

Date: 20001204

File: 447-HC-4

Citation: 2000 PSSRB 108

Parliamentary Employment
and Staff Relations Act



Before the Public Service
Staff Relations Board

BETWEEN

COMMUNICATIONS, ENERGY AND PAPERWORKERS UNION OF CANADA

Applicant

and

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Employer

RE: Application under Section 24 of the
Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act

Before: [Joseph W. Potter, Deputy Chairperson](#)

For the Applicant: David Migicovsky, Counsel

For the Employer: Lynn H. Harnden, Counsel

Heard at Ottawa, Ontario,
March 27 to 30 and October 17 to 20, 2000.

DECISION

[1] On March 24, 1987, the Board certified the National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians (NABET) as bargaining agent for all employees of the House of Commons (the employer) in the Technical Group: Board file 442-HC-1. On August 14, 1995, the Board granted a request filed by the NABET to amend its certification to change its name to the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada (CEPUC): Board file 442-HC-1.

[2] This is an application filed by the CEPUC pursuant to section 24 of the *Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act* (PESRA). Specifically, the CEPUC has raised two issues: the first issue is whether nine employees, whose positions have been reclassified outside the Electronics Subgroup of the Technical Group, are included in the Technical Group bargaining unit; the second issue concerns whether approximately 16 other employees occupying Information Technology (I.T.) Support Specialist positions in the Administration Group should be included in the Technical Group bargaining unit.

[3] This decision deals with the first issue only and I was asked by the parties to retain jurisdiction with respect to the second issue. I will retain jurisdiction of the second issue if either party requests a hearing within two months of the issuance of this decision.

Evidence

[4] On or about June 1999, the employer reviewed the job descriptions for the positions in the Electronics Subgroup of the Technical Group and reclassified them into the Administration Group. Incumbents of positions in the Technical Group are represented by the CEPUC, while those whose positions are in the Administration Group are not represented by a bargaining agent. The CEPUC argued that the essence of the duties of the positions in question had not changed and therefore their incumbents should remain in the Technical Group bargaining unit.

[5] Dave Batho is currently the elected president of the CEPUC local and occupies one of the positions that have been reclassified in the Administration Group as an ADS-06. Prior to the reclassification of his position, he was a member of the Technical Group bargaining unit.

[6] Mr. Batho has been an employee of the employer since 1978.

[7] Around October 1998, the employer began a process of looking at the Electronics Technician (ELT) job description with a view towards updating it (Exhibit U-1, tabs 5 and 6). At that time, Mr. Batho's position was classified at the ELT-03 level.

[8] Exhibit U-1, tab 3, is the job description identified as the one in place for ELT positions when the review started.

[9] A review committee was formed to look over the then current job description and arrive at a revised one that more accurately reflected the duties the employees were performing.

[10] Andrew Gehrke and Ken O'Regan were occupying positions classified at the ELT-03 level and were on the review committee, along with Ray Tyson and Lynn Guindon representing management.

[11] The review process started in October 1998, and a new job description was finalized in June 1999 (Exhibit U-1, tab 10). The new job description identifies the positions in question as "I.T. Support Specialist". There is no dispute that this new job description accurately reflects the duties an I.T. support specialist does.

[12] About nine employees were affected by this revised job description and all received a letter informing them of the reclassification of their position (Exhibit U-1, tab 11).

[13] On or about June 11, 1999, management held a meeting with the employees whose positions were being reclassified. Mr. Ray Tyson, Manager of the Desktop Consulting and Field Services (DCFS) Unit, made the presentation to the employees. Mr. Batho was given a document by management titled "Position Rationale" some 30 minutes before this meeting (Exhibit U-1, tab 19). This document purports to set out the rationale for the reclassification.

[14] On June 14, 1999, Mr. Batho wrote to Chantal Paquette, who was a staff relations officer with the employer, and requested all documentation related to the decision to reclassify the positions. He also asked that the decision not be implemented until he reviewed this documentation (Exhibit U-1, tab 12).

[15] A reply, dated June 23, was received by Mr. Batho, with the information he requested. He was also told the decision to reclassify the positions would not be held in abeyance (Exhibit U-1, tab 13).

[16] Mr. Batho agreed in cross-examination that past efforts had been made to rewrite the ELT-03 job description but these efforts were not successful (see also Exhibit U-1, tab 6). Mr. Batho also agreed that the job description needed to be updated to reflect the duties currently done by employees.

[17] Ken O'Regan and Andrew Gehrke each testified extensively about the work they have done since being hired by the employer in the late 1980's. Each was initially classified at the ELT-03 level and is currently classified at the ADS-06 level.

[18] The essence of their evidence-in-chief was that, fundamentally, their work has not changed since they commenced employment with the employer. Although the types of computers on which they work have advanced, they have continually dealt with both hardware and software issues. They have also had to resolve problems that clients have with their printers.

[19] Exhibit U-6 was identified as a listing of all the calls that came to the help desk and were then routed to the I.T. support specialists in DCFS over a one-week period. In other words, these calls generated the workload of the I.T. support specialists over this specific period of time.

[20] In cross-examination, both Messrs. O'Regan and Gehrke recognized that there were a number of tasks which electronics technicians performed in the past but are no longer required to be done by them. Examples of these include using various tools, soldering equipment, and repairing defective resistors and transistors. In the early 1990's, other employees classified at the ELT-03 level worked in the shop to repair parts, but today's defective parts are simply replaced. Additionally, work is currently done on personal computers, whereas previously the work took place on terminals.

[21] John Sargent has been with the employer since 1979, in the Electronic Data Processing System Unit, which has since become DCFS. He has always been classified as an ELT. He identified Exhibit U-18 as his current job description.

[22] Mr. Sargent repairs data processing equipment in the shop. His ELT-04 classification level was downgraded to that of an ELT-03, where he remains (see Exhibit E-20).

[23] Mr. Sargent has worked in the shop since 1990 and testified that, since that time, his work has changed as a result of evolving technology. From 1990 to 1995, a large amount of time was spent replacing bad computer chips. However, since 1995, a significant amount of time is spent replacing defective modules. Currently, Mr. Sargent installs software on new equipment before it is installed in a client's office.

[24] Mr. Sargent estimated that 75 percent of his time is spent fixing hardware problems and the remaining 25 percent is spent resolving software issues.

[25] The witness identified Exhibit U-1, tab 10, as being the I.T. Support Specialist job description and stated that he did a number of the duties outlined therein.

[26] The witness identified Exhibit E-9 as notes taken by Ms. Huot, a personnel advisor, at a meeting held with Mr. Sargent on November 9, 1999. The meeting was held to allow Mr. Sargent to explain the nature of his job. The witness agreed that the notes were an accurate reflection of what was discussed.

[27] Mr. Sargent acknowledged that a distinction between his position and that of an I.T. support specialist is that he works most of the time in the shop.

[28] Ray Tyson is included in the Technical Group bargaining unit. He began working for the employer in 1982 as an ELT-04 and, in 1996, he became the Manager of DCFS.

[29] Mr. Tyson described the work of an ELT-04 in the early 1980's and testified that it was mainly focused on computer hardware. The only software used at that time involved word processing. Mr. Tyson also described many tools used by the electronics technicians in the early 1980's, which are no longer used because of the changing nature of the job.

[30] A major portion of the electronics technicians' time in the early 1980's was spent aligning printers and disc drives. Then, in the late 1980's, desktop computers became popular and the nature of the work changed. Defective component parts were replaced, as repairs were too costly.

[31] Current I.T. support specialists' training is on Microsoft software. The witness identified Exhibit E-10 as a listing of appropriate training courses the I.T. support specialists would need now. They form part of a certificate program.

[32] A local community college currently offers two "technician" programs as described in Exhibits E-1 and E-2. An *Electronics Engineering Technician Program* (Exhibit E-1) was the initial technician program but, with the computer revolution, an additional program began. This one is called the *Computer Systems Technician Course* (Exhibit E-2) and, in Mr. Tyson's view, is the better of the two as far as training someone to be an I.T. support specialist.

[33] Mr. Tyson pointed out the similarities in work between the employees who report to him, that is the I.T. support specialists, and the employees who report to the Manager, Software Support and Consulting Services (Exhibit U-1, tab 2, page 4), who occupy positions classified in the Administration Group.

[34] Mr. Tyson said that, currently, the main focus of the I.T. support specialists is software-related, although some hardware work is also done.

[35] Mr. Tyson identified Exhibit U-1, tab 27, as a job posting put out by the employer for a vacant Electronics Technician position in early 1995. It was eventually withdrawn because the language profile of the position changed. The problem Mr. Tyson had with staffing Electronics Technician positions in the mid-1990's was that the job description was outdated and did not reflect the current job needs. The witness cited examples of this deficiency while reviewing the job description used at that time (Exhibit U-1, tab 3).

[36] To address this problem, Mr. Tyson began the process of rewriting the job description. The events are outlined in Exhibit U-1, tab 13. On April 30, 1999, the revised job description was sent for a classification assessment (see Exhibit E-12).

[37] In cross-examination, Mr. Tyson agreed that, prior to writing the formal job description, he put forward an informal request to Ms. Carole Huot, a classification officer, and asked her what she thought the appropriate classification would be for the I.T. Support Specialist position. In fact, Mr. Tyson testified he had three meetings with Ms. Huot prior to the Committee being established to write a new job description.

[38] Also in cross-examination, Mr. Tyson reviewed the Technical Category Group definition (Exhibit U-1, tab 1 at page 9). The witness agreed that the I.T. support specialists are involved in the installation of computer systems and related hardware. He said he was not in 100 percent agreement that the I.T. support specialists repair computer systems, as the word “repair” is a question of degree. He also did not agree that the I.T. support specialists maintain systems.

[39] The witness identified Exhibit U-1, tab 19, as being a document prepared by Ms. Huot, which is a rationale for the I.T. Support Specialist position’s classification. The witness agreed that the document does state that the job “...consist[s] of installing, maintaining and modifying computer systems but not in the same way...as it was intended through the classification standard...”

[40] The witness also identified a job posting for an I.T. support specialist that the employer drew up after the reclassification was finalized (Exhibit U-1, tab 24). The witness agreed that the job posting stated the incumbent would be responsible for the “...installation, repair, configuration and maintenance of...systems and related software.”

[41] The witness then agreed that in 1995, prior to the reclassification, the electronics technicians did maintenance, installation and repair.

[42] The witness compared the job posting for the ELT-03 position (Exhibit U-1, tab 23) with the job posting for the I.T. Support Specialist position classified as an ADS-06 (Exhibit U-1, tab 24) and agreed that both state the job has the same essential duties, professional experience and knowledge. The only difference is the educational requirements.

[43] In re-examination, Mr. Tyson stated that the word “installation” now refers to software, and that there was no software in the 1980’s. Also, the words “repair” and “maintain” do not have the same meaning now as they did in the 1980’s.

[44] Carole Huot has been a classification officer with the employer since 1997. Ms. Huot explained that the managers have the responsibility of describing the duties and responsibilities of a position, following which she would undertake to classify the position into the appropriate group and subgroup.

[45] The Technical Group classification standard is found at Exhibit U-1, tab 20. Page 2 of this document outlines the key elements in the Electronics Subgroup and Ms. Huot testified that the I.T. Support Specialist position now is more focused on the manipulation of software; therefore it does not fit in the Electronics Subgroup.

[46] The witness stated the Administration Group definition (Exhibit U-1, tab 1, page 3) indicates that positions in this group provide service and support to the employer's programs. Computer systems are for House of Commons programs, therefore the I.T. Support Specialist position more properly fits this category, in the witness' view.

[47] Ms. Huot also testified that she looked at the Computer Systems (CS) classification standard used in the Federal Public Service as well as the Electronics classification standard. The primary purpose of the CS position (see Exhibit E-15 at page 5) is similar to how Ms. Huot saw the I.T. Support Specialist position. There is no group within the employer called Computer Systems and its computer systems employees are classified in the Administration Group.

[48] Ms. Huot referred to Exhibit U-1, tab 13, as outlining the process she undertook in classifying the I.T. Support Specialist position. This included one on-site visit where she observed an I.T. support specialist performing his tasks for a period of about two hours. She observed that the individual did more consulting-type work involving the use of software.

[49] Ms. Huot and Dianne Lacourse formed a classification committee and felt that the best fit for the I.T. Support Specialist position was with the Administration Group because the definition of that group indicates that positions in that group provide support systems for House of Commons programs. This, the Committee felt, was what the I.T. support specialists were really doing, and where their skill sets lay.

[50] In cross-examination, Ms. Huot stated that, at the time the classification process began for the positions in question, she had been a classification officer for nine months. Her training consisted of attending a two-week classification course in October 1997. Ms. Huot estimated that, by March 1998, she had sat on about 100 classification committees.

[51] Ms. Huot agreed in cross-examination that the three major tasks she observed the I.T. support specialist doing in her on-site visit were also tasks an electronics technician would have done in 1995.

Arguments

For the Bargaining Agent

[52] The issue to be decided in this case is whether the employees in DCFS are still in the Technical Group bargaining unit or whether they have become part of the Administration Group. Counsel provided a Book of Authorities (tabs 1 to 12) in support of his position.

[53] In this case, the Board has jurisdiction under section 24 of the PESRA to decide whether the employees in question still fall within the definition of the bargaining unit set out in the Board's decision certifying the CEPUC as bargaining agent. Similar cases have been decided by the Board (see, for example, Board file 147-2-25, at tab 1 of the Book of Authorities, as well as Board file 147-2-34, at tab 7).

[54] In similar cases on which the Board has ruled, the Board examined the specific duties the employees performed and compared them with the group definition. A determination was then made to see if the primary duties fell within one group or the other.

[55] The issue, therefore, is not whether today's duties are the same as they were 10 years ago. The issue is whether today's duties fall within the Technical Group definition.

[56] In this instance, the employer must bear the onus of showing that the work falls within a group definition other than the Technical Group.

[57] The group definition of the Technical Group is found at Exhibit U-1, tab 1, page 9. The definition reads:

TECHNICAL GROUP

Group Definition

The Technical Group is composed of positions engaged in the design, construction, installation, testing, inspection, maintenance, repair or operation of electronic systems and

associated equipment and apparatus used in the broadcasting of live coverage of the proceedings of the House of Commons and Committees and/or used in electronic communications within the parliamentary precincts. Also included is the provision of associated broadcast services and specialized activities.

[58] The definition of the Electronics Subgroup is found at Exhibit U-1, tab 1, page 9, and reads:

Electronics Sub-Group

SUB-GROUP DEFINITION

Positions included in this sub-group are those in which one or more of the following duties is of primary importance:

- 1. The design, construction, installation, maintenance, modification, and general technical support of electro-mechanical systems and devices employed throughout the Parliamentary Community.*
- 2. The supervision of any of the above duties.*

Exclusions

Positions excluded from the sub-group are those which meet the sub-group definitions and/or inclusions of any other sub-group.

[59] A position does not need to involve all of the elements listed in the first sentence of the Technical Group definition to be within the definition. Instead, it only needs to involve one or more of the elements. A definition of each element is found at tab 12 of the CEPUC's Book of Authorities.

[60] The primary purpose of the I.T. Support Specialist position is found under the "General Accountability" heading in the job description (Exhibit U-1, tab 10). The employees ensure that the computer systems are running properly, thereby enabling other employees to do their various jobs.

[61] The work done by the I.T. support specialists corresponds to the words used in the Technical Group definition. The principal aspects of the position can be found under the heading "Specific Accountabilities" (see Exhibit U-1, tab 10, page 3). The main functions of the position all relate to the provision of technical support of

electro-mechanical systems and devices (see numbers 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16 and 18). The employees do testing, repairs, installation and modification.

[62] The position rationale produced by the employer, and found at Exhibit U-1, tab 19, has the very wording found in the Technical Category Group and Electronics Subgroup definitions.

[63] After the reclassification exercise was finalized, the employer posted a job competition for an I.T. Support Specialist position (see Exhibit U-1, tab 24). The words used in that posting are the very words used in the Technical Group and Electronics Subgroup definitions, yet the employer says that the position does not belong here.

[64] The historical development of the position is not relevant. If the core function of the position today continues to correspond with the Technical Group definition, the position remains in that group. The specific duties of a position continually evolve; therefore, the fact that a position changes does not mean that it cannot continue to meet the group definition.

For the Employer

[65] It is not disputed that it is within the Board's jurisdiction to find that the employees are still in the Technical Group bargaining unit on the basis of the fact that their duties fit that group's definition. Section 24 of the PESRA states that it is the Board who must decide this question, if there is a dispute. Therefore, the burden of proof is not an issue, as the Board decides this task.

[66] The Board must determine what the duties of the I.T. Support Specialist position are and then examine whether they fit the Technical Group definition or not. The Board must also be cognizant of the Administration Group definition and determine the best fit.

[67] In 1987, the NABET was certified as the bargaining agent for all employees in the Technical Group and the CEPUC became its successor. At that time, the Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) sought to include the Computer Systems (CS) employees in its bargaining unit, and NABET did not seek to represent them (see *National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians v. House of Commons* (442-HC-1, March 24, 1987)). The CS work is described at paragraph 8 of that decision. The I.T. Support Specialist work has progressed to this level now.

[68] In other words, the work of the I.T. support specialists has evolved to the extent that they have become, in essence, equivalent to the Computer Systems employees.

[69] Currently, the primary duties of the I.T. support specialists include interfacing with clients, determining the nature of the problems and deciding on an appropriate course of action.

[70] The skill sets necessary to the I.T. Support Specialist position no longer correspond to the skill sets needed for the Electronics Technician position. Today, a computer science program is needed, whereas in the past the course work was Electronics Engineering Technician (see Exhibits E-1 and E-2).

[71] The job description of the I.T. Support Specialist position is very different from the job description of the Engineering Technician position when we compare Exhibit U-1, tabs 10 and 3.

[72] Currently, the I.T. Support Specialist position can be related to that of a consultant. The incumbent would have flexibility to resolve client problems, whereas this would not be the case with an Electronics Technician position.

[73] The old job description speaks of employees “fabricating”, “assembling” and “installing” (see tab 3, page 2). These are very mechanical tasks and technical in nature. They are not present in the current job description.

[74] An examination of the definition of the Technical Group shows that employees do installation. However, it is not a major function of the I.T. Support Specialist position and it takes very little time and requires minimal skill. Also, installation is not intended to include software, as the definition speaks of installation of electronic systems and associated equipment.

[75] The words “testing” and “inspection”, which appear in the group definition, do not appear in the job description and have not been shown to be part of an I.T. support specialist’s functions.

[76] The words “maintenance” and “repair” appeared in the old Electronics Technician position’s job description, but do not appear in the new job description. They were major functions of the old job, but are not evident in the tasks an I.T. support specialist now does.

[77] Therefore, since there is no dispute with respect to the contents of the new job description, and it does not encompass words used in the Technical Group definition, the new job cannot be included in that group.

[78] Where an I.T. support specialist does some of the work listed in the Technical Group definition, that work is of such a minor role in the totality of the functions performed that these functions cannot bring the employees within the group definition. Therefore, the Board must look at the definition of the Administration Group to see if the I.T. support specialists fall within it.

[79] The I.T. support specialists plan programs; they execute, conduct and control programs. They provide a service to the employer. These are all functions within the group or subgroup definition of the Administration Group.

Reply

[80] In order to determine in which group the employees should fall, it is necessary to look beyond the mere words used in the job description. Exhibit U-6 shows what the I.T. support specialists do on a daily basis.

[81] The current dispute centres around whether or not the employees are in the correct grouping, which is not what the *NABET* case (*supra*) dealt with; therefore, that decision is of little value here.

[82] The employer's own document, identified as Exhibit U-2, uses the words "install", "maintain" and "repair" in describing the work of the I.T. support specialists. These are the very functions they actually do and this coincides with the Technical Group definition.

[83] In Exhibit U-6, a listing of the daily activities of the I.T. support specialists, repeated use of the words "testing" and "inspection" is found. Again, this coincides with the Technical Group definition.

Reasons for Decision

[84] Section 24 of the PESRA states:

24. Where, at any time following the determination by the Board of a group of employees to constitute a unit appropriate for collective bargaining, any question arises as

to whether any employee or class of employees is or is not included therein or is included in any other unit, the Board shall, on application by the employer or any employee organization affected, determine the question.

[85] I agree with the submissions of counsel for the employer that the question of who bears the onus is moot, as the legislation provides for the Board to determine whether the I.T. support specialists are included in the Technical Group bargaining unit. In doing so, I must be mindful of the evidence and determine to which group the I.T. Support Specialist positions belong. This is the very exercise that the Board conducted, albeit with different groups, in its decision of the *Federal Government Dockyards Trades v. Treasury Board* (Board file 147-2-25).

[86] In making a determination as to which group definition applies to an employee or group of employees, the Board must, in my view, decide the question of which group definition is the best fit. Therefore, while there may be merit to the views that each of the parties takes, ultimately the Board must look at the core duties of the employees in question and see where they best fit in terms of meeting a group definition.

[87] There was no dispute that once a job description is finalized, the next task is to assign it to a group definition. The job description in this case is not in dispute and is found at Exhibit U-1, tab 10.

[88] The group definition of the Technical Group reads as follows:

TECHNICAL GROUP

Group Definition

The Technical Group is composed of positions engaged in the design, construction, installation, testing, inspection, maintenance, repair or operation of electronic systems and associated equipment and apparatus used in the broadcasting of live coverage of the proceedings of the House of Commons and Committees and/or used in electronic communications within the parliamentary precincts. Also included is the provision of associated broadcast services and specialized activities.

[89] The group definition of the Administration Group reads as follows:

ADMINISTRATION GROUP

Group Definition

The Administration Group is composed of classification sub-groups engaged in the planning, execution, conduct and control of programs serving the professional and internal management requirements of the House of Commons.

[90] A review of the job description of the I.T. Support Specialist positions does not, in my view, establish conclusively that the positions fall within the group definition of either the Administration or Technical Group.

[91] What I find instructive, in this case, are two job postings put out by the employer, both of which describe what the employer feels is the essence of the position. The first posting (Exhibit U-1, tab 23) describes the position before the reclassification. This position, therefore, fell within the Technical Group definition.

[92] The second posting (Exhibit U-1, tab 24) describes the position after the reclassification and is within the Administration Group definition, according to the employer.

[93] The newly classified position speaks of the incumbent being “responsible for the installation, repair, configuration and maintenance of Intel-based PC systems and related software.” These are virtually the same words used when the position was classified in the Technical Group.

[94] The only significant difference between these two job postings appears to be the educational requirements. This is not a factor in determining in which group a position is more appropriately placed.

[95] After listening to all of the evidence of the various witnesses and reviewing the exhibits filed by the parties, I have no hesitation in concluding that the positions have changed over time. Technology has also evolved significantly to the extent that we are now a throwaway society. It is no longer cost-effective to “repair” parts, as that term was once thought of. However, by replacing one component with another, it can be said that the component itself has been “repaired”.

[96] Therefore, while the meaning of some of the words used in the Technical Group definition may carry a different connotation today, I find the group definition sufficiently broad so as to encompass the work that the I.T. support specialists are doing. The work is described in the competition poster (Exhibit U-1, tab 24) and, without the successful applicant testifying as to what it is he/she actually does, I find that this evidence is a clear indication of what the employer expects I.T. support specialists to do. These positions fall with the Technical Group definition, in my view.

[97] I find further support for this conclusion after reviewing a document drafted by the employer titled "Position Rationale" (Exhibit U-1, tab 19). This document describes the process leading up to the reclassification, and the justification for placing the positions in the Administration Group. A portion of the Rationale reads:

...

... The essence of the job does not include the design and construction of electro-mechanical systems and devices which are similar to duties benchmarked in the EL category. It does however, consist of installing, maintaining and modifying computer systems but not in the same way (as mentioned above) as it was intended through the classification standard. The classification committee therefore concluded that the technical expertise previously required has been replaced by an overall understanding of computers and their applications. Subsequently, it was agreed that the best fit was to convert the position to the ADS group.

...

The words "installing, maintaining and modifying computer systems" are very, very similar to words used to describe positions classified in the Technical Group.

[98] Whether the drafters of the definition used to describe employees in the Technical Group ever envisioned the actual work evolving to the extent it has today, I cannot say. However, it is my view that the definition is sufficiently broad so as to encompass the core range of duties which the employees in question in DCFS are currently doing.

[99] It is recognized that, as jobs evolve over time, the new functions may not place the positions squarely within the letter of the group definition from which they came. However, in this case, I find the evidence and the testimony lead me to believe that the

best fit for the I.T. Support Specialist positions is in the Technical Group bargaining unit.

[100] Therefore, the application filed by the CEPUC under section 24 of the PESRA is upheld to the extent that the I.T. Support Specialist positions which were previously classified in the Electronics Subgroup are to be included in the Technical Group bargaining unit.

[101] As stated previously, I will retain jurisdiction on the issue of whether employees occupying I.T. Support Specialist positions in the Administration Group should be included in the Technical Group bargaining unit if either party requests a hearing on that issue within two months of the issuance of this decision.

**Joseph W. Potter,
Deputy Chairperson**

OTTAWA, December 4, 2000.