



TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee**Second report: Personnel questions****Contents**

	<i>Page</i>
I. Statement by the staff representative.....	1
II. Amendments to the Staff Regulations	2
III. Exceptions to the Staff Regulations	2
IV. ILO Human Resources Strategy: Update	2
V. Pensions questions	19
(a) Report of the Board of the UN Joint Staff Pension Fund.....	19
(b) Report of the Board of Trustees of the Special Payments Fund	19
(c) ILO Staff Pensions Fund.....	19
VI. Report of the International Civil Service Commission	20
VII. Matters relating to the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO	21
VIII. Other personnel questions	21

1. The Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee met on 7, 8 and 10 November and was chaired by Mr. Amorim (Government, Brazil; Chairperson of the Governing Body). Mr. Willers (Government, Germany) was the Reporter.

I. Statement by the staff representative

2. The Chairperson of the Staff Union Committee referred to the signature of two collective agreements since March, when the Governing Body had endorsed the introduction of collective bargaining. The new agreements dealt with a new procedure for the resolution of grievances and new procedures for the recruitment and selection of staff. The Office and the Staff Union had also agreed on practical arrangements to set up a review panel, which had been reflected in an annex to the recognition and procedural agreement. Much change, in a short time and to the great satisfaction of the parties, had been possible through collective bargaining. This confirmed that collective bargaining did not have to bring conflict and showed that negotiations in good faith could offer solutions to many thorny issues. He expressed the wish that the Governing Body endorse the changes proposed on fundamental topics which had been settled after intense negotiations. The only reserve the Staff Union had concerned the time and effort required to rewrite the Staff Regulations. It should suffice to attach the signed agreements to the Staff Regulations to make them part of the regulations, as was the case in many countries. Agreements on other important matters should follow in the near future, for example, on preventing and remedying harassment, on the Personal Development Plan (PDP) and on restructuring and simplifying job classification. It was through the negotiation of such changes that the Office could better fulfil the aims of an efficient international civil service based on international recruitment, employment stability, and promotions based mainly on merit, while securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. These changes could also bring a significant improvement in the working climate of the Office and contribute to a change in management culture. While the Staff Union was optimistic about the human resource reforms, means to recognize excellence in conduct or performance were needed. Staff loyalty and commitment also had to be matched by the loyalty of the employer. This could be done in many ways, including the allocation of time and resources for training, a necessary part of a true career development strategy. As already stressed in March, a Joint Training Board with Union representation should be mandated to decide on priorities and allocations. The budget for training should represent 2 to 5 per cent of the ILO budget.
3. The Union was concerned with a number of other areas. The first area concerned staff in precarious employment and their exclusion from social protection (health insurance, annual leave, pension rights and protection in case of service-incurred accidents). Some progress has been made since March on identifying the scope of the problem. All people under such contracts should remain employed until agreement on a solution was reached and the issue was resolved. The practice of employing people under unfair conditions was contrary to the principle of decent work and the ILO's values and principles, and needed to be corrected. Another area dealt with conditions under which local staff, representing about half of ILO staff, were employed in field duty stations. While there were legitimate reasons for some differences in the employment conditions of local and international staff, certain inequalities required urgent remedy. The purchasing power of salaries when local currencies became volatile should be protected, and provisions for personal security and safety in times of political unrest, as well as in the case of arrangements for medical evacuation in emergency situation, should be established. Remedying these situations would be in line with action already taken by other UN agencies and programmes and should be commensurate with the urgent and humanitarian nature of these issues. Corrective action would be cost-neutral in the medium term. The introduction of a pro-mobility rationale also required further attention and one aspect, namely duty travel,

should be mentioned for particular examination. Some staff spent significant periods of time travelling. The travel preparedness of staff members was neglected; what was needed were proper briefing and debriefing routines on health issues and security, clear and reasonable provisions for rest and recuperation during and after missions, arrangements for emergency evacuation, better facilities for communication during missions to remote areas, and a link between travel preparedness and a wellness programme for all staff. Furthermore, the Office should take a more proactive approach to remedying the causes of sickness and absenteeism. Improved health and better travel preparedness could reduce absenteeism and improve staff satisfaction and were in the interests of the Office as well as of staff. Finally, the Office's proposals for a work, family and well-being policy were to be supported as part of a larger agenda to allow individuals to balance their professional and personal life. In conclusion, he called on the Governing Body to support collective bargaining and search for adequate solutions to the concerns the Staff Union had expressed. For its part, the Staff Union would continue its strong contributions to the process of reforming the human resources policy, both at headquarters and in the field.

II. Amendments to the Staff Regulations (Tenth item on the agenda)

4. The Committee took note of a paper¹ on the amendments to the Staff Regulations approved by the Director-General during the preceding 12 months under the authority delegated to him by the Governing Body.

III. Exceptions to the Staff Regulations (Eleventh item on the agenda)

5. The Committee noted that there was no business under this agenda item.

IV. ILO Human Resources Strategy: Update (Twelfth item on the agenda)

6. The Committee had before it a document providing an update on implementation of the ILO Human Resources Strategy.²
7. Mr. Blondel, speaking on behalf of the Worker members, welcomed the two collective agreements reached by the Director-General and the Staff Union. In the workers' view, and with respect to the determination of conditions of employment, collective bargaining was a positive development alongside the rules of the international civil service; its extension to other international organizations would be welcomed. He requested the opinion of the staff of the Office regarding the new forms of staff relations and staff management.
8. The costs associated with grievance handling, and in particular the establishment of the office of an Ombudsperson and the appointment of facilitators, were important. Clarification was requested on the nature of the role of the Ombudsperson. As for the crèche, could Conference delegates benefit in the future and have places for their children?

¹ GB.279/PFA/10.

² GB.279/PFA/12 and Add.1.

Finally, he objected to the tone and manner in which paragraph 15 was written. On the one hand, a proposal to fund the development of an information system was in preparation; on the other, “irrespective of the Governing Body’s decision on this proposal” it was already necessary to modify the existing system. He asked whether the development of a new human resources information system should not be part of the larger debate concerning financial management; the matter should be considered as a whole and in a way that would, in respect of human resources, avoid a period of transition from the existing to the new system.

9. Mr. Marshall, speaking on behalf of the Employer members, welcomed the initiatives being pursued as generally positive and a reflection of best international practice. His group wished to raise and discuss a number of issues prior to considering the point for decision. The late receipt of the documentation was also of concern.
10. In considering the issues before the Committee, the Governing Body should assume a “governance” role, as the Director-General enjoyed the delegated authority to manage as the employer. It was assumed that the Director-General, in presenting the proposal, was giving his assurances that the proposed measures were in line with the UN common system. It was also assumed that there was no element within the collective bargaining process or elsewhere that could be seen as limiting or restricting the Governing Body’s right to determine policy. Collective agreements could not be interpreted in ways that suggested that agreements took precedence over the Governing Body and its regulatory function. He expressed concern that non-union staff appeared to be required to use a union-dominated grievance procedure. Clarification was sought in respect of a provision within the collective agreement on grievance procedures that appeared to provide for a review of the Statutes of the Administrative Tribunal by negotiation; this was inappropriate, since the Tribunal came under the responsibility of the Governing Body. In particular, the issue of class actions should be considered by the Office and other international organizations that had recognized the jurisdiction of the Tribunal before the submission of a proposed policy position to the Governing Body. It would be procedurally incorrect for policy issues of this nature to be submitted to the Governing Body after negotiation by the Office and the Staff Union, as this would risk overruling a collective agreement by the Governing Body. The Employer members also sought clarification as to whether the bargaining process and all of the provisions in the agreement applied with respect to the Director-General and senior staff.
11. In terms of the Office’s proposal for remedial action where an official failed to comply with family support obligations, Mr. Marshall sought assurances that, given the unclear status of some court orders, the Office would be able to make deductions from an official’s salary without incurring legal liability. The Employer members were also concerned with the high cost of the budget requested to support implementation of the HR Strategy. The Employers requested the Office to ensure that ongoing costs were minimized. Finally, his group noted that \$150,000 has been requested to undertake a temporary upgrade of the HR information system. An assurance was sought that the upgrade was as critical as was suggested in the document, and that such an upgrade would be compatible with the IT project.
12. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the IMEC group, considered the documents before the Committee on this agenda item to be very important. The ILO, given its mandate, should play a leading role in the development of human resource management within the UN system. It was doing so. The IMEC group welcomed the new grievance procedures, which should lead to a faster resolution of most disputes and ultimately release resources for other HR activities. It also welcomed new recruitment procedures which gave line managers a direct role and should assist in reducing recruitment time, the introduction of the Personal Development Plan (PDP), work

being done to combat harassment, the successful launch of the Young Professional Career Entrants Programme, the long-overdue drive to improve management skills and the introduction of measures to implement family support obligations. These measures were an impressive list of achievements, being delivered within the scheduled time frame. On the other hand, the level of additional funds sought was not insignificant, despite the proposal to fund it from existing resources on a one-off basis. In this respect, the IMEC group questioned the proposed cost of the Ombudsperson and asked for an indication regarding the savings likely to occur as a result of the initiative, both in terms of greater efficiency. IMEC also asked if the proposed changes were likely to result in any increased running costs.

- 13.** One feature of the documentation gave rise to concern as it appeared to challenge the prerogatives of the Governing Body. While it was clear that the Governing Body had given the Director-General the power to negotiate agreements with the Staff Union – on condition that they were compatible with the common system – it could not be accepted that such agreements had primacy over the Staff Regulations. There was, therefore, a serious problem with some of the language contained in the agreements and in the suggested amendments to the Staff Regulations to give effect to those agreements. The parties to the agreements could not demand changes to the Staff Regulations and set time limits for amendments. In the event of a conflict between an agreement and the Staff Regulations, it was clear that the Staff Regulations should have primacy. It was stressed, however, that the IMEC group had no problem with the substance of the agreements and would have liked to see them implemented as soon as possible, but the late receipt of the documents and the manner in which they were presented had given rise to difficulties. Accordingly, it was proposed that the point for decision in paper GB.279/PFA/12 be amended by –

- (1) replacing the word “endorse” by the word “note” in subparagraphs 19(b) and (c);
- (2) deleting the following:
 - (i) paragraph 10.1(d) of Appendix I to that document (draft Staff Regulations to give effect to the Recognition and Procedure (Collective) Agreement);
 - (ii) section VII (Interpretation) of the Amendment to Chapter XIII of the Staff Regulations: Procedure for the Resolution of Grievances (presented as Appendix III in GB.279/PFA/12(Add.1));
 - (iii) paragraph 19 (Interpretation) of the draft Staff Regulations to give effect to the Collective Agreement on Recruitment and Selection (presented as Appendix VI in GB.279/PFA/12(Add.1)).

- 14.** The IMEC group also emphasized that it would not be able to endorse any agreement in the future that contained such prejudicial language nor would it agree to any proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations contained in such a text. Lastly, many IMEC delegations were still examining other aspects of the draft amendments to the Regulations and hoped that it would be possible to agree to these proposals during the current session.

- 15.** He also requested assurances concerning the compatibility of the paternity leave proposal in GB.279/PFA/12 with the UN common system. Information was requested as to whether that proposal had been discussed with the ICSC. He then proposed that the word “note” be substituted for the word “approve” in paragraph 19(e) of the point for decision. Finally, information was sought on the annual cost to the Office for each child placed in the Scoubidou crèche.

16. The representative of the Government of Canada, on behalf of the Government group, expressed a common concern regarding the proposed changes in the Staff Regulations. As noted by the representative of the United Kingdom Government, paragraph 10.1(d) as well as other points appeared to impinge on the prerogatives of the Governing Body. He supported the request that these paragraphs be deleted or amended. He also referred to the late receipt and presentation of the documents, which left insufficient time for adequate consideration and consultation.
17. The representative of the Government of the Russian Federation thanked the Office for the ideas presented regarding the restructuring of the human resource policy and noted their broad scope. He indicated that his Government had objections to the extension of collective agreements within the Office. These fears were linked to factors including the compatibility of the agreements with the status of the international civil service, their possible impact on the decision-making process of and the role of the management bodies in the Organization, and the inevitable financial consequence of the agreements, which were identified in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the document. While expressing satisfaction in certain areas, he regretted the brevity of the presentation; further explanations were required before his Government could make a decision. Referring to posts and resources, he enquired whether all present grades would be maintained, whether job descriptions would be different for different grades and whether all vacancies would be announced for specific grades, as in the past. His Government would not object to the interesting proposal of specific sets of job descriptions for grade bands and assessment centres in so far as they were intended to set minimum criteria for grade levels. If the Office was moving towards a much broader banding of jobs, however, his Government would object as this would contradict the current post classification arrangements in the UN system. Concerning recruitment, promotion and staff assessment and appraisals, he welcomed the move towards a more competitive process, but asked how the qualifications of internal and external candidates would be compared. Would competitions be open to all persons, both internal and external, and if so, under what conditions? He queried why performance appraisals would only be established for officials once in the course of their career (during their probationary period). He also requested an explanation of the proposed transitional measures stipulating that currently serving staff should not need to participate in the assessment centre. Was it possible that, irrespective of their qualifications and performance, all currently serving staff members already deserved promotion within their grade level and would continue to merit it for the remainder of their career? Assurances were also requested that the work-life agenda would not go against the common system standards and that the proposed delegation of authority to managers with respect to recruitment was accompanied by specific measures to ensure adequate accountability. His Government continued to be interested in the forthcoming proposals on contract policy reform.
18. The representative of the Government of the Russian Federation strongly supported the proposals by the representative of the United Kingdom relating to the point for decision in paragraph 19 of the document. As regards the other proposals in the agenda paper, he suggested that the Committee recommend to the Governing Body that they be implemented on a trial basis and reviewed by the Governing Body in a few years.
19. The Chairperson asked the secretariat to clarify the scope of the point for decision.
20. The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Wild, Director of the Human Resources Department) confirmed that paragraph 19 of agenda paper GB.279/PFA/12 was the point for decision. Other matters presented in the documents were either within the existing mandate of the Director-General to implement or would be the subject of future proposals for the Governing Body to consider.

21. The representative of the Government of Germany expressed concern about the late delivery of the papers. This raised particular difficulties when amendments to the Staff Regulations were involved and when the subject was complex. While the point for decision was contained in paragraph 19, it covered a number of points in the two documents before the Committee. The addendum had only been made available the previous day. This did not allow for consultation with national experts regarding the question of the compatibility of the proposals with the UN common system. While he could to a very large extent support the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom Government on behalf of the IMEC countries, his position diverged slightly with regard to procedure.
22. It had already been stated that the Director-General could only work within the common system. A blank cheque could thus be issued regarding all things that had been agreed collectively. However, the amendments proposed by the IMEC representative showed that a number of points were potentially in contradiction with the common system. No decision on amending the Staff Regulations, in particular on subparagraphs 19(b) and (c) could be taken at this point by his Government. He proposed that the decision be postponed to March 2001. He could not take part in any decision at present.
23. Finally, he referred to two earlier comments. He supported the wish of the representative of the Government of the Russian Federation that the recruitment of external candidates be possible and not exceptional, as suggested by the text. As regards performance appraisals, he disagreed with the representative of the Russian Federation. A distinction had to be made between regular appraisals, which applied to all staff, and ad hoc appraisals, which were required for specific requirements, such as promotions or transfers. He was against an increase in the periodicity of regular appraisals.
24. The representative of the Government of Italy supported the amendments proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the IMEC group, and subscribed to the request for more time to allow a decision to be reached before the end of the current Governing Body session. His Government appreciated the efforts of the Organization to develop its own human resources. With respect to recruitment and training, he underlined the importance of the Turin Centre, which should play a central role in the training of all levels of staff. The Centre was already used for the training of Italy's associate experts sent to different UN organizations. The Office should use the capacity developed by the Centre to train international staff and perhaps make savings. He called for further elaboration on the utilization of the funds budgeted for the training of the first two groups of young professionals.
25. The representative of the Government of Namibia associated himself with several of the points made by other speakers. A serious issue for his Government was that the agreement could supersede the role of the Governing Body in decision-making. If the document was complicated for a country like Germany to consider, with all its infrastructure, how could countries like Namibia be expected to take a position quickly? He supported the suggestion that the issue be postponed to allow time for consultation.
26. He also faced a moral dilemma. How could he convince his people to support the additional financial expenditure proposed for the HR Strategy out of savings in the Office's budget while programmes such as the one on HIV/AIDS faced financial constraints and could not be funded?
27. The Chairperson noted that there was a proposal by the representative of the Government of Germany (seconded by the representatives of the Governments of Namibia and Italy) that the Governing Body defer a decision to March 2001 on those parts of the point for decision (paragraph 19 of the agenda paper) which required the Governing Body to

approve amendments to the Staff Regulations. He sought clarification from the secretariat on the consequences of postponing such a decision.

- 28.** The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Wild) replied in detail to the various issues raised in the discussion. He stated that, at this stage, he would limit his reply to the two major issues before the Committee: first, the compatibility of the framework of the proposals in the HR Strategy with the UN common system; and, secondly, a possible decision by the Governing Body to postpone a decision on the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations to its next session. As regards the first issue, he confirmed the statement he had made to the Committee in November 1999 and March 2000 that nothing in the proposals contravened the common system. To reinforce this point, he referred to discussions he had held with the Chairperson and other senior members of the ICSC secretariat in New York in early November, where they had expressed keen interest in the HR Strategy and had stated that they were comfortable with the way it was being pursued. In fact, on the one aspect where there was potentially an issue in relation to common system requirements – job grading – the ICSC secretariat had invited him to make a presentation to a meeting in Vienna next month (consultations on the Review of the Pay and Benefits System) to demonstrate the flexibility available to make changes within the common system grading arrangements. As regards the second issue, he encouraged the Committee to recommend that the Governing Body approve the Staff Regulations at its current session. He stressed the high level of commitment demonstrated this year by senior management, the HR Department and the Staff Union to implementing the significant work programme attached to giving effect to the HR Strategy early in 2001. This work had been undertaken in partnership and through agreement with the Staff Union, which explained why some of the documentation before the Committee had been delayed in its circulation. A considerable amount of time had been spent consulting with staff through seminars and workshops and through joint communications with the Staff Union, which provided information to staff on the development of the HR agenda. He stressed that the grading system had been “in suspense” in the Office since 1 January 2000 because it would shortly be replaced. Staff were expecting that the new system would commence operation at the beginning of 2001. A delay until March 2001 in introducing the new recruitment arrangements would also be undesirable. They were directed to introducing common and objective selection mechanisms for internal and external candidates, providing more latitude to managers to make staffing decisions, reducing bureaucracy in the system and beginning to reduce the recruitment period from 14 months to 90 days. He therefore asked the Committee to make a recommendation to the Governing Body which would allow the work on the HR Strategy to continue unimpeded.
- 29.** The representative of the Government of Italy clarified the earlier statement made on behalf of her Government. Italy did not support the request by the Government of Germany to postpone the discussion until March. The representative had wished only to state that more time was needed to consider the proposals and that he supported the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom Government on behalf of the IMEC group.
- 30.** The Chairperson encouraged the Committee not to leave to the Governing Body the need to find a solution on how to proceed in relation to the proposal that the Staff Regulations not be approved at the present session.
- 31.** The representative of the Government of France referred to the need to understand the concerns of the representatives of governments, which contributed to the budget. They were in a difficult position. While the late delivery of the documents could be understood in the light of the difficulties inherent in collective bargaining, it did not prevent an examination of whether the proposals were compatible with the common system. This was an important task which a number of countries such as France were not in a position to

undertake. She shared the view expressed by the United Kingdom Government that paragraph 19 should be amended to take note of the proposed changes. She also considered that a number of articles in the appendices which were covered by paragraph 19 should be deleted. Finally, she was in favour of postponing a decision on the point for decision, but the matter should be settled during the present session of the Governing Body, and not in March 2001.

32. The representative of the Government of the United States congratulated the Office on the many initiatives taken to update its human resource practices. The ILO appeared to be well-advanced in developing policies that other UN agencies might wish to use as models for similar changes. In principle, her Government supported the recently concluded collective agreements on the resolution of grievances and on resourcing procedures. However, there was concern with the interpretation provision included in both agreements to resolve a discrepancy between the Staff Regulations and the agreements. As there should be no difference between the principles contained in the regulations and the collective agreements, this provision was unnecessary and should be eliminated. The Governing Body was being asked to approve changes to the Staff Regulations which, in theory, would bring the Regulations into compliance with the agreements. The Regulations, however, were designed to stand the test of time and their amendment was a major responsibility of the Governing Body. The addendum containing proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations had been received only the previous day and, accordingly, her delegation was not in a position to approve them, although there was a willingness to expedite their review. The estimated cost associated with the arrangements was noted with concern, and it was stressed that all costs had to be absorbed within the existing budget allocation, without affecting negatively the agreed work programme. As regards the assurance provided by the representative of the Director-General that nothing in the proposals contravened the common system, she referred to paragraph 14 of Appendix VII, which appeared to suggest that, in fact, the proposal on paternity leave was incompatible with the situation in the UN common system. Accordingly, approval could not be given to that proposal. However, she expressed full support for the proposal regarding family support obligations. It was hoped that the outstanding issues noted by the Committee could be resolved quickly and, hopefully, within the present session of the Governing Body.
33. The representative of the Government of Japan indicated support for the statement by the representative of the Government of the United Kingdom on behalf of the IMEC group. His Government firmly supported the ILO's Human Resources Strategy. The document before the Committee contained information on the Young Professional Career Entrants Programme, which was appreciated as it provided initial training for young professionals from underrepresented countries. It was hoped, however, that the programme would encompass a broader regional perspective. The Office was also requested to bear in mind the need for geographical distribution in taking action on this aspect of the Human Resources Strategy.
34. The representative of the Government of Portugal wholeheartedly supported the statement by the IMEC group. His Government supported the Office's efforts to establish a Human Resources Strategy. This was an indispensable tool for the modernization of the Organization. Even if more time were required, a decision could be taken during the current session. He asked whether the Governing Body should not give a clear sign of support for this strategic step.
35. The representative of the Government of the Netherlands welcomed the progress made by the Office and noted with interest the brochure on the Young Professional Career Entrants Programme. Referring to the coaching of managers, she enquired whether training was voluntary or whether all managers would go through the programme. She also expressed

her satisfaction regarding the progress made with resourcing, development appraisals and job classification, noting that, taken together, these elements could help officials to map out clearer career paths. She welcomed the review of contract policy and the simplification of contract types, and appreciated the efforts made by the Office to eliminate long-term recourse to of short-term contracts. Regarding National Professional Officers, she requested clarification. Finally, in reference to the work-life agenda, she noted that some common system organizations had undertaken to put in place a policy to recognize common law marriages for dependency purposes, as recommended by the CCAQ. She urged the ILO to adopt such a policy and requested the submission of a detailed report in March 2001.

- 36.** The representative of the Government of Denmark expressed her satisfaction with the progress made by the Office in respect of the Human Resources Strategy and strongly supported the proposal for paternity leave mentioned in paragraph 12 of the document, on the basis that it was compatible with the common system. She also supported the proposal to reach an agreement on the terms of a decision on this agenda item at the current session of the Governing Body.
- 37.** The representative of the Government of Switzerland wholeheartedly supported the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom Government on behalf of the IMEC group. Switzerland supported the Human Resources Strategy, and although it regretted the delay in receiving the documents, it would do all it could to have the Governing Body take a positive decision. The Governing Body had given the Office a mandate to restructure its human resource policy rapidly, and it was the Governing Body's responsibility to do all it could to allow a decision to be reached during the present session.
- 38.** The representative of the Government of New Zealand expressed support for the statement by the IMEC group and for reforms in the human resources domain, including the participation of staff in the process. He awaited a reply to the question posed by the Employer members concerning changes with respect to the Administrative Tribunal. A clear response from the Office had already been given concerning the question of the compatibility of various proposals with the common system, but an improved process was needed to ensure consistency between the Staff Regulations and collective agreements and ensure that the concerns expressed in the IMEC statement were recognized.
- 39.** The representative of the Government of the Russian Federation, referring to the question of the compatibility of the ILO's proposals with the common system, explained that compatibility could be established only through an official statement to this effect issued by the ICSC. He supported the proposal by the representative of the Government of Germany to suspend a decision on this item until the next session of the Governing Body. Finally, he clarified that he had not called for more appraisals to be made than at present; his country simply opposed a sole appraisal for a staff member during the entire period during which he or she worked.
- 40.** The Chairperson acknowledged that the Governing Body had specific responsibilities which it could not renounce and that it had a right to express its concerns. On the other hand, it seemed strange that certain powers were delegated to the Director-General yet the Governing Body seemed to seek excessive reassurances regarding their exercise. He encouraged the Committee to reach a pragmatic solution to the issues surrounding approval of the amendments to the Staff Regulations. He concluded that there was no consensus in relation to the proposal put forward by the representative of the Government of Germany, but he would place that proposal on record. He noted also that several delegations had stated that they wanted a solution to be found concerning the amendments at the present session of the Governing Body.

41. Mr. Blondel, speaking on behalf of the Worker members, underlined that the Director-General was responsible for managing the Office, which included negotiating collective agreements with the Staff Union. If the Governing Body decided not to approve the Director-General's management of the Office, this would have more far-reaching consequences than collective bargaining.
42. With respect to the proposal that the Governing Body's decision be postponed, the Workers took the view that the Governing Body's response should be given during the current session. The documents submitted to the Governing Body should have been sent earlier so as to allow sufficient time for members to undertake the necessary consultations and determine their positions, since this would have facilitated agreement.
43. The representative of the Government of Germany reaffirmed that he could not participate in a decision on subparagraphs 19(c) and (d), as his Government had not had a chance to study the compatibility of the proposals with the common system. Although he could not associate himself with a consensus, he did not wish to prevent the adoption by the Governing Body of the report in plenary.
44. Mr. Marshall, speaking on behalf of the Employer members, observed that there was a clear desire on the part of some members to seek further advice. A range of questions had been put forward for consideration by the Office, and he suggested, in view of the comments by Mr. Blondel, that the Committee meet later in the week to hear a detailed response from the Office and allow time for the Committee members to consider their position.
45. The Chairperson noted that the sitting would have to be adjourned to a later date, but asked the secretariat to provide some initial clarifications which might assist the Committee to reach a decision on the issue of approving the amendments.
46. The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Wild) indicated that in the limited time still left during the sitting it would probably be most useful if he addressed the issue of the relationship between a collective agreement and the Staff Regulations. The purpose of reaching collective agreements was to reflect the approach of working in real partnership with the staff, through the Staff Union, in developing the HR Strategy. A collective agreement was a document signed between the Office and the Staff Union. Where a collective agreement or parts of it impinged on the Staff Regulations, a change to the Regulations was required to put it or particular parts of the agreement into effect. Any such changes to the Staff Regulations required the agreement and approval of the Governing Body. Some collective agreements may not require a change in the Staff Regulations, and unless they had substantial financial implications or involved major changes in administrative procedures, which the Governing Body would need to approve, the Director-General could implement them. Certain aspects of the collective agreements which have been presented to the Committee required changes to the Staff Regulations, and the relevant amendments had therefore been presented for the Governing Body's approval.
47. As regards the proposal by the IMEC governments to delete certain parts of the amendments, he stated that, in proposing the current amendments the Office and the Staff Union had clearly intended that they should mirror the provisions of the collective agreements. Such an approach protected both the interests of the staff to ensure that the agreement was transposed properly into the Staff Regulations, and the interests of the Governing Body to ensure that when a collective agreement required implementation through amendments to the Staff Regulations those amendments were brought before the Governing Body for approval. The lesson learned from the Committee's discussion and from the experience of the Office and the Staff Union was clear: when the Office and the

Staff Union made a collective agreement, its words should be identical to the amendments to the Regulations that gave effect to it. This approach would be followed by the Office in the future. But what approach should be taken with respect to the amendments to give effect to the present agreements? The clause providing that where there was a doubt between the documents, staff should be entitled to the more favourable interpretation, was very common in all kinds of arrangements in all parts of the world, and had a place in a collective agreement. The real issue was whether the clause should appear in the Staff Regulations. There were two potential solutions. The effect of the IMEC amendment would be that, if those collective agreements were not implemented properly, the matter would have to be referred back to the Governing Body; the effect of leaving the clause in place would mean that the collective agreements could be implemented by the Office without further reference to the Governing Body.

48. Finally, he clarified that his earlier references to the common system and breaches of the system had been in the context of the discussion on collective agreements, not the paternity leave provision. He would revert to the latter issue at the Committee's next sitting.
49. The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Devlin, the Legal Adviser) confirmed that the main thrust of what Mr. Wild had said was correct from a legal point of view. The essential effect of the new arrangements was as follows: the measures relating to the establishment of conditions of employment that the Director-General and the Office had now been undertaking alone could henceforth be determined collectively. As regards those measures which the Director-General could not now undertake alone – because the consent of the Governing Body or of the International Labour Conference or of other parties was required – the Legal Adviser noted that they would not be able to be effected simply by concluding a collective agreement. The consent of the Governing Body or other appropriate authority would still be required. As regards the assumption that the provisions of collective agreements should be identical to those of the Staff Regulations, he noted that they had completely different purposes. A collective agreement was concluded only between the Office and the Staff Union and operated at a high policy, rather than a legal, level. When the agreed conditions of employment were being drafted for inclusion in the Staff Regulations or in other documents, the actual wording could not be exactly the same, although the substance should be identical to what had been agreed. Thus, any ambiguity in a provision of the Staff Regulations that was designed to implement a collective agreement should be resolved by looking at the collective agreement as a reference document. This, in the Legal Adviser's view, was the effect of the interpretation clause on which questions had been raised, although he would have preferred more clarity in its wording. From the point of view of the contracts of appointment of officials, the collective agreements could not be taken into account except in so far as they clarified the relevant provisions of the Staff Regulations.
50. At the Committee's meeting on Friday, 10 November the representative of the Director-General (Mr. Wild) resumed his reply to the questions raised at the previous sitting by emphasizing that none of the collective agreements concluded were in conflict with the UN common system. Indeed, the Recognition and Procedure Agreement excluded the possibility of reaching agreement on items that were covered by the common system. As regards other questions raised at the previous sitting, he noted that the amount sought for the Office of the Ombudsperson (within a total cost for the grievance procedures of \$700,000 for the 2000-01 biennium, with an ongoing cost of \$500,000 per year) comprised \$220,000 for the salaries and benefits of one-and-a-half staff posts plus their travel expenses and other associated expenditure. The overall development cost of the HR agenda was admittedly high, but it was the firm view of the Office that it represented genuine value for money in the context of a very major programme of change. While sympathetic towards the point raised by the representative of the Government of Namibia that the approximately \$2 million requested by the Office could represent a substantial field

project, it had to be stressed that an investment in human resources would reap significant benefits in terms of the overall performance of staff. These measures would develop effectively the main resource of the ILO – its staff – and, as it could be expected that the delivery rate on projects would increase, the investment should pay for itself very quickly. Regarding the question asked by Mr. Blondel about the functions of the Ombudsperson, reference was made to articles 9, 10, 11 and 12 of the Grievance agreement, presented in GB.279/PFA/12 (Appendix II), which described fully the anticipated mandate of the Ombudsperson.

- 51.** As regards the question of making childcare facilities available for the children of delegates to ILO meetings, another issue raised by Mr. Blondel, Mr. Wild observed that a better solution than crèche care should be found to accommodate the situation where a significant number of delegates brought their children to conferences and meetings. The Scoubidou crèche could take only a small number of children under the age of 6 years, and the hours of opening would probably not be compatible with the needs of delegates. Measures would be taken, however, to ascertain the availability of a limited number of places for the Governing Body session in March 2001 and for the Conference in June 2001 but, under the Work-Life Agenda, a better longer-term solution would have to be found to address the need, should it prove substantial. In reply to the question asked by the representative of the United Kingdom Government, Mr. Wild indicated that the maximum ILO subsidy available to an individual user of the crèche amounted to Sw.frs.7,000 per year, but this varied according to the salary of the official. Of the 12 places occupied by the ILO in 2000-01, only seven were subsidized to any extent: for the full academic year, the current projected cost amounted to Sw.frs.32,500.
- 52.** On the question of the sum of \$150,000 sought for enhancements to the information technology system, he explained that a module was being implemented called HR Pulse, which was dedicated specifically to career development, succession planning and training. This would improve not only the management of HR development from the beginning of 2001, but would also continue to be operable after the implementation of the new Human Resources Information System.
- 53.** On the matter of consultation and communication with ILO staff beyond that undertaken with the Staff Union, an issue mentioned by Mr. Blondel, Mr. Wild noted that, in respect of each aspect of the HR Strategy, measures had been taken to develop the issues through working groups, which had involved a wide range of people at all levels in the Organization. Regular newsletters had also been produced to keep persons informed which could in future be circulated to members of the Governing Body, if desired. In addition, a series of briefings and question-and-answer sessions had been conducted in Geneva and in the field. The most recent such session in Geneva had been attended by around a quarter of headquarters staff; that session has also been transmitted around the world in audio on the Intranet. In other words, the action being taken and changes being developed did not rely just on a small number of people involved in negotiating sessions, but on the consensus approval of the ILO workforce as a whole.
- 54.** Mr. Wild apologized for the delay in providing documents to the Governing Body and reiterated that efforts would be made to have papers available as early as possible for the March session of the Governing Body. A further question raised by the Employers' group at the previous sitting related to non-union members being required to use a grievance procedure that was union-dominated. On this matter, Mr. Wild pointed out that no one would want a two-track system, one that was available for union members and one non-union members. Such a situation would be very confusing and divisive in the Office. Moreover, the new procedure provided for officials to select whomever they wished as their representative. It also provided for an independent Ombudsperson and a joint panel comprised of one representative nominated by the Office, one independent chairperson and

one person nominated by the Staff Union. Finally, there remained, of course, the possibility to take a matter to the ILO Administrative Tribunal. Although the Office had negotiated the new procedures with the Staff Union, there had been wide consultation outside the negotiations and specific briefings and question-and-answer sessions on the grievance procedure. These consultations had provided much evidence inside the Office that union and non-union members alike were very unhappy with the old system contained in the current Staff Regulations. Furthermore, there was every indication that the staff were very much happier with the prospects for the new procedures. The plan to review the success or otherwise of the procedures with the Governing Body would provide an additional opportunity to make any necessary improvements. In reply to the question asked about the cost of the current grievance resolution procedure, he indicated that those costs had been estimated at around \$400,000 per year if account was taken of the work of all of those involved, including the Human Resources Development Department and the Offices of both the Legal Adviser and the Director-General. Over time, it was hoped that these costs would not only be diverted into the new grievance resolution procedure but that ultimately savings would accrue from the introduction of the grievance procedure.

- 55.** In considering any possible changes to the Statute of the ILO Administrative Tribunal, Mr. Wild indicated that the Office would discuss the matter first with the Staff Union and would then bring the broad issues before the Governing Body. After receiving the Governing Body's comments, the Office would prepare a further paper taking into account all views. That paper would have to be circulated to all those bodies that had recognized Administrative Tribunal's jurisdiction. The Office would make the outcome of those consultations known to the Governing Body. Any proposals for amendments then decided by the Governing Body would then have to be presented to the International Labour Conference. The process was thus quite lengthy and complex and would mean that the Governing Body would be consulted several times. As regards classification, the proposed grievance procedure simply accepted the notion of a class action for internal procedures and agreed that the prospects for class actions at the Tribunal would be discussed and would be subject to this decision-making process.
- 56.** Mr. Wild indicated that, on reflection, the question raised by the Employer members regarding the inclusion of the Director-General and senior managers in the grievance procedures would be taken up in the suggested amendment to the decision paragraph. As regards the means of implementing court orders for maintenance payments for families, proposed regulations would be presented to the Governing Body in March 2001 which would ensure that attached earnings from the pay of officials would be done only where it was very clear that the Office bore no liability.
- 57.** Mr. Wild acknowledged the various comments made by members of the Governing Body about the ILO's playing a lead role in the UN system. Increasingly, the Office was being asked to contribute to discussions with other agencies. In recent weeks requests had been received from the World Health Organization, the United Nations Development Programme, the International Civil Service Commission, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund about the kinds of reforms being undertaken in the ILO.
- 58.** Concrete proposals on paternity leave would be presented to the Governing Body in March 2001. It was important to stress, however, that the issue of paternity leave was not one on which the ICSC had specific jurisdiction. Rather, it was one of a number of issues including maternity leave, adoption leave and special leave, which had tended to fall within the discretion of the executive heads of the UN agencies to determine. In 1995 the executive heads, sitting as the ACC, had endorsed a work-family agenda which, in turn, endorsed the provision of paternity leave, but left it to each organization to determine the basis on which such leave should be introduced. For example, the UN secretariat, funds and programmes, including UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF and UNFPA, had taken a lead role

in providing for paternity leave within the common system. In June 2000, the UNDP had put forward a proposal for paid paternity leave of eight weeks, which was awaiting endorsement within UNDP.

- 59.** On the questions raised by the representative of the Government of the Russian Federation, he stated that all current grades would be maintained; there would be different job descriptions for different grades; vacancies would be announced for specific grades; and internal and external assessments would use common criteria. As to whether it was planned to use these processes for vacancies above the level of director, Mr. Wild stated that such appointments were not a part of the prescriptive processes described, because the Director-General had the discretion to appoint officials at these levels. On the balance between internal and external recruitment, the Office was very keen to achieve the right balance and for the foreseeable future would need to resort to external recruitment to quite some degree. For the year 2001, it was considering recruiting some 70 or 80 external candidates, roughly three times the average of recent years. This need was associated with forthcoming retirements from the Organization. As regards performance appraisals, the Office was trying to end the situation whereby organizational, team and individual performance management was the subject of an appraisal only once in an every two-year period. Performance management was best done on a daily, weekly, monthly and annual basis. The essence of the existing two-year performance appraisal, as well as the personal development plan, would be retained until there was a better way of managing merit pay, titularization and personal promotions. As regards opportunities for advancement, if a P4 official had the skills to move to P5 and the Organization had a need for P5 skills, then that official would be able to advance either through competition or development within his or her existing function. With regard to the question concerning the monitoring of recruitment procedures, it was noted that all individual decisions would be monitored by the Human Resources Development Department, by the sector or the department involved, by the Staff Union and ultimately by the Director-General. On an annual basis, there would also be a review of all aggregate data concerning performance: in March 2001, the Governing Body would be presented with some new suggested statistics for the Governing Body's monitoring of human resource development performance. Measures were being taken to ensure active participation in the programmes organized by the Turin Centre. All of the training for the Young Professional Career Entrants Programme was being developed at Turin and would take place there, with the result that the Office's future managers would begin their careers by spending four weeks a year at Turin. This would increase their familiarity with that branch of the Organization, which was important. As to whether line-manager coaching was voluntary, he indicated that, in theory, that was the case but that no one who had been approached with the suggestion that they participate in the coaching programme had refused.
- 60.** A paper would be prepared in 2001 outlining proposals for simplifying the types of contracts available and to reduce the current plethora to three kinds – one for bona fide consultants, one for short-term staff, and one for long-term staff. In addition, a proposal would be presented dealing with national professional officers, and professional staff who were “professional” but not internationally mobile and were therefore treated and paid as local staff.
- 61.** A further point raised concerned common law marriages, where the ILO lagged behind other organizations in its recognition of common law partnerships. The Office would make a proposal on the matter in 2001.
- 62.** The Chairperson asked Mr. Wild to explain the amendments which were proposed to the point for decision in paragraph 19 of the Office paper.

63. Mr. Wild stated that the introductory phrase and paragraph (a) of the point for decision remained unchanged. The amendments to paragraph (b) were of three kinds. The first was to “note” rather than “endorse” the collective agreement; the second introduced the concept of a review of the Regulations in November 2002, so that the Regulations would be implemented, subject to a review by the Governing Body at that time; and the third amendment would delete the paragraphs that the Committee had debated at its last sitting which gave staff the benefit of either the Regulations or the collective agreement, whichever was the better; the amendment would provide for the Regulations to prescribe the terms and conditions of employment and, if any Regulations did not reflect correctly or sufficiently the terms of a collective agreement, any change to the Regulations would be referred back to the Governing Body. The new subparagraph (b) would therefore read:

(b) note the Collective Agreement on a Procedure for the Resolution of Grievances and approve the implementation of the draft Staff Regulations to give effect to the Agreement set out in Appendix III, subject to the following amendments and subject to a review of the Regulations, at the Governing Body session in November 2002;

64. It would then be necessary to replace clause 10.1(d) in Appendix I, as reproduced in the Addendum³ on page 13 of the English text with the following text:

Where relevant, these Staff Regulations will, subject to article 14.7 of the Staff Regulations, be amended to give effect to the provisions of a collective agreement or an amended agreement or to reflect the expiry of an agreement.

65. The second sentence in the current draft, which referred to what happened where there was a doubt between a collective agreement and the Regulations, would be deleted.

66. It would then be necessary to delete section VII of Appendix III, as reproduced in the Addendum on page 8 of the English text, which related to a possible conflict between a collective agreement and the Regulations.

67. Mr. Wild explained that the changes to subparagraph (c) of the point for decision were identical to the change in clause (b). It was to “note” rather than “endorse” the collective agreement and to remove the article that related to the possible conflict between a collective agreement and the Staff Regulations. The new subparagraph (c) would therefore read:

(c) note the Collective Agreement on Recruitment and Selection and approve the implementation of the draft Staff Regulations to give effect to the agreement set out in Appendix VI, subject to the following amendment and subject to a review of the Regulations at the Governing Body session in November 2002.

68. The relevant amendment would delete paragraph 19 of Appendix VI, on page 12 of the English text in the Addendum.

69. Mr. Wild said that subparagraph (d) of the point for decision, which related to the additional funds sought to implement the HR Strategy, would remain unchanged. There was a small change in subparagraph (e): to change the word “approve” at the beginning of the paragraph to “note”. The subparagraph would then read:

³ GB.279/PFA/12(Add.1).

(e) *note proposals (1) and (2) associated with the Work-Life Agenda set out in paragraph 12 and Appendix VII and note that related Staff Regulations would be presented to the Governing Body in March 2001.*

70. Neither proposal would then be approved by the Committee, and the point for decision would simply note that draft Staff Regulations would be presented in March 2001 on the question of court orders, which seemed to have received general acceptance, and in relation to the question of paternity leave, where a more detailed discussion was still required.

71. Three new subparagraphs would then have to be added to the point for decision:

(f) *reaffirm its primary role in recommending amendments to the Statute of the ILO Administrative Tribunal to the International Labour Conference;*

This was the subject that Mr. Marshall had raised and which the speaker had addressed in his earlier statement;

(g) *request the Office to ensure that appropriate amendments are made to the procedure for the resolution of grievances so that the procedure does not apply to officials in the grades of Assistant Director-General, Deputy Director-General or Director-General;*

This amendment responded directly to an issue raised by Mr. Marshall during the Committee's earlier sitting;

(h) *reaffirm the primacy of the UN common system with respect to the establishment of terms and conditions of employment for ILO officials.*

72. The Chairperson asked whether the Committee could move to a consensus decision based on these proposed amendments.

73. Mr. Blondel, speaking on behalf of the Worker members, expressed regret that the Committee had been put in a situation of tripartite debate vis-à-vis the Staff Union. The Governing Body had mandated the Director-General to reach a collective agreement with the Staff Union and this agreement had been concluded, but the Office was now proposing that the Governing Body examine the agreed text. The Workers' group did not want to be the interlocutor for the Staff Union or negotiate on its behalf. The situation was an uncomfortable one and could have been avoided had the Office consulted the Officers of the Governing Body. He asked the administration to ensure that the Committee was not placed in a similar situation in the future. Knowing that the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations differed from the text of the agreement, Mr. Blondel asked the Office about its plans. Would there be an exchange of correspondence with the Staff Union or a negotiation of additional clauses to the agreement? Was the HR Department going to declare the signed texts void with respect to a decision of the Governing Body? If the Office wished to validate the signing of a collective agreement, the foundations had to be clear and solid. With respect to the Administrative Tribunal, he supported the position of the Employers' group that the role and function of the body remained the prerogative of the Governing Body.

74. The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Wild) replied that while a fairly major revision of the point for decision had been proposed, only one aspect of these proposed amendments had an impact on a collective agreement. The other clauses were consistent with the collective agreements as negotiated. The one inconsistent element was the removal of the Assistant Directors-General, Deputy Directors-General and the Director-General from the grievance procedure. This change would not have been proposed if the

Staff Union had not been prepared to discuss and agree with the Office an amendment to the agreement to accommodate the change.

75. Mr. Marshall said that the Employers' group were conscious that the Office, in consultation with ILO staff and the Staff Union, had taken some large and very positive steps towards the modernization of the human resource development policies and practices of the Organization. His group greatly appreciated the responses by the representative of the Director-General. The reworded point for decision paragraph met his group's concerns regarding whether there was a contradiction between the amendments to the Staff Regulations and the common system.
76. The representative of the Government of Germany observed that the revised decision paragraph submitted by the Office had the advantage of allowing the Governing Body to take a final decision on the Regulations on the basis of the experience that would have been acquired by November 2002 and of clear knowledge regarding whether or not there was a contradiction between the amendment to the Regulations and the common system. However, he wondered what would happen should the Governing Body, in the light of experience, not then approve the agreements. In other words, it was possible that there would be a contradiction between what was agreed with the staff and what the Governing Body might finally approve. Would the agreements be re-negotiated? His delegation would agree to the revised text of the point for decision, provided that the Governing Body was able to reject those provisions of the agreements which had proven to be impractical or were not in line with the common system. Finally, he asked for clarification of the wording of paragraph (g) of the proposed point for decision – the paragraph referred to the grades of ADG and DDG, which he had understood had been abolished and replaced by Executive Directors and Regional Directors. There seemed to be confusion arising from the use of the word "grade".
77. The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Wild) stated that the grades ADG and DDG continued to exist, although the titles Executive Director and Regional Director were now used. He indicated that Executive Directors and Regional Directors were paid at the salary levels of DDG and ADG; this was the reason the point for decision mentioned the issue in the way it did. In addition to Executive Directors and Regional Directors, some other senior staff would also be excluded from the operation of the grievance procedure currently provided for in the agreement.
78. As to the issue of what might happen in November 2002, Mr. Wild stated that the new agreements would change significantly the way in which grievances were resolved and recruitment was undertaken in the Office. Two outcomes were possible by November 2002: either the new processes would not be working effectively, in which case changes would be proposed, or they would be operating well and the parties would wish to retain them. He expected the reality to be somewhere in between: in November 2002, it was likely that the Governing Body would be asked to approve some changes to the Staff Regulations to reflect the operational experience of the previous two years. Any such proposals would have resulted from an internal review involving management, HR professionals and the Staff Union and would seek to reflect an agreed position, as the Office's objective was to work in partnership with ILO staff represented by the Union. If the Governing Body did not approve what was proposed in November 2002, then the Office would not be able to implement those measures.
79. On the basis of the foregoing discussion, the Chairperson took it that there was a consensus to agree on the point for decision, as amended by Mr. Wild.
80. *The Committee accordingly recommends that the Governing Body –*

- (a) *note the status of implementation of the Human Resources Strategy;*
- (b) *note the Collective Agreement on a Procedure for the Resolution of Grievances and approve the implementation of the draft Staff Regulations to give effect to the Agreement set out in Appendix III to document GB.279/PFA/12(Add. 1), subject to the following amendments and subject to a review of the Regulations at the Governing Body session in November 2002:*
 - (i) *to replace clause 10.1(d) to the Corrigendum: Appendix I (GB.279/PFA/12(Add.1)) with the following text:*

Where relevant, these Regulations will, subject to article 14.7 of the Staff Regulations, be amended to give effect to the provisions of a collective agreement or an amended agreement or to reflect the expiry of an agreement.
 - (ii) *to delete section VII of Appendix III to document GB.279/PFA/12(Add.1);*
- (c) *note the Collective Agreement on Recruitment and Selection and approve the implementation of the draft Staff Regulations to give effect to the Agreement set out in Appendix VI, subject to the following amendment – to delete paragraph 19 of Appendix VI of GB.279/PFA/12(Add.1) – and subject to a review of the Regulations at the Governing Body session in November 2002;*
- (d) *decide that the cost of these arrangements, estimated at \$1.95 million for the 2000-01 biennium, be financed in the first instance from savings in Part I of the budget on the understanding that, should this subsequently prove impossible, the Director-General would propose alternative methods of financing at a later stage in the biennium;*
- (e) *note proposals (1) and (2) associated with the Work-Life Agenda set out in paragraph 12 and Appendix VII to document GB.279/PFA/12 and note that related draft Staff Regulations will be presented to the Governing Body in March 2001;*
- (f) *reaffirm its primary role in recommending amendments to the Statute of the ILO Administrative Tribunal to the International Labour Conference;*
- (g) *request the Office to ensure that appropriate amendments are made to the procedure for the resolution of grievances so that the procedure does not apply to officials in the grades of Assistant Director-General, Deputy Director-General and Director-General;*
- (h) *reaffirm the primacy of the UN common system with respect to the establishment of terms and conditions of employment for ILO officials.*

V. Pensions questions (Thirteenth item on the agenda)

(a) Report of the Board of the UN Joint Staff Pension Fund

81. The Committee examined a paper,⁴ submitted for information, reporting on the action that had been taken by the Board at its fiftieth session (July 2000). The Board had mainly dealt with the management of the Fund's investments; the results of the actuarial valuation of the Fund as at 31 December 1999; the entitlement to survivors' benefits; the pension situation of former international civil servants in the former USSR; the selection of the next Secretary/Chief Executive Officer of the Fund; and the Fund's long-term administrative arrangements and strategy. The paper noted that the Board's recommendations would be submitted to the UN General Assembly for approval in December 2000.
82. Mr. Blondel, speaking on behalf of the Worker members, asked the Director-General to approach the Government of the Russian Federation to find a solution to restore the pension entitlements of the former international servants in the ex-USSR. As the matter had been outstanding for a number of years, it was imperative to find a rapid solution for these now elderly persons.
83. The representative of the Government of the Netherlands noted with interest that the Board would consider the possible extension of entitlements to surviving domestic partners in the coming year. Domestic partnerships had been recognized under national legislation in the Netherlands and surviving partners could make pension claims. The present Pension Fund rules created problems for many Dutch citizens working in international organizations. Her Government would warmly welcome progress in this area.

(b) Report of the Board of Trustees of the Special Payments Fund

84. The Committee took note of a paper⁵ on the report of the Board of Trustees of the Special Payments Fund which had been submitted for information.

(c) ILO Staff Pensions Fund

85. The Committee considered a paper on the ILO Staff Pensions Fund which had been submitted for information.⁶ The paper outlined a small modification to the pension adjustment system that had negligible administrative implications.

⁴ GB.279/PFA/13/1.

⁵ GB.279/PFA/13/2.

⁶ GB.279/PFA/13/3.

VI. Report of the International Civil Service Commission

(Fourteenth item on the agenda)

86. The Committee had before it a paper⁷ informing the Governing Body of the recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) submitted to the United Nations General Assembly in its annual report for 2000, which had financial implications for the Office and were submitted to the Committee for early consideration so as to avoid the need for costly retroactive adjustments. The paper also provided information on the ICSC's examination of other issues, particularly work relating to the comprehensive review of the pay and benefits system, which was about to commence, and the revised standards of conduct in the international civil service.
87. Mr. Blondel, speaking on behalf of the Worker members, supported the point for decision. He noted, however, that there were apparent differences in the methodologies for setting family allowances for Professional and higher category staff and General Service category staff. In the present climate of collective agreements, it was to be hoped that these differences would be overcome.
88. Mr. Marshall, speaking on behalf of the Employers, indicated that his group could accept the point for decision.
89. *The Committee recommends that the Governing Body –*
- (a) accept the recommendations of the ICSC, subject to their approval by the United Nations General Assembly, on the following entitlements:*
 - (i) an increase of 5.1 per cent in the base/floor salary scale, and consequential increases in the mobility and hardship allowance and separation payments, for staff in the Professional and higher categories, with effect from 1 March 2001;*
 - (ii) increases in the present levels of family allowances for staff in the Professional and higher categories, with effect from 1 January 2001;*
 - (iii) increases in the maximum education grant and maximum admissible expenses payable to eligible staff members at designated duty stations, with effect from the school year in progress on 1 January 2001.*
 - (b) authorize the Director-General to give effect in the ILO, through amendments to the Staff Regulations (as necessary), to the measures referred to in subparagraphs (a), subject to their approval by the General Assembly.*

⁷ GB.279/PFA/14.

VII. Matters relating to the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO

(Fifteenth item on the agenda)

90. The Committee had before it two papers⁸ proposing that the Governing Body approve the recognition of the ILO Administrative Tribunal's jurisdiction by the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) with effect from 1 January 2001, and by the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) with effect from the date of such approval.
91. The Worker members welcomed further recognition of the jurisdiction of the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO, which was evidence of the esteem it enjoyed. However, account being taken of the number of organizations having accepted the Tribunal's jurisdiction, he wondered whether it would not be useful for the Governing Body to benefit from a general paper describing the functions of the Tribunal, listing the organizations and providing statistics about the number of cases handled and other relevant information.
92. In noting the Committee's approval of the recognition of the Tribunal's jurisdiction by these two organizations, the Chairperson indicated that these new recognitions contributed to the prestige of the Tribunal.
93. *The Committee recommends that the Governing Body approve the recognition of the Tribunal's jurisdiction by –*
- (a) the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute, effective 1 January 2001;*
- (b) the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization.*

VIII. Other personnel questions

(Sixteenth item on the agenda)

94. The Committee noted that there was no business under this agenda item.

Geneva, 13 November 2000.

Points for decision: Paragraph 80;
Paragraph 89;
Paragraph 93.

⁸ GB.279/PFA/15 and GB.279/PFA/15/1.