

To

Shri Sunil Kumar

Director (HR), MTNL

Corporate Office, New Delhi

Subject: unjust and uncalled for raising the benchmark for promotions of the executive — a deep dent in MTNL's Performance and Efficiency

Sir

MTNL management unilaterally and unjustly raised the benchmark grading for promotion, totally detrimental to the executives and the company's interest. The earlier benchmarks were decided with profound deliberations and in line with Dot Rule and Absorption Conditions.

Despite our clear and outright opposition, MTNL management highhandedly issued new stricter benchmark for promotions of the executives in isolation. We have raised strong objections to this raising of benchmark and demanded immediate review of all dropped Promotion cases immediately for justice, fairness and organisational harmony.

In spite of intended objectives of achieving higher efficiencies and performance improvement, this is doing the opposite. Several persons are denied upgradation on pretext of not rated Very Good. Since our Annual Appraisal System itself is inherently defective and counterproductive, we are losing many man-hours of constructive productivity from these affected persons.

How anyone can imagine and understand that even a **single below Very Good rating** that too not for performance but for extraneous reasons can be so incurable, harmful, and detrimental by depriving one his legitimate right of upgradation for ten precious years.

If anyone already having continuously excellent APAR and for, whatever reasons, he was not given very good for even a year or half or say for even a period of 90 days only, he will be stripped of his promotional avenues for further five years with indicator that during next 5 years if such things will happen again, it lowers the esteem in workplace and society. The person will be a totally irritated, displeased and disguised one. He will be highly frustrated and have zero motivation. Such a person is not expected to perform for the company any more. He or she simply start passive working attending only the formalities with all his capabilities died forever causing irreparable loss to the company also.

See the other face of it; even after paying full salary to that person only denying merely 3% increment that too after 5 years, but his efficiency is dropped to bottom down level immediately. There are chances that person starts working detrimental to the company and at least against the team spirit. This way company's full salary is wasted.

We have seen in reality that some people want their egos and self-esteem satisfied by subordinates, irrespective of sincerity to work and to the company by influencing rating in APAR. That way it is rapidly eroding faithfulness to the company. Moreover appraisal reports are written years after the reported period, when it has no relevance and memories of actual period. It is written merely as a formality and does not fulfil intended purposes. This way it is a waste of time and efforts. There are several questions in the minds of executives, which raises doubts and established the insufficiency of the system itself.

To operate the system, even the most essential element i.e. the KPA's have not been formulated as yet. No training activities have been undertaken to implement the change. Neither any feedback system has been put in place nor have any training and development programme been put in place or even proposed for improving the individual low performers. No provision has been made in the policy that even after undergoing successful performance enhancing training & development process, the performance rating of an individual will be restored to desired level. It does not address the question as to how otherwise a continuously excellent or very good rated executive suddenly becomes a low performer while working with a particular superior. Is reporting officer's failure is not responsible for the low performance of their subordinates. Is there exists any accountability to how and when the superior has been able to caution and motivate the lower performance of his subordinates while delivering the service? What to do if a frequently under performer superior gives low rating due to his own superiority or inferiority-complex and why no detailed reason and suggestion for development are given for low rated performance.

In the name of representation against, instead of asking from the reported executive for the lower rating given to him, why not the reporting office is also made to explain his role and accountability in the underperformance and enumerate the detailed reason for his remarks and rating. After all it is the question of someone's career and promotion. In our legal system, one can only be punished when proved guilty beyond doubt and by all means deserve benefit of doubt. Is HR Unit is prepared enough to enumerate and debate any benefits derived out of this policy so far? Whether after implementation of this policy any improvement in the performance of the company has been visible whilst opposite is seen and believed everywhere.

The system is totally punitive, demoralising, depressing, oppressing and certainly bound to lower the efficiency of the company. We openly condemn this benchmark policy and particularly linking it to promotion, which is counterproductive and detrimental to both the executive and the company as well.

We appeal and demand the management to call off revised benchmark and discuss this issue with our associations for better and workable solutions and hold old DPCs

with old bench marks (CRs of the period before December 2010 be considered for promotion with old bench marks).

The main motive of APAR and bench mark must be to encourage individual executive and enhance the company's performance. APAR should not be used as punitive and in negative terms in name of Bench Mark for promotions but for development. There should be various ways to deal this situation of alleged underperformance i.e.

- i) All below bench mark grading in APAR must accompany details of the timely initiatives and corrective steps taken by the boss to correct the underperformer of his subordinate. This will go a long way in building an atmosphere of trust, cooperative work environment and inculcate team spirit in the company.
- ii) Company may send an executive rated below bench mark to training to acquire identified weaknesses and needed skill. And only after result of that training any action be taken on that APAR. On successful completion of that training, entry be made in APAR and the APAR should be considered above bench mark.
- iii) If some APARs are below bench mark, then earlier APAR's may be considered to evaluate for promotions. This way executive is prompted to maintain a steady state of good performance and any bias element in reporting of APAR while posting under a notorious boss will be taken care of. It will ensure that executive aligned to company's interest as against satisfaction of personal interest of his superior.
- iv) Alternatively, marks secured in last (5 Yrs) APAR's may be summed up and average score determined. To this few grace points may be allowed seeing the past and present performance of the executive so that he is prompted to better performance in coming time.
- v) Records of all reported underperformances under any senior executive should also be indicated in APAR of that executive (Boss) by him indicating remedial steps taken to turn around that underperformance. All such underperformance shall be properly accounted in his APAR with suitable weighage of marks.

All outstanding APAR's should be posted on intranet webpage as recognition of excellent performances and encouragement for those individuals as well as to fire an urge to excel in others.

With warm regards

Yours sincerely

(V.K.Tomar)

Copy to:

1. Shri A.K.Garg, CMD for n/a pl
2. Shri P.K.Purwar, Director (Fin) for n/a pl
3. Mrs Rajni Taneja GM (HR) for n/a pl
4. Shri B.K.Mittal, ED, Delhi for n/a pl
5. Shri Peeyush Agarwal, ED, Mumbai for n/a pl