

Briefing Note

Peter A Gallo

Tel: +44-7719-063462 (UK)
Tel: +1-917-575-8835 (US)
email: gweilicus@gmail.com
URL: www.peteragallo.com
Twitter: <http://twitter.com/PeterAGallo>
Skype: pagallo7278

Comparison of Staff Surveys of UN Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights

12 March 2017

Reference is made throughout to the United Nations Global Staff Survey 2017. This is a 200 page document available [online](#).

The results of OHCHR Staff Association Survey 2017 is attached as an **annex**.

The Author is a former UN staff member who appeared before the US Congressional hearing on ‘UN **Peacekeepers: Abuse and Accountability**’ by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations in April 2016.¹

¹ <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/FA/FA16/20160413/104766/HHRG-114-FA16-Wstate-GalloP-20160413.pdf>

Introduction

This is a comparison of two surveys of the management of the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (“OHCHR”).

These are;

- 1) the survey organised by the staff unions of the UN Secretariat and carried out between 13 and 24 February 2017 (“the Global Survey”)², and
- 2) the survey organised by the OHCHR Staff Committee and carried out between 17 and 21 January 2017 (“the OHCHR survey”) an annotated copy of which is attached.

Of the 35 UN departments listed in the Global Survey, OHCHR was rated best overall, and was rated:

- top for **job satisfaction**
- top for **career development**
- second for **supervision**
- top for **leadership**
- top for **Ethics and organizational culture**
- second for **empowerment**
- top for **internal communication**
- third for **work/life balance**, and
- second for **positive attitude towards the UN**.

The findings of the Global Survey come at a particularly auspicious time for OHCHR and the High Commissioner in particular.

The reputation of the department was seriously harmed by his mishandling of the child sexual abuse scandal in the Central African Republic in 2015³, his treatment of former OHCHR official Mr. Anders Kompass, the retaliation case by a second OHCHR staff member Ms. Miranda Brown⁴ and the subsequent resignation of Mr. Kompass who continued to face a hostile working environment⁵ after being cleared of all of the accusations of wrongdoing made against him.⁶

2 <http://www.staffcoordinatingcouncil.org/attachments/article/440/UN%20Global%20Staff%20Satisfaction%20Survey%202017.pdf>

3 <http://www.codebluecampaign.com/carstatement/>

4 <https://www.whistleblower.org/blog/093005-once-again-un-whistleblower-jeopardy>

5 <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jun/07/child-sex-abuse-whistleblower-resigns-from-un>

6 <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/12/17/the-u-n-official-who-blew-the-lid-on-central-african-republic-sex-scandal-vindicated/>

This was followed by further disclosures about a *third* staff member being denied Protection against Retaliation by the UN Ethics Office after reporting that OHCHR was handing over the names of human rights activists to their governments, as well as other improper relationships for which senior OHCHR staff have never been investigated.⁷

The results of the Global Survey would appear to indicate that senior management have overcome any problems there may have been in the past and that the office is now performing very well.

These ratings are comparative however, and while OHCHR appeared to perform very well; the only conclusion that can be made is that they performed better than any other UN department or mission.

In addition to the qualitative aspect of the survey, staff were given the opportunity to add comments.

Staff were advised that these comments would be published anonymously, but the Organisers also stated that a number of comments made direct allegations against fellow colleagues and these were removed.⁸ The number of these is not known. Moreover, it is not known whether the staff unions organising the survey took any steps with regard to having these allegations reported or investigated.⁹

Of the 50 comments known to have been submitted by OHCHR staff, it is significant that 44 (**88%**) are negative and critical of management.¹⁰ None of the remainder are complimentary, and those that are positive only express appreciation for being invited to participate in the survey.

What should be of great concern, however are the comments such as:

*Managers need to be fair which is not the case. many lack integrity and honesty in the office. ...The race factor is crucial, if you are not white, it would be almost impossible to be in the attention of supervisor.*¹¹

*Managers should lead by example, especially when it comes to integrity and respect.*¹²

*In general the managerial abilities of chiefs and leaders are bad which negatively influences our work, efficiency and the results.*¹³

*No accountability, departments and sections are run as fiefdoms and anyone presenting a dissenting view is to be silenced. Senior managers only want to hear good news and don't seem to realise how bad it is.*¹⁴

UN has become a corrupted place of hypocrisy where "impunity" is indulged through abuse of system and power. It has failed to stay impartial and independent to be the voice of those

7 <http://peteragallo.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/OHCHR-Retaliation-Briefing-PAG-290117.pdf>

8 [Global Survey](#). Page 6. Methodology. Foot of page

9 UN Staff Members have an affirmative duty under Staff Rule 1.2(c) to report any breach of the Regulations and Rules for appropriate investigative action to be taken.

10 [Global Survey](#). Pages 130 to 135

11 [Global Survey](#). Page 131. Comment 5

12 [Global Survey](#). Page 134. Comment 3

13 [Global Survey](#). Page 130. Comment 16

14 [Global Survey](#). Page 133. Comment 2

*disadvantaged or victimized. There is lack of fair distribution of resources, leadership is not held accountable for lack of delivery of services or results.*¹⁵

*It is also important to hold managers accountable for their behavior and to increase confidence in managers, as right now there is a feeling of impunity of managers when staff are treated unfairly.*¹⁶

*More need to be done to counteract unethical behavior in the organization and reform should start in the Ethics Office, which has not properly carried out its mandate.*¹⁷

In addition to being criticism of the style of management, these comments go further and indicate an institutional paucity of integrity and ethical standards among managers of OHCHR.

This has to be particularly embarrassing given their role in promoting human rights, and is also something that one might expect to be of great concern to the Staff Association, but this does not appear to be the case.

Still, the result of the Global Survey – taken without critical analysis – reflects very well on OHCHR. That survey, however, appears to conflict with the findings of the earlier OHCHR survey, whose findings are significantly less positive.

Internal Communication

The Global Survey rated OHCHR better than any other UN department for ‘Internal Communication’¹⁸ while the OHCHR survey findings for ‘internal communication’ found:

- only 45% of staff said they were kept informed of developments in OHCHR or in the UN in general, and
- only 18% reported having reasons behind decisions being explained to them.¹⁹

The Global Satisfaction survey rated OHCHR second highest in the Organization for supervisors being open to new ideas and suggestions.²⁰ The OHCHR survey found:

- only 22% believed that management was in touch with their views and opinions as staff members, and
- only 24% believed senior management to be responsive to the views and opinions of staff.²¹

In terms of staff communicating with management; 53% of respondents were “*not afraid to openly*

¹⁵ [Global Survey](#). Page 134. Comment 4.

¹⁶ [Global Survey](#). Page 134. Comment 10.

¹⁷ [Global Survey](#). Page 134. Comment 11.

¹⁸ [Global Survey](#). Page 24

¹⁹ Annex:Page 2, between letters O and P

²⁰ [Global Survey](#). Page 12

²¹ Annex; Page 2, between letters P and Q

express their views and opinions.” By extrapolation therefore 47% must be afraid to do so.²² 40% of Respondents even indicated they “*experienced, or fear reprisals for speaking out*”.²³ What action the Staff Association is taking to address these observations is not known.

The Global survey rated OHCHR highest in the Organization for communication in the department being “open and honest”²⁴, and for people communicating *respectfully*.²⁵ This has to be compared to the findings of the OHCHR Survey that found only 25% of respondents considered OHCHR to be “open and honest” in their communications.²⁶

Given that OHCHR’s function is to promote human rights, and supposedly to support and assist activists working for freedom of expression against oppressive regimes around the world; it must be a particular source of embarrassment that the High Commissioner that such a high percentage of his own staff would express fear of retaliation for speaking out in his own department.

Misconduct by Senior OHCHR Staff

More significantly, the Global Survey rated OHCHR highest in the Organization for being free from harassment or abuse of authority,²⁷ but at the same time, the OHCHR survey reported that 25% of respondents *experienced* “harassment, discrimination or abuse of authority at work.” Given the sample size, that would imply at least 85 instances of violations of ST/SGB/2008/5 in that one department alone.

Responsibility for initiating investigations under ST/SGB/2008/5 lies with the ‘Program Manager’ - which in the case of OHCHR is the High Commissioner, and given that 40% of the respondents (i.e. at least 136 OHCHR staff members) expressed a fear of reprisals for speaking out - these figures indicate a serious problem with misconduct and retaliation by management.

The OHCHR Survey indicates that 75% of respondents did *not* believe the UN Regulations and Rules in the area of human resources were effectively implemented at OHCHR.²⁸ This supports the anonymous comments made by staff members referring to the culture of impunity in that workplace.

The OHCHR survey report only describes the number who believe there to be ‘accountability’ in the Department to be “few.” This has to be indicative of a lack of political will within the Organization to

22 Annex; Page 1 at letter R, to page 2 at letter B

23 Annex; Page 2, at letter C. Retaliation is a serious problem in the UN, and one that senior management has been very slow and reluctant to address seriously. (<http://peteragallo.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Designed-to-Fail-PAG-on-ST-SGB-2017-2.pdf>) The recent case of Ms. Emma Reilly also indicate the lengths to which the Ethics Office goes – even after the Kompass and Brown cases - to deny there is even a *prima facie* case of retaliation in OHCHR. (<http://peteragallo.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/OHCHR-Retaliaton-Annex-A-Ethics-findings290117.pdf>)

24 [Global Survey](#). Page 25

25 [Global Survey](#). Page 24

26 Annex: Page 2 at letter A

27 [Global Survey](#). Page 17. This also has to be considered in light of the Kompass, Brown and Reilly cases.

28 Annex: Page 4 between letters D and E

enforce the existing rules against senior staff.

In distributing the results of the survey, the Staff Association made no reference to a situation that appears to be a hostile working environment.

Integrity

The Global Satisfaction survey rated OHCHR second highest in the UN for operating with integrity.²⁹

The public disclosures in the OHCHR whistleblower cases - particularly in regard to the department's treatment of Mr. Anders Kompass – would appear to undermine this accolade.

The UN however does not define 'integrity' by reference to personal qualities of honesty or strong moral rectitude as much as considering it a measure by which one "*demonstrates the values of the United Nations*" in the behaviour of their staff. One of the examples of a desirable characteristic given in the UN's own guidance literature³⁰ is that the individual "*stands by decisions that are in the Organization's interest, even if they are unpopular.*" This, of course, makes the determination an entirely subjective one; the UN being the sole arbiter of what is in the UN's interest.

By this measure, a UN staff member can demonstrate their "integrity" by standing by an official decision that appears to be both illegal and morally repugnant, simply because it was a decision taken by their superior. The UN's concept of that is "right" is clearly not analogous to any objective moral standard.

Indeed, the Kompass case serves as a very clear warning for all OHCHR staff. While Mr. Kompass was driven out of the Organization, the OHCHR official in the Central African Republic who actively failed to prevent the sexual abuse of children suffered no harm to his career; he was not only promoted but retains a position of influence over the UN's relationship with the CAR Government.³¹

Similarly, it is clear that senior management orchestrated an unwarranted investigation by OIOS – who continued to investigate Kompass AFTER he was formally cleared by an external Independent Review Panel - and despite the then Under-Secretary-General of Oversight being found guilty of abuse of authority, no OIOS investigators were ever sanctioned for their involvement in what was a patently punitive investigation.³²

Staff remain vulnerable to future abuses by OIOS, which – far from being independent – remains available to conduct similarly prejudicial investigations on behalf of biased senior managers.

29 [Global Survey](#). Page 18

30 United Nations publication 'Competencies for the Future'

31 <https://www.linkedin.com/in/onana-renner-ml-182a7690/>

32 'Taking Action on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by Peacekeepers' Report of an Independent Review on Sexual Exploitation & Abuse by International Peacekeeping Forces in the Central African Republic. (The Deschamps Panel) <http://www.un.org/News/dh/infocus/centafricrepub/Independent-Review-Report.pdf>

There is a very public record of how Mr. Kompass was first investigated in October 2014 for allegedly leaking confidential information to the Moroccan ambassador, and it was only when OIOS was unable to substantiate that accusation that the High Commissioner looked for another excuse to dismiss him.³³ It now appears that another OHCHR official enjoyed a close relationship with the Moroccan ambassador and accepted an advantage from him – but that was not deemed to be worthy of investigation and the relationship appears to be condoned by the High Commissioner.³⁴ The double standard here does not appear to be of concern to the Staff Association. Managers Performance

The Global survey rated OHCHR highest for leadership and for having confidence in their department's leader.³⁵ The OHCHR Survey on the other hand found that:

- 53% of respondents had trust in and respect for senior management, while
- 54% had that trust and respect for senior management in the field.³⁶

In terms of measuring actual performance by management, however, the figures show

- only 45% of OHCHR staff considered that the department's priorities had been implemented effectively in their area of work, and
- only 35% considered that senior management provided clear guidance on those priorities.³⁷

Recruitments and Promotions

The Global Survey rated OHCHR highest in the UN for appointing the right people for the right jobs³⁸, but the OHCHR survey found only 21% of respondents believed this to be the case,³⁹ and only 13% considered there was a strong connection between performance and promotion.⁴⁰

One area where the OHCHR survey returned what appears to be a finding favourable to managements was for 'Performance Evaluation' where 65% of staff believed that their evaluation was "*fair and unbiased*."⁴¹ That, however, leaves a third of staff believing their appraisals might be *unfair* and *biased*. What is not known is the percentage of OHCHR staff members who exercise the right to rebut their Annual Appraisal⁴² - but if this is significantly less than 33%, it would have to be considered in light of the 40% of staff who reported having experienced being afraid of reprisals.⁴³

33 <http://www.codebluecampaign.com/carstatement/>

34 <http://peteragallo.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/OHCHR-Retaliation-Briefing-PAG-290117.pdf>

35 [Global Survey](#). Pages 15 & 16

36 Annex Page 1 at letter O.

37 Annex: page 2 at letter N

38 [Global Survey](#). Page 10.

39 Annex: Page 4 at letter H

40 Annex: Page 4 at letter M

41 Annex: Page 4 at letter L.

42 ST/AI/2010/5, Section 10.

43 Annex; Page 2, at letter C. Retaliation is a serious problem in the UN, and one that senior management has been very

Many comments by OHCHR staff members section of the Global Survey are particularly critical of promotion procedures:

*There are no opportunities for promotion, and it is incredibly demotivating to do the same job well for years with no change and no recognition. Furthermore, people who do little or nothing get the same rights, opportunities, and remuneration as those who do a good job. The incentive to do well is non-existent, leaving it only up to your personal morale do continue to deliver. There must be human resources programme that has career progression, like any other organization or company. Otherwise the good staff leave and the non-performing ones stay.*⁴⁴

*Recruitment processes, are biased and lack accountability mechanisms. Recruitment in OHCHR is often done, with a candidate in mind, and yet interviews are conducted for a whole lot of people. All in all the system is corrupt and flawed , there is a lack of accountability.*⁴⁵

*...the recruitment process is not transparent and allows recruiting managers to tailor tests and interviews to particular staff. Geographic balance is not taken into account and some departments are favouring staff from particular regions. Career perspective is non existent.*⁴⁶

*NCEs and YPPs are being neglected and exploited at OHCHR. Management have zero concept of the lack of career progress or promotions or opportunities for lateral moves. The OHCHR NCE /YPP staff survey showed HIGH frustration by this group.*⁴⁷

*Important problems the office faces are these: - cronyism in recruitment We do not have enough low level staff to do the work we need. total absence of professional evolution / promotion opportunities - no willingness or motivation for managers to listen to suggestions and take it on board. no protection for those who provide constructive suggestions.*⁴⁸

The Global Staff Satisfaction survey rated OHCHR second highest in the Organization for staff feeling happy and motivated to come to work.⁴⁹ At the same time, the OHCHR survey found only 13% of OHCHR staff believed management was doing a good job at retaining its most talented people.⁵⁰

The implication has to be that the way to get promoted in OHCHR has very little to do with how well someone actually does their job, and a lot more about other factors.

Conclusions

These two surveys cannot be dismissed as being contradictory; both present appear to present their findings accurately. If that is the case, however, while OHCHR appears to have performed

slow and reluctant to address seriously.(<http://peteragallo.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Designed-to-Fail-PAG-on-ST-SGB-2017-2.pdf>) The recent case of Ms. Emma Reilly also indicate the lengths to which the Ethics Office goes – even after the Kompass and Brown cases - to deny there is even a *prima facie* case of retaliation in OHCHR.

(<http://peteragallo.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/OHCHR-Retaliaton-Annex-A-Ethics-findings290117.pdf>)

44 [Global Survey](#). Page 134. Comment 1

45 [Global Survey](#). Page 135. Comment 2

46 [Global Survey](#). Page 134. Comment 5.

47 [Global Survey](#). Page 130. Comment 7

48 [Global Survey](#). Page 134. Comment 8.

49 [Global Survey](#). Page 8

50 Annex B: Page 4 at letter H

comparatively very well, the implications for the management of the other departments and missions in the UN are extremely poor indeed.

These findings raise serious concerns for the career development of OHCHR staff, and for their welfare in general. The Staff Association, however, appears to be very muted in its response, showing little enthusiasm for challenging senior management on behalf of their members, particularly with regard to accountability for wrongdoing.

In seeking to explain how OHCHR performed so well in the second survey, after such criticism in the first, it is possible that OHCHR management was aware of the critical results of the first, which was carried out between 17 and 21 January 2017, and therefore had time to ensure that a more determined effort was made to ensure the Global Survey - carried out three weeks later, between 13 and 24 February – was heavily supported by managers who had a vested interest in maximising the number of positive responses.

It is also curious to observe that it was an *OHCHR* staff member who commented:

*Be aware that it is easy to take this survey several times... (on your office computer, home computer, your own ipad, your kid's ipad, your phone, your partners phone, and so on and so forth...) Just sayin'!*⁵¹

Nothing is stated in the ‘methodology’ section⁵² as to what, if any, measures were taken to prevent this – or indeed to prevent this from being done in the future.

This seriously undermines the credibility of the exercise. It is not possible to dismiss the possibility that OHCHR actively encouraged their own managerial and supervisory staff to respond to the Global Staff Satisfaction Survey with favourable ratings.

If so, this could be compared to the strategy adopted by Venezuela in flooding the OHCHR Universal Periodic Review process with comments from several hundred allegedly bogus NGOs enthusiastic in support of the Venezuelan government human rights record.⁵³

Peter A Gallo.
12 March 2017

51 [Global Survey](#). Page 130. Comment 14

52 [Global Survey](#). Page 6

53 <https://www.unwatch.org/fraud-un-venezuelas-corruption-2016-upr-human-rights-review/>

Annex: OHCHR Staff Association Survey 2017

OHCHR STAFF COMMITTEE SURVEY RESULTS

23 FEBRUARY 2017

A. CONTEXT

From 17 to 21 January 2017, the OHCHR Staff Committee administered an OHCHR staff survey with a view to identifying staff perceptions and receiving feedback on areas of engagement proposed by the Staff Committee. The survey further invited staff to formulate additional suggestions.

341 staff members participated in the survey, broken down as follows:

- 226 staff from headquarters (out of some 600 staff). All HQ divisions participated in numbers relatively proportional to their size. **38% Response Rate**
- 74 staff from the field (out of some 600 staff in OHCHR field presences): 36 staff from 15 OHCHR country offices, 25 staff from 12 regional offices, 8 staff from the NYO, and 5 out of 19 Human Rights Advisors. **12% Response Rate**
- 22 staff from the human rights component in 14 peace missions (out of some 800 staff in such UN missions).

Two thirds of the respondents were women.

B. PERCEPTIONS AND STAFF COMMITTEE ACTION

I. TRUST AND INCLUSION

93% of respondents expressed that the Staff Committee should engage in activities clustered in the thematic area of “trust and inclusion”.

1. Overall perceptions

a. Motivation. Survey respondents strongly believe in the “goals and objectives of OHCHR” (94%). They are “proud to say that they work for OHCHR” (87%) and are “clear about OHCHR’s mission and vision” (82%). 63% of respondents currently feel “motivated to work for OHCHR” and that “their work is valued”.

b. Senior management. “Trust in and respect for senior management” at HQ stands at 53%, and at 54% for “senior management in the field”. **almost half the staff do NOT trust management**

c. Diversity. 55% of respondents think that “OHCHR is a diverse enough workplace to project the message of universality of human rights”. 69% think that “colleagues in their direct surrounding are treated equally, regardless of sex, race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability or other status”. [1] 71% are in favour of “temporary special measures to redress the gender imbalance at senior management and other levels”.

d. Internal communication. While 53% of respondents are “not afraid to openly **almost half the staff ARE afraid to express their opinions!**”

341 staff members participated in the survey and 24% (i.e. 85 people) claim they EXPERIENCED harassment, discrimination or abuse of authority

Only 25% express their views and opinions”, one out of four respondents views “communication at OHCHR as open and honest”. The same proportion of 25% respondents indicated that they “experience harassment, discrimination or abuse of authority at work” and two out of five indicated they “experience or fear reprisals for speaking out”. i.e 40% admit fear of a culture of RETALIATION

In this section of the survey, some 76 individual comments were received but most related rather to the area of accountability and talent management (see below).

Additional suggestions from respondents for areas of engagement by the Staff Committee relate to organizing social activities and working towards improving staff morale. It was further suggested that if everyone follows the rules, this builds trust. Some respondents suggested that a record be kept of good practices relating to “trust and inclusion”.

2. Top five suggested priorities of work of the Staff Committee as validated by staff

- Convey staff views and concerns to senior management (208 respondents).
- Provide "good offices" and advice to staff on individual cases (120).
- Organise focus group discussions on issues of concern to staff (68).
- Advocate with senior management to enhance geographic and other diversity in recruitments (61).
- Make staff management relations (including respect and trust building) an explicit management goal of OHCHR (58).

...because

II. MEANINGFUL SUBSTANTIVE PARTICIPATION

89 % of respondents expressed that the Staff Committee should engage in activities clustered in the thematic area of “meaningful substantive participation”.

1. Overall perceptions

a. Prioritization. 45% of respondents feel that “OHCHR-wide priorities have been implemented effectively in their area of work,” and 35% that “senior management provides clear guidance in relation to the Office’s substantive priorities”.

b. Internal communication. While 45% believe they are “kept informed about what is happening at OHCHR or in the broader UN context”, only 18% suggest that, in their experience, the “reasons behind decisions at OHCHR are fully explained to staff”. 22% believe that “OHCHR management is in touch with the views and opinions of staff” and 24% believe that “senior management is responsive to the views and opinions of staff”.

c. The Change Initiative. A very small number of respondents think that “OHCHR manages change effectively.” 36 % agree that “the regionalisation

Two thirds of staff believe that senior management fails to show leadership.

Over 75% of staff think managers do not LISTEN

Over half the staff believe OHCHR is failing to act on their own priorities

Over half the staff are not told what is happening.

Over 75% of staff think managers do not know what the staff think.

should go ahead as currently envisaged.” 32% agree that the “HQ division mergers should proceed as currently envisaged.”

Some 90 individual comments were received on the change initiative. Some 20 respondents supported the objectives of the change initiative especially in relation to regionalization; several respondents would prefer the strengthening of country offices (in different configurations) over that of regional presences, some 10 respondents called for a Plan B. Several comments demonstrated fatigue, low staff morale, a feeling of not being listened to, things dragging on for too long (overall some 30 comments), and that HQ efficiencies could be gained through simpler means (some 5 responses). One respondent suggested that an issue not addressed in the survey but which should receive priority attention was to look at distribution of and current unequal workloads.

d. Field participation. Respondents based in field presences, in their individual comments throughout the three sections of the survey (some 20 individual comments), pleaded for receiving more information (e.g. through info sharing with all staff in field presences and not only heads of field presences), for the establishment of a formal consultation mechanism, inclusion in discussions and decisions made at headquarters, for improved communication between senior managers and staff in the field, for increased opportunities and budget for training, and for increased opportunities for field staff to move to HQ (and vice-versa). One respondent pointed out that the field experience that existed at headquarters should not be discounted.

2. Top four suggested priorities of work of the Staff Committee as validated by staff

While 89 % of respondents expressed that the Staff Committee should engage in activities clustered in the thematic area of “substantive participation”, several respondents commented that the Staff Committee should not engage in this area, not facilitate discussions on substantive issues, not become a “shadow cabinet”, be careful not to absolve management from its obligation to communicate with staff, but rather advocate for a more inclusive approach to discussions and decision-making.

i.e. some respondents think the Staff Association should do nothing and just let senior management carry on.....

Taking these comments into account, the Staff Committee will focus on the following areas prioritized by respondents in the survey:

- Seek representation of the OHCHR Staff Committee in senior management bodies (when issues concerning staff are on the agenda) (141 respondents).
- Promote the representation of field staff in senior management bodies (130).
- Promote staff participation in the OMP 2018-21 strategic planning process, and promote overall staff participation in substantive discussions and decision-making with an emphasis on ways to enhance field participation, but also Section/Branch/Division level participation at HQ (115).
- Remind senior managers of and advocate for the implementation of relevant recommendations from previous change initiatives (82).

A

III. ACCOUNTABILITY AND TALENT MANAGEMENT

B 94% of respondents expressed that the Staff Committee should engage in activities clustered in the thematic area of “accountability and talent management”.

C

1. Overall perceptions

a. **Internal communication.** 32% of respondents indicate that they are “kept informed about matters affecting them directly”.

b. **Human resources.** One out of four respondents thinks that “UN Regulations and Rules in the area of human resources are effectively implemented at OHCHR”, and few believe that there is “accountability at all levels”. This section of the survey yielded some 100 individual comments. More than 30 individual comments related to recruitment processes (e.g. questioning long term vacant posts, recent senior appointments from one region, lateral staff moves undertaken in 2016, extension of temporary contracts beyond the 1 year limit for some but not others, etc.). It was suggested that the Staff Committee should advocate with human resources to ensure that staff members are better informed about their entitlements.

c. **Talent management and career advancement.** 21% of respondents think “OHCHR appoints the right people for the right jobs.” 13% think “OHCHR is doing a good job at retaining its most talented people.” The same proportion of respondents think “OHCHR provides them with good prospects for promotion and career advancement”. In addition, more than 20 comments related to the recognition of competence and performance in recruitment and promotion processes, that references be checked systematically, and that there should be more opportunities for career development, promotion and training within the Office, such as staff exchanges (including G staff).

d. **Performance evaluation.** While 65% believe the “evaluation of their performance is fair and unbiased”, 30% think that “good performance is recognised beyond the formal performance evaluation process”, and only 13% think there is a “strong link between career advancement and performance at OHCHR”. 31% feel that “OHCHR provides good learning and career development opportunities”. More than 30 individual comments also asked for increased accountability of managers, calling for 360° performance appraisals. Respondents also suggested that the issue of underperforming staff should be dealt with.

e. **Mobility.** With regards to the Mobility Policy, some 10 comments asked for transparency and clarity in its implementation. It was also suggested that, while advocating for family-sensitive mobility, the Staff Committee should give special attention to the mobility for spouses working at the UN, and try to include all types of family configurations.

f. **Specific situations.** The situation of NCE/YPPs being “stuck” (i.e. lack of career advancement) was invoked several times in the comments to the survey. It was also indicated that temporary staff should have the same entitlements as fixed term staff (e.g. equal annual leave days). Some respondents suggested

75% of staff believe that the UN Staff Rules are NOT being implemented effectively in OHCHR!

Almost 80% of staff believe the WRONG people are appointed!

1 out of 3 believe Staff Evaluations ARE (or may be) unfair and biased.

This is NOT encouraging!

A that interns should receive an allowance to cover living expenses. A

B **2. Top seven suggested priorities of work of the Staff Committee as validated by staff** B

- C • Advocate for a 360-degree performance assessment of all OHCHR staff with supervisory functions, starting with the performance cycle 2016-17 (140 respondents). C
- D • Advocate for the respect of UN Regulations and Rules, UN jurisprudence decisions and better quality control in recruitments (e.g., no excessively stringent qualifications, accessible tests, real competency-based interviews) (116). i.e. ensure existing the rules are FOLLOWED! D
- E • Advocate for regular updates on the implementation of the Mobility Policy at OHCHR (84). E
- F • Promote briefings and discussions on human resources issues of interest (84). F
e.g. harassment, discrimination & abuse of authority?
- G • Advocate for family-sensitive Mobility (80). G
- H • Advocate for increased training and learning opportunities for OHCHR staff (76). H
- H • Advocate for regular dissemination of data on OHCHR staff movements and disaggregated statistics on staff composition (60). H

J

K

L [1] The Staff Committee is aware that the "Diversity Task Force" is analysing diversity-related issues in detail and will make recommendations. The Staff Committee survey was conducted without prejudice to the outcome of the work of the Diversity Task Force. Moreover, the Departmental Focal Points for Women will, as part of their mandate, ensure the integration of a gender perspective in all activities of the Staff Committee, advocate for gender parity in senior positions, and carry out other activities in line with the mandate included in SG bulletin ST/SGB/2008/12. L

M

N

O

P

Q

R