

Subj Chron: CF/EXD/SP/1987-0008

Address by Mr. James P. Grant
Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
to the
UNICEF General Staff Meeting on
Wednesday, February 18, 1987

Dag Hammarskjold Auditorium
New York



UNICEF Alternate Inventory Label



Rcf0006HNL

Item # **CF/RAD/USAA/DB01/1998-02009**

ExR/Code: **CF/EXD/SP/1987-0008**

Address to UNICEF Staff by Mr. James P. Grant, Executive I
Date Label Printed 12-Dec-2001

Cover + 8pp + 06

2539G

Chron Subj: CF/EXD/SP/1987-0008

UNICEF General Staff Meeting on Wednesday, February 18, 1987
at The Dag Hammarskjöld Auditorium

Of course is the very significant shift in the exchange rates and countries contribute to us in their own currencies. So the contributions from Sweden, Finland, Italy - the lire has gone from 2100 to a dollar to 1300...my thoughts were at 1480...anyway this has been a significant factor in this increase ... Secondly we did have an income from global special events - Sport Aid, First Earth Run together gave us a significant additional amount Third, we did get a significant increase in support for the Child Survival Revolution particularly UCI for 1990 than we expected....much of this increase came very late in the year. Finally, the major reduction in contributions from the United States that we feared ...They have gone in for a request for \$34 million for us against the \$52 million that we were getting against general resources...did not materialize and we received the same amount of money again for 1987 as we have been scheduled to receive for 1986. So for this, it is a very positive picture. The second thing I could tell them is that when we came before them last year, we said that we expected for 1987 and the next biennium to reduce our core posts by some 80, over that projected in the 86-87 biennium. And the principal reason that we gave was that our income in 85 had been significantly less of an increase than we had anticipated....almost no real increase and our administrative costs and programme support costs as a percent in total had been creeping up and we needed to stabilize and frankly bring them down. And that was the starting juncture....But instead of these 80 we are coming to the ACABQ and our Board with a proposal to reduce our core posts by 180 instead of the 80. Now, part of this is explained by the fact that 77 of these are conversions to Project posts following primarily the Board's decision last year that with the supplementary funding - that there should be much more attribution of personnel to the Management of supplementary funding so that in a place such as Copenhagen some 19 of the posts were switched to project posts to reflect this Board mandate. But still we had a reductionand that reduction of 103 in our core posts. Again, the question can come up....Why?

Well, one of these is the fact that there is the general climate in the United Nations....they are expecting much more tightness....tightness to the point of overload in the system....as you all know....the UN as a whole is being asked to implement a 15% reduction of staff and a quarter reduction at the ASG/USG level and this very much affects the climate in which we work. But there is also the fact that we still have very continued uncertainty in

cover + 8 pp + 0b

our income. We are very subject to a yoyo type of situation. The U S Administration this year has requested \$30 million not 34 but 30 million dollars for us against 52 million as the request for the next year and we can observe from UNDP where the Congress gave them just what the Administration asked for which was a devastating drop for UNDP from \$165 million two years ago to I believe \$107 million for this year. It is a warning that we do need to have some increased liquidities.

Most importantly we have had an increased need for programme dollars for programme delivery....and it's against this background when we went through our review process....we came up with, what we believe, is an honest figure, but it does represent an unexpected degree of tightening and shifting of core posts at a time when we have a significant funding increase. Third, I plan to tell them that programmatically the Child Survival & Development Revolution has continued to accelerate and this has taken place primarily through increased immunization, increased use of ORT....we were able to say in the SOWCR that there were 1.5 million children who lived in 1986 who would not have lived but for these accelerations that have taken place in the early 1980s. And that we now seek a fair prospect that by 1990 the improvement of health will be such despite the adverse economic climate of the world, that some 3 - 5 millions lives of children a year will be saved as a result of these measures, which if it materializes will result in the greatest percentage drop in infant mortality in history in a comparable ten year period. Even with these difficulties ...and that UNICEF is able to do this not only because of the new technologies and the new capacity to communicate....but frankly we and others have been able to find a way to relate these to the decision makers of the world so that there is a new political will to generate them and we see this in many different ways from the monumental decision of the newly established South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation SAARC - last November in Bangalore, the Heads of State to put children up in front for this co-operative effort of these 7 countries including such goals as universal child immunization by 1990 and really assuring that water supply for all before the year 2000. We have world leaders all over the globe who are taking unprecedented actions in this regard whether you look at President Diouf in Senegal or President Soeharto in Indonesia. And UNICEF is the principal catalyst in this global movement. We are doing it obviously in very close association with a great many others. The governments themselves are the real leaders in this. But we are working very closely with the major bilaterals, international organizations such as The League of Red Cross Society, The IPA, Rotarians, Religious structures as well as others and as I've said that during this period I am pleased while we have made this great initiative on this front, we have been able to maintain most or nearly all our efforts on the other fronts at the same time - water, women, community participation. Education is the one that has dropped the most during this period and this has been possible frankly only through a great increase in effort by UNICEF and it raises the question - can UNICEF continue to maintain this level of increasing output, improving quality, and reducing core staff, simultaneously without a system breakdown somewhere in the process? And my reply is - that we think so and we think it possible - we see in our supply consolidation in Copenhagen, the potentials for reducing staff substantially. Allowing re-deployment of posts elsewhere while doubling

output and shortening delivery times. We are experimenting this coming year 1987 and beyond with a major innovation in East and Southern Africa region ESARO where after some 8 or 9 years of build-up of all our country offices having taken place all through the 80s, we are making a significant reduction in the ESARO Regional office, on the assumption that the strength of country offices can do much more to carry these functions. And as most of you know, we do think the Regional office from some 73 posts to 19 posts...however some of that being summed illusory in that there is a significant strength in that for the Kenya country office. But there will be a net reduction of 33 posts out of this exercise after the strength in the Kenya office and after redeploying advisory functions out to the countries, with these advisors serving the entire region but from a country base. I might mention parenthetically in this exercise the great majority of staff have been placed but we still have what's left - in Nairobi 14 where termination will have to be the way that we go.

Third, we are mounting a major acceleration in our training. Clearly if we are taking our new functions, new directions, expecting increased capacities from our staff, one needs to give them the training for this and this has been most conspicuous in the field of social mobilization and in the last - little over one year some 500 of our professional staff have gone through some special training in this regard, around the world.

Fourth, there will be a step up in monitoring and evaluation for quality control, learning lessons quickly. We have an improvement in the information reporting management system. The new IRM unit and a small central planning office. All of these are designed to improve our quality. But the workload is clearly heavy. One of our colleagues was commenting to me on Sunday that he has an office post in the UN and UNICEF and he will move back and forth and he always notes that there seems to be almost nobody in one building and they run a substantial sprinkling of staff through the other building....and you can guess which is which. We also have the first results in from the staff opinion survey that most of you are aware took place and I am looking forward to the detailed evaluation of it. My very simple of it, after a quick reading through it, was to say that most UNICEF staff like what they are doing. Most UNICEF Staff like their colleagues. Most UNICEF staff grumble about training, placement, supervision, much of what we put into our system. But what I found very interesting was that the same staff that likes it's work and likes it's colleagues, universally from one end of the world to another, from every office, felt that they were being overworked....which does indicate a rather heavy load and we all do know that last year was a particularly heavy load with Sport Aid, First Earth Run, 40th Anniversary - the first two of those weren't anywhere in our workplans when the year started and in South Asia they did the monumental task of the initiative with respect to SAARC and three of these four were not in anybody's workplans at the start of the year. And understandably one would feel some pressure from this. This is basic in what I had planned to say in abbreviated form to the ACABQ. Let me say to you the questions come up in my discussions with the Global Staff Association. We just raised the question - What about GSA participation in this decision-making as to what happens in the Regional Office in Nairobi - what happens in terms of these various approaches to staff functions. My

reply to this has been - that one needs to separate very clearly the process by which we come to the conclusion as to what staff functions are required and what staff need to perform these functions. In that, UNICEF has, I suspect, the most participatory open system in the world, than any other major agency. But we do this through involving those who are functionally responsible for the staff. So as many of you remember we began a process two years ago whereby two bienniums- the biennium before this one is coming up where Mr. Knutsson and Mr. D'Agati and the whole team went to the field. And before they met in the Regional Offices, each representative conducted his review in his own country situation - then they came and met in their regional office and then there was the meeting with the team from New York which included all the major functions and I consider this to be really quite an unprecedented accomplishment for a global organization to have this much interaction.

The second task of course, is that once the decisions are made - how to implement them and it is in this arena that the global staff association, has a major important significant role and in which we out very closely with them as to how so that staff participate in the first process to their functional responsibilities or they participate in the second through their GSA chairman. Let me also mention what happened since we last met in October was that we had our biennial meeting of the Joint Boards of UNICEF and the World Health Assembly as most of you know - every two years a selected number of Board Members from UNICEF and the World Health Assembly meet to discuss our joint efforts and policies. This was, I think a very unusual, even better than usual session - much agreement on the complementarity of the two organizations. It was grossly overemphasised by Dr. Mahler at the end of the session, when he said -maybe I shouldn't say this one....its rather devastating - but having gone this far - he said WHO knows everything but does nothing - UNICEF knows nothing but does everything. Another organization who goes un-named knows nothing and does nothing - And in a grossly overempathised way the distinction between WHO and UNICEF is a correct one. I see everybody wincing in the front row - UNICEF is much more of a doer agency and WHO is much more of a policy - broad policy - without the same responsibility of doing - And we get a lot of policy wisdom out of doing things and they get their advice out of being a highly technical body in the form of all the Ministries of Health that make up the WHO. The notable among the outcomes of the meeting was the fact that, really for the first time in the last 4 - 5 years - I think there is a genuine meshing of the two organizations and agreement on social mobilization, child survival revolution, the health for all - how these all fit together - and there is agreement today between the two organizations - that frankly a principio dynamic for the next 10-15 years is to capacity for social mobilization. And that mobilizing all for "Health for all" is really the common theme we will be working on and that initially the cutting edge of that mobilizing all for health for all will be the immunization effort. They were two other issues that came up that I think I was noting - one because of its personal applicability to all of us - the other because of its potential - One was AIDS - there was serious discussion on the AIDS question. AIDS is one of those issues which commands a tremendous amount of media attention - in the sense it isn't that serious yet globally - one day's toll from diarrhoea around the world with small children is roughly equal to all known deaths to today around

the world - so that's one scale and on the other hand it is very clear that the AIDS issue is becoming rapidly worse and unlike diarrhoea, increasingly is affecting all elements of society. And it is threatening our immunization effort in some ways because one of the ways of transmitting AIDS is as you know through the use of needles. And I should go back and say the 4 major ways of transmitting AIDS - one is through sexual intercourse which can be largely met if one doesn't want to go through the known through condoms - the second, is through blood transfusion which can be met in very large part through screening of blood which is now pretty well prevalent in industrial countries - but is a serious problem in many developing countries, in Africa. Third through needles - and fourth about half of the mothers who have HIV - almost half of those children who are born to those mothers will get it. Now in our case the particular point of concern is the needles used in immunization and Jonathan Mann of WHO who is in charge of the greatly expanded massive AIDS effort is very definitive on the fact that all information to date indicates that the immunization programmes have not contributed to this process and when you think about it there are some reasons for this - one, the level of incidence is very low among infants - second, the immunization programmes are around the world run, in a much more sanitary sterile basis than are most immunizations - one study for example, in Zaire showed that children, small children in this area in Zaire received 44 injections a year and the great majority of these obviously after they get sick from almost any cause they go to whatever form of health treatment they get - indigenous doctors, the health system - the two things obviously used are first the sound of their chest and second they take an injection - and this does represent a serious danger because there is very little quality control on the sterilization process. Fourth, immunization itself raises very little blood. The injection on the buttock doesn't usually result in blood movement so there too the are modest. But it was agreed that worldwide we need to have the strictest policy on implementing the concept of one sterile needle - one sterile syringe - and that otherwise we do face the danger that with this growing problem it could considerably adversely affect our whole immunization effort.

The second topic of was the discussion of smoking or health - as you know the World Health Assembly has passed a resolution calling on all organizations to accompany the WHO in giving up smoking in the office premises. And we have issued the guidelines on this now. It is interesting to me that within the WHO the region that started the snowball on this was the Pan American Health Organization and I suspect the Pan Americans and the Latin Americans must be the heaviest smokers in the world - certainly more than Europeans - but they did take the lead in this and they took it in a lead that there is no smoking anywhere in the PAHO building - You can go on the roof or you can go on the street but you can't do it anywhere in the building. We will have a question of how do we ourselves adapt to this - the instructions gone out says that we should implement our own practice on this no later than May 7th when frankly we will be required by law. It is interesting to me that on this area of smoking on the premises, the momentum has been gathering slowly but suddenly we have an avalanche on this and if you would have asked me a year ago a largely smoke-free place by next

January, I would have said absolutely not - or that the Federal buildings across the country of United States would be largely smoke-free, I would have doubted very much. But this is going on and we now face the case that nearly as of May 7th by New York Law, since we are not officed within UN property, we are compelled to move in this direction. So the question is how do we move. For some of you who know him, I think you will be pleased to hear that as of the middle of January, one of our notable exponents of the value of smoking - who was good for several packs a day - David Haxton - gave up the habit - now if we will all think very positively I hope we can keep him on that pact.

Let me mention two other events before I close my comments - one is that the Board at it's last session told us to give much more attention to children in especially difficult circumstances. And you will all remember, that there is interest growing in the Board dealing with children in wartime circumstances - street children in particular in Latin America, and it was against this background that this practice started in 1985 in El Salvador where 3 times they stopped the war to immunize the children - a practice which they started when they learned more children died because they had not been immunized and everybody killed in all the fighting in 1984. And it was nice to see this repeated in 1986. And I was just down there 2 weeks ago for them to start the third years cycle of days of tranquillity to immunize their children. Its notable that these 2 years alone have already saved the lives of and prevented the crippling of more than 10,000 children - this increased immunization. And this exceeds the total of casualties in the war in 1985 and 1986 and we are very proud of what our colleagues are doing. This push from the Board, has also caused us to take a very much closer look at the situation in Southern Africa where the apartheid question is coming increasingly to the fore and while most of the question is on the situation in South Africa itself, it is quite clear from our few reports that by far the greatest impact is on the front line states who are really on the front line, at the friction edge of the world's confrontation with South Africa over it's apartheid policies. And it was three weeks ago, I believe, that I released in London an excellent report done by our own staff with some outside consultants on the situation of children on the front line. And it is noteworthy that in these 9 states with some 70 million people - 3.5 million children are born each year and nearly 800,000 of those children die before the age of 5. And in the two countries in which we were able to analyze carefully, out of their roughly 340,000 child deaths, 143,000 of these child deaths were attributed to the consequences of the confrontation with South Africa and those issues that come up including all the economic consequences, the military destabilization that is going on in both Mozambique and Angola. And this will continue to remain quite in the fore of our attention and is the principal reason, why on the 1st of February we transferred Angola from being part of the West Africa Region to the East and Southern Africa Region so that all 9 frontline states would be in the same regional structure...as well as putting the two major Portugese speaking language states in the same region.

The final thing I want to mention is to take this occasion to say Thank You All for your unbelievable contributions in 1986 - not only to our 40th anniversary year and an extremely successful SOWCR, but also for Sport Aid,

First Earth Run which as I indicated earlier, were major events which were not our workplan for 1986 at the start of the year - they got added later. And produced a really significant impact in terms of opinion on the governments that met here at the General Assembly in May on Africa and also was the biggest single event of the Year of Peace. Children need peace for the International year of peace - And I think we can take a lot of pride and get a lot of satisfaction from that innovation - the major question is having put our pole into the water, in a major way on these global events exemplified by Sport Aid one, and by First Earth Run, - what do we plan to do with it in the future. And there are very serious discussions underway about starting a new process that will be done jointly with the International Amateur Athletics Federation and the League of Red Cross & Red Crescent Societies to launch in 1988 and thereafter global sporting mechanisms for people to show their solidarity with children first - child survival - particularly immunization by 1990 - And if we are successful, this will also pull in the Olympics and the FIFA the Football Federation into a grand alliance for participation in some quarters of our childrens' interests which hopefully will also have major financial consequences of a beneficial sort. With that, let me ask Karl-Eric - do you want to add anything to this at this moment?

KEK.....U. House

GSA.....

JPG -

Okay I thought I had addressed some of this - the starting point would be to stress I think is what we have learnt in the 80s - what everybody has learned is that there is no certainty other than change. This has been the decade that virtually every organization which started had a degree of certainty, has woken up to find that it didn't have certainty - whether it was the United Nations with its assessed contributions or Caterpillar Tractor Company or Saudi Arabia OPEC countries - all of us have faced the fact that this is in the decade of hard realities. I think UNICEF can take satisfaction from the fact that we began the adjustment to these realities in 1981-82 - 1982 was really the period - in 1981, the Board really gave us a rather hard knock over the head with a two by four and we heard it - and out of this UNICEF did two things, one was to come up with the beginning of a real tightening up of the organization of which the supply consolidation in Copenhagen was the most dramatic example of what we were deploying very heavily into Africa or largely very heavily through savings - now at the same time programmatically, we came up with the concepts of child survival revolution, adjustment with a human face - which were very responsive to the programmatic changes of the times. So that you have in UNICEF I think an organization which is fundamentally in a much sounder position than a great many organizations. We have been making the adjustment to change circumstances. And in this sense, one can have a sense of confidence in UNICEF..... interesting enough, during this period core staff has remained basically tight and we have some reduction actually over the levels of two

years ago. We do have 50% more staff in UNICEF than when I came....more than 50%and this indicates that on our project posts side and our field posts side, we have had a dramatic set of increases....one sees that if you address core post advancement, it is relatively tight....that in the project posts there is a great deal of flexibility and increasing opportunity but not the assurance of job security that comes out of having a core post. That is a difficult trade off for those of you who want to leave and the great increase of these posts in the field. Our HQ staff has remained essentially constant in terms of numbers over the last several years....and probably over the next several years. While I think we can foresee that the few posts will continue to go up particularly in Africa. I would hope that in so far as individuals are concerned, the feedback for those of you who are in functional divisions, you will get that from your Section Chiefs. They know where that section is going and you are placed in it. For those of you who are in a process of transition, obviously, it is another issue and one on which we are trying to work with the GSA to make sure that the process is as effective as possible.... Manou do you want to add anything to that?....

KEK.....

MA - First I would like to go back to the first concern that was raised - the security.....There is no security anywhere. Name me one organization in the UN, the Government Service, a Company, a Corporation - that the day one joins says Here you are, you remain until you have done 30 or 40 years - and here you are you will get promotions every 6 months or every 6 years - and this is your career pass - this is what you are going to be in 15 years - UNICEF is no exceptionSecondly I wrote to one of our ^{sometime ago} that what makes you believe that anybody who joins UNICEF has to succeed and remain until 30 years until retirement. Some of us will have to drop - either now or later....the post is not there....the project post - the very fact is that it is for a limited period financed from a non-administrative budget. Therefore there is never a guarantee that that post will continue for 30 years. Even the core posts, that were 2 years ago, we see this year that some of them have to be abolished because there are a number of reasons - whether there is a need for that - 30 years ago many of us who joined UNICEF didn't