

For Official Use



A Guide to Performance Evaluation

**PAKISTAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
RESEARCH CENTRE
MANAGEMENT SERVICES WING
ESTABLISHMENT DIVISION
ISLAMABAD
(Edition 2004)**

Copyright(C) 2004,
Director General, Pakistan Public Administration Research Centre, Islamabad

All rights reserved.
No Part of this publication can be reproduced in any form or by any means without prior permission in writing
from Director General, Pakistan Public Administration Research Centre, Islamabad.

FOREWORD

The Performance Evaluation Reports are the most important document in the history of career of a civil servant. An officer's promotion and retention in service mostly depends on what has been recorded in the PERs. For convenience of the Ministries/Divisions and functionaries who have to write PERs on their subordinates, the PPARC of Establishment Division compiled all relevant instructions and orders issued by the Government from time to time emphasizing the importance of report writing and the principles and rules governing it, in the form of a handbook titled "A Guide to Performance Evaluation". The last edition of the handbook was published in 1991 copies of which are no more available in stock.

2. As there was a large demand for more copies of the publication, it was considered important to bring out a revised/updated edition incorporating the latest instructions/amendments issued since the publication of its last edition. It is hoped that the revised edition will provide guidance to the reporting/countersigning officers, facilitate proper maintenance of character rolls as well as quick disposal of related issues.

3. I would appreciate the hard work done by Miss Saeed-Un-Nisa Abbasi, Director (M&P) in the revision work of "A Guide to Performance Evaluation" which has been completed under able leadership of Syed Tariq Ali Bukhari, Secretary Establishment and guidance of Mr. Mukhtar Ahmad, Additional Secretary.

4. Any suggestions for improvement of the publication would be most welcome and may be addressed to the Director General, Pakistan Public Administration Research Centre, M. S. Wing, Establishment Division.

Islamabad
December, 2004

Zafarullah Khan
Director General

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

SECTION	PARA(s)
1. INTRODUCTION	1.1-5
2. WRITING OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS (ANNUAL AND SPECIAL)	
(i) Importance of writing Performance Evaluation Reports and precautions to be taken:	
(a) General Instructions	2.1-6
(b) Instructions applicable to Superintendents and non-gazetted staff	2.7
(ii) How to write and countersign the Reports:	
(a) Instructions for the Reporting Officers	2.8
(b) Manner and style of dress of officers	2.9
(c) Use of typewriter for preparing reports	2.10(a)
(d) Name and designation of the Reporting Officer to be typed or written in block letters	2.10(b)-12
(e) Instructions for the Countersigning Officers	2.13-14
(f) PER Gradings	2.15-17
(g) Rating of Performance Evaluation Reports as "Outstanding"	2.18-20
(h) Avoidance of personal remarks in writing PER's	2.21
(i) Dealing with the public and interest in socio-economic reforms	2.22
(j) Maintenance of a 'Katcha' Register	2.23-24
(k) Placing Government servants on Special Reports.....	2.25-26
(iii) When to write Reports:	
(a) General Instructions	2.27-34
(b) Linking of Performance Evaluation of C.B.R. Employees with financial year instead of calendar year	2.34-A
(c) Reports to be written in time.....	2.35-36
(d) Time-schedule for sending PERs to the Establishment Division	2.37
(e) Timely Return of Performance Evaluation Reports of Officers in BS-17 and above.....	2.38
(f) Forwarding of PERs to Establishment Division in respect of Officers in BS-17	2.39
(g) Keeping PERs Dossiers complete and up -to-date	2.40-41
(h) Return about completion of PERs	2.42
(iv) Who should write or countersign?	
(a) General Instructions	2.43
(b) Officer who has worked for less than three months with Reporting Officer.....	2.44-45
(c) Cases where there are one or more than one Countersigning Officers	2.46
(d) Reports of Officers under suspension/absent from duty	2.47
(e) Writing/Countersigning of PERs by Officers under suspension	2.48
(f) Officers in Pakistan Diplomatic Missions abroad	2.49-50
(g) For Officers retired under MLRs 58 and 114	2.51
(h) Officers retired compulsorily or expired	2.52-53
(i) Completion of PERs of Officers/Officials working in the Ex-Prime Minister's Secretariat	2.54
(j) Completion of PERs of Officers/ Officials	2.55
(k) East Pakistani Officers	2.56
(l) Officers on deputation to Foreign Organizations.....	2.57-60
(m) Countersignature of PERs	2.61-62
(n) PERs on Secretaries to Government.....	2.63

	PARA(s)
(o) Officers of the status of Secretary to Government, Additional Secretaries and Joint Secretaries including those on deputation to Autonomous Bodies	2.64(i-v)
(p) Additional Secretaries and Joint Secretaries to Government	2.65-67
(q) Officers of the rank of Joint Secretary and above serving in the Provinces.....	2.68
(r) Ex -CSP Officers of Judicial Branch.....	2.69
(s) Section Officers holding current charge of Deputy Secretary and those working directly under the Secretary	2.70-71
(t) SO (F&A)/DS (F&A).....	2.72
(u) Officers of a Division under the charge of the President	2.73
(v) Personal staff of Ministers	2.74
(w) Private Secretaries/Personal Assistants/Stenographers	2.75
(x) Armed Forces Officers	2.76
(y) District Officers.....	2.77-81
(z) Authorities for initiation/countersigning and expunction of adverse remarks in respect of DCOs, EDOs and District Officers	2.81-A
(1) Officer holding charge of two posts	2.82
(2) PERs initiated by Heads of Autonomous Bodies	2.83
(3) PERs on:	
(i) Members of Services Tribunal	2.84(i)
(ii) Members of Income Tax Appellate Tribunal	2.84(ii)
(iii) Officers of Northern Areas	2.85
(iv) Re-employed officers	2.86
(v) Officers on Special Duty.....	2.87
(vi) Non-official Members, Directors, etc. of Corporations/Autonomous Bodies under the Government appointed on contract basis	2.88
(vii) Finance Directors serving in corporations controlled by the Government	2.89
(viii) Service Financial Advisors	2.90
(ix) Assistant Collectors and Appraisers under the CBR	2.91
3. PROCEDURE REGARDING ADVERSE REMARKS	
(i) Summary of instructions regarding 'Adverse Remarks'	3.1
(ii) Instructions regarding:	
(a) Communication of adverse remarks	3.2-8
(b) Adverse remarks to be underlined in red ink by countersigning Officer	3.9-10
(c) Remarks "unlikely to progress further/unfit for further promotion" ..	3.11
(d) Officers with average reports	3.12
(e) Effect of communication - of adverse/advisory remarks	3.13-15
(f) Un-finalized departmental proceedings	3.16-19
(g) Communication of Evaluation Reports by NIPAs and Pakistan Administrative Staff College, Lahore	3.20
(h) Communication of Adverse Remarks in the Evaluation Reports of Training Institution	3.21
(i) Communication of adverse remarks recorded in the PERs of deputationists	3.22
(j) Communicating adverse remarks to probationers	3.23-24
(k) Recording of punishment orders in the character rolls of officers including orders conveying warning/displeasure	3.25-29
(iii) Procedure for dealing with representations for expunction of adverse entries:	
(a) Representations against adverse remarks in evaluation reports	3.30-34
(b) References to officers who have retired or proceeded on LPR	3.35-37
(iv) Procedure for expunction of adverse entries in the evaluation reports of Government servants	3.38-40
(v) Revised Gradings of expunged remarks	3.41-42
4. ANCILLARY DOCUMENTS TO BE PLACED ON CRs DOSSIERS	
(i) Letters of appreciation from Government	4.1-3
(ii) Remarks recorded by Minister/Senior Officers	4.4

	PARA(s)
(iii) Entries regarding honoraria/award	4.5
(iv) Suggestions accepted by Idea Award Committee	4.6
(v) Requests for posting out of officers from Ministries/Divisions	4.7
(vi) Reflection in Performance Evaluation Report of Extraneous Influence by Government Servants in respect of Service matters	4.8
(vii) Evaluation reports on the trainees at NIPAs, P.A.S.C. etc	4.9-11
(viii) Reports on Officers detailed for training abroad	4.12
(ix) Nomination forms under the Central Employees Benevolent Fund and Group Insurance Act, 1969	4.13
(x) (a) Annual Medical Examination Reports	4.14-19
(b) Re-employed/superannuated officers	4.20
(c) Army Officers in civil employ	4.21
(d) Maintenance of Medical Rolls with the C.R. dossiers	4.22-25
(e) Medical reports on officers deputed to international organizations	4.26
(xi) Strictures passed by Courts against Government servants	4.27
5. SAFE CUSTODY, PROPER MAINTENANCE AND MOVEMENT OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS/CHARACTER ROLL DOSSIERS	
(i) Safe custody-General Instructions.....	5.1-4
(ii) Confidential record to be page numbered	5.5
(iii) Character Rolls of Retired Officers	5.6
(iv) Character Rolls of Government servants no longer in service	5.7
(v) Forwarding and returning of character rolls	5.8-9
(vi) Where to be kept-Character Rolls of different Category of Officers:	
(a) Secretariat Officers.....	5.10
(b) Officers of the Attached Departments	5.11
(c) Duplicate PERs Dossiers-former CSP and PCS Officers	5.12-14
(d) Section Officers, other than former CSP, PCS and GAR Officers	5.15
(e) PCS Officers, serving at the Centre	5.16
(f) All remaining Grade 17 and above Officers serving in the Federal Secretariat, Attached and Subordinate Offices	5.17
(g) Character Rolls of Officers of former PA & AS, PMAS, PTS, Assistant Accounts Officers and Officers of Railway Accounts Departments	5.18-19
(vii) Duplicate Evaluation Reports of all Grade-17 officers and above	5.20-22
(viii) Duplicate C.R Dossiers not to be requisitioned from the Establishment Division	5.23-24
(ix) Proper maintenance of character rolls	5.25-26
(x) Affixing of photographs on C.R. Dossiers of Gazetted Officers (excluding Purdah observing Officers)	5.27-31
6. STANDARDISED FORMS -PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS	
(i) Standardised PER Forms of Ministerial Staff/Staff Car Drivers/Despatch Riders.....	6.1-3
(ii) Revised PER Forms for Officers in Grade 17 and above	6.4-5
(iii) Revision of Performance Evaluation Forms (PER).....	6.6-8
7. MISCELLANEOUS INSTRUCTIONS	
(i) Writing of PERs not a condition of service	7.1-3
(ii) Guarding against personal likes and dislikes	7.4
(iii) Cost of photographs affixed on the Character Roll Dossiers	7.5-6

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

‘But Allah is not unmindful of what ye do!’

(Al-Quran S. II-140).

1.1 ‘Performance Evaluation’ may be termed as a system of making judgments about performance of officials of various levels by their superiors in order to guide selections and other personnel decisions. Evaluation Reports (Form S. 121-A to G) rendered by reporting officers, on the performance of officials serving under them constitute the most important basis of Evaluation. The character roll dossier maintained for the purpose contains a systematically prepared and carefully assembled performance record of the official concerned.

1.2 The Establishment Division of the Government of Pakistan is responsible for issue of policy directions for preparation and maintenance of the confidential records and standardisation of report writing forms. A centralised policy control ensures uniformity of practice and procedure throughout the range of the Federal Government. It is also responsible for maintenance of Character Rolls of officers of the All-Pakistan Unified Grades, the cadres administratively controlled by it *e. g.*, Office Management and Secretariat Groups, and duplicate PER dossiers of other BPS- 17 and above officers. Detailed instructions on all important aspects of the reporting system have already been issued from time to time. Instructions of current application have been reproduced in this Hand Book after suitable editing. Some of the important points have also been printed on the Forms itself for convenience of the reporting/countersigning officers and others responsible for custody of the character roll.

1.3 Since the Evaluation reports constitute an aid to selections for training, appointments/transfers, promotions, confirmations or screening of officials, it is essential that they are written most carefully. A reporting officer before he embarks on the report writing work should try to comprehend the characteristics listed in the Evaluation Report Forms. The report should give a clear picture of the officer reported upon *viz* personal qualities, standard of performance, dealings with others, potential growth and his suitability for promotion to special posts according to individual aptitude. Similarly, the countersigning officers should scrutinise the report scrupulously, in accordance with the prescribed procedure before countersigning it.

1.4 The revised performance evaluation report form (S- 121 -G) was introduced by the Establishment Division in 1982 to reflect an officer's strong and weak points more objectively and to ensure that such performance evaluation effectively serves its true purpose. The revised form is by now well understood and generally accepted to have improved the quality of reporting. The new form and promotion policy in fact constitute the key elements in personnel administration but their usefulness is ultimately dependent on objective reporting. The attention of the reporting officers/countersigning officers is drawn to the deficiencies commonly noted in such reports

(1) Assessment by Reporting Officer

Many reporting officers are overly generous in their assessment. In some extreme cases, reporting officers have rated all officers serving with them as "very good" which is obviously a misjudgement. Such reporting places equally good officers of the same group working elsewhere at a disadvantage since their work is evaluated under more objective and stricter criteria. This also applies to cases where all entries under Parts II, III and IV of the PER Form (S-121-G) are recorded as uniformly superlative.

(2) Counselling

Adverse remarks are often recorded by the reporting officers without prior counselling to the officer reported upon. This is contrary to the existing instructions and is, in fact, a reflection on the reporting officer. They are expected to counsel an officer about his weak points and advise him how to improve. Adverse remarks should normally be recorded only when the officer fails to improve despite counselling.

(3) Countersigning

It has been noticed time and again that countersigning officers, when differing with the assessment or remarks given by a reporting officer, neither score these out nor do they give their own assessment in red ink against the relevant remarks. These entries, particularly on "quality and output of work" and "integrity" are of crucial importance when considering an officer for promotion. Further, some countersigning officers do not initial the appropriate boxes in Part VI of the reports on overall grading and fitness for promotion.

(4) Countersigning officer does not underline in red ink the remarks which in his opinion are adverse.

1.5 It is hoped that reporting and countersigning officers will avoid these deficiencies in reporting. It may be added that the President had been pleased to direct that any casual or intemperate writing of PERs should also be brought to his notice.

[Establishment Secretary's D.O. No. 6/1/84-PP. II dated February 12, 1984. May be read with Establishment Division's OMs No. 1/10/2000-DS (Coord) dated 18-8-2000, 17-10-2000 and 25-10-2001 (Paras 6.6, 6.7, and 6.8)].

SECTION 2

**WRITING OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS
(ANNUAL AND SPECIAL)****Importance of writing Evaluation reports and precautions to be taken**

2.1 The preparation of Evaluation reports is an important and responsible duty. The manner in which Evaluation reports are written will be taken into account in judging the qualities of the reporting officer. The opinions which are expressed should represent the result of careful consideration objective assessment, so that, if called upon, the reporting officer could justify the assessment of his subordinate made by him.

2.2 Reports should be rendered without reference to previous reports by reporting officers. Neither the reporting nor the countersigning officer should pass to another officer any notes or copies of his reports which he may have made.

2.3 Although the reporting officers, should write the Evaluation reports initially without reference to the previous reports to facilitate unbiased judgement, they may afterwards consult previous reports particularly to ensure whether any additional comments are required on points previously reported on.

[c.f. Paras 7-8 of O.M. No. F. 5/3/48-Estt. (SE), dated 1-8-1949.]

2.4 Evaluation reports on officers are of the greatest importance when appointments or promotions have to be made. The necessity of preparing these reports with the utmost care cannot therefore be over emphasised. The following points need to be invariably checked when the reports are written :

- (a) The period under review should be clearly stated.
- (b) If the report mentions a remediable fault, which is to be or has been communicated, this should always be stated.
- (c) The remarks, if written in hand, should be written very legibly.

(d) The initials, name and the designation of the reporting officer being clearly written in block letters or typed under the signature and date on which the report is signed being clearly shown.

(e) If the report mentions an apparently remediable fault, which has not been communicated, the highest authority handling the report should be asked by a note, whether or not this should be done. The decision not to do so, or the letter in which this communication is made, should form Part of the file.

[c.f. Para 2 of O.M. No. 5/3/48-SE. I, dated 12-9-1951.]

2.5 It has been noticed that despite clear instructions regarding writing of PERs and maintenance of character rolls issued by the Establishment Division from time to time and printed on the PER Form itself, a large number of Character Rolls submitted to the various Departmental Promotion Committees, Selection Boards and FPSC etc. by the Ministries/Divisions are neither complete nor upto-date. This causes great difficulty in assessing the suitability of candidates for promotion etc. A few general defects which have frequently come to the notice are given below :-

- (i) In a number of cases, the reports for the last 5-10 years are not complete nor is any reason recorded for the missing report of a year.
- (ii) Evaluation reports are neither page numbered in ink nor placed in chronological order.
- (iii) Due care is not taken while recording assessment and pen picture of the official/officer in PER. Form and writing the remarks in other Parts of the PER with the result that assessment recorded in different parts of that PER. Forms are not in conformity with each other.
- (iv) In some cases particulars of officers given in their Character Rolls do not tally with the service and other particulars of the officers furnished separately to F.P.S.C.
- (v) Sometimes there is no record to show whether or not the adverse remarks have been communicated to the officers concerned.
- (vi) In certain reports names and designations of reporting officers and countersigning officers are not indicated clearly in block letters or typed or rubber stamped below the signature as required under rules.

(vii) Medical examination reports are not regularly sent.

2.6 Evaluation Reports are of extreme importance and the need to prepare them with utmost care can not be over emphasised. It should therefore, be impressed on the officers concerned that the reports should be written and maintained strictly in accordance with the relevant instructions.

[c.f. D.O. Letter No. 6/3/73-A, 11, dated 14-6-1973.]

2.7 *Superintendents and non-gazetted staff.*-In order to ensure uniformity in the procedure for the preparation, custody etc., of the PERs in respect of officers and other staff, it has been decided that the basic rules printed on the PER form for officers [Form S. 121-G (i) (ii) & (iii)] and the provisions of the following Office Memoranda shall also henceforth be applicable in cases of other staff including superintendents:

(1)	Last sentence of para 6 of O.M. No. 8/4/59 E.O.M. dt. 16-1-1960	(Para 5.20)
(2)	No. 3/3/60-C dt. 10-6-1960	*Omitted
(3)	No. 1/8/60-C dt. 9-2-1961	(Para 4.5)
(4)	No. 6/14/61-C dt. 7-8-1961	(Para 7.4)
(5)	No. 6/16/61-A. II dt. 20-1-1962	[Para 2.10]
(6)	Para 5 of O.M. No. 2/17/61-A. IV dt. 31-10-1961	(Para 4.9)
(7)	No. 6/5/66-A. II dt. 14-9-1966	(Para 2.59)
(8)	No. 4/3/66-A. II dt. 7-1-1967	(Paras 3.35-37)
(9)	No. 6/1/67-A. II dt. 20-2-1967	(Para 2.33)
(10)	No. 126/1/27-O&M dt. 12-7-1967	[Para 3.3(iii) (a)]

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/6/65-A. 11, dated 4-11-1965.]

How to write and countersign the Reports

2.8 *Instructions for the Reporting Officers.*-(I) While reporting on your subordinates:

- (1) Be as objective as possible.
- (2) Be as circumspect as possible.
- (3) Be clear and direct, not ambiguous or evasive in your remarks.
- (4) Avoid exaggeration and gross understatement.

*Note.- For latest instructions see para 7.5-

(ii) State whether any of the defects reported have already been brought to the notice of the officer concerned and also whether he has or has not taken steps to remedy them.

(iii) Fill the form in duplicate by initialling the relevant boxes in both the original and the duplicate copies. You may, if necessary, have your views under "Pen Picture" typed; in that case affix your signature at the end of the "Pen Picture".

[c.f. PER Form S. 121 -A (Rev) Page 4, Section C.]

*[(iv) The President had desired that undue generosity or harshness in the PERs should be pointed out to the reporting/countersigning officers.

(v) It has to be kept in view that too generous reporting places equally good officers of the same group working elsewhere at a disadvantage.]

*[c.f. Estt. Secy's DO. No. 2/6/82-PD-11, dated 15th April, 1982 and D.O. No. 2/23/82-PD. 11, dated 27th May, 1982.]

(vi) The special entry regarding the fitness of a Government servant for continued retention in service will commence 3 years before he is due to complete 25 years. These instructions apply to Gazetted Officers only.

[c.f. O.M. Nos. 6/4/78-PD-II, dated the 13th February, 1979 and dated the 2nd May, 1979.]

2.9 *Manner and style of dress of officers.*-Attention is invited to para 8 of the President's Directive issued *vide* Cabinet Division letter No. 8/503/ 79-Imp, dated 7th November 1979. The reporting officers are required to indicate in the pen picture of an officer's PER whether his manner and style of dress etc. is ostentatious or foppish to the point of being objectionable. This will take effect from the PERs for the year 1979. Instructions may be issued to all concerned for strict compliance.

[c.f. O.M. No. 1/2/79-A. II, dated 18th December, 1979.]

2.10 (a) *Use of typewriter in preparation of the Reports.*-According to the existing orders the Evaluation Reports on Gazetted Officers should be written in duplicate. The Evaluation Reports (both original and duplicate) are normally required to be written in the reporting officer's own hand. It has now been decided that while the reporting officer must continue to initial the relevant boxes in both original and the duplicate copies of the reports, the views expressed under pen picture may be typed and signed by the reporting officer.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/16/61 -A. 11, dated 20-1-1962.]

(b) *Name and designation of the Reporting Officer.* -In many cases the signature of the reporting officers on the reports are illegible. This means that after some time it may, in such cases, be impossible to identify the reporting officer. The name and designation of the reporting officer should, therefore, invariably be typed or written in block letters on the evaluation reports.

[Extract from D.O. Letter No. 9(5)/52-SE. III, dated 11-2-1953.]

2.11 The Establishment Division have been requesting all concerned that remarks in the Evaluation Reports of Government employees, if written in hand, should be legible, the name and designation of the reporting Officer should be clearly written in block letters or typed just below their signatures and the date on which the report is signed should also be indicated.

2.12. Cases, however, continue to come to notice in which these instructions are not followed. It may be partly due to the fact that the officers, who at an earlier stage were not entitled to write out Evaluation Reports, were not kept posted with the relevant instructions on the subject.

It is, therefore, requested that:

- (a) The relevant instructions in this regard may kindly be once again brought to the notice of all the existing reporting officers for their compliance in future.
- (b) Instructions should be issued that any officer who is to begin writing the evaluation reports for the first time should in each case be apprised of the relevant instructions on the subject and asked to follow the same strictly.

[Extract from D.O. Letter No. 12/1/59-Con. dated 19-2-1959.]

2.13. *Instructions for the Countersigning Officers.* - (i) The Countersigning Officers should weigh the remarks of the RO against their personal knowledge of the officer under report and then give their assessment in Part V. In case of disagreement, the Countersigning Officers should give specific reasons in Part V. Similarly, if the Countersigning Officers differ with the grading or remarks given by the Reporting Officer in Part III they should score it out and give their own grading by initialling the appropriate box.

(ii) The Countersigning Officers should make an unbiased evaluation of the quality of performance evaluation made by the RO by categorizing the reports as exaggerated, fair or biased. This would evoke a greater sense of responsibility from the reporting officers.

(iii) The Countersigning Officers should underline, in red ink, remarks which in their opinion are adverse and should be communicated to the officer reported upon. All adverse remarks whether remediable or irreparable should be communicated to the officer underreport, with a copy of communication placed in the CR dossier. Reporting Officers should ensure that proper counselling is given to the officer under report before adverse remarks are recorded.

(iv) The Reporting and Countersigning Officers should be clear, direct, objective and unambiguous in their remarks. Vague impressions based on inadequate knowledge or isolated incidents should be avoided.

(v) Reports should be consistent with the pen picture and overall grading.

[c.f. Guidelines for filling up the PER form printed on S-121-G (i).]

(vi) The Countersigning Officers should weigh the remarks of the RO against their personal knowledge of the officer under report, compare him with other officers of the same grade working under different Reporting Officers, but under the same Countersigning Officer, and then give their overall assessment of the officer. In case of disagreement with the assessment done by the Reporting Officer, specific reasons should be recorded by the Countersigning Officers in Part IV (2).

(vii) The Countersigning Officers should make an unbiased evaluation of the quality of performance evaluation made by the RO by categorizing the reports as exaggerated, fair or biased. This would evoke a greater sense of responsibility from the reporting officers.

(viii) The Countersigning Officers should underline, in red ink, remarks which in their opinion are adverse and should be communicated to the officer reported upon. All adverse remarks whether remediable or irreparable should be communicated to the officer under report, with a copy of communication placed in the CR dossier. Reporting Officers should ensure that they properly counsel the officer under report before adverse remarks are recorded.

(ix) The Reporting and Countersigning Officers should be clear, direct, objective and unambiguous in their remarks. Vague impressions based on inadequate knowledge or isolated incidents should be avoided.

(x) Reports should be consistent with the pen picture, overall grading and comparative grading.

[C.f. Guidelines for filling up the PER form printed on S-121-G (ii).]

(xi) After countersigning the form, return it to the Officer responsible for the custody of the character roll.

(C.f. Page 4, Section D of Form S. 121-A Revised.)

2.14 Utmost care should be taken by the reporting officer while assessing the qualities and work of their subordinates. Biased or evasive reports are likely to cause incalculable damage to the officers reported upon. The whole purpose of Evaluation reports is defeated unless the reporting Officers judge the performance of their sub-ordinates from an absolutely detached and objective point of view. To achieve this objective, it has been provided in the revised form that the countersigning officer should assess the report itself and categorise it as very good/ reasonably good/strict/lenient/biased. This would be conducive to greater sense of responsibility on the part of the Reporting Officer.

[C.f. Para 4 of O.M. No. 8/4/59-EOM, dated 16-1-1960.]

2.15 *PER Gradings.* -(i) The following two points have been raised in connection with writing of Evaluation reports of officers :-

- (a) How to determine the performance assessment of an officer in Part III of the Evaluation report form when the assessment of any other officer in the same grade is not known to the reporting/ countersigning officer?
- (b) Whether the assessment in Part III of the PER form in respect of officer's performance is to be determined with reference to his assessment in Part-II of the form?

(ii) With regard to the first point it has been decided that where there is only one officer in a particular grade his assessment of performance in Part III may be made independently.

(iii) As regards the second point, it has been observed that in some cases the assessment of an officer in Part II and Part III of the PER form [S. 121-A (Revised)] are not co-related. This inconsistency causes a lot of inconvenience to the DPCs as well as the CSB while reviewing the cases of such officers for promotion to higher grade posts. To remove this inconsistency, the assessment of an officer in Part III should, as far as possible, be based on the assessment made about his personal traits and on-the-job performance in Part II. If the major number of entries in Part II are 'good' and in Part III the officer is classified 'average' the reporting officer should give detailed reasons for his 'average' assessment. Normally these should be identical.

[Extract from D.O. Letter No. 6/1/77-A. 11, dated 18-1-1978.]

2.16 (i) It has been observed in a large number of cases that Reporting and Countersigning officers award intermediate gradings in Part III e.g. "between Very Good and Good" and "between Good and Average" etc. It is requested that Reporting and Countersigning Officer may be directed to adhere to the gradings provided in the PER Form [S. 121-A (Revised)] and not to deviate from these.

(ii) It has also been observed that Countersigning Officers while assessing the reports given by Reporting Officer and having assessed these as "strict" or "lenient" do not give their final grading themselves which leads to complications. It is requested that Countersigning Officers may be advised that when they assess the report as "strict" or "lenient" they must record their overall assessment of the officer reported upon in their remarks clearly and also preferably change the overall assessment in Part III of the report [Form S-121-A (Revised)].

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/2/80-A. II, dated 16th January, 1980.]

2.17 In May, 1985 when a new entry for "outstanding" was introduced in the PER proforma, the Establishment Division had emphasized that an officer should be graded outstanding in exceptional cases and only where such grading was fully justified. The relevant portion from the d.o. letter No. * 10(10)/ 85-CP-I, dated 15-5-1985 written by the Establishment Secretary is reproduced below:

"In exceptional cases where the reporting/countersigning officers want to rate an officer as 'outstanding', they may draw in their own hand another box in Part VI of the PER form, initial it and write 'outstanding' on the descriptive side. They would also be required to fully justify this assessment in Part V(c) (by the reporting officer) and Part VII(a) (by the countersigning

*Pl. See promotion policy.

officer). Unless so justified, the assessment would only be deemed to be 'very good' carrying 8 marks."

2. It has been observed that the assessing Officers rating a subordinate as 'outstanding' do not give detailed justification. In many cases officers who were rated as "average" or only "good" till the preceding year suddenly become "outstanding". Obviously such assessments are overgenerous and unjustifiable.

3. The Establishment Division reiterate the instructions reproduced in para 1 of this letter. It has also been decided that the reporting officer assessing an officer as "outstanding" can be called upon to explain as to how the officer has suddenly become so if he had been rated as 'average' or 'good' till the previous year.

[cf. Establishment Division D. O. letter No. 6/25/90-PD-II dated 28th June, 1990.]

Rating of Performance Evaluation Reports as "Outstanding"

2.18 It is clarified that in future the Performance Evaluation Reports are not to be adjudged as "Outstanding" by the Reporting/Countersigning Officers. In case a Reporting Officer still wishes to rate an officer as "Outstanding" he would be required to inform his Countersigning Officer and Establishment Division at least three months prior to the writing of the report. The Countersigning Officer would then be required to keep the concerned officer under close observation for these three months. After the end of the observation period if the report has been rated as "Outstanding" the Countersigning Officer would assess whether the rating has been fully justified by the Reporting Officer or otherwise. If the Countersigning Officer is satisfied with the rating, he/she will provide his/her own justification in the relevant column and rate the report as Outstanding. However, if the Countersigning Officer is not satisfied with the rating, he/she would down grade the report suitably. Upon receipt of the PER in the Establishment Division it would again be scrutinized to confirm the "Outstanding" rating.

2. On similar lines, if the Countersigning officer wants to rate an officer as Outstanding, he/she would be required to inform the Establishment Division at least three months prior to the writing of the PER. Upon receipt of the PER in the Establishment Division it would be scrutinized and down graded suitably if proper justification has not been provided by the Countersigning Officer.

3. It is requested that the above clarifications may also be brought to the notice of offices under administrative control of Ministries/Divisions.

[c.f. Establishment Division's O.M. No. 1/10/2000-D.S. (Coord), dated 11-04-2001.]

Rating of Performance Evaluation Reports as "Outstanding" and "Very Good"

2.19 Reference Establishment Division O.M. of even number dated 11th April, 2001. During the review of Performance Evaluation System held by the Chief Executive, the competent authority was pleased to direct that the 'outstanding' and 'very good' rating in the Performance Evaluation Reports should be given under exceptional circumstances and only after due justification has been provided by the Reporting/Countersigning Officers.

2. The above instructions may also be brought to the notice of offices under administrative control of Ministries/Divisions.

[c.f. Establishment Division's O.M. No. 1/10/2000-D.S. (Coord), dated 04-09-2001.]

2.20 Reference Establishment Division O. M. No. 1/10/2000. DS (Coord) dated 11-4-2001, it has been decided to withdraw with immediate effect, the condition of three months prior notice for rating an officer in exceptional cases as "Outstanding" in the PER of an officer by his Reporting/Countersigning Officers. It is however, further clarified that the Reporting/Countersigning Officer shall fully justify such assessment in the PER of the officer concerned.

2. Ministries/Divisions/Departments and Provincial Governments are requested to bring these instructions to the notice of the offices under their administrative control.

[c.f. Establishment Division's O.M. No. 1/10/2000-D.S. (Coord) CP. 9, dated 01-06-2004.]

2.21 *Avoidance of personal remarks in writing PERs.*-It may be impressed upon the reporting officers that, in writing such reports, they should take utmost care to ensure that personal remarks are avoided and that reports are written in an objective manner. If, subsequently, despite these instructions, any reporting officer indulges in subjective reporting, it will be open to his superior officers to report adversely on him for having failed to record his remarks in an objective manner.

[c.f. D.O. letter No. 9(4)/54-SE III, dated 5-10-1954.1

2.22 *Dealing with the public and interest in socio-economic reforms.*-The merit of an officer for promotion will henceforth be judged, apart from other considerations from the manner in which the Government servant conducts himself in his dealings with the public and zeal and enthusiasm which he shows in carrying out Government's programme of reforms. The reporting officer should make special mention in the "Pen Picture" of the Evaluation report very clearly and specifically, about the Government servant's dealing with the public and his attitude towards Government's socio-economic reforms.

[c.f. Para 2 of D.O. letter No. D. 3168/72-DS(R), dated 27-6-1972.]

2.23 *Maintenance of a 'Katcha' Register*-A 'Katcha' register should be maintained by every reporting officer for keeping rough notes relating to the work of his subordinates including cases of outstanding good or poor work. Another advantage of this register will be that the officer concerned will be able to comment on the representations against adverse remarks and quote instances of poor work.

2.24 A proforma of this register is given below. The register will not be a permanent record but will be destroyed as soon as it has outlived its utility:

Page No

Name of officer

Date.....

Remarks

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/4/64-A. 11, dated 30-6-1964]

2.25 *Placing Government servants on Special Reports.*-Whenever the Head of Ministry/Division/Department is convinced, on good grounds, that the work of a particular Government servant is not satisfactory, the former could put the Government servant concerned, with simultaneous intimation to him, on a special report. A Special Report on the latter's work would, in such an eventuality, be drawn on the expiry of six months, irrespective of the fact whether the annual report on him becomes due during this period.

2.26 If such a special report does not indicate any improvement in the work of the Government servant concerned it would be open to the competent authority to take such action against him as may be permissible under the existing rules.

[Extract from O.M. No. 9(1)/58-SE III, dated 9-10-1958.]

When to write the Reports

2.27 *General Instructions.* -The reports should be prepared annually at the close of each calendar year also on the departure of the Government servants/reporting officer concerned on transfer, if this occurs more than three months after the annual report has been recorded.

[Extract from Para 6 of O.M. No. F-5/3/48-Estt. (S.E.), dated 1-8-1949.]

2.28 (i) The words "more than three months" occurring in the preceding paragraph include a period of just three months under a particular reporting officer for the purpose of calculating the period of three months.

[Extract from D.O. Letter No. 6/1/68-A. II, dated 19-10-1968.]

(ii) It has been decided that the period spent on leave on average pay will not be included in this period and the period of three months will mean and include the actual period in which the work, performance and conduct of an officer has been seen by the reporting officer.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/80-A. II, dated 31st May, 1980.]

(iii) The period of Performance Evaluation Report of two calendar years cannot be combined to form single report for the purpose of report writing.

[c.f. U.O. No. 6/1/80-A, 11, dated 23-10-1980.]

2.29 (i) It is stated that, under the existing instructions, Evaluation reports on an officer are required to be written annually at the close of each calendar year and also for part periods if the period of report is three months or more. The question of quantification of such part reports initiated during a calendar year has been under consideration in the Establishment Division for some time past. In order to bring about uniformity in the matter, it has been decided that if more than one Evaluation report has been initiated on an officer during a calendar year, the average/arithmetic mean of all ratings of various such reports earned during the year will be worked out for the purpose of quantifying the overall grading for that year. For example, in 1982 three reports were initiated on the performance

of an officer for periods each of 3 months or more with the following ratings:

<i>Period of report</i>	<i>Overall assessment</i>	<i>Marks</i>
1.1.82 to 4.4.82	Good	7
2.6.82 to 10.9.82	Average	4
1.10.82 to 31.12.82	Very good	10
	Average/Mean	21/3=7

The mean so worked out will be taken as the overall grading earned by the officer during that particular year for the purpose of quantification.

(ii) It has also been observed that sometime an Evaluation report is written to cover part periods covering two calendar years. It is *not* permissible to do so, as in terms of para 2.29 (iii) of "A Guide to Performance Evaluation", the period of two calendar years cannot be combined to form a single report for the purpose of report writing. *If a civil servant has served under a reporting officer in two calendar years for a period aggregating to reports one each for the period of 3 months or more in a calendar year confidential report should be written for such periods.* If the period under report in one calendar year is 3 months or more and less than 3 months in the other year, the report for the former period only should be written. If the continuous period of service under a reporting officer is spread in two years but the part period in each year is *3 months or more*, two Evaluation reports-one each for the period of 3 months or more in a calendar year - should be written.

(iii) *The instructions in para 2.29 (ii) may in future be strictly observed and in no case should the period in two calendar years be combined. As for such reports already written, quantification of an Evaluation report covering a period which falls in two calendar years will be done as follows:-*

- (a) If each of the part periods of the report falling in two calendar years is 3 months or more the report will be treated as two part reports instead of one. The grading of the single report will hold good for the part periods falling in the two calendar years. In other words, the single report, for purposes of quantification, will be deemed to comprise two part reports - one for each calendar year. These part reports will be considered in their respective years alongwith other part reports, if any, for the purpose of quantification as in para 2.29(i) above.

- (b) If only one of the part periods of report is three months or more, this part report will be considered as the report for the period of the year in which the said period falls, and will be counted alongwith other part reports of the year, if any, as in para 2.29 (i) above.
- (c) If the period of report in each calendar year is less than 3 months, such reports shall be ignored for purposes of quantification.

[c.f. Estt. Division O.M. No. 10(3)/84-CP 1, dated 9-1-1985.]

2.30 According to Promotion Policy issued *vide* Establishment Secretary's d.o. No. 10(10)/85-CP I, dated 15-5-1985 (SI. No. 154 Chapter 11 of Estacode), the overall grading in PERs are allocated the following marks:

<i>Overall Grading</i>	<i>Marks</i>
(i) Outstanding	10
(ii) Very Good	8
(iii) Good	7
(iv) Average	5
(v) Below Average	1
(vi) Poor	0

2.31 In order to bring about uniformity in the matter in the Federal and Provincial Governments it has been decided that the discretion allowed to write Evaluation reports for periods less than three months may be withdrawn, particularly in the case of centrally controlled cadres. This should be without prejudice to such reports already written.

[Para 3 of D.O. No. 4(2)/66 A. 11, dated 26-08-1968.]

2.32 The writing and keeping on record of reports for periods of less than three months was irregular according to the relevant instructions on the subject. In order to bring about uniformity in practice for those already written and for future it has been decided that all such reports which have found their way in the character roll dossiers of the officers should be removed from the character roll dossiers and destroyed. A note at the appropriate place

in the dossier should be kept stating that the Evaluation report for the period, such and such, which was for less than three months and earlier included in the character roll at page (such and such) has been removed in accordance with the relevant instructions. This would avoid the necessity of renumbering the pages and eliminate the risk of removal of other reports.

[Extract from D.O. No. 6/1/69-A. II, dated 6-2-1969.]

2.33 It is not necessary to write a report on officers in the event of transfer of the countersigning officer.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/67-A. 11, dated 20-2-1967.]

2.34 An Evaluation report is required to be written on an officer if the period of report is three months or more. It has no specific relevance with the transfer of the reporting officer or officer reported upon.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/69-A. 11, dated 16-8-1969.]

Linking of Performance Evaluation of C.B.R. Employees with Financial Year instead of Calendar Year

2.34-A The Establishment Division has agreed to CBR's proposal to link performance evaluation with the currency of the financial year instead of the present practice of writing PERs on a calendar year basis. In future, PERs of all CBR employees will, therefore, be initiated in July instead of January and the timetable for writing PERs will be as follows:

- (i) Reporting Officer by 20th July
- (ii) Countersigning Officer by 31st July

It may also be noted that those supervisory officers who fail to write the PERs within the prescribed time period will be asked to explain as to why this was not done and may have to forego their bonus if found negligent on this account. It may be further noted that PERs initiated in July 1998 must clearly reflect the targets that were set for the employee for the year 1997-98 and the actual collection achieved alongwith remarks of the reporting officers. Similarly, in the case of employees who are posted in positions other than the field, all reporting officers would be expected to assess the performance of their subordinates on as objective a basis as is possible. It may be remembered that the Board would like to link performance with record and therefore, PERs must be written in a way that they ensure a fair and correct assessment of the subordinate.

In view of Establishment Division's approval the PERs of CBR employees will be written for the period 1-1-98 to 30-6-98 this time. In the future, however, these will be written for the period ending June *i.e.* according to the financial year.

[c.f. CBR Circular No. I(1)M(Admn)/98, dated 18-6-1998 communicated *vide*
Estt Divn. U.O. Note No. 3/1/2003-CP-11, dated 26-11-2004]

2.35 (i) *Reports to be written in time.*-In spite of laying repeated emphasis on the importance of observing instructions on the subject, little improvement is visible. PERs are still not written in time and in many cases are in arrears for a number of years. It will be appreciated that in the absence of up-to-date PERs, the performance evaluation of officers due for promotion, etc. cannot be properly judged and cases of promotions, appointments are thus considerably delayed for want of up-to-date PERs. This is unfair to government servants.

[Extract from D.O. letter No. 1/1/74-A. 11, dated 14.11.1974.]

(ii) It has come to the notice of the President that the PER dossier files of the officers are incomplete in many cases despite the best efforts of the Establishment Division. Reminders sent to various Divisions/Provincial Governments requesting for the missing PER have been ignored. This state of affairs must be put right without delay. In this regard, reference is invited to President's Secretariat, Establishment Division letter No. 6/9/62-A. II, dated 15th November, 1962 (*See* para 2.42).

(iii) The President is pleased to direct that the reporting officers concerned will be held responsible for ensuring that the reports of the officers working under them are written in time and sent to the Establishment Division/Administrative Ministry concerned when due with the least delay.

(iv) In case the President received further complaints in this regard, serious notice will be taken thereof and defaulting officers will be liable to disciplinary action.

(v) Secretary of a Ministry/Division is responsible for ensuring that these instructions are complied with by all officers working in the Division/Ministry/Department under him and PERs are sent to Establishment Division when required under rules.

[c.f. D.O. No. 2/78-JS (CP) dated 7th October, 1978.]

2.36 (i) In pursuance of President's Directive on the importance of proper career planning for civil servants, all the Ministries/Divisions and the Provincial Governments had been asked to prepare Individual Career Planning Charts for the occupational groups and cadres administered by them. The Establishment Division is maintaining I.C.P. Charts for officers belonging to the occupational groups controlled by it. Since I.C.P. Charts alongwith C.R. Dossiers are frequently submitted to the President in all cases involving transfers, promotion, training and discipline, they should reflect the correct and up-to-date position in respect of each officer. Unfortunately, the C.R. Dossiers and the I.C.P. Charts on most of the officers are incomplete as their PERs have not been sent by the Reporting/ Countersigning officers despite our repeated reminders to all Divisions and Provincial Governments.

(ii) In this regard, attention is invited to the Cabinet Secretary's letter No. 2/78-JS (CP), dated 7th October, 1978 [para 2.35 (ii, iii, iv & v)]. Despite clear instructions, no significant improvement is found in the flow of missing PERs to the Establishment Division. A concerted effort should be made to send the outstanding PERs to the Establishment Division.

[C.f. Estt. Secretary's D.O. No. 1/2/81-A.11, dated 15th April, 1981.]

(iii) The President has taken a serious view about the incomplete ICP Charts and C.R. Dossiers of officers despite repeated directives issued on the subject.

(iv) All Divisions/Provincial Governments should ensure that PERs of all officers are written and sent to the Establishment Division in time. It is re-emphasised that no proposal pertaining to posting, promotion, discipline, deputation and foreign training is to be entertained unless it is accompanied by C.R. Dossiers and ICP Charts which are complete in all respects.

[C.f. Estt. Secretary's d.o. No. 1/2/81-A 11, dated 9th September, 1981 and dated 5th July, 1982.]

2.37 *Time schedule for sending PERs to the Establishment Division.* -It has been decided to lay down the following procedure which the Ministries/Divisions are requested to strictly adhere to:

(a) PERs must reach Establishment Division according to the following schedule:

- (1) Officers of Grade 21 and 2031st January
- (2) Officers of Grade 1928th February
- (3) Officers of Grade 18 and 1731st March

- (b) Ministries/Divisions will forward grade-wise lists of officers held on their strength on 01 January each year as follows:-
- (1) List A.-Will contain names of all those officers whose PERs are being forwarded on due date. Period of report will be mentioned in each case.
 - (2) *List B.*-Will give names of all those officers whose PERs have been forwarded earlier, giving reasons and period covered in each case.
 - (3) *List C.*-Will state names of all those officers whose reports cannot be initiated on 31st December, with reasons and dates on which reports will be initiated in each case.

The Secretaries, Additional Secretaries and Joint Secretaries concerned are requested to ensure that delays do not occur.

[c.f. O.M. No. 1/7/78-CP I, dated 21.12.1978.]

**Timely Return of Performance
Evaluation Reports of officers
in BS-17 and above**

2.38 It has been generally observed, that the schedule given in Para 2.37 is not adhered to strictly. This not only disturbs the proper maintenance of PERs but also cause delay in the submission of cases for promotion.

2. The PERs duly complete in all respects may be furnished in respect of officers of DMG, Secretariat Group, PSP and OMG, to the Establishment Division and of other Federal employees to the concerned controlling Ministry/Division/Department strictly according to the laid down schedule ensuring that:

- (i) The basic rules/provisions printed on page-7* of PER (Form-S12 1 -G) has been followed.

- (ii) The PERs are examined by the administration responsible for its dispatch and are free from any fault/ambiguity. The PERs are strictly forwarded at least at Deputy Secretary level and be sent to an officer by name not lower than a Deputy Secretary as laid down in paras 5.8 and 5.9 of the booklet "A Guide to Performance Evaluation".
- (iii) A certificate (specimen below) duly signed by Deputy Secretary (Admn) may be added on reverse of Page-7* of the PER Form, to ensure its completion.

3. All Ministries/Divisions/Provincial Governments *etc.* are requested to kindly ensure that the reports are written strictly in accordance with the relevant instructions.

[c.f. Establishment Division O.M. No. 1/4/96-PD 11, dated 12-2-1997]

(SPECIMEN OF CERTIFICATE TO BE ATTACHED WITH EACH PER)

Government of Pakistan
 Ministry of.....
 (Admn. Wing)

F. No.....

Dated.....

This is to certify that PER of Mr. _____ an officer of _____ (BS-)for the period _____ initiated and countersigned by the officers both being concerned with the work of the person reported upon during the said period.

2. The report has been examined and found complete in all respect.

Deputy Secretary (Admn)

*In the present context the revised Form of PER S-121-G (i), (ii) and (iii) respectively.

**Forwarding of PERs to Establishment
Division in respect of officers in BS-17
and above**

2.39 Reference is invited to the instructions issued from time to time on the subject. It has been observed that Performance Evaluation Reports in respect of officers in BS-17 and above are delivered at Establishment Division by hand and without covering letter etc. This is a gross violation of procedure as laid down in the Secretariat Instructions and the Security Booklet which contain specific instructions concerning handling of confidential correspondence.

2. The competent authority has taken a serious view of the matter, and it has been decided that hence-forth no PER without a covering letter will be entertained in Establishment Division.

3. Further, the instructions issued *vide* this Division's O.M. No. 1/4/ 96-PD. II dated 12.02-1997 (Para 2.38) are to be observed strictly.

4. All Ministries/Divisions/Departments and Provincial Governments are requested to bring these instructions to the notice of all concerned Officers and ensure strict compliance.

[c.f. Establishment Division's O.M. No. 7/2/2004-CP. 9, dated 17-2-2004.]

2.40 *Keeping PER Dossiers complete and up-to-date.*-It is unfair to officers, who are worthy of promotion if they are not promoted or if their promotions are delayed simply because the Ministries/Departments concerned have either failed to maintain their C.R. Dossiers up-to-date or allowed them to be misplaced or lost. Steps should be taken in every Ministry/Department for a careful examination, by a competent officer, of the character roll dossiers of all the officers under their control, with a view to checking whether these are completed or not. If they are not complete, the missing character rolls should be completed or re-constructed to the maximum extent possible, so that the Departmental Promotion Committee/Selection Board are able to assess an officer's capability on the basis of reports for the last 10 years where the officer is an optee and for maximum period of his service if he has been appointed after the independence.

2.41 Secretaries/Joint Secretaries-in-Charge of the Ministry when approving a proposal to be sent to the Establishment Division for the consideration of the Central/Special Selection Board, should satisfy themselves that the character rolls in support of the proposal are complete and up-to-date before they are sent to the Establishment Division.

[c.f. Paras 2-3 of O.M. No. 8(2)-55-SE III, dated 21-12-1955.]

2.42 *Return about completion of PER.*-The annual evaluation reports should be written at the close of each calendar year. It appears however, that these instructions are not being properly followed with the result that evaluation reports on a number of officers have not been written for several years. In order to ensure proper maintenance of the Character Rolls, it has been decided that every Ministry/Division should report to the Establishment Division in the 1st week of April every year, whether or not the annual evaluation reports for preceding year in respect of officers and members of staff in the Ministry and its Attached/Subordinate offices have been completed and forwarded to the appropriate authority, with reasons for delay in respect of outstanding evaluation reports.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/9/62-A II, dated 15-11-1962.]

Who should write and/or countersign?

2.43 The report should be initiated by the next higher officer and countersigned by an officer higher than the reporting officer, both being concerned with the work of the officer reported upon; for example :-

Officer reported upon	Reporting officer	Countersigning officer
<i>Ministries/Divisions:</i>		
(i) Section Officer	Deputy Secretary concerned	Jt. Secretary concerned (or Secretary, if there is no Jt. Secretary).
ii) Deputy Secretary	Joint Secretary concerned	Secretary (if there is no Jt. Secretary, report should be initiated by Secretary himself and countersigned by the Minister-in-charge).
<i>Attached Departments and Subordinate Offices:</i>		
(i) All officers other than Head and Deputies to Heads of the Departments/ Offices.	Next higher officer concerned	Officer higher than the reporting officer concerned with the work.

Officer reported upon	Reporting officer	Countersigning officer
(ii) Deputies to Head Deptt/Office.	Head of the Department	Deputy Secretary, Jt. Secretary; or Secretary of the Administrative Ministry, according to the status of the Head of the Deptt.
(iii) Head of Deptt/	Deputy Secretary, Jt. Secretary or Secretary of the administrative Ministry, according to the status of the officer reported upon.	Secretary of the administrative Ministry (or Minister-in-charge) when the report has been initiated by the Head of the administrative Ministry.

[PER Form S.121-A (Rev.), Page 4, Section A.]

2.44 *Officer who has worked for less than three months with a Reporting Officer*-The question of recording of Evaluation reports in respect of officer who may not have worked with a reporting officer for a minimum period of three months during a year has been considered. It has been decided that in such cases the countersigning officer may obtain separate reports from each of the reporting officers with whom the officer concerned has worked during the year. After examining their reports he may exercise his discretion to decide which of those reports should be accepted. Alternatively, he may himself write the report after examining the reports of the reporting officers with whom the officer concerned worked during the year.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/69-A. II, (Pt. II), dated 1-7-1972.]

2.45. It has come to the notice of the Establishment Division that interpretation of instructions contained in para 2.44 of the booklet "A Guide to Performance Evaluation" has not been correctly made. It is clarified that if major period in a calendar year is spent by an officer under different reporting officers for less than three months on each occasion, the above-mentioned instructions will apply. In cases where a major period of the calendar year is covered by a regular report, the Performance Evaluation Report for a period of less than three months is not required to be initiated.

[c.f. Estt. Division O.M. No. 6/34/87-Pt. II, dated 8-11-1987.]

2.46. *More than one countersigning officers.*-Where there are more than one countersigning officers during a year, the one who has seen the performance of his subordinates for the major part of the year is entitled to countersign their evaluation reports.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/69-A. 11, dated 7-10-71 and 13-3-1972.]

2.47. *Officers under suspension/absent from duty.*-There is no need to record an evaluation report on an officer/official for the period during which he remained under suspension/absent from duty.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/79-A. II, dated 13-5-1979.]

2.48. *Writing/countersigning of PER by Officers under suspension.*-A question has arisen whether an officer under suspension may initiate or countersign the PER of his subordinates. The matter has been considered in the Establishment Division and it has been decided that officers under suspension may not be allowed to write or countersign the PERs of their subordinates during the period of their suspension.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/80-A. 11, dated 3-2-1980.]

2.49. *Officers in Pakistan Diplomatic Missions.*-The Reporting Officers in the case of Officers in BPS-17 and above on the Diplomatic side shall be the Head of the Pakistan Mission concerned abroad and the Countersigning Officer shall be the Foreign Secretary/Additional Foreign Secretary.

2.50. As regards Evaluation Reports on officers belonging to other Ministries/Departments such as Ministry of Information, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Commerce (holding the posts of Press Attache, Commercial Attache, Military Attaches, etc.) the existing practice, that the report on these officers is to be written by the Head of the Mission concerned and sent directly to the respective Head of Department unless there is something in the report to be brought to the attention of the Foreign Secretary, will continue to be followed.

[Extract from Ministry of Foreign Affairs Circular No. SS(A)-1/3/67, dated 9-5-1968.]

2.51. *Officers retired under MLR 58 and MLR 114.*-The question as to who should write or countersign the evaluation reports which the officers retired under MILR 58 and MLR

114 were supposed to write had they not been compulsorily retired, has been considered in the Establishment Division and it has been decided that the following procedure should be followed in getting the reports in question written or countersigned :-

- (i) The Reporting Officers who have been compulsorily retired will not write or countersign any report on their subordinates. In such cases the next higher officer may initiate the report provided he has seen the performance of the officer reported upon for a minimum period of 3 months.
- (ii) The report initiated under sub-para (i) above will be countersigned by the officer higher than the reporting officer, if available, provided that the former has personal knowledge about the performance of the officer concerned. In case no countersigning officer be available to countersign, the report will not be countersigned and the circumstances under which the report could not be countersigned will be mentioned in Part-IV of the report indicating the name of the officer who was supposed to countersign the report had he not been retired under MLR 58 and MLR 114.
- (iii) In case both the reporting officer and the countersigning officer have been compulsorily retired, the officer higher than both of them, if available, may initiate the report and the next higher officer, if any, will countersign it. In a case like this both the reporting and the countersigning officers should have personal knowledge about the officer concerned. In case no countersigning officer be available, the fact should be noted in Part IV of the form.
- (iv) When no officer is available to write or countersign the report, the Administrative Division may make a reference to the Establishment Division, as to how the situation can be met. It is, however, to be ensured as far as practicable, that the report, does not remain unwritten.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/70-A. 11, dated 2-3-1970 and O.M. No. 6-5-72-A. 11, dated 17-6-72.1

2.52. (i) *Other Officers retired compulsorily.*-It has been decided that officers compulsorily retired under Efficiency and Discipline Rules or on completing 25 years service or under FR 10-A may not be allowed to write or countersign the PERs of their subordinates.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/77-A, 11, dated 1-11-1977.]

(ii) A question has arisen whether officers retired compulsorily under Efficiency and Discipline Rules or on completing 25 years of service or under FR 10-A should not be allowed to write or countersign the PERs of their subordinates. Officers can write PERs during the leave preparatory to retirement. After due consideration it has been decided that such officers, if allowed leave preparatory to retirement, should not be allowed to write/countersign PERs of their subordinates. In that case the procedure laid down in this Division's O.M. No. 6/1/70-A. II, dated 17th June, 1972 and No. 43/1/78-CP I, dated 21st December, 1978 may be followed for writing of the PERs of the affected officials.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/7/78-A, 11, dated 11th June, 1979.]

(iii) A question has arisen whether officers retired under article 13(i) of Civil Servants Act, 1973 can initiate/countersign Performance Evaluation Reports of their subordinates or not. After a careful consideration it has been decided that officers so retired may not be allowed to write Annual Evaluation Reports of their subordinates. For writing of PERs of affected subordinates procedures laid down in this Division's Office Memoranda No. 6/1/70-A. II, dated 17th June, 1972 and No. 43/1/78-CP-I, dated 21st December, 1978 may be followed.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/79-A, II, dated 24th June, 1979.]

2.53. (i) *Writing/ countersigning of PERs by retired or expired Officers.*- It has been decided that as in the case of Government Officers who are transferred, the officers proceeding on retirement, whether voluntary or on attaining the age of superannuation, should be asked to write/countersign reports on the officers and staff who have worked under them for more than three months, before their retirement. If an officer proceeds on retirement without writing/ countersigning the reports and cannot be contacted or fails to oblige despite repeated requests, the following procedure should be adopted:

- (1) The officer who would have countersigned, had the report been initiated by the retired officer, should initiate the report provided he has seen work of the officer reported upon, for a minimum period of three months. The next higher officer, if any, should countersign it.
- (2) If the report has already been initiated but the countersigning officer has retired, the next higher officer, if any, should countersign, provided he has personal knowledge of the work of the officer concerned.
- (3) If both the initiating and the countersigning officers have retired, the officer next higher than both of them, if any, should initiate and the next higher officer, if any, should countersign it. In such cases both the initiating and countersigning officers must have personal knowledge of the work of the officer reported upon.

- (4) In case the report cannot be initiated at all, a suitable note to this effect be recorded in the C.R. dossier. If the report has been initiated but cannot be countersigned, the reasons, therefore, be recorded in Part IV of the PERs.

[c.f. O.M. No. 43/1/78- CP. I dated 21st December, 1978.]

- (ii) These instructions shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to cases where the reporting/countersigning officers have expired.

[c.f. O.M. No. 43/1/78- CP. I dated 31st December, 1978.]

Completion of PERs of Officers/ Officials working in the Ex-Prime Minister's Secretariat

2.54. Reference CMLA's Secretariat (Public) O.M. No. F. 17(2)-Estt/ 78, dated the 30th January, 1979 it is stated that in accordance with the procedure in vogue, the Political figures who cease to hold offices and compulsorily retired officers are not allowed to write/countersign PERs on their subordinates. In such cases a certificate to this effect stating the reason and the names of the reporting/ countersigning officers who had to initiate/countersign the reports are recorded by the competent authority in part IV of the PERs.

[c.f. Establishment Division's O.M. No. 6/1/79-A. 11. dated 20-02-1979.]

Completion of PERs of Officers/Officials

2.55 It has been noticed that contrary to the procedure contained in instructions issued by Establishment Division *vide* O.M. No. 6/1/79-A, II, dated 20-2-1979, some of the political figures who ceased to hold office from 5-11-1996 are still initiating/countersigning the Performance Evaluation Reports in respect of the officers who worked under them. -

2. This is to reiterate in line with the instructions in force that the PERs initiated/countersigned by any political figure ceasing to hold office on 5-11-1996 and/or received after that date (although dated prior to 5-11-1996) will neither be treated as valid nor count towards assessment of officers covered by such reports.

3. To prevent the report period from being treated as blank, the assessment made by the last career civil servant prior to the remarks of the political figure shall be treated as final.

4. The above position may be brought to the notice of all officers working under your control for strict observance/compliance.

[C.f. Establishment Division's D.O. No. 6/1/79-A. 11, dated 28-04-1999.]

2.56 *East Pakistani Officers.*-Please see Para 2.40 of A Guide to Performance Evaluation Edition, 1991.

2.57. *Officers on deputation to foreign organizations.*-It is not advisable to call for reports on officers who are serving with foreign organizations because the work of such officers is deemed to be satisfactory as long as they continue to work in those organisations.

[Extract from U.O. No. 6/1/63-A. II, dated 1-5-1963.]

2.58. It has been decided, with the approval of the President, not to call any evaluation reports on all officers for the period they remain on deputation to the Foreign Governments/International Organizations.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/2/79-A. II, dated 10-7-1979.]

2.59. *Clarification.*-The Establishment Division O.M. No. 6/5/66-A. II, dated 14.9.1966 was superseded by the O.M. No. 6/2/79-CPI, dated 22-2-1979 which was in turn cancelled vide O.M. No. 6/2/79-A. II, dated 10-7-1979 (Para 2.58).

2.60. Instances have come to the notice of the Establishment Secretary wherein evaluation reports received from foreign governments were placed on the C.R. dossiers of the officers in contravention of the standing instructions.

In a certain case an evaluation report containing adverse remarks was communicated to the officer and his representation was also referred to a foreign government for comments. This practice would create an embarrassing situation for the Government. The Ministries/Divisions are requested to ensure that such reports, if received from foreign governments, should not find place in the C.R. dossiers of the officers concerned.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/5/66-A. 11, dated 28-11-1972.]

2.61.(i) Many reports have been received which have not been seen by the senior officer in the Ministry higher than the Reporting Officer. This is clearly undesirable; they should always be countersigned by him in token that he accepts the report, if he does.

[Para 2 (b) (iii) of Establishment Secretary's D.O. No. 5/3/48-SE. 1, dated 9-6-1951.]

(ii) *Countersignature of Reports initiated by the Federal Secretaries.* - The President was pleased to direct that all Secretaries should be informed that the annual evaluation reports initiated by the Federal Secretaries should invariably be countersigned by the Minister concerned as required under the standing instructions.

[c.f. D.O. Letter No. 6/13/80-A, 11, dated 10th August, 1980.]

2.62. It appears from the instructions contained in part vii (a) of the Performance Evaluation Report (S-121-G) that the countersigning officer should give reasons if he disagrees with the assessment of a reporting officer besides commenting on any aspect not touched upon by the Reporting Officer. He is also required to indicate how closely he has watched the work of the officer reported upon. Thus it is always desirable for a countersigning officer to record his own assessment of the officer even when he agrees with the reporting officer.

[c.f. Estt. Division D.O. No. 6/32/87-PD-II, dated 13-10-1987.]

2.63. *PERs on Secretaries to Government.* - Secretaries to Government are invariably very senior officers who have reached at stage in their careers where their work and conduct are well known. It is indeed because of their proved ability that they are appointed to these posts. It would, therefore, serve little or no purpose for evaluation reports to be written on such officers.

[Extract from D.O. No. 5(11)/Cord/49, dated 20-8-1949.]

2.64.(i) *Officers of the status of Secretary.* - It has been decided that no annual evaluation report should be recorded on officers enjoying the status of Secretary to the Federal Government. It has also been decided that performance evaluation reports on officers of the status of Acting Secretary appointed Heads of Semi-Autonomous Organisations/Attached Departments should be written by the Secretary of the Ministry concerned.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/64-A, 11, dated 16-11-1965.]

(ii) PERs of Chairmen of Autonomous Bodies of the Federal Government are required to be written with the exception of those who are in Grade-22.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/79-A. 11, dated 28-3-1977.]

(iii) A question was raised whether Performance Evaluation Reports of Grade-22 officers, not having the status of Secretaries to the Federal Government are required to be written. It has been decided that Performance Evaluation Reports of Grade-22 officers need not be written. It partially modifies this Division's O.M. No. 6/1/64-A. II, dated the 16th November, 1965.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/79-A. II, dated 16-4-1979.]

(iv) PERs of Additional Secretaries and Joint Secretaries on deputation to Autonomous Bodies/Semi Autonomous Bodies who are not heads of the organizations are not required to be countersigned by the Minister-in-charge.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/79-A. II, dated 28-3-1979.]

(v) The existing procedure of writing of performance evaluation reports in respect of lent officers has been examined and it has been decided that the PERs on the Chief Secretary to the Azad Kashmir Government will in future be initiated by the Chief Executive Azad Kashmir and countersigned by the Minister for Kashmir Affairs Division. Similarly the PERs on other Federal Government Officers in Azad Kashmir will be initiated by the Chief Secretary and countersigned by the Chief Executive. The Minister for Kashmir Affairs will be the second countersigning officer.

[c.f. Estt. Secretary D.O. No. 6/15/81-PD-II, dated 28th October, 1981.]

2.65. *Additional Secretaries/Additional Secretaries Incharge.* - It is clarified that performance evaluation reports on Additional Secretaries should be written by their Secretaries and Countersigned by the Ministers concerned. In the case of Additional Secretaries-Incharge of the Ministries/Divisions, the Reports should be written by their Ministers.

[c.f. Estt. Secretary D.O. No. 6/1/74-A-11, dated 14th July, 1981.]

2.66. *Joint Secretaries to the Federal Government.* - PERs on Joint Secretaries who are working under Additional Secretaries should be initiated by the latter and countersigned by the Secretary of the Ministries/Divisions concerned. Minister incharge will be the second countersigning officer in such cases. Where a Joint Secretary is working directly under the Secretary, his PERs will be initiated by the Secretary and be countersigned by the Minister-in-charge.

[c.f. Estt. Secretary D.O. No. 6/3/81-PD-II, dated 21st January, 1982.]

2.67. In the case of Joint Secretaries who have independent charge of Ministries/Divisions, their Performance Evaluation Reports should, of course, be written up by the Minister.

[Extract from D.O. letter No. 16/2/59-Con., dated 24-12-1959.]

2.68. (i) *Officers of the rank of Joint Secretary and above serving in the Provinces.*- Performance Evaluation Reports on officers of the rank of Joint Secretary and above to the Federal Government written by the Chief Secretary, will be submitted to the Governor for favour of his countersignature and remarks, if any.

[Extract from E.P. letter No. C.A. VIII Conf-180/70/563, dated 17-6-1971.]

(ii) It has been decided that PERs of officers should be initiated only by such officers who have the opportunity of seeing the performance of the subordinate officers closely. For example, it is not practicable for Chief Secretary of a Province to supervise the performance of a Chief Engineer of a Development Authority.

[c.f. letter No. 6/11/80-A. 11, dated 23rd September, 1980.]

2.69. *Ex-C.S.P. Officers of Judicial Branch.*-Proposal regarding maintenance of triplicate copies of the Character Rolls of ex-C.S.P. Officers of the Judicial Branch by the High Court is agreed to.

[Extract from D.O. letter No. 6/1/67-A. 11, dated 20-2-1967.]

2.70. *Section Officers holding current charge of Deputy Secretary.*- According to para 2.43 of this booklet, a reporting officer should be of next higher status and concerned with the work of the officer reported upon. It will not, therefore, be proper to allow a Section Officer to write PERs on other Section Officers while holding current charge of the duties of a Deputy Secretary whatever may be the duration of such charge. If he gives some adverse comments on the performance of an officer and if the officer so reported upon represents challenging the authority of the Reporting Officer on the ground that he is not the next higher officer according to rule, it will be difficult to ignore such an argument. As a working arrangement the officer can give his impression informally to the next senior officer who can take those into account when writing his report.

2.71. *Section Officers working directly under the Secretary.* - Reports on the Section Officers working directly under the Secretary will be initiated by him. Part IV of those reports may remain without counter-signature as Minister need not be bothered for a junior officer like Section Officer. The circumstances under which C.R. could not be countersigned may be indicated thereon.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/3/70-A. 11, dated 13-5-1970.]

2.72. *S.O. (F&A)/D.S. (F&A).* - After obtaining the views of the Ministries/ Divisions and in consultation with the Ministry of Finance, it has been decided that the Performance Evaluation Report on a Section Officer (Finance and Accounts) should be initiated by the Deputy Secretary (Admn) in a Ministry/ Division and countersigned by the Joint Secretary-in-charge of Administration and that of Deputy Secretary (Finance and Accounts) should be initiated by the Joint Secretary-in-charge of Administration and countersigned by the Secretary of the Ministry/Division.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/70-A. II, dated 10-11-1970.]

2.73 (i) The question as to who should countersign the Performance Evaluation Reports of the officers of the Division under the charge of the President has been examined and it has been decided with President's approval that these would be countersigned by the Principal Staff Officer to the President when these reports are written by the Secretary of the Division.

[Extract from D.O. letter No. 6/4/70-A. 11, dated 13-2-1971.]

(ii) The President has been pleased to direct that the Performance Evaluation Reports initiated by the Secretaries of Ministries/Divisions which are directly under the charge of the President, would be countersigned by the COS to the President.

[c.f. D.O. letter No. 6/13/80-A. 11, dated 28th February, 1981.]

(iii) A question has now arisen as to who should countersign Performance Evaluation Reports initiated by the Secretaries of Ministries/Divisions which are directly under the Charge of the Prime Minister. It has been decided with the approval of the Prime Minister that the requirements of countersigning of PERs recorded by the Secretaries of the Ministries/Divisions under the Charge of the Prime Minister should be dispensed with.

[c.f. Estt. Division O.M. No. 6/13/80-A. 11, dated 15-11-1987.]

2.74. *Personal staff of Ministers.*-Performance Evaluation Reports on the Personal Staff of the Ministers/Ministers of State/Special Assistants to the Prime Minister are to be written by the Ministers/Ministers of State/Special Assistants to the Prime Minister and need not be countersigned.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/76-A. II, dated 25-2-1976.]

2.75 *Private Secretaries/Personal Assistants/Stenographers.*-The questions as to whether the Performance Evaluation Reports on Private Secretaries, Personal Assistants, Stenographers *etc.* should be countersigned by an officer higher than the reporting officer has been considered in the Establishment Division. It has been decided that the Performance Evaluation Reports on these officials need not be countersigned by the next higher officer as they are not expected to have any personal knowledge of the performance of these officials.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/71-A. 11, dated 26-3-1971.]

2.76 *Armed Forces Officers.*-It has been decided that PERs on the Armed Forces Officers, while in civil employ should be written on the form prescribed for the civilian officers.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/73-A. II, dated 8-10-1973.]

2.77 *District Officers.*-It has been decided by the Government of Pakistan that every year the Deputy Commissioner should write an evaluation report on District Officers of other Departments serving in his District and send it to the Division Heads of the Departments concerned with a copy to the Commissioner. The Divisional Officers should forward the report for inclusion in the character roll of the officer reported upon with his own remarks if any.

2.78 The Performance Evaluation Reports of these officers by the Deputy Commissioner should be written on the following points :

- (i) The general behaviour of the officer concerned.
- (ii) His co-operation with other Departments and his relations with the public.
- (iii) The interest taken in development work.
- (iv) In the case of the Superintendent of Police, the measure of co operation received by the D.M. from him in the maintenance of law and order.

2.79 These orders will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the writing of performance evaluation reports by the Divisional Commissioner on Divisional Officers of other Departments serving in his area. These reports should be sent to the Provincial Head of the Department and should form part of the character roll of the officer reported upon.

[Extract from letter No. 6/2/61-C, dated 11-4-1961.]

2.80 *Writing of Performance Evaluation Reports of Deputy Commissioner- The* proposal of the Provincial Government regarding countersigning of PERs of Deputy Commissioners/Political Agents by Chief Secretary to Provincial Government in addition to Member Board of Revenue has been examined in the Establishment Division and it has been decided that no change is considered necessary in the existing channel of reporting. Chief Secretary to the Government of a Province may record his appreciation of or displeasure over the work of Deputy Commissioners/Political Agents, as considered necessary. This measure should prove equally effective as such appreciations/displeasures will go on record in the CR dossiers of the officers concerned.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/4/79-A. 11, dated 19-4-1979.]

2.81 *Question whether or not Deputy Commissioner in Grade 18 can record Evaluation Report of an officer under him but having a personal Grade-18.-* Attention is also invited to para 2.43 of this booklet which says that a reporting officer should be of next higher status and concerned with the work of officer reported upon. This means that a Deputy Commissioner can initiate reports on all officers working under him *e.g.* Additional Deputy Commissioners *etc.*, although such officers may be in the same grade of pay as the Deputy Commissioner. Similarly a Secretary to the Provincial Government can write PER of the Directors, Chief Engineers *etc.* of the departments under him though the later may be in the same grade of pay as the Secretary. Also the Director of a department can write reports on his Deputy Directors *etc.*

[*c.f.* letter No. 6/4/75-A. 11, dated the 17th July, 1979 and subsequent change resultant in the PER Form.]

Authorities for Initiation/Countersigning and expunction of adverse remarks in respect of DCOs, EDOs and District Officers

2.81-A. In pursuance to the provision of Punjab Local Government Ordinance, 2001 as envisaged under Section 34, authorities for initiation/ countersigning and expunction of adverse remarks in respect of D.C.Os, E.D.Os and District Officer under the administrative control of S&GA Department are hereby notified as shown below :

NAME OF POST	REPORTING AUTHORITY	FIRST COUNTERSIGNING AUTHORITY	SECOND COUNTERSIGNING AUTHORITY	AUTHORITY COMMUNICATION OF ADVERSE REMARKS	AUTHORITY TO EXPUNGE THE ADVERSE REMARKS
District Coordination Officer	Zila Nazim	Chief Secretary	Chief Minister	Secretary (Services) S&GAD	Chief Minister
Executive District Officer	District Coordination Officer	Zila Nazim	None, except for the post of EDO(R) SMBR shall be the 2 nd Countersigning Officer Administrative Secretary	Secretary (Services) S&GAD	Chief Secretary
District Officer	Executive District Officer	District Coordination Officer	concerned will give his technical assessment/Report as second countersigning officer	Secretary (Services) S&GAD	Chief Secretary
District Officer (Coordination)/ equivalent posts (BS-18) directly attached with D.C.O.	District Coordination Officer			Secretary (Services) S&GAD	Chief Secretary

[c.f. Govt. of Punjab Notification No. SOR.IV(S&GAD)14-1/76(P), dated Lahore the 5th March, 2003 communicated *vide* Estt Division U.O. Note No. 3/1/2003-CPII dated 26-11-20041

2.82 Officer holding charge of two posts.-There is no harm in having two reports on an officer for the same period when he has performed two different jobs. When a question arises as to which of the reports is to be accepted while considering the merit of the officer, reference may be made to the countersigning officer provided both the reports are countersigned by the same officer. In case, countersigning officers are different, the matter is to be decided by the Head of the Department or the Secretary of the Ministry/Division concerned.

[Extract note, dated 25-1-1971, File No. 6/1/71-A.II.]

2.83 PERs initiated by Heads of Autonomous Bodies.-It has been decided that all PERs initiated by Chairman of Corporations/Autonomous Bodies will be countersigned by the Secretary of the Ministry concerned.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/7/75-A. 11, dated 1st November, 1978.]

2.84 (i) *Members of the Services Tribunal.*-It has been decided that PERs on Chairman and Members of the Services Tribunal are not to be rendered.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/17/78-CP. I. dated 24-4-1979.]

(ii) *Members of Income Tax Appellate Tribunal (ITAT).*- PERs on Judicial and Accountant Members of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal shall be written by the Chairman of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal and countersigned by the Secretary, Ministry of Justice and Parliamentary Affairs.

[c.f. Estt. Division's O.M. No. 6/9/84-PD. 11, dated 16th June, 1985.]

2.85 *Officers of Northern Areas.*-It has been decided that the PERs of the under mentioned officers of Northern Areas will be routed through the MLA Zone "E" who may countersign these reports in his capacity as Chief Executive.

- (a) Resident and Commissioner.
- (b) Deputy Commissioners of the three Districts.
- (c) Development Commissioner.
- (d) Director of Education.
- (e) Deputy Directors of Education.

[c.f. O.M. No. 43/4/78-CP. 1, dated 24-4-1979.1

2.86 *Re-employed Officers.*-Matter relating to writing of PERs on the work and conduct of re-employed officers/officials has been considered in the Establishment Division and it has been decided that such Officers/Officials must also be reported upon and medically examined like other officers/officials of the Government of Pakistan.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/7/80-A. 11, dated 24th May, 1980.]

2.87 *Officers on Special Duty.*- Evaluation Reports on Officers on Special Duty who have been assigned any job are to be written in the normal manner. Reports on officers who are awaiting posting cannot be written for the obvious reason that they have not been assigned any work. A note to this effect, however, should always be placed in their PER dossiers so that no break occurs in their record.

[c.f. letter No. 6-1-79-A. II, dated 22nd August, 1979.]

2.88 *Performance Evaluation Reports non-official Members, Directors etc. of Corporations/Autonomous Bodies under the Government, appointed on contract basis.*- The question of writing of Performance Evaluation Reports on the work and conduct of non-official Members, Directors *etc.*, of Corporations/Autonomous bodies under Government, appointed on contract, has been considered in the Establishment Division. It has been noted that the contracts of such non-official Members, Directors *etc.*, are generally for long terms, and at times renewable. In such cases, the services of these officers take the nature of career appointments. It has accordingly been decided that Performance Evaluation Reports may be recorded on the work and conduct of such Members. Directors *etc.*, (including retired Government Servants appointed as such) also.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/6/80-A 11, dated 13th July, 1980.]

2.89 *PERs on Finance Directors serving in Corporations controlled by the Government.* The Finance Member/Finance Directors will be treated as nominees of the Finance Division which would be ultimately responsible for assessment of their performance. Their reports shall be countersigned by Finance Secretary instead of Secretary of the Ministry concerned.

[c.f. para 'C' of Estt. Division O.M. No. 16/2/79-A. V. dated 1st March, 1979
read with O.M. No. 6/14/78-A 11, dated 25th January, 1983.]

2.90 *PERs-Service Financial Advisers.*-It is stated that, on the recommendation of the Committee appointed by the President under the Chairmanship of the Secretary General, Defence to examine the Financial Management and Accounting in Defence Services, it has been decided that:

"At the end of the year, the Service Chief may write a D.O. letter to the Secretary Finance about the performance of the Service FA particularly with regard to the assistance rendered by him to the Service and the understanding developed by him of the needs of the Services. Secretary Finance may add his comments on the letter which should then be filed in the PER Dossier in the normal way."

These instructions shall take effect from the 1st January, 1982.

[c.f. Estt. Division's O.M. No. 6/4/82-PD 11, dated 21st November, 1982.)

2.91 (i) *PERs of Assistant Collectors and Appraisers under the CBR.*-The Chairman or a Member of Central Board of Revenue is free to enter his remarks wherever some special features or circumstances come to their notice but they need not be formally designated as second countersigning officers.

(ii) The Establishment Division have no objection to designate the Member, CBR and the Collectors as second countersigning officers for reports on Assistant Collectors and Appraisers respectively.

[C.f. Estt. Division's D.O. No. 6/7/83-PD 11, dated 10th April, 1984
addressed to the Chairman, CBR, Islamabad.]

SECTION 3

**PROCEDURE REGARDING
ADVERSE REMARKS**I. SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING ADVERSE
REMARKS

3.1 (i) (a) When a report is built on the individual opinions of the reporting and countersigning officers, it is only the opinion as accepted by the latter which should be communicated.

@(b) All adverse remarks whether remediable or irremediable should be communicated in writing to the officer reported upon and copy of the communication placed in the dossier.

(ii) Countersigning Officer should under-line in red ink remarks which, in his opinion, are adverse and should be communicated to the officer concerned.

(iii) Remarks in cases where the Head of a Department/countersigning or other higher officer suspends judgment, should not be communicated.

(iv) (a) When an adverse remark is made in the evaluation report of any officer, a copy of the whole report should be furnished to him at the earliest opportunity, and in any case within one month from the date the report is countersigned, with a D.O. letter, a copy of which should be signed and returned by him in acknowledgement of the report. A serious view should be taken of any failure on the part of the officials concerned to furnish a copy of the report containing adverse remarks to the officer reported upon, within the stipulated period. Nevertheless, the adverse remarks should be communicated to the officer concerned even at the belated stage.

(b) The officers making representation against adverse remarks recorded in their evaluation reports should not make any personal remarks or remarks against the integrity of the reporting officer. Violation of this rule will be considered a misconduct and will also render the representation liable to be summarily rejected.

(v) Any remarks to the effect that the officer reported upon has or has not taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him in a previous year, should also be communicated.

(vi) The adverse remarks should be communicated by the Head of Ministry/Division/Department/Office in the case of Grade-17 and above officers and by the senior officer-in-charge of establishment matters in the case of other officers.

(vii) An evaluation report containing adverse remarks should not be taken into consideration until they have been communicated in writing to the officer concerned and a decision taken on his representation, if any.

II. INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING ADVERSE REMARKS

3.2 *Communication of adverse remarks.*-The question of communication to subordinate officers in civil employ of such unfavourable remarks as may be made in regard to them by their superiors at the time of annual reports or on other occasions has been under consideration for some time. This is a matter of great importance both in the interest of the efficiency of administration and of the officers of Government themselves and it is necessary that it should be dealt with on uniform lines. While it may not be considered desirable to lay down any hard and fast rules in this matter, there should be no difficulty in giving general effect to the broad principles that should appropriately govern it.

3.3 The following principles are laid down for guidance:

- (i) when a report is built up on the individual opinions of different departmental superiors in gradation it is only the opinion as accepted by the highest authority which need to be considered from the point of view of communication;
- (ii) as a general rule in no case should an officer be kept in total ignorance for any length of time that his superiors after sufficient experience of his work are dissatisfied with him; in cases where a warning might eradicate or help to eradicate a particular fault, the advantages of prompt communication are obvious; where criticism is proposed to be withheld, the final authority to consider the report should record instructions, with reasons, according to the nature of the defects discussed as to the period for which communication is to be kept back.

- (iii) (a) Adverse remarks should be communicated to the officer concerned, mainly to enable the officer to make efforts for improvement.
- (b) When any adverse remark is made in the evaluation report of any officer, a copy of the whole report should be furnished to him at the earliest opportunity, and in any case within one month from the date the report is countersigned, with a D.O. letter, a copy of which should be signed and returned by him in acknowledgement of the report. A serious view should be taken of any failure on the part of the officials concerned to furnish a copy of the report containing adverse remarks to the officer reported upon within the stipulated period. Nevertheless, the adverse remarks should be communicated to the officer concerned even at belated stage.

**[Note:- In case of advisory remarks, only the remarks and not the whole report will be communicated.]*

- (iv) the reporting officer should specifically state whether the defects reported have been already brought in another connection to the notice of the officer concerned;
- (v) remarks in cases where the Head of a Department or other officer suspends judgement should not be communicated;
- (vi) great attention should be paid to the manner and method of communication in order to ensure that the advice given and the warning or the censure administered, having regard to the temperament of the officer concerned, may be most beneficial to him. The adverse remarks may be communicated in writing or verbally. In the latter case, the fact of communication should be recorded on the evaluation report and, if the officer so requests, the remarks should be given in writing;
- (vii) the adverse remarks should be communicated by the Head of Department in the case of officers in Grade-17 and above and by heads of offices in other cases. As copies of evaluation reports are sent to the Establishment Division, in the case of All-Pakistan Service Officers (apart from officers in the Federal Secretariat), they will have an opportunity to watch that the adverse remarks have been communicated;

- (viii) the effect of the communication of adverse entries should be carefully watched and the reporting officer should, when drawing up a report in the next year, state whether the officer reported on has or has not taken steps to remedy defects to which his attention was drawn in a previous year. Such remarks should also be communicated to him, so that he may know that his efforts to improve have not passed unnoticed. The method of communication in either case should be the same;
- (ix) copies of the letters communicating adverse remarks and subsequent communications referred to in sub-para (iii) above should also be kept in the officer's Character Rolls and brought to the notice of the officer reporting at the time when reports are due to be written.

[Paras 4-5 of O.M. No. F. 5/3/48-Estt (SE) dated 1-8-49 read with corrigendum No. 6/1/66-A 11, dated 9-9-1966 and O.M. No. 126/1/27 O&M dated 12-7-1967.]

3.4 Attention is drawn to the following faults which (in addition to unpunctuality in reporting) have come frequently to notice:

Failure to communicate adverse remarks.-Please see paragraphs 4 & 5 of the Office Memorandum No. F. 5/3/48-Estt (SE), dt. 1-8-1949. The Procedure briefly should be:

- (j) adverse remarks should be communicated to the officers reported upon;
- (ii) the fact of communication must be recorded on the evaluation reports;
- (iii) adverse remarks should be communicated by the Head of Department in the case of Grade- 17 and above officers and by head of offices in other cases;
- (iv) copies of the letters communicating adverse entries should also be kept in the officers' personal files.

3.5 In too many cases it has been noticed that there is no remark to show whether any such communication has or has not been made. In the absence of such a remark one must presume that this has not been done. If, later, it is proposed to pass the officer over or to take other action on the basis of such reports, he will be entitled to complain.

[Para 3 of D.O. letter No. 5/3/48-SE I, dated 9-6-1951 read with O.M. No. 126/1/27 O&M dated 12-7-1967.]

3.6 The following procedure should be adopted so far as former CSP and GAR officers are concerned:

- (i) The final authority to consider the report should record on all the copies of the evaluation report concerned whether the adverse remarks should not be communicated; and if not, why not?
- (ii) If the adverse entry is to be communicated in writing, a copy of that communication and any reply thereto should be placed in the character roll and copies should be sent to the Establishment Secretary.
- (iii) If the remarks are communicated verbally, the fact should be recorded by the officer who communicates the remarks on all copies of the evaluation report.

3.7 The same principles should also be followed in evaluation reports on officers of other occupational groups.

[Extract from letter No. 5/3/48-SE I, dated 14-6-1952.]

3.8 It has come to the notice of the Government in connection with screening of Government servants that instructions issued by the Establishment Division from time to time, *vide* that Division's Office Memoranda No. F. 5/3/ 48-Estts (SE) dt. 1-8-1949, No. 5/3/48-SE I. dt. 9-6-1951 & No. 5/3/ 48-SE I dt. 14-6-1952, in regard to the communication of adverse remarks in the evaluation reports of Government servants are not being followed strictly. While this omission is obviously unfair to the Government servants reported on adversely, it is considered harmful to the interests of Government to hold back from their employees information which would enable them to try to better themselves for their jobs. All concerned are requested to ensure that adverse remarks occurring in the Performance Evaluation Reports of Government employees are invariably conveyed to them in accordance with the existing instructions.

[Extract from O.M. No. 12/1/59-Con., dated 18-4-1959.]

3.9 *Adverse remarks to be underlined in red ink by Countersigning Officer-*In a large number of cases, it has been observed that the Countersigning Officers do not underline in red ink the remarks which in their opinion are adverse and should be communicated to the person concerned, though they are required to do so according to the instruction 11 printed on page 7 of the PER form. This leads to confusion on the part of the Administrative Ministries concerned in deciding whether certain remarks should be considered adverse or not. This was considered in a meeting of the Secretaries Committee and their recommendation was that the rule on the subject should be strictly followed by all Countersigning Officers.

[Extract from O.M. No. 126/1/27 O&M (1), dated 10-12-1968 with necessary verbal changes.]

3.10 (1) The presumption that if an adverse entry is not underlined in red ink, it is not to be communicated, is not quite in order. Marking in columns "C" "below average" and "D" "poor" do create an unfavourable impression on the members of the Selection Committee/Board while scrutinizing the service record of an officer. Unless an officer is informed about such entries, he will remain in the dark without making any effort for improvement and yet suffer for the adverse entries.

[Extract from U.O. No. 6/4/69-A 11, dated 9-9-1972.]

(ii) Entries which may tend to create an unfavourable impression about an officer should be communicated even if the reporting officers or countersigning officers do not underline them in red ink.

(iii) Under the existing instructions, remarks once recorded in evaluation reports cannot be altered. If a reporting/countersigning officer changes his views about the officer reported upon, the changed views can be incorporated only in the next year's report.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/4/69-A 11, dated the 17th March, 1975.]

3.11 (i) **Unlikely to progress further/unfit for further promotion-* .A question has been raised whether or not the remarks "*unlikely to progress further/unfit for further promotion has reached his ceiling*" in an evaluation report are adverse and should be communicated. The point has been given due consideration and it has been decided that the remark should be considered as adverse and should be communicated to the officer reported upon.

[Extract from O.M. No. 2/6/68-A 11, dated 27-4-1968 with necessary verbal changes]

*Added keeping in view this entry in the Existing PER Form S-121-G(i).

(ii) The question whether the remarks "*Not yet fit for promotion, but likely to become fit in course of time*" in Part-III of the PER under the caption "Fitness for promotion" are to be treated as adverse in the case of an officer who fulfils the condition of length of service for promotion to the next higher grade has been considered. It has been decided that the remarks should be considered as adverse in the case of an officer who fulfils the condition of length of service for promotion to the next higher grade and should be communicated to him.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/9/78-A 11, dated the 21st August, 1978.]

(iii) It has been decided that if an officer is adjudged *unfit for continued retention in service* such an entry should be treated as adverse and should be communicated to the officer concerned.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/4/78-A 11, dated the 21st September, 1978.]

(iv) It has been decided that the remarks against item IV of PART VI (b) of the existing Performance Evaluation Report Form (S-121-G) under the caption "Unlikely to progress further" should be considered as adverse and communicated to the officer reported upon as required under the rules.

[c.f. Estt. Division O.M. No. 6/1/83 PD-II, dated 25th October, 1983.]

3.12 (i) *Officers with average reports.*-An officer who is superseded or whose promotion is deferred comes to know about it automatically when his juniors are promoted to higher scale posts. He need not, therefore, be informed of average reports, unless the Countersigning Officer decides otherwise. The cases of officers whose promotion is deferred may be reconsidered on the basis of their PERs for the next year.

[c.f. O.M. No. 32/4/76-A IV, dated 6-7-1976 read with notes in File No. 6/2/73-A 11.]

(ii) It is clarified that if any or all entries in Part II of the existing PER form No. S. 121-A. (Rev.) are initialled in the column headed B, *i. e.* Average, the assessment does not become adverse in nature and is, therefore not to be treated and processed as an adverse report is. PERs with average entries in Part II of the PER form would continue to be treated in accordance with the instructions contained in this Division O.M. No. 32/4/76-A. IV, dated 6th July, 1976 [*see* para 3.12 (i).]

[c.f. O.M. No. 4/13/79-A 11 dated 28-6-1980.]

3.13 *Effect of communication of adverse remarks.*-Paragraph 4 (vii) of the Establishment Division Office Memorandum No. F. 5/3/48-Estt (SE), dated the 1st August, 1949 lays down that;

"the effect of the communication of adverse entries should be carefully watched and the reporting officer should, when drawing up a report in next year, state whether the officer reported upon has or has not taken steps to remedy defects to which his attention has been drawn in a previous year. Such remarks should also be communicated to him, so that he may know that his efforts to improve have not passed un-noticed. The method of communication in either case should be the same."

3.14 It has been observed that wherever any adverse remarks are communicated to any officer, no mention is made in the next year's report whether the officer concerned has or has not taken steps to remedy defects. This defeats the very purpose for which the system of communicating adverse remarks had been introduced.

[c.f. O.M. No. 1/1/63-A 11, dated 3-10-1963.]

3.15 *Advisory remarks.*-*Advisory* remarks are not to be treated as adverse for the purpose of promotion unless it has been established that the officer concerned has not paid any heed to the piece of advice given to him and has failed to show any improvement.

[c.f. letter No. 6/16/78-CP 1, dated 20-5-1979.]

3.16 *Un-finalized departmental proceedings.*-*In* the case of an officer against whom departmental proceedings are in progress, no mention whatsoever should be made about it in his Performance Evaluation Report. Only when such proceedings have been finalized, and the punishment if any has been awarded should be mentioned in his evaluation report. In such a case a complete copy of the final order may be placed, as is usually done, on his character roll.

[Extract from D.O. letter No. 9 (1)/58-SE III, dated 8-5-1958.]

3.17 According to the Establishment Division instruction [*vide* para 3.16] no mention should be made in the evaluation report of a Government servant, of the departmental proceedings which may be in progress against him, unless such proceedings have been finalised, and the punishment, if any, has been awarded. There is no bar to a government servant being considered for promotion during the pendency of departmental proceedings against him. However, in such cases, a copy each of the charge sheet and the statement of allegations should be placed before the Central Selection Board or the Departmental Promotion Committee, as the case may be, *vide* Establishment Division's O.M. No. 2/20/67-D. I, dated the 13th November, 1967 [printed at serial No. 118 of Chapter V, page 615 of ESTACODE].

3.18 It is the responsibility of the departmental representatives who attend the meetings of the Departmental Promotion Committee/Central Selection Board to apprise the Committee/Board whether or not any departmental proceedings are pending against the Government servants whose cases are being considered by the Committee/Board. A serious view should be taken if the departmental representatives do not give this information to the Committee/Board and if later it comes to notice that a Government servant was promoted notwithstanding the fact that disciplinary proceedings were pending against him.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/4/74-A II, dated 6-7-1974.]

3.19 According to the instruction contained in the Establishment Division's letter No. 9(1)/58-SE. III, dated the 8th May, 1958 (para 3.16) no mention whatsoever can be made about a departmental inquiry pending against an officer in the evaluation report. However, there should be no harm in making a mention about a criminal case pending against an officer in his C.R.

[Extract of note, dated the 24-6-1971.]

3.20 *Evaluation Reports.*- If there are any adverse remarks in the evaluation reports prepared by NIPA and Administrative Staff College, Lahore, on officers who received in-service training at these institutions, Ministries/Divisions concerned will communicate them to the officer, place a copy of the letter on the character roll and endorse another copy of it to the Establishment Division. In case the officer concerned makes a representation against these remarks, the Ministries/Divisions should forward the representation to the Head of the training institution concerned for his comments in order to substantiate the correctness of the adverse remarks. After hearing from the training institutions, the authority concerned should take a decision whether or not the adverse remarks occurring in the evaluation reports should be expunged. The Establishment Division are to be informed of the decision.

[c.f. paras 3 and 4, O.M. No. 6/9/63-A 11, dated 6-12-1963.]

Communication of Adverse Remarks in the Evaluation Reports of Training Institution.

3.21 The PD-Wing of Establishment Division may convey the adverse remarks in writing, in the Evaluation Reports prepared by the Training Institutions, to the officer concerned and process further action as per rules/instructions, in respect of APUG officers.

[c.f. Establishment Division's U.O. No. 3/1/2003-CP 5, dated 18-10-2003.]

3.22 *Deputationists.*- The question whether the borrowing Government/Department should communicate the adverse remarks recorded in the P.E.Rs of the civil servant who is on deputation, and who should dispose of his representation for expunction of such remarks has been considered in the Establishment Division in consultation with the Provincial Governments. It has been decided that the borrowing Government/Department should communicate the adverse remarks to the civil servant concerned and take further action thereon in accordance with the existing instructions on the subject. The borrowing Government/Department should, however, keep the lending Government/ Department informed of the adverse remarks communicated to the civil servant concerned during the period of his deputation, and of the decision of the competent authority to expunge such remarks, by furnishing a copy each of such communications/orders to the lending Government/Department. A copy of such communications may also be furnished to the Establishment Division in respect of officers of the Federal Government in Grade-17 and above.

[Extract from O.M. No.6/2/74-A. 11, dated 12-2-1977.]

3.23 *Probationers.*- So far the practice has been that the adverse remarks recorded by the Director of Academy/Institution in the evaluation reports of the Probationers were not communicated to them. As the evaluation reports are part of the PERs dossiers, it has been decided that the adverse remarks, if any, recorded in these reports should be communicated to the Probationers concerned. This would enable the Officer (Probationer) to take remedial action in respect of the deficiencies noticed.

3.24 This supersedes earlier instructions on the subject as contained in the Establishment Division O.M. No. 2/4/6 6-A. II, dt. 29-10-1968.

[c.f. O.M.No.6/5/77-A-II, dated 29-3-1978.]

3.25 *Punishment orders.* - A question was raised whether and how any facts regarding punishments in departmental enquiries should be recorded in the character rolls of officers.

3.26 (a) The answer is that, in such cases, only a copy of the order awarding punishment should be filed in the character roll of the officer concerned. In case an appeal is preferred, a note may be recorded on the copy of the punishment order filed in the character roll, stating the decision taken on the appeal, and a reference to the relevant records.

[c.f. O.M. No. 9(4)/54-SE. 111, dated 27-9-1954.]

(b) (i) On initiation of disciplinary proceedings against an officer, a copy of original order/show cause notice should be placed on his CR Dossier.

(ii) If an officer is exonerated or some punishment is awarded, a copy of the final order should be placed on the dossier as per instruction mentioned at para 3.26 (a)

[c.f. Estt. Division O.M. No. 6/9/83-PD. 11, dated 4th July, 1983.]

(c) It is clarified that the instructions mentioned at para 3.26 (b) (i) & (ii) will also be applicable to non-gazetted staff.

[c.f. Estt. Division O.M. No. 6/9/83-PD, 11, dated 5th May, 1984.]

3.27 *Orders conveying warning/displeasure in the character roll.* It has been decided that copies of orders conveying warning and Government's displeasure should be kept in the character rolls of the officers concerned in the same way as copies of the orders awarding punishment to officers are kept in the PERs.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/68-A.11, dated 20-6-1968.]

3.28 *Warning order.* - A warning order to be placed in the C.R. dossier of the Government servant concerned, should have the approval of the competent authority.

3.29 A warning issued by an officer, who is not competent authority in respect of the Government servant concerned cannot be placed in PER file of the Government servant without specific approval of the competent authority *i.e.* appointing authority.

[Extract from O.M. No.4/2/74-D. 1, dated 30-3-1974.]

III. REPRESENTATIONS FOR EXPUNCTION OF ADVERSE ENTRIES

3.30 The officers making representations against adverse remarks recorded in their evaluation reports should not make any personal remarks or remarks against the integrity of the Reporting Officer. Violation of this rule will be considered a misconduct and will also render the representation liable to be summarily rejected.

[Extract from O.M. No. 126/1/27-O&M., dated 12-7-1967.1

3.31 Comments of the Reporting/Countersigning Officers should be obtained only after a representation has been made by the officer adversely reported upon. These comments are meant for the senior officers competent to take final decision on such representations. They are, in no case, to be divulged to the individual concerned before or after he has made a representation to avoid generating avoidable controversy between such officer/ official and the reporting officer.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/74-A.11,dated 8-7-1976.]

3.32 According to existing instructions, there is scope for only one representation against adverse remarks, which should be submitted, if desired, by the officer concerned, within * [30 days] of the receipt of those remarks.

3.33 It has been observed that the instructions as in para 3.32 are not being strictly followed. It is therefore, being re-emphasised that only one representation against adverse remarks should be entertained if submitted within the prescribed period of * [30 days]. Representation received after that period may be filed without any action.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/69-A.11. dated 24-9-1969.]

3.34 A few cases have come to notice where adverse remarks have been expunged from evaluation reports after the lapse of several years and that too has been done rather casually by the Ministries/Divisions/Departments concerned. This is not consistent with the rules regarding expunction of adverse remarks. It is of utmost importance that decision on the representation against adverse remarks should be taken by the competent authority as quickly as possible and within a reasonable period of time.

[c.f. D.O. No. 6/7/72-A.11, dated 27-5-1974.]

*Subs, vide Estt. Division O.M. No. 6/2/84-PD.11 dated 4-9-84.

3.35 *References to officers who have retired or proceeded on LPR.*-Representations against adverse remarks recorded by officers, who have retired or have proceeded on L.P.R., should not ordinarily be referred to them for comments, unless the representation contains certain points which, in the opinion of the administrative authority concerned, cannot be dealt with properly without inviting the views of the Reporting/Countersigning Officer. In such cases, a reference on these points only should be made to the Reporting/Countersigning Officer, giving him a reasonable time limit for reply. If no reply is received within the given time limit it may be assumed that the officer has nothing to say against the points raised in the representation, which may then be disposed of by the administrative authority on its merits.

3.36 In deciding whether a reference contemplated in the preceding paragraph would or would not bring any fruitful result in any individual case, the Ministries/Divisions should use their own judgment and discretion, keeping in view the general reputation of the retired officers.

3.37 In no case, a reference in connection with representations against adverse remarks, should be made to a Reporting/Countersigning Officer after one year of the date of his retirement or proceeding on leave preparatory to retirement.

[c.f. O.M.No.4/3/66-A.II, dated 7-1-1967.1.

IV. PROCEDURE FOR EXPUNCTION OF ADVERSE ENTRIES

3.38 The question has been raised by what exact procedure adverse entries in the evaluation reports of Government servants should be expunged, if it is decided by the competent authority to do this.

3.39 In such cases the adverse entry should be scored through, but not in such a way as to make it illegible. A marginal note should be added showing the file number and date of the orders under which the entry has been expunged. In no circumstances should any entry in an evaluation report be made illegible or any papers be physically removed from a file of evaluation reports.

3.40 The words 'competent authority' in the last sentence of para 3.38 mean an authority next higher than the countersigning officer. All decisions on the representations against adverse entries in evaluation reports should be taken by such an authority.

[Extract from Memoranda Nos. 5/51-SE. 1, dated 18-8-1951 and 2/1/66-A.II dated 9-9-1968.]

“Note:- *In this para, the authority next above the Secretary means the Minister-in-charge and where there is no Minister-in-charge in a Ministry/Division, the Minister of State/Advisor to the Prime Minister (with the rank and status of Minister). The authority next above the Minister in charge/Minister of State/Advisor to the Prime Minister (with the rank and status of Minister) will be the Prime Minister of Pakistan”.*

[Added vide Establishment Division O.M.No.3/8/2005-CP.II, dated 30.11.2005].

3.41 *Revised Gradings of expunged Remarks.*-Under the existing promotion policy, the following columns are taken into account for quantification of an officer's PERs for his promotion to a higher grade:

- (i) Integrity
- (ii) Quality & Output of Work
- (iii) General Assessment (over all grading)

In the case of a representation against adverse remarks, a competent authority while expunging these remarks does not revise their grading. This creates problem in the quantification of such reports. It has now been decided that competent authority while allowing representation against adverse remarks would give his own assessment about the expunged entries.

[c.f. Establishment Division's O. M. No. 6/45/87-PD-II dated the 17th February, 1988.]

3.42 The columns of "Quality & Output of Work and Integrity" are no longer in the revised Performance Evaluation Report Form. As a result, only the quantified score of officers in "Overall Assessment" shall, henceforth, be taken into account by the Central Selection Board (CSB) while considering promotion of officers to next grade.

[c.f. Establishment Division's O.M. No.3/11/2003-CP.11, dated 19-12-2003.]

SECTION 4

ANCILLARY DOCUMENTS TO BE PLACED ON C.R. DOSSIERS

Letters of appreciation from Government

4.1. Letters of appreciation from Government or from the Head of a Department may be filed in the Character Roll of the officers who do special work outside their ordinary function.

4.2. In the case of Committees/Commissions set up by Government, not only letters of appreciation issued by such Committees/Commissions to Government officers serving with them but also attested copies of such remarks or paragraphs concerning them which have been embodied in their reports may be placed in the Character Rolls of the Officers concerned.

[Extract from letter No. 9(1)/57-SE. III, dated 27-3-1957, read with para 4 of O.M. No. 25/2/61-CV, dated 13-2-1961.]

4.3. In modification of the earlier instructions, it has been decided that the letters of commendation which may be issued to the officers in recognition of their meritorious work or commendable efficiency, should be placed on the C.R. dossiers of the officers concerned, and a copy should be endorsed to the officers concerned.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/5/76-A. II, dated 17-5-1976.]

Remarks by Ministers/Senior Officers

4.4. (i) There is no objection in placing the remarks recorded by a Minister in appreciation of the work of an officer on his character.

[Extract from U. O. No. 114/60-E XXII, dated 26-2-1960.]

(ii) A senior officer should not be debarred from writing his remarks in the evaluation report of a subordinate, if he so desires even after it has been countersigned by the officer higher than the reporting officer.

[Extract from D.O. letter No. 6/13/71-A. 11, dated 23-8-1971.]

Entries regarding honoraria/awards

4.5. If an officer has received any honorarium/award, a suitable entry should be made in his character roll and a copy of the citation placed in it.

[Extract from letter No. 1/8/60 C, dated 9-2-1961.]

Suggestions accepted by Idea Award Committee

4.6. The Idea Award Committee considered a suggestion and agreed that a record should be kept in the character roll of the person concerned if an idea presented by him is accepted by that Committee. It has accordingly been decided that a copy of the communication conveying the acceptance and commendation of the Committee together with a copy of the actual suggestion accepted, should be kept in the character roll of the person concerned.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/10/64-A. 11, dated 11-11-1964.]

Request for posting out of officers

4.7. It has been decided that requests for posting out of officers from Ministries/Divisions will not be entertained in future unless specific grounds are given. It has also been decided that such requests will then be placed in the CR Dossier of the officer concerned.

[c.f. D.O. letter No. 6/5/76-A. 11, dated 24-12-1979.]

Reflection in Performance Evaluation Report of Extraneous Influence by Government Servants in respect of Service Matters

4.8. The Establishment Division issued instructions *vide* D.O. letter No. 5/4/82-D.I, dated 5th July, 1995 reminding the government servants of the provisions under the rules and emphasising upon them the need to refrain from bringing any extraneous influence in service matters and directing all the competent authorities to bring, immediately, to the

notice of the Prime Minister's Secretariat cases of defaulting civil/government servants for seeking orders for initiating disciplinary proceedings on case-to-case basis through the Establishment Division. It has, however, been observed that although the practice is still continuing but not a single case has been reported to the Establishment Division by the Ministries/ Divisions/Departments for seeking the orders of the Prime Minister's Secretariat in such cases.

2. It has been decided that the civil/government servants be advised once again in their own interest, to scrupulously observe the provisions contained in the Conduct Rules and the E&D Rules. If any civil servant attempts to bring extraneous influence in respect of his posting, transfer, deputation, promotion, *etc*, a note to this effect shall be placed in his C.R. dossier, besides initiating the disciplinary action under intimation to this Division.

3. It may please be brought to the notice of all civil/government servants working under the Ministries/Divisions/Departments, *etc*.

[*c.f.* Establishment Division's D.O. letter No. 5/4/82-D.1, dated 18-04-1996.]

**Evaluation reports on the trainees at NIPAs,
P.A.S.C. etc.**

4.9. Evaluation reports on the trainees should be prepared by the Training Institutions. Copies of the evaluation reports should be sent to the sponsoring Ministries/Provincial Governments for being placed on the Character Roll dossiers of the officers. The evaluation reports may be taken into consideration at the time of promotion and given such weight, alongwith other factors, as the relevant authorities may deem fit.

[*c.f.* Para 5 of letter No. 2/17/61-A. IV, dated 31-10-1961.]

4.10. With a view to ensuring that officers take their training seriously, evaluation reports from the training institutions should be given the same importance as the performance evaluation reports are given. In view of this, Heads of training institutions will send evaluation reports in duplicate to the Ministries/Divisions where the officer was employed last before coming to the training institution. The Ministries/ Divisions will place one copy of the report in the character roll dossier of the officer concerned, available with them, and send the other copy of the report to the Establishment Division for placing on the character roll of the officer maintained in that Division.

[c.f. Paras 1 and 2 of O.M. No. 6/9/63-A. 11, dated 6-12-1963.]

4.11. It has been observed that the documents received in the Establishment Division from Ministries/Divisions/Provincial Governments for placing in the C.R. dossiers of officers are not evaluation reports prepared by the training institutes. These are either Degrees/Certificates or in the form of general letters issued to the officers concerned after completion of training and as such these cannot be placed in the CR dossiers. Such Degrees, Certificates, *etc.* can only be filed in the personal files of officers and necessary entries regarding training they underwent, can be made in the relevant column of the PER Form [S.121G]. Therefore, to avoid unnecessary correspondence in this regard, it is requested that only "evaluation reports" prepared by the Training Institutions are sent to the Establishment Division for placement in the C.R. dossiers of the officer concerned.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/11/72-A. II, dated 28-3-1974 with necessary verbal changes]

Reports on officers detailed for training abroad

4.12. In accordance with the principles initiated in the Establishment Division's letter No. 2/17/61-A. IV, dated the 31st October, 1961 (para (4.9) (full text at pages 299-301 Chapter IX, Establishment Manual, Ed. 1992) reports on officers detailed for training courses abroad at various Institutes will be placed on the C.R. dossiers of the officers.

[c.f. letter No. F.1/29/62-A. 111, dated 19-11-1962 read with No. 1/29/62-A. 111, dated 18-4-1963.]

Nomination Forms under the Central Employees Benevolent Fund and Group Insurance Act, 1969

4.13. (i) One copy of the nomination forms duly signed by the Head of the Office is to be returned to the employee, one to be placed in the CR/Service Book, of gazetted/non-gazetted employee respectively and one to be sent to the Director, Regional Board in whose jurisdiction an employee is serving.

[C.f. O.M. No. 1(4)-BT-A/RP/70, dated 24th August. 1971.]

(ii) Ministries/Divisions are requested to obtain such nomination forms from the officers serving under their control and furnish the same to the Establishment Division, for record.

[C.f. Estt. Division O.M. No. 6/17/81-A-11, dated 23rd November, 1981.]

Annual Medical Examination Reports

4.14. Government of Pakistan has decided that every officer in the employ of the Federal Government should be medically examined every year and the report of such examination be recorded in the performance evaluation reports/ service record of the officer.

4.15. The medical examination will be conducted as follows:

1. For Officers posted at Karachi (Heart Clinic, Jinnah Central Hospital).
 - (a) Officers of the rank of Joint Secretary and above, Professors of Medicines, Dow College-Incharge, Heart Clinic, Karachi.
 - (b) Other Officers in Grade-17 or above, Associate Physicians, Assistant Professors of Medicines, Jinnah Central Hospital.

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2. | For Officers posted at Rawalpindi (Central Government Hospital); | (a) | Officers of the rank of Joint Secretary and above. Their authorised medical attendants. |
| | | (b) | Other Officers in Grade-17 or above, Physicians of the Hospital. |
| 3. | Other places. | | Civil Surgeons at District Head quarters. |

[N.B.-Officers would be examined only at the station of their posting.]

4.16. The report of the medical examination will be in the form attached and will be furnished by the examining officer direct to the Head of the Office/ Department concerned.

4.17. It is proposed to divide the officers in the following categories on the basis of their medical fitness:

- | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (i) Category A | An officer who has not been definitely disabled on account of a serious defect. |
| (ii) Category B | An officer who suffered from serious defect which has disabled him partially but permanently, provided he is fit to perform certain types of duties, such as sedentary duties. |
| (iii) Category C | An officer who is completely incapacitated. |

4.18. The report will be disclosed to the officer. If he contests the medical category assigned to him by the Medical Officer conducting the medical examination he may be placed before a Medical Board.

4.19. The above decision has been taken in the interest of the officers themselves so that their physical defects are discovered at an early stage and an easy treatment is assured. An officer who is completely incapacitated and placed in "C" Category would still be given such treatment as may be possible. There will be no categorisation of jobs and the Establishment Division/Service Department concerned will take the medical report into consideration while considering particular appointment.

[C.f. Health Division O.M. No. 9/18/60-M, dated 10-1-1961.]

4.20. *Re-employed/superannuated officers.*-The intention of the orders issued in the Ministry of Health O.M. No. F. 9/18/60-M, dated the 10th January, 1961 (Para 4.14-19) is to ensure that officers in Government service are fit and as such all Grade-17 and above officers including those re-employed after retirement, should be medically examined annually.

4.21. *Army officers in civil employ.*-If they are serving officers, seconded to the Civil, they will be examined by the Army medical authorities. If they have given up connection with Army and are retired *etc.* They will be examined by the Civil medical authorities.

4.22. *Maintenance of Medical Rolls with the C.R. Dossiers.*- According to the instruction contained in the Health Division O.M. No. 9/18/60M, dated 10th January, 1961 (Para 4.14) annual medical reports in respect of all Grade- 17 and above officers are required to be placed in the C.R. Dossiers of the officers concerned. Experience has, however, shown that mixing of medical reports with evaluation reports in the C.R. Dossiers creates confusion at the time of examination of C.R. Dossiers for purposes of career planning, promotion *etc.*, of the officer. It has, therefore, been decided that medical reports should henceforth be placed in a separate folder to be called "Medical Roll" attached with the C.R. Dossier of the officer.

4.23. As regards medical reports from 1961 to 1970 which have been placed in the C.R. Dossiers, these may also be removed from the dossiers and placed in the Medical Rolls.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/70-A. 11, dated 27-5-1971.]

4.24. According to the existing instructions, Annual Medical Reports in respect of all officers of Grade- 17 and above are required to be placed in their C.R. dossiers and that, instead of mixing the medical reports with the evaluation reports in the P.E.R.s, the medical reports should be placed in a separate folder to be called Medical Roll which should be attached to the C.R. dossier of the officer concerned.

4.25. It has, however, been noticed that the annual medical reports are not being sent to the Establishment Division regularly alongwith the C.Rs. with the result that the C.R. dossiers of the officers concerned maintained in this Division remain incomplete. The medical reports are very important documents and are taken into account for considering the question of continued retention of officers in service and also for consideration of the proposals for their promotion to higher posts which involves the discharge of heavy and

strenuous duties. It is accordingly requested that great care and vigilance may please be exercised in getting the officers medically examined every year and in furnishing their medical reports to the Establishment Division by 31st March, positively. Serious action may be taken against the officer who evade the annual medical examination. If there are any cogent or plausible reasons for which the officer could not be examined medically during a particular year or years, the circumstances, in which they could not or did not undergo the annual medical check up, should be intimated to the Establishment Division. The Officer-in-charge of the administration in the Ministries/Divisions may be directed to ensure that every officer of the Ministry/Division undergoes the medical examination at the appropriate time.

[c.f. O.M. No. 1/176-A, 11, dated 27-3-1976.]

4.26. *Medical reports on officers on deputation to international organisations (U.N., RCD, etc.).*-It has been decided in consultation with the Health Division that the medical reports on such officers should be dispensed with, and the officers concerned deemed to be medically fit unless a report to the contrary is received from the foreign organisation concerned.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/173-A, 11, dated 19-7-1973.]

Strictures passed by Courts against Government servants

4.27. The question whether strictures passed by Courts of Law against a Government servant render him liable to departmental action has been under the consideration of the Establishment Division for some time. It has been held that when a Court passes any strictures against a Government servant, it should not necessarily be assumed that he is guilty of some misconduct or breach of rules or an act of omission or commission. The nature of the action to be taken should be decided after careful consideration of the facts and circumstances of each individual case. If the strictures are such as to merit disciplinary action against the Government servant concerned, he should be dealt with departmentally in the light of Government Servant's (Efficiency and Discipline) Rules. No Government servant should, however, be punished on the basis of the strictures without drawing up necessary proceedings in accordance with the aforesaid rules. An entry may be made in the Character Roll of the Government servant concerned or a copy of the strictures placed therein only when specific orders are passed to that effect by the competent authority. In no other case, strictures should find a place in the Character Roll of the Government servant.

[c.f. O.M. No. 3/110/59-EV, dated 28-4-1960.]

**SAFE CUSTODY, PROPER MAINTENANCE AND MOVEMENT
OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS/
CHARACTER ROLL DOSSIERS**

Safe custody-General Instructions

5.1. Reports will be kept in the safe custody of the next higher officer-incharge of administration. In no case should an officer have access to his own reports.

[c.f. para 10 of O.M. No. 5/3/48-Estt. (SE), dated 1-8-1949.]

5.2. Secretaries to Government should satisfy themselves that no officer in a Ministry or in an Attached Department or Subordinate Office has custody of his own Character Roll.

[Extract from D.O. No. F.5/3/48-Estt. (SE.1), dated 24-6-1950.]

5.3. Except for the communication of adverse remarks, according to the existing instructions the contents of the reports will not be divulged to the Government servants concerned.

[c.f. para 9 of O.M. No. 5/3/48-Estt. (SE), dated 1-8-1949.]

5.4. There is too much reason to believe that some Ministries do not take sufficient care to preserve the secrecy of these reports. Some have reached the Establishment Division under covering notes signed by very junior officers. The most scrupulous care is taken here in regard to their secrecy and it is requested that the reports should be kept in the personal custody of senior officers.

[c.f. para 3(d), D.O. Letter No. 5/3/48-SE.1, dated 9-6-1951.]

5.5. *Evaluation record to be page-numbered.*-In order to minimise the possibility of any of these reports being tampered with, it is necessary that the sheets in evaluation record should be page-numbered in ink.

[Extract from O.M. No. F.5/3/48-Estt(SE. 1), dated 2-10-1950.]

5.6. *Character Rolls of Retired Officers.*-It has been decided as a general principle that the character rolls may not be given to retired officers.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/70-A. 11, dated 30-11-1970.]

5.7. *Character Rolls of Government servants no longer in service.*- It has been decided that in case of death or resignation of officers, the Character Rolls may be preserved for five years after their death and resignation and in other cases for ten years after their retirement, removal, discharge or dismissal *etc.* or until they attain the age of 65 years, whichever is earlier.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/70-A. 11, dated 27-2-1970.]

5.8. *Forwarding and returning of character rolls.*-In order to maintain complete secrecy, Ministries/Divisions *etc.* are requested that on both occasions while forwarding the evaluation reports/character rolls and obtaining the character rolls from the Establishment Division, the correspondence should always be, at least, at Deputy Secretary's level.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/67-A. 11, dated 1-3-1967.]

5.9. Evaluation reports should always be sent to an officer by name not lower than a Deputy Secretary.

[c.f. para 3, D.O. letter No. 9(5)-52/SE. 111, dated 25-2-1953.]

Where to be kept-Character Rolls of different category of officers

5.10. *Secretariat Officers.*-Character Rolls of all officers of the rank of Section Officer/Assistant Secretary and above should be kept with the Establishment Division. The PERs of all such officers, if any, with the Ministries/ Divisions may be sent to the Establishment Division for record, after being brought up-to-date.

[Extract from O.M. No. 3(2)F.O./48, dated 11/14-6-1948.]

5.11. *Officers of the Attached Departments.*-A question has been raised whether or not the evaluation reports on the officers of the Attached Departments in respect of which the Secretaries are the countersigning officers, should be kept in the Ministry or passed on to the Head of the Department concerned. It has been decided that such reports should be retained by the Ministry concerned, except those which are required to be maintained by the Establishment Division.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/69-A, II, dated 14-6-1969.]

5.12. *Duplicate P.E.R. Dossiers: former CSP and PCS Officers.* - Inconvenience is caused when it is desired to get an officer from a Province owing to the delay in obtaining his character roll for the Selection Board. Provinces have been asked to adopt a system by which duplicate files of former CSP Officers will be kept both at the Centre and in the Provinces. This will entail all reports being made in duplicate a copy being sent to the Centre when an officer is serving in Province. When the officer is deputed from the Centre to a Province the duplicate set of reports will be sent with him. It is requested, therefore, that all future reports should be sent in duplicate. The same should apply in the case of ex-PCS Officers serving at the Centre; it is obviously desirable that the Provincial Governments should be informed each year of their progress.

[Extract from para 4 of D.O. letter No. 5/3/48-SE. 1, dated 9-6-1951.]

5.13. (1) One copy of every former CSP Officer's character roll (kept up-to-date by the addition of duplicate copies of evaluation reports received from the Provincial Governments and the Federal Ministries from time to time) must always be kept available with the Establishment Secretary.

(2) If an officer is transferred from a Province to the Centre, the Provincial Government will transfer his character roll to the Central Government.

(3) If an officer is deputed from the Centre to a Province, a copy of the character roll with the Establishment Secretary will be sent to the Province to which the officer is deputed.

(4) If an officer is transferred from one Province to another (under the orders of the Federal Government), the Provincial Government under whom the officer was serving before transfer will send his character roll to the other Provincial Government, direct.

[Extract from para 2 of D.O. letter No. 5/3/48-SE. 1, dated 28-8-1951.]

5.14. The objective is for each former CSP Officer and former GAR Officer to have two exactly similar Character Rolls and two only. One, the original, will remain with the Establishment Secretary and the other, the duplicate, will, so to speak, move with the officer wherever he is posted. It should be noted that in some cases copies of Character Rolls sent by Provinces to the Establishment Division are now being treated as original in order to reduce unnecessary further movement of the Character Rolls.

[C.f. para 3 of D.O. letter No. 9(3)/52-SE. III, dated 11-8-1952.]

5.15. *Section Officer, other than former CSP, PCS and GAR Officers.*-The original copy of performance evaluation report should be sent to the Establishment Division and the duplicate kept by the Ministry/Division concerned.

5.16. *Officer of the former PCS serving at the Centre.*-One copy of the report should be sent to the Establishment Division and the other to the Provincial Government concerned as already laid down in para 5.12 above.

5.17. *All remaining Grade-17 and above officers serving in the Federal Secretariat, Attached and Subordinate Offices.*-One copy of report should be sent to the Establishment Division and other maintained by the authority administratively concerned.

[C.f. paras 1(a), (b) & (c) of O.M. No. 1/38/61-A. 11, dated 16-1-1962.]

5.18. *Character Rolls of officers of ex-PA&AS, ex-PMAs, ex-PTS, etc.*-The performance evaluation reports of the officers will be written, maintained and passed on as specified below:

Service	Pool Officers		Non-Pool Officers	
	Original CR.	Duplicate CR.	Original CR	Duplicate CR
PA & AS and Establishment PRAS.	Establishment Division	Comptroller and Auditor General of Pakistan.	Comptroller and Auditor General of Pakistan.	Establishment Division.
PMAS	-do-	Financial Adviser, Military Finance.	Financial Adviser, Military Finance.	-do
PTS & PC & ES	-do-	C.B.R.	C.B.R.	-do

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/64-A. 11, dated 10-9-1964, as amended.]

5.19. (i) *Duplicate PERs of Assistant Accounts Officers.*- Establishment Division agree to the proposal that duplicate copies of evaluation reports in respect of the Assistant Accounts Officers should continue to be maintained in the Office of the Auditor General, in relaxation of the existing instructions.

[Extract from letter No. 6/774-A. 11, dated 10-11-1974.]

(ii) *Duplicate PERs of officers of Railway Accounts Department.* - The existing arrangement for maintenance of duplicate copies of C.R. dossiers in respect of officers Grade-17 and above of Departmental Cadre of the Railway Accounts Department in the Finance Directorate of the Railway Board is acceptable to the Establishment Division in relaxation of the existing instructions.

[c.f. Establishment Division O.M. No. 6/25/80-A-11, dated 30-12-1980.]

5.20. *Duplicate PERs of all Grade 17 officers and above.* - To eliminate the risk of loss of evaluation reports and to provide for the safe custody of the dossiers containing the evaluation reports, it has been decided that every evaluation report should be written in duplicate and in the case of all Grade- 17 officers and above one copy should be sent to the Establishment Division even if that Division is not concerned with the Services to which the officers concerned belong. A special Secret Section is being created in the Establishment Division:

- (a) to remind Ministries/Divisions/Departments periodically that evaluation reports of their officers should be written well in time and placed in the relevant dossiers;
- (b) to keep duplicate dossiers of evaluation reports of all Grade-17 officers and above and to make available for use in case any dossier containing original reports is lost or misplaced;
- (c) to draw the attention of Ministries and Divisions to the desirability of prompt decisions on representations made against adverse remarks.

In the case of Grade- 16 officers, duplicate dossiers should be maintained in the respective Ministries.

[c.f.-Para 6 of O.M. No. 8/4/59-EOM, dated 16-1-1960.]

5.21. Performance evaluation reports should be kept in newly designed folders. The utility of folders and envelopes is explained below:-

- (a) The entries on the front and the fourth page of the folder will provide the number and pages of the reports in the dossier and indicate the names of the officers responsible for the custody of reports from time to time.
- (b) The entries on the second and third page of the folder will give the record of employment of the officer at a glance.
- (c) The photograph of the officer for which space has been provided on the second page will give an idea of the appearance and personality of the officer.

5.22. The dossiers of evaluation reports should be kept in the specially designed envelopes. These envelopes are to be retained by the officer responsible for the custody of the reports, when the dossier is sent out. The entries on the envelopes will enable the officer-in-charge to keep track of the movement of the dossier.

[c.f. - Para 7, O.M. No. 8/4/59-EOM, dated 16-1-1960.]

5.23. (i) *Duplicate C.R. Dossiers not to be requisitioned from the Establishment Division.* - Ministries/Divisions have been asking for the duplicate copies of the C.R. Dossiers of officers of Grade-17 and above, from the Establishment Division, on the plea that the original C.R. dossiers were not readily available or had been misplaced/lost. In quite a number of such cases, the Establishment Division's copies of the C.R. dossiers were sent to the Ministries/ Divisions, who did not return them promptly. On the other hand, the Establishment Division require the C.R. dossier of officers at short notice for submission to the Central Selection Board, the Establishment Minister and the Prime Minister. If the C.R. dossiers are not readily available in such cases, it causes a lot of embarrassment and delay.

(ii) In view of the circumstances explained in the preceding paragraph, it would not be possible in future to send the C.R. dossiers belonging to the Establishment Division to the various Ministries/Divisions who may kindly ensure that their copies of the C.R. dossiers are properly maintained and are readily available.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/74-A. 11, dated 28-3-1974.]

(iii) C.R. dossiers maintained by the Establishment Division primarily for its own use cannot be made available to other Ministries/Divisions. In view of the above, it is requested that the Establishment Division may not be approached for obtaining PER dossiers of officers.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/81/80-CPI, dated 25-9-1980.]

5.24. It is once again emphasised that PER dossiers will not be sent out of this Division. Ministries/Divisions may please consult the dossiers in this Division through appointment with the Deputy Secretary (Career Planning) or the Joint Secretary concerned.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/19/78-CPI, dated 31-12-1978.]

Proper maintenance of character rolls

5.25. It has been noticed that a large number of character rolls are not only incomplete, but also defective in as much as relevant instructions have been followed in their preparation. A few instances are quoted below:

1. In many cases the remarks of the reporting/countersigning officers are not legible, their names and designations are not clearly written in block letters or typed below their signatures, as required under the rules.
2. Many irrelevant papers such as copies of U.O. notes, forwarding D.O. letters *etc.*, which have no connection with evaluation reports found their place in a large number of character rolls in complete disregard to Government instructions.
3. Sometimes both original and duplicate copies of the same evaluation reports are placed in the same dossier, though according to instructions one copy should be sent to the Establishment Division and the other copy placed in the dossier maintained by the Ministry concerned.
4. The character rolls received from Ministries/Divisions in connection with cases are sometimes found to be torn, shabby and without being page numbered or indexed.

5. Last but not the least, the character rolls are not up-to-date in most cases. This causes great difficulty in assessing suitability of candidates for promotion *etc.*

5.26. The importance of the performance evaluation report can hardly be over emphasized. Their defective preparation without proper care is likely to reduce their value. It will, therefore, be appreciated if proper care is taken to avoid such omissions in the performance evaluation reports and necessary steps are taken to ensure that the reports are written and maintained strictly in accordance with the rules.

[Extract from O.M. No. 6/1/69-A. 11, dated 16-8-1969]

Affixing of photographs on Character Rolls

5.27. According to the instructions contained in the Establishment Division Office Memorandum No. 8/4/59-EOM, dated 16th January, 1960 (para 5.21) the Ministries/Divisions were asked to affix photographs in the character rolls of Gazetted officers with a view to giving an idea of their appearance and personality. Specific space has been provided for the same on second page of the revised character roll folder No. S. 121-(A)(I) with printed instructions underneath that the photograph should be replaced after every ten years. It has been observed that in many cases these instructions have not been followed by the Ministries/ Divisions concerned with the result that no photographs have been affixed in character roll of several officers. The President's Secretariat have specifically pointed out such omissions. Ministries/Divisions' are therefore, requested to ensure that photographs of all officers are affixed in both the folders of the character roll dossiers.

[c.f. D.O. letter No. 6/1/70-A. II, dated 16-3-1970]

5.28. A serious view has been taken by the President's Secretariat (Public) that photographs of officers are not always affixed in their character rolls. It is, therefore, requested that the officers responsible for the custody of character rolls may please see that photographs of all officers are affixed at page 2 of respective character roll folders (both the copies) irrespective of their rank and status. A copy each of recent photograph of all Grade-17 officers and above working in different Ministries/Divisions/Attached Departments may also be sent to Establishment Division, for record.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/1/70-A. 11, dated 26-2-1970.]

5.29. In spite of the instructions noted in the margin, in a quite large number of cases, photographs of officers are not affixed to their C.R. dossiers. In some cases the photographs have become too old, although according to instruction photographs should be replaced after every ten years.

O.M. No. 6/1/70-A.11
dated 26-2-1970
(para 5.28).

D.O. No. 6/1/70-A. II
dated 16-3-1970
(para 5.27).

5.30. It may be ensured that the latest photographs of all officers are affixed immediately to their Character Roll Dossiers. Copies of the latest photographs may also be supplied to the Establishment Division.

[cf. D.O. letter No. 6/1/70-A. II, dated 8-11-1973.]

5.31. Certain 'Purdah' observing officers have objected to supply their photographs for affixing them on their C.R. dossiers. The matter has been considered in Establishment Division. It has been decided that such officers will have the option to supply or not to supply their photographs for the purpose. In respect of officers who do not like to supply their photographs, a certificate that they observe purdah will have to be given by the Head of the Institution where they serve.

[c.f. O.M. No. 6/6/77-A. 11, dated 17-1-1978.]

SECTION 6

**STANDARDISED FORMS-PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
REPORTS**

6.1. (i) *Standardised PER Forms of ministerial staff.*-After examination of the various forms at present in use, it has been decided that the attached forms Forms S-121 B, S-121 C, S-121 *D & S-121 E will be the most suitable in so far as officers and staff in the Secretariat and Attached Departments are concerned.

(ii) In addition to the general instructions regarding the preparation of the reports, as reproduced in section 2, special instructions relating to the particular forms are given on each form.

(iii) No departure should be made from the headings in the standard forms that have been prescribed. In cases, however, where considering the special nature of the duties entrusted to officers, it is necessary to bring out any 'special' qualities in the evaluation reports, suitable additions may be made to the 'Listed' heading in the form.

(iv) *Staff Car Drivers/Despatch Riders.*-Form S. 121-F is meant for writing PERs of Staff Car Drivers/Despatch Riders.

[c.f. paras 1-3 of O.M. No. F.5/3/48-Estt. (SE), dated 1-8-1949.]

6.2. In consultation with the Establishment Division it has been decided to introduce a new form for writing performance evaluation report on Stenographers/Stenotypists (S-121-E Revised).

[c.f. O & M Division O.M. No. 10/5/77-RO. III, dated 29-10-1979.]

6.3. In consultation with the Establishment Division it has been decided to introduce a new form for writing performance evaluation report on Assistants, Upper Division Clerks and Lower Division Clerks (S-121-C Revised).

[c.f. O & M Division O.M. No. 10/5/77-R.O. III, dated 22-9-1979.]

6.4. *Revised PER Form for Officers in Grade-17 and above.*-It has been felt for sometime that the present PER form has failed to serve as an adequate index of a civil

*The form (S-121 D) has since been discontinued.

servant's qualities, attitudes and performance for the purpose of career planning, training, promotion *etc.* The Establishment Division undertook an exercise to devise a new performance evaluation form which would reflect an officer's strong and weak points more objectively and ensure that such performance evaluation effectively serves its true purpose.

6.5. The President has been pleased to approve the form prepared by the Establishment Division. This form will be used for evaluating the performance of all civil servants in Grade 17 and above. It will be introduced from the 1st January, 1983 and all PERs for 1982 onwards will be recorded in the new Form (S-121-G).

[c.f. -Estt. Secretary's d.o. letter No. 6/9/79(CP. 11) dated 8-8-1982]

Revised Performance Evaluation Form S-121-G.

6.6. The competent authority has been pleased to approve a revised and separate PER format for officers in BS-17/18, BS-19/20 and BS-21 (S-121-G i, ii & iii).

2. It may be observed that PER forms have been trifurcated and colour coded. This is indicative of the fact that evaluation criteria for lower management, middle management and higher management posts is clearly distinguishable and in line with the job requirements of the posts at different levels.

3. It may be intimated that the revised format of PER shall come into force *w.e.f.* 1st January, 2001, meaning thereby that PERs for the year 2000 shall be initiated in the revised format.

[c.f. -Estt. Division's O.M. No. 1/10/2000-DS(Coord.), dated 18-8-2000].

6.7. Reference Establishment Division O.M. No. 1/10/2000-DS (Coord) dated the 18th August, 2000. A detachable certificate shall be affixed to the revised format of the PERs. Samples of certificate already provided to Secretaries/ Additional Secretaries Incharge of Ministries/Divisions.

2. The officers being reported upon would be required to fill in the name/designation of their reporting and countersigning officers and dispatch the certificate to the officer in charge entrusted with the maintenance of their evaluation records on the same date the PER is forwarded to the reporting officers.

3. This shall enable the controlling Ministries/Divisions/Authorities to ensure follow-up and prompt retrieval of PERs from the Reporting/Countersigning Officers.

4. The guidelines for filling up the PERs shall be printed on the reverse of the PER proformae.

[c.f.-Estt. Division's O.M. No. 1/10/2000-DS (Coord) dated 17-10-2000.1

6.8. Reference is made to Establishment Division's letter of even number dated 17th October, 2000.

2. In a briefing given to the Chief Executive on the performance evaluation system, the competent authority has been pleased to direct that the comparative grading column (top 10%, next 20% and next 70%) in the PERs for officers in BPS- 19, 20 and 21 should be deleted.

3. Accordingly, revised samples of PERs (without the comparative grading column) have been prepared and are forwarded for information. These amended revised PERs shall be introduced *w e f* January 1st, 2002 for initiating the PERs for the year, 2001.

4. As per previous practice requisite indents may be placed with the Department of Stationery and Forms, Cabinet Division and the printed forms may be distributed among officers working under Administrative control of Ministries/ Divisions.

[c.f.-Estt. Division's O.M. No. 1/10/2000-DS(Coord), dated 25-10-2001].

SECTION 7

MISCELLANEOUS INSTRUCTIONS**P.E.Rs not a Condition of service**

*7.1. [Omitted].

*7.2. [Omitted].

**Note:- These paras have been omitted as the instructions contained therein were in conflict with the judgment of the Supreme Court (1981 SCMR-840) in which it was held that the Performance Evaluation Reports were very much a part of the terms and conditions of the service: hence, appeal against remarks in Performance Evaluation Reports were competent before Services Tribunal and such Tribunal competent to expunge such remarks.*

*7.3. [Omitted].

*[Establishment Division's Letter No. 6/24/87-PD. II dated 20-10-1987].

Guarding against personal likes and dislikes

7.4. It has been decided that with a view to guarding against personal likes and dislikes, an officer receiving adverse remarks for two successive years from the same reporting officer should be placed under another reporting officer.

[c.f. letter No. 6/14/61-C, dated 7-8-1961.]

Cost of photographs affixed on the C.Rs

7.5. Government servants are required to furnish their photographs on official account or for official purposes on various occasions. In the past specific instructions regarding reimbursement of his expenditure have been issued on each occasion when it arose. In order to obviate the need to issue occasional instructions, it has been decided that the actual cost of such photographs, whenever required to be furnished on official account or for official purposes, may be reimbursed to government servants on the production of cash memos or receipts.

[c.f. Finance Division O.M. No. F-3(6) R. 12/78, dated 1st July, 1978.]

7.6. Queries have been raised from different quarters seeking clarification with regard to payment of cost of the standing cabinet size photographs. The matter has been considered and it has been decided that, as a special case, the cost of photographs will be reimbursed in the case of officers who have made their own arrangements. In this connection it should be clearly understood that no TA/DA will be admissible for journeys, if made on this account.

[c.f. O.M. No. 1/3/78-A. 11, dated the 10th July, 1978.]

PART II

The rating should be recorded by initialling the appropriate column or box.

'A1' Very good; 'A' Good, 'B' Average; 'C' Below Average; 'D' Poor.

		A1	A	B	C	D	Remarks
1.	Intelligence and mental alertness						
2.	Judgement and sense of proportion						
3.	Initiative and drive						
4.	Power of expression:						
	(a) Writing						
	(b) Speech						
5.	Ability to plan, organise and supervise work						
6.	Quality and output of work						
7.	Perseverance and devotion to duty						
8.	Capacity to guide and train sub-ordinates						
9.	Co-operation and tact						
10.	Integrity:						
	(a) Intellectual						
	(b) Moral						
11.	Sense of responsibility						
	(a) General						
	(b) In financial matters						
12.	Personality						
**13.							
**14.							
**15.							
**16.							
**17.							
*18.	Interest in social welfare	Takes interest in social welfare activities..... <input type="checkbox"/>		Is inclined to treat this aspect of his duty as routine function..... <input type="checkbox"/>			
*19.	Interest in economic development	Is interested in planning and execution of development schemes..... <input type="checkbox"/>		Is inclined to treat this duty as routine function..... <input type="checkbox"/>			
*20.	Behaviour with public	Is modest and helpful..... <input type="checkbox"/>		Is inclined to be arrogant..... <input type="checkbox"/>			
21.	Standard of living	Lives within known means of income..... <input type="checkbox"/>		Reported to be living beyond known means of income..... <input type="checkbox"/>			
22.	Observance of security measures	Takes reasonably good care..... <input type="checkbox"/>		Inclined to be negligent..... <input type="checkbox"/>			
23.	Punctuality	Punctual..... <input type="checkbox"/>		Unpunctual..... <input type="checkbox"/>			
24.	Touring	Adequate and systematic. <input type="checkbox"/>		Inadequate or unsystematic..... <input type="checkbox"/>			

*To be initialled only when applicable.

**Please see instruction A-1.

PART III

Comparing him with other officers of the same grade, give your general assessment of the officer by initialling the appropriate column below:

Very Good	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor	Remarks on special aptitude, if any, e.g., for secretariat, executive, judicial, development or diplomatic work.

FITNESS FOR PROMOTION
(Initial the appropriate box below)

- (a) Recommended for accelerated promotion
- (b) Fit for promotion
- (c) Recently promoted; assessment for further promotion premature
- (d) Not yet fit for promotion, but likely to become fit in course of time
- (e) Unfit for further promotion, has reached his ceiling
- (f) Fitness for retention after 25 years service Fit Unfit

Pen Picture

Date _____ 20

Signature, name and designation.

Official Stamp

PART IV

REMARKS OF THE COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER

I consider that the assessment made by the Reporting Officer is very good/reasonably good/strict/lenient/biased*.

The remarks underlined in red ink should be communicated in writing.**

I have the following remarks to add:

Date _____ 20

Name and designation of countersigning officer

Official Stamp

*Strike out the entries which are inapplicable.

**Strike out this sentence if there are no adverse remarks to be communicated.

A. INSTRUCTIONS FOR MINISTRIES, DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

1. This form has been designed to cover the basic qualities of an officer. Where necessary, comments on other qualities required of an officer belonging to a specialised service or employed on a particular kind of duties, should be made in the blank space provided against items 13-17 of Part-II, Ministries/ Departments/ Provincial Governments, *etc.*, should issue administrative instructions in this behalf to the reporting officers under them indicating the specific qualities required for any particular group or post deserving special mention in the evaluation reports. Suitable entry headings relating to these qualities should be typed in the space provided against items 13 to 17 when the form is initially prepared by office for individual officers.
2. The report should be initiated by the next higher officer and countersigned by an officer higher than the reporting officer both being concerned with the work of the officer reported upon.
3. (i) When an adverse remark is made in the evaluation report of any officer, a copy of the whole report should be furnished to him, at the earliest opportunity, and in any case within one month from the date the report is countersigned, with a d.o. letter, a copy of which should be signed and returned by him in acknowledgement of the report. A serious view should be taken of any failure on the part of the officials concerned to furnish a copy of the report containing adverse remarks to the officer reported upon.

(ii) The officers making representation against adverse remarks recorded in their evaluation reports should not make any personal remark or remarks against the integrity of the Reporting Officers. Violation of this rule will be considered a misconduct and will also render the representation liable to be summarily rejected.
4. When a report is built up on the individual opinions of the reporting and countersigning officers, it is only the opinion as accepted by the latter which should be communicated.
5. Remarks in cases where the reporting/countersigning officer suspends judgment, should not be communicated.

6. Any remarks to the effect that the officer reported upon has or has not taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him in a previous year, should also be communicated.
7. The adverse remarks should be communicated by the senior officer incharge of establishment matters.
8. An evaluation report containing adverse remarks should not be taken into consideration until they have been communicated in writing to the officer concerned and a decision taken on his representation, if any.

**B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE OFFICERS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE
CUSTODY OF CHARACTER ROLLS**

1. Arrange for the completion of the routine part of form and send it to the reporting officer concerned.
2. On receipt of the completed form from the reporting officer, submit it alongwith relevant character roll, to the countersigning officer concerned.
3. Go through each report carefully in order to see it there are any adverse remarks underlined in red ink. If so, arrange to have them communicated to the officer concerned immediately with the direction that his representation, if any, should be submitted within a fortnight of the receipt of those remarks by him.
4. Fill column 4 of the folder and watch receipt of representation. Arrange to obtain a decision on the representation, if any, and communicate it to the officer concerned within one month. Place a copy of the decision in the dossier.
5. In case of officers in BPS-16 send the duplicate copies of the evaluation reports to the administrative Department/Ministry concerned. If the officer belongs to the Ministry, keep the duplicate as well as the original in your own office.
6. Place the report in the folder [(S-121-A(i))] and make necessary entries thereon. Place the folder in the envelope [S-121-A(ii)] and make entries in the columns

provided thereon, when you have to send the dossier out make entries in the relevant columns of the envelope and retain it with you.

7. If an officer has been receiving adverse remarks for two successive years from the same reporting officer, take up the question of placing him under another reporting officer.

C. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REPORTING OFFICER

I. While reporting on your subordinates:

- (i) Be as objective as possible.
 - (ii) Be as circumspect as possible.
 - (iii) Be clear and direct, not ambiguous or evasive in your remarks.
 - (iv) Avoid exaggeration and gross understatement.
2. State whether any of the defects reported have already been brought to the notice of the officer concerned and also whether he has or has not taken steps to remedy them.
 3. Fill this form in duplicate by initialling the relevant boxes in both the original and the duplicate copies. You may, if necessary, have your views under "Pen Picture" typed but in that case, affix your signature at the end of the "Pen Picture."
 4. Where two or more qualities are bracketed together in Part II and the officer reported upon possesses only one of them, bring this fact out in "Remarks" column, e.g. if an officer is cooperative but not tactful, say so.
 5. After completing Parts II and III, send the form to the officer having custody of the relevant character roll in your office.

D. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER

1. Weigh the remarks of the Reporting Officer against (a) your personal knowledge, if any, of the officer reported upon; (b) the previous reports in his character roll, and then give your own remarks in Part-IV.

2. If you consider that a particular remark of the Reporting Officer is wrong and should be expunged, score it out in red ink, initial the scoring and any other remark which you may consider appropriate. If you do not wholly agree with remark, give your own remarks either against the relevant entry in the "Remarks" column in Part-II or under "Remarks of the Countersigning Officer" in Part-IV
3. See whether any adverse remarks were communicated to the officer in a previous year and, if so, whether or not he has taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him. Comment on this aspect unless the Reporting Officer has already done so.
4. Underline in red ink remarks which, in your opinion, are adverse and should be communicated to the officer concerned. Please see also instructions 3 to 6 under A.-Instructions for Ministries, Departments, *etc.*
5. After countersigning the form, return it to the officer responsible for the custody of the character roll.

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FORM FOR
SUPERINTENDENT/ASSISTANT INCHARGE
GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN**

Name of Ministry/Division/Department/Office _____

Annual/Special Report for the period from _____ 20 to _____ 20

PART-I

Name _____ Date of Birth _____

Designation _____ BPS _____ Basic Pay _____

Date of entry into Government Service _____ Date of appointment to the present BPS _____

Qualifications _____

Training course, attended, if any _____

Nature of duties on which employed _____

PART-II

A. Performance	A1	A	B	C	D	Remarks
1. Regularity and punctuality in attendance -----						
2. Knowledge of procedure and regulations. --						
3. Capacity for ensuring prompt disposal of work -----						
4. Submission of cases in proper order -----						
5. Ability to handle: (i) difficult cases						
(ii) simple cases						
6. Maintaining discipline in the Section -----						
7. Standard of work: (a) quality						
(b) output						
B. Superintendence of Work						
8. Capacity to train/help and advise less experienced staff -----						
9. Allocation of work so that no man is unduly burdened -----						
10. Maintenance of Record (including recording and indexing) -----						
11. Maintenance of tidiness in premises -----						
C. Personal Traits						
12. Intelligence -----						
13. Perseverance and devotion to duty -----						
14. Cooperation and tact -----						
15. Amensibility to discipline -----						
16. Integrity						
17. Trustworthiness in confidential and secret matters -----						

Note.--The rating should be recorded by initialling the appropriate box.

'A1' Very good, 'A' Good, 'B' Average, 'C' Below Average, 'D' Poor

PART-III

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

(Appraise in the present grade by initialling the appropriate column below)

Very Good	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor	Special aptitude, if any

PART-IV

SUITABILITY FOR PROMOTION

(Initial the appropriate box below)

- (a) Recommended for accelerated promotion.
- (b) Fit for promotion.
- (c) Recently promoted/appointed, consideration for Promotion premature.
- (d) Not yet fit for promotion.
- (e) Unfit for further promotion.

PEN-PICTURE

Date: _____ 20

Signature, Name & Designation of Reporting Officer

Official Stamp

PART-V

REMARKS OF THE COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER

Date: _____ 20

Signature, Name & Designation

Official Stamp

A. INSTRUCTIONS FOR MINISTRIES, DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

1. The reports will be initiated by the Branch/Section Officer and will be countersigned by the next higher officer, both being concerned with the work of the person reported upon.
2. When an adverse remark is made in the evaluation report of the official reported upon a copy of the whole report should be furnished to him, at the earliest opportunity, and in any case within one month from the date the report is countersigned, with a memorandum, a copy of which should be signed and returned by him in acknowledgement of the report and be in turn placed in the character roll for record. A serious view should be taken of any failure on the part of the officials concerned to furnish a copy of the report containing adverse remarks to the person reported upon.
3. The officials making representation against adverse remarks recorded in their evaluation reports should not make any personal remark or remarks against the integrity of the Reporting Officers. Violation of this rule will be considered a misconduct and will also render the representation liable to be summarily rejected.
4. When a report is built up on the individual opinions of the reporting and countersigning officers, it is only the opinion as accepted by the latter which should be communicated.
5. Remarks in cases where the reporting/countersigning officer suspends judgment, should not be communicated.
6. Any remarks to the effect that the persons reported upon has or has not taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him in previous year, should also be communicated.
7. The adverse remarks should be communicated by the senior officer incharge of establishment matters in the Ministry/Division/Department/ Office concerned.
8. Performance evaluation report containing adverse remarks should not be taken into consideration until they have been communicated following rule A2 above and a decision taken on the representation, if any, of the person reported upon.

**B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE OFFICERS RESPONSIBLE FOR
THE CUSTODY OF CHARACTER ROLLS**

1. Arrange for the completion of the routine part of form and send it to the reporting officer concerned.
2. On receipt of the completed form from the reporting officer, submit it alongwith relevant character roll, to the countersigning officer concerned.
3. Go through each report carefully in order to see if there are any adverse remarks underlined in red ink. If so, arrange to have them communicated to the person concerned immediately with the direction that his representation, if any, should be submitted within a fortnight of the receipt of those remarks by him.
4. Arrange to obtain a decision on the representation, if any, and communicate it to the official concerned within one month. Place a copy of the decision in the dossier.
5. Keep the duplicate as well as original copies of the evaluation reports in your office.
6. If an official has been receiving adverse remarks for two successive years from the same reporting officer, take up the question of placing him under another reporting officer.

C. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REPORTING OFFICER

1. While reporting on, your subordinates:
 - (i) Be as objective as possible
 - (ii) Be as circumspect as possible
 - (iii) Be clear and direct, not ambiguous or evasive in your remarks
 - (iv) Avoid exaggeration and gross understatement
2. State whether any of the defects reported have already been brought to the notice of the person concerned and also whether he has or has not taken steps to remedy them.
3. Fill this form in duplicate and affix your signature in both, at the end of the general remarks.

4. After making relevant entries, send the form to the officer responsible for custody of character roll in your office.

D. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER

1. Weigh the remarks of the Reporting Officer against (a) your personal knowledge, if any, of the person reported upon; (b) the previous reports in his character roll, and then give your own remarks at the end of the report.
2. If you consider that a particular remark of the Reporting Officer is wrong and should be expunged, score it out in red ink, initial the scoring and add any other remark which you may consider appropriate. If you do not wholly agree with a remark, give your own remark either against the relevant entry or at the end of the report.
3. See whether any adverse remarks were communicated to the person concerned in a previous year and, if so, whether or not he has taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him. Comment on this aspect unless the Reporting Officer has already done so.
4. Underline in red ink remarks which, in your opinion, are adverse and should be communicated to the person reported upon. Please see also instructions 2 and 4 to 6 under A.-Instructions for Ministries, Departments, etc.
5. After countersigning the form, return it to the officer responsible for the custody of the character roll.

S. 121-B (Revised)

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FORM
FOR
ASSISTANTS/U.D.Cs./L.D.Cs.**

GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN

Name of Ministry/Division/Department/Office

Annual/Special Report for the period from _____ 20 to _____ 20

PART-I

Name _____ Date of Birth _____
 Designation _____ BPS _____ Basic Pay _____
 Date of entry into Government Service _____ Date of appointment to the
 Present BPS _____
 Qualifications _____
 Training courses, attended, if any _____
 Nature of duties on which employed _____

PART-II

A. PERFORMANCE	AI	A	B	C	D	Remarks
1. Referencing and paging of notes and correspondence						
2. Keeping of files and papers in tidy conditions						
3. Maintenance of records (including recording and indexing)						
4. Skill in writing and drafting, where applicable						
5. Other duties; e.g. Cashier duties, preparation of bills, statements and returns, etc.						
6. Other Clerical duties e.g. typing, diary/ despatch/disbursement of cash, statements/returns						
7. Regularity and punctuality in attendance						
8. Standard of work: (a) quality						
(b) output						
B. PERSONAL TRAITS						
9. Intelligence						
10. Perseverance and devotion to duty						
11. Co-operation and initiative						
12. Amenable to discipline						
13. Integrity						
14. Trustworthiness in confidential and secret matters		Yes			No	

Note.—The rating should be recorded by initialling the appropriate box:
 'AI' Very good, 'A' Good, 'B' Average, 'C' Below Average, 'D' Poor.

**PART-III
GENERAL ASSESSMENT**

(Appraise in the present grade by initialling the appropriate column below)

Very Good	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor	Special aptitude if any

**PART-IV
SUITABILITY FOR PROMOTION**
(Initial the appropriate box below)

- (a) Recommended for accelerated promotion.
- (b) Fit for promotion.
- (c) Recently promoted/appointed, consideration for Promotion premature.
- (d) Not yet fit for promotion.
- (e) Unfit for further promotion.
- (f) Fitness for retention after 25 years service Fit Unfit

PEN-PICTURE

Date: _____ 20

Signature, Name & Designation of Reporting Officer

Official Stamp

PART-V

REMARKS OF THE COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER

Date: _____ 20

Signature, Name & Designation

Official Stamp

A. INSTRUCTIONS FOR MINISTRIES, DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

1. The reports will be initiated by the Branch/Section Officer and will be countersigned by the next higher officer, both being concerned with the work of the person reported upon.
2. When an adverse remark is made in the evaluation report of the official reported upon a copy of the whole report should be furnished to him, at the earliest opportunity, and in any case within one month from the date the report is countersigned, with a memorandum, a copy of which should be signed and returned by him in acknowledgement of the report and be in turn place in the character roll for record. A serious view should be taken of any failure on the part of the officials concerned to furnish a copy of the report containing adverse remarks to the person reported upon.
3. The officials making representation against adverse remarks recorded in their evaluation reports should not make any personal remark or remarks against the integrity of the Reporting Officers. Violation of this rule will be considered a misconduct and will also render the representation liable to be summarily rejected.
4. When a report is built up on the individual opinions of the reporting and countersigning officers, it is only the opinion as accepted by the latter which should be communicated.
5. Remarks in cases where the reporting/countersigning officer suspends judgment, should not be communicated.
6. Any remarks to the effect that the persons reported upon has or has not taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him in previous year, should also be communicated.
7. The adverse remarks should be communicated by the senior officer incharge of establishment matters in the Ministry/Division/Department/ Office concerned.
8. An evaluation report containing adverse remarks should not be taken into consideration until they have been communicated following rule A2 above and a decision taken on the representation, if any, of the person reported upon.

**B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE OFFICERS RESPONSIBLE FOR
THE CUSTODY OF CHARACTER ROLLS**

1. Arrange for the completion of the routine part of form and send it to the reporting officer concerned.
2. On receipt of the completed form from the reporting officer, submit it along with relevant character roll, to the countersigning officer concerned.
3. Go through each report carefully in order to see if there are any adverse remarks underlined in red ink. If so, arrange to have them communicated to the person concerned immediately with the direction that his representation, if any, should be submitted within a fortnight of the receipt of those remarks by him.
4. Arrange to obtain a decision on the representation, if any, and communicate it to the official concerned within one month. Place a copy of the decision in the dossier.
5. Keep the duplicate as well as original copies of the evaluation reports in your office.
6. If an official has been receiving adverse remarks for two successive years from the same reporting officer, take up the question of placing him under another reporting officer.

C. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REPORTING OFFICER

1. While reporting on your subordinates:
 - (i) Be as objective as possible
 - (ii) Be as circumspect as possible
 - (iii) Be clear and direct, not ambiguous or evasive in your remarks
 - (iv) Avoid exaggeration and gross understatement
2. State whether any of the defects reported have already been brought to the notice of the person concerned and also whether he has or has not taken steps to remedy them.

3. Fill this form in duplicate and affix your signature in both, at the end of the general remarks.
4. After making relevant entries, send the form to the officer responsible for custody of character roll in your office.

D. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER

1. Weigh the remarks of the Reporting Officer against (a) your personal knowledge, if any, of the person reported upon; (b) the previous reports in his character roll, and then give your own remarks at the end of the report.
2. If you consider that a particular remark of the Reporting Officer is wrong and should be expunged, score it out in red ink, initial the scoring and add any other remark which you may consider appropriate. If you do not wholly agree with a remark, give your own remark either against the relevant entry or at the end of the report.
3. See whether any adverse remarks were communicated to the person concerned in a previous year and, if so, whether or not he has taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him. Comment on this aspect unless the Reporting Officer has already done so.
4. Underline in red ink remarks which, in your opinion, are adverse and should be communicated to the person reported upon. Please see also instructions 2 and 4 to 6 under A. -Instructions for Ministries, Departments, etc.
5. After countersigning the form, return it to the officer responsible for the custody of the character roll.

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FORM
FOR
STENOGRAPHERS/STENOTYPISTS**

GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN

Name of Ministry/Division/Department/Office _____

ANNUAL/SPECIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD FROM ___20 to ___20

PART-I

Name _____ Date of Birth _____
 Designation _____ BPS _____ Basic Pay _____
 Date of entry into Government Service _____ Date of appointment to the
 present BPS _____
 Qualifications _____
 Training courses, attended, if any _____

PART-II

A. PERFORMANCE	A1	A	B	C	D	Remarks
1. Standard of Shorthand/Typing: (a) Speed (b) Accuracy						
2. Attending Telephones: (a) Etiquette (b) Checking unnecessary intrusion (c) Economy						
3. Maintenance of officers engagement diary and conducting of visitors -----						
4. Movement of files and records of suspense cases. -----						
5. Dress and cleanliness -----						
6. Other duties, e.g., tour arrangements, provision of amenities, etc. -----						
7. Regularity and punctuality in attendance --						
B. PERSONAL TRAITS						
8. Intelligence -----						
9. Perseverance and devotion to duty -----						
10. Cooperation and tact -----						
11. Amenability to discipline -----						
12. Integrity -----						
13. Trustworthiness in confidential and secret matters -----		Yes			No	

Note—The rating should be recorded by initialling the appropriate box:
 'A1' Very good, 'A' Good, 'B' Average, 'C' Below Average, 'D' Poor.

PART-III

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

(Appraise in the present grade by initialling the appropriate column below)

Very Good	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor	Special aptitude if any

PART-IV

SUITABILITY FOR PROMOTION

(Initial the appropriate box below)

- (a) Recommended for accelerated promotion.
- (b) Fit for promotion.
- (c) Recently promoted/appointed, consideration for Promotion premature.
- (d) Not yet fit for promotion.
- (e) Unfit for further promotion.
- (f) Fitness for retention after 25 years service Fit Unfit

PEN-PICTURE

Date: _____ 20

Signature, Name & Designation of
Reporting Officer

Official Stamp

A. INSTRUCTIONS FOR MINISTRIES, DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

1. The reports will be initiated by the officer to whom the stenographer/stenotypist is attached.
2. When an adverse remark is made in the performance evaluation report of the official reported upon a copy of the whole report should be furnished to him, at the earliest opportunity, and in any case within one month from the date the report is countersigned, with a memorandum, a copy of which should be signed and returned by him in acknowledgment of the report and be in turn placed in the character roll for record. A serious view should be taken of any failure on the part of the officials concerned to furnish a copy of the report containing adverse remarks to the person reported upon.
3. The officials making representation against adverse remarks recorded in their performance evaluation reports should not make any personal remark or remarks against the integrity of the Reporting Officers. Violation of this rule will be considered a misconduct and will also render the representation liable to be summarily rejected.
4. Any remarks to the effect that the persons reported upon has or has not taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him in a previous year, should also be communicated.
5. The adverse remarks should be communicated by the senior officer incharge of establishment matters in the Ministry/Division/Department/ Office concerned.
6. Annual performance evaluation report containing adverse remarks should not be taken into consideration until they have been communicated following rule A-2 above and a decision taken on the representation, if any, of the person reported upon.

**B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE OFFICERS RESPONSIBLE FOR
THE CUSTODY OF CHARACTER ROLLS**

1. Arrange for the completion of the routine part of form and send it to the reporting officer concerned.

2. Go through each report carefully in order to see if there are any adverse remarks underlined in red ink. If so, arrange to have them communicated to the person concerned immediately with the direction that his representation, if any, should be submitted within a fortnight of the receipt of those remarks by him.
3. Arrange to obtain a decision on the representation, if any, and communicate it to the official concerned within one month. Place a copy of the decision in the dossier.
4. Keep the duplicate as well as original copies of the evaluation reports in your office.
5. If an official has been receiving adverse remarks for two successive years from the same reporting officer, take up the question of placing him under another reporting officer.

C. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REPORTING OFFICER

1. While reporting on your subordinates:
 - (i) Be as objective as possible
 - (ii) Be as circumspect as possible
 - (iii) Be clear and direct, not ambiguous or evasive in your remarks
 - (iv) Avoid exaggeration and gross understatement
2. State whether any of the defects reported have already been brought to the notice of the person concerned and also whether he has or has not taken steps to remedy them.
3. Fill this form in duplicate and affix your signature in both, at the end of the general remarks.
4. After making relevant entries, send the form to the officer responsible for custody of character roll in your office.

S. 121 E (Revised)

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FORM FOR STAFF CAR
DRIVERS/DESPATCH RIDERS**

Report for the year ending 31st December 20

PART I

Name: _____ Date of birth: _____ BPS: _____
Present Pay: _____ Type of Licence held: _____
Type of Vehicle Driven: _____

PART II

Initial the appropriate Column.

STANDARD OF PERFORMANCE/PERSONAL TRAITS	YES	NO
1. Whether he is conversant with the rules for the staff cars and observes them rigidly.		
2. Whether he possesses adequate knowledge of the mechanism of cars and their engines, and is competent to do minor running repairs and replacement of spares.		
3. Whether he has been careful in observing the ordinary courtesies and rules of traffic.		
4. Whether he has been involved in any road accident or traffic offence and whether there has been any adverse entry in his Driving Licence during the period under review.		
5. Whether he is co-operative and tactful.		
6. Whether he is polite and courteous.		
7. Whether he puts up clean appearance and bearing.		
8. Is he amenable to discipline.		
9. Is he regular and punctual in attending office and appointed place of duty.		
10. Whether he takes due care of the documents of the vehicle issued to him.		
11. Whether he keeps the Car/M./Cycle in neat and tidy condition and keeps watch of the timely servicing/change of oil/parts according to the service manual.		
12. *While driving motor cycle/scooter, does he make use of crash helmet; sun glasses.		
13. *Does he take proper care of the mail/packages/documents on his charge and takes signature of the recipient at the time of handing them over?		

*For despatch riders only.

General Remarks of the Reporting Officer:

Date _____ 20

Signature

Remarks of the Countersigning Officer:

Date _____ 20

Signature

A. INSTRUCTIONS FOR MINISTRIES, DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

1. The reports will be initiated by the officer incharge and will be countersigned by the next higher officer, both being concerned with the work of the person reported upon.
2. When an adverse remark is made in the evaluation report of the official reported upon a copy of the whole report should be furnished to him, at the earliest opportunity, and in any case within one month from the date the report is countersigned, with a memorandum, a copy of which should be signed and returned by him in acknowledgement of the report and be in turn placed in the character roll for record. A serious view should be taken of any failure on the part of the officials concerned to furnish a copy of the report containing adverse remarks to the person reported upon.

3. The officials making representation against adverse remarks recorded in their performance evaluation reports should not make any personal remark or remarks against the integrity of the Reporting Officers. Violation of this rule will be considered a misconduct and will also render the representation liable to be summarily rejected.
4. When a report is built up on the individual opinions of the reporting and countersigning officers, it is only the opinion as accepted by the latter which should be communicated.
5. Remarks in cases where the reporting/countersigning officer suspends judgment, should not be communicated.
6. Any remarks to the effect that the persons reported upon has or has not taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him in a previous year, should also be communicated.
7. The adverse remarks should be communicated by the senior officer incharge of establishment matters in the Ministry/Division/Department/ Office concerned.
8. Annual evaluation report containing adverse remarks should not be taken into consideration until they have been communicated following rule A-2 above and a decision taken on the representation, if any, of the person reported upon.

**B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE OFFICERS RESPONSIBLE FOR
THE CUSTODY OF CHARACTER ROLLS**

1. Arrange for the completion of the routine part of form and send it to the reporting officer concerned.
2. On receipt of the completed form from the reporting officer, submit it alongwith relevant character roll, to the countersigning officer concerned.
3. Go through each report carefully in order to see if there are any adverse remarks underlined in red ink. If so, arrange to have them communicated to the person concerned immediately with the direction that his representation, if any, should be submitted within a fortnight of the receipt of those remarks by him.

4. Arrange to obtain a decision on the representation, if any, and communicate it to the official concerned within one month. Place a copy of the decision in the dossier.
5. Keep the duplicate as well as original copies of the evaluation reports in your office.
6. If an official has been receiving adverse remarks for two successive years from the same reporting officer, take up the question of placing him under another reporting officer.

C. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REPORTING OFFICER

1. While reporting on your subordinates:
 - (i) Be as objective as possible
 - (ii) Be as circumspect as possible
 - (iii) Be clear and direct, not ambiguous or evasive in your remarks
 - (iv) Avoid exaggeration and gross understatement
2. State whether any of the defects reported have already been brought to the notice of the person concerned and also whether he has or has not taken steps to remedy them.
3. Fill this form in duplicate and affix your signature in both, at the end of the general remarks.
4. After making relevant entries, send the form to the officer responsible for custody of character roll in your office.

D. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER

1. Weigh the remarks of the Reporting Officer against (a) your personal knowledge, if any, of the person reported upon; (b) the previous reports in his character roll, and then give your own remarks at the end of the report.

2. If you consider that a particular remark of the Reporting Officer is wrong and should be expunged, score it out in red ink, initial the scoring and add any other remark which you may consider appropriate. If you do not wholly agree with a remark, give your own remark either against the relevant entry or at the end of the report.
3. See whether any adverse remarks were communicated to the person concerned in a previous year and, if so, whether or not he has taken steps to remedy the defects pointed out to him. Comment on this aspect unless the Reporting Officer has already done so.
4. Underline in red ink remarks which, in your opinion, are adverse and should be communicated to the person reported upon. Please see also instructions 2 and 4 to 6 under A.-Instructions for Ministries, Departments, etc.
5. After countersigning the form, return it to the officer responsible for the custody of the character roll.

S. 121-F (Revised)

CERTIFICATE

Certified that I _____
(Name of Officer) Personnel Number (if allotted)

_____ have on _____ submitted my
(Group/Service) (BPS) (Date)

Performance Evaluation Report for the period _____

To _____
(Name/Designation of Reporting Officer)

My countersigning officer is _____
(Name/Designation of Countersigning Officer)

Signatures _____

Designation/Department _____

Note.- This certificate is required to be dispatched by the officer being reported upon to the Officer Incharge entrusted with the maintenance of his/her C.R. dossier on the same date the PER is forwarded to his/her reporting officer.

FOR OFFICERS IN BPS 17 & 18**CONFIDENTIAL**

اسکیل ۱۷ اور ۱۸ کے افسران کے لیے

بصیغہ راز

GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN

حکومت پاکستان

Ministry/Division/ _____ Service/Group _____

Department/Office _____ سروس/گروپ

وزارت/ڈویژن/تھمہ/دفتر

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

کارکردگی رپورٹ

FOR THE PERIOD 20 TO 20
۲۰ء تا ۲۰ء برائے عرصہ**PART I**

حصہ اول

(TO BE FILLED IN BY THE OFFICER REPORTED UPON)

(مشاورہ افسر پر پُر کریں)

1. Name (in block letters) _____
نام (دائیں حروف میں)
2. Personnel number _____
انٹرنیٹ نمبر
3. Date of birth _____
تاریخ پیدائش
4. Date of entry in service _____
ملازمت اختیار کرنے کی تاریخ
5. Post held during the period (with BPS) _____
پیشی اظہر عرصہ میں مہمہ (سج اسکیل)
6. Academic qualifications _____
تعلیم
7. Knowledge of languages (Please indicate proficiency in speaking (S), reading (R) and writing (W)) (پ، پ، اور ل کی صلاحیت) (بولے، پڑھے، اور لکھے)

8. Training received during the evaluation period

متعلقہ عرصہ کے دوران حاصل کی گئی تربیت

Name of course attended کورس کا نام	Duration with dates تاریخوں کے ساتھ دورانیہ	Name of institution and country ادارے اور ملک کا نام

9. Period served

عرصہ ملازمت

- (i) In present post _____ (ii) Under the reporting officer _____
موجودہ عہدہ پر رپورٹنگ افسر کے ماتحت

PART II

حصہ دوم

(TO BE FILLED IN BY THE OFFICER REPORTED UPON)

(متعلقہ افسر خود پُر کریں)

1. Job description

ذمہ داریوں کی تفصیلی

2. **Brief account of performance on the job during the period supported by statistical data where possible. Targets given and actual performance against such targets should be highlighted. Reasons for shortfall, if any, may also be stated.**

پیش نظر عرصہ میں کارکردگی کو اعداد و شمار کے ساتھ مختصر بیان کریں۔ دیے گئے اہداف اور کارکردگی کو نمایاں طور پر لکھیں۔ اہداف نامکمل رہ جانے کی وجہ بھی بیان کریں۔

PART III

حصہ سوم

(EVALUATION BY THE REPORTING OFFICER)

(رپورٹنگ افسر کا جائزہ)

The rating in Part III should be recorded by initialling the appropriate box.

The ratings denoted by alphabets are as follows:

'A' Very Good, 'B' Good, 'C' Average, 'D' Below Average

حصہ سوم میں کارکردگی کا اندراج مختلف خانے میں مختصر دستخط سے کیا جائے۔ حروف کے لحاظ سے درجہ بندی حسب ذیل ہے:

الف: اعلیٰ ب: اچھا ج: اوسط د: اوسط سے کم

For uniform interpretation of qualities, two extreme shades are mentioned against each quality

سمجھوتہ کے لیے ہر صفت کے دو انتہائی درجوں کا ذکر کیا گیا ہے:

		A	B	C	D	
		الف	ب	ج	د	
1.	Intelligence ذہانت Exceptionally bright; excellent comprehension انتہائی ذہین اور مطالعہ					Dull; slow گٹھان سے کم

		A الف	B ب	C ج	D د	
2.	<p>Confidence and will power خود اعتمادی اور قوت ارادی</p> <p>Exceptionally confident and resolute انتہائی پر اعتماد اور مستقل مزاج</p>					Uncertain; hesitant عدم اعتماد اور ہچکچاہٹ کا شکار
3.	<p>Acceptance of responsibility ذمہ داری اٹھانے کی آمادگی</p> <p>Always prepared to take on responsibility even in difficult cases مشکل معاملات میں بھی ذمہ داری اٹھانے کے لیے ہمیشہ آمادہ</p>					Reluctant to take on responsibility; will avoid it whenever possible. ذمہ داری اٹھانے سے گریز کرنے والا
4.	<p>Reliability under pressure دباؤ کی حالت میں کام کرنے کی صلاحیت</p> <p>Calm and exceptionally reliable at all times بر حالت میں قابل اعتماد</p>					Confused and easily flustered even under normal pressure پریشان، معمولی دباؤ میں حواس باختہ
5.	<p>Financial responsibility مالی معاملات میں احساس ذمہ داری</p> <p>Exercises due care and discipline احتیاط سے کام لیتا/ لیتی ہے، قواعد و ضوابط کا خیال رکھتا/ رکھتی ہے</p>					Irresponsible غیر ذمہ دار
6.	<p>Relations with تعلقات</p> <p>(i) Superiors اعلیٰ افسران کے ساتھ</p> <p>Cooperative and trusted معاون اور قابل اعتماد</p>					Un-cooperative مُرجحان

	(ii) Colleagues رفقائے کار کے ساتھ Works well in a team مل جل کر اچھا کام کرتا/کرتی ہے					Difficult colleague مشکل رفیق کار
	(iii) Subordinates ماتحتوں کے ساتھ Courteous and effective; encouraging خوش اخلاق، موثر اور حوصلہ دینے والا/والی					Discourteous and intolerant; بد اخلاق
7.	Behaviour with public عوام کے ساتھ رویہ Courteous and helpful خوش اخلاق اور معاون					Arrogant, discour- teous and indifferent مغرور اور لا تعلق
8.	Ability to decide routine matters روزمرہ معمولات کے فیصلے کرنے کی صلاحیت Logical and decisive منطقی اور فیصلہ کن					Indecisive; vacillating ھنر نہ چڑپ اور ڈانٹوں ڈولی
9.	Knowledge of relevant laws, rules, regulations, instructions and procedures مختلقہ قوانین، قواعد، ضوابط، ہدایات، اور طریق کار سے واقفیت Exceptionally well informed, keeps abreast of latest developments تو اور ضوابط پر فہم ترین اور تازہ ترین امور سے آگاہ					Ignorant and uninformed لا علم اور ناواقف

PART IV

حصہ چہارم

(REPORTING OFFICER'S EVALUATION)

(رپورٹنگ آفسر کا جائزہ)

- Please comment on the officer's performance on the job as given in Part II(2) with special reference to knowledge of work, quality and quantity of output. How far was the officer able to achieve targets? Do you agree with what has been stated in Part II (2)?
حصہ دوم (2) میں بیان کی گئی کارکردگی کا جائزہ لیں۔ کام سے متعلق آفسر کے علم اور کارکردگی کے معیار و مقدار کے حوالے سے لکھی جاتی ہیں۔ اہداف کو پورا کرنے میں آفسر کی مدد کا معیار کیا ہے؟ اور کیا آپ حصہ دوم (2) میں بیان کی گئی معلومات سے متفق ہیں؟

2. **Integrity** (Morality, uprightness and honesty)
دیانت (راست بازی، ایمان داری)

3. **Pen picture with focus on the officer's strengths and weaknesses not covered in Part III** (Weakness will not be considered as adverse entries unless intended to be treated as adverse).

قلمی خاکہ: افسر کی خوبیوں اور کمزوریوں کا جائزہ لیں (کو تاہی کو اس وقت تک منفی تصور نہیں کیا جائے گا جب تک رپورٹنگ افسر ضروری تصور نہ کرے)

4. **Special aptitude**

خصوصی استعداد

5. **Recommendations for future training**

آئندہ تربیت کے لیے سفارشات

6. Overall grading

مجموعی درجہ

		Reporting Officer رپورٹنگ افسر	Countersigning Officer کاؤنٹرسائنگ افسر
(i)	Very Good اعلیٰ		
(ii)	Good اچھا		
(iii)	Average اوسط		
(iv)	Below Average اوسط سے کم		

7. Fitness for promotion

ترقی کے لیے مناسبت

		Reporting Officer رپورٹنگ افسر	Countersigning Officer کاؤنٹرسائنگ افسر
(i)	Fit for promotion ترقی کے لیے منوزوں		
(ii)	Recently promoted/appointed, Assessment premature حال میں ترقی ہو چکی ہے مزید ترقی عمل از وقت ہے		
(iii)	Not yet fit for promotion ترقی کے لیے ابھی منوزوں نہیں		
(iv)	Unlikely to progress further مزید ترقی کے قابل نہیں		

Name of the reporting Officer _____ Signature _____

(Capital letters) _____

رپورٹنگ افسر کا نام (دائیں طرف میں)

Designation _____

عہدہ

Date _____

تاریخ

PART V

حصہ پنجم

(REMARKS OF THE COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER)**(کاؤنٹرسائنگ افسر کی رائے)**

1. How well do you know the officer? If you disagree with the assessment of the reporting officer, please give reasons.

آپ افسر کو کس حد تک جانتے ہیں؟ اگر آپ رپورٹنگ افسر کی رائے سے متفق نہیں تو وجہ بیان کریں۔

2. Evaluation of the quality of assessment made by the reporting officer

رپورٹنگ افسر کے جائزہ کے معیار کے بارے میں کاؤنٹرسائنگ افسر کی رائے

Exaggerated
(مبالغہ آمیز)

Fair
(مناسب)

Biased
(جانب دار)

Name of the Countersigning Officer

Signature _____

(Capital letters) _____

دستخط

کاؤنٹرسائنگ افسر کا نام (واضح حروف میں)

Designation _____

Date _____

عہدہ

تاریخ

PART VI

حصہ ششم

REMARKS OF THE SECOND COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER (IF ANY)

دوسرے کاؤنٹرسائنگ افسر (بشرط موجودگی) کی رائے

Name _____ Signature _____

نام

دستخط

Designation _____ Date _____

مقام

تاریخ

GUIDELINES FOR FILLING UP THE PER

- After initiating their PERs, the officers under report should immediately fill up the detachable 'certificate' giving names of the RO/CO and send the same to the Officer Incharge of their respective confidential records. This exercise will ensure proper follow-up of the pending performance evaluation reports by the concerned Ministry/Division/Provincial Government etc.
- Forms should be filled in duplicate. Parts I and II are to be filled by the officer under report and should be typed. Parts III and IV will be filled by the Reporting Officer while the Countersigning/Second Countersigning Officers will fill Parts V and VI respectively.. The ratings in Part III should be recorded by initialling the appropriate box.
- Each Division, Department, autonomous body and office etc. is required to prepare specific job descriptions giving main duties of each job to be mentioned in Part-II (1). The job descriptions may be finalized with the approval of the Head of the Organization or any person authorized by him.
- The officer under report should fill Part II(2) of the form as objectively as possible and short term and long term targets should be determined/ assigned with utmost care. The targets for each job may be formulated at the beginning of the year wherever possible. In other cases, the work performed during the year needs to be specifically mentioned.
- Assessment by the Reporting Officers should be job-specific and confined to the work done by the officer during the period under report. They should avoid giving a biased or evasive assessment of the officer under report, as the Countersigning Officers would be required to comment on the quality of the assessment made by them.
- The Reporting Officers should support their assessment in Part IV through comments against each characteristic. Their opinions should represent the result of careful consideration and objective assessment so that, if called upon, they could justify the remarks/comments. They may maintain a record of the work done by the subordinates in this regard.
- The Countersigning Officers should weigh the remarks of the RO against their personal knowledge of the officer under report and then give their assessment in Part V. In case of disagreement, the Countersigning Officers should give specific reasons in Part V. Similarly, if the Countersigning

Officers differ with the grading or remarks given by the Reporting Officer in Part III they should score it out and give their own grading by initialling the appropriate box.

- The Countersigning Officers should make an unbiased evaluation of the quality of performance evaluation made by the RO by categorizing the reports as exaggerated, fair or biased. This would evoke a greater sense of responsibility from the reporting officers.
- The Countersigning Officers should underline, in red ink, remarks which in their opinion are adverse and should be communicated to the officer reported upon. All adverse remarks whether remediable or irremediable should be communicated to the officer under report, with a copy of communication placed in the CR dossier. Reporting Officers should ensure that proper counselling is given to the officer under report before adverse remarks are recorded.
- The Reporting and Countersigning Officers should be clear, direct, objective and unambiguous in their remarks. Vague impressions based on inadequate knowledge or isolated incidents should be avoided.
- Reports should be consistent with the pen picture and overall grading.

IMPORTANT

- Parts I and II of the PER should be duly filled and dispatched to the Reporting Officer not later than the 15th of January. The ROs should forward the report to the Countersigning Officer within two weeks of receipt after giving their views in Parts III and IV. The COs should then finalize their comments in Part V within two weeks of receipt of PER. The Second Countersigning Officers, if any, should also complete their assessment within a period of two weeks.
- Name and designation of Reporting/Countersigning Officers should be clearly written. Comments should be legible and in the prescribed format and which can be easily scanned.
- Personnel Number is to be filled in by the officer under report, if allotted.
- Proforma has been devised in English/Urdu to provide flexibility to RO/ CO in the choice of language.

CERTIFICATE

Certified that _____
(Name of Officer) Personnel Number (if allotted).

have on _____ submitted my

(Group/Service) (BPS) (Date)

Performance Evaluation Report for the period _____

to-----
(Name/Designation of Reporting Officer)

My countersigning officer is _____
Name/Designation of Countersigning Officer)
Signatures

Designation/Department

Note.- This certificate is required to be dispatched by the officer being reported upon to the Officer Incharge entrusted with the maintenance of his/her C.R. dossier on the same date the PER is forwarded to his/her reporting officer.

FOR OFFICERS IN BPS 19 & 20**CONFIDENTIAL**

اسکیل ۱۹ اور ۲۰ کے افسران کے لیے

بصیغہ راز

GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN

حکومت پاکستان

Ministry/Division/ _____ Service/Group _____

Department/Office _____ سروس/گروپ

وزارت/ڈویژن/محکمہ/دفتر

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

کارکردگی رپورٹ

FOR THE PERIOD 20 TO 20
۲۰ء تا ۲۰ء برائے عرصہ**PART I**

حصہ اول

(TO BE FILLED IN BY THE OFFICER REPORTED UPON)

(مقرر رپورٹ کرنے والے کے لیے)

1. Name (in block letters) _____
نام (دائری حروف میں)
2. Personnel number _____
انفرادی نمبر
3. Date of birth _____
تاریخ پیدائش
4. Date of entry in service _____
تاریخ داخلہ سروس
5. Post held during the period (with BPS) _____
پست (بپس) کے ساتھ اس عرصہ میں
6. Academic qualifications _____
تعلیمی
7. Knowledge of languages (Please indicate proficiency in speaking (S), reading (R) and writing (W)) _____
زبانوں کا علم (پ، پ، پ کی صلاحیت) (S) (R) (W)

8. **Training received during the evaluation period** (Training courses attended earlier, if any, may please be listed separately on the back page of the report)

متعلقہ عرصے کے دوران تربیت کی تفصیل (اس سے پہلے تربیتی کورسوں میں شرکت، رپورٹ کے صفحہ کی پشت پر درج کریں)

Name of course attended کورس کا نام	Duration with dates تاریخوں کے ساتھ دورانیہ	Name of institution and country ادارے اور ملک کا نام

9. **Period served**

عرصہ ملازمت

- (i) In present post _____ (ii) Under the reporting officer _____

موجودہ عہدہ پر

رپورٹنگ افسر کے ماتحت

PART II

حصہ دوم

(TO BE FILLED IN BY THE OFFICER REPORTED UPON)

(متعلقہ افسر خود پُر کریں)

1. Job description

ذمہ داریوں کی تفصیل

2. Brief account of achievements during the period supported by statistical data where possible. Targets given and actual performance against such targets should be highlighted. Reasons for shortfall, if any, may also be stated.

پیش نظر عرصہ میں نمایاں کام کا احاطہ شمار کے ساتھ مختصر بیان کریں۔ اہداف اور کارکردگی کو نمایاں طور پر لکھیں۔ اہداف تکمیل نہ جانے کی وجہ بھی بیان کریں۔

PART III

حصہ سوم

(REPORTING OFFICER'S EVALUATION)

(رپورٹنگ افسر کا جائزہ)

1. Please comment on the officer's performance on the job as given in Part II (2) with special reference to his knowledge of work, ability to plan, organize and supervise, analytical skills, competence to take decisions and quality and quantity of output. How far was the officer able to achieve the targets? Comment on the officer's contribution, with the help of statistical data, if any, in the overall performance of the organization. Do you agree with what has been stated in Part II (2)?

حصہ دوم (۲) میں بیان کی گئی کارکردگی کا جائزہ لیں۔ افسر کے علم، تنظیمی اور نگرانی کرنے کی صلاحیت، تجزیاتی مہارت اور فیصلہ کرنے کی صلاحیت کے متعلق رائے دیں۔ کارکردگی کے معیار و مقدار کے حوالے سے بھی رائے دیں۔ اہداف کو پورا کرنے میں افسر کس حد تک کامیاب رہا/ رہی۔ ادارے کی مجموعی کارکردگی میں افسر کے کردار کی اعداد و شمار کے حوالے سے نشاندہی کریں۔ کیا آپ حصہ دوم (۲) میں دی گئی معلومات سے متفق ہیں؟

2. Integrity (Morality, uprightness and honesty)
(راست بازی، ایٹاندراری) دیانت

3. Pen picture with focus on the officer's strengths and weaknesses with focus on emotional stability, ability to work under pressure, communication skills and interpersonal effectiveness (Weakness will not be considered as adverse entry unless intended to be treated as adverse).

قلمی خاکہ افسر کی خوبیوں اور کمزوریوں کا جائزہ لیں، خصوصاً جذباتی ٹھہراؤ، دباؤ کی حالت میں کام کرنے کی صلاحیت، راہنما اور باہمی افہام و تفہیم پیدا کرنے کی صلاحیت بیان کریں (کوئی اس وقت تک حتمی تصور نہ کیا جائے جب تک رپورٹنگ افسر ضروری نہ سمجھے)

4. Area and level of professional expertise with suggestions for future posting

پیشہ دارانہ مہارت اور آئندہ تعیناتی کی نشاندہی

5. Training and development needs

مزید تربیت کے لیے تجاویز:

6. Overall grading

مجموعی درجہ

Very Good اعلیٰ	Good اچھا	Average اوسط	Below Average اوسط سے کم
--------------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

7. Fitness for promotion

ترقی کے لیے مہتممیت

Comment on the officer's potential for holding a higher position and additional responsibilities.

افسر کی اعلیٰ پھر... پر کام کرنے اور اضافی ذمہ داریاں سنبھالنے کی صلاحیت کے بارے میں مارے درجی

Name of the reporting Officer _____ Signature _____

(Capital letters) _____

رپورٹنگ افسر کا نام (دفاعی حروف میں)

Designation _____ Date _____

تاریخ

PART IV

حصہ چہارم

(REMARKS OF THE COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER)

(کاؤنٹرسائنگ افسر کی رائے)

1. How often have you seen the work of the officer reported upon?

افسر کا کام کس حد تک آپ کی نظر سے گزرتا رہا؟

Very frequently اکثر و بیشتر	Frequently اکثر	Rarely شاذ و نادر	Never کبھی نہیں
---------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------

2. How well do you know the officer? If you disagree with the assessment of the reporting officer, please give reasons.

آپ افسر کو کس حد تک جانتے ہیں؟ اگر آپ رپورٹنگ افسر کی رائے سے متفق نہیں تو اس کی وجہ بیان کریں

3. Overall grading

مجموعی درجہ

Very Good بہتر	Good اچھا	Average اوسط	Below Average اوسط سے کم
-------------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

4. Recommendation for promotion (Comment on the officer's potential for holding a higher position and additional responsibilities.

ترقی کے لیے سفارش

(افسر کی اعلیٰ عہدہ پر کام کرنے اور اضافی ذمہ داریوں سنبھالنے کی صلاحیت کے بارے میں تبصرہ کریں)

5. Evaluation of the quality of assessment made by the reporting officer

رپورٹنگ افسر کے جائزہ کے معیار کے بارے میں کاؤنٹرسائٹنگ افسر کی رائے

Exaggerated مبالغہ آمیز	Fair مناسب	Biased جانب دار
----------------------------	---------------	--------------------

Name of the Countersigning Officer

Signature _____

(Capital letters) _____ دستخط

کاؤنٹرسائٹنگ افسر کا نام (واضح حروف میں)

Designation _____ Date _____

عہدہ

تاریخ

PART V

حصہ پنجم

(REMARKS OF THE SECOND COUNTERSIGNING OFFICER) (IF ANY)

دوسرے کاؤنٹرسائٹنگ افسر (بشرط موجودگی) کی رائے

Name _____ Signature _____

نام

دستخط

Designation _____ Date _____

عہدہ

تاریخ

GUIDELINES FOR FILLING UP THE PER

- After initiation of their PER, the officers under report should immediately fill up the detachable 'certificate' giving names of the RO/CO and forward the same to the Officer Incharge of their respective confidential records. This exercise will ensure proper follow-up of the pending performance evaluation reports by the concerned Ministry/Division/Provincial Government etc.
- Forms should be filled in duplicate- Parts I and II are to be filled by the officer under report and should be typed. Part III will be filled by the Reporting Officer while the Countersigning/Second Countersigning Officers will fill Parts IV and V respectively.
- Each Division,, Department, autonomous body and office etc. is required to prepare specific job descriptions giving main duties of each job to be mentioned in Part-II (1). The job descriptions may be finalized with the approval of the Head of the Organization or any person authorized by him.
- The officer under report should fill Part II (2) of the form as objectively as possible and short term and long term targets should be determined/ assigned with utmost care. The targets for each job may be formulated at the beginning of the year wherever possible. In other cases, the work performed during the year needs to be specifically mentioned.
- Assessment by the Reporting Officers should be job-specific and confined to the work done by the officer during the period under report. They should avoid giving a biased or evasive assessment of the officer under report as the Countersigning Officers would be required to comment on the quality of the assessment made by them.
- The Reporting Officers should carry out their assessment in Part III through comments against each characteristic- Their opinions should represent the result of careful consideration and objective assessment so that if called upon, they could justify the remarks/comments. They may maintain a record of the work done by the subordinates in this regard.
- The Reporting Officers should be careful in giving the overall and comparative gradings. Special care should be taken so that no officer is placed at an undue disadvantage.

- The Countersigning Officers should weigh the remarks of the RO against their personal knowledge of the officer under report, compare him with other officers of the same grade working under different Reporting Officers, but under the same Countersigning Officer, and then give their overall assessment of the officer. In case of disagreement with the assessment done by the Reporting Officer, specific reasons should be recorded by the Countersigning Officers in Part IV (2).
- The Countersigning Officers should make an unbiased evaluation of the quality of performance evaluation made by the RO by categorizing the reports as exaggerated, fair or biased. This would evoke a greater sense of responsibility from the reporting officers.
- The Countersigning Officers should underline, in red ink, remarks which in their opinion are adverse and should be communicated to the officer reported upon. All adverse remarks whether remediable or irreparable should be communicated to the officer under report, with a copy of communication placed in the CR dossier. Reporting Officers should ensure that they properly counsel the officer under report before adverse remarks are recorded.
- The Reporting and Countersigning Officers should be clear, direct, objective and unambiguous in their remarks. Vague impressions based on inadequate knowledge or isolated incidents should be avoided.
- Reports should be consistent with the pen picture, overall grading and comparative grading.

IMPORTANT

- Parts I and II of the PER should be duly filled and dispatched to the Reporting Officer not later than the 15th of January. The ROs should forward the report to the Countersigning Officer within two weeks of receipt after giving their views in Parts III. The COs should then finalize their comments in Part IV within two weeks of receipt of PER. The Second Countersigning Officers, if any, should also complete their assessment within a period of two weeks.

- Name and designation of Reporting/Countersigning Officers should be clearly written. Comments should be legible and in the prescribed format and which can be easily scanned.
- Personnel Number is to be filled in by the officer under report, if allotted.
- Proforma has been devised in English/Urdu to provide flexibility to RO/CO in the choice of language.
- Comparative grading only applies to officers falling in very good, good and average categories. This grading would not apply to anyone falling in below average category in Part III (6).

CERTIFICATE

Certified that _____
(Name of Officer) Personnel Number (if allotted).

_____ have on _____ submitted my
(Group/Service) (BPS) (Date)

Performance Evaluation Report for the period _____

to _____
(Name/Designation of Reporting Officer)

My countersigning officer is _____
Name/Designation of Countersigning Officer)

Signatures _____

Designation/Department _____

***Note.*—This certificate is required to be dispatched by the officer being reported upon to the Officer Incharge entrusted with the maintenance of his/her C.R. dossier on the same date the PER is forwarded to his/her reporting officer.**

FOR OFFICERS IN BPS 21CONFIDENTIAL

اسکیل ۲۱ کے افسران کے لیے

بصیغہ راز

GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN

حکومت پاکستان

Ministry/Division/ _____ Service/Group _____
 Department/Office _____ سروس/گروپ _____
 وزارت/ڈویژن/محکمہ/دفتر

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

کارکردگی رپورٹ

FOR THE PERIOD 20 TO 20
 ۲۰ء تا ۲۰ء برائے عرصہ

PART I

حصہ اول

(TO BE FILLED IN BY THE OFFICER REPORTED UPON)

(معلقہ افسر فرم کریں)

1. Name (in block letters) _____
 نام (واضح حروف میں)
2. Personnel number _____
 انفرادی نمبر
3. Date of birth _____
 تاریخ پیدائش
4. Date of entry in service _____
 ملازمت اختیار کرنے کی تاریخ
5. Post held during the period _____
 فرائض منصب میں عہدہ (سج اسکیل)
6. Academic qualifications _____
 تعلیم
7. Knowledge of languages (Please indicate proficiency in speaking (S), reading (R) and writing (W)) (اور لکھنے (ل) کی صلاحیت) (بولنے (ب)، پڑھنے (پ) اور لکھنے (ل) کی صلاحیت) (W) writing (W))
 زبانوں کا علم

8. Participation in conferences, seminars, meetings during the period reported upon

متعلقہ عرصہ کے دوران کانفرنسوں، سیمیناروں اور اجلاسوں میں شرکت

Title کورس کا نام	Country ملک	Duration with dates تاریخوں کے ساتھ دورانیہ

9. Period served

عرصہ ملازمت

- (i) In present post _____ (ii) Under the reporting officer _____

موجودہ عہدہ پر

رپورٹنگ افسر کے ماتحت

PART II

حصہ دوم

(TO BE FILLED IN BY THE OFFICER REPORTED UPON)

(متعلقہ افسر پر پُر کیا جائے)

1. Job description

نصاب کاروبار کی تفصیلی

2. Significant achievements during the evaluation period

تعمیراتی نظر عرصہ میں نمایاں کام کی تفصیلی

PART III

حصہ سوم

(EVALUATION BY THE REPORTING OFFICER)

(رپورٹنگ افسر کا جائزہ)

1. Comments on the officer's performance on the job

افسر کی کارکردگی پر تبصرہ

2. Assessment of officer's

متعلقہ افسر کا جائزہ باہر

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (i) Strategic vision
مستقبل کے لیے حکمت عملی
وضع کرنے کی صلاحیت | (Ability to transform the organization in view
of changing environment)
بدلتے ہوئے ماحول کی روشنی میں ادارے کے مستقبل کا تصور کرنا |
| (ii) Integrity
ریاضت | (Morality, uprightness, honesty and commitment to
national interests) کے
راست، بائری، ایماندار اور قومی مفادات کے
ساتھ وابستگی |

(iii) **Ability to supervise, guide, and motivate subordinates**

ماتحت ملازمین کی نگرانی، رہنمائی اور متحرک کرنے کی قابلیت

(iv) **Area of professional expertise with recommendations for future posting**

پیشہ وارانہ مہارت اور آئندہ تعیناتی کی نشاندہی

3. Pen picture

تلی خانہ

4. Overall grading

مجموعی درجہ

Very Good
اعلیٰGood
اچھاAverage
اوسط

Name of the reporting Officer _____ Signature _____

رپورٹنگ افسر کا نام

دستخط

Designation _____ Date _____

مہندہ

تاریخ

GUIDELINES FOR FILLING UP THE PER

- After initiation of their PER, the officers under report should immediately fill up the detachable 'certificate' and send the same to the Officer Incharge of their respective evaluation record. This exercise is aimed at ensuring proper follow-up of the pending performance evaluation reports by the concerned Ministry/Division/Provincial Government etc.
- Forms should be filled in duplicate. Parts I and II are to be filled by the officer under report and should be typed while Part III will be filled by the Reporting Officer.
- Each Division, Department, autonomous body and office etc. is required to prepare specific job descriptions giving main duties of each job to be mentioned in Part II. The job descriptions may be finalized with the approval of the Head of the Organization or any person authorized by him.
- The officer under report should fill Part II (2) of the form as objectively as possible. Achievements should be quantified wherever possible.
- Assessment by the Reporting Officers should be job-specific and confined to the work done by the officer during the period under report. They should avoid giving a biased or evasive assessment of the officer under report.
- The Reporting Officers should record their assessment in Part III through comments against each characteristic. Their opinions should represent the result of careful consideration and objective assessment so that, if called upon, they could justify the remarks/comments. They may maintain a record of the work done by the subordinates in this regard.
- The Reporting Officers should be careful in giving the overall and comparative gradings. Special care should be taken so that no officer is placed at an undue disadvantage.
- All adverse remarks whether remediable or irremediable should be communicated to the officer under report, with a copy of communication placed in the CR. dossier. Reporting Officers should ensure that they properly counsel the officer under report before adverse remarks are given.

- The Reporting Officers should be clear, direct, objective and unambiguous in their remarks. Vague impressions based on inadequate knowledge or isolated incidents should be avoided.
- Reports should be consistent with the pen picture, overall grading and comparative grading.

IMPORTANT

- Parts I and II of the PER should be duly filled and dispatched to the Reporting Officer not later than the 15th of January. The ROs should finalized the report within two weeks of receipt after giving their views in Part III.
- Name and designation of the Reporting Officers should be clearly written. Comments should be legible and in the prescribed format and which can be easily scanned.
- Personnel Number is to be filled in by the officer under report, if allotted.
- Proforma has been devised in English/Urdu to provide flexibility to RO in the choice of language.

