

MOBILITY USER EXPERIENCE RESEARCH STUDY: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Submitted by

Susan Stuart, *User Experience Research Consultant for DHR*

June 14, 2019



Table of Contents

Overview	01
About the Participants.....	01
Mobility’s Goals and Rationale.....	02
Managed Rotation Exercise Impact on Staff Well Being	03
Clarity of the Mobility Policy + Procedures.....	04
Timing Issues	05
Application + Hiring Process.....	06
Perceived Biases in the Candidate Selection Process	07
Reassignment Outcomes	09
Career Development.....	09
Relocation and Acclimation	10
Personal Life and Challenges for Specific Populations (by Gender, Sexual Orientation, Nationality, and Family Situation).....	12
UN Context	13
Summary.....	14

Overview

A User Experience Research and Analysis project was undertaken at UNICEF from January to June 2019 to explore International Professional (IP) staff's perceptions and experiences of the Mobility policy and program, along with those of P6/ D1/ D2 managers of IP staff. The calls for participation in the study stated a need for staff input to help improve the Mobility program; therefore, problem areas and potential improvements to the Mobility program are the focus of this study.

Quantitative and qualitative methodologies, including surveys, focus groups, and interviews, were used to gather data on staff's views around the world, both in-person and remotely. Secondary (background) research was also conducted. The objective of this study was to inform future discussions, analyses, and ideation on improvements to the Mobility policy, process, and communications.

About the Participants

The calls for participation were met with a strong response, both to the survey and the invitation to attend focus groups. In fact, the participant numbers for the focus groups and interviews far exceeded those normally deemed necessary for qualitative research, reinforcing confidence levels in the exhaustiveness and validity of the findings, even for a group as diverse as UNICEF IP staff.

Survey responses received:

- 1231 from IP staff, with nearly 3,000 comments submitted and reviewed
- 15 from P6/ D1/ D2 managers of IP staff

Staff interviewed:

- 110 IP staff in focus groups or one-to-one
- 14 HR staff in a workshop or one-to-one
- 6 D1/ D2 managers of IP staff
- Senior management staff members at DHR, as well as all Regional Chiefs of Human Resources
- Additional senior management in the Supply Division, along with a staff member who has conducted an independent study of Mobility with Supply staff

The response from IP staff to the survey was quite balanced and representative regionally (respondent numbers were: 199 in WCAR, 230 in ESAR, 46 in ECAR, 118 in MENAR, 97 in SAR, 99 in EAPRO, 50 in LACRO, 235 in New York, 67 in Copenhagen, 76 in Geneva, 1 in Washington). The gender balance of respondents was 50.28%



women, 49.07% men, with 8 respondents self-identifying as gender-variant/ non-conforming. Fifty-three women and forty-nine men attended IP staff focus groups/ interviews. Staff who participated are serving in duty stations with all levels of hardship (“H,” “A,” “B,” “C,” “D,” and “E”), some in remote or isolated locations, and represent a wide spread of grade levels and functional areas (with 35 staff members responding from HR). Participants reported varying personal circumstances, years of service, and career ambitions. We committed to not including any staff member names in our final report, so they could feel comfortable expressing their views openly.

All IP staff were invited to participate in the study, whether or not they had yet rotated, as we were interested in perceptions from all staff subject to the policy.

A substantial number of staff who had participated in the managed rotation exercise (or were currently participating) gave detailed feedback on their experiences.

Representatives from two staff groups were also interviewed: The Global Staff Association and The Gender PUSH Initiative.

The summary that follows highlights key themes that have emerged consistently throughout the research.



Mobility's Goals and Rationale

Opinions about the goals and rationale for Mobility at UNICEF were somewhat varied, but tended to center around the following three, offered by senior management in DHR:

- Broadening of skillsets globally (73.49% of survey respondents agreed)
- Equitable sharing of UNICEF's responsibilities and opportunities (63.86% of survey respondents agreed)
- Breaking down “silos”—better understanding between all locations and functions (62.31% of survey respondents agreed)

In the qualitative research (focus groups and interviews) and survey comments, many staff were hyper-focused on the second goal, which can be seen as one of the more challenging to achieve. Many staff felt that the current rotation exercise outcomes of multiple “H” to “H” and “E” to “E” movements was not in line with true Mobility.

Staff also were just as likely to cite the need for new challenges, fresh perspectives, the spreading of knowledge (being a medium of knowledge and tested methodologies), avoiding stagnation and boredom, diversity, as well as “going where the organization needs you to go” as being fundamental reasons for Mobility.

Staff agreed that increasing UNICEF’s agility to move between developmental and humanitarian mandates was also a valid reason for Mobility, but to a lesser extent, with a survey agreement response of 53.96%. Finally, 28.06% of respondents agreed that safeguarding against fraud was a clear and compelling reason for Mobility; in the qualitative research, staff mentioned a related reason—the importance of making sure positions of influence and power weren’t held by the same people for too long—similar to government and politics.

When the topic of the uniqueness of the International Professional category was probed, few staff members mentioned specific examples of how they leverage international experience in their daily work. Instead, examples occasionally arose while discussing the importance of field experience to headquarters duty station service, and how a lack of such experience can result in not grasping certain basics of UNICEF’s field work—such as working relationships between IP and National Officer (NO) staff. Additionally, some staff mentioned a lack of field experience as potentially impacting critical deliverables and outputs—such as policies, workflows and documentation for field offices—in a negative manner.

Staff members occasionally mentioned, or hinted at, suspected hidden agendas for the Mobility program, such as managing low-performing staff out of the organization. Only a few staff members were unable to see any rationale at all for Mobility, though many felt that strictly mandated Mobility was not in the best interests of staff, UNICEF, nor the children UNICEF serves. Others felt that

Mobility should be more strictly mandated than it is currently, especially in terms exceptions (such as deferments or non-rotational posts), and wanted to see leaders at UNICEF “walk the talk” when it comes to Mobility—specifically in terms of service in higher hardship duty stations. There were a few reports of managers “ticking the box” on high hardship duty station service, as they delegated most of their responsibilities to other staff members while there.

Managed Rotation Exercise Impact on Staff Well Being

Regardless of whether or not they agreed with the aforementioned goals and rationale of Mobility at UNICEF, many staff members felt that the current Mobility program was not meeting UNICEF’s objectives. The Global Staff Association cited increasing the well-being of staff in “E,” “D,” and “C” duty stations as a primary impetus for the Mobility mandate, but the program seems to be falling short in this respect currently, with the added pressures of stricter deadlines, more competition, and potential separation; it has also been reported to decrease the well-being of other duty station staff for the same reasons. Staff reported increased stress, fear, uncertainty, awkward peer pressures to either support or resist Mobility or avoid the rotation exercise all together, and loss of productive work time or R&R time due to application pressures. Even staff members that had a good outcome from the rotation exercise often expressed that the collective experience was negative, with many of their colleagues terrified of rotation. Other staff members described being on rotation as “humiliating,” and many of its impacts as “demoralizing.”

Clarity of the Mobility Policy + Procedures

While staff varied in their understanding of the Mobility policy and its corresponding rules, guidelines, and procedures, almost all staff felt uncertain about how the candidate selection process worked, including the relationship between hiring office, regional office, functional area, and DHR inputs. Additionally, many staff members were unsure how their Tour of Duty end date determined their inclusion in the managed rotation exercise.

The basic architecture of the Mobility program was found to be counterintuitive to many staff as they tried to grasp how the Mobility program works, its potential outcomes, as well as advantages and disadvantages of waiting for rotation.

- Staff were unsure whether or not to wait to be included in the managed rotation exercise, as there are advantages and disadvantages associated with either action. Some took DHR's advice to try to avoid the exercise as doctrine, while others saw rotation as a career opportunity for cross-functional moves or advancement. The paradox of a key guideline for end of Tour of Duty as the ultimate rule of rotation, versus the advice to not wait for the end of Tour of Duty, caused confusion.
- Basic mental models of what it means to have a contract with UNICEF were conflicting, with many staff feeling that they had signed up "for my current post only," versus those who think their contracts with UNICEF are to "go where the organization needs me to go." The survey found that 61% of IP staff respondents were aware of the requirement for Mobility prior to employment, and 39% were not.
- The concept of rotation as "managed" (per the "managed rotation exercise") caused problems in its interpretation. Many staff members interpreted this name to mean that "DHR will manage this for me,"—or, on the other hand—that "management is using a heavy hand by mandating this."

There was some confusion around some rotation jargon, such as "rotation panel," or "unplaced" versus "displaced." The concept of a minimum versus maximum Tour of Duty—specifically, the window of time between—was also not always clear to staff.

Some hiring managers expressed confusion around flexibility in candidate selection, or exactly how they should be expected to help current staff members who needed to rotate.



Many staff expressed that communications throughout the managed rotation exercise, such as status updates, were not frequent enough, and applicants generally felt they didn't receive sufficient feedback from hiring offices. Many staff complained of a lack of transparency in the managed rotation process and application of the Mobility rules, but this point was usually made in reference to perceived bias, which is discussed later. Guidelines around deferments and non-rotational posts were difficult for staff to find (both of these were often mentally grouped under the same category of "exceptions" by IP staff), and Mobility program information was generally perceived as too lengthy and scattered. While the staff notification timeline was seen a good example of a concise type of reference document that IP staff applicants and hiring managers appreciated, the timeline itself was sometimes seen as a bit misleading and incomplete. Many staff were surprised that separation, in particular, might be an outcome for them. Some also indicated the tone of some communications were lacking in sensitivity.

While staff who attended the webinars appreciated them, and Yammer communications were generally received well (except when critical status information was not able to be delivered), staff expressed a desire for a better orientation to Mobility, more concise "tool kits" or "one-pagers" to explain its rules, guidelines, and expectations.

Timing Issues

The managed rotation exercise was generally seen as taking too long, especially because of the high stakes and uncertainty around the potential outcome. Additionally, most staff members wanted to know their reassignments much further in advance (even 1-2 years). There were quite a few perceptions that UNICEF's managed rotation wasn't



timed with the school year, even though that is currently the intent (for northern hemisphere staff). Some staff members commented that international schools often have deadlines in the spring and the reassignment announcement, with its current schedule, can easily miss these deadlines.

Several staff members asked about the possibility of being included earlier or later in the rotation exercise, and didn't understand the lack of flexibility, particularly for being included earlier—though these staff admitted they weren't sure of the necessity of being on rotation as a full commitment—if they would be required to give up their posts at the end of the exercise (unless another staff member wasn't found for their posts).

Staff were split on whether the rotation exercise should be done more frequently, or less frequently, with staff in "C," "D," and "E" duty stations generally in favor of a more frequent exercise.

Application + Hiring Process

The Mobility program has incorporated a competitive application and hiring process that has proven problematic in many cases, according to IP staff. Staff generally feel that Mobility the current process is time-consuming, inconsistent, and untrustworthy, whether one waits for the managed rotation exercise or not. Some staff in E duty stations reported having to spend their R&R working on applications. Many staff felt it is unfair (or even insulting) to be asked to retest for the same level post—and even the nature of the test or reported results have been perceived to be “rigged,” so as to exclude the consideration of staff members by managers who have decided in advance they wanted a specific candidate.

Some staff were understandably confused by why their applications and qualifications (with solid Performance Evaluation Reviews (PERs), and even fifteen years of experience, for example) were not receiving more attention and follow-up, even after a year of applying. Various interviewing practices that lacked professionalism and integrity were reported by IP staff. For example, quite a few staff members reported being invited to “chats” by hiring managers, with very little notice, only to be told at the end of the session they actually just completed an interview, and that no further discussion about the position would be had.

Some IP and P6/ D1/ D2 hiring managers openly discussed concerns about low performing staff at UNICEF, leading them to be suspicious of internal candidate pools, and wanting their posts to be opened up to external hires. Hiring managers generally seemed risk-adverse when it came to hiring (process?) at UNICEF, due to the “results-driven” mandate, and general distrust of the accuracy of the PERs. Some reported behavioral issues from internal hires. Many staff, both applicants and hiring managers, felt that the PERs are not an effective tool in building trust between

potential managers and applicants. The new Performance Improvement Program (PIP), while winning accolades from one manager, were said to be unreasonably time-consuming by others. Some managers felt the demand to consider so many pools of internal staff (abolished posts pool, talent pools, and now the rotation pool) before focusing on qualifications was adversely affecting appropriate candidate selection.

Throughout the qualitative research, participants would speak primarily from one side of the hiring issue—as an applicant or hiring manager. Interestingly, when staff were prompted to speak from both sides of this issue, there was an admission of “being an accomplice” in the hiring scenario at UNICEF, again, largely because of lack of trust around the PERs. One hiring manager admitted “someone needs to stop me from [hiring only inside my comfort zone].” Another alluded that some PER problems were due to typically long work hours at UNICEF and the focus only on results and objectives, to the exclusion of exceptional amounts of effort often asked of staff members.

On the other hand, one manager reported getting good results from proactively giving opportunities to staff members who had gotten a “bad rap,” which won admiration from other managers in the room, and led to another participant commenting that “UNICEF does not teach management skills.” Some hiring managers asked if additional reassurance in the form of remedies for dismissals or other actions could be given in the Mobility system, should a staff member they hired turn out to be a low performer.

Comparisons were noted by some staff to the SSRE, which avoids a competitive process all together, provides personalized matching, and gives staff members more notice for moves.

Perceived Biases in the Candidate Selection Process

Biases of various sorts were perceived by a large number of IP staff to exist in the candidate selection process for Mobility (and some apply to UNICEF in general). These were conveyed both through survey comments and in the focus groups and interviews.

Stigmatization of the Managed Rotation Exercise

One of the primary biases negatively impacting Mobility at UNICEF is a pervasive rumor around the managed rotation exercise—specifically, that it is lacking in quality of both candidates and posts. Some managers reported viewing much

of the rotation pool as full of staff who didn't put any effort into applying for posts until the “last minute,” or having candidates no one else wants. On the flip side, many candidates reported that the pool contained a lack of good posts (yet, posts outside the exercise were also perceived to be dwindling in number). Though there are many examples of these perceived biases against candidates and posts on rotation being clearly untrue, the biases seem to especially disadvantage “D” and “E” duty station staff, who simply do not have much time or opportunity to apply for posts outside of the exercise.

Networking + “Club of Friends” Culture

While breaking down regional “silos” was confirmed by most staff to be a clear and compelling rationale for Mobility at UNICEF, the Mobility program seems to fall short in breaking down other silos, such as cross-functional ones. But one other key issue emerged around the challenge of silos at UNICEF as a result of this study: the “clubs of friends” silos that seem to be preventing Mobility from taking place in an effective way. In fact, the Mobility program in its current form might even be making these kinds of silos worse, as staff have been advised to view networking as an essential part of seeking out opportunities, either before or during the formal Mobility exercise.

Staff in the managed rotation exercise have reported significant consequences and high frustration as a result of the networking aspect of Mobility, which was viewed as in conflict with a values-based organization like UNICEF. Consequences included skepticism around whether posts inside (or outside) the exercise were already informally filled, and having to “waste” ranked preferences and application time on such posts. Deferrals and non-rotational posts were commonly viewed as existing mostly, or exclusively, for those in “H” duty stations with good networks.



Regional Directors, Country Representatives, and Deputy Representatives were often seen as holding an inappropriate amount of power and influence over candidate selection. Many IP staff expressed discontent about the pressure to find a senior staff member to “sponsor” them (lobby on their behalf) for a particular post; this custom is viewed by many as part of an unhealthy “Old Boys/ Old Girls Club” culture at UNICEF, and was described, even by newer staff who had a good outcome from rotation, as something they were unpleasantly surprised to see existing at UNICEF to the degree that it does. Some staff who spoke primarily from a managerial perspective also tended to agree that there is too much “cliquishness” at UNICEF. Additionally, a few staff members commented that such a culture, in combination with the current Mobility policy and process, might increase the risk of abuse of power by management.

Emergency Versus Non-Emergency

Many staff reported feeling that they were “labeled” or perceived as able to work only in Emergency or Non-emergency settings by hiring managers, which therefore greatly limits their options for movement between the two. It is important to note that, while the attention has been primarily on staff in “E” (and “D”) duty stations not having ample opportunity to move to “H/ A” duty stations, staff in “H/ A” duty stations also expressed that they aren’t being fairly considered for field positions either. Some staff members mentioned an additional concern that while UNICEF needs talented people to go into the field, including into some of the most difficult locations, the perception at UNICEF is that being assigned to such a location implies a poor judgement by the organization on the overall performance of the staff member, which stigmatizes such a move.



Transparency

Lack of transparency was a key theme in staff perceptions of Mobility, mostly discussed in relationship to non-rotational posts and deferments, but also placements, and even promotions or demotions. In other words, staff were suspicious about the rationale for exceptions and assignments, and the lack of reported data of Mobility’s outcomes (and rationale for those outcomes) was seen as problematic. The rotation panel was often viewed with suspicion as well—like a “black box”—which has led to many rumors and increased stress levels. Furthermore, lack of transparency was also seen as a problem with hiring offices inaccurately reflecting their stages of application review, shortlisting, and selection, which has led many staff to believe, again, that “private deals” and lateral “swaps” were taking place.

Reassignment Outcomes

While some staff indicated positive reassignment outcomes either from taking part in the managed rotation exercise, or from applying to posts outside the exercise, many felt there were insufficient suitable posts available within the rotation pool, and that outside of it, the number of suitable posts had greatly diminished as well. The lack of potential posts was reported to result in staff members accepting positions that were not a good match—on either a professional or personal level—or in potential separation, or other uncertainties. Some staff members suggested that better matching algorithms be developed and applied, but others felt that, under the current system, the potential for suitable outcomes for all would still be limited.

Many staff members felt that rotation still had too much of a “lottery” nature, due to the timing of the end of the Tour of Duty being the only determinant of posts being available at any given time. There was disagreement about whether staff on abolished posts should be added to the rotation pool, as doing so increases the number of staff competing for posts, but the issue of suitability goes beyond just numbers. Some staff reported positions being vacated, only to find that there were no suitable candidates to fill them for many months.

Career Development

The majority of staff participating in the study felt that career development should be a top priority of Mobility at UNICEF, and needed to be taken much more seriously. However, there was a debate that Mobility—perhaps in relation to its goal of making UNICEF staff more agile in moving between humanitarian and development mandates—was also creating too many generalists (“jacks of all trades, masters of none”), and reducing the number of specialists. Having too many generalists was sometimes argued to disadvantage UNICEF as a whole, and to also disadvantage staff who may eventually need to separate, because specialists still seem to be more highly valued in a modern workforce.

While some staff expressed appreciation of career coaching options provided at UNICEF, many staff wanted more career path conversations, with more flexibility on rotation, directly linked to Mobility. Some staff believed this alone would create many more voluntary movements, without the need to mandate movement so strictly at a given time—a practice that many staff feel disrupts careers, and sometimes, important projects, work efforts, and the accountability associated with them.

Functional Area Issues

Some staff reported mis-categorizations of the primary functional area assigned to their profiles or feeling forced to rotate into a because of their associated functional area that does not at all represent the actual focus of their work (or, in some cases, their advanced educational degree, such as a PhD). Some staff took issue with classifications of their title and functional area as a result of a process that was “not human enough,” assigned only by Systems Analysts.

Other staff expressed that the same job title could have completely different duties depending on

location, which would seem to indicate the staff in these posts are not interchangeable. Some staff felt that certain functional areas seem to require Mobility (especially the interplay between field and HQ experience it brings) more than others.

Cross-Functional Movement

There were no staff who felt that moving cross-functionally is adequately supported by the Mobility program, despite its mention in the policy, or at UNICEF in general. Yet several staff interviewed were primarily interested in cross-functional moves.

Inter-Agency Movement

Again, no staff felt there was support provided for inter-agency Mobility, despite its mention in the Mobility policy. But such support was seen as a way to possibly help staff who want or need to stay in one location longer.

Promotions + Lateral Moves

Most staff saw rotation as providing lateral move opportunities only, despite quite a few promotional moves that have happened during each rotation exercise. However, there were a few staff who viewed rotation primarily as providing them with promotion possibilities, only to become greatly disappointed at the outcome of the managed rotation exercise.

There was a general lack of understanding of how lateral moves or “swaps” between duty stations fit into Mobility—whether or not they were officially allowed (or should be). Some staff admitted they intend to keep doing lateral moves at same duty station to avoid rotation. One staff member wondered about the timing of the managed rotation exercise for those hoping for a promotion into P6/ D1/ D2 levels, as it is not timed with the SSRE.

Relocation and Acclimation

Those who were strongly vocal about this issue most often spoke of lack of time off between duty stations at the biggest challenge they faced. Many staff wanted two weeks minimum, not part of annual leave, to deal with uprooting from one country and settling into another. There were some gender patterns found, as women seemed to be bearing the burden of logistics and coordination of housing, schooling, caregiving, and so forth, more often and to a greater degree than men. Women living alone also communicated more concerns around safety in choosing a residence and transport options.

Quite a bit of variance was reported in logistical and acclimation support provided by UNICEF, dependent mostly on the duty station—but there was even a wide disparity in the relocation experience within the same duty station (from no support at all, to the best support yet at



UNICEF). Many staff said that information around relocation logistics were shared informally only, through personal networks, and that staff groups usually had to collate resources into information packets themselves. Senior staff were perceived by some IP staff to receive more support of the kind IP staff could benefit from as well, such as training on political context (including tolerance needed to certain views), living conditions, and cultural primers. In general, staff felt there should be a better repository of duty station information, which should especially provide details on hardship and family status classification issues; on occasion, lack of knowledge of these led to detrimental impacts felt by staff members' children.

Onboarding with GSSC was reported to be smooth, and small country offices were said to generally offer the best welcome and support. In terms of work transitions, however, induction and onboarding are seen as sorely lacking across UNICEF, and some staff members mentioned wanting a mandatory in-person or Skype handoff between rotations.

Other requests were:

- Language courses for staff and families of staff
- Help with logistics: housing, school (or even provided housing), nanny, determining level of medical and psychological services available
- More transparency on entitlements (like a car being provided)
- Counseling or written guides on adjusting to very new environments
- Maps for remote areas
- Flexi-work (transitional telework)
- Grace period/ ramp-up period
- Banking support (fluctuations of exchange rate can be problematic for non-US/ European staff needing income proof for housing contracts)
- Better explanation of education grants
- Buddy system as mandatory
- Reassessment of the assistance needed for individuals versus families
- Shipping help, support groups, help with pets, help with drivers licenses and utilities



Personal Life and Challenges for Specific Populations (by Gender, Sexual Orientation, Nationality, and Family Situation)

Staff expressed concerns about the effect of the Mobility program on specific populations, such as women, the LGBT community, staff of certain nationalities, and staff with families. However, staff also discussed the high demand that Mobility places on everyone's personal life, and some felt that bias based on personal life issues has led to unfairness in the outcomes of reassignments.

Issues discussed included: Mobility's impact on marriage and partnership stability (spousal employment being ranked as a high concern among those with spouses, and with occasional data requests around divorce rates or family mental health); the challenge of creating and uprooting social networks; caregiving for extended family, general personal stability; and, of course, challenges with raising children. Most staff agreed that Mobility works best for couples with one working spouse and no children—an uncommon scenario.

Staff also agreed that Mobility can bring great personal rewards, such as cultural enrichment and greater adaptability skills, and career advantages for those wanting to stay in international careers.

The following are the specific populations that have reported Mobility to be especially challenging:

- single parents, particularly those with legal obligations to stay geographically close to their dependents to access visitation or custody privileges
- married staff members, including UNICEF couples

- parents with young children in formative years
- parents with children in high school who want to minimize educational disruption
- LGBT staff, who experience additional challenges around spousal employment and harassment or targeting at certain duty station locations
- women, who are often primary caregivers, with partners less likely to follow them in a career move (especially women of certain nationalities), and experience harassment and targeting to a higher degree than men in some duty station locations
- single staff members who have noted greater difficulties in creating personal networks in many duty station locations, especially as compared to staff with children in international schools, where natural bonds are often created

Though family issues were often at the center of personal life impact debates, no easy answers emerged in this study for UNICEF, where staff's family concerns are equally shared around the globe, and which has a mandate to work in very difficult locations.

According to the survey responses, [by a margin of 5-10% \(depending on the wording of the question\), women](#) felt, [more than men](#), that Mobility was not fair and equitable as it stands, were less confident about cross-functional candidacy, and that Mobility was not useful, or less useful, to their careers. Women also had 5-10% more concern about family impacts than men (again, depending on the exact wording of the question), although, according to the survey responses, there are 18% more men than women with dependents among IP staff.

There were quite a few women and men who would prefer to continue with "E" to "E" duty station rotations—a movement pattern that Mobility is aiming to limit—precisely because of

personal circumstances. These staff members felt the stress levels from doing so were manageable, compared to the stress they would experience by being several flights away from their families, for instance—or the stress of separation.

UN Context

There were quite a few requests from staff members to analyze other agencies' Mobility programs, as their Mobility programs were generally—though not always—seen as having fewer complaints (this was said of other international organizations as well). Some staff also felt that Mobility might be best discussed within the context of UN reform with a view toward inter-agency movement strategies.

There were a few reported perceptions that Mobility at the UN dates back to 1950's when many societies were quite different, particularly in terms of gender roles, but documentation on this history could not be uncovered. Secondary research revealed various efforts to increase Mobility dating back as far as the early 1990's.



Summary

2019 marks the fourth year of the 'revitalized' mobility exercise at UNICEF. Since the reintroduction of the Mobility Exercise in 2016 the Mobility team has worked continuously to improve the process and more importantly the staff experience. In that respect, the Mobility User Experience (UX) project, completed in early 2019, provided an opportunity for the team to identify whether or not the goals and needs of UNICEF and UNICEF staff members are being fulfilled through mobility. It was also an opportunity to detect and map potential pain points and ultimately identify implementable ideas to redesign the programme to better meet the needs and strategic priorities of the organization as a whole. The UX project provided valuable insight into staff perceptions around mobility and laid out a road map that UNICEF can leverage to develop a more holistic approach to talent mobility.

This will be an ongoing journey, and change will take time. While we continue to make improvements in the 2019 exercise we are targeting 2020 for major changes. The intent is to transform mobility from its' current state of an annual, reactive exercise to a more proactive, ongoing talent mobility framework. We plan to have a forward looking horizon (2-3 years out) and proactively build career and skills development, career mapping, training etc into the process.

We will be redefining how the mobility team supports staff in the new, on-going Talent Mobility framework with the hope that mobility is seen as an opportunity to grow and develop, rather than a "must do".



for every child