



Madam Chairperson,
Distinguished representative of the Director-General,
Excellencies,
Distinguished delegates,

It is an honour to address you and to extend a warm welcome the new Director of the Bureau of Human Resources Management, Ms Kazumi Ogawa.

In my statement, I will discuss a number of issues related to personnel management and the Organization's major strategic directions.

The Organization's strategy, which is seemingly centred on creating a dynamic and favourable work environment, shows **no improvement in this regard**. Neither a **career development plan** nor a **merit-based promotion policy** have yet been established. Our colleagues are **demotivated and without career prospects**. Certain promotions are given **without any transparency or clear rules**, leaving the door open to **arbitrariness** and risking the appointment of individuals with inadequate profiles.

The Post Classification Policy **does not mention** the abolition of Staff Rule 102.2, which entitles a staff member to make an individual request for reclassification, even though this point is the subject of a major draft amendment to the Staff Regulations. This constitutes a **violation of the most basic of staff rights**. The procedure for individual requests for reclassification is **strictly regulated and leaves no room for interpretation**. Furthermore, because it concerns only a few cases per year, its abolition will, first and foremost, send a message of **mistrust and disregard** to staff. This is an important issue, and it is surprising that the document is **silent on the matter, potentially depriving you of the chance for legitimate debate**.

We regret that HRM has submitted its proposed amendments to the Statutes of the Appeals Board, even though **we had expressed reservations about the lack of consensus** on certain issues. Reducing the membership of the Appeals Board to three people, only one of whom is elected denies any possibility of **genuine debate**.

We **do not accept** that permission to participate in hearings of the Appeals Board should be only granted to associations "*subject to the agreement of the Appellant*". Although our job is indeed to defend individuals, our role goes beyond that; our purpose is to represent all staff. We thus ask that associations be allowed to speak during the debate.

ISAU recognizes the need to simplify disciplinary procedures. However, the Administration must avoid an increase in the number of appeals submitted to the Board – indeed, to the International Labour Organization Administrative Tribunal (ILOAT) – which entail significant costs for the Organization.

We continue to regret ADM/HRM's insufficient involvement in recruitment. From that perspective, delegating exclusive responsibility for recruitment of P-1 to P-4 posts to the Assistant Directors-General (ADGs) should not lead to the lifting of the safeguards which ensure rigour and objectivity. Trust **does not obviate** oversight. ISAU therefore continues to denounce the lack of transparency in the recruitment of Project Appointments (over 450), who are often assigned to regular Secretariat missions. These recruitments are **subject neither to geographical distribution nor to the Appointment Review Board (ARB)**. **It bears recalling that posts are the responsibility of the Organization, and not of the services and sectors.**

On the subject of geographical and functional mobility, we wish to say from the outset that the corresponding reforms are being carried out with a **lack of consistency and transparency**. We regret that the geographical mobility process has been carried out **completely** independently of the considerations of functional mobility and of field office reform. This lack of coherence will **impair the Organization's ability** to conduct its missions effectively and efficiently. We should be concerned about staff becoming the adjustment variable used to compensate for the inconsistency of these reforms and, especially, about this inconsistency potentially increasing the arbitrariness of decisions which affect individuals and their families. Geographical mobility has thus given rise to individual exceptions which are all the more illegitimate because they undermine staff confidence and, therefore, the smooth operation of the mobility process.

We regret that the document does not mention the first mobility exercise or its assessment. We cannot dispense with an assessment which makes it possible to fix the flaws in the reform process. While we are still on the subject of transparency, we wish to express our surprise upon **not having been consulted** on the modalities of functional mobility. Reforms of this magnitude cannot be **carried out without the involvement** of staff representatives.

With regard to the use of non-staff contracts, it should be noted that this document is presented separately from the UNESCO Human Resources Management Strategy, even though it should **fall within the scope thereof**. Indeed, non-staff personnel accounts for approximately 47% of UNESCO's total staff in full-time equivalent. This percentage clearly shows that there is a **strategy to reduce permanent staff and create a class of precarious workers**.

We should ask ourselves whether the significant number of consultants and service contracts does not in fact reflect **faulty personnel management**, since it is based on a **lack of needs forecasting and resource planning**.

In addition to the lack of planning, **instances of precariousness and inequality**, particularly in the field, are directly linked to the fact that the Secretariat commits to missions for which it does **not have adequate resources**. **This approach leads, yet again, to the use of non-staff contracts as an adjustment variable**.

Finally, ISAU questions the continuing predominance of consultants from group I, which accounts for **nearly one third** of all consultants and **41% of expenses** relating to consultant contracts. **This imbalance is unacceptable**.

Thank you for your attention.