OVERVIEW OF THE PAY AND BENEFITS REVIEW

The General Assembly, in its resolutions 51/216 of 18 December 1996, 52/216 of 22 December 1997 and 53/209 of 18 December 1998, called upon ICSC to play a lead role in the development of new approaches in the field of human resources management, and as part of the overall reforms taking place in the organizations of the common system. To that end, ICSC developed an integrated Framework for Human Resources Management which it reported to the General Assembly in 2000.

Within the context of the framework, the Commission in the summer of 2000 decided to review, on a priority basis, the pay and benefits system, one of the principle elements of the framework. The framework was conceived as a management tool to enable organizations to manage their resources in a strategic manner and reinforce their capacity for carrying out overall management reform. The review was thus embedded in, and intended to support, the framework, and was linked to the ongoing process under way in the organizations.

ICSC agreed that alternative approaches to the existing compensation and benefits system should be based on a holistic approach as set out in the framework for human resources management. To improve delivery of services mandated by member States and in line with the principles set out in the framework, a modernized compensation system would:

(a) Strengthen management capacity;
(b) Improve organizational performance by linking remuneration performance;
(c) Increase flexibility;
(d) Allow greater competitiveness;
(e) Improve work/life policies;
(f) Allow streamlining, simplification, greater transparency and accountability.

The Commission established three focus groups to identify the challenges faced by the organizations in the changing international environment and to propose possible approaches. The Commission was presented in 2001 with a report of its Steering Committee which was a synthesis of the work of the three focus groups.

Following the consideration of the report of the Steering Committee, the Commission decided to establish working groups in 2002 to assist it in its review of the pay and benefits system.

The working groups presented the Commission in 2002 with their proposals:

(a) Revision of the current job classification system;
(b) Introduction of broad banding;
(c) Introduction of reward for contribution
(d) Introduction of a Senior Management Service.
While other aspects of a revised pay and benefits system are also under study, the Commission decided to follow a phased approach and adopted the following time frame for its review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Validation and Promulgation of the new job evaluation system; Strategy for rewarding contributions; Further development of modalities for the Senior Management Service Modalities for the pilot study of broad banding/reward for contribution;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Development of modalities for strategic bonuses Implementation of the pilot study of broad banding/reward for contribution Implementation of aspects of the Senior Management Service Modernizing and simplifying allowances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Implementation of strategic bonuses Assessing the implementation of the new job evaluation system Monitoring the pilot study of broad banding, of strategic bonuses and the implementation of the Senior Management Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Assessing the pilot study of broad banding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its resolution 57/285 of 20 December 2002, the General Assembly took note with appreciation of the concrete progress made by the Commission in the review of the pay and benefits system in the context of the approved framework for human resources management. It also invited the Commission to duly take into account all views expressed by Member States regarding the review of the pay and benefits system, bearing in mind that any eventual proposals should be aimed at enhancing the effectiveness as well as the efficiency of the secretariats of the organizations of the United Nations system, consistent with the principles set out in paragraph 12 of its 2002 annual report. The General Assembly also requested the Commission to review the question of whether the Senior Management Service should be dealt with in the framework of the review of the pay and benefits system.

In 2003 the Commission continued its review of the pay and benefits system. In the spring of 2003 it endorsed a conceptual model of the new job evaluation system and subsequently, a validation process was launched. By the summer of 2003, the new job evaluation standard was ready for promulgation. However, to respond to the request of the
organizations of the common system to formally submit the final version of the standard to their executive heads before its promulgation, and thereby facilitate the consultative and formal approval process within each organization, the Commission decided to delegate the authority for the promulgation to its Chairman. The Chairman has promulgated the new job evaluation system with effect from 1 January 2004. All organizations are expected to use the new system as of that date in classifying posts in the professional and higher categories.

Early on in the pay and benefits review, the Commission considered the adoption of the broad bands to recognize the world of work as it currently exists. The ability to deploy staff in other than a hierarchical structure would assist the accomplishment of work by permitting working arrangements that would facilitate the achievement of results. The ability to move staff through bands based on measurements other than time-based measurements would permit a link to pay-for-performance. Broad banded systems where they exist generally operate in the context of a pay-for-performance system.

The Commission decided to conduct a pilot study with a broad-banded structure which volunteer organizations would test one of three models.

Regarding the Senior Management Service, the Commission decided that it would continue to address the issue of the Senior Management Service on the basis of the guidelines provided on the subject in its 2002 annual report and noted that developmental work on the Senior Management Service was proceeding under the auspices of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination. It did not feel that consideration of the Senior Management Service would need to be undertaken in the context of the pay and benefits review.

COMPONENTS OF THE REVIEW OF THE PAY AND BENEFITS SYSTEM

Job evaluation

Early on in the review of the pay and benefits system, the Commission identified the revision of the current system of job evaluation as one of high priority. It felt that the existing Master Standard for the classification of Professional and higher category posts was in need of fundamental overhaul. Under article 13 of the ICSC Statute, the Commission set out to revise and simplify the current system of classifying positions to focus on those factors and elements, which are key in determining the level of the posts. The new job evaluation system is designed around two evaluation tools; a New Master standard, which updates a point rating approach to provide a consistent basis of evaluation across organizations and occupations, and Grade Level Descriptors, which are based on the values of the New Master Standard but are designed to be broadly accessible, flexible, and most importantly, provide linkages to competency development and performance management. The Grade Level Descriptors have been designed to be the primary tool of evaluation. Created as a framework of United Nations common system “values”, the Grade Level Descriptors provide a textured profile of work that presents not only the demands of the job but critical competencies and measures of success to support performance management. With these new tools, a new job description format has
also been developed, which simplifies and focuses on the information necessary to evaluate a post. This new format has been designed to complement generic job profiles developed by the organizations.

To facilitate access and updating, the system has been designed to function from an automated platform. In a virtual environment it is possible to distribute the new system broadly and quickly update its utility as experience in its use is gained. More importantly, though, through an automated application it is possible to incorporate visual features that facilitate the use and comprehension of the system.

The ICSC has organized extensive training to familiarize staff in the functionality of the new system but anticipates that the human resource office of the organizations will provide continuing guidance at local level. Job evaluation training workshops have so far been conducted in Bangkok, Cairo, Geneva, New York, Vienna, Rome and Paris. Other venues will be planned in accordance with demand.

In line with the decision of the Commission, a review of the new system in terms of applicability, effect on existing post/organizational structures, and ongoing development will take place over the next 18 months, and organizations are urged to provide feedback and proposals on job evaluation issues at any time.

The new job evaluation system provides direct linkages between the nature of work, competency development and performance management. Critical competencies related to the nature of work are defined to reflect staff growth in a wide range of jobs at different levels.

As defined in various management articles, a job competency is "a series of behaviors or actions that make up a portion of a job". It is emphasized that a competency is not a job but rather an attribute, which focuses on behavior and action rather than passive knowledge of a subject. It reflects what a successful employee must be able to do to accomplish desired results on a job. The literature notes further that competencies are built up over time and are different from knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs), which represent attributes brought into the job at the point of recruitment.

In line with this approach, the ICSC’s expectations are that organizations will build a continuum of occupational competencies that are important for effective organizational performance. These competencies will serve as the basis for staff development plans and the measurement of staff performance.

**Broad banding**

In the context of the review of the pay and benefits system, the Commission also considered the question of the establishment of a broad banding system. Such a system groups current grades into broad salary bands. Generally, there are no steps between the minimum and maximum pay for the band. It provides for career development and enables 
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organizations to use jobs and deploy staff in a manner that is more aligned with programme demands. Accordingly, the broad banding approach is more responsive to the management of work, including teamwork. It permits the managers to shift duties and responsibilities of their staff to meet new requirements and priorities. It accommodates the simplification and streamlining of the job evaluation system, permitting a more generic description of the work at each level. Accordingly, it reduces the focus on job classification and the need for numerous job classification specialists. Lateral job changes are made without the need to reclassify jobs. Vertical job changes are fewer, since the change in job duties and responsibilities must be significant before a change from one band to another is warranted. Broad banding involves less central staff control and supports the delegation of more administrative responsibility to managers. It therefore requires a significant increase in management development and training. There is less emphasis on job-to-job comparisons and it permits redefinition of pay equity to include a measure of how well a job is performed rather than just ensuring that duties and responsibilities are equivalent.

The Commission has decided to pilot one broad banded structure. The Commission feels that having only one broad banded structure is necessary to preserve the integrity and cohesion of the common system. The existence of pay structures that vary by organization would create unnecessary competition for staff among the organizations.

**Performance pay**

The Commission feels that the current remuneration system does not adequately recognize performance contribution and competencies. To meet the current challenges, organizations need to move from “entitlement” to “performance”. Staff should be rewarded primarily for their performance, as well as their experience, less emphasis should be placed on seniority. Therefore, ways need to be found to closely link the pay system to the organizations’ performance management systems in order to better recognize contribution and performance, both individual and team. The Commission has selected 3 models that include pay for performance, to be tested in the pilot study.

**Performance appraisal systems**

A robust performance appraisal system is a prerequisite to any pay for performance system. In this regard, the setting of goals and objectives is of primary importance. Goals should be specific for the jobholder and capable of being measured or their achievement observed. Individual goal setting should draw its coherence from the work and budget of the department or unit, the job description of the staff member and the competency framework of the organization.

**Competency Development**

A competency framework contains knowledge, skills and behaviours that staff members or members of a specific category need to demonstrate in order to carry out their task and responsibilities successfully. Competencies are the foundation for effective performance in any
job or position. A competency profile can include core competencies, which identify those core values that all staff members should demonstrate; managerial competencies, relevant for management positions and functional/technical competencies that are specific to functional areas. Examples of core competencies are integrity, initiative, flexibility, communication skills, respect for diversity/gender etc. Managerial competencies involve planning skills, problem solving capacities, coaching and developing skills, leadership, quality insurance etc. Specific competencies relate to the application of technical knowledge as described in the staff member's job description.

While competencies have been used by private and public sector organizations for recruitment and career development since the 1980s, competencies linked to development plans represent a relatively new area for the United Nations common system. Data collected by the ICSC secretariat in 2003 shows that an increasing number of organizations have developed competency frameworks in recent years. Core competencies for all staff have been developed in a number of organizations. By definition, all staff members should demonstrate these core competencies each reporting cycle. However, depending on the organizations, the first reporting officer and the staff member may choose to focus on a few core competencies that would be most relevant to carry out the work plan during the reporting cycle.

In several organizations the competency profile includes managerial competencies. Organization specific competencies have also been developed in some organizations.

Evaluating staff on the basis of competencies is especially useful in new organizations, organizations that need to change rapidly and knowledge or learning institutions. The evaluation of individuals based on competencies is from information gathered from peers, subordinates, supervisors and clients. The information is then consolidated in a single rating that compares the individual's competencies to the model designed for the job.

Client feedback

The purpose of client feedback is to gather input that will enable the organization to improve the quality and efficiency of service delivery continuously. The concept of outputs also includes more intangible flows of influence on the surroundings from organizations. In the context of the organizations of the common system, service units may survey internal clients and operational units may survey external clients. On the basis of client feedback, organizations can initiate performance improvements at all levels, including individual performance improvement.

Measuring results by obtaining the feedback of clients has never been more important for many organizations. With the need to raise resources from increasingly diverse sources, the ability to engage these sources, identify opportunities for collaboration and deliver services of a recognized value is the basis for future programme success. Performance in terms of achievement becomes truly a more relevant indicator of organization performance.

In publicly funded organizations, without a “bottom line”, it is a challenge to define meaningful indicators of performance. If organizations are to develop institutional
competencies which enables them to adapt, measuring performance through client feedback will be essential. The term client is often misunderstood to imply a customer to whom the organization sells some product or service. All organization programmes are designed to deliver service to an important community of interest. Some serve primarily internal communities, for example, human resources, others external, for example, member States. While your work may not in many or even in most instances be quantitative, in all instances it is possible to ask in a structured manner the communities served their perception of the value of your services and ways in which you are both exceeding and falling short of expectations.

Gathering this information in a coherent manner is a challenge. Facing the implications of asking these questions can be intimidating. If the questions are asked, this creates an obligation to respond. By including client feedback in the assessment of team/individual performance, this provides all staff with a sense of responsibility and ownership for the work of the larger programme.

**Modernizing and simplifying allowances**

Some of the allowances currently payable in the United Nations common system have been criticized as cumbersome and in need of simplification. In 2001, the Commission decided, as part of its review of the pay and benefits system, to undertake a comprehensive review of allowances currently payable in the United Nations common system with a view to modernizing and simplifying them. The Commission also decided to begin in 2004 with a review of the education grant and the mobility and hardship scheme.

In spring 2004, the Commission decided on the following schedule for its review of the allowances and benefits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1. Education grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Allowances relating to mobility and hardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Mobility and hardship allowance (including the role of the rental subsidy scheme in enhancing mobility);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Assignment grant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Hazard pay;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Recruitment, relocation and retention bonuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1. Dependency benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Spouse benefits (including dependency and single rates, salary structure);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Children’s allowance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Secondary dependant allowance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1. All leave entitlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Language incentive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Pensionable remuneration and consequent pensions.

3. Separation payments
   (a) Termination indemnity;
   (b) Repatriation grant;
   (c) Death grant.

PILOT STUDIES

In reviewing possible new approaches to the way staff are currently paid, the Commission understood that it was considering approaches which, if implemented, would be the most significant departure from the current system of remuneration since the United Nations was established. The new approaches would require a significant change in the culture of the organizations and particularly management culture. The Commission recognized that such change is never easy and would require a significant effort of all parties concerned.

The Commission decided on a considered and deliberate effort to ensure that the new approaches would be initiated on a sound footing. Accordingly, it decided on pilot studies to test the new approaches over a period of time. The studies would be rigorous and would need to be successful in order to move forward with implementation. It decided to request organizations to volunteer for the studies. It recognized that some common system organizations were more prepared to participate in the studies having already introduced human resources subsystems, which would facilitate the testing process.

Nonetheless, in order to move forward with the pilot studies, considerable work would need to be completed at each volunteer organization. In particular, a credible performance appraisal system would need to be in place. Competencies would need to be developed where they did not exist and they would need to be linked to learning and development plans. Client feedback measures would need to be developed to identify relevant clients and to measure their views of services received. At the same time, the modalities of the study would need to be developed including the project plan, baseline data, IT requirements and numerous other aspects of the exercise. All of these efforts are currently proceeding at the volunteer organizations.

A number of United Nations system organizations have volunteered in participating in the pilot study which will commence on 1 July 2004. The organizations participating in the pilot study are: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the World Food Programme (WFP), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

WHY IS THERE A REVIEW?

A few years ago, the United Nations General Assembly called upon the International Civil Service Commission to play a lead role in the development of new approaches in the field of human resources management as part of the overall reform taking place in the organizations of the common system.

HOW DID THE COMMISSION RESPOND TO THE REQUEST OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY?


WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE FRAMEWORK?

The purpose of the framework is to enable the organizations of the United Nations common system to manage their human resources more effectively.

WHAT DOES THE FRAMEWORK INCLUDES?

The Framework includes a definition of organizational design and its impact on the human resources management environment. It identifies the diverse yet interrelated elements which make up human resources management in the common system. It has six major components, some of which have a number of sub-components. Definitions, identification of core/non-core elements, underlying principles and the linkages between human resources subsystems described in the framework.

The Framework provides the organizations with a holistic conceptual base from which to take action in one or more areas of human resources management reform. As such, it can be used to form the basis of the organizations’ future work on human resources policies and procedures.

WHAT IS THE LINK BETWEEN THE FRAMEWORK FOR HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND THE REVIEW OF THE PAY AND BENEFITS SYSTEM?

In the framework, the pay and benefits system was seen as a priority issue. The Commission considered that the reform of the pay and benefits system was an essential element in the organizations’ efforts to modernize their performance management system and bolster organizational performance.
**WHY IS THERE A NEED TO REFORM THE PAY AND BENEFITS SYSTEM?**

It has been clear from the earliest stages of the current review that changes in the nature of work have made our pay and benefits system less responsive to the needs of the organizations. At the most basic level the nature of work has changed radically since the early days of the United Nations and it continues to change. The changing nature of work, impacted by new technologies and a shift in demographics, from an ageing workforce possessing institutional memory and knowledge, to a younger, more mobile workforce with different expectations, has generated the need not only for new ways of working, but also of managing and rewarding performance to meet new realities.

**WHO PARTICIPATES IN THE REVIEW OF THE PAY AND BENEFITS SYSTEM?**

Both administration and staff representatives of the organizations as well as the International Civil Service Commission and its secretariat participate in the review. So far three meetings of focus groups and a steering committee meeting have been held as well as meetings of working groups. Also during the ICSC sessions in 2002 and 2003 time a significant amount of time was spent on the review of the pay and benefits system. The United Nations General Assembly also provides guidance to the Commission on this issue.

**WHAT NEW APPROACHES ARE BEING DISCUSSED UNDER THE PAY AND BENEFITS REVIEW?**

The Commission is about ready to promulgate the new job evaluation system; test a new broad banded salary structure and link performance appraisal to pay in the common system; look into the establishment of a senior management service; and the introduction of recruitment, retention and relocation bonuses.

**WHY SHOULD WE HAVE A NEW JOB EVALUATION SYSTEM**

Over the years it was felt that the current standard for the classification of professional and higher category posts has deficiencies. It was felt that it does not adequately evaluate some highly technical jobs; impedes career development, by not sufficiently supporting a dual ladder career; it is too hierarchical and control oriented; impedes deployment of staff resources and mobility of staff; and does not support competency development.

It was also felt that the system is administratively cumbersome; labour-intensive and time-consuming; rigid and inflexible; not sufficiently transparent, slow and unresponsive; too complex and difficult to explain and requires too much expertise to run properly.
WHAT IS THE GOAL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW SYSTEM OF JOB EVALUATION?

The goal is to create an approach to job design that, inter alia, links the development of competencies and supports performance management.

WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES OF THE NEW SYSTEM?

The model of the new job evaluation system is designed around two evaluation tools; the new master standard, which updates a point rating approach to provide a consistent basis of evaluation across organizations and occupations, and grade level descriptors, which are based on the values of the new master standard but are designed to be broadly accessible, flexible, and most importantly, provide linkages to competency development and performance management.

The new standard is much simpler and focuses on factors and elements which are key in determining the level of the post. Further, the new system means that managers will be better able to determine how the assigned work is to be accomplished and how to best manage the performance of staff selected to carry out this work. Managers will be able to evaluate positions for which they are responsible with the assistance of tools, including computerized programs, which will ensure the required consistency of application. The job classification system will also support revised salary structures tailored to meet the needs of the organizations of the common system.

WHAT ARE COMPETENCIES?

The term 'competency' refers to a combination of skills, attributes and behaviours that are directly related to successful performance on the job. Competencies relate more to what a person does, than what a person knows, they are observable. Examples of competencies: client-orientation, integrity, professionalism etc.

WHAT IS BROAD BANDING?

Broad banding means different things to different people. Broadband structures have fewer grade levels and broader minimum-to-maximum ranges.

WHY BROADBAND?

Since jobs are defined more broadly, the employer has more flexibility in assigning work and getting a job done. Workers can be redeployed to meet changing needs without constant attention to classification issues. There is reduced job hierarchy. Also an advantage for staff members is improved career development opportunities; opportunities for horizontal mobility can increase since a greater range of job functions are encompassed in a single band vis-à-vis
a traditional single grade. In a broad banded system accountability for people management can be delegated to managers.

**WHAT WOULD A BROAD BAND LOOK LIKE IN THE UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM?**

The International Civil Service Commission decided in 2003 to test one broad banded model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>P-1, P-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>P-3, P-4, P-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>D-1 and D-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE CURRENT PAY SYSTEM?**

The current pay system is performance-insensitive. It basically says performance does not matter; time in grade matters. It places great emphasis on equivalence of duties and responsibilities at a grade but not on how well those duties and responsibilities are carried out. It inhibits the deployment of staff and does not focus on the development of staff.

**HOW WILL PAY BE ADJUSTED IN A BROAD BANDED SYSTEM?**

Once pay bands are defined each organization will adjust the salary of each staff member within a band based on performance measurements including competency development and client feedback measures. The current system uses longevity (time-in-grade) and step increases to move a staff member within a grade and promotion to move a staff member to a higher grade. In a pay banding system, the amount of a pay increase within a band is based on the staff member’s skills or competencies, job performance, contributions, or similar measures. Staff members will receive pay based on their performance. Accordingly, a high performing staff member can move to the top of a pay band much more quickly than under the current step-based system.

**HAVE OTHER EMPLOYERS MOVED TO BROAD BANDING, AND RELATED PAY FOR PERFORMANCE SYSTEMS?**

Yes, not only private sector employers but also national civil services have moved to broad banding. Some of the countries that have introduced broad banding are: Australia, South Korea, Mexico, and New Zealand. Norway, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States

**HAVE THESE EFFORTS BEEN SUCCESSFUL?**

There have been both successes and failures experienced by other employers. Where there have been successes they have generally been with employers where staff have trust and
confidence in their supervisors and managers. Transparency and communication played key roles in these success stories.

**HOW WILL THE SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF THESE IN THE UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM BE DETERMINED?**

The new approaches (pay for performance/ broad banding) will be tested for 3 years in a pilot study for which a number of United Nations common system organizations have volunteered. Measurements to evaluate the success of the studies have been developed in consultation with organizations and staff representatives and will be applied by an independent body. The independent body will provide a report on its evaluation to the Commission.

**IN ORDER TO TEST THE NEW APPROACHES, HOW WILL THE ACQUIRED RIGHTS OF STAFF BE PROTECTED?**

The ICSC secretariat has looked into the question of whether:

(a) The eventual introduction of a new salary structure based on broad banding and related pay for performance system for staff members of the United Nations common system organizations would result in a breach of the principle of “acquired rights” or,

(b) As regards those staff members participating in the pilot study testing, such a breach could be foreseen.

Following careful examination of the question, the ICSC secretariat concluded that the “new system of grading and its accompanying salary structure, whether in their ultimate form (the “real system’), or in the form in which it is intended to be tested in a pilot study (the” virtual system’), would not contradict the legal principle of ‘acquired rights’”

Furthermore, the study, as currently planned, will be conducted as a “virtual” test. This means that staff included in the test will continue in the current system and receive all the benefits of that system that would normally be granted. However, they will also be included in the “virtual” system and should be credited with greater remuneration under the “virtual” system than under the current system, the difference will be granted. Accordingly, for staff participating in the pilot studies it is a win-win situation, since they will receive all the remuneration of the current system throughout the duration of the study plus any higher amounts of remuneration earned under the “virtual” system.

**HOW WILL STAFF BE INTEGRATED IN THE PILOT STUDY IF IT IS A “VIRTUAL” EXERCISE?**

Staff participating in the pilot study will be placed, for example, into a salary band, based on their current position, as evaluated under the revised job evaluation system. Once the salary band has been identified, the salary level within the band at which the staff member will be
placed, will be identical to the salary level of the staff member in the current system. From then forward, however, movement through the salary band will be based on performance measures and not time in grade.

**HOW WILL STAFF BE REINTEGRATED INTO THE CURRENT SYSTEM AT THE END OF THE STUDY?**

There is no need to reintegrate staff participating in the study into the current system since they never left the current system during the duration of the study. If the study were deemed to be successful, however, it would mean that the “virtual” system would need to be transformed into a continuing operational system for all organizations of the common system.

**WILL THE STUDY COVER ALL CATEGORIES OF STAFF?**

The pilot studies, as currently planned, will cover the professional and higher categories of staff. It is the Commissions intention, however, that the General Service and related categories of staff be fully included in all aspects of the new approaches, as soon as practicable.