

# **STAFF MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**United Nations**

**Final Report SMC XI  
24-29 April 2023**



## Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	2
II. Review of Previous SMC Agreements.....	2
III. SMC Procedural Concerns & Participation of All SMC Stakeholders in SMC .....	2
IV. Staff Selection .....	3
V. Update on the Status of the Working Groups.....	5
VI. Delegation of Authority (standing item) .....	6
VII. Interpretation of Staff Rule 4.4 .....	7
VIII. Liens.....	7
IX. Placement Outside of the Staff Selection System and Functional Mobility .....	8
X. Resubmission of job applications .....	9
XI. Safety and Security (standing item).....	9
XII. Tests & Examinations .....	9
XIII. GGST .....	10
XIV. Regulating the use of UNVs .....	11
XV. Budget.....	11
XVI. Advance Notice of Expiration of Child Benefits.....	11
XVII. Rosters.....	12
XVIII. Toxic Workplaces and Teams.....	14
XIX. OSH Psychological Health and Safety Policy .....	14
XX. Medical Director Conflict of Interest .....	15
XXI. Reasonable Accommodation.....	15
XXII. Management of Appointments .....	16
XXIII. Translators’ working conditions .....	18
XXIV. Gender Parity, Gender Focal Points and Contact Points .....	18
XXV. G1-G4 Continuing Appointments for Long Serving Staff.....	19
XXVI. Expiration of Network Access .....	20
XXVII. Exit Interviews.....	20
XXVIII. Sabbatical Programme .....	21
XXIX. Secondary Punishment .....	21
XXX. Information Technology Frameworks, Data Privacy and Personal Data Protection .....	22
XXXI. Anti-racism.....	23
Annex 1: Adopted Agenda.....	24
Annex II: Review of previous agreements.....	26

## ***I. Introduction***

1. The President opened the session, with a statement from the Secretary-General presented by USG Catherine Pollard, who followed with her own opening remarks. The President presented the Draft Agenda. Staff proposed a discussion of the staff engagement survey as AOB, which was agreed should time permit.
2. **The agenda was adopted. Annex I refers.**
3. Nomination for the Office of Staff Management Committee (SMC) Vice-President
4. **The staff representatives elected Pamela Villalobos as the Vice-President of the SMC.**
5. Nomination for and appointment of a single representative for staff views to the General Assembly (GA)
6. **The staff representatives designated Laura Johnson to be the single representative of staff views to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly.**
7. Nominations for and appointment of SMC Rapporteurs
8. **The staff representatives designated Samar Haidar and Raymond Ratanya, management designated Menada Wind-Andersen and David Falces as rapporteurs for SMC XI.**
9. Nominations for and appointment of the SMC 3 x 3 Contact Group
10. **Leila Manly-Spain, Karin Esposito and Brad Smith were nominated as staff representative members, and Katharina Margetts, Miguel Mourato Gordo and Jonathan Ball were nominated as management representative members of the 3 x 3 Contact Group.**

## ***II. Review of Previous SMC Agreements***

11. Staff and management members of the 3x3 Contact Group agreed to review the list of agreements during the course of the week, with a proposal for closure to be reached at the close of the SMC session.
12. Agreement was reached before the close of proceedings and the summary of the outcome is attached as Annex II.
13. **The SMC agreed to close the proposed agreements, and to annex the list to the report.**

## ***III. SMC Procedural Concerns & Participation of All SMC Stakeholders in SMC***

14. While noting their commitment to engaging positively and constructively, Staff expressed frustration with several matters such as the issue of data protection, where there had not been an effective engagement, noting that this has led to an erosion of trust in the SMC

process. As a demonstration of openness and transparency, Staff proposed that the specific issue of the proposed amendment to Art. 9 of the UNDT Statute be worked on in a concrete and consultative manner. They also requested a discussion at the 3x3 as to when ad hoc sessions are used and when information sessions are appropriate.

15. Management affirmed the importance of effective engagement, both at the SMC plenary and in the ad hoc sessions throughout the year. In relation to the specific issue of data protection, an information session was held to address staff concerns. Management confirmed that an ad hoc meeting on the issue of the UNDT Statute amendment will be organized to further discuss the issue.

16. On the issue of participation at SMC, staff expressed that the rotational nature of management representation leads to suboptimal engagement and imbalances, and situations where staff representatives had to brief their own management. Staff request that all UN Secretariat entities have representation in all SMC meetings, or if there must be a rotation, to better understand the modalities of the rotation and the logic of the cycle membership. They also asked that all management counterparts in the entities be included on a comprehensive email list or SharePoint site. Staff feel that hybrid meeting modalities and on-line facilities could go some way to address these issues. As OLA are involved as a substantive party in many issues subject to staff/management consultation, such as data privacy, it would make sense that they are represented directly in the proceedings. While the cluster of ICT-related issuances had been discussed with OICT in an information session, that session explicitly excluded the draft on data privacy and protection, consultation on which remained pending. Staff shared concerns regarding the organization and use of information sessions, which are not an adequate tool to protect the right of staff.

17. Management clarified that the management team represents the entire Secretariat as a whole, not the constituent entities. Although the management personnel do not always correspond directly with staff representation, there are regular meetings and other fora where the information and outcomes of staff/management engagements are fully shared. Management reiterated the importance of having management representation from the missions and field-based entities, and that the rotational schedule is determined in advance, and can be shared with staff.

#### ***IV. Staff Selection***

18. Management introduced their paper, which proposed improvements to staff selection, aimed at simplifying and making the process of candidate assessment more effective and efficient, and reducing the time required to advertise locally recruited posts to a minimum of 15 days.

19. Staff noted the substantive character of the paper, asked for more clarity on its overarching objectives, and whether this represented the establishment of staff selection 2.0.

They noted that staff focus was on ensuring that changes did not disadvantage serving staff. Staff agreed in principle with removal of biographical information to protect against bias, as it was a request that they made in the past, but stressed the need for more information on this, including the stage of recruitment where diversity criteria will be applied, noting some managers' confusion on this issue. Staff raised concerns regarding the use of technology to alleviate hiring managers' workload, as it is known that technology and algorithms can have common biases baked into them. They raised issues with the impact of simplification on hiring managers' responsibilities and accountability. While acknowledging that CBIs were problematic and expressing preference for interviews that are focused on the work to be done, they raised concerns regarding alternative assessment methodologies aimed at replacing the CBI, changes to the structures of interviews, and the involvement of external experts in the interview process. Finally, staff also requested to be informed of the overall plan for the process in moving toward staff selection 2.0 as well as clarity regarding the mechanisms for monitoring and accountability, including CRB and MEU. As a concrete measure for enhancing the objectivity of selection processes, they called for limiting the hiring manager's role in forming selections panels.

20. Management replied that this was the introduction of a vision for revamping the staff selection process, noting that a longer-term process would be required, and that these interim changes would be the beginning of the process. The overall approach was one of "trust and verify", noting that simplification was aimed at streamlining controls, not removing them. Management noted that for the recruitment of local positions, 15 days would be the minimum default, but could be extended as circumstances dictate. About the possibility of introducing new methods of assessment to replace the CBI and other elements, a fully harmonized and coordinated approach to replacing it is needed, and will take 2-3 years, noting that setting a specific timeline with milestones will be dependent on the identification of resources to focus on the different project streams. Management did not agree that the hiring manager should select the interview panel from a pool of interviewers, but did confirm that panel members must have undergone mandatory training, and that the selection of panel members is done in collaboration with HR.

21. **SMC agreed in principle with the following Management proposals regarding staff selection, with the understanding that any policy changes will follow the usual wide consultation process:**

**a. Appropriate provisions to safeguard applicant privacy and measures to limit potential bias, including the removal of some candidate bio data from the Hiring Team view for the purpose of screening applications**

**c. Hiring Teams should use standard assessments as much as possible; in case bespoke assessments are developed by Hiring Teams, they should be reviewed by human resources to ensure that they are appropriate, fair, and unbiased.**

**d. Assessments may include written and/or oral tests and/or structured interviews, including but not limited to the competency-based interviewing approach.**

**e. Diverse interview panels may include suitable UN Common System staff members and may include technical experts.**

**22. Staff did not agree with the following Management proposal:**

**b. While the hiring manager remains accountable for the selection, they may use available technologies, tools, and services to facilitate it, provided that they adhere to principles of fairness and transparency.**

**23. Management did not agree with Staff's proposal to change the hiring manager's authority to establish the selection panel.**

**24. SMC agreed with the adoption of the 15-day minimum timeline for local recruitments, with possible extension as circumstances may dictate.**

**25. SMC agreed to have an ad-hoc meeting in a few months to discuss MEU and CRB procedure.**

#### ***V. Update on the Status of the Working Groups***

**26. Working Group on Staff Selection and Mobility:** The co-chairs reported that following the last SMC, the working group discussed roster management issues and the draft Administrative Instruction on staff mobility. In the group's discussions, staff tabled issues that they felt were not aligned with the SMC agreement. Discussions concluded with an agreement on the draft AI, subject to final approvals. The group was lauded by both sides for their work as an example of good collaboration.

**27. Working Group on Delegation of Authority:** The Staff co-chair reported that the staff side met several times, resulting in three points that are put to management: 1) Staff access to the delegation of authority portal; 2) Supplementary communications; 3) Questions about whether authorities have been revoked. The management co-chair confirmed that management remain available to convene the working group as required. The issues raised were referred for further discussion under the standing item on delegation of authority.

**28. Working Group on G to P:** The co-chairs reported that they had set out a new action plan to make a compelling case for removal of the G to P restrictions and were preparing a report on the impact of the removal of the restrictions, with the intention of presenting the report on this issue to an ad hoc SMC in June. It was noted that the report should address the issue of impact on geographical distribution, which was a concern repeatedly raised by Member States.

29. **Working Group on Administration of Justice:** The Staff co-chair reported that the working group has been engaged in the task of reviewing the policy on protection against retaliation with the active involvement of OIOS and the Ethics Office. The group was reviewing the scope of the policy, as well as the need for closer collaboration within the Ethics Panel, given the overall risk of reputational damage to the UN system. In addition, the group will look further at the issues of the duty to report and victim protection. Further meetings will be held to finalize agreements, with a report to be presented to the SMC by the summer. The progress of the working group was lauded by the SMC.

#### ***VI. Delegation of Authority (standing item)***

30. Mr Christophe Monier updated the SMC on the work of BTAD in implementing the Secretary-General's reform on the delegation of authority, explaining the work and responsibilities of his Division.

31. In 2022, BTAD noted that the performance indicators showed positive trends in gender parity (43% -> 44%), recruitment process timelines (16% improvement, or 184 days -> 155 days), and mandatory training (improving from 48% to 68% over a 3 year period). The overall volume of exceptions is down, driven by the decrease in COVID-19-related exceptions. BTAD rolled out the Accountability Handbook, and jointly conducted with the Ethics Office the annual leadership dialogue on the topic of accountability in 2021. BTAD will update the Delegation of Authority Portal and enhance the Accountability Indicator Monitoring (or AIM). The Delegation of Authority Viewer (or DAVi), which provides transparency and visibility over who has received what sub-delegation, was released two years ago and is accessible to all staff. BTAD offered to provide a demonstration of the tool, which was welcomed by staff.

32. Staff asked whether BTAD had a role in assessing the quality of the decisions made, or whether their work was limited to a mapping exercise. They expressed concern over the monitoring on "softer" issues that are not quantified, such as mental health issues, toxic workplace environments or excessive working hours and asked what could be done for better stewardship of human resources. They asked whether BTAD's work was allowing the administration to assign accountability in the context of Tribunal cases. While acknowledging that exceptions were not bad in themselves, and could be in the interest of staff, they flagged that when decisions were made at a more local level, "close to home", it had a stronger impact on the morale of staff. These issues were responded to by Mr. Monier. Staff welcomed his remarks on the importance of patterns of decisions, as well as his offer to make a presentation at a later stage.

33. Management noted that, while BTAD does provide useful insight into the operational performance of the organization, it does not have managerial responsibility for entity compliance.

### **VII. Interpretation of Staff Rule 4.4**

34. Staff referred to staff rule 4.4 and to the relevant guidance issued by DOS in September 2022, which provided clarity regarding the candidate's required location or residency status at the time they apply for a position. Staff welcomed the guidelines but regretted that they were never discussed at SMC. They had requested that this item be placed on the agenda of the SMC for a discussion on the underlying legal consideration and rationale for the latest interpretation of SR 4.4., as well as its relative advantages and disadvantages with specific regards to: a) facilitating mobility for currently serving GS-staff, within and across national borders; b) implications for duty stations in the European Union and other regional blocks with free movement of labour arrangements; c) UN couples. They called for a unified interpretation of Staff Rule 4.4 that would prioritise unified rosters across all duty stations within a country, particularly in countries where the United Nations has various (or shifting) duty stations, as practices currently vary.

35. Management responded that due to various location-specific realities and current limitations of some existing local rosters, it is not possible to adopt a one-size-fits all approach to this issue. Management committed to remaining open to constructive discussion.

### **VIII. Liens**

36. Management introduced the paper on liens, noting that the proposal aims at addressing the current inconsistency of application across the organization as well as the challenges created in coherent workforce planning.

37. Staff sought clarity on liens as well as on TJO management overall and the difference between "release" and "liens", as well as on the use of general and specific liens. On point 2 of the Management paper, regarding TJOs, staff requested clarification on the regulation and administration of TJOs and expressed deep concern regarding the increase in the number of TJOs, many of which may not have been created for their intended purpose under the applicable policies. When justified, Staff noted the importance of TJOs for staff as they are vehicles of growth and development. They called for fairness and clarity as overarching principles and stressed that staff in non-headquarter locations should not be further disadvantaged by the way TJOs and liens are administered as well as the need for equitable access to HQ TJOs for staff coming from hardship locations.

38. Staff agreed with management's proposal that liens will not be granted for selection through Job Openings and should be limited to a maximum of two years. However, they saw value in the secondment system, particularly for entities with specific staffing needs. On the discretion to grant liens, staff stressed that it was granting release that should be at the discretion of the head of entity. If release was granted, the staff member should have predictability on whether there is a lien and what type of lien, which should not be a discretionary decision. On the management's third proposal, staff requested that the two-year



duration of liens remain, with no possibility for extension, as expecting staff to move for one year is not realistic, given that it would impact benefits and entitlements, and that moving staff from mission or hardship locations to headquarters for less than one year would further disadvantage their opportunities and chances for long-term placement at headquarters. Staff proposed that management create a system for prioritizing moves from hardship locations to non-hardship. Staff called for ST/AI/404 to be updated, not abolished, as it contained relevant points. They asked for data on the number of interagency secondments that were granted as well on the type of liens used, the number of requests made and the number of approvals, the number of TJOs listed each year and the average duration of a lien.

**39. The SMC agreed that:**

**When a staff member is selected for a position through a Temporary Job Opening, they may be granted release and a lien to the parent post for up to two years. Such release and lien to a post would be granted at the discretion of the entity, and subject to operational needs. Liens will not be granted for selections through Job Openings.**

**Staff members holding permanent or continuing appointments may be granted a secondment to organizations of the UN Common System with a lien to the parent post of up to two years. Staff members holding fixed term appointments will normally move on transfer, subject to the inter-agency agreement; if transfer is not feasible, they may be granted a secondment of up to two years. After two years on secondment, the staff member will either transfer to the receiving organization or return to the post in the Secretariat.**

***IX. Placement Outside of the Staff Selection System and Functional Mobility***

40. Staff stressed their concern regarding irregularities in staff selection and requested more clarity on issues such as minimum standards, applicable rules and current practices for release time upon geographic relocation, including on surge. On post locations, they sought clarity on processes regarding placement in new positions and locations as well as on existing safeguards to ensure full legal recognition by both the UN and the host countries. Regarding placement authority, staff raised the links with functional and lateral mobility and requested data on how delegation of authority might influence those processes. They requested a thorough review of all HR moves at Secretariat duty stations, particularly those subject to reform in the past few years. Staff also raised the issue of assignments not being properly documented and the issue of varying practices between offices and duty stations in terms of reflection of functional mobility in Personnel Actions.

41. Management clarified required release time for moves within the same duty station and across duty stations. The Head of entity has the delegated authority to move staff laterally within the same entity. Management indicated that support is provided to entities regarding lateral reassignments, release, delegated authority, etc. Further guidance and information would be provided on this issue.

### ***X. Resubmission of job applications***

42. Staff submitted a request for the modernization of Inspira to allow staff members to modify, change or resubmit their applications in Inspira within the posting period. There are valid reasons to implement such a change, among which the obtention of new degrees and certifications that might enhance the application, as well as small mistakes, such as the ones that might relate to language proficiency. The staff drew attention to the de facto inequality between external and internal candidates in this respect, as external candidates can create a new account and reapply. Such a measure would constitute a boost to staff morale at little cost. Staff also requested data on the number of applications withdrawn in 2022 and on the reasons for such withdrawals.

43. Management noted that applicants need to pay utmost attention in completing and submitting applications in Inspira. Extensive guidance is available to applicants, and since Inspira has been in use for 14 years, internal applicants should be especially prepared on how to submit applications. Management also flagged that staff could take the required time to apply to vacancies, as selections cannot be made before job openings close. If applicants were able to withdraw and resubmit applications, there could be risks associated with some applicants using internal information to rewrite and resubmit applications to their advantage. Management clarified that most requests for resubmission happen after a candidate has been screened out, indicating that resubmissions entail a substantive recrafting of the application, and not the correction of a simple mistake. Based on this, management cannot agree to changing the system to allow applicants to withdraw and resubmit. However, it recognized the need to ensure continued guidance and communication to staff on how to submit applications successfully.

44. **Management did not agree to the proposal to change Inspira to allow resubmission of applications.**

### ***XI. Safety and Security (standing item)***

45. USG/DSS presented an update on safety and security matters focusing on the recent crisis in Sudan, noting that a multiparty effort, including UN entities as well as national governments, has been involved in securing the safety of staff and dependents. Evacuation efforts are underway in what has been the most challenging situation the UN has faced in recent history. The USG/DSS responded to questions from the SMC and indicated that DSS was open to further discussions and ready to receive any suggestions for improvement in relation to security management. SMC participants thanked USG/DSS for his department's critical work.

### ***XII. Tests & Examinations***

46. Staff presented a paper that was the product of a two-year working group and voiced their concerns in three areas, with the expectation that they would be given special attention in

staff selection 2.0 and the inclusive hire project. These areas are: centralized tests and related web-based platforms (the UN Online Examinations and Tests System (UNOETS) /Moodle); rules and procedures on test taking; and technical testing practices for PSJOs. More clarification was sought on the technology-based platforms as well as the oversight measures in place to ensure diversity, equity and inclusion in selection processes. Staff called for a reduced reliance on multiple-choice tests; where used as an eliminatory phase, candidates should not be required to undertake written essays until the eliminatory tests were marked. Moreover, multiple choice tests should be subjected to best practice audits to enhance effectiveness and transparency for applicants. Staff stressed the importance of applicants understanding the scoring mechanisms prior to commencing the test. The overreliance of IQ-type questions and psychometric testing was deemed unfair. Online remote proctoring was unreliable due to the various infringements involved and a clarification of rules to all candidates was required prior to the tests. Staff presented eight proposals focused on a centralized testing system; review of rules, procedures, governance and quality control of testing platforms; a fast-track system to avoid re-testing candidates who previously passed tests and were placed on rosters; review of integrity statements as well as allowing staff to access their own answers (intellectual ownership) after the results were published; provision of adequate resources during testing; consistency across the Secretariat to avoid disadvantaging candidates from various groups, while taking into consideration diversity and unique needs in the system; best practices and lessons learnt from the various platforms in use.

47. Management thanked staff for their views on this important topic and responded to a range of points raised by staff. In terms of reasonable accommodation, new guidelines have been developed which consider a range of requirements for applicants. On testing platforms and related issues, management confirmed that UNOETS has a feature to allow for multilingualism and accessibility and that DOS can provide support and guidance to entities as required. Noting that the development of appropriate and effective methods of assessment was a specialized field and critical to ensuring talent acquisition, management committed to remaining engaged with staff on this issue, aiming to ensure that assessment methods accurately measure the qualities sought without undue bias.

### ***XIII. GGST***

48. Management introduced the paper, which proposed optional application of the Global General Service Test (GGST). After detailed discussions with staff and careful consideration, and in light of the fact that the recruitment of G-1 through G-4 is now subject to review by a central review body, management proposed the discontinuation of the GGST for both external and internal candidates.

49. **SMC agreed with the proposal to discontinue the use of the GGST.**

#### ***XIV. Regulating the use of UNVs***

50. Staff referred to the increased recruitment of UNVs and raised concerns pertaining to the adherence to the framework of contractual arrangements. They stressed the need for adequate reflection on the matter within the broader strategic priorities for human resources and workforce planning and registered their objections to recruitments solely motivated by the wish to save time and money, as well as to the use of UNVs to deliver on regular organizational mandates and outputs. They objected to the increased hiring of UNVs to perform staff functions and to the hiring of UNVs to staff positions without a break in service. While recognizing their valuable contributions, they noted that such hires are in effect becoming a probationary period as well as a way of fast-tracking recruitment and circumventing relevant GA resolutions. They sought clarity on applicable accountability mechanisms and stressed their attachment to the principles of equal pay and equal opportunity for all, including UNVs. They requested data regarding average tenure of UNVs in the organization and the number of UNV hires on staff contracts without the six-month break. They also requested a more systematic conversation on the issue, especially on the use of UNVs in non-mission settings and on management's proposal regarding the cooling down period.

51. Noting that UNVs are not staff members, management nevertheless welcomed the views of staff. It was clarified that the former requirement for a 6-month break in service before a UNV can apply to professional/FS6-7 positions did not arise from a GA decision. This requirement is no longer applicable. Management noted that there are both international UNVs as well as national UNVs, including programmes that serve as a means by which women, disabled persons and youth are given opportunities to gain exposure and experience. Management underlined the importance of ensuring that UNVs have appropriate titles and functions.

52. **The SMC agreed that the issue would be discussed outside of the SMC with the involvement of UNV.**

#### ***XV. Budget***

53. There is a clear trend showing that the SMC travel budget has consistently been exceeded, primarily due to the cost of travel of staff representatives, with the deficit supplemented by OHR. OHR noted that there is an impact in regard to other activities which must be adjusted to compensate. Management committed to review the regular budget for 2025 to ensure adequate funding.

#### ***XVI. Advance Notice of Expiration of Child Benefits***

54. In presenting their paper, staff highlighted that dependent child benefits currently expire automatically when the child turns 18, which means that staff must then reach out to their benefits manager to provide evidence that their child remains enrolled in full-time education, at

which point the benefits are reinstated retroactively. Staff requested that UMOJA be configured to send a reminder six weeks before the 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, with instructions on the relevant procedure, to avoid interruption of payment.

55. Management emphasized that staff are generally expected to ensure that their records are updated to ensure their dependency benefits are accurately administered. While an automatic notification from the system when the child turns 18 would be nice to have, there is currently no scope for such change due to an ongoing major system upgrade. The proposed enhancement will be added for prioritization among all other Umoja changes under the applicable prioritization framework. To raise awareness, management indicated that they would include a reminder in upcoming communications as part of the currently ongoing annual declaration exercise for dependency benefits, as well as at the global HR community VTC in May. Management will also share an existing Umoja report with entities for possible follow-up with staff.

### ***XVII. Rosters***

56. Management introduced their paper on rosters, highlighting that rosters are the primary tool to fast-track recruitment in the UN Secretariat staff selection system. While rosters have served a useful role, management of rosters has become a challenge given the sheer number of rostered candidates and the fact that the rosters have become outdated. Management outlined proposals to improve roster management, including enhancing diversity and updating roster profiles; approaches to modernize rosters and remove rostered candidates according to workforce planning needs; and mutual recognition of rosters in the UN Common System.

57. Staff acknowledged that progress on the topic would be beneficial for all sides as they both want effective and meaningful rosters and stressed that effective management of rosters does not necessarily mean a reduction in membership, but rather the need for well-analyzed data. They noted that the large size of the roster was normal given that all currently serving staff are rostered at least once for their current post. While they acknowledged that rosters do need an update, they rejected the notion that rostered staff could become “aged” or “irrelevant” with time. A reduction of roster membership would be a temporary and palliative solution at best as long as the credibility of the selection process was not addressed. Staff welcomed the projected clean-up exercise by DOS on Inspira but rejected implementation of expiration dates. They requested full adherence to the previous agreements at SMC to remove expiration dates and in the WG on clean-up principles; an in-depth analysis on the current utilization of rosters; as well as developing ways to strengthen the systemic and strategic use of rosters going forward. Staff also called for strengthened monitoring and accountability for the negative effects to the organisation when hiring managers opt to conduct a full assessment process instead of selecting from roster.

58. Having heard the issues raised by staff in regard to the paper and having noted that roster management must take into account workforce planning, management introduced a

supplementary proposal for consideration of staff during the SMC, seeking agreement on this as well as the original paper.

59. **SMC agreed to the following proposals from the Management paper:**

- Roster Building and Roster Management: Rosters of pre-cleared qualified and available candidates are built across the Secretariat by entities with delegated authority using generic job openings. Generic rostering exercises are planned and coordinated by a dedicated recruiter in these entities, benefit from standardized assessments, and use structured panel interviews. The proposed changes are as follows:
  - o Measures to support roster health and roster management may include, *inter alia*, periodic updating of generic roster profiles, updating the association of rosters with similar functions, the retirement of rosters with outdated job profiles and capabilities, requests for roster members to confirm their continued interest in job openings associated with their roster membership, and periodic feedback to roster members.
  - o Diversity: All roster building and selections shall be made with full regard to organizational strategies addressing the staffing composition of the Secretariat.
- Harmonized Roster Candidate Selection Modalities: Further to the issuance of ST/AI/2023/1 on downsizing, roster selections can no longer be made during the posting period for Position Specific Job Openings and Recruit from Roster.
  - o A first level review of rostered candidates before non-rostered candidates will be instituted in all Job Openings. After the review of roster candidates, hiring teams would decide to make a roster selection or continue with a full assessment process. The workflow in Inspira would be amended accordingly.
  - o Minimum periods for JOs will be 15 days for field operations, 30 days for project posts, and 45 days for non-field locations.
  - o Removal from a roster: Removals in the following circumstances are agreed: (a) upon reaching retirement age, (b) death, and (c) if facts anterior come to light during the selection or on-boarding process.

60. **Staff did not agree to the following proposals from the Management paper:**

- Roster health tools and roster management procedures would be put in place by the Department of Operational Support to support the consistent availability of qualified roster candidates to hiring teams based on strategic and operational workforce planning taking into account overall human resources imperatives, including diversity goals related to, *inter alia*, geography and gender, key workforce capabilities, evolving operational requirements, and transparency for roster members and hiring teams.
- Candidates are retained on the roster for an established length of time.
- As part of Organizational priorities related to strategic and operational workforce planning, criteria for assessing roster health should include, *inter alia*, gender balance, geographic diversity, and age.

61. **SMC agreed to the following proposals put forward by Management during the session:**

- Rostering will only be through centrally managed Generic Job Opening processes. Rostering by PSJO will be discontinued.
- Removal from roster: Roster membership will be discontinued after a candidate refuses a job offer three times.
- For future roster-building (built through GJOs following the revised AI), new roster membership expiry timelines will be different depending on workforce planning needs.

62. **Staff did not agree to the following proposal put forward by Management during the session:**

- Existing roster memberships will be discontinued after three years (five years for female members), effective from date of issuance of a revised staff selection system administrative instruction.

### ***XVIII. Toxic Workplaces and Teams***

63. The staff thanked Ms. Susan John from the Ombudsman's office for her briefing on the topic. They raised the problems of toxic workplaces and teams and their negative impact on staff and on the organization, especially in terms of cost. They requested management to take concrete steps to address the issue, such as looking into appropriate tools and external expertise, as well as the creation of a working group to look into the issue. They sought clarification on whether prohibited conduct should be considered in performance management.

64. Management thanked the staff for submission of the paper, which recognizes the complexity of the issues. In addition to the collective effort of staff and management following the lead of UN senior leadership since 2020, more work is needed to advance and harmonize approaches on this topic. Leadership culture is important, and HR can act to help focus on mainstreaming the issues, looking at prevention and early detection, improving training and awareness, and continuing the work required to integrate this into performance management where appropriate, noting that should any instance escalate to the level of misconduct, this has its own process and cannot be treated as a performance issue.

### ***XIX. OSH Psychological Health and Safety Policy***

65. Staff presented a paper seeking the introduction of a Policy on Psychological Health and Safety at Work and interacted with Dr. Michael Rowell from DHMOSH on the topic. The paper called for the revision of ST/SGB/2018/5 into a clear and descriptive policy that defined and detailed an OSH management systems and mechanism related to accountability and duty of care, guided by ISO 45001; as well as a proposal to develop a policy on psychological health and

safety at work based on ISO 45003 and its implementation guide. Staff recommended the establishment of a working group comprising staff, management and other experts to address the issue and make recommendations to SMC XII. Staff sought clarification on why ISO standards could not be adopted into the UN policy, which was in the drafting process

66. Management invited the unions to designate a representative to join the technical working group currently working on an OSH policy framework. Management confirmed that the over-arching framework will incorporate elements in regard to protecting staff in respect of psycho-social health and safety.

### ***XX. Medical Director Conflict of Interest***

67. Staff acknowledged the efforts to transform the Medical Division into the Division of Healthcare Management and Occupational Safety and Health (DHMOSH) in order to strengthen the organization's focus on Occupational Health and Safety as well as the progress made in recent years on the development of occupational safety risk analyses. Staff however saw this transformation as problematic insofar as it potentially gives rise to a conflict of interest for DHMOSH in general and for the Medical Director in particular, given his additional role as Medical Advisor to the ABCC. Staff argued that the Medical Director may find himself in situations where he has a vested interest in minimising the potential shortcomings of his own Division's risk assessments as well as a clear incentive to deny that an injury or death was work-related, if doing so would reveal shortcomings in DHMOSH's risk assessments in that area of activity. Staff feared that if not corrected, this anomaly would severely undermine the credibility of the ABCC process and could provide legal grounds for Appendix D applicants to systematically challenge any adverse ABCC decision before the Tribunals. They requested a discussion on this pressing issue and called for measures to mitigate the potential conflict of interest. In response to the clarifications given, staff expressed their disappointment that the remedy to an existing conflict of interest is an individual legal challenge.

68. Management asserted that there is no inherent conflict of interest between the development of a broad general risk management framework and the consideration of specific cases. These cases are assessed on their particular circumstances, and where lessons are learned from specific cases, they will be applied and potentially used to modify the general framework. This is similar to other areas of management, where reviewing specific incidents against a general overall risk assessment does not represent a structural conflict of interest.

69. **Management did not agree with the perceived conflict of interest, nor on the need for any mitigation measures in this regard.**

### ***XXI. Reasonable Accommodation***

70. Staff presented their paper and expressed their appreciation for the various efforts made by the organization in the areas of accommodation for permanent disabilities, for mental health-



related issues and for post-viral syndromes, respectively. They however expressed concerns that the fragmentation of efforts may bring out confused and conflicting outcomes and result in a non-inclusive approach. Staff raised specific concerns regarding shortcomings in addressing short term disabilities; stigma and lack of awareness on these issues amongst managers; an absence of accountability; and lack of clarity regarding the distinction between reasonable accommodation for temporary disability and medical leave. They regretted that the relevant documents had not been shared with SMC in order to discuss the discrepancies with the prospect of issuing a unified and comprehensive AI. They also sought a commitment from management to educate managers and hold them accountable.

71. Management thanked staff for their recognition of the work being done on this topic, noting that the concept of reasonable accommodation was developed in the context of long-term disability, and not in terms of temporary disability that has been discussed more recently. It was clarified that cases are assessed in terms of the undue burden on the workplace, as determined by the manager. For cases of long term or permanent disability, the assessment is relatively straightforward, but in the case of disability of indeterminate length, it is more difficult to assess the extent and scope of the burden. The development of this type of framework would benefit from close staff-management dialogue.

## ***XXII. Management of Appointments***

72. Management presented its paper, outlining a set of proposals related to the administration of appointments. A number of the proposals had been discussed and agreed previously, including at SMC VIII in Sarajevo. In relation to introducing appointments limited to service with a specific entity, it was explained that this would be limited in application to time-bound project work, such as start-ups, liquidations and specific short- to mid-term projects. It was further explained that the proposal would help to reduce the widespread use of alternative modalities of engaging personnel and the overheads associated with them and would promote the wider use of fixed term appointments where typically the temporary appointments modality was used. At the same time, it would afford the organization flexibility and agility in responding to urgent mandates.

73. Staff received the proposals with interest and supported a number of them, with the exception of those that they feared could lead to an erosion of contractual conditions. While they acknowledged the challenges of recruiting for project work, they recalled that the ICSC had recently confirmed that the existing contractual modalities remain fit for purpose and they encouraged entities to expedite recruitment through the use of rosters. They also reaffirmed that the organization should adhere to a single performance management system, and that the recently updated system should apply to all staff, including those recently hired and on probation. While supporting that the Secretariat lead by example in awarding continuing contracts to eligible staff upon inter-agency transfer, they stressed the need to remain attentive to reciprocity. Staff raised concerns that the provisions on eligibility restrictions for UNVs in ST/AI/2010/4/Rev.2 were not being implemented in practice. They inquired whether the MoU

between the Secretariat and UNV superseded the AI, and whether the MoU could be shared, to which Management indicated that the MoU could not be shared with the SMC.

74. **The SMC agreed that guidance would be provided to entities to grant initial fixed term appointments of up to two years where funding allows.**

75. **The SMC agreed to the introduction of a one-year probationary period for initial fixed term appointments. Staff did not agree to the management proposal for a streamlined performance review process and no rebuttal.**

76. **On streamlining breaks in service, the SMC agreed, subject to verification that the proposed 31-day break would not have negative effects on pension rights, in which case would be adjusted to 30 days:**

<b>Current break in service</b>	<b>Agreement</b>
Continuing or FTA to TA: 31-day break	No break in service but continuity is broken
FTA to FTA following resignation: 31 days break	No break in service but continuity is broken
TA to FTA	No break in service but continuity is broken
TA (364 days or more) to TA: 3 months break if same duty station, 30 days break if different duty station	31 days break in service whether same or different duty station; continuity is broken
TA to consultant/IC: 3 months if same duty station, 30 days if different duty station	<b>No break in service; continuity is broken</b>
Retiree to staff: 3 months; Retiree to consultant/IC: 30 days	<b>Keep status quo</b>
Fixed term GS need to resign and take a 7-day break in service to take up appointment as FS or NPO	No resignation/separation or break in service
Former staff are ineligible to work for 36 months following agreed termination	Ineligibility equal to the number of months received as termination indemnity including any payment in lieu of notice if applicable and any additional payment on account of an enhanced termination indemnity

77. **Staff did not agree to the management proposal to increase use of fixed-term appointments limited to the entity with a simplified recruitment process without CRB review.**

78. The SMC confirmed the agreement to grant continuing appointments (within the GA-mandated post envelope) to UN system staff members holding continuing or permanent appointment upon joining the Secretariat on an inter-agency transfer.

79. The SMC agreed to the proposal to remove the one-grade limitation from eligibility requirements for temporary job openings.

80. Staff did not agree to the management proposal to remove eligibility restrictions for UNV applying to temporary job openings.

### ***XXIII. Translators' working conditions***

81. Staff presented their paper on the issue and referred to the ongoing tribunal cases. They reiterated their concerns regarding the failures of staff-management consultations within DGACM and the rising mental health toll of the workload increase. Staff disagreed with the legal adviser's view that the issue was departmental and governed only by ST/SGB/274, stressing that the SMC was an appropriate forum, given the large number of staff affected across duty stations, the mental health impact and the technology-related issues, whereas ST/SGB/274 refers to obsolete UN HQ bodies. Nonetheless, they accepted to proceed under ST/SGB/274 and to escalate the matter from the department level to the Joint Negotiation Committee if necessary.

82. While management noted that this issue had been brought to an SMC ad-hoc for discussion, it was specific to DGACM and should be handled within the entity. Nonetheless, management affirmed its support to staff in any area related to well-being and mental health. Management took note of the staff decision to proceed in the context of ST/SGB/274 on staff-management consultations at entity level to further discuss the issue within DGACM.

### ***XXIV. Gender Parity, Gender Focal Points and Contact Points***

83. Staff presented their paper on temporary special measures for the achievement of gender parity. They indicated that the temporary special measures had strengths but also shortcomings and referred to evidence that women were improperly screened out of shortlists and artificially failing interviews because of a common misperception amongst hiring managers that any women who are recommended would be given priority for final selection. They requested relevant data points referenced in their paper. They highlighted the need for ST/AI/2020/5 to be more thoroughly evaluated for unintended negative consequences and requested clarification on how to implement the AI in the entities where gender parity had been reached. Particular concern was expressed about application of 3.4 (b) and the exclusionary effect of a senior women talent pipeline available only to external candidates. They also raised the need to expand the scope of diversity, particularly with respect to non-binary staff members. Staff also referred to the 2018 initiative to revise ST/SGB/2008/12 on department

focal points for women in the Secretariat. They requested to reengage in the process, in view of the extensive delays, and raised various concerns relating to the modes of appointing focal points and the resulting risk of lack of independence of the appointee. They also referred to the ongoing confusion between focal points for women and the term “Gender Focal Points” used in departments to refer to staff members who are appointed to work on substantive gender mainstreaming and implementing department gender strategies. Staff recalled that the SMC contact points for gender needed to ensure engagement. They requested that they meet at a higher frequency, based on the agreed agenda and expected outcomes, addressing not just gender parity but a broader systemic approach. They raised the possibility of increasing the number of contact points.

84. Management confirmed the importance they place on the role of the gender focal points and recalled the discussions that took place on this issue during an SMC ad-hoc meeting in 2019. While progress on the policy has taken longer than expected, the SGB will be issued shortly. Management indicated that they would share with staff a summary showing how their suggestions on the SGB are being incorporated, where possible. Management confirmed that the discussions under this item go beyond the issue of gender focal points, and that such discussions might be better handled by adding gender as a standing agenda item at the SMC. Regarding gender contact points at SMC, management confirmed their availability to have more frequent meetings. They highlighted the successes to date through temporary special measures for the achievement of gender parity. Although the achievement of parity has been slower in the field, some progress is being made. During the discussion, management raised the concept of special measures for achieving geographical distribution, and noted staff support for such measures.

85. **The SMC agreed to retain gender as a standing item and designated the following staff side contact points: Michael Lund, Gloria Otieno, Pamela Villalobos, Karin Esposito.**

#### ***XXV. G1-G4 Continuing Appointments for Long Serving Staff***

86. Staff presented a paper that sought for the inclusion of long serving staff in the G1-G4 category during the 2016-2021 combined continuing appointment exercise. Under the eligibility requirements established during the 65<sup>th</sup> session of the General Assembly, only CRB cleared G5 and above are in consideration. It was noted that ordinarily for lower-level staff, the scope /nature of their duty limits them to their posts, and they can only progress if they move out of their job groups or duty stations. As a result, the chances of the staff undergoing a CRP process were severely limited and management was requested to develop an approach to consider them for continuing appointments. Staff requested information /data regarding such exercises prior to SMC to allow a more productive debate. A request was made for information on the implementation of the post envelopes if it were to include the G1-G4, as well as information on how the combined post envelope for the years 2016-2021 was determined. Additional questions included the eligibility of rostered candidates as well as the review of data related to the CRB process. Staff also sought a clarification on discontinuation of the future

continuous appointment exercises.

87. On continuing appointments, management clarified that the elements of the framework on continuing appointments are set by the General Assembly, which has regulated the CRB requirement and the envelope of available continuing appointments. The framework is therefore not subject to change or exceptions. Management confirmed that the exercises for 2016-2021 are underway and that it is a significant effort. The number of continuing appointments available as of 2016 was shared, and it was clarified that numbers available for subsequent exercises will depend on how many are granted as the exercise moves forward.

### ***XXVI. Expiration of Network Access***

88. Staff presented a paper regretting the current practice of the immediate expiration of access to UN IT systems such as Unite ID, Umoja and related ICT for separating staff members, including retirees. Staff described the current strict policy as unrealistic and detrimental, considering the lengthy checkout procedures and the connectivity issues in remote and field locations. They noted that although the system allows 30 days access, there was an arbitrary application of the rules in various duty stations. This was especially affecting retirees, who were expected to follow up on matters related to the Pension Fund. While accepting the need to preserve the integrity of the UN data system, Staff requested the adoption of measures to allow longer access to those crucial facilities.

89. In response to the request from staff, management proposed to maintain email active for 3 months post separation, with the proviso that 1) it is not used to conduct any official business, and 2) if the separation is for disciplinary grounds, it may be necessary to cut access immediately. Access to other organizational ICT resources, such as those accessed using the UniteID would be curtailed immediately. Noting that there would be challenges with holding former staff accountable for the use of ICT resources, OICT will need to assess to what extent access to Teams and SharePoint would be available, as these services are currently linked to email access.

90. **The SMC agreed that email access would be maintained for 3 months post separation.**

### ***XXVII. Exit Interviews***

91. Staff stressed the need for consistency regarding the conduct of exit interviews and that they yield valuable data regarding gender parity and the application of the enabling environment guidelines. They sought information on their degree of detail and on the consistency of their application and raised the need for further reflection on the categories who should be given an exit interview (such as in the case of SLWOP or liens). Staff also referred to available information that junior staff might be leaving in greater numbers and reiterated the importance of confirming such data. They enquired on the possibility of a pilot project.

92. Management confirmed that a review of exit interviews is underway as part of its holistic review of the separation process. The review links to anti-racism efforts, where relevant data on staff members' experience could be useful. Management indicated that they would revert to staff as appropriate for further input.

### ***XXVIII. Sabbatical Programme***

93. Staff expressed their appreciation for the sabbatical program and requested data about the levels represented amongst the staff members selected in the program, the number of repeat participants and the number of applicants during the past 5 years, including rejection rates. They enquired about the impact of the research projects conducted during sabbatical on the organization. They also requested the removal of the maximum participation of 30 staff, a 'carry forward' of unutilised slots for the subsequent programme period as well as priority consideration for staff members who have been rejected in previous rounds.

94. Management expressed appreciation for the staff paper, which mirrors management support for the programme. Noting the resource and the work coverage implications of the programme, it is clear that the limited number of places cannot be increased. Within this limitation, applications are carefully reviewed on the substantive topics as well as in relation to criteria such as gender, geography and entity representation, noting that the overall balance of these criteria and benefit to the organization are key. Management provided data in regard to the programme, and noted that the programme both improves morale and sparks innovation, and that more work should be done as to how the research work could be incorporated into the work plan of the staff member.

### ***XXIX. Secondary Punishment***

95. Staff presented their paper and asked for further discussion on the issue. They gave examples of current practices concerning unjust subsequent and secondary punishments in various administrative issuances and processes such as job applications. Staff representatives pointed out the open-ended and not time bound language in such issuances, that as such would capture *any* prior disciplinary measure, no matter how removed in time, its relevance, or severity, resulting in unfairness for staff. They also felt that reference to A/RES/70/114, which concerns specifically criminal accountability, is an inappropriate reference with respect to screening out from job applications staff who previously received disciplinary or administrative measures for violations of lesser gravity or non-criminal failures to comply with obligations. They requested information on the various administrative issuances and on ClearCheck and requested changes along the lines referenced in their paper. Based on the answers received from management, they expressed concern at the broad latitude that hiring managers could exercise in determining if a prior disciplinary record was grounds for denial of future employment, if absence of rigorous standards or transparency on the matter.

96. Management confirmed that accountability is an imperative for the Organization and all

staff members must demonstrate conduct befitting international civil servants. Management clarified that a disciplinary measure cannot be seen as a 'secondary punishment', but rather that the measures imposed may have consequences for the staff member. Disciplinary records do not expire and cannot be removed from the official record. When staff members apply in Inspira for a job and disclose a disciplinary measure, this does not automatically mean exclusion from consideration. It depends on aspects such as the measures that had been imposed, the timing of the measure, and the nature of the job opening. In relation to the ClearCheck database, it was confirmed that currently it only includes cases where a staff member has been separated or dismissed for sexual harassment and sexual exploitation & abuse, as well as cases where the staff member resigns/otherwise separates and refuses to cooperate as a former staff member in the investigation/disciplinary process. The General Assembly has recently requested that ClearCheck be expanded to other forms of misconduct resulting in separation or dismissal of staff. Staff members are informed when their names are entered into ClearCheck.

### ***XXX. Information Technology Frameworks, Data Privacy and Personal Data Protection***

97. Staff presented a paper to raise concerns regarding four draft information technology related policies and the substantial risks concerning the responsibilities and liabilities of staff if these policies are promulgated in their current form. There was a general concern that several issues on data privacy were not well defined and further consultations were needed before the promulgation of the policies. Staff further noted that the policies failed to address the infringement of staff members' privacy rights during investigations, and the use of unofficial communications platforms and applications. A request was made for an update on sections 18.6, 19.5 and 19.6 of the draft SGB on data protection and privacy. Staff raised key issues in the context of personal devices and investigations in relation to the draft SGB and regretted that they were not given an opportunity to discuss the substance of the policy prior to drafting, contrary to SMC procedure. Staff asked for a substantive discussion on the draft SGB by the establishment of a working group to review the policy and reach an agreement on the core principles.

98. Management affirmed the importance of engagement on the topic of data protection and privacy, noting that consultation dated back to SMC X in Valencia and subsequent written consultations. On the forthcoming policy on *Data protection and privacy*, it was highlighted that supporting guidance material will accompany the promulgation of the SGB, which will assist and guide staff during implementation. Management reiterated its commitment to provide staff representatives with a table showing how their feedback was incorporated as appropriate. On the ICT policies recently shared for written consultation, management recalled that this was discussed at a recent ad-hoc meeting, followed by an information session for staff representatives. The extensive feedback provided by staff was being reviewed. Regarding a forthcoming policy on the use of personal devices (*Bring your own device*), it was clarified that such a policy has not yet been drafted and that representation from the staff union was invited for the working group currently examining the issue.

99. **The SMC agreed that ICT-related issues would be established as a standing item at the SMC.**
100. **Management did not agree with the staff proposal to establish a working group on this topic.**

### ***XXXI. Anti-racism***

101. Staff expressed their strong support for the SG's Strategic Action Plan and their hope that this initiative yields its intended results. They referred to the numerous activities they held, such as capacity buildings and campaigns in order to lend support to the action plan. They regretted that the UN does not collect data on race and ethnicity, as nationality doesn't necessarily reflect ethnicity and race, and deemed it a barrier to the implementation of the action plan. They expressed their wish to see measures similar to the ones deployed within the gender parity strategy in order to allow measurable progress and required a system where the staff could self-identify.

102. Management appreciated the active support of staff in working groups and other fora and are confident that this will continue as a collective effort. It was recognized that while ample data is available on nationality, there is limited data captured in regard to race. In this respect, the recent JIU report notes possible progress could be made through self-reporting, by using 12 categories established to assist in this respect. Progress is noted with the Special Advisor recently coming on board, actively collecting information and perspectives from both staff and management. At the HLCM level, racism has been confirmed as an issue critical to organizations across the UN system, with a glossary of terms adopted to ensure coherent dialog across the system. Management confirmed that this is long term work and must be approached systematically with the full engagement of all stakeholders. In particular, engagement with staff is of key importance, and management will work together with staff to develop approaches to extend the reach of this critical effort.



## Annex 1: Adopted Agenda

# Agenda SMC XI 2023 – Brindisi

### A. Standing items

1. Adoption of Agenda and Programme of Work and Logistics
2. Nominations for / Election of the Office of Vice-President of the SMC
3. Designation of General Assembly staff representative
4. Nomination/ Appointment of Rapporteurs
5. Nomination/Appointment of 3x3 Contact Group Members
6. Update on the Status of Working Groups - working group updates
7. Review of previous SMC Agreements
8. Annual budget and Programme of Work
9. Staff Safety and Security (DSS)
10. Delegation of Authority (management – BTAD)

### B. Substantive items

- I. Staff selection
  1. Staff selection
  2. Roster management (x2)
  3. Liens (x2)
  4. Tests and examination
  5. Placements outside the staff selection system
  6. GGST
  7. Exit interviews
  8. Functional mobility
  9. Resubmission of job applications
  10. Interpretation of Staff rule 4.4
  11. Regulating UNV\*
- II. SMC process/procedures
  1. Procedural concerns
  2. Participation of all SMC stakeholders in SMC
- III. Health and Wellbeing, incl. Mental Health
  1. Toxic workplaces and teams
  2. Medical Director conflict of interest
  3. Reasonable accommodation
  4. OHS psychological health safety policy
- IV. Gender
  1. Gender Focal points
  2. Gender Contact points
- V. Administration of appointments
  1. Appointments
  2. G1-G4 Continuing appointment exercise
  3. Regulating UNV \* (duplicated above – staff selection)

- VI. Anti-racism
- VII. Next normal
- VIII. Long service awards
- IX. Sabbatical programme
- X. Secondary punishments
- XI. Expiration of child benefits
- XII. Translators' working conditions
- XIII. ICT
  - 1. Data privacy
  - 2. Expiration of network access

**C. Any other business (AOB)**

- 1. Staff Engagement Survey

**Annex II: Review of previous agreements**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Agreement/outcome</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Additional staff rule amendment: Family Support court orders</b>		
Ad hoc of 25 Sept 2019	Requested confirmation that management's position was that they would come back to the SMC with the SGB and AI drafts to address details and nuances on this issue - ASG OHR confirmed this agreement.	proposed to close
<b>Review of GSDM mitigation measure: Temporary suspension of GS recruitment</b>		
Ad hoc of 11 Feb 2020	The SMC agreed to lift temporary suspension of GS recruitment until a final decision was reached by the General Assembly on the introduction of GSDM.	proposed to close
<b>Administration of Justice</b>		
Ad hoc of 28 Oct 2020	The ASG OHR committed to reverting through the SMC Secretary shortly. It was agreed that Management would liaise with AoJ further, particularly to confirm that the changes to the membership qualification would not be retroactive and revert through the Secretary of the SMC by 13 November.	proposed to close
<b>Global Service Delivery Model</b>		
Ad hoc of 22 Apr 2020	It was agreed that the GSDM WG would continue to be suspended, pending developments/approval of the GSDM reports by the General Assembly.	proposed to close
<b>GS Prospects</b>		
Ad hoc of 7 Dec 2022	It was agreed to relaunch the WG on GS career prospects.	proposed to close
<b>Continuing Appointments</b>		
SMC/A/DEC/VIII/031	Request for proper presentation to be made to the SMC at a later stage. It was agreed that the topic of continuing contracts be adjourned and brought back to a future Ad hoc SMC.	proposed to close
<b>Calculation of Lump Sum</b>		
Ad hoc of 1 Apr 2022	It was agreed to revert to the Committee on the subject.	proposed to close
<b>Mobility policy</b>		
Ad hoc of 19 Oct 2022	It was agreed that the report of the working group on staff selection and mobility is approved subject to amendment of text of part a). Language will be submitted by management, by end of week for the review and agreement of the working group Co-Chairs.	proposed to close
<b>Compassionate leave</b>		
Ad hoc of 9 Aug 2022	There was broad agreement that it is important to support staff during their time of need. There was an agreement to discuss again in January, in the meantime DMSPC and DOS will discuss internally and in the UN Secretariat (considering issues of confidentiality, flexibility, etc.).	proposed to close