

CONFIDENTIAL

COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Meeting 86/1
4:30 p.m., January 16, 1986

A. Kafka, Chairman

Executive Directors

A. Alfidja
Huang F.
M. Massé
P. Pérez
A. K. Sengupta

Alternate Executive Directors

T. Alhaimus
Song G.
H. A. Arias
M. Foot

A. Wright, Secretary
K. S. Friedman, Assistant

Also Present

G. Salehkhoul
M. K. Bush
W.-R. Bengs, Temporary
J. de Beaufort Wijnholds
O. Kabbaj
L. Tornetta, Temporary

Administration Department: J. D. Huddleston, M. Minako, P. D. Swain.
Legal Department: J. G. Evans, Jr., Deputy General Counsel.
Secretary's Department: B. R. Hughes, M. J. Papin. Office of the
Managing Director: R. Noë, Internal Auditor. Advisors to Executive
Directors: J. Hospedales, G. Nguyen. Assistants to Executive
Directors: J. R. N. Almeida, F. Di Mauro, S. Geadah, E. L. Walker.

1. TEMPORARY SECRETARIAL HELP

The Chairman recalled that at EB/CAM/85/4 (9/5/85), it had been agreed that the staff should prepare a paper suggesting ways in which additional temporary secretarial assistance might be made available to Executive Directors' offices at times of peak work load. EB/CAM/85/69 listed several options and suggested that option (c), followed by option (d), might best meet the needs of Executive Directors' offices. However, while the staff paper contained suggestions that the Committee

might wish to consider at the present meeting, the various options apparently would not solve the particular problem facing Mr. Dallara's office. The staff would have to prepare another paper to deal with that problem.

Ms. Bush remarked that EB/CAM/85/69 dealt with the part of the problem facing her office that had been described to the Committee members and the staff. Only part of the problem had been described because she had hoped that, by making certain changes in the office, it would be possible to continue to operate efficiently with just two secretaries. In fact, it had become clear that her office was in great need of a third secretary. The work load was very heavy, partly for the same reasons that other Executive Directors' offices also faced heavy work loads, and partly because her authorities were located near headquarters and were in constant contact with her office. Moreover, there was a tradition among U.S. Executive Directors of attempting to make a detailed and substantive statement on most of the items on the Executive Board's agenda.

In the circumstances, there was a clear need for a third secretary to enable her office to operate efficiently, Ms. Bush continued. However, her chair had been consistently conscious of the need to limit administrative costs and had therefore delayed requesting additional secretarial assistance. Moreover, rather than request a third full-time secretary, she wondered whether arrangements could be made for a half-time position.

One indication of the need for additional secretarial assistance in her office was the nearly nine weeks in overtime that had been recorded by each of the two secretaries in her office over the previous year at a cost of nearly \$8,000, Ms. Bush stated. That amount was close to the cost of a half-time position, the availability of which would likely reduce significantly the amount of overtime assistance required.

The Committee Secretary, responding to a question, recalled that on a recent occasion the Committee had considered two requests for additional temporary advisor positions in Executive Directors' offices. There had been no previous requests for temporary secretarial or clerical positions.

Mr. Alfidja stated that he was prepared either to consider Ms. Bush's request at the present meeting, or to ask the staff to prepare a separate paper on the matter for consideration on another occasion.

Mr. Alhaimus said that he, too, was prepared to consider Ms. Bush's proposal at the present meeting or on another occasion. Presumably, if Ms. Bush's request were accepted, other Executive Directors' offices could make the same request, if necessary.

Mr. Huang remarked that, if a part-time position could be accommodated under the budget, he was willing to accept Ms. Bush's request.

The staff representative from the Administration Department explained that there was a ceiling on the number of staff members in each Executive Director's office. The ceiling for the office of the U.S. Executive Director had already been reached.

Mr. Foot commented that the efficient operation of the office of the Executive Director for the Fund's largest member was in the best interest of all Executive Directors. The work load of the U.S. Executive Director's office was obviously very heavy. He himself also was committed to keeping administrative costs at a minimum. The presentational--as well as the substantive--aspects of a solution to the staffing problem in the U.S. Executive Director's office should be kept in mind. He sympathized with Ms. Bush; the staff paper showed that the two Executive Directors' offices with just two secretaries obviously had a particularly heavy work load. But it should be clearly understood that the problem facing her office was exceptional, and that the solution to that problem should be exceptional.

The staff representative from the Administration Department responding to a question said that, after extensive discussions, the Executive Board had approved a formula for the number of staff positions in Executive Directors' offices. The formula took into account the various work load factors in different offices, such as the number of languages used in an office and the number of countries in a constituency. Each Executive Director had some choice in the composition of his staff in the sense that he could choose the mix of positions that he preferred up to the overall ceiling. In the case of the office of the U.S. Executive Director, the choice had been to have two secretarial positions among the various staff positions in that office. The U.S. Executive Director could have chosen to have one less technical assistant in favor of a third secretarial position.

Mr. Massé considered that the staff paper had made a good case for establishing a system that would make some allowance for additional staff in peak load periods. Apparently, the work load in Ms. Bush's office consistently exceeded the volume that the present staff of that office could handle efficiently. He preferred a solution on the basis of option (e), under which there would be a central pool of secretarial assistants to cover peak work load needs; Executive Directors could draw on the pool on an "as needed" basis. Accordingly, a permanent peak load position--specifically a part-time secretary--could be allocated from the pool to the U.S. Executive Director's office. It should be understood that the increase in staff for the U.S. Executive Director's office had been permitted for special reasons and was not meant to set a precedent for other Executive Directors' offices.

Mr. Pérez said that a solution of the type favored by Mr. Massé might be difficult to accept because it mixed two different variables, namely, temporary and permanent positions. He hoped that the Committee would be able to agree on a means of meeting Ms. Bush's request for additional assistance. Apparently Executive Directors' offices had an unlimited

entitlement to overtime secretarial assistance, the cost of which was often substantial. He wondered why offices were entitled to an unlimited amount of overtime assistance, but faced rigid restrictions on part-time positions. He also wondered whether Ms. Bush's problem could be solved by approval for a limited amount of overtime secretarial assistance.

Ms. Bush commented that she assumed that, if her office were able to have a third, part-time secretary, the amount of overtime in the office could be reduced. The office would certainly make every effort to keep the amount of overtime to the minimum. However, she would not wish to see a limit placed on overtime secretarial assistance, partly because her office actually needed a third full-time position, rather than merely a part-time position; hence, her staff would still be under strain even if a third, part-time secretary were added. In any event, her office would also make every effort to keep to a minimum the number of hours worked a week by the part-time person; the extra person would probably be used two days a week, rather than two and a half days. Of course, her first preference was for approval of a half-time position, together with the continued possibility of additional overtime secretarial assistance.

After a further brief discussion, Mr. Sengupta said that he sympathized with Ms. Bush. In assessing her request Executive Directors should give first priority to ensuring the efficient functioning of the office of the U.S. Executive Director. The main question at hand was whether Ms. Bush's request should be dealt with as an exception, or whether the Committee members should consider a general scheme for providing additional secretarial assistance as necessary. In general, creating exceptions tended to cause difficulties. The Committee members had recently had no particular difficulty in recommending additional staff for an Executive Director's office that dealt in a number of languages and with a large number of members. At that time, it might have been preferable to increase the number of basic staff positions from five to six for offices that dealt in a number of languages and had large constituencies. A number of offices probably could make a case for additional secretarial assistance because of the heavy work load they faced. Increasing the maximum number of assistants in a Director's office would give each Executive Director the freedom to choose the combination of technical and secretarial assistants that would best help him to handle the work load of the office. If the U.S. Executive Director's office were permitted to have an additional, half-time secretarial position, other Executive Directors with one to five members in their constituency should have the same opportunity.

The Chairman said that it would be useful to have the staff prepare a paper on the budgetary and other implications of permitting a constituency with one to five members to have an additional, half-time secretarial assistant. It seemed best to limit the examination of a possible additional, half-time secretarial assistant to constituencies with one to five members. That approach would by no means rule out the possibility of

considering the same addition for larger constituencies on another occasion. For the time being, the only firm request for additional secretarial assistance was Mr. Dallara's request for an additional, half-time position.

Mr. Alhaimus remarked that a case could be made for temporary additional assistance in the offices with larger constituencies.

Mr. Alfidja commented that he agreed that the offices with the largest constituencies would clearly benefit from additional secretarial assistance. In his office, for example, considerable overtime was required, and the secretarial assistants had expressed a preference to avoid particularly large amounts of overtime when possible. The present general guidelines concerning the number of secretarial and technical assistants did not distinguish sufficiently between the needs of larger and smaller constituencies.

The Chairman said that different solutions probably were needed for the secretarial assistance problems facing the smallest and largest constituencies. The problem for larger constituencies could perhaps be handled by considering possible changes in the entitlement for assistants on the basis of the number of countries in a constituency and the number of different languages that a constituency had to work with. A solution probably could be found without changing the present basic entitlement of five secretarial and technical assistant positions per office. He hoped that it would not prove necessary to increase the basic entitlement for all offices simply because one smaller constituency had found that it was not able to operate efficiently under its present entitlement. The staff paper that would be prepared in response to Mr. Dallara's request should be limited to offices that had no more than the basic complement of five secretarial and technical assistants. The problems facing offices with larger constituencies could be dealt with on another occasion.

Mr. Sengupta commented that the Committee had previously considered the need for sufficient assistance in offices dealing with a large number of members. If additional problem cases were brought to the Committee's attention, the Committee would undoubtedly deal with them in an equitable manner. As to the present request from Mr. Dallara's office, it was useful to remember that constituencies with six to nine members were given one advisor position in addition to the basic five positions. It seemed sensible to consider the budgetary implications of adding a half-time position for constituencies of one to five members; the Committee could consider a general rule for those smaller constituencies.

Mr. Foot said that he continued to be concerned about the presentational aspects of any solution to the problem of secretarial assistance in Executive Directors' offices. The paper that the staff was to prepare should briefly describe the trend in secretarial positions throughout the Fund over the previous two or three years. He assumed that the new staff paper would not rule out substantive consideration by the Committee members at their next meeting of option (e) in EB/CAM/85/69. That option

seemed preferable in the light of his concern about the presentational aspects of the issue of additional secretarial assistance. Presumably the Committee members would discuss the question of temporary secretarial assistance in the context of the new staff paper.

The Chairman commented that the next meeting of the Committee could be held as soon as the staff had prepared the new paper, which should take into account Mr. Foot's comments.

2. SALARY OF ASSISTANT

The Chairman noted that Mr. Finaish had requested a waiver to enable him to appoint a former staff member as Assistant to Executive Director at a salary exceeding the ceiling on the starting salary of assistants; that salary would equal the one that the staff member had had when he left the Fund some seven months previously and was within the limits on Assistants' salaries. He had been informed by the staff that the matter could be decided on a lapse of time basis. Accordingly, the staff could issue another paper requesting the Executive Board to approve the appointment on a lapse of time basis. The lapse of time date could be in one week, thereby giving nonmembers of the Committee sufficient time to consider the matter. The staff report could note that the Committee members were willing to accept a waiver of the rule on the starting salary of an Assistant.

The Committee members accepted the Chairman's proposal.

3. ENTITLEMENTS - TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONAL EFFECTS

The Chairman suggested that the Committee members might wish to postpone the discussion on Executive Directors' entitlement to transportation of personal effects until the staff was able to provide a further paper that would include additional information that had recently become available.

The Committee members accepted the Chairman's proposal.

APPROVED: September 8, 1986