



# ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTIFIC & TECHNICAL OFFICERS

Registered with the Registrar of Societies Uttarakhand Govt., Registration No. 172 (1967-68)

## OIL AND NATURAL GAS CORPORATION LTD.

Room No. 2016, 2nd Floor, Tower-A, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi-110070

Telefax : 011-26129070 Email : amitkumar@ongc.co.in



### CENTRAL WORKING COMMITTEE

**No. ASTO/CWC/PAR/2018-21/12**

**12.10.2020**

To,  
Director (HR)  
ONGC  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor Deendayal Urja Bhawan  
New Delhi - 110070

#### **Sub: Review of PAR Assessment System introduced from the PAR year 2109-20**

Madam,

As per the office order no. DDN/HRD/PAR/2020/e-PAR dated 27.03.2020, the number of outstanding grade (A+) in PAR up to E6 level has been restricted to 70% at controlling officer level and 50% at Accepting level. The system as such is in the right direction and the efforts of office of Chief HRD are appreciated in this regard. However, there are certain gaps in the system for which we have received number of suggestions.

Madam, the main objective of performance appraisals is to measure and improve the performance of employees and increase their future potential and value to the company. Other objectives include facilitating promotion decisions, providing feedback, understanding training needs, PRP and annual awards.

The restriction of performance appraisal has led to many deserving officers getting 94.99 with accepting officers mentioning that he deserves better but due to system restriction we are unable to rate him excellent.

Controlling officers identify the potential of their subordinates and assign the tasks as per their best capabilities and it is his prime responsibility to keep them motivated and take best work out of them. They need to award the PAR grade as per the contribution, capabilities and with the objective to develop an officer so that he/she realizes his/her true potential. PAR grading is an important tool available for motivation. Restricting the same has reduced the judgmental freedom.

The overall impact on team building shall also be there especially in field operations. Lot of officers who are outstanding could not be given outstanding as they were not in promotion zone and the accepting officer felt that he shall rate the officer in promotion zone outstanding. Thus restricting the number of executives getting outstanding PAR does not serve any organizational objective rather it has demotivated the work force. It is one of the main driving force of an employee to work hard and maintain high level of performance.

Madam, please find enclosed some suggestions on the PAR system in order to address the gaps in the present system.

With warm Regards

  
(Amit Kumar)  
President CWC

#### **Copy to:**

1. CMD pl.
2. Dir (Fin)/Dir (Offshore)/ Dir (Expl)/Dir (T&FS)/Dir (Onshore) pl.
3. ED - Chief HRD/ Chief ER
4. President/Secretary - All ASTO units



**CENTRAL WORKING COMMITTEE**

**REFERENCE:**

1. OONO. DDN/HRD/PAR/2020 /e-PAR dated 27.03.2020 in regards to improvements & modifications in the Performance Appraisal Process (ePAR system) w.e.f. Assessment Year 2019-20.
2. Circular No. 11(34)/RP-C/2020/Cut-off dated 23.09.2020 in regards to Cut-off batch for Corporate level promotions for promotion w.e.f. 01.01.2021
3. Letter President, ASTO CWC dated 14.05.2020 in regards to Modified Performance Appraisal System (e-PAR system) and extension of Date filling of e-PAR.

**ISSUES OF CONCERN:**

- The OO has been notified at the end of AY 2019-20 and changes such as moderation, reporting chain, etc. have been incorporated in the ongoing review process of AY 2019-20.
- The implementation of Clause 7 of the said order (Moderation) in system appears to be flawed and in contravention of the Office order. It requires clarification on the part of implementers on following as aspect(s):

A. Clause 7(ii) & (iii) of the order says:

***“ii. Moderation limit shall be met in phased manner. The A+ grades %age shall be reduced @ 10% every year till limit is reached. For year 2019-20, the limit of A+ grades shall be 50%. Reporting and Reviewing Authorities to also adhere to the limits at their end. Accepting Authority shall meet the defined A+ grade %age limit.***

***iii. However, in cases of Accepting Authorities, where A+ grade limit could not be met (%age higher than specified), moderation of A+ grades of E1-E5 level PARs shall be done by L-1 executive concerned and the PARs of E6 level shall be moderated by Functional Director (as per promotion process)”***

B. So, as per the order, moderation to be carried out at the level of Accepting authorities but in case the %age is higher, the same shall be done by concerned L-1. It means the system must not stop the accepting authorities from giving A+ than the specified percentage but rather inform them about the limit. In case, they choose to allot A+ to higher percentage of people, the moderation should flow to L-1.

C. However, this is not the case and it appears the system is restricting accepting authorities (for E-1 to E-3 level) from allotting A+ to higher percentage of assessee. The moderation at L-1 level is not being enabled in the system. **This is a contradiction of the office order and needs to be clarified from the end of implementers in system.**



**CENTRAL WORKING COMMITTEE**

- The system has been enabled with checks at executive levels, so for instance, if there are two E-2, one E-3 and one E-4 under an accepting authority, the system would allow A+ to three assessee (one at each level) and even if the performance of E-2 is better than employees at other levels, because of the level wise moderation, he/ she would suffer.

If the idea is to have a realistic evaluation of employees and then how come system based technicalities prove detrimental for performance evaluation of the deserving ones. The system here, with part-manual and part-systematic appears to be taken without taking into consideration of realistic situation within the organization.

- It needs to be looked at how reporting chain works in a decentralized setup and centralized set up within the organization. For instance as per clause 10 of the said order, for E-1 and E-2, the accepting authority has to be L-III (not below E-5) and for E-3, the same has to be L-II (not below E-6). For example if we take a case of MM section, In-charge MM at various workcenters (excluding Corporate Set up) is L-III / L-II. So accepting authorities are at that level and PAR shall be moderated at that level. So, he will have a clear picture of all the E-1 to E-3 level MM officers under his command in the Asset.

And, coming to the same set up in Corporate Set up like Corporate MM, there are four L-III (Group-In charges) and one L-II (HOD). Manpower is distributed across the groups based on the work-load of the group. Now, when it comes to PAR evaluation, the workload goes for a toss and evaluation becomes a number game.

It has been brought to our notice that this year, large number of officers were graded below A+, not because they have performed lesser in the eyes of seniors / evaluators but on the grounds of technicalities (being two individuals in a small working group at same level). Most of the officers opined that the new e-par system is in present shape can be detrimental in long run.

- New EPAR system will be problematic in cases where there is very sparse manpower and choosing one out of two equally competent person is extremely difficult. And if the CO is forced to do it, then he has to be prepared to expect only 50% output of his team subsequently.
- Our entire operations are team work and every team member has a role to play. The success depends on efforts of entire team. For example, in Plants or Drill sites or Installations or Offshore, where there is 14 days ON-OFF system, one team handles operation for 14 days and the other for another 14 days. Both these teams perform equally and only then production is maintained. It is not that one team gives higher production and the other does not. So discrimination and restricting one group is demoralising.

As an example say A & B of same level are posted in field under controlling officer C. D who is also of the same level as A & B is posted at head quarter under



**CENTRAL WORKING COMMITTEE**

controlling officer E. Here at the level of C only one from A or B can get A+ grade. If A gets A+, B will automatically be restricted to maximum grade A. Now D can get A+ from his controlling officer E. A, B & C being at same level will compete for promotion. B is at clear disadvantage and without getting a fair chance is out of the race even before it starts. This way, one who is in headquarter performing 8 hours duty with another controlling officer is eligible for higher grades whereas one in field performing 12 hours duty is not in spite of facing hardships of field. This makes the new system unfair especially to executives working in field operations onshore as well as offshore.

In present circumstances, every officer has contributed beyond their limits in field. For them if one gets higher and the other gets lower from the Controlling officer, it is injustice. And most CO are in dilemma. Now some in HQ will be getting A+ whereas those in field for 55 / 60 days will be restricted to maximum "A". This will be unfair for them and highly demoralising.

- Moderation of PAR should not be at the controlling officer level, the lowest level in the PAR chain. Moderation should be at highest level so that every officer gets fair chance to achieve highest grade.

Restricting at controlling officer is very unfair. Similar to say a student being restricted by university to score 100% and only 50% students are eligible to score 100 or first class and next 50% are eligible to score maximum second class . This seems unfair. All should have fair chance to score 100%.

**Suggestions:**

1. **KRA-2:** Marks on system improvement should be reduced to 2or3 from existing 5.
2. **KRA-3:** HSE management has been given a weightage of 10 marks. This needs to be changed because there are no existing set protocols by which this parameter can be assessed objectively. Take for example a comparison of an offshore installation and an R&D institute situated at Dehradun. The odds of HSE management are strikingly different. There can be a situation that where despite better adherence to the HSE protocols an offshore installation has recorded more number of HSE incidents than the R&D centre. But while evaluation during the PAR, the R&D centre gets more marks because there has been no HSE related incidences. Comparing/Equating HSE management in field and Office management is not a fair comparison. Moreover, HSE reporting are often filtered/curtailed at many levels. We feel that this weightage in PAR will lead to increase in curtailment of HSE incidences. We need to adopt a system for HSE similar to what is done for MOUs; different assets /basins/institute, the HSE marks also need to be rated centrally and hence should remain same (as per HSE rating) for all the employees of a particular asset/basin/ institute.



**CENTRAL WORKING COMMITTEE**

3. **KRA-4:** Qualitative: The guidelines issued on PAR 2019-20 define it as a measure of quality / reliability of performance.

Our view:

- The quality/reliability of performance largely depends upon the experience and exposure which in case of ONGC are very varied.
  - The measure of quality too, is individual specific
  - In case somebody lacks enough experience and expertise that is hampering the quality of his output, it's the responsibility of his Manager to see to it that the gaps in his exposure are filled leading to better performance.
  - There can be a situation where in the person who has actually executed the work ends up getting low grade that his senior for the same assignment. This needs to be done away with. There is no need for having separate qualitative evaluation as this aspect is intrinsically embedded in KPIs.
4. **On the marks given to the timely completion if PAR process:** Although this is a welcome step but the circular says that this is applicable w.e.f. MTR of 2019-20 (ended in Oct 2019), whereas the guidelines to this effect were issued on 27.03.2020. It is not fair to rate PAR on a timeline parameter which has ended some six months before the guidelines of evaluation are issued.
5. Restriction of A+ grading should not be made level specific. Instead Controlling officers should be given the authority of grading 70% of his subordinates as A+, irrespective of their levels. For example: if one controlling officer has two E3 and two E2 level officers than gross total of officers i.e. 04 officers should be taken and 70 % of the total may be given A+ as the output may not depend upon the level. Controlling officers should be at liberty to select his best performer, irrespective of their levels. The same system should be available to Accepting Officers also with 70% limit instead of 50% limit.
6. Classifying the assignments into office/field/lab is incomplete. There are locations other than these three and many a time there is more than one location in which an officer performs.
7. Performance system as such should not be restrictive as we could not come across any such guideline/GOI circular in this regard.