



Leadership & Talent Development in International Organizations



A CCL / AHRMIO Review of Current
and Future Practice and Expectations

The Center for **Creative Leadership (CCL)** is a top-ranked, global provider of executive education that develops better leaders through its exclusive focus on leadership education and research. Founded in 1970 as a not-for-profit, educational institution, CCL helps clients worldwide cultivate creative leadership – the capacity to achieve more than imagined by thinking and acting beyond boundaries – through an array of programmes, products and other services.

CCL is headquartered in Greensboro, North Carolina, with campuses in Colorado Springs, San Diego, Brussels, Singapore and Moscow. Its work is supported by more than 400 faculty members and staff. www.ccl.org

The Association for Human Resources Management in International Organizations (AHRMIO) is the pre-eminent global forum where information is exchanged on practices at the cutting edge of human resource management in the international environment and where HR practitioners develop their professional expertise to enhance their effectiveness. AHRMIO provides ideas and solutions to support the strategic development of international organizations by bringing together specialists from those organizations with private sector practitioners and distinguished academics. Founded in 2000, the Association's membership covers a broad range of international organizations (the UN family, other governmental organizations, international finance institutions and a number of NGOs), together with a growing number of HRM specialists as individual members. www.ahrmio.org

This review was prepared by the Europe, Middle East & Africa headquarters of the Center for Creative Leadership in Brussels.

Created, written and researched by Mike Johnson.

Center for Creative Leadership
Avenue de Tervueren / Tervurenlaan 270
B-1150 Brussels, Belgium
(+32) (0)2 679 0910
www.ccl.org

Enquiries and additional copies of the report:
Sarah Basha bashas@ccl.org

Association for Human Resources Management in International Organizations
Boite Postale 36
F-01230 Ferney-Voltaire Cedex
France
(+41) (0)22 379 8841
Enquiries and additional copies of the report:
Elizabeth Macdonald elizabeth.macdonald@ahrmio.org

©Copyright : Center for Creative Leadership, 2010

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction Rudi Plettinx</i>	2
<i>Introduction Mary Jane Peters</i>	4
<i>Key People-related Issues that Leaders of International Organizations Face</i>	5
<i>A Commentary on the Study</i>	6
<i>Leadership – Making the Case for a New Definition</i>	9
• <i>HR as the Enabler of a New Leadership Process</i>	11
• <i>Making HR Relevant</i>	13
• <i>From Crisis Management Mode to a Permanent Leadership Culture Model</i>	14
• <i>The Case for Culture-Carriers</i>	15
• <i>The Cultural Aspects of Management Development</i>	16
• <i>Owning up to Bad Fits in the Workplace</i>	17
• <i>Leadership in a World of Change</i>	18
<i>Talent Management – the Future Challenge</i>	19
• <i>We're All Looking for the Same People</i>	19
• <i>Retirement and Succession Planning – Twin Areas of Concern</i>	20
• <i>Next Generation Talent Traumas</i>	21
• <i>Coping with the Mobility Monster</i>	22
• <i>Leveraging the Power of IT</i>	23
• <i>Coaching and Mentoring</i>	23
<i>Human Resources' Hot Buttons</i>	24
<i>Looking at Leadership Opportunities and Options</i>	25
• <i>Coaching</i>	26
• <i>Talent Management</i>	27
• <i>Leadership</i>	28
• <i>Life-work Balance</i>	29
• <i>In summary</i>	30
<i>AHRMIO Member Listing</i>	31-32

About the Study

The interviews took place in Europe and the United States during March, April, May and June 2009. To encourage the most open discussion, all the interviews were “off the record”, with no individuals or their organizations identified in the review. However, CCL and AHRMIO would like to thank staff of the following organizations for their support in developing the review, which could not have been achieved without their help, enthusiasm and co-operation.

- *European Investment Bank (EIB)*
- *European Patent Office (EPO)*
- *International Finance Corp (IFC)*
- *International Maritime Organization (IMO)*
- *International Monetary Fund (IMF)*
- *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)*
- *United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)*
- *United Nations (UN)*
- *World Bank (WB)*
- *World Economic Forum (WEF)*
- *World Food Program (WFP)*
- *World Health Organization (WHO)*
- *World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)*
- *World Trade Organization (WTO)*

An Introduction by CCL

Leadership can be a confusing, hard to define word. Many of us, faced with the word leadership, think of the person at the top: the director general, president or chief executive. But in today’s ever more complex world, in both the public and private sector, leadership is more than just that single, often remote man or woman at the very apex of the organizational pyramid – it’s about the whole organization. While the phrase “leadership culture” might seem just another piece of management-speak, there is a strong case that creating a leadership-driven culture in any organization (for profit or not-for-profit) can make a great deal of difference, not only to the success of that organization but to the overall wellbeing of the people inside it.

As organizations the world over become more democratic, transparent and accountable for their presence and their actions, so leadership is seen not as something that is concentrated on one person at the top, but as a culture that cascades down through an organization. This type of leadership culture is the antithesis of the autocratic “I’m the boss” role that often still rules in many places. A true leadership culture is predicated on creating strong ties, sharing openly, a dedication to making people at all levels across a business better at what they and their colleagues do. Interestingly, this type of leadership culture seems to catch the zeitgeist of today: its inclusivity, its openness, its acceptance of constant change and new ideas, all fit with what current and next generations seek in a place where they work -- a place where they really and truly want to do the best job that they can.



This review of leadership and talent management was developed to look at the good, the bad and the (just occasionally) ugly aspects of how international organizations function in today's world, when it comes to their people. More than that, its mission was to go further, by examining where today's practitioners can do better, as well as offering up some practical ideas to take the concept of a leadership-driven culture to the very heart of how international institutions, NGOs and others can adopt this approach as simply doing "business as usual."

The idea of this initiative was hatched during the AHRMIO Annual Conference in Tunis in September 2008. In a series of conversations with senior human resource professionals from a host of international institutions, it became clear that international organizations (and other not-for-profit groups) were facing some unprecedented organizational challenges and changes. This investigation – based on one-on-one and group discussions with many of the key players charged with finding new solutions for emerging issues – set itself two specific aims:

- To assess the key people-related issues facing international organizations in the coming years and their likely impact on how these will be managed and led.
- To offer some thoughtful, creative and above all practical, leadership-related solutions that can assist in the transition and change these institutions will experience over the next decade.

In doing this, we have concentrated on two areas that are dominated by people issues: leadership and talent development.

This report outlines some of the key people challenges facing international organizations now and tomorrow. We begin by an examination of the role of leaders and leadership in today's hierarchical structure, followed by a report on the key talent issues that need to be faced. We conclude with some creative and, we hope, insightful solutions that can be adopted, adapted and added to as required. We also include some HR-specific issues raised by the interviews. Finally, we have included in the text many quotes from the interviews, to give some sense of the intensity of feeling around many of these leadership and talent development issues.

I hope you find this review of Leadership and Talent Development in International Organizations both instructive and timely. More than that, I hope it spurs you, your colleagues and most of all your superiors to action.

Rudi Plettinx
Vice President and Managing Director, Europe, Middle East, Africa`
Center for Creative Leadership

Brussels, January 2010



An Introduction by AHRMIO

AHRMIO's mission is to "strengthen the development and effectiveness of all those charged with responsibility for people management, be they human resources specialists or line managers."

In this context it is wholly appropriate on this, AHRMIO's 10th Anniversary, to reflect on just how current HR directors, managers and specialists see themselves and their leadership role.

CCL's review will touch a nerve with most HR specialists. This must be the first time so many HR colleagues from such a broad range of international organizations have so frankly shared their concerns, not only for the future of their function but also for the success of their organizations.

So many of the views expressed will resonate loudly with others struggling with the same preoccupations; many will find solace in the realization that they are not alone. But more, many interviewees have provided pointers to future success, which will hopefully inspire and motivate those who continue to fight to keep their organizations equipped and effectively managed to meet the very real cross-border, political, humanitarian and developmental challenges of the 21st century.

CCL's review touches all the "hot buttons" of the complexities of current HR management in international organizations.

It is a pleasure to read.

Mary Jane Peters, Executive Director, AHRMIO

Key People-related Issues that Leaders of International Organizations Face

There are a great many human resource-related issues that the leadership of international organizations have to face. Most of these issues are fairly similar one way or another. Here are some of the key people challenges that emerged from our interviews and discussions.

How can international organizations :

Develop technical professionals into effective leaders ?

Learn from effective collaboration in times of crisis ?

Make human resources (HR) an effective collaborator and strategic partner to the business ?

Maintain their historical culture and mission in the face of massive organizational change and restructuring ?

Find new ways to encourage and reward staff to change jobs, be mobile and experience new working environments ?

Motivate hard-pressed employees to secure long-term engagement ?

Meet the coming competition for talent from the private (for profit) sector ?

Minimize the loss of institutional knowledge brought about by the unprecedented levels of retirements ?

Become a talent beacon for the best and brightest of the next generation ?

Make people development relevant to the real needs and expectations of staff at all levels ?



A Brief Commentary on the Study

Before examining the results of this investigation into leadership and talent management, it makes sense to mention a few points that recurred time and again in the interview process.



From the outset, virtually everyone interviewed went to great lengths to explain that their organization was totally different from any other international organization we were likely to talk with. “You have to understand that we are completely different,” was the usual start point of any discussion. Well, we have news for you, this just isn’t so. True you may all employ super specialists in your chosen area, but this doesn’t make you any different. Rather, it makes most of you very similar.

It doesn’t matter whether you employ meteorologists, patent attorneys, shipping experts, engineers or economists, you are still facing the same, ongoing problems for yourselves. These fall into two distinct areas. First you have a tough time recruiting the right specialists with the right skills (including languages) and find that you are often competing with the private sector and its bonus culture. Second you struggle mightily to turn these technocrats and other related specialists into anything resembling a manager. As for leadership? Well even those at the top of many of the organizations – it is reported with much resignation – tend to be specialists, not given to generating the kind of enthusiasm that lead to adoring follower-ship from the staff.

So, rather than all being different, the reality is (specialization apart) that you are all exceedingly similar in the overall people challenges you face. And these challenges are, of course, intensified by the multicultural mix that is the human make up of virtually all international organizations, a mix of nationalities creeds and cultures that takes a great deal to manage and motivate successfully.

It also became increasingly obvious as we developed the interviews that there seemed to be some organizations where there just wasn’t any way that change was going to come either easily or within a short space of time. It became clear to us that to affect change within the organizations we interviewed, there was only one real way. That was to push hard on the doors that were partly open: those institutions (or parts of them) where at least some progress was possible. In interview after interview, we were made acutely aware that some organizations had adopted a “hands off” approach when it came to changing the way they were managed and led.

Having said that, and as we will highlight later in the full report, there is no doubt that despite often antiquated management systems, severe bureaucracy and frustrated staff, things do get done. There is no doubt that there still exist high levels of both group and individual commitment to making things work,




often – according to those we interviewed - despite confused or misleading directives from senior managers. This left us with a sense that within the special universe of international organizations, many people just got on with the job that had to be done. The sad part was that it could be much better with just a few changes to improve working practices and decision-making.

Additionally, there was also a strong feeling, voiced by many, that international organizations were at their very best at times of crisis. Organization after organization reported that when trouble knocked on the door, divisions and departments forgot their petty squabbles and came together to make things work. If only, we thought, you could take those moments and turn them into the status quo of “how things get done around here.”

However, that “just get on with it and do the job” attitude may work for the present generation, but it will not for the next. In our discussions, we heard stories of serious employee disengagement at junior entry levels. The fact that stiff, formal bureaucracy still rules in many organizations is a turn-off that the next generation of recruits won’t and don’t tolerate. For example, having one of the best brand names in the world won’t help if the organization cannot be a whole lot more flexible in its employment practices to a new, wired up generation that want tomorrow today and know where to get it. Current economic woes may make them less likely to vote with their feet, but that is only postponing the inevitable happening when the upturn arrives. Put simply, coming generations, with ever shorter attention spans won’t sit and wait while the machinery of corporate governance grinds slowly along. New recruits are going to require new policies and new procedures to make them want to build a career within the often confining walls of the international organizations’ world.

And, of course, this becomes one of the challenges of human resources (HR), how to not just recruit these very different people, but to hold onto them when other opportunities and excitements beckon? When it comes to pushing through change, HR seems to have its work cut out. A large number of HR professionals interviewed for this study admitted that they didn’t have a “seat at the top table” in their organizations. While some said that they needed to do a lot more to deserve to be there, others made it clear that the idea of HR sitting with the rest of the strategic top team just wasn’t going to happen anytime soon.

Time and again we were told that HR was still very much at the transactional stage (hiring, assessing, rewarding, training and retiring people), rather than being involved in anything strategic. There was also a feeling among many interviewees that in many places HR didn’t deserve any better because it hadn’t made a convincing business case to be recognised as a strategic partner.



All these issues occur at a time when key staff are retiring or leaving (creating concerns for loss of institutional knowledge and continuity), new recruits are not as likely to stay for entire careers and the very face of many organizations is changing with global developments that most of us find hard to keep pace with.

Having said all that, we must not lose sight of the fact that the international organizations we interviewed have very strong reputations when it comes to the people they recruit as specialist professionals. Such are the very high technical and intellectual standards that working for one of these organizations is a high point in many careers. That reputation can stand up to any sort of scrutiny. It is when you try to turn highly qualified, very bright professionals into managers and leaders that things don't always work out. Nevertheless, these organizations have little choice but to rise to the challenges facing them.

Whatever their mission or mandate, from being at the forefront of the global warming debate, meeting the challenges of the global financial system and facing increasing refugee and human rights crises, not to mention leading humanitarian military interventions (that number over 100,000 troops in 19 separate deployments), these organizations are at an interesting crossroads. In all this, there is one constant - people. Virtually every international organization exists because it has a mandate to help people in one form or another. Moreover, the only assets these groups of talented people have are just that – themselves. Over 80 percent of international organization budgets go on one thing – people. It would seem logical therefore, that the wellbeing, development and performance of those people takes the very highest priority.

One further point. All these interviews were non-attributable. Allowing people to talk, to open up with their real concerns and expectations has aired a large number of ideas and options. This approach gave an unprecedented view of the people side of a broad sweep of international organizations. One positive thing dominated these discussions: although there may have been a few complainers who saw little hope for change, most of those interviewed were enthusiastic, actively looking for ways to make changes, however incremental, just to make their bit of the business function better. It is thanks to those people, not visionaries, but hard-working professionals that there will indeed be changes. The only question is how long will it take to achieve them?





Perhaps, we have even lost sight of what we are really all about.”

Another agrees, adding, “We are spending too much time on fixing internal issues. The risk is that we just end up ticking boxes, but not effecting any lasting change. Worse still, there will be a new director general in two years and they – to leave their own legacy – will want to make changes all over again.” He concludes, “My concern is that the things we are trying now internally won’t embed themselves into the organization before we are off with yet another initiative.”

More criticism of too much internal focus includes this: “right now, just too much management time is spent on delivering the internal stuff. Key managers are spending 50 to 80 percent of their time on internal issues – this means other things don’t get done.”

This pattern repeats itself from organization to organization: the need for internal house-cleaning creating constant changes and initiatives, coupled to the rising impact of external pressures to fulfill the group’s mandate. Stir into that already heady mixture the loss of experienced people and often severe budget limitations to buy your way out of a crisis, and the case for a more inclusive leadership model becomes quite compelling. Put simply, it becomes fairly obvious that external complexities and internal needs cannot be met by a single person at the top of the pyramid. If director generals and the like are appointed for their technical expertise or negotiation skills then they should be freed up to concentrate on tasks that require their specialization. Only by adopting some kind of democratic approach to leadership can that be sensibly achieved in today’s fast-paced world.

There is a distinct case for adopting a new leadership definition to bring both clarity of purpose and day-to-day operational efficiency to many international groups. This, of course, begs the question, WHO makes that happen and HOW does it get achieved?

And there, perhaps, is the real challenge for HR. Especially in organizations where the focus is all towards the external mission, HR has a great opportunity to become the organizational champion for the internal issues that need to be addressed. As many explained to us, HR shouldn’t complain about how it is treated -- it needs to go out and prove its worth.



HR as the Enabler of a New Leadership Process

Across the broad range of institutions we interviewed, the human resources function has a significantly mixed status. A few have the HR function embedded within the strategic processes of the business at the highest level. Sadly, many do not. Nor are they likely to do so any time soon.

The main reason for HR's inability to progress from a purely transactional role to one that is more strategic would seem to be predicated on a variety of factors. In some cases all of these factors come together, creating a huge barrier to further organizational progress:

- HR is stuck in an old-style personnel role and seems unable to break out of it. This would seem largely due to the people in the function and their inability to convince others in the business that they have anything more than a basic "form-filling" role to play.
- More than that, as was explained to us several times, HR isn't sitting at that top table because many organizations operate in two distinct parts – Operations and Policy (read strategy). As one commented, "Usually we (HR) are in Operations, so we don't get to sit in when strategic decisions are made."
- HR hasn't learned where the "triggers" are to get them to the next level. The need to provide hard, solid evidence that their expertise can make a difference in the people-management processes and successes of the organization.
- HR doesn't truly understand the business they are in, and therefore consistently fails to make a convincing case for their ongoing involvement in strategic decision-making.

If those statements seem highly critical or unreasonable, remember they came from interviewees, we didn't make them up! Here are some examples (perhaps a little extreme) of why in many places HR isn't where it claims it would like to be:

- "HR don't sit at the top table – far from it. My boss reports to a committee, they report to another group and then to the director, so I am five levels down and I'm supposed to be running HR!"
- "The real challenge for us is that there has been no tradition of HR management at all. Indeed, there was no staff development until I came here a few years ago."
- "Our issue is how can HR persuade top management to take its contribution seriously. We have been absent from strategy setting, because it has been felt that we haven't got anything useful to add."

But for those who have found their way to the top table and DO get involved in strategy setting, they find that they have to work hard to keep at the very top of their game and show clearly what their contribution is all about. The constant mantra would seem to be, "add value, add value, add value," or forget it.



- “Yes HR is at the top table and in on strategic decisions – but we add value. My advice to others is do your homework, don’t give your homework to the director general! Come with it all thought through AND some practical solutions. The bottom line? Make it easy to be included and taken seriously.”
- “We find that if we present issues in the right sort of way (e.g. as a bottom-line impact business case), then we get attention. For example, we explained that we needed to adopt talent management and succession management programs for the straightforward business reason that a large number of people were coming up for retirement and something needed to be done. When they saw the business case we had made, top management realized the impact this would have and were only too pleased to get us to develop the required tools.”
- “We always use data to illustrate why we need to do something and make a real business case for it. That gets attention because it impacts the real bottom-line. That way, you earn credibility.”
- “Don’t talk the language of human resources, talk the language of the business. They don’t care about fancy terminology as long as you help make the business and the people better at what they do.”
- “Traditionally, we haven’t had the brightest management in HR. But we need to do something now. I don’t know if it will be HR who takes us forward, but someone really needs to do it. We are serving a lot of good people with high expectations and seeking life-long employment. To keep people motivated and productive we need to give them the tools.”

During these interviews – which were very open and candid – there was a tendency for HR professionals in international organizations to be under the impression that they were somehow inferior or behind the private sector in getting recognition for their abilities. Not so. In our view, there would seem to be just as many private sector, for-profit businesses out there that still have old-style personnel managers (even if that is not the title they now give them) and who don’t take their possible contribution of HR seriously.





Making HR Relevant

While some of those interviewed despaired of ever forcing through organizational change, others seem to have got the right ideas. Being seen as relevant to the business and making it easy to be invited into strategy sessions seems to be the way forward. One head of HR described arriving at her new organization to discover that there was basically nothing that existed in terms of people policy. “We managed the payroll and that was about all. There wasn’t even any staff training, or even orientation for new arrivals.”

Realizing that she had to make her mark, she spent some days doing an analysis of sick leave on a department by department basis. “When I’d finished, I had a pretty good idea about who’s group was motivated and those employees that just didn’t care.” She presented this evidence (together with a set of proposals for action to the director general). “He was very impressed, mainly because he had no idea just how many days we were losing in work-time due to long-standing poor management.” She added, “That was my springboard. From there, I launched other value-added initiatives like an employee survey. I even managed to get some training and coaching working, especially for some autocratic technocrats, who didn’t manage, just shouted at people!”

Commented another HR professional, “If the door is partly open and senior management are open to new ideas then you can make a difference. But you have to make it practical and relevant, a real contribution. Most of us don’t have huge budgets, so you have to do what you can with what’s available. I know I am making an impact when the heads of other departments call me for help.”

From Crisis Management Mode to a Permanent Leadership Culture Model

Although it isn't the self-imposed role of every international organization to save the world (or their specific part of it), one of the most striking things of the interviews was just how many times interviewees cited times of crisis as the best of times for their business. It appears that when a natural disaster or some other world-shaking event happens, agencies seem able to unite their people. As we discussed with several senior international organization staffers, "wouldn't it be wonderful if you could take those times of crisis with everyone contributing and sharing and turn that into "business as usual?"

One interviewee explained, "Everyone is great working in their silos on a day-to-day basis, but if we could all pull together it would make it so much more efficient. We seem to be brilliant individually, but put us all together in a room and disaster strikes!" She went on, "but, the exception is when there is a real crisis – then we all respond wonderfully together." And they concluded, "we need to know how to tap into this, understand what comes into play when we do our best."

Another had this to say: "When we all add value to what we do, it makes us all work together so much better. I suppose the governing factor is that there is just no time to think, so we just get on with it." And they added, "It is a sort of collective movement that says, "we must get it right (all of us working together) or millions of people will suffer."

This view is borne out by another interviewee who commented, "Sure we work in our silos, but a recent crises forced people to come out and work together." They added, "we even had an informal network of middle managers who came together on their own volition and worked on problems at nights and weekends to get them completed. Sadly, I suppose, once we had achieved our goal, everyone went back to his own silo. We didn't know how to capitalize on all this positive energy we had generated."

In another discussion, a human resource professional commented, "There are a few people in our organization that always seem to make things happen [in a crisis] and bring people together. They manage to motivate people from all around the world to collectively achieve something good – at times like this everyone is willing to cut out the red tape."

They then added, "Of course, a lot of what I've just described we don't talk about when it's over – I suppose we just go back to getting on with our jobs!"

Concludes another, "Yes, everyone knows about these shortcomings. We talk about it, but that's about all. We don't ever really do anything about them."

According to the comments above, there would seem to be plenty of real leaders in these organizations, but they only really get to be effective when the chips are well and truly down on the table. This would seem to pose the question, is there some way of identifying and developing these seemingly natural talents in a more formal way so that their contribution can be ongoing, not just when the world is falling apart?



The Case for Culture-Carriers

The answer to at least part of that question may be tied up in another initiative (particularly focused on development agencies and the like) that is certainly causing some feelings of concern. That is the move by several organizations to regional hubs, having been historically centered in one headquarters with some small, outlying offices.

Two challenges are appearing here:

- The challenge of motivating people to move from their comfortable position at headquarters to a field hub. “They don’t want to go, so we are having to hire a lot more local people,” is the usual comment.
- This reluctance to move coupled to the influx of new, “local” people means that there is a great fear that the culture of these organizations will become diluted or irrevocably changed.

As one agency said during a discussion, “What we need is to find and encourage what I term ‘culture carriers’ -- people who will go out into these regional offices and take with them the culture of our organization. Without doing this, we will have problems in retaining a lot of what we stand for as a business.”



The Cultural Aspects of Management Development

Of course, there's plenty of training and development on offer for the employees of international organizations, although – according to our research – there are some leaders who don't embrace the idea of staff development with all that much enthusiasm. "We have struggled to get a management/leadership program off the ground. The problem is that senior people don't see the need for it," reported one interviewee. "Our director doesn't want to send people to outside courses, as he thinks our issues are unique (they aren't really)," said another.

That said, it seems that the provision of people development is on the increase. Not only that, organizations seem more reluctant than in the past to just buy standard "off-the-shelf" solutions and more and more are turning to courses and other initiatives that have been tailor-made for their particular business needs. It is also encouraging to report that there seems to be an increase in agencies assessing staff for leadership roles (and offering training to fill skill gaps), although there are still many good "technicians" being turned into bad managers (see later).

However, there were two specific, recurring points about people development that are worth mentioning:

- The "cultural" aspects of organizational development programs
- The increased adoption of coaching and mentoring, particularly as a substitute for classroom-style sessions

Several organizations reported that they were using development programs as a foundation for building stronger cultures across their businesses. As one explained, "We have developed a global career network and we are mixing people from different locations around the globe during training and development." They added, "Part of this is to maintain the culture of the overall business." On top of that, they pointed out that, "we are also, to encourage mobility and spread our business culture, offering what we term developmental assignments to people on a short term basis of several months."

Elsewhere, the cultural benefits of people development have been recognized by one agency with most of its people in one central location. An HR manager told us that, "management development programs provide the opportunity for a very useful, informal encounter that allows people from different areas of the business to get to know one another in an off-site situation." He continued, "We think the off-site aspect is very important as it seems the social aspects are just as important as the business aspects. Indeed they have already made a huge difference to the culture within the company." He went on to explain that the initial program often becomes just the starting point for something more permanent. "We find that our development program allows people to discover each other not just as professional colleagues, but as fellow human beings. This has led to the creation of an in-house network, and often groups keep on meeting in our cafeteria after the event. They have even become involved in creating their own informal coaching program."

With evidence like this, could it be that organizations are changing the way that leadership works almost accidentally, becoming more inclusive, open and cross divisional in their scope?

Certainly, according to the people we interviewed, there is also a move to really try and offer the right sort of development that meets not just the needs of the individual but delivers it in a package that they can relate to. Several discussions centered on how many specialist and technical staff had a real aversion to classroom-style programs. Because of this, some agencies have moved much more into individual or group coaching and mentoring, with much better results all round.

Of course, that perennial problem still remains: how to make managers out of people totally unsuited to the role. No matter how much organizations try, it seems this is one of those issues that just doesn't go away.

Owning up to Bad Fits in the Workplace

At least part of the problem for putting the wrong people into the wrong positions is a failure to face up to bad people-management decisions. That is compounded where personnel systems still promote people on length of service rather than a real talent for the job they are required to do.

Hiring professional managers is limited to very few agencies, with nearly all managers coming from a specialist background. However, things are changing, if rather slowly. As one HR manager explained about his own organization, "Of course, our first priority in a selection process is on technical skills, but at the second selection we now also assess social skills."

Having said that, bad fits and poor assessment are still the order of the day in many places. "In my organization," said one development professional, "you have to be technically very good. This means that there is a lot of tolerance shown to people, even if you are 'different', but can do the work." They add, "Unfortunately, for those that aren't quite good enough we are not at all good at dealing with exit policies. So, if you make it through the first three years you are almost guaranteed to stay forever, even to the point of 'parking' people in an out-of-the-way function where they won't cause too much trouble."


Others agree with this assessment. "We need to face up to bad fits – right now we don't," commented one interviewee. "People don't seem to be able to confront bad fits, by doing something about them." She goes on, "The upshot is that people get promoted (to get them out of one department) and they get passed around the organization getting more and more important, when they should have been weeded out early on." Finally she said, with some exasperation, "Everyone knows this, we just don't ever tackle it."

Commented another, "One of our problems is that people are in a job for some years and get a promotion to manager. Doesn't matter if they have no skills, they get promoted anyway. To try and solve this problem we have pushed heavily on creating technical job streams, so there is another way to grow." They added, "However, there's a lot of work needs to be done to instill the right feeling amongst the staff that this is an OK career route and isn't seen as a second-class position. However, we need to make this work if we are to stop turning great technical people into bad managers."

Here's another, "We are, above all, an organization of experts. They are recruited for their specific skills. We then 'try' to turn them into managers, but that is not why they were hired, or even their primary function." They continue, "Yes, we have the twin tracks of experts and managers, but (as with other organizations) the management positions are perceived to have a higher status. A large part of the reason for that is because from a political point of view it is believed that managerial positions have more influence."

This is borne out by reports of other, similar experiences. "In our case, people on the technical track can get all the way to director, but this has led to a situation where people become managers for the wrong reasons. Also to stop people getting moved for the wrong reasons we have made a rule that people on the managerial track can't be rewarded for technical achievements."

This problem seems to be prevalent in most agencies where specialists are in the majority. However, perhaps few have the problems of one particular organization where the HR manager explained that, "teaching negotiation and communication skills are vital for us. Many of our staff arrive here from a military background and think that shouting orders at the staff works! We really have to work hard to change this mind-set."



An experiment by some agencies to put time limits on job tenure at senior levels hasn't proved very workable either. Determined push back from incumbents, who valued the post they were in and didn't want to move, made the whole thing fairly uneven in its execution. As one person explained to us, "One of the big problems in the system is that an agency sets up a procedure, then someone breaks the rules, makes an exception, and the whole concept loses credibility and eventually collapses."

Perhaps it's that inability or unwillingness to confront day-to-day reality that ultimately causes a lot of the problems of these international organizations to remain unchanged. A good example of this is the creation in many agencies of 360 degree feedback. Except it isn't really 360 degree feedback at all! Time and again, we were told about 360 degree feedback, only to discover that at the top of many organizations it is in reality only 180 degrees. The reason? To protect the sensibilities of senior management, perhaps. As one development professional reported, "We have moved to a lot of development and assessment. In fact we have moved to 360 degree feedback. But not really, as many of the senior managers don't feel comfortable with feedback from employees and peers. So we do it, sort of, but they are the only ones who see the collective feedback and it doesn't get discussed."



Leadership in a World of Change

As we pointed out in the introduction, these global institutions are facing massive changes – a lot of them unprecedented. Indeed, there were several of the people we talked with who recalled one agency (someone referred to it as "a sleepy corner of the system") that was, due to a series of global developments, "suddenly catapulted onto the world stage." Its staff, while able and competent at what they did technically, were ill-prepared for the new role they had to assume. This is a perfect example – and there will be more in the coming years – where an organization can't possibly move forward and do their mandated job without a professional management structure. Just as for-profit enterprise has begun to advocate the splitting up of responsibilities at the top, so it would seem large, ponderous international organizations need to examine this route as well.

The world may be a great deal more connected, a lot more global, but these developments have brought with it a whole host of new complexities. Technocrats and political apparatchiks can only go so far in dealing with massive emerging issues. If their staff are to do the job, they need to be sure that leadership is not one person at the top, but a way to involve and evolve everyone. Interestingly, from all the comments we have received in the course of this investigation, it would appear that many of the staff think so too.

One of the more senior people we interviewed summed up the leadership debate with un-diplomatic directness. "We lack leadership, real leadership at the very top." They added, "Our senior people may be very good in their subject, but they are not good leaders!"

Talent Management – the Future Challenge

Recruiting, rewarding and retaining talent in international organizations is hard work. According to our discussions, it is a lot harder work than it used to be. The main reasons, as we detail below, are that these workplaces are increasingly seeking out the same smart people as the private sector. Even the fact that the present business downturn makes it a great time for recruiting, doesn't bring that much in the way of optimism. Many are worried that come the economic upturn new recruits, with more and more choices as to how, where and when they work will move away to new opportunities.

While talent management seems to have improved greatly in the international agencies we talked with, there's still a lot to do. Hiring, retention, reward and succession planning all need attention, derided by some as "too slow and too cumbersome." Question is, how soon will these areas improve to compete with the greedy recruiters from the private sector?

• • • • • • • • • • **We're All Looking for the Same People**

"Of course, we are all looking for the same people," complains a senior HR manager, "and it's getting worse than ever. The reason is that so many jobs in the private and public sector are now the same in terms of the skills required. Everything from economists to legal experts, communications people, engineers and IT specialists, they can all find employment in almost every sector."

"One issue that we sometimes overlook," explains another, "is that although most of us are global in our scope (and our recruitment planning), it is often very difficult to get people from some countries and regions." They go on, "The very best talent in places as far afield as Brazil, South Africa, Russia and China can get good jobs at home, so they are not at all easy to recruit for international organizations. More than that we don't just compete with national government agencies - the private sector wants these people too."

And it would seem the higher up the talent ladder you go, the tougher it gets. "We have a great deal of trouble getting senior women to join us," laments one recruiter. "Problem is that these people are not only hard to find for us, they are hard to find in their home country too. The upshot of that is national governments will offer them all kinds of incentives to stay in their home country." In fact, it's even worse than that, as he points out, "At best these highly talented people will join us for two or three years, but then they'll go back to their home country. Trouble is, we don't pay enough to woo these people for long. You get the package for your grade – period. And your country can't pay you any more while you are part of the organization, so you head back home, where they can reward you anyway they choose."

At lower levels in many international organizations – especially those with large forces in the field - it can be tough to get the right kind of people. As one staff member points out, "Our fieldwork is increasingly complex and requires more and more knowledge. Having said that, my problem is not finding development professionals, my issue is can they manage at all?" Adds another: "We all seem to have the problem of getting our hands on the right people. Too often people look great on paper, but just don't deliver what we really need."

Retirement and Succession Planning – Twin Areas of Concern

While accessing the right people is one ongoing drama, the problem is getting steadily worse year by year. Why? Unprecedented numbers of senior staff are up for retirement in the next four to five years. In some agencies the numbers are set to reach epidemic proportions with between 40 and 60 percent of senior management slated for retirement (at the mandatory 60 or 62-years-of-age) between now and 2015. Attempts to stem the flow by upping the retirement age to 65 have so far gone nowhere and don't seem to have much chance of immediate adoption. Meanwhile many across virtually all of the major international organizations are deeply worried about not only succession planning, but also the huge loss in institutional knowledge that these departures will create. As one senior official commented, "what's happening right now is a complete disgrace, we will lose more than half our senior people and we're just not equipped to solve this problem. So far, we have taken too much of a narrow, self-centered approach, and this just won't do."

Even worse than just losing all this experienced talent and creating a huge institutional memory loss, is the plain fact that many of the agencies don't have much in place to cover the problem at all. "We are truly terrible at valuing the people we have," commented one HR director, "and we are also very bad at effective succession planning." More than that, many organizations have inherited a massive demographic hole, because cuts a decade or so ago led to hiring freezes. This means that for many, there are lots of people coming up to the mandatory age of retirement and a lot of people around age 30, but nothing much in between.

"People leave for all sorts of reasons," highlights one interviewee, "but often because they get frustrated where they are and so move on to another organization."

And there are other forms of frustration too. The new vogue for highly centric organizations to move to a model of regional hubs forces people nicely hunkered down in a cozy bivouac to go into the field once more. They don't like it (see below). Add to that, the highly unpopular annual rolling contracts introduced into some organizations and people feel what one interviewee termed as a, "rapid erosion of conditions of service." They added, "OK, I understand if you are in the private sector a one year contract is OK, but then you can get a bonus. With us, it is one year, but there's no bonus go with it."

The result of that is that agency employees report an increasing lack of loyalty and a drift to what they term, "safer employment, with more security."





Next Generation Talent Traumas

Into this already bubbling pot, comes the need to recruit the next generation. Here at least there is some good news. The UN and its family – not to mention many of the international financial institutions and the like – still have great brand recognition. Equally, there are still plenty of young people who want to make a difference, rather than simply make money. As one boasted to us, “We have no shortage of applications. Recently, we had 25,000 applications for our junior professional program for just 45 places.” This level of interest is borne out by another agency that had 4,000 applications for 20 places.

The question is, having got them in, will they stay? Unfortunately, according to many we spoke with, retention amongst the younger staffers is becoming an issue. Here’s an HR director being very candid indeed: “We do have fallout. Young people in particular – used to casual or flat organizations - find the formal atmosphere and culture hard to take.” He goes on, “We are still very hierarchical and they don’t like that, so they look for other options. In the past five years young people – especially from Europe – have left because they don’t like our culture. Problem is, it isn’t changing and it hasn’t changed since I arrived almost 30 years ago.”

Another agency staff member agrees and says that there have to be new ways to attract and, most importantly, retain young people. “The big question is how do we turn on young people. We need to be honest with ourselves and realize that our salaries are what they are (and they won’t change), so we have to find other things to excite them: job security, work environment and wellbeing, an exciting peer group to work with?”

Coping with the Mobility Monster

Are there yet more issues that these hard-pressed agencies need to face up to? Yes, there are. As mentioned earlier in this report, mobility has become an issue for many groups. Much of that has been exacerbated by the trend to move towards regional hubs for many of the major organizations. This has shaken a lot of them to their foundations as employees wake up to a whole new ball game. Mobility, from being a manageable problem, would now seem – especially linked to other factors like retirees and a new generation – to be heading for a serious situation.

Here's one view, "We have non-family duty stations and hardship placements, which are always difficult to fill with the right kind of people, I think this is getting harder today." Here's another, "We need international staff to be placed in the field, but find mobility a big problem, especially in recruiting mid-career professionals, they just don't want to work in the field at all."

Added to that, an unevenness in how hardship premiums are applied from one organization to another leads to resentment from some and job hopping for a better deal for others. Indeed, the massive move to regional hubs by some of the mega-agencies has seen calls for a complete redrawing of the compensation structures. "As we continue to decentralize into regional hubs," says one, "We have to change both where and how we recruit and how we reward people." They add, "We have to be able to create better incentives for mobility, although I am not convinced that this will be enough to solve the problems we face."

And at the even sharper end of the field operations the same problems exist. "Areas like peacekeeping operations have problems to attract talent. It's OK for a short time, but if people have children and all that family stuff they don't want to do it forever," explains one development counselor. They add: "Neither, of course, do you want the opposite, what we call the 'bad duty station junkie.' We avoid these at all costs."

Despite these problems, there are positive moves afoot too. Much effort is directed at rotating people around different agencies with the objective of getting long-term staff comfortable in more than one role. As one senior manager suggested, "The world of the international organization today is very complex, so we need people who can understand – and have experience of – different parts of the system. So we are actively pushing people to leave one place and try out another." They add, "One good thing about this is that it plays right to the expectations of Generation Y and their impatience to try new experiences." Although this is not common practice in every international organization, it is becoming standard practice in some. As our interviewee explained further, "Right now, we have a system where if you haven't moved on after a few years as a new entrant, you become subject to a managed move. We think it is important to have experience of different bosses (with different leadership styles), different jobs and responsibilities."

This of course was experimented with (as we reported earlier) at more senior levels, without the same success.

Leveraging the Power of IT

In their quest for the very best talent they can find, international organizations are casting their recruitment nets further than ever before. Much of that activity has been centered on a much more aggressive use of internet and related recruitment processes. And it is paying off. As one agency recruiter reported, “we are getting much higher diversity than we used to, basically because we can reach so many more people across a much wider geography.”

Does this include a move to hire professional managers, well versed in leadership? Well no, it doesn't. Although all the signs seem to point to that being one direction that some of these organizations could go, to solve both organizational and motivational issues, there are some limitations that need to be kept in mind. These were perhaps best described by the HR manager of one aid agency who told us, “No, we don't hire professional managers. I could say that they are few and far between in our business. The main reason is that working with a huge range of governments on extremely sensitive issues our people need to be able to talk in depth about our mandate and our technical expertise. That, after all, is the key focus.” He added, however a corollary to that remark, “Sadly, of course, being a specialist doesn't mean that you are any good with your staff!”

Coaching and Mentoring

Turning those specialists into managers and leaders is set to be a long-hard battle. But there is some good news. As explained earlier in this report, there is a lot more soul searching in many organizations about the best way to turn technical and professional experts into successful supervisors. Obviously the adoption of the twin track system, with something for those who don't want or aren't suitable for a management role, helps to refine the process at an early stage. More than that the adoption of coaching and mentoring (even to very senior managers), is having a very real effect. A good part of the reason for that is people like it, enjoy it and open themselves up to it. This is something that hopefully will be extended and expanded in the future.

Human Resources' Hot Buttons

At every interview, we asked our participants to give us their top “hot buttons” – what were the critical things that HR needed to do or improve to make the places they worked more efficient, attractive places to work? After we had collected them all, we broke them down into a list of those that were mentioned the most and seen as the most critical. Remember, these are not for the agency as a whole, but for Human Resources as an organizational function. They are not in any order of priority, but reflect the overall concerns of the human resources professionals and others who took part in our investigation.

- *Learn how best to nurture future talent*
- *Be prepared to challenge existing policies and practices in the business*
- *Move the organization to a model of principles and values, rather than rules-based systems*
- *Build credibility and relationships across the organization*
- *Find ways to deal effectively with political interference*
- *Measure the HR function by the success of its “clients”*
- *Add value by helping the Executive Heads achieve their goals*
- *Create credibility and recognition for the HR function as a key organizational player*
- *Introduce penalties for poor performance (people and departments)*
- *Talk business (adopt and talk the language of the business you are in) and avoid HR jargon*
- *Run HR as a best-practice role model*

Looking at Leadership Opportunities and Options: A CCL Viewpoint

After months of interviews and discussions, it is all too easy to concentrate on what's bad about how international organizations get managed and led. It's a simple task to be critical, to say how it should and could be done better. But look underneath the concerns, the self-criticisms and, as yet, unmet expectations, and all is not as bad as it would seem at first glance.

This study began with a desire to examine leadership and talent management across a broad, diverse range of international institutions. It has filled that mission admirably. And while it has pointed out many of the bad bits, it has also highlighted a lot of good practice too. Certainly there are problems, the three R's of the international organization have to be Recruitment, Reward and Retention and there is a need to add a fourth - Retirement. Each of these areas merits not just a report, but a book-length subject of its own.

But there are signs, despite the bureaucracy and unwieldy size of many of these storied institutions, that there is real energy to create change. Some may be reluctant to move away from a decades old status quo, but world events, emergent technologies and, yes, new recruits to these organizations are all making it impossible not to expect that change will happen, whether director general, middle managers, experts or the lowliest employees like it or not.

Facing up to the plain fact that change happens doesn't have to be hard. It's only hard if you struggle against it, fighting off the inevitable. Because, led by those three pillars of corporate change (events, technologies and people), every organization evolves a little bit each and every day.

Therefore, keeping those inevitabilities in mind, let's look at four areas (all being forged and molded by events, technologies and people) that are already changing how our global institutions get managed and led.

We've listed them under the following categories:

- Coaching
- Talent management
- Leadership
- Life-work balance

These may not seem to fit together neatly or logically but, from all the interviews and discussions, it is these four areas that are going to make the most organizational impact in the years to come. As we said, and we make no apology for saying again, change has already begun.

Coaching

One significant development in virtually every organization we met with was the tremendous amount of focus on coaching (one-to-one and collective) that seemed to be going on. Not only was it prevalent in most organizations, it was also significantly on the increase. Many human resource professionals explained that much of the success of coaching was due to its format: easy to organize for busy professionals; a long way from the “I’ll tell, you listen” approach of more formal training. However, there was more. Coaching also sends out a new message. It involves people (individually and in groups) and provides a new way of getting better at something, or finding out about something. And when mentoring is added, it opens up another learning vista that champions the concept of sharing knowledge.

And there was yet another reason that coaching seems to work so well. It’s the kind of activity that is “do-able” in a recession, particularly where the coaches and mentors are staff members. It’s the type of pro-active approach that doesn’t need to be affected all that much by reduced budgets. More than that, it actually sends the right message to the organization - underscoring a commitment to ongoing development, while keeping costs under control.

This increasing emphasis on coaching is great news for these organizations and is opening up many new opportunities. The Center for Creative Leadership has been researching the effects of coaching for many years and has found that it leads to many positive factors of organizational life being adopted:

- It increases how leaders actively contribute to the development of others
- It helps in reviewing and managing people’s performance
- It encourages and leads to knowledge sharing
- It makes decision-making more transparent
- It creates a climate where ongoing learning and development are regarded as a top priority, even in the toughest economic times

There’s just one dark cloud casting a shadow over this: how do you get a coach-driven culture that delivers all the benefits listed above to the whole organization? Well, already some institutions are beginning to solve this dilemma. The key is to select the right people, invest in their development and position them as role models throughout the organization. They in turn will coach others until the whole becomes a complete coach-driven culture. No one seems to be quite there yet, but they are getting close. Moreover, the next generation in the workplace really embraces the benefits of coaching (they expect it as a condition of employment). This is an easy door to push open. Why? Because it is a true win-win. The organization wins and so does the individual. Better still, it ushers in positive change – quietly and efficiently.

Talent Management

We realized, as we put this report together, that there's a great deal of talent in international organizations – some of the very best that can be found anywhere. Indeed, these global agencies are packed full of smart professionals. The challenge is, can you take very clever people, the very best experts you can find, and turn them into talented managers and leaders? Fact is, none of us have much choice in the matter. We need talented leaders to take us forward into the future. Certainly, as we have explained earlier, coaching and other personal development helps, but there is still a need for organizations to be fully committed and signed up to the right talent management strategy.

Although economic and operational decisions may be taking priority over talent development in the short-term, today's challenging times also underscore the importance of having a really effective talent management program in place. The responsibility for talent management can no longer be delegated to the Human Resources department (although it has a vital role to play as the primary support function). It must be at the highest levels of the organization, held by the Executive Head and members of the executive team as a shared commitment to the future of the organization. There is a paramount need to live the concept of talent management, not just delegate it to someone else to deliver.

So what's to be done? How do international organizations embrace talent management as an ongoing corporate lifestyle? Well, we think that they would do well to go back to those basics of what will be forcing change within our organizational structures: events, technologies and people. It is only by understanding the impact these three things will have that you can begin to plan a viable talent strategy.

Consider this: if an organization doesn't really know the type of role it will have to play in the next five years, how can it possibly be prepared to have the right people with the right skills, in the right place at the right time; how can it deploy the right technologies (systems and procedures) to make that talent effective?

This, of course, is the responsibility of an organization's leadership

Leadership

We have used leadership as a plural word, for good reason. We don't have much faith or belief in the supreme leader - the lonely man or woman at the top of the pyramid. Today, the ability of an organization to accomplish its goals does not depend solely on the force of will of a single, great leader. Complexity - those events, technologies and people - all conspire to make it well nigh impossible for one person to lead any kind of globally responsible entity on their own.

So, in order to understand what leadership strategy needs to be, we first have to be clear about what we mean by leadership. The Center for Creative Leadership has been studying leaders and leadership for nearly 40 years and has recently come to an important conclusion: leadership begins with individuals in leadership positions, but it doesn't end there. It's not simply the number or quality of individual leaders that determines organizational success, but the ability of formal and informal leaders at all organizational levels to pull together in the support of common goals that ultimately makes the difference.

In international organizations this already happens to a certain degree. Time and again we were told that individuals from all levels were able to come together (usually in times of crisis or emergency) and work together. Some people were seen and even recognized as natural leaders, but everyone seemed content to go back to the status quo when the red alert sirens were turned off. But we know from our conversations, that they haven't been entirely turned off. There is a new leadership model under construction. It hasn't asserted itself quite yet, but it is there.

Consider the following:

- **Coaching and mentoring:** there is a huge and growing demand for both. It leads to sharing of ideas and information. It opens up people, departments and whole businesses. It is a basis for change.
- **Coming together after seminars and workshops:** increasing reports of seminar participants continuing to meet on a regular basis, share ideas, solve problems without any formal structure. It is a basis for change.
- **Managing those crises:** those who naturally come together in times of crisis and make things happen are leaders who need to be encouraged further - some reports suggest this is happening. It is a basis for change.

All these illustrate that leadership IS being shared around the corridors and offices of international organizations a great deal more, and in more ways, than you might think. It is the very beginning of positive and lasting change. As we said earlier, push on the doors that are open. Once others see how it works, they'll join in.

Where does this leave human resources and organizational development professionals? Their job is to encourage these early signs of collective leadership. Show how well and why they work and report, record and catalog what they achieve. When the benefits of collaborative, across-the-board leadership become clear others will want to try too. Human Resources is tasked with helping organizations make that transition.

Life-work Balance

Writing this report in the midst of an economic recession, it may seem somewhat peculiar to highlight life-work balance as a significant area where change will affect the workplace. But, maybe surprisingly, it is this area that will see a huge impact on the way international organizations function at the people-to-people level. Much of that will be led by the new recruits, the current and future intakes of international civil servants, who are already demanding and getting a work style that is different from that of previous generations.

Life-work balance isn't just about working less, or taking time off, it is about restructuring work to get the most out of everything you do. Earlier, we referred to the four R's. Here's what life-work balance brings to them:

Recruitment: This report has already highlighted those unchanging, entrenched organizational systems and procedures are turning off the next generation. Agencies that want to recruit the best and brightest will have to find ways to accommodate the needs of these new employees - otherwise they will take their talents elsewhere.

Reward: It's not just about money. It's about getting the right quality of life. Again, technology should be able to play a role here, but recruiters will have to be able to convince new recruits that they can follow through. Home working and remote working have to be on the list of needs.

Retention: Lots of tempting offers, plus much more of a "butterfly" attitude (not wanting to stay in any job for long) towards employment will make it harder to keep talent. Again, talent will only stay with organizations that know how to take care of their emerging needs.

Retirement: Right now, there's a retirement crisis in many organizations. So again, thinking of new ways to keep high-performing talent instead of just letting it go is a good idea. That means initiatives like short workweeks, contract working, and home working.

More than just the people factor, those other two criteria (emerging events and technologies) will have their impact too. Consider: technology allows anyone to work from anywhere. It means you can have experts virtually managing a world away. You can have support, and back-up without endangering people. You can recruit and reward people without having to separate families or send people to places they don't want to go. It may be early days for these ways of working – but believe us it is coming. How do we know? The private sector already does this and the technology already exists and is getting, better, cheaper and easier to use every day. The take-away from this is that life-work balance isn't a nice thing to do --it is THE thing to do.





In summary

We've mentioned before, in discussing change, that the place to start is where the doors are open (not perhaps wide open but at least showing a way through to the next room). That's the way to begin (push hardest where acceptance to new ideas and ways of working seems to be the norm). After that, of course, anything can happen. As history has shown, once critical mass is achieved, major change – especially revolutionary change – doesn't come through the door, it arrives through the window, down the chimney, taking those inside by surprise!

We believe – hard as it might be to see it – that the revolution is already in full swing. All we need to do is work out the final story about where we and our organizations want to be when the change process is complete. That's something we will all need to think about long and hard. But, we haven't got long if we want to influence and be a significant part of the outcome.

There's a mood – a feeling for change – out there. And it's not revolutionary. It's evolutionary and it's going to be wonderful to see it work.



AHRMIO Member Organizations



(A) = Advisory Organization

- African Development Bank (AFDB), Tunis, Tunisia (A)
- Aga Khan Development Network (AKDN), Gouvieux, France
- Asian Development Bank (ADB), Mandaluyong City, Philippines
- Bank for International Settlements (BIS), Basle, Switzerland (A)
- Bioversity International, Rome, Italy (formerly known as International Plant Genetic Resources Institute)
- Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), St Michael, Barbados
- Center for Creative Leadership (CCL), Brussels, Belgium
- Commonwealth Secretariat (CS), London, UK
- Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Gender and Diversity Programme, Rome, Italy
- Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France
- Eurocontrol Experimental Centre, Brétigny-sur-Orge, France
- European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), London, UK
- European Central Bank (ECB), Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany
- European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), Reading, UK
- European Investment Bank (EIB), Luxembourg
- European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), Geneva, Switzerland
- European Patent Office (EPO), The Hague, Netherlands
- European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO), Brussels, Belgium
- European Space Agency (ESA), Paris, France
- Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy (A)
- GAVI (Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation), Geneva, Switzerland
- Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), Washington, D.C., USA
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Vienna, Austria (A)
- International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), Montreal, Canada
- International Criminal Court (ICC), The Hague, Netherlands
- International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Ottawa, Canada
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), Geneva, Switzerland
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Rome, Italy
- International IDEA, Stockholm, Sweden
- International Labour Organisation (ILO), Geneva, Switzerland (A)
- International Maritime Organization (IMO), London, UK
- International Monetary Fund (IMF), Washington, D.C., USA (A)
- International Organization for Migration (IOM), Geneva, Switzerland
- International Telecommunication Union (ITU), Geneva, Switzerland
- Inter-organisation Study Section on Salaries and Prices (Coordinated Organizations) (IOSSP), Paris, France
- INTERPOL, Lyon, France
- NATO C3 Agency, The Hague, Netherlands
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Brussels, Belgium
- OPEC Fund for International Development, Vienna, Austria
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris, France
- Organisation internationale de la Francophonie (OIF), Paris, France
- Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), The Hague, Netherlands
- Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Vienna, Austria
- Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), Washington, D.C., USA

- *United Nations (UN), New York, USA (A)*
- *UNAIDS, Geneva, Switzerland*
- *United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), New York, USA (A)*
- *United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Geneva, Switzerland*
- *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), New York, USA*
- *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Paris, France*
- *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Geneva, Switzerland*
- *United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), Vienna, Austria*
- *Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), New York, USA*
- *United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) New York, USA*
- *United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), Amman, Jordan*
- *United Nations Special Tribunal for Lebanon, Leidschendam, The Netherlands*
- *United Nations System Staff College (UNSSC), Turin, Italy*
- *World Bank (WB), Washington, D.C. USA (A)*
- *World Food Programme (WFP), Rome, Italy (A)*
- *World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland (A)*
- *World Intellectual Property Organization, Geneva, Switzerland (A)*
- *World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland*
- *World Trade Organization, Geneva, Switzerland*

Associate Members

- *Association Mutualiste des Fonctionnaires Internationaux en Europe (AMFIE), Luxembourg*
- *Coordinating Committee of International Staff Unions & Associations (CCISUA), New York, USA*
- *International Public Management Association for Human Resources (IPMA-HR), Alexandria, VA., USA*
- *United Nations Field Service Staff Union, Brindisi, Italy*

Leadership Gap Indicator



Q.

- What skills and perspectives are most critical to your organisation's success?
- How strong are those skills and perspectives among your current leaders?
- Are there gaps that need to be addressed?

A.

Successful organisations require effective leadership, which is comprised of knowing your current organisational leadership skills and how valuable those are to the success of the organisation now and in the future. Identifying the gaps in your organisational leadership capacity is fundamental to knowing where to focus development efforts.

The Leadership Gap Indicator is a new assessment designed to help your organisation identify the effectiveness of current leadership skills and draw attention to developmental needs that may exist. By identifying any gap between today's skills and those required for future success, organisations will have the data they need to begin making strategic plans for developing leadership talent.



Developed as part of a major research initiative, the study surveyed 2,670 managers from 15 organisations in three countries.

Outcomes:

- Discover the specific leadership skills essential to the success of your organisation.
- Identify the strength of skills and perspectives among current leaders.
- Recognize the gaps that need to be addressed.
- Identify factors impeding success and derailing careers.

Who Would Benefit from This Survey?

Organisations that need help with talent management and training needs.

The Leadership Gap Indicator is the only instrument of its kind on the market today.

The assessment is:

- Customisable targeting only the competencies you need.
- Research based ensuring valid and reliable results.
- Web enabled reducing administration time and costs.

For more information, contact:

Hans Onderbeke • +32(0) 2 679 09 10 • onderbekeh@ccl.org

Center for Creative Leadership
Avenue de Teroueren / Terourenlaan 270
B-1150 Brussels, Belgium
(+32) (0)2 679 0910
www.ccl.org

Association for Human Resources Management in
International Organizations
Boite Postale 36
F-01230 Ferney-Voltaire Cedex
France
(+41) (0)22 379 8841
www.ahrmio.org

85 €

