Facts and performance of our career system
The NCS has made career advancement subject to performance.

Circular 364 states consideration for equal opportunities & attention to staff left out

But does the NCS deliver?
What is performance?

Necessary: Achieve goals, Demonstrating strength in competencies, Show engagement on priorities

Can staff be compared?

Regulations silent on criteria sufficient to avoid arbitrariness. Instead: Harmonization process.

The case of DG1: Examiners and FOs
Examiners perform similar tasks with a well-defined end point

Work intensity ×
Work output ✓

Work output per unit time = productivity
One KPI to compare performance: productivity

Distribution of productivity in DG1 over 10 months

- **Sector ICT**
  - Peak 1,48
  - Av. 1,7

- **Sector M&M**
  - Peak 1,64
  - Av. 1,82

- **Sector HBC**
  - Peak 1,83
  - Av. 2,22
Productivity shows a Gaussian spread

- Normal distribution
- Number of colleagues

Productivity [days/product]
One would expect the distribution of rewards to display a Gaussian distribution as well.

But does it?
The real distribution of awards (Average : 5)
Expected Gaussian distribution with an average of 5 steps and a sigma of 1 step

Pensionable reward distribution 2015-2021
The career system does not reflect the performance.

It amplifies the differences.
Difference between reality and fairness

Difference "Real - Gaussian"

Staff that received too few steps
Notwithstanding the catch-up mechanism!
The catch-up mechanism of 2020
Formality officers perform a large variety of tasks

Work intensity ✔

Work output ❌

Same observation for the distribution of rewards
Conclusion: if you have been rewarded less than average and yet you provide a fair contribution to the collective output, you have a reasonable cause to request a pensionable salary progression.
Disclaimer: this presentation is not an endorsement of any feature of the “New Career System” as all aspects of it are still subject to legal challenges.