

IHO Working Group on Staff Regulations

4. Meeting

Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency, Hamburg

17.3.-18.3.2010

Summary Minutes

Participants:

Ms. Hering (Chair)
Ms. Davis (UKHO)
Mr. Hackett (US Department of State)
Adm. Maratos (Pres. IHB)
Ms. Williams (IHB)
Dr. Trümpler (BSH)

1. Welcome and Agenda

Ms. Hering welcomed the group and presented a paper to structure discussions of the meeting (Attachment 1). The group agreed to proceed according to the proposal.

2. Social Benefits

Adm. Maratos referred to the question of medical cover for retired Directors and staff. This is currently limited to those staff having completed 10 years of service. This concern was addressed in a proposal by Ms. Hering, as amended following discussions in the group. The wording (reproduced in Att. 4) is based on three changes:

- The “Monaco and France Privilege“ should be removed. Directors and staff from the IHB should be able to retire not only in Monaco and France, but anywhere in the world and still be eligible to receive health care cover, provided they are not entitled to receive such benefits from another source (e.g. a national or a military scheme). That is in line with the status of the IHB as an international organization.
- Health care should only be provided to staff when retirement is immediately following the service at the IHB. The IHB should not be liable for health care costs for those staff who choose to leave the IHB before retirement or whose temporary contract is not renewed.
- The minimum service time should be brought in line with the standard employment terms for Directors (under the new structure) and Cat. A staff, i.e. should only be nine years.

The group expects these changes to be cost neutral on balance. However, since the number of staff at the IHB is small, predictions are exceedingly hard to make.

3. Discussion of Pay scale

Ms. Davis introduced the modified evaluation form (Att. 2). The group agreed that the form provides a good basis for employee evaluation and should be used. The group agreed that an open, transparent evaluation procedure is crucial for the acceptability of the new pay scale.

Adm. Maratos explained again that the origin of the currently used B1 and B2 pay scales dated back to the need to establish a suitable salary system for translators. However, the system was then expanded to the whole Cat. B staff, while the translators were moved to their own pay scale in a later reform.

Ms. Davis explained that the UK was proposing a consolidated single table for Cat. B and Cat. C staff. She pointed out that a purely time-based progression beyond what was envisaged in the UK proposal could not be sustained by the current budget. However, based on the budget situation, there might be room for a non-consolidated bonus.

After some discussion, in particular concerning the small number of staff at the IHB, the group agreed on the pay scale as proposed by the UK with the following modifications:

Upon hiring, the following should be fixed by individual agreement for each entrant into the service:

- starting point on the pay scale
- target rate on the pay scale
- maximum rate on the pay scale

In fixing these rates, the established budget of the IHB shall be taken into account. The responsibility not to exceed the approved budget rests with the directors.

The group agreed that the exact wording on the progression on the pay scale needed to be worked out. It also agreed that an example of a pay scale for a new entrant, given the normal level of performance, be included in the report.

4. Performance Review

Adm. Maratos briefly restated the performance review procedure currently used. The group agreed that the transparency of the process for the employee should be increased. The group agreed with the evaluation form proposed by UK (Att. 2). The group also agreed that the proposed evaluation form is only a minimum requirement which can be exceeded, if the Directors so decide.

Ms. Davis offered to amend the form to reflect the discussions of the group.

5. Draft Staff Regulations (Att. 3)

The group discussed the draft regulations prepared in the intersessional period by Ms. Williams, amended according to a US proposal.

The group accepted the proposed wording of the Staff Regulations with some drafting changes and the following major exceptions:

- III.3.i): The group discussed in depth the proposal by the US. Mr. Hackett explained that the proposal is in line with the current developments at the United Nations and that indeed such a clause is part of the UN staff regulations. Adm. Maratos pointed out that the IHB budget is small and that 80 % are spent on permanent staff. Accord-

ingly the IHB does not initiate any major tenders or procurements. Hence even the opportunity for improper behaviour is very limited.

The group agreed that the proposed regulation would be a heavy administrative burden for Directors and an intrusion into their private lives while the scope for financial wrongdoing is very small. Weighing up these factors the group decided that a mere attestation that the director or staff member has complied with the regulations proposed under III.3.g) is sufficient.

- VII.2: The group discussed the issue of an education grant extensively, taking into consideration the geographic situation of the IHB in Monaco, and decided to align the current wording with UN practice.

An agreed text of the amended versions together with other agreed drafting changes is attached as Attachment 4.

Ms. Williams agreed to produce a consolidated version of the Staff Regulations, taking into consideration the agreed drafting changes.

6. Transitional Arrangements

The new Staff Regulations should be effective for every newly hired employee after their entry into force.

The group agreed that current staff hired under the old Staff Regulations should be given the option to transfer to the new Staff Regulations. The group also agreed that where their remuneration is concerned, staff hired under the old Staff Regulations had the option to retain the old Regulations.

The group agreed that staff hired under the old Staff Regulations should be given the choice to move to the new system within a year. The Regulations must however be accepted in full; it will not be possible to choose individual regulations.

A draft transitional regulation is contained in Attachment 4.

The new Staff Regulations should be a single document for all staff members. Where appropriate, they should indicate in two different versions the difference between staff hired under the old and the new rules. The group identified the following areas in which such different regulations should be indicated: Pay Scale, Social Benefits, Education Grant.

7. Content of the report

The report of the SRWG should:

- Reflect the Terms of Reference of the Group
- Explain the purpose of the exercise
- Name the legal issues that were identified by the group

Ms. Davis agreed to draft the section on the pay scale for the report. Mr. Hackett agreed to draft a section on the education grant. Ms. Williams agreed to draft a new set of Staff Regulations taking into consideration the findings of the WG.

Ms. Hering will submit a draft on health care, other benefits and the summing up.

The group agreed that the report and the Staff Regulations should be submitted to the Member States for acceptance as a whole.

A first draft of the report should be distributed by the end of April. The work of the group should be finished by the end of May.

Further face-to-face meetings are not considered necessary at this point.

For the protocol

Dr. Trümpler

Attachments

1. Paper by Chair
2. Evaluation form as proposed by UK
3. Draft Staff Regulations with US amendments
4. Sections of Staff Regulations as drafted and agreed on by the group

12 March 2010

SRWG

Meeting 17 / 18 March 2010 Line of Discussion

With the aim to further a concentrated discussion and final conclusions it is suggested that SRWG should achieve the following as a result of the Meeting:

- I. With the aim to come to final conclusion the issues listed below under items 1 to 3 should be considered. The Meeting has to agree upon those questions to be presented to Member States for final decision.
- II. The Meeting should agree upon the lines for the report to be submitted to Member States. The report should reflect
 - issues SRWG has dealt with
 - conclusions of SRWG
 - options for decisions by Member States.
- III. The Meeting should agree upon the Draft Staff Regulations to be submitted to Member States for decision.

1. Health Care

After having considered several options in respect of reorganizing the social security system, inter alia joining the UN insurance system, SRWG came to the conclusion that the existing social security system as outlined under Chapter VII., 1 "Preamble" of the Staff Regulations should be maintained.

Nevertheless during the discussions of the SRWG several questions were raised concerning social benefits following retirement. To this end the following questions were outlined in SRWG-document 5 February 2010 for consideration.

- Is the "Monaco-/France-privilege" justifiable or is it appropriate to find a solution for retired Directors and staff members without reference to the country of residence? Should reimbursements of costs generated in other countries be limited in line with Reg. VII.4 (a)?
- Should the possibility to gain coverage for medical expenses under the IHO system be kept for retired Directors and staff members under any circumstances or should there be coherence between the service in the IHO and the date of retirement? This question might rise in context of staff members with fixed term appointments as well as Directors which have a limited period of service.
- Should reference be made to other forms of cost coverage a Director or staff member might enjoy?

No comments have been made until the deadline 19 February 2010.

Therefore the issue should be discussed to achieve final conclusion on social benefits for retired staff members and Directors.

2. Salary Options

a) Pay Scale

There was no objection to the proposal made in document from 23 December 2009 that the pay scale developed by the UK should form the basis for the final discussion of the SRWG nor have any comments been made to SRWG-document 5 February 2010. Thus the scale has been inserted into the Draft Staff Regulation for final consideration.

A remaining question to be discussed in this context by the SRWG is the applicability of the new pay arrangements to the existing staff and the interest of the existing staff to adapt to the new system respectively.

b) Performance Review

Reference is made to the consensus reached in respect of necessary changes in performance review, (Staff Regulations, Chapter V (Summary Minutes 2nd Meeting, Item 3, 3. Para, 4. indent):

“The group agreed that a transparent, open, clear and visible system for performance review needs to be put in place and implemented at the IHB.”

In addition reference is made to

- UK proposal in respect of “Performance and Development Review”, email 9 October 2009, see form in Attachment 1 to this document.
There has been an exchange between UK and IHB on how the suggested table could best be applied to IHB staff members. The outcome should be considered with the aim to come to a final conclusion in respect of a proper performance review system to be implemented by the Staff Regulations.
- Document “Regulation / Rules for Staff Promotion”, 3 November 2009, and comments by the Secretariat, see Attachment 2 to this document

The form as suggested by the UK and amendments of the Staff regulations, as far as needed, should be considered to reach final conclusion.

3. Draft Staff Regulations

The Secretariat submitted a revised Draft reflecting the latest stage of discussion. This should form the basis for final consideration. It should be accepted that no further amendments or changes, except those arising from discussion of item 1 and 2 above, should be discussed.

The text should be attached to the Final Report of SRWG for decision by Member States.

PERFORMANCE & DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

- (a) **Name:** (b) **Date entered current post:**
- (c) **Age** (c) **Position held:**
- (d) **Salary scale step and date of promotion:**

Assessment definitions:		
Outstanding*	- performance significantly better than would be expected	* justification and examples required
Very Good	- high level of performance corresponding with experience and qualifications	---
Satisfactory	- satisfactory performance	---
Unsatisfactory*	- performance significantly less than would normally be expected	* justification and examples required

PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW			
	Definition	Assessment (Outstanding*, VG, Sat, Unsat*)	* Examples / Justification of Extreme Assessments
EFFICIENCY	The ability to apply knowledge and understanding of the job diligently in order to complete assigned tasks both accurately and in a reasonable time scale.		
INITIATIVE	The resourcefulness to find novel and innovative methods of carrying out various tasks successfully.		
RELIABILITY	The ability to complete tasks without the need for close or constant supervision.		
COOPERATION	The ability to work cooperatively with other members of staff both on individual and joint tasks.		
BONUS RECOMMENDATION (based on behaviour, achievement and competence)			
DEVELOPMENT PLAN (details of any specific courses recommended for further development)			

NARRATIVE REPORT (additional information on the overall assessment)
JOB HOLDER COMMENTS

Date and signature of job holder

Date and signature of the Chair of the SAB

SRWG 3, 17.03.2010

I.6 Category B and C Staff recruited on or after the 1st of August 2010 are subject to the new arrangements contained in Annex [...] and indicated in the text of the regulations. Those staff employed prior to 1st of August 2010 have an option to retain their existing terms and conditions of service or to transition to the new arrangements by declaration in writing to the Directing Committee by the 31st of December 2010.

III.3 (i) Directors and Professional Assistants shall be required to attest on appointment and at intervals thereafter with respect to themselves, their spouses and dependent children that they comply with the regulation stated under (g) and to assist the Finance Committee in verifying the accuracy of the attestation submitted when asked to do so.

IV.2.4.1 Education Grant

A Director or Category A Staff Member who reside outside their home country shall be entitled to receive an education grant for each dependent child who meets the conditions laid down in Article II.1 (m), other than maximum age, which is covered by (b) below, and who is in full-time attendance at an educational institution.

VII.2

Directors and Staff members in Service or retired ... shall be granted by the Bureau as regards social security - ... - social benefits at least equivalent to those provided by the laws of Monaco provided that the beneficiaries fulfil the conditions of such laws unless specified otherwise by these rules.

VII.5

Directors and retired Staff Members who have reached retirement age shall be entitled to the above mentioned social benefits on behalf of themselves and their dependent families where retirement is immediately following service and they have completed at least nine years service in the Bureau. Should a Director or Staff Member leave the Bureau without meeting these criteria he will not receive such benefits from the IHB.

Social benefits are only paid on this basis by the IHB where the Director or staff member is not entitled to receive any such benefits from other sources (including i.a. national or military insurance schemes). In no case duplicate payment may be authorised.

Reimbursements of medical costs are limited to reimbursement paid under VII.4(a). For medical expenses incurred outside Monaco adequate validation has to be produced.