. These legitimate concerns raised by staff could be considered in that framework.

155. Staff thanked management for the initiative. However, concern was expressed that reviews of Field Service category had taken place in the past. Staff indicated that the proposed review should include participation of staff representatives, with face-to-face meetings. Staff requested that clear instructions be provided to field missions on review of post structure, with the objective of converting some of the current P-3 and P-4 posts to FS-6 and FS-7.

156. Management would reiterate guidance given to administration of missions on review of post structure, bearing in mind that FPD cannot impose structures and that those were based on related mandates. Management confirmed association of FSU staff representatives with the comprehensive review.

157. SMC took note of the intention of management to undertake a comprehensive review of the Field Service category with staff participation in the latter part of 2012.

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

(d) Recruitment freeze in DPKO/DPA missions

158. Staff introduced a paper on recruitment freeze in DPKO/DPA missions (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.21).

159. Management indicated that while not all posts and staff were fungible, vacancy rates had come down and the number of approved posts had also been reduced. It was confirmed that missions were encouraged to give priority to internal candidates especially those affected by downsizing. Meanwhile, the Organization did not have the authority to introduce a recruitment freeze. Management suggested that feasibility of a freeze on FS recruitment could be considered in the context of the comprehensive review of FS category which would address other concerns of Member States and stand a better chance of success in the General Assembly. Management would also communicate again to hiring managers that preference should be given to internal candidates from down sizing missions as far as they were suitable.

160. While accepting this approach, staff expressed concern with the time the FS review would take and sought immediate measures to freeze external recruitment, not only for FS but also Professional category. In response, management would urge managers to try their utmost to consider suitable staff from downsizing missions. Management confirmed that a comprehensive FS review would encompass career opportunities, greater nationalization and feasibility of an FS recruitment freeze, with a view to arriving at cohesive and comprehensive measures.

(e) Recognition of civil union partnership

161. Staff presented a paper on recognition of civil union partnership (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.22). During the discussion, staff amended the proposal by removing completely paragraph 2 of ST/SGB/2004/13.

162. Management indicated that this matter was discussed in the HR Network. Management assured staff of its efforts in this matter. Management recalled member states' sensitivity in this regard leading to removal of a previous ST/SGB on personal status of staff members for the purposes of entitlements in 2003. It would not be advisable to amend ST/SGB/2004/13. The practice had been that permanent missions concerned were consulted with a general question on their national policy, without any personal information. For the majority of countries, the relevant information was available. Under the mobility framework, this issue would be part of the family support measures, and would fall under the purview of the Special Constraints Panel.

(f) Revision of the procedures and TOR of Staff Management Consultation Machinery as agreed by the last session of SMC including consideration of the JIU report on Staff Management relations

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

163 . Staff presented the issue of relationship between staff and management in the context of JIU report on staff-management relations within the United Nations. It was indicated that this was the first time the issue was reviewed by an expert body such as the JIU. Staff appreciated the value of the report and welcomed its conclusions and recommendations. It was, however, felt that JIU might have exceeded its mandate by looking into staff union issues. It was suggested that it needed to go further on relation between staff and member states. Staff brought forward for discussions at SMC recommendations 1 through 6 of the JIU report.

164 . Management welcomed the report of JIU. Noting that the report covered not only the Secretariat but also funds and programmes, management was of the view that issues seemed to be more complex in terms of what the Secretariat could address internally. Concern was expressed on the recommendation relating to the functioning of the SMC as well as its duration. Given that the report would be submitted to the General Assembly and included recommendations addressed to the General Assembly, it would be advisable to await the reaction of the Assembly. Recent experience had shown that better communications would help staff-management relations. Heads of departments and offices had been reminded of the need to consult with staff in accordance with established procedures.

165 . Management indicated that its own comments on the JIU Report would be issued in a report of the Secretary-General.

(g) Downsizing guidelines

166 . Management presented a paper on downsizing guidelines jointly prepared by staff and management (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.23) which represented an outline for an administrative instruction.

167 . Staff expressed concern with the lack of transparency in restructuring or downsizing exercises. Staff suggested that lessons-learned should be taken into consideration. Experience in similar matter in funds and programme was also shared. Questions were raised regarding the composition and the role of the proposed review committee. Clarification was sought on lien on posts and secondment. Staff also suggested that staff members affected by downsizing should be informed in a timely manner.

168 . Management clarified that abolition of posts fell within the purview of the General Assembly. It was also clarified that the review committee would review positions concerned, and not the incumbents. It was proposed that the number of members of the review committee be relatively small in order to ensure efficiency. Given the comments from staff, management would further consider the provisions

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

pertaining to the review committee. Management confirmed that there were still cases of lien on posts. It was agreed that concerned staff members should be advised as early as possible. ICTR shared its best practices and experience with downsizing, and indicated that the Tribunal's staff had been involved from the beginning.

It was agreed that the working group would continue with the work on the administrative instruction, taking into account views expressed during the discussion, and Field Staff Union and DFS/FPD would join the working group.

(h) Local salary surveys

169 . Staff presented a paper on reactivation of the Inter-session working group on conditions of service of local staff (SMC-I/2012/III/Add.24)

170 . Staff expressed concern about accountability regarding mistakes in past surveys. Questions were raised regarding currency devaluation in some duty stations. Staff expressed the desire that the administration act as guardian of the survey process and requested direct access to data and constant communication with OHRM and ICSC during the survey process, access to training for staff representatives as the survey is a UN internal process and in order to assist staff as much as possible in carrying it out, and establishment of concrete and transparent procedures for dispute resolution during the survey process.

171 . Management recognized that salary issues were always sensitive and difficult, and noted the views and concerns expressed by staff. Management informed SMC that the most recent review by ICSC of local salary survey methodology was completed and approved by the General Assembly in December 2011, with effect from 1 January 2012. The next review would take place in 2016 or 2017, following completion of surveys in all duty stations under the new methodology. Management noted that staff federations were present during ICSC review of the salary survey methodology. During the review, management representatives also expressed some concerns. It was noted that every time ICSC conducted such reviews, questions were always raised concerning the Fleming Principle. Management clarified that secondary salary scales were issued following consultation with ICSC. Management also stated that, in the instances where the survey had a negative result, the issuance of a secondary scale reflects the Fleming Principle. However, staff representatives expressed strong views that application of secondary salary scales erodes the Flemming principle reducing the competitiveness of the UN as an employer, erodes the morale and working environment, as well as violates the internationally recognized labor law for "equal pay for equal work" and the basic Human Rights Principles. OHRM committed to provide training on local survey methodology to staff. It was stressed that the surveys were a technical exercise but that staff in the local salary survey committees at the duty stations should play a key role in identifying and selecting comparator employers to be surveyed, ensuring that the methodology would

Session I
Staff-Management Committee
Arusha, 15 – 22 June 2012

correctly be applied. For headquarters duty stations, ICSC was in charge of conducting local salary surveys. At this stage, management was of the view that there was no need for a working group since the matter would not be considered by ICSC soon. OIOS had been requested to review the process and determine if there was room for improvement.

172 . Staff expressed appreciation for the effort by management in addressing this issue, and sought advice if any immediate remedial measures could be applied. Staff clarified that the proposal was indeed reactivation of an existing working group on conditions of service of local staff. Suggestion was made that the working group should review experience in recent surveys, and look forward to appropriate training for staff. Questions were asked regarding currencies of salary scales and currencies of payment. Staff referred to special measures which could be taken in extremely difficult situations such as high inflation.

173 . Management clarified that currency of payment was based on the practice of local comparator employers. Management cited example of duty stations where special measures were applicable, and indicated that such measures would not be applicable in Bangkok and Santiago. With regard to the working group, management was of the view that resources would be better utilized for training of staff on salary survey methodology. It was proposed that a video conference could be held with the ICSC Secretariat so that staff could raise their concerns.

It was agreed that a contact group would be established, comprising staff representatives from ECLAC, ECA, ESCAP, ESCWA, UNSU, and funds and programmes, to follow up with OHRM regarding discussions with the ICSC Secretariat on the salary survey methodology.

XX. Venue of SMC-II

174 . Management indicated that there were some expressions of interest to host SMC-II, scheduled to be held some time in June 2013. Amongst them were ICTY and ESCAP with possibly other interested parties. It was agreed that there would be a consultation process to arrive at an agreement on the venue for SMC-II.