



UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/35/7/Add.8
20 November 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-fifth session
Agenda item 91

PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981

Reclassification of regular-budget posts

Ninth report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Requests for the reclassification of regular-budget posts have been a feature of all the proposed programme budgets of the United Nations in recent years and of most budget estimates in the years prior to the adoption of biennial programming and budgeting.

2. In its first report on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975 - the first biennial programme budget of the United Nations - the Advisory Committee included an analysis of the question of reclassifications over the years, with particular reference to the preceding six years. 1/ Regarding the reclassifications requested for 1974-1975, the Advisory Committee decided to address itself to their budgetary impact as a whole and to confine its observations on individual posts to the proposed reclassifications to the D-2 and Assistant Secretary-General levels. With regard to reclassifications to levels D-1 and below, the Committee recommended that the related financial provision be reduced by 50 per cent and that the number of posts to be reclassified be similarly halved. The selection of posts to be reclassified was left to the Secretary-General.

3. Two years later, the Advisory Committee adopted a broadly similar approach to the requests made in the context of the programme budget proposals for 1976-1977. 2/ The Committee dealt, on an individual basis, with the proposed reclassifications to the D-2 and Assistant Secretary-General levels and recommended approval of approximately half the proposed reclassifications to the P-5 and D-1 levels, and of all those to levels P-4 and below. On that occasion the Committee stated:

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 8 (A/9008 and Corr.1), chap. I, paras. 47-64.

2/ Ibid., Thirtieth Session, Supplement No. 8 (A/10008), chap. I, paras. 59-62.

"As for the proposed reclassifications to grades D-1 and below, the Advisory Committee - in the absence of a consistent post classification structure in the United Nations - had no objective yardstick for determining whether all the requests were really justified in terms of level of qualifications and responsibilities." 3/

4. The Committee restated that view in paragraph 85 of its first report on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979. 4/ In the Committee's opinion, the problem of determining whether a given proposal was really justified was particularly acute in the case of proposals related to posts which did not involve supervisory responsibilities, such as those within the General Service category and in the junior and middle grades of the Professional category. The Committee's recommendations were addressed on an individual basis to proposals for reclassifications to the D-2, Assistant Secretary-General and Under-Secretary-General levels, and to proposed reclassifications from the General Service to the Professional category. It recommended a 50 per cent reduction in the number of reclassifications to the levels P-5 and D-1, and approval of all other recommendations. 5/

5. During the subsequent consideration of the programme budget proposals for 1978-1979, the representatives of the Secretary-General informed the Advisory Committee that they could not determine which of the posts proposed for reclassification to P-5 and D-1 should be reclassified if the General Assembly approved the Advisory Committee recommendation to reduce the number of such reclassifications by half. In the circumstances, the Advisory Committee reviewed the question and submitted additional specific recommendations (A/C.5/32/83).

6. The Advisory Committee's recommendations on all the reclassifications requested in the programme budget proposals for 1980-1981 were made on a case-by-case basis. 6/ In his opening address to the Fifth Committee on 3 October 1979, however, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee voiced misgivings about that course. He said on that occasion:

"To be quite frank with you, I personally do not relish discussing the reclassification of posts in the Advisory Committee. But the Committee has no alternative. Preliminary information given to us by a number of United Nations specialized agencies shows that responsibility in this matter is shared between the executive and legislative branches. Both have to be involved in this question. For, in the final analysis, reclassification of a post technically means the abolition of one post and the creation of another at a higher or lower grade. Furthermore the reclassification presupposes a change in the job content of the post.

3/ Ibid., para. 61.

4/ Ibid., Thirty-second Session, Supplement No. 8 (A/32/8 and Corr.1).

5/ Ibid., chap. I, paras. 79-91.

6/ Ibid., Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 7 (A/34/7), chap. I, paras. 41-43.

This, however, is not always clear from the information given to support reclassification requests. Even when the Classification Unit has given its blessing, doubts still linger in the minds of many in the Advisory Committee. I am not claiming for the Advisory Committee absolute competence in this matter which, in present circumstances, often involves subjective judgement. I am aware that a large number of factors influence reclassification proposals. Indeed, it may be unrealistic to ignore such factors. For the future, may I suggest the following. It may be well for the Advisory Committee to consult further with the United Nations Secretariat and the agencies in the United Nations system and with the help of the International Civil Service Commission advise the General Assembly on the best procedure of handling this problem." (A/C.5/34/13)

7. In the course of 1980, the Advisory Committee discussed the question of reclassifications with the executive heads of specialized agencies or their representatives. The Committee focused its inquiry on the division of responsibilities between the intergovernmental organs and the executive heads of individual agencies and also on the scope of the problem in the agencies concerned. The Committee did not address itself to the criteria and procedures used by the various agencies in determining the grading of individual posts. In this connexion, the Committee bore in mind that the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) had adopted at its eleventh session, and promulgated for use within the organizations of the common system, Tier I (the Master Standard) of a three-tiered system of common job classification standards, and that Tier II (Grade-level standards) was being developed. 7/ Furthermore, the Advisory Committee's primary concern was not how the reclassified posts were to be filled - whether by the promotion of the incumbents or by transfer or outside recruitment. In the Committee's opinion, that question is part of the personnel policies of the organizations and is outside the terms of reference of the Committee which specify that it "shall deal with personnel matters only in their budgetary aspects" (General Assembly resolution 14 (I) of 13 February 1946).

II. THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM IN THE UNITED NATIONS

8. As was stated in paragraph 1 above, requests for the reclassification of regular-budget posts have been included by the Secretary-General in all his budget estimates or programme budget proposals for many years.

9. As a rule, the Secretary-General identifies all the posts in respect of which he proposes changes in level. However, there were also occasions in the past when he requested lump-sum provisions for reclassifications. 8/

7/ Ibid., Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 30 (A/35/30), paras. 234-264.

8/ In the budget estimates for 1963 for example, Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Supplement No. 5 (A/5205), sect. 3, chap. I, p. 36.

10. In recent years, the number of requests for reclassifications to and within the Professional category and above have been as follows:

Budget estimates for 1968	81* (64 within the Professional category and above, 17 from the General Service and local category to Professional)
Budget estimates for 1969	73* (64 within the Professional category and above, 9 from the General Service and local category to Professional)
Budget estimates for 1970	70* (61 within the Professional category and above, 9 from the General Service and local category to Professional)
Budget estimates for 1971	47* (33 within the Professional category and above, 14 from the General Service and local category to Professional)
Budget estimates for 1972	50* (42 within the Professional category and above, 8 from the General Service category to Professional)
Budget estimates for 1973	40 (38 within the Professional category and above, 2 from the General Service category to Professional)
Proposed programme budget for 1974-1975	95 (89 within the Professional category and above, and 6 from other categories to Professional)
Proposed programme budget for 1976-1977	63 (56 within the Professional category and above, and 7 from other categories to Professional)
Proposed programme budget for 1978-1979	47 (38 within the Professional category and above, and 9 from other categories to Professional)
Proposed programme budget for 1980-1981	66 (54 within the Professional category and above, and 12 from other categories to Professional)

* Sect. 3 of the budget only.

11. The biennial cost (net of staff assessment) of one reclassification, based on the standard costs used in the preparation of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981, after applying a 5 per cent turnover deduction, is as follows:

	<u>New York</u>	<u>Geneva (UN Office)</u>
	\$	\$
P-1/P-2 to P-3	15,000	18,800
P-3 to P-4	15,100	21,000
P-4 to P-5	16,600	20,400
P-5 to D-1	9,700	14,200
D-1 to D-2	10,600	15,300
D-2 to ASG	19,800	25,800
ASG to USG	14,300	12,900

If one excludes reclassifications to the Assistant Secretary-General and Under-Secretary-General levels, the average biennial cost of a reclassification within the Professional and higher category can be seen to be \$13,400 in New York and nearly \$18,000 at Geneva.

12. Had the General Assembly not approved a reduced number of reclassifications, as recommended by the Advisory Committee, the total cost of the Secretary-General's recommendations would have been approximately \$1 million in 1980-1981. While it can be argued that this is not a significant amount in relation to the biennial budget (it is about 0.1 per cent of the total), it is a substantial amount in absolute terms. Furthermore, in a system in which downgradings are very uncommon, despite the view expressed by the Secretary-General in 1958 (see para. 33 below), approval of a reclassification entails a net continuing obligation. The cumulative effect of reclassifications over the years has been quite considerable.

13. It should also be remembered that the requests for reclassifications included by the Secretary-General in his programme budget proposals constitute a fraction of the total number of requests submitted to him by the heads of the major organizational units. Information provided to the Advisory Committee at the time it was examining the Secretary-General's programme budget proposals for 1980-1981 indicated that the Secretary-General had approved for inclusion in his proposals approximately half the reclassifications requested by the departments. This pressure for reclassification underlines the need for the application of strict criteria in the grading of posts.

III. THE EXPERIENCE OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

14. All the specialized agencies informed the Advisory Committee that, from time to time, they experienced the need to reclassify posts. As all of them state that they classify posts and not the incumbents, the reclassifications are presented, as a rule, in terms of increased or decreased responsibilities. At the same time, the Committee was informed by several agency representatives that an element of rewarding meritorious performance was often also present. In the case of specialist posts, reclassifications are sometimes also motivated by the desire to attract persons having the necessary qualifications and experience.

15. In the view of the representatives of several agencies, the pressure for the reclassification of posts was due in part to reduced use of P-1 and P-2 grades for recruitment purposes and a resultant shortage of genuine promotion opportunities. For example, the Secretary-General of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) informed the Committee that there are no P-1 posts on the Union's staffing table since the Union is not able to employ or train inexperienced staff; the lowest recruitment grade for telecommunication engineers is P-3. The Universal Postal Union (UPU) also has no P-1 posts; recruitment is occasionally done at the P-2 level; mostly, however, new entrants are given P-3 posts. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) normally takes on Professional staff at the P-2 or P-3 level; it endeavours to recruit at the P-1 level in the rare cases where work experience is not required, but the grade is proving unattractive. The World Health Organization (WHO) recruits medical specialists at P-4. Recruitment of Professional staff in Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) is usually done at level P-3 or even P-4.

16. The Committee was informed that, inasmuch as most P-5 posts are reserved for supervisory staff (chiefs of section), the career span of Professional staff often covers only two grades and involves one promotion (from P-3 to P-4 and, in the case of medical specialists in WHO, from P-4 to P-5).

17. To mitigate the disadvantages of a restricted career span, WHO and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have introduced a limited system of personal grades for meritorious service. The Advisory Committee has been informed that the procedure is invoked in exceptional cases only. In WHO, there are currently approximately a dozen officials in P-5 posts who have the personal grade P-6 (equivalent to D-1). In IAEA, there are currently three officials who have been promoted to D 1 for meritorious service.

18. In UPU, posts have dual grades. New staff are appointed to the lower grade and are later promoted to the higher, without change of functions, in recognition of the greater contribution they can make to the work of the Union; when a staff member leaves or is reassigned, the post reverts to the lower grade. The same procedure is also used by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) for some posts in the technical areas.

19. The representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) informed the Advisory Committee that, in practice, the concept of promotion could not be wholly divorced from the reclassification process. The

/...

representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) told the Committee that pressures for the reclassification of posts build up every three or four years. In ILO, which experienced staff reductions attributable to the financial crisis, there have been more promotions in recent years through reclassifications than through transfer to more senior posts.

20. In the agencies, requests for the reclassification of posts originate either with the staff members concerned or with their organizational units. All the specialized agencies except UPU have internal machinery for the review of such requests. The machinery often includes a high-level interdepartmental body which makes recommendations to the executive head. ^{9/} The representatives of several organizations stressed that their executive heads personally reviewed the justifications for proposed reclassifications, particularly to levels D-1 and above.

21. In most organizations, posts are reclassified in the context of the approval of the budget or programme budget. The major exceptions are ILO and WHO, in which the reclassification process is independent of budget approval.

22. In several organizations, the executive heads have the authority to reclassify posts. In others this authority is shared between the executive heads and the intergovernmental organs or is vested wholly in the latter. The position in the individual agencies is as follows:

ILO The Director-General has the authority to regrade posts below D-1; the Governing Body is informed ex post facto.

FAO The Director-General has the authority to upgrade posts at all levels provided there are countervailing downgradings. All other upgradings require approval (the Council and the Conference concentrate on the programme budget and the budget level but the Finance Committee reviews the upgradings in more detail).

UNESCO Posts foreseen for reclassification are so indicated for information in the draft programme and budget submitted to the General Conference. Posts graded P-5 and below may be reclassified by the Director-General without further reference to intergovernmental bodies.

ICAO The Secretary-General of the International Civil Aviation Organization has full authority to regrade posts below the D-1 level, even after the budget has been approved. Regrading of posts at the Principal Officer level (United Nations grade D-1) requires the agreement of the President of the Council and at the Bureau Director level (United Nations grade D-2) the Council itself (an intergovernmental body) must agree.

UPU The Director-General has the authority to classify all posts up to and including D-1. The level of posts D-2 and above is determined by the Executive Council.

^{9/} The Classification Committee of WIPO is chaired by a person who is not a staff member of the organization.

- WHO Authority to reclassify posts at all levels is vested in the Director-General. The question is never discussed in any WHO intergovernmental body.
- ITU Authority to reclassify posts in the General Service category has been delegated to the Secretary-General subject to the availability of funds. The authority to grade posts in the Professional category and above rests with the Administrative Council.
- WMO Authority to reclassify posts at levels P-5 and below is vested in the Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organization. The Congress determines the maximum number of posts at levels D-1 and above.
- IMCO Reclassification to levels P-5 and below are approved by the Secretary-General on his own authority, provided their cost can be accommodated within the global allocation approved for that purpose in the biennial budget. Reclassifications to level D-1 and above require approval at intergovernmental level.
- WIPO Authority to grade posts is vested in the Director-General.
- IAEA All reclassifications in the Professional category and above (except for those from D-1 to D-2) must be referred to the Conference (the manning table is part of the Agency budget). The manning table shows only one "D" grade, and promotions within that grade from D-1 to D-2 are within the competence of the Director-General.

23. The Advisory Committee received the following information from the specialized agencies on the numbers of reclassifications of posts within and to the Professional and higher categories in recent years.

ILO	1976-77:	upwards	35	downwards	13
	1978-79:	"	38	"	7
UNESCO	1977-78:	"	84	"	40
	1979-80:	"	39	"	12
ICAO	1979:	"	13		
WHO	1976:	"	73	"	7
	1977:	"	33	"	15
	1978:	"	42	"	11
	1979:	"	49	"	10
ITU <u>10/</u>	1977:	"	116	"	1

10/ Result of an over-all classification review; no Professional or higher posts have been reclassified since 1977.

WMO	1977:	upwards	1
	1978:	"	5
	1979:	"	1
IMCO	1978-79:	"	22
WIPO	1978-79:	"	1
IAEA	1980:	"	2

24. The Advisory Committee understands that, in some agencies, there has been growing resistance to reclassifications on the part of intergovernmental organs. The representative of FAO informed the Committee that because of this the number of requests submitted to the competent intergovernmental body has been kept under constraint even though that meant leaving out many deserving cases.

IV. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

25. Professional and senior posts in the United Nations may be divided into three groups: P-1/P-2, P-3/P-4, and P-5 and above.

26. Grades P-1 and P-2 are, basically, beginner grades, although some posts at those levels are also occupied by officials (often promoted from the General Service category) performing functions which might possibly be included in an extended local-level category. In this connexion, the Advisory Committee notes that the Classification Section of the Office of Personnel Services in testing a system for classifying General Service posts at Headquarters based on a seven-grade structure (A/C.5/35/10, paras. 17-19).

27. Grades P-3 and P-4 contain the bulk of Professional staff on both the technical and the administrative side. They also include supervisors of units consisting mainly of General Service staff.

28. The functions of most posts graded P-5 and above include supervision of other Professional staff. Some P-5 posts, however, are occupied by officials who are not supervisors but who possess highly specialized expertise.

29. A similar pattern - with some variations attributable in the main to the size of the organizations - is to be found also in the various specialized agencies.

30. There is no question that the United Nations needs a rational job classification system. The recommendations and other proposals of ICSC on job classification to which reference was made in paragraph 7 above should provide a basis for the United Nations to commence the establishment of such a system.

/...

31. In paragraph 248 of its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, 11/ ICSC states that organizations should begin no later than 1 January 1981 to apply the Master Standard when any decision is taken on classification of jobs in the Professional and higher category within common fields of work at Headquarters and established field offices. The Commission outlined three possible alternative approaches and requested organizations to report back to it at its thirteenth session (February-March 1981) which of the above approaches it will have implemented. 12/ The Commission intends to consider and, if possible, promulgate at its thirteenth session the Tier II Grade-level standards for translators and personnel management specialists. 13/

32. In paragraph 13 of his report on the implementation of personnel policy reforms, the Secretary-General states that "the introduction in the United Nations of the methodology recommended by ICSC for the application of its standards is likely to be a complex and labour-intensive process. The implications of the application of the ICSC standards and the staff and other resources necessary to carry it out are under study" (A/C.5/35/10). In an administrative instruction dated 10 November 1980, the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services states that, beginning 1 January 1981, the common job classification standards established by ICSC will be implemented by the United Nations (ST/AI/277, para. 5).

33. The grade structure of a dynamic organization also requires adjustment to meet changing circumstances. As the Secretary-General stated in his budget estimates for the financial year 1959:

"In an organization such as the United Nations ... where programmes develop quickly in some fields and functions expand correspondingly, there is need for a minimum facility to adjust the gradings of certain posts which have carried increasing responsibility for a period. It is, of course, equally incumbent to readjust gradings downwards as circumstances warrant and opportunity affords." 14/

34. Experience indicates, however, that changes in the job content and related levels of responsibility do not always account for requests for the reclassification of posts. Such requests are sometimes motivated also by the desire to provide promotion opportunities for staff members. The cumulative effect of such promotions contributes to the phenomenon of "grade creep". It can be argued that the system of annual increments, of which there are 13 at grade P-3 and 12 at grade P-4, should compensate for the lack of promotion prospects and to reward increased experience. In practice, however, annual increments have not proved an adequate substitute for better promotion prospects.

11/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 30 (A/35/30).

12/ Ibid., para. 249.

13/ Ibid., para. 258.

14/ Ibid., Thirteenth Session, Supplement No. 5 (A/3825), sect. 6, chap. I, p. 18.

35. Organizations have tried various approaches to this problem, including those described in paragraphs 17 and 18 above. In this context, reference can also be made to the purely budgetary approach to reclassifications which consists in the executive head requesting a lump-sum provision which is not supported by detailed justifications post by post. While this approach is not part of the current practices in the United Nations, it was resorted to in the past. For instance, the Secretary-General's budget estimates for 1963 included the following passage:

"Changes in post levels

"Aside from the more specific changes in post levels described above, the estimates include a general provision for some strengthening of the Secretariat at the Principal Officer and Senior Officer levels (with offsetting reductions at the lower professional levels) and a general provision for a number of additional Principal level general service posts (with offsetting reductions at lower general service levels), in order (a) to provide for reasonable opportunity for promotion of staff whose duties and responsibilities have increased as a result of the continued expansion in particular work programmes or departmental responsibilities, and (b) to allow in particular cases for appointments at levels higher than the normal entrance levels." 15/

36. The representative of UNESCO informed the Advisory Committee that the UNESCO budget for 1981-1983 includes a small provision for reclassifications. A lump-sum provision for reclassifications is also included in the budget of IMCO. The representatives of IMCO informed the Advisory Committee that reclassifications are staggered throughout the financial period, thereby reducing their budgetary impact in the first biennium. The Advisory Committee cautions that the IMCO approach imposes a larger continuing liability on the organization since it makes it possible for the executive head to accommodate a larger number of reclassifications within the budgetary provision.

37. In the Secretariat-level discussions of the broader question of promotion prospects, it has also been suggested that a system can be devised in which promotions below the first supervisory level are based on a combination of merit and seniority in grade without need for classifying individual posts. Such a system would apply to grades P-1 to P-4 or even P-5 since the latter grade is sometimes used for highly skilled specialists who do not have supervisory responsibilities. It has been argued in support of such an approach that the complexity of the tasks entrusted to Professional officers is not necessarily related to the grade level of the post they occupy, and that a similar system has operated satisfactorily for General Service staff below the Principal level. The Advisory Committee points out that to operate successfully such a system would require strict safeguards. Otherwise, all Professional staff would find themselves, within a few years, promoted to the level P-4 or P-5 and the present difficulties would be exacerbated. Indeed, the pitfalls of automatic promotion for General Service staff were illustrated by Inspector Bertrand in his report on some aspects of the strike at the

15/ Ibid., Seventeenth Session, Supplement No. 5 (A/5205), sect. 3, chap. 1, p. 36.

United Nations Office at Geneva from 25 February to 3 March 1976, in which reference is made to the promotion of messengers to Geneva level G-4 or G-5, i.e., to levels of remuneration comparable to those of grade P-1 in the Professional category (A/31/137, annex, para. 64).

38. Similarly, it can be argued that the use of personal grades (which are now awarded in exceptional cases to officials of WHO and IAEA) or a system of dual grades for each post (as is done in UPU) is more economical in the long run than the practice of reclassifying posts in order to promote a meritorious incumbent, for a post, once reclassified, tends to remain at the higher level even after the departure of the official whose performance justified the upgrading. The Advisory Committee cautions, however, that a system of personal grades, unless strictly controlled, can easily lead to the wholesale promotion of staff of average competence.

39. The Advisory Committee recognizes that, in a dynamic organization, the job content of posts can change in ways that will justify both upgradings and downgradings. The Secretary-General referred to that factor in his budget estimates for the financial year 1959 (see para. 33 above). There is a need, however, to separate reclassifications requested because of a genuine increase in the level of responsibilities from those which are motivated in the main by the desire to reward meritorious service.

40. In his report on the implementation of the classification systems for posts in the Professional and General Service categories submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session, the Secretary-General proposed that he be "authorized to adjust the staffing tables within each budget section, provided that the number of posts upgraded to each grade level is offset by an equivalent number of downgradings from that grade level to lower grades, thereby leaving the authorized number of posts at each level concerned unchanged" (A/C.5/34/37, para. 12 (c)). There was no objection to the proposal either on the part of the Advisory Committee or in the Fifth Committee. At its 84th meeting on 17 December 1979, the Fifth Committee recommended to the Assembly that it should take note of the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/34/37). The recommendation was adopted by the Assembly on 20 December 1979 (see resolution 34/219, sect. IV). The Advisory Committee expects that the results of the exercise will be reflected by the Secretary-General in his programme budget proposals for the biennium 1982-1983.

41. The Advisory Committee believes that the Secretary-General's proposal can be expanded to include the possibility of exchanging posts at level P-5 and below between budget sections, provided the total numbers of posts at each level, as approved by the General Assembly, remains unchanged. The Secretary-General would be required to seek the concurrence of the Advisory Committee in the proposed upward and downward reclassifications, and the Committee would submit reports to the Assembly on such changes in grade levels.

42. The Advisory Committee expects that, after the implementation of the job classification standards established by ICSC (see para. 32 above) and bearing in mind that the procedures referred to in paragraphs 40 and 41 should give the Secretary-General some flexibility in adjusting the staffing tables, requests for

/...

upward reclassifications would be submitted in exceptional circumstances only. Any such submissions should be made in the context of the proposed programme budget for a given biennium. All such proposals must have been reviewed and endorsed by the Classification Section of the Office of Personnel Services.

43. To facilitate consideration of the proposals by the Advisory Committee, the Secretary-General should compile background material which would include job descriptions for the posts at their current levels and at the proposed higher levels. Posts should be reclassified only when it has been determined in the light of strict criteria that there has been a significant change in the nature of the duties and responsibilities.

44. As regards requests for the reclassification of posts which are motivated in the main by the desire to reward meritorious service, the Advisory Committee understands that they are made when a staff member, who is considered deserving of promotion, cannot be transferred to a more senior post either because of specialization or through lack of vacancies at the higher level. The Advisory Committee is of the opinion that such requests are inconsistent with the introduction of job classification standards. If the Secretary-General considers that the problem is serious enough to warrant the working out of alternative procedures - which would not involve the reclassification of posts - he can examine it (if so desired on an interagency basis, and with the assistance of ICSC) and make appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly.
