

DOCUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND NOT FOR PUBLIC USE

MASTER FILES

ROOM C-120

14

CONFIDENTIAL

COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Meeting 85/2

3:00 p.m., February 28, 1985

A. Alfidja, Chairman

Executive Directors

M. Finaish
A. Kafka
R. K. Joyce
P. Pérez
A. K. Sengupta

Zhang Z.

Alternate Executive Directors

T. A. Clark

A. Wright, Secretary
S. J. Fennell, Assistant

Also Present

J. de Groote

Y. A. Nimatallah

S. Salehkhoul

M. K. Bush

T. Alhaimus

M. Sugita

B. Goos

Jaafar A.

B. Jensen

J. de Beaufort Wijnholds

A. S. Jayawardena

V. Govindarajan, Temporary

I. Angeloni, Temporary

Administration Department: P. Hirschfeldt, J. D. Huddleston,
N. J. Smith. Secretary's Department: B. R. Hughes. Bureau of
Computing Services: W. N. Minami, Director; K. X. Nelick.
Advisors to Executive Directors: A. A. Agah, H. A. Arias,
L. K. Doe. Assistants to Executive Directors: J. R. N. Almeida,
G. D. Hodgson, S. Kolb, E. L. Walker.

1. OFFICE STAFFING

The Committee members considered a staff paper on the staffing of
Executive Directors' offices (EB/CAM/85/9, 2/14/85).

The Chairman recalled that at the previous Committee meeting (EB/CAM/Meeting/85/1, 1/24/85) it had been agreed that the present formula for staffing Executive Directors' offices should not be changed but that the current requests for additional staff would be considered on an ad hoc basis. He suggested that Committee members should address the criteria and procedures that should be established for examining ad hoc requests and for reviewing the policy with regard to temporary staff positions. The outstanding requests for additional staff, summarized in EB/CAM/84/43 (12/19/84), could then be taken up.

Mr. Kafka remarked that Attachment I to EB/CAM/85/9 did not give a clear indication of the work load of Executive Directors' offices. It was misleading to indicate only the number of stand-by and extended arrangements in effect on a particular date; the burden on an office was measured not so much by the number of arrangements in effect but by the number of arrangements under negotiation. All but two of the countries in his constituency either had a stand-by or extended arrangement in effect or were negotiating in one way or another with the Fund on December 31, 1984; however, the table in Attachment I indicated that only three countries in his constituency had stand-by or extended arrangements in effect.

The Committee Secretary stated that the staff recognized the limitations of the presentation in Attachment I. Discussions with the various departments concerned had made it clear that there would be considerable difficulty with providing consistent information about the number of arrangements under negotiation.

The Chairman remarked that the staff had provided the Committee with some broad indicators. The work load of an Executive Director's office was difficult to quantify, and specific requests for additional staff should perhaps be considered on their individual merits.

Mr. Finaish commented that he had similar concerns to those of Mr. Kafka. Although in 1984 only five countries in his constituency had been discussed by the Executive Board according to Attachment III, in only the first two months of 1985 eight countries in his constituency had been discussed by the Executive Board. A fairer representation of the work load of Directors' offices would be achieved by taking the number of country items discussed by the Board in a two-year period.

He did not consider that column (4) of the table in Attachment III--duration of Board discussion on country items, by constituency--was particularly relevant to the question of Executive Directors' work load, Mr. Finaish stated. Even if a country item was discussed for only a short time by the Executive Board, the Executive Director still had to read the staff reports, prepare a statement, anticipate Directors' questions, and make concluding remarks.

The number of business trips undertaken by staff in Executive Directors' offices was also an inappropriate measure of work pressure, Mr. Finaish considered. Some Directors might argue that they needed

additional staff because of the large number of business trips they were required to undertake as indicated in Attachment II, while others might argue that they had only taken a few business trips because they did not have enough staff. Members of his office had undertaken only nine business trips in 1984 because of the considerable work pressure at headquarters in Washington. He did not have any immediate plans to request additional staff but was concerned about the criteria proposed to determine the burden of work in Directors' offices.

Mr. Clark remarked that the staff papers identified some of the main factors that should be taken into account when considering ad hoc requests from Directors for additional staff positions. It was his understanding that the proposed criteria would not be applied rigidly but would represent indicators that could be used in considering Directors' requests. He was concerned that the criteria outlined in paragraph (d)(i), in addition to covering the criteria detailed in paragraphs (a)-(c), introduced a number of other considerations. The proposed procedure, whereby the Committee would judge Directors' requests for additional staff against a set of criteria, seemed awkward and he wondered whether a different approach might be adopted.

The Committee Secretary indicated that the staff had included a catch-all criterion relating to exceptional work load because it had recognized the weakness of the other indicators. Some Directors were requesting additional staff for reasons that were not covered in paragraphs (a)-(c).

Mr. Sengupta agreed with Mr. Clark that it would be difficult for the Committee to review Directors' request for additional staff based on a set of criteria. A comparison of the work load of different Directors was difficult, and the Committee, more often than not, would approve a Director's request.

The staffing requirements of each Executive Director were quite different, Mr. Sengupta indicated. For example, he had sometimes felt the need for a temporary research assistant to conduct some background research into a Fund policy issue or to prepare statistics. An approach whereby a dollar amount could be allotted to each Executive Director's office for the purpose of hiring additional staff, whether on a temporary or permanent basis, would give Executive Directors more flexibility in hiring additional staff and would be more simple to administer than an approach whereby the Committee had to determine whether a Director's request for additional staff was justified.

Mr. Pérez stated that he agreed with Mr. Finaish and Mr. Kafka that the information in Attachments I and II did not give a fair indication of the work load of Executive Directors' offices. For example, the average duration of a business trip by a member of his office was much shorter than that for the staff in Mr. Alfidja's office. Perhaps an additional criterion, such as hours of overtime, should be taken into account in assessing an Executive Director's need for additional staff.

Mr. Nimatallah stated that while he believed that Executive Directors should have the benefit of the doubt regarding their requests for additional staff, he was willing to cooperate with the Committee. He recognized the limitations of the criteria included in the staff paper. Nevertheless, those criteria did give some indication of the work load of Executive Directors' offices, and he welcomed the suggestion that hours of overtime should be included in the criteria. Perhaps another useful indicator would be the number of interventions by Executive Directors in Board meetings. The staff in his office made every effort to prepare an intervention at every Board meeting. Considerable background work was required for each intervention.

The staff paper provided enough information for the Committee to act in response to the requests by some Executive Directors for additional staff, Mr. Nimatallah considered. The question of staffing had been discussed in three meetings and it was time to take a decision. The Fund's Executive Directors should be allowed to have additional staff when they felt the need.

Mr. de Groote remarked that the staff paper proposed a number of criteria that, while limited in their scope, were useful as indicators of the work load of Executive Directors' offices. In his case, the criterion relating to the number of stand-by arrangements in effect was not a good indicator of his work load. In the past two years, he had devoted much of his time working with the authorities of, and traveling to, Belgium, the Government of which had requested Fund assistance in formulating, implementing, and monitoring performance under an economic program that was not associated with the use of Fund resources. Fund assistance to countries that were not making use of Fund resources might increase in the future, and the criteria outlined in the staff paper did not cover the work associated with such assistance.

On the question of languages, the staff in his office had to communicate to members of his constituency in Turkish, German, Flemish, and French, in addition to English, Mr. de Groote commented. He did not have a need for additional staff at present for language reasons, but if an assistant were to leave, he would have an immediate need for additional staff. He agreed with Mr. Clark and Mr. Nimatallah that the need for additional staff by an Executive Director should be left to the judgment of the Executive Director. The Committee should be flexible in dealing with requests for additional staff.

With respect to Mr. Sengupta's comment that the Committee would automatically approve any Director's request, Mr. de Groote recalled that an Executive Director had experienced difficulty in the past in obtaining an additional staff position. On a related point, the editor position in his office could perhaps be upgraded in due course. He suggested that a new position be created between that of an assistant to the Executive Director and that of a secretarial assistant.

Mr. Jaafar stated that a previous request for an additional staff position in his office had been refused. He wondered whether a vacant position for a translator in his office could be upgraded to an assistant position. A number of countries within his constituency had inquired whether a position in the Executive Director's office could be used for training purposes.

The Committee Secretary stated that the staff paper was intended to cover requests for a temporary reclassification of an existing position, in addition to requests for a temporary additional position.

Mr. Joyce indicated his agreement with Mr. de Groote that a set of rigid rules regarding requests for additional positions should not be established. It should be up to the individual Executive Director to decide whether the existing work load was too heavy for the number of staff in his office. He could then present his case in support of the request for an additional staff position to the Committee. The criteria proposed by the staff should not be interpreted in a mechanistic way. There might be other factors that were relevant to a particular Director's request. Following a decision by the Committee regarding a Director's request for additional staff, the Executive Board's approval would have to be sought, perhaps on a lapse of time basis. Given the time already spent by the Committee on the question of staffing of Directors' offices, a decision should be reached at the present meeting.

Ms. Bush recalled that at the previous Committee Meeting (EB/CAM/Meeting/85/1, 1/24/85) the Committee had decided to consider Directors' requests for additional staff on a case-by-case basis. She hoped that the Committee would, however, keep under consideration the possibility of adopting a more objective approach to meeting the staffing needs of Executive Directors, perhaps by establishing budgets for each Executive Director's office. A budgetary approach would have the advantage of leaving the management decisions of an Executive Director's office to that Executive Director.

Mr. Nimatallah reminded Committee members that a number of problems with the approach suggested by Ms. Bush had been identified at the previous Committee meeting. The staff could, however, examine further the possibility of establishing a ceiling on personnel costs of each Executive Director's office and suggest solutions to the problems discussed at the previous meeting. Nevertheless, the Committee should consider Directors' requests for additional staff at the present meeting on the basis of the ad hoc approach decided on earlier.

Mr. Clark pointed out that the Committee had decided at the previous meeting that ad hoc requests from Executive Directors for additional staff should be considered on the basis of a set of criteria to be established. He was concerned that the criteria proposed in the staff paper, one of which included the all-encompassing phrase "exceptional work load caused by unusual problems or other temporary circumstances related to the work of the Fund," would be ineffective in ensuring consistency between the cases put forward by Executive Directors in support of their requests for additional staff.

Mr. Kafka suggested that the inclusion in the guidelines of a more general phrase such as "other criteria which may be found relevant by the Committee, in addition to paragraph (d)," would be an appropriate way to indicate that the quantified criteria paragraphs (a)-(c) were not fully indicative of Directors' staffing needs and that other relevant criteria could be used by a Director to present his case. The requirement that a Director would have to justify his need for additional staff to the Committee would prevent Directors from making unnecessary requests. The ad hoc approach could be tried and, if found inappropriate, a new approach could be proposed.

Mr. de Groote indicated his agreement with Mr. Kafka.

Mr. Sengupta suggested that the procedures should refer to "any other criteria considered relevant and reasonable."

The Committee Secretary, responding to questions from Directors, stated that Section 2, paragraph (c) of the staff paper referred to Executive Board discussions of country items and did not cover the number of interventions in the Board by Executive Directors on all topics. He had prepared some statistics on hours of overtime paid to staff of Executive Directors. Those figures, however, were distorted by a number of factors, including the promotion of a secretarial assistant from range E to range F, at which point a secretarial assistant ceased to be eligible for overtime, and the different working practices of Directors' offices.

Responding to a question from Mr. de Groote, the Committee Secretary explained that Attachment II referred to only those business trips that had been specifically identified as Fund business trips.

Mr. Finaish suggested that columns (3) and (4) of the table in Attachment III should include all country items discussed in a two-year period.

The Chairman noted, following further discussion, that Committee members agreed that the criteria for considering ad hoc requests for additional positions or for temporarily changing the status of existing positions outlined in the staff paper, while useful indicators of the work load of Directors, had many limitations. All Directors requesting temporary additional positions or temporary changes in the status of positions should present the reasons for their request to the Committee. In considering the request, the Committee would take into account the criteria suggested in EB/CAM/85/9 and any other criteria that the Committee might find relevant and reasonable.

It was then proposed by the Chairman that the Committee should consider the requests by Executive Directors for temporary additional staff positions as outlined in EB/CAM/84/43, 12/19/84.

The Committee approved Mr. Nimatallah's request for a temporary additional position for an Advisor.

Mr. de Groote indicated that he did not need an additional staff member at present.

The Committee approved Mr. Alfidja's request for a temporary additional position for an Advisor.

The Committee Secretary said that he assumed that approval for temporary additional positions and for temporary changes in the status of positions would be for a maximum period of two years, with the usual qualification that the appointment would be at the pleasure of the Executive Director concerned.

The Chairman inquired whether, if the Executive Director that had requested the additional staff position resigned, the temporary additional position would be terminated automatically.

The Committee Secretary explained that the temporary position would be available for a maximum of two years. If a new Executive Director came into office during that period, the additional position would still be available. The new Executive Director could, however, appoint someone else to fill that position.

Responding to a question from Mr. Goos, the Committee Secretary indicated that the last, bracketed sentence on page 4 of EB/CAM/85/9 had been included as an option to be considered if the Committee wished to tighten further the procedures for reviewing the policy on staffing of Executive Directors' offices. It seemed that the Committee did not wish to adopt the provisions suggested in that sentence.

The Chairman asked the Committee Secretary to prepare a draft report and recommendations concerning the staffing of Executive Directors' offices for submission to the Executive Board on a lapse of time basis. Committee members would be given an opportunity to comment on a draft of the report and the recommendations before they were distributed to the Board.

2. ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING SUPPORT

The Committee considered proposed amendments to the guidelines for electronic data processing support for Executive Directors' offices (EBAP/85/15, 1/18/85; and Sup. 1, 1/23/85). They also had before them a staff paper providing additional information as background for the Committee's discussion (EB/CAM/85/10, 2/22/85).

The Chairman commented that there were three issues on which the Committee should focus its attention--namely, the proposals regarding additional word processing equipment, the question of access to Fund electronic data processing (EDP) systems, and the plans for developing complex office automation systems.

The Committee approved a request by Mr. Angeloni, on behalf of Mr. Zecchini, that discussion of the question of access to Fund EDP systems, a matter on which Mr. Zecchini had made a proposal (EBAP/85/15, Sup. 1, 1/23/85), should be postponed in order that he could be present.

The Committee Secretary, commenting on the differences between the Managing Director's proposals contained in EBAP/85/15 and Mr. Zecchini's proposals in EBAP/85/15, Supplement 1, stated that the Managing Director had suggested that the entitlements of each Executive Director's office should be increased by one stand-alone word processor or a personal computer. Mr. Zecchini had proposed that the present entitlement would be maintained and if an Executive Director's office needed an additional word processor it would have to make a specific request. Mr. Zecchini had not made any reference to the possibility of substituting a personal computer for a second word processor.

The proposals did not refer to the cost of a word processor or of the associated software, the Committee Secretary pointed out. Given the wide range of supplementary equipment and software that could be added to the word processor, however, he suggested that the Committee, in drafting its report to the Executive Board, should consider including some overall ceiling on expenditure.

Reponding to a question from Ms. Bush, the Committee Secretary stated that there were currently six personal computers available for loan to Executive Directors' offices on a first come first served basis. Only four of those computers had been used, and the staff was not proposing any increase in the pool at present.

Mr. Angeloni stated that it was his understanding that Mr. Zecchini's proposal had not required that requests for additional word processing equipment be approved, but that the entitlement would become available upon request.

Mr. Alhaimus noted that word processors could have dual language capabilities, and he considered that Directors should have the option to acquire such processors.

The Director of the Bureau of Computing Services, responding to a question from Mr. Jaafar, stated that a personal computer could be made to have word processing capabilities.

The staff representative from the Bureau of Computing Services explained that more than one terminal could be linked to a printer, the number varying according to vendor. One printer could be used for a variety of languages, although the print wheel would sometimes have to be changed, depending on the language.

The Committee Secretary commented that the proposed amendments to the guidelines referred to an entitlement of two stand-alone word processors. The proposal would have to be redrafted if the Committee wished to refer to additional screens and sharing a printer.

Ms. Bush remarked that her office was not so much in need of a second printer but of various components for the word processor. The guidelines should be flexible enough to meet a variety of Directors' needs.

The staff representative from the Bureau of Computing Services, responding to questions from Mr. Clark, stated that the word processing capabilities of a personal computer were less sophisticated than those of an IBM Displaywriter. Furthermore, the keyboard of a personal computer was less durable than that of a Displaywriter. If a Director decided to use a personal computer for word processing, a better quality printer than the standard dot matrix printer would be desirable and would cost about \$3,000 as opposed to \$400 for a dot matrix printer.

Mr. Govindarajan recalled that the Committee Secretary had mentioned at the beginning of the meeting that some modification of the draft proposals might be required. If an Executive Director's office did not require an additional word processor or personal computer at present but required an additional screen, would it be forfeiting its entitlement to other equipment at a later date?

The Committee Secretary explained that for budget purposes, the total cost of the increased entitlement for all Executive Directors' offices as proposed by the Managing Director was estimated at \$175,000. That figure had been based on the cost of a keyboard, screen, and printer and had not included the cost of any additional software or supplementary equipment. The guidelines could be redrafted in terms of an overall ceiling on expenditures for EDP equipment for each office.

The Director of the Bureau of Computing Services, responding to a question from the Chairman, explained that the budgeted amount for Directors' increased EDP entitlement had been based on the cost of the physical components of the word processor and personal computer. In other words, the EDP entitlement for Executive Directors' offices had been described in terms of an equipment constraint, rather than a dollar constraint.

Following further discussion, the Committee Secretary noted that Committee members broadly agreed with the guidelines as proposed by the Managing Director but considered that they should be amended to build in more flexibility and to reflect Mr. Zecchini's suggestion that the new EDP equipment would be made available on request. He asked whether the Committee might wish to include some cost limitation on expenditures for such equipment for each office.

The Chairman stated that the Committee should keep the idea of a cost ceiling in mind. He wondered whether the guidelines would have to be redrafted to provide for the purchase of software or supplementary equipment.

The Committee Secretary remarked that under present procedures, the offices of Executive Directors, unlike staff departments, did not have to comply with budgetary ceilings. A request by an Executive Director's

office for additional software would be handled by the Executive Board Services Unit, and a reasonable request would usually be granted. If a request appeared unreasonable, it could be referred to the Chairman of the Committee on Executive Board Administrative Matters, a course of action that had not yet been necessitated.

The Director of the Bureau of Computing Services remarked that the software packages for word processors and personal computers cost in the range of \$200-\$400.

The Chairman commented that Directors' suggestions and concerns would be reflected in the Chairman's memorandum to the Executive Board on the guidelines for electronic data processing support for Executive Directors' offices.

The Chairman then invited Committee members to address the question of developing complex office automation systems.

The Committee Secretary noted that the memorandum from the Managing Director (EBAP/85/15, 1/18/85) and the staff paper prepared for the present meeting (EB/CAM/85/10, 2/22/85) had referred to the need of some Directors' offices for office automation systems. A more detailed review of Executive Directors' requirements than the preliminary survey carried out in the second half of 1984 would be undertaken in financial year 1986. Additional funds had been included in the 1986 budget proposals to cover the development and implementation of complex systems in three offices.

Mr. Angeloni indicated his support for the proposed study. Would the complex office automation system link word processing units within an Executive Director's office or between different Directors' offices?

The Director of the Bureau of Computing Services stated that initially the staff intended to link the word processors in the three Directors' offices to minicomputers, which would enlarge the office capabilities of the systems considerably.

Mr. Clark indicated his support for the proposed survey of Executive Directors' requirements. Clearly, the question of security would have to be considered before an interoffice automation system could be established.

The Chairman asked the Secretary to prepare a draft report and recommendations for approval by the Executive Board on a lapse of time basis. Committee members would be given an opportunity to comment on a draft of the report and the recommendations before they were distributed to the Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

APPROVED: December 6, 1985