

**STAFF UNION BULLETIN**  
**BULLETIN DU SYNDICAT**  
**BOLETIN DEL SINDICATO**



9 March 2009

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE STAFF REGULATIONS**

**A REAL RISK FOR ARBITRARY TRANSFERS IN THE ILO**

The Administration has decided to unilaterally submit an amendment to Article 4.2 (f) of the Staff Regulations to the Governing Body, in violation of the Collective Agreement on a Procedure for Recruitment and Selection. This Agreement specifically requires that any amendment to this article be the subject of negotiation with the Union.

**THIS AMENDMENT IS DANGEROUS FOR YOU**

The Administration wishes to be able to undertake in-grade transfers without competition, in particular to implement the so-called “mobility policy” as well as to respond to “other specific needs” of the Office.

In short, the Administration could arbitrarily transfer any staff member to any post, with absolutely no guarantee of transparency.

**Some concrete examples:**

- You are a P3 in the Employment Sector, and you want to participate in the mobility policy once a position becomes vacant in Asia. However, your responsible chief decides to transfer you without competition to a position in Africa.
- You are a G5 in NORMES and you learn that an interesting position becomes vacant in SECTOR, or you are a G3 in Bangkok and would like to be promoted to a G4 post that will soon become vacant. You think that you have a good chance of winning the competition, but the competition is never opened because the responsible chief preferred an in-grade transfer of a colleague s/he knows well.
- You are a P4, who has been working for over 6 years as a social dialogue specialist in Lima. You are hoping to move back to headquarters. However, the responsible chief decides to offer a direct transfer to a colleague who is already based in Geneva. You remain stuck in the field: for how long?

## **WHAT IS THE UNION'S POSITION?**

While always maintaining its insistence that such an amendment must be the subject of negotiations, the Staff Union nevertheless declared its willingness to find a solution. The Union made a series of counterproposals to the Administration, the most important of which included:

1. The Union proposed that in-grade transfers without competition would not be possible except in humanitarian cases or to allow for the return of a staff member from detachment to a technical cooperation project or leave without pay. Such transfers should be made with the consent of the staff member concerned.
2. The Union proposed that all changes of duty station be made through competition, while giving priority to those staff applying for competitions outside of their duty station.
3. The Union proposed that, after a certain number of years of service, staff members on technical cooperation and short term contracts be given priority over other external candidates in competitions.

Despite these constructive proposals, after 10 days of silence, the Union was informed that the Administration had decided to move forward with its original text.

Thus, not only have the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations not been negotiated, they have not even been the subject of genuine consultations, as the Union never had the chance to participate in a discussion on the substance of the proposals.

## **WHAT HAS THE UNION DONE SINCE IT HAS RECEIVED THIS INFORMATION ?**

Extremely troubled by the seriousness of these events, the Staff Union Committee sent a letter to the Director-General, requesting that consideration of the proposed amendment by the Governing Body be postponed until a genuine negotiation has taken place.

### **Now is the time for mobilization!**

Our colleagues from the field are also mobilized, and are organizing actions which we will communicate to the staff at large.

If our efforts are unsuccessful, the consequences for the staff will be extremely serious, no matter how you look at it.

An effective and independent international civil service is based on a recruitment and selection system that is transparent and fair.

### **Prepare to defend your rights!**

**Yes to change which allows us to better respond to new global challenges, but not at any price...and particularly not at the price of arbitrary decision making, and the death of collective bargaining!**