

**Chief Executives Board  
for Coordination**CEB/2011/3  
23 March 2011**Conclusions of the Twenty-first Session of  
the High Level Committee on Management  
(Paris, 8-9 March 2011)****TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Paragraph/s</u>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>I. Adoption of the Agenda</b> .....	2 – 12
<b>II. Dialogue with Staff Federations</b> .....	13 – 19
<b>III. Security and Safety of Staff:</b>	
A. Briefing by the Under Secretary-General for Safety and Security .....	20 – 22
B. Programme Criticality.....	23 – 26
C. Recent events in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) .....	27 – 33
D. Issues from the IASMN meeting .....	34 – 35
E. HR implications within the implementation of the Security Level System (SLS) .....	36 – 38
<b>IV. Mandatory Age of Separation</b> .....	39 – 45
<b>V. HLCM Programme of Work and Coordination with UNDG</b> .....	46 – 56
<b>VI. Improving efficiency and effectiveness of the UN System</b> .....	57 – 71
<b>VII. HLCM Networks</b>	
A. Human Resources .....	72 – 86
B. Procurement .....	87 – 96
C. Finance and budget .....	97 – 109
D. Information and communication technology .....	110 – 118
<b>VIII. Social Media and the UN System</b> .....	119 – 127
<b>IX. Any other business</b>	
A. Auditing as One .....	128 – 129
B. Medical Directors' Working Group .....	130 – 133

## ANNEXES

Annex I – List of participants

Annex II – Checklist of documents

Annex III – Statement by FICSA

Annex IV – Statement by CCISUA

Annex V – Statement by UNISERV

## INTRODUCTION

1. The High Level Committee on Management held its twentieth session at the Headquarters of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Paris, on 8-9 March 2011. The meeting was chaired by the Committee's Chairperson, WFP Executive Director, Josette Sheeran, and Vice-Chair, UNAIDS Deputy Executive Director, Jan Beagle.

### I. Adoption of the agenda



#### Documentation:

- *CEB/2011/HLCM/1/Rev.3 – Revised Agenda*
- *CEB/2011/HLCM/1/ Add.1/Rev.1 – Revised Programme of work*
- *Checklist of Documents*

2. The agenda as adopted by the Committee is reflected in the table of contents.

3. The complete list of participants is provided in Annex I.

4. The checklist of documents is in Annex II. All documents related to the session are available on the CEB website at: <http://www.unsceb.org/ceb/mtg/hlcm/march-2011/>

5. In her welcoming remarks, the Chair thanked UNESCO's Director-General, Ms. Irina Bokova, for her kind presence at the opening of the meeting and for her generous hospitality, and extended her appreciation to the office of the Deputy Director-General, Mr. Getachew Engida, who had so efficiently led all the arrangements for the 21<sup>st</sup> session of the Committee in the beautiful venue of Paris.

6. After the Chair's remarks, Ms. Bokova welcomed HLCM members to UNESCO. In doing so, she noted that the times of change we were living through – both inside our organizations and in the world outside – required the UN to adapt and to innovate, responding to a shifting environment in order to meet new challenges with strength and determination.

7. The Director-General recalled that UNESCO was engaged in a wide ranging effort to sharpen its effectiveness and efficiency, with the clear objective to enhance the organization's capacity to deliver. This started with senior management and included human resources policy, also taking into account the network of field presences, as well as the structure and focus of programmes.

8. In this respect, HLCM provided an important platform to share thoughts and experience, along with good practice. Indeed, efficiency gains are expected from within each of our organizations - and also from leveraging synergies between one another. Member States want the United Nations family to work together more coherently.

9. In conclusion, UNESCO's Director-General emphasized the changing security environment for UN operations, and how recent events in the Middle East had made it even more evident that investing in security was vital for ensuring basic safety and for the delivery of UN's mandates.

10. Introducing the session's agenda, the HLCM Chair recalled some of the most recent HLCM achievements, namely the re-designed Security Management System; the improvements in benefits coverage for staff and personnel; the completion of the first project - on Vendor Eligibility - and the tangible progress in the other initiatives funded through the Harmonization of Business Practices Plan of Action; and, the closer attention to the operational needs of the field, thanks to a close and growing cooperation with UNDG.

11. The Chair noted the critical role of the UN system, and further highlighted the fact that the UN is under increasing pressure to do more at the same time we are facing financial constraints. The HLCM's role remained that of putting reform into action, and to continue to pursue greater efficiency and effectiveness across the UN system to deliver on our mandates. In that respect, changing expectations among Member States and donors demanded greater measures of accountability, including performance management, risk management and internal control. The Secretary-General was looking to HLCM to lead on this effort.

12. The Chair marked a very special occasion: the 100<sup>th</sup> International Women's Day, and noted the creation of UN-Women as an historic reform in the UN system. In this light, when introducing new participants and guests, the Committee took special note of the presence of the representatives of the new agency.

## II. Dialogue with the Staff Federations

### Documentation:

- Statements from CCISUA, FICSA, UNISERV
- [CEB/2011/HLCM/11 - Proposed Terms of Reference for a renewed dialogue between HLCM and the Staff Federations](#)

13. The Committee welcomed the representatives of the Federation of International Civil Servants Association (FICSA), the Coordinating Committee for International Staff Unions and Associations (CCISUA) and the United Nations International Civil Servants' Federation (UNISERV). The full statements made by each federation are reflected in Annexes III to V of this report.

14. The Staff Federations were invited to participate as observers in the following agenda items: a) Security and Safety of Staff; b) Mandatory Age of Separation; c) Human Resources issues.

15. In their statement, FICSA, CCISUA and UNISERV elaborated on some key issues:

- Regarding Staff Safety and Security, the Federations expressed concern about national staff, especially in view of the current situations in the Middle East.
- On contractual arrangements, CCISUA expressed disappointment at the fact that the continuing contracts remain very limited.
- On the Mandatory Age of Separation, the Staff Federations looked forward to the thorough review that was to take place, indicating general support by the staff towards an upward increase in the retirement age.
- On the harmonization of conditions of service in the field, CCISUA looked forward to the ICSC's measures to mitigate the impact of the recent General Assembly resolution and expressed its deep disappointment for the provisions related to rest and recuperation.
- The Federations welcomed the "Dialogue with Staff Federations" as an item on the agenda and underlined the need to strengthen the said dialogue in the future.
- Lastly, FICSA informed the Committee that the Association was operating in the absence of a General Secretary, since its latest Council was unable to identify candidates who could provide proof of the required agreement to paid full-time release and relocation to Geneva, remunerated at the Geneva level. FICSA had therefore initiated a procedure to run by-elections through a postal vote.

16. Following the agreement at the twentieth session of the Committee, to identify modalities for an improved dialogue between HLCM and the Staff Federations, the CEB Secretariat undertook consultations with members of the three Federations and developed draft Terms of Reference for a re-designed Dialogue. The draft Terms of Reference were subsequently shared with HLCM members and the Staff Federations and revised taking into account comments received.

17. The draft Terms of Reference provided for a dialogue that may take the following form: a) Staff Federations would be invited to present statements in advance, and to read them during the session; b) Staff Federations would be invited on an ad-hoc basis to participate, in an observer capacity, in the discussions of subjects on the regular agenda that were of particular interest to the Staff; c) HLCM Networks, Committee members and Staff Federations could suggest additional discussion on a small number of items identified and agreed in advance of the meeting.

18. HLCM members expressed their preference to receive the Staff Federations' statements in advance, in order to have time to read them prior to the meeting for a more meaningful response. Committee members also stressed that HLCM was the only opportunity for senior managers to discuss issues among themselves and that it was important to maintain the nature of this forum. It was also noted with appreciation that the Joint Inspection Unit was currently undertaking a study on Staff – Management relations, which should be completed by the end of 2011 and that was expected to include suggestions and recommendations that could also be useful in the context of the dialogue between HLCM and the Staff Federations.

19. The Committee thanked the representatives of the three Staff Federations for their statements and their spirit of collaboration. It took note of the comments regarding the proposed Terms of Reference for improved dialogue between HLCM and the Staff Federations and requested the CEB Secretariat to undertake further consultations before finalizing the ToRs.

### III. Security and Safety of Staff



#### Documentation:

- *CEB/2011/HLCM/2/Rev.1 – Interim Policies from 14th session of the IASMN*
- *CEB/2011/HLCM/3 – Measures to replace the present Annex I of the Field Security Handbook*
- *CEB/2011/HLCM/4 – Status Report from the Programme Criticality Working Group*
- ❖ *9 Summary sheets*

#### A) Briefing by the Under-Secretary General for Safety and Security

20. The briefing by the Under-Secretary General for Safety and Security emphasized the simple philosophy at the basis of the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS): to enable the UN to fulfill its mandates in many places around the world.

21. HLCM noted the abolition, as of 1 January 2011, of the Security Phase System, a system directly linked with benefits and lacking stringent analysis, and the launch of the new Security Level System (SLS), a process which allowed for the identification and categorization of the threats the UN faces, that allowed for a comparative analysis of threats across the board, and that provided for greater granularity and transparency. The launch of the SLS was underlined as a remarkable achievement, resulting from the effort led by HLCM, in close coordination with UN/DSS, to re-design the UN Security Management System. The USG/DSS noted that the SLS was only one part of the security risk management (SRM) process. If, as a result of the SRM process, it was determined that the residual risk in a particular situation was very high, an examination of the objectives for which the UN system continued to operate in those situations would be required, together with the results that it was accomplishing. The Programme Criticality Framework would guide such process, which was therefore not security-driven but rather driven by programmatic concerns.

22. HLCM and the Staff Federations commended the Under-Secretary General and the Department for Safety and Security for the remarkable work that had been undertaken to re-design and strengthen the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS), particularly in consideration of the very challenging times during which this work was completed.

## **B) Programme Criticality**

23. Ms. Hilde Johnson, Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF, in video conference connection, presented the Committee with an update on the development of a framework for determining Programme Criticality within the Guidelines for Acceptable Risk, an effort undertaken with the contribution of all UN entities with large field operations (UNDP, WFP, UNHCR, WHO, ILO, FAO, UN-DSS, UN-DPKO, UN-DFS, UN-DPA and OCHA).
24. The Programme Criticality framework represented the last element of the Guidelines for Acceptable Risk, one of the improvements meant to respond to the complex and shifting security challenges faced by UN staff by re-orienting our security thinking from 'when to leave' to 'how to stay'. This new framework would help ensure that the programmes and personnel that remain in high-risk situations are working on the highest priority functions and programmes, in accordance with the strategic objectives of the UN system.
25. The draft Programme Criticality Framework, whose criteria and definitions were presented to the Committee in ample detail, was now ready and would be subject to field-testing in Somalia, Afghanistan and Pakistan beginning 30 March 2011.
26. HLCM took note of the briefing provided by the Chair of the Programme Criticality Working Group and looked forward to considering its final outcome, as also informed by the results of the field testing, at its fall 2011 session, for subsequent submission to CEB.

## **C) Recent events in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA)**

27. HLCM undertook a discussion on the current security situation in the in the Middle East and North Africa, the actions taken to date by the UN Security Management System, and the lessons learned so far. The discussion benefited from contributions by the organizations with the largest presence in the region, namely UNDP and WHO.
28. Acknowledging that there was neither a great number of UN programmes in Tunisia, nor a considerable presence of local staff, the USG/DSS informed HLCM that an analysis was undertaken on the threats and the mitigation measures in place, leading to the decision not to evacuate staff, and to continue to operate in Tunisia.
29. A similar analysis was carried out in Egypt, where the UN had a large international presence. This indicated that communications links had been severed at the outset of events, preventing most regional offices from performing their work; travel into and out of Egypt was curtailed; banks were not distributing money and food and transport were becoming problematic. Although there were no indications of a direct threat against the UN, a decision was made, on the recommendation of the Designated Official (DO), in consultation with the Security Management Team (SMT), to evacuate all non-essential international staff and eligible family members. This followed an earlier decision taken by the World Bank to evacuate. With the help of DPKO/DFS aircrafts, the evacuation was managed quickly. A short time later, when the situation improved, those evacuated were authorized to return.
30. Among those lessons learned in Egypt, was an important one related to the SLS. Some remnants of the old security phase system had led the SMT to try and raise the security level, in light of the decision to evacuate. It was therefore necessary to clarify that, because the security level represented an aggregate of all threats in a particular area, and because the security phase system had been abolished, it was no longer necessary to reach a certain security level before evacuation may be authorized. The Committee also noted the power of communication networks but also its vulnerabilities to a total shut-down in communication by governments.
31. Almost concurrently with the lifting of the evacuation status in Egypt, international staff and eligible family members had to be evacuated from Libya. The Libyan situation was developing, with both refugee and

humanitarian issues emerging on both sides of the Libyan border, representing a clear example of how the UN must operate amid tough security concerns.

32. UN/DSS was also examining events very closely in Yemen, as well as in Bahrain, Jordan, Mauritania, Algeria, Syria and Morocco. All this while UN operations still continued in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, Darfur and Somalia.

33. HLCM acknowledged the role of the UN Security Management System to enable the continuation of UN programmes against the background of major and challenging events, demonstrating that the UNSMS was no longer risk adverse. HLCM also noted that the UNSMS functioned as a confederation, comprised of UN/DSS, members of the IASMN, as well as individual agencies' security officers: a combined network that added value to the UN System itself.

#### **D) Issues from the last session of the Inter Agency Security Management Network (IASMN)**

34. The USG/DSS provided a briefing from the 14<sup>th</sup> session of IASMN, introducing some new and/or revised policies as well as providing updated information on several areas of the IASMN's work. The Committee was also reminded that the policies and issues presented were considered by the senior most security officials of the member organizations of the IASMN.

35. HLCM:

- a) Endorsed the newly approved Chapter III of Security Policy Manual: UNSMS Applicability Policy, as reflected in CEB/2011/HLCM/2/Rev.1, and which replaces Chapter III of the old Field Security Handbook.
- b) Endorsed the IASMN recommendation that all UN system Close Protection Officers be fully certified to the UNDSS specified standard within four years.
- c) Endorsed the policy on Security Clearance Procedures and the Travel Request Information Process (TRIP) to go into full effect on 1 January 2012 by which time it is expected there will be full integration between each organization's travel system and TRIP.
- d) Endorsed the Use of Force Policy for UN security officials in the Security Management System, as approved by IASMN.
- e) Took note of the documents entitled "Relocation, Evacuation, Alternate Work Modalities – Measures To Avoid Risk" and "Security Level System" for inclusion in the UNSMS Security Policy Manual, as contained in CEB/2011/HLCM/2/Rev.1, as well as of the update provided on other issues taken up by the IASMN at its 14th session, i.e. Premises Vulnerability Questionnaire and UN Premises Policy; Draft Model Host Country Security Agreements and Private Security Companies. The Committee recommended completion of any necessary follow up work for consideration by HLCM at its next session.

#### **E) HR implications within the implementation of the Security Level System (SLS)**

36. Following the endorsement of the new Security Level System by CEB and the abolishment of the Security Phase System on 1 January 2011, a Taskforce of the HR Network was convened to consider how these changes would impact on security-related entitlements and administrative measures. Among the issues considered by the Task Force was the need for the revision of Annex I of the Field Security Handbook on

security evacuation and relocation entitlements. A revised version of Annex I, which was reviewed and approved by the HR Network, the IASMN and DSS was presented to HLCM for endorsement. Other provisions included in the revised Annex I referred to GA resolution 65/248 on the phasing out of the Extended Monthly Security Allowance, which would eventually be replaced by the non-family hardship element.

37. The HR Network Spokesperson clarified that the guidance, as included in document CEB/2011/HLCM/3, would entail further work, especially in relation to the General Assembly's resolution on harmonization of conditions of service in non-family duty stations.

38. The Committee took note of the work undertaken by the HR Network and endorsed document CEB/2011/HLCM/3 on the "Measures to replace the present Annex I of the Field Security Handbook".

#### **IV. Mandatory Age of Separation – Briefing by the UNJSPF**



##### **Documentation:**

- *CEB/2011/HLCM/5 – Presentation by the UNJSPF*
- ❖ *1 Summary sheet*

39. Upon request of the Commission, the ICSC Secretariat asked HLCM to develop a position paper providing views and recommendations on the issue of mandatory age of separation.

40. At its 20<sup>th</sup> session in September 2010, the Committee agreed to form a working group that would review, in consultation with the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund, all aspects of the issue, including innovative and flexible modalities in applying the mandatory age of separation.

41. The working group, led by WFP, met in early 2011 and is expected to present its final recommendations at the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of HLCM in the fall of 2011. During October and November 2011, the working group would finalize any follow-up recommendations from HLCM and a final report would be submitted to ICSC in early 2012. To help inform its work, the working group prepared a questionnaire to be forwarded to all organizations, to obtain their point of view, both from the HR management perspective as well as from the financial one.

42. As an informative session for this work, HLCM invited the CEO of the UN Joint Staff Pension Fund at its 21<sup>st</sup> session to deliver a presentation on several aspects of the matter, from the point of view of the Fund.

43. The presentation to the Committee included background information on the Fund, the current financial situation, the normal retirement age, the UNJSPF Plan Design and trends in the normal age of retirement.

44. HLCM members concurred that this was a complex issue and all factors should be looked at carefully. While a long term view of the financial implications must be considered, a concurrent analysis of organizations' human resource priorities, such as the rejuvenation of the workforce and staff profiles required to reflect evolving needs, was also required.

45. The Committee thanked the working group and the CEO of the UNSJPF for his comprehensive presentation. It urged all organizations to complete in an objective manner the questionnaire prepared by the working group; took note of the work undertaken up to date and looked forward to the working group's final recommendations at the next session of HLCM in the fall of 2011.

## V. HLCM Programme of Work and coordination with UNDG



### Documentation:

- *CEB/2011/HLCM/6 – HLCM Programme of work*
- *UNDG Joint Funding and Business Operations Network - programme of work*
- ❖ *2 Summary sheets*

46. As a follow up to concerns raised in February 2010 that the work of the HLCM Networks was too spread out and risked duplication and overlap with UNDG activities, this item was introduced to ensure smooth coordination and a focused HLCM programme of work, in turn resulting from improved coordination between all CEB pillars and between the different networks of HLCM. The discussion was divided into three sub-items:

- (i) Presentation of the programmes of work of the newly established UNDG Joint Funding and Business Operations Network, represented by its Co-Convener, Ms. Mari Simonen; and, of the UNDG Working Group on RC System Issues, represented by its Co-Convener, the HLCM Vice-Chair, Ms. Jan Beagle.
- (ii) Briefing on the status of the joint UNDG-HLCM study to identify common principles of Results Reporting, an initiative agreed by the joint HLCM-UNDG meeting of September 2010 and co-led by UNDP and WFP.
- (iii) Approval of the HLCM programme of work, compiled by the CEB Secretariat on the basis of the prioritized overview of HLCM activities and on the Implementation Plan for the recommendations of the HLCM-UNDG joint mission, which were presented and approved in September 2010.

47. The work of the UNDG in the area of funding and harmonization of business practices would focus on implementation of existing agreements in collaboration with HLCM networks, particularly in the areas of procurement and ICT. Collaboration between UNDG and HLCM would also focus on the alignment of the harmonization of business practices with the UNDAF roll out process. This was highlighted as an important joint initiative, that promises to improve the effectiveness of the UN at the country level, and results directly from the recommendations of the joint HLCM/UNDG mission completed in 2010.

48. The key priorities for UNDG in the area of harmonization of business practices for 2011-2012 would be:

- Pursuing integrated approach to programme and operations.
- Implementation of already existing guidance on elements on harmonized ICT and common procurement.
- Support to the implementation of Common Services.
- Helping speed up the removal of bottle necks organizations find in terms of legal clearances, e.g. MoUs.
- Supporting on-going initiatives, such as the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer and Common Premises.
- Focus on joint funding mechanisms, especially multi donor trust funds, on their effectiveness and on harmonization of procedures for their management/administration.

49. A few key challenges that needed to be overcome for effective reform were also identified by the UNDG. To succeed in change, the UN as a system needed to make sure that adequate recognition and rewarding schemes were in place for staff at all levels working on harmonization issues. In the view of the UNDG, current funding challenges risked pushing UN organizations to look inwards. Therefore, leaders needed to take responsibility and keep the momentum to implement agreed solutions.

50. The key priorities for the UNDG Working Group on Resident Coordinator System Issues would be:

- Full implementation of the Management and Accountability System at all levels, with particular focus on strengthening mutual accountability between the RC and UNCT members;
- Implementation of the recommendations from the joint HLCM/UNDG field mission;
- Performance appraisal instruments;
- Integrated missions leadership policy; and,
- RC talent management and development.

51. Emphasis was placed on the key leadership role of the Resident Coordinator in driving change and promoting an integrated approach to programme and business operations. An RC pool of the highest quality, with candidates from many organizations of the system, was recognized as essential, as was the need to provide for incentives for staff to work jointly, both in work plans and in performance appraisals. The recently approved financing through the HLCM HBP Plan of Action of joint training of UN Country Teams and operations staff by the Staff College was another tangible representation of HLCM/UNDG cooperation. The importance of mutual accountability was stressed in view of the fact that existing instruments were not yet implemented by many organizations.

52. The Committee was also briefed on the progress of the UNDG-HLCM study to identify common principles of Results Reporting. A task team with experts from 12 agencies, under the joint leadership of WFP and UNDP, was formed. A small team of consultants was undertaking a desk review of UN organizations' results reporting procedures and mechanisms, with a view to producing a review of best practices. An orientation and consensus building exercise with UN focal points would take place in late March 2011 to discuss challenges and opportunities facing the UN system and possibilities for learning from key innovative models currently in practice. A schedule of interviews and visits would then be agreed at key institutions both in Europe and the US, including a proposed conversation with the OECD. A second focal point meeting would be held in New York in late April, whereby findings would be discussed and viable recommendations agreed upon. Full harmonization would not be the aim, but instead agreed principles across the system, drawing on already existing commonalities. The final product was expected to be finalized in May 2011, when the agreed findings would be submitted to the UNDG and the HLCM.

53. The HLCM prioritized Programme of Work was finally presented to the Committee by the CEB Secretariat. The Programme of Work re-grouped activities as selected and prioritized by the Committee and its Networks, assigning priorities to them as follows: High - those activities that come directly from the Harmonization of Business Practices Plan of Action or on direct request by the Committee; Medium - on-going activities carried out by the Networks; and, Low - activities that are important, but only require the Committee to be kept informed.

The Committee:

54. Took note of the cooperation and coordination with the UNDG and requested that its continuation remains a priority.

55. Took note of the progress in the area of results reporting, recognizing the need to avoid ad-hoc reporting requests in favor of more consolidated efforts and urged organizations to commit the necessary attention to this matter while the study is being completed.

56. Approved the HLCM Prioritized Programme of Work in the areas of finance and budget, human resources, information and communication technology and procurement, as outlined in document CEB/2011/HLCM/6.

## **VI. Improving efficiency and effectiveness of the UN System**

57. In response to a request by the Secretary General, HLCM tabled a discussion on reforms put in place and/or planned by the UN system in response to budget constraints. HLCM members were asked to share key management actions undertaken or foreseen, both contingent and structural, highlighting their actual or expected impact and implementation challenges.

58. As part of this discussion, the UK Department for International Development (DFID) was invited to present to HLCM the methodology and design of its Multilateral Aid Review (MAR) framework, as one example for assessing effectiveness and efficiency.

59. Recognizing the great importance of the UN and the multilateral system in the area of development assistance, DFID explained that the purpose of the assessment was to find out where the UK could expect the best results for its investments as well as to ensure that public support for an increase in ODA could be sustained at a time of financial crisis. The newly released report from the Multilateral Aid Review (MAR), therefore, also addressed a key domestic political need.

60. According to DFID, organizations were assessed in relation to high standards, and DFID itself would not score at the top if assessed through the MAR framework. Accordingly, the analysis was presented as an opportunity for multi-lateral organizations to learn from each other. In the results from the MAR, the lending and grant giving institutions performed well on overall organizational effectiveness criteria, the emergency response organizations next, followed by the remaining organizations. The general conclusion for the UN system was that organizational effectiveness needed to be improved while, at the same time, the UN system was recognized as having performed particularly well in the areas of partnership and gender.

61. Emphasizing the UK's increase in ODA and its commitment to the multi-lateral system, the MAR was not intended to be a cost cutting exercise, but an attempt at identifying which partners DFID judged to be the most effective, at a time when transparency was critical in most donor countries and changes in the UN system were demanded in this area.

62. The ensuing discussion focused on measures the UN system could take to "do business with less" and to address the scarcity of resources and expected budget cuts.

63. The importance of UN organizations learning from each other to improve efficiency and effectiveness was strongly affirmed, especially at a time when all UN organizations are investing considerable efforts on improving their operations, even independently from any consideration on budgetary constraints.

64. The increasing demand for additional accountability measures was acknowledged. At the same time, however, agencies are facing significant challenges in putting in place satisfactory accountability mechanisms that have broad legitimacy and ownership within organizations, particularly in the field and in difficult or sensitive situations, and in sensitive areas of work. It was recognized that there are objective difficulties in measuring results linked to some of the broad activities carried out by the UN, and that reliance on qualitative measures and narratives remains essential to fully capture their level of success – or failure.

65. Concerns over the methodology used in the Multilateral Aid Review in relation to the role and mandate of different UN organizations were raised. The potential bias of the methodology adopted was particularly evident for normative organizations, as the results of the Review had shown. DFID acknowledged that there were differences in organizations but that efforts had been made to take such differences into account and to interpret results in a fair and balanced way. However, it was emphasized that, as the purpose of the Review was for domestic use, it had to produce one set of results without being overly complicated.

66. Several examples of past or on-going internal assessment exercises were mentioned by HLCM members, as well as experiences with monitoring and reporting frameworks, such as the work that the HLCP is undertaking on the Integrated Implementation Framework for MDGs. The need for performance benchmarks and improved reporting were seen as critical as the UN system moves forward.

The Committee:

67. Took note of the presentation offered by DFID on its Multilateral Aid Review (MAR) framework for assessing effectiveness and efficiency, that could help inform the UN system's efforts in developing and adopting tools for pursuing institutional reform.

68. Acknowledged the central role of HLCM in leading the effort by the UN system towards greater accountability and towards developing and implementing tools for better understanding and measuring its efficiency and effectiveness.

69. Agreed to form a special Task Force, led by the HLCM Chair, to identify and share approaches and to develop quick and actionable proposals to: a) pursue efficiency and cost savings; b) develop self-pacing, internal benchmarks of effectiveness and efficiency that can serve as a benchmark for all the UN system; c) identify basic common principles for reporting results to the donor community and the Member States that can be adopted throughout the UN system; and, d) analyse the process aspects of inclusive and successful institutional reform.

70. As part of this Task Force and with the immediate objective to bring a preliminary set of recommendations to the Chief Executives Board Meeting of 1-2 April, the HLCM Chair appointed a Sub-Committee, convened by Martin Mogwanja, Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF, and supported by UNHCR and WHO. This Sub-Committee would rapidly prepare recommendations on how the UN System could improve efficiency and control costs that do not contribute directly to results.

71. Requested all HLCM members to provide quick, actionable and high yielding ideas/summaries of experience on how their organizations have successfully increased efficiency or controlled costs in the last one or two years. Organizations could also put forward experiences on ideas that did not work or were found to be inappropriate for a UN entity to undertake, or ideas for increasing efficiency or controlling costs that they would like to pursue but are blocked from doing so for some specific administrative or legislative reason beyond their control.

## VII. HLCM Networks

### A) Human resources



#### Documentation:

- *CEB/2011/HLCM/7 – ToR of the Study on “non-staff personnel”*
- ❖ *2 Summary sheets*

72. At its 20<sup>th</sup> session in September 2010, HLCM requested an in-depth analysis on “non-staff” personnel with respect to definitions, statistics, principles and policies regarding organizations’ responsibilities and liabilities.

73. The HR Network spokesperson presented the Terms of Reference for the review/analysis, as outlined in document CEB/2011/HLCM/7. A consultant was already identified and would commence his work in March 2011.

74. The HR Network also agreed on a series of actions for the implementation of recommendations contained in the comprehensive “Review of contractual arrangements, staff regulations, rules and practices”, completed by the HR Network in October 2010 in the context of the Plan of Action for the Harmonization of Business Practices (HBP). These were prioritized as follows:

- *First priority:* Grading and Classification, implementing the ICSC classification standards across the UN system;
- *Second priority:* Selection process, development of harmonized vacancy announcements, launch of pilots for the establishment of a single Central Review Body in local duty stations and for the opening of vacancies on a reciprocal basis on functional clusters;
- *Third priority:* Performance Evaluation: provision for common elements in all performance appraisals systems;
- *Fourth priority:* Contractual arrangements: organizations to report progress towards adjusting conditions/criteria for the granting of contracts, based on the ICSC Framework for contractual arrangements, and on GA Resolution 65/247 regarding continuing contracts.

75. The Committee subsequently received a briefing by the ICSC Vice Chairman on the General Assembly decisions on harmonization of conditions of service in the field and on the outcome of place-to-place surveys of headquarters duty stations (post adjustment).

76. In December 2010, the General Assembly adopted resolution 65/248 on the harmonization of conditions of service in non-family duty stations. Among the lessons learned from a difficult debate, the Vice-Chairman noted the need for the Commission and the organizations to improve their cooperation to pursue achievable strategic goals.

77. Some HLCM members voiced their concern over the General Assembly’s decision on the harmonization of conditions of service in non-family duty stations and requested the ICSC to provide indications on the type of data and information that would be required from organizations to evaluate the impact that the Assembly’s decision is expected to have.

78. The ICSC Vice Chairman reported that considerable preparatory work was underway by both the organizations and the ICSC Secretariat, in preparation for the effective date (1 July 2011) for the General Assembly’s deliberations, which include a provision for a five year transitional period. The ICSC prepared an explanatory note on the transitional measures, which was intended to ensure consistency in the information conveyed to the staff of all organizations and that the transitional measures are applied in a uniform way across the system.

79. As part of the General Assembly’s decision on harmonization, it was also decided that the Commission would regulate the framework for Rest and Recuperation (R&R). The ICSC Secretariat was already working with the organizations to present the framework to the Commission, which would also work closely with organizations to make a recommendation to the General Assembly on a harmonized allowance for R&R travel by 2012.

80. Since the General Assembly approved the Commission’s recommendation that service in non-family duty stations be compensated by a separate allowance, it was considered imperative to agree on a firm definition of what precisely the term “non-family” means in the context of the new Security Level System. The ICSC secretariat was working with organizations and UN/DSS on this.

81. The Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions (ACPAQ) reviewed the results of the baseline cost-of-living surveys conducted by the ICSC Secretariat at eight headquarters duty stations and Washington D.C. These surveys were conducted to provide the benchmark data required for comparisons of cost of living

between New York and other duty stations around the world. The conduct of these surveys was based on the application of the methodology approved by the Commission. The results of the cost-of-living surveys at each of the nine designated duty stations would be considered at the spring session of the Commission and, if approved, the new results would be implemented in April 2011.

82. The number of completed survey questionnaires received was ten-fold that of 2005. A major outcome of the baseline surveys was the fact that a set of common expenditure weights derived exclusively from household expenditures reported by staff was now available, and could therefore be considered as truly reflective of their expenditure patterns, as consistent with global economic trends.

83. The results of the surveys showed modest increases in the post adjustment indices compared with the prevailing pay indices for the respective duty stations, thereby confirming that the updating procedures approved by the Commission, upon recommendations of ACPAQ, were working well, and that staff salaries could therefore be considered to have evolved fairly since the last cost-of-living surveys.

The Committee:

84. Took note of the work being undertaken by the HR Network and of its prioritized implementation of recommendations contained in the comprehensive “Review of contractual arrangements, staff regulations, rules and practices”. The Committee also encouraged organizations to lead such initiatives under the HBP Plan of Action, and requested further updates on these issues at its fall 2011 session.

85. Expressed its full support for an in-depth analysis on “non-staff” personnel and endorsed the Terms of Reference developed by the Network to carry out such an analysis, underlining that flexibility in employment modalities remained a necessity. It also recommended that, when collecting information from organizations, interviews with non-staff personnel should also be foreseen.

86. Thanked the ICSC Vice Chairman for the information provided and expressed its full commitment to work closely together on the transitional arrangements for the harmonization of conditions of service in non-family duty stations and on the framework for Rest and Recuperation (R&R).

## **B) Procurement**



### **Documentation:**

- *CEB/2011/HLCM/8 – Model Policy Framework (MPF) for determining vendor eligibility*
- *Draft Approach to collaborative procurement by HLCM Procurement Network*
- *Letter from ITU Secretary-General on procurement matter (dated 28 February 2011)*
- ❖ *1 Summary sheet*

### **(i) Vendor Eligibility Project**

87. HLCM was presented for approval a Model Policy Framework (MPF) for Vendor Eligibility, which was the first tangible product of the Plan of Action for the Harmonization of Business Practices.

88. The Model Policy Framework was developed by the HLCM Procurement Network, under the leadership of UNDP and was reviewed and approved by all members of the Legal Network. It consists of a common mechanism for dealing with vendors suspected, accused of or proven guilty after due process of misconduct in line with the UN Supplier Code of Conduct. The common approach would allow agencies to have access to information on vendors who are under investigation, restricted, suspended or removed by UN organizations. In addition, there were now commonly agreed criteria for judging the eligibility of vendors. Legal concerns regarding the level of proof needed to identify a suspect vendor were agreed on and incorporated into the framework.

89. As explained by the Chair of the Procurement Network, the application of such a system should go a long way towards fulfilling the General Principles of procurement applied: best value for money; fairness, integrity and transparency; competition; and the interest of the Organization. The framework, which mirrored in many aspects the pace-setting approach successfully applied by the World Bank across all its offices around the world, was intended to provide a foundation on which a fully developed system, materially and politically supported by the UN System would evolve. It should be noted that organizations would adapt the MPF to their own process in a manner that would produce consistent results.

The Committee:

90. Congratulated the Procurement Network on finalizing the Model Policy Framework (MPF) for Vendor Eligibility and emphasized its appreciation for the support that had been given to this project by UNDP.

91. Expressed appreciation to the Legal Network that had reviewed and approved, following incorporation of all comments into the final document, the Model Policy Framework.

92. Approved the Model Policy Framework for Vendor Eligibility as outlined in document CEB/2011/HLCM/8. Urged all member organizations to take the necessary steps to implement the framework according to internal processes and procedures.

**(ii) Update on the HBP projects and other activities under the HLCM Procurement Network**

93. The Committee was informed that HLCM members were exploring mechanisms through which they would be able to opt-in on collaborative procurement for products or services that are cross-cutting to all or some organizations, particularly for shared needs including vehicles, cargo, and freight. The Network was exploring possibilities using different organizations as lead agencies for different products. It was also noted that a lot of progress had already been made in the system in the area of collaborative procurement (both at the local level and at headquarters) and with procurement for programmatic supplies (for example, for WHO-UNICEF on health products).

94. The Procurement Network also confirmed that the UN system had made considerable progress in sharing contracts to ensure savings and, more in general, information sharing on contractual clauses and conditions, though there remained occasions when this effort had not been successful, like in ERPs. It was recognized that the UN system needed to do its best to be pro-active and to plan well in its future endeavors related to large systems procurement to avoid situations of fragmentation like the one existing in this area.

95. As a further update on the activities of the Procurement Network the Committee was informed that a project leader for the HBP project on harmonization of procurement guidelines had been recruited and was expected to be in place soon. Concrete results in this area of work were expected by the end of the third quarter of 2011.

The Committee:

96. Expressed strong support for the Procurement Network's work on collaborative procurement, as these efforts had the potential for real savings for the system as a whole. It therefore requested the Network to prepare a comprehensive update on this subject for its fall 2011 session.

## C) Finance and budget



### Documentation:

- *CEB/2011/HLCM/9 – IPSAS Progress Report and Results of the External Review*
- ❖ *2 Summary sheets*

### (i) External review on modalities for continuation of system-wide support for IPSAS beyond 2011

97. Introducing this discussion, the HLCM Chair took the opportunity to thank Mr. Jay Karia, Deputy Controller, UN Secretariat, who was retiring shortly, for his tremendous contribution, leadership, professionalism and commitment in co-chairing the FB Network for the past 4 years and leading the Task Force on Accounting Standards over the last 5 years.

98. The HLCM received a progress report on IPSAS implementation and considered the recommendations of the external review on modalities for continuation of system-wide support for IPSAS beyond 2011, which included strategic orientations and activities of the system-wide IPSAS team for the period 2011–2013.

99. Eight organizations had reached the key implementation milestones for IPSAS implementation effective 2010, such as establishing IPSAS compliant opening balances and ensuring that all requirements to meet IPSAS compliance at year end had been addressed. IPSAS compliance of these organizations and the practical impact of IPSAS implementation would shortly be tested during the 2010 external audit.

100. The Finance and Budget Network discussed the outcomes of the external review and approved them with certain conditions. Recommendations relating to the membership of the Steering Committee were already implemented and a Vice Chairman for the Task Force - Mr. Greg Johnson, Director of Finance, ILO – was appointed. Consultations to replace Mr. Karia as Co-Chair of the FB Network and Chair of the Task Force were still on-going.

### (ii) Update on FB Network activities

101. The Feasibility Study for Common Treasury Services, already approved by HLCM and co-led by IFAD and WHO, was currently being conducted by KPMG. Nineteen organizations were participating in the project. The study implementation was scheduled to take 6 months, ending May 2011. On-site visits of the treasuries and legal representatives of participating organizations were being completed, while the next main milestone would be an Accelerated Solutions Design (ASD) meeting, taking place on 4-5 April 2011 in Geneva, to seek common understanding and consensus on the preliminary recommendations resulting from the study. The study was expected to produce recommendations for harmonization and possible integration of treasury services and should include realistic scenarios for potential economies of scale and improved investment performance. For this reason, it would be essential for participants in the ASD meeting to have the necessary authority to consider and support/reject such recommendations.

102. The UN system-wide Financial Statistics Database project was launched, under the leadership of the CEB Secretariat and in close coordination with UN/DESA, with a needs assessment of stakeholders and data contributors. The identification of a technical solution for data collection was forecast for the end of 2011.

103. The WFP-led Working Group on Safety and Security Costs streamlined the UN/DSS budget proposal review process, allowing for due review process to take place at the levels of the Inter-Agency Security Management Network and the FB Network. As its next activity, the Working Group would address the security cost-sharing arrangements by looking at various cost-sharing options.

104. Finally, the FB Network reviewed the jointly financed budgets for the biennium 2012-2013 for JIU, ICSC and the CEB Secretariat, as well as the UN/DSS jointly financed activities for the UN Security Management System, as already reviewed and endorsed by the Inter-Agency Security Management Network.

The Committee:

105. Took note of the IPSAS progress report and of the external review of the system-wide project.

106. Approved the extension of the project team until the end of 2013, with corresponding resource requirements of \$1,502,000 for 2010-2011 and of \$1,896,000 for 2012-2013, and with strategic orientations and activities as approved by the FB Network.

107. Decided that continuation of the Task Force until 2015 would be subject to a review of the system-wide IPSAS related activities to be undertaken before the end of 2013. The review would reassess the way forward beyond 2013, including resources required and the issue of institutionalization of the Task Force.

108. Took note with appreciation of the update on the Network activities, particularly on the Common Treasury Services project, and looked forward to the completion of a detailed feasibility study, inclusive of the analysis for an accurate evaluation of the recommendations towards implementation. Member organizations also committed to provide the necessary support to the study at the necessary level, especially for the Accelerated Solution Design meeting to be held in April 2011.

109. Endorsed the 2012-2013 budgets of all jointly financed activities (UN/DSS jointly financed activities, CEB Secretariat, JIU and ICSC) at zero growth level, and utmost efforts will be made to absorb any re-costing adjustments through efficiencies.

#### **D) Information and communication technology**



##### **Documentation:**

##### **❖ 1 Summary sheet**

110. In late 2010, the ICT Network reviewed its work plan with the view to focus on a limited number of high-priority activities. The ICT Network Chair reported to the Committee on the status of three of these: information security, data communications and the ICT costing study. The Committee was also briefed on the status of other projects being pursued, including the introduction of Common Services, ERP Harmonization and the Common Directory.

111. The focus of the ICT Network in the area of information security was on the protection of internal computer systems from malicious actors. In this respect the Network was pursuing the development of a system-wide approach to awareness, a coherent response capability as well as harmonized policies and standards. The Committee was informed that ITU was organizing a conference to convene ICT security experts and practitioners to advance the ICT security agenda.

112. The ICT Network Chair recounted how this became an important issue for the Network as organizations had experienced a recent rise in targeted cyber attacks. Due to the sensitive nature of such incidents, it was explained that statistics remained scarce while the threat remained ever present. It was noted that all personnel played a role and training provided one line of defence against common infringements including viruses, spam and phishing. An uneven distribution of security resources across organizations set against an equally measured threat against them all raised the need for funding.

113. The second priority area for the Network was implementing the recommendations from the data communications study, which encompassed four activities; country-level shared network, a UN system core gateway, common procurement and communication standards.

114. The ICT Network Chair briefed the Committee on progress made implementing recommendations that reduce cost and increase capacity. The country-level shared network initiative sought to achieve economies at the country level by avoiding duplication of communication services in selected countries. The core gateway project was intended to connect together existing agency global networks, which could result in reduced communication costs.

115. The UN Secretariat, as part of its process to improve global communication services, was about to distribute a tender for a communication service known as MPLS. For the UN Secretariat, MPLS intended to reduce the number of point-to-point locations, reducing cost and increasing capacity. Several agencies agreed to either join in the procurement exercise or were observing it very closely and included their sites within the terms of the request for proposal. The idea was to negotiate for a global contract that would benefit all agencies interested in using this service, which included most of the development-oriented agencies. Advantages foreseen from this project included the interconnection of telephone and video call services between agencies at almost no cost as well as the secure sharing of organizations' communications services.

116. Few agencies were seen to have a firm grasp on their entire ICT expenditure, due in large part to the decentralized and non-standardized way ICT expenses are captured. Led by UNODC, the ICT Costing Study (funded through the HBP initiative) was set to develop and implement a standardized mechanism for agencies to calculate their total cost of ICT services. The purpose was to develop a shared set of ICT benchmarks, which would enable a comparison of ICT investments between and within organizations as a percentage of total investment and ultimately allow organizations to better manage and govern their ICT operations. During the discussion, the role of high-level and inter-agency support was highlighted as playing a critical role in the successful deployment of technical solutions. A number of agencies expressed interest in participating in the next phase of the project, including ITU, WMO, ICAO and WFP.

117. The Committee was informed that the Joint Inspection Unit intended to conduct a study on ICT governance in the UN system. The ICT Network would work closely with the inspectors on this study and looked forward to a valuable report on this critical subject.

118. Highlighting the relevance of these projects to emerging priorities under discussion, including the need cost efficiency, modernization of practices and improved transparency, HLCM took note with appreciation of the report on the status of the activities of the ICT Network and encouraged all organizations to participate in priority activities of the Network.

## VIII. Social Media and the UN System



### Documentation:

- *CEB/2011/HLCM/10/Rev.1 – Briefing note by the CEB Secretariat on issues faced by organizations when utilizing social media services, and on the specific experience of the UN System*
- ❖ *1 Summary sheet*

119. During its previous session, the HLCM had requested the CEB Secretariat to organize a discussion “on social networking tools, including the legal, technical and public relations aspects of their use and relevant agencies' experiences”. The Committee had before it a briefing note summarizing some of the challenges currently being faced by organizations.

120. While social media have witnessed a significant uptake by UN system organizations, findings suggested that advances have occurred despite an incomplete understanding of all the risks, or potential uses of these tools.

121. The briefing note suggested some possible modalities for HLCM to address, jointly with all relevant stakeholders, some of the issues raised in the note, including the need to collectively identify a vision for the future. Concrete outputs of this proposed process included harmonized social media principles, policies and guidelines.

122. The topic was introduced by expert speakers, who provided an external and institutional perspective and understanding of the opportunities and issues raised within a UN context. Robert Kirkpatrick (Director of Global Pulse) and John Crowley (Coordinator of the Crisis Dynamics Research at the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative) introduced the topic of social media, with reference to its crucial role supporting the Haiti emergency response and highlighted the need, for the UN system, to play a catalytic role in its continued evolution. Stephen Mathias, ASG for Legal Affairs, UN Secretariat, presented the legal issues that surround social media's adoption within the UN. The legal perspective raised concerns about agreements that organizations must sign on to in order to use many new media platforms, some of which contradict key principles of UN immunities. In this respect, OLA recommended that the UN system develop a communications policy for the use of social media, taking into account, inter alia, legal concerns. This would facilitate the subsequent negotiation of agreements with the social media sites, including potentially collectively by the entities of the UN system.

123. Presentations from practitioners underlined that social media was not about technology, but rather achieving real-time awareness, interactive engagement with stakeholders, and building social capital inside and outside of the UN system. Adoption of social media tools so far by the UN system was seen as only "scratching the surface" of their potential. Emphasis was placed instead on the need to integrate these tools into planning, executing, and evaluating organizations' work.

124. Recognizing that in the years ahead the UN must learn to do more with less and deliver as one with agility, openness and transparency, it was proposed that focus now be placed on how to leverage its reach and convening power and act as a catalyst for collective action. Social media were described as the tools for making this happen. In turn, social media practices required due consideration to linkages with communication, human resource, legal, privacy and ethical policies.

125. Insights from the key speakers were then discussed by HLCM members, who also recounted their own organization's experiences. Tension was noted between the need to balance the needs of new information flows (associated with social media and other sources) with the structure of the UN itself.

126. Many HLCM organizations expressed the need to look beyond initial steps already taken and tap into the potential of new approaches for engaging the world with the work of the UN system. In acknowledgement of the potential cost-savings and the ability to leverage goodwill, they highlighted the risk of management overlooking the importance of new practices, not recognizing the need to change but instead embrace the opportunities presented by social media. Leveraging advantages, such as increased transparency and accountability were also seen as a means for the UN system to shed its traditionally closed and bureaucratic image.

127. The Committee expressed appreciation for the presentations and tasked the CEB Secretariat to reach out to relevant parties and stakeholders, particularly the UN Communication Group, and including legal representatives, to facilitate the sharing of best practices and approaches to common challenges.

## IX. Any other business

### A) Auditing as One - Concept paper for auditing Delivering as One programmes



#### Documentation:

- *Concept paper for auditing Delivering as One programmes*

128. The Representative of the Internal Audit Services of UN Organizations (UN-RIAS), Mr. Craig Nordby of UNESCO, presented the concept note for an "Auditing as One" initiative endorsed at their most recent virtual meeting. The note, prepared by UNDP on behalf of the UN-RIAS members, was highlighted as a proposed approach for joint audits of Delivering as One programmes. The first pilot audit was planned for the 4th quarter of 2011. Tanzania had been envisaged as the location for the pilot audit.

129. HLCM thanked UN-RIAS for the update, took note of the concept paper and asked to be kept informed on further developments on the subject of auditing Delivering as One programmes.

### B) Medical Directors Working Group



#### Documentation:

- ❖ *I Summary sheet*

130. The Representative of the Medical Directors Working Group, Dr Brian Davey of the UN Secretariat, presented an update regarding the implementation of Working Group's proposals regarding Emergency Medical Preparedness in the UN System.

131. The United Nations Medical Emergency Response Team (UNMERT) concept was fully operational and an UNMERT team was successfully deployed in response to the earthquake in Haiti. Progress in the area of emergency medical response was closely linked to the new initiative of the USG Department of Management, the Emergency Preparedness and Support Team (EPST), recently approved and at this time temporarily funded by the General Assembly. Medical aspects of the EPST initiative would be reviewed, including feedback on inter-agency training already completed, and planned for the balance of 2011.

132. The Committee was also briefed on associated efforts of the Medical Directors to harmonize system-wide policy and approach to healthcare issues, including professional medical ethics, medical confidentiality, and minimum standards of medical care for UN system staff.

133. The Committee acknowledged with appreciation the work undertaken by the Medical Directors as a significant step towards an improved UN capacity to prepare for, respond to, and follow up after medical emergencies and mass casualty events.

## ANNEX I – PROVISIONAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Chairperson:** Ms. Josette Sheeran, WFP  
**Vice-Chair:** Ms. Jan Beagle, UNAIDS  
**HLCM Secretary:** Mr. Remo Lalli, CEB Secretariat

Organization	Name – Title – Division
<b>United Nations</b>	Ms. Angela Kane, USG, Department of Management
	Mr. Gregory Starr, USG, Department of Safety and Security
	Ms. Catherine Pollard, ASG, Office of Human Resources Management
	Mr. Stephen Mathias, ASG, Legal Affairs
	Mr. Jay Karia, Deputy Controller, and Co-Chair of the FB Network
	Mr. Brian Davey, Director, Medical Services Division, and Medical Directors WG Spokesperson
	Ms. Ruth de Miranda, Chief, Human Resources Policy Service & HR Network Spokesperson
	Ms. Anne Marie Pinou, Special Assistant to the USG for Safety and Security, and Secretary of IASMN
<b>UNJSPF</b>	Mr. Bernard Cochemé, CEO
<b>FAO</b>	Mr. Manoj Juneja, ADG, Corporate Services, Human Resources & Finance Department
<b>UNESCO</b>	Mrs. Khadija Zammouri-Ribes, ADG of the Administration Sector
	Mr. Jean Yves Le-Saux, Director, Bureau for Strategic Planning & Co-Chair of UNDG Joint Funding and Business Operations Network
	Mrs. Ana-Luiza Thompson-Flores, Director a.i., Bureau of HR Management
	Mrs. Dominique Notari, Deputy Director of the Bureau of Financial Management & Treasurer
	Mr. Michael Cora, Director, Procurement Division
	Mr. John Haigh, Chief Accountant
	Mr. Craig Nordby, Head of Internal Audit
	Mrs. Magdalena Landry, Field Security Coordinator
	Ms. Helen Assefa, Senior Executive Officer
<b>WHO</b>	Mr. Mohamed Jama, ADG, General Management
	Ms. Nicole Krüger, Management Officer
<b>ICAO</b>	Ms. Fang Liu, Director, Bureau of Administration and Services
<b>World Bank</b>	Mr. Carl Wessmann, Acting Director, General Services Department
	Mr. Robert Simpson, Global Security Operations Coordinator
<b>IMF</b>	Mr. Frank Harnischfeger, Director, Technology and General Services Department
<b>UPU</b>	Mr. Pascal-Thierry Clivaz, Director of Finance and Strategy
<b>ITU</b>	Ms. Julia S. Watt, Chief, Human Resources Branch, Administration and Finance Department

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name – Title – Division</b>
<b>WMO</b>	<b>Mr. Joachim Müller</b> , Director, Resource Management Department
<b>IMO</b>	<b>Mr. Andrew Winbow</b> , Director, Administrative Division
<b>WIPO</b>	<b>Mr. Ambi Sundaram</b> , Assistant Director-General, Administration and Management
<b>IFAD</b>	<b>Mr. Pierre-Justin Kouka</b> , Acting Director, Human Resources Division
<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>Ms. Hui Sui</b> , Managing Director, Programme Support and General Management Division
	<b>Mr. Sarwar Hobohm</b> , Director, Office of the Director-General
<b>UNWTO</b>	<b>Mr. José G. Blanch</b> , Director, Administration Division
<b>IAEA</b>	<b>Ms. Catherine Monzel</b> , Head, Recruitment and Staff Development, Division of Human Resources
<b>UNAIDS</b>	<b>Ms. Jan Beagle</b> , Deputy Executive Director, Management and External Relations and HLCM Vice-Chair and Co-Chair of UNDG Working Group on RC System Issues
	<b>Ms. Helena Eversole</b> , Director, Organizational Development Department
<b>UNDP</b>	<b>Ms. Akiko Yuge</b> , Assistant Administrator and Director of Bureau of Management (BOM)
	<b>Ms. Irina Stavenscaia Botezatu</b> , Planning Advisor, BOM
<b>UNICEF</b>	<b>Ms. Hilde Johnson</b> , Deputy Executive Director ( <i>by videoconference</i> )
	<b>Mr. Martin Mogwanja</b> , Deputy Executive Director
	<b>Mr. Ashok Nigam</b> , Associate Director, Governance, UN and Multilateral Affairs
	<b>Ms. Shanelle Hall</b> , Director, Procurement, and Chair of the Procurement Network
<b>WFP</b>	<b>Ms. Josette Sheeran</b> , Executive Director and HLCM Chair
	<b>Ms. Gina Casar</b> , Deputy Executive Director & Chief Financial Officer, Resource Mgt Accountability
	<b>Mr. Robert Opp</b> , Director, Business Innovation & Support
	<b>Ms. Rebecca Richards</b> , Special Assistant
<b>UNFPA</b>	<b>Ms. Mari Simonen</b> , Deputy Executive Director, and Co-Chair of the UNDG Joint Funding and Business Operations Network
<b>UNRWA</b>	<b>Ms. Laura Londén</b> , Director of Administrative Support
<b>UNHCR</b>	<b>Mr. T. Alexander Aleinikoff</b> , Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees
<b>UN-HABITAT</b>	<b>Mr. Antoine King</b> , Director, Programme Support Division
<b>UNOV/UNODC</b>	<b>Mr. Dennis Thatchaichawalit</b> , Director, Division for Management, UNOV and UNODC
<b>UNEP</b>	<b>Mr. Paul Akiwumi</b> , Chief, Executive Office, Chef-de-Cabinet
<b>UNCTAD</b>	<b>Mr. Angelo Galindo</b> , Chief, Resources Management Service
<b>ITC</b>	<b>Ms. Eva K. Murray</b> , Director, Division of Programme Support
<b>UNOPS</b>	<b>Mr. Vitaly Vanshelboim</b> , Deputy Executive Director
<b>UNSSC</b>	<b>Mr. Paolo Ceratto</b> , Deputy Director, Administration
<b>UNWOMEN</b>	<b>Mr. Moez Doraid</b> , Officer-in-Charge, Division of Management and Administration

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name – Title – Division</b>
	<b>Ms. Sonia Urriza</b> , Chief, Human Resources Centre
<b>ICSC</b>	<b>Mr. Wolfgang Stoeckl</b> , Vice-Chairman
<b>FICSA</b>	<b>Mr. Mauro Pace</b> , President
	<b>Ms. Marie-Thérèse Conilh de Beyssac</b> , President of the UNESCO Staff Union
<b>UNISERV</b>	<b>Mr. Dimitri Samara</b> , President
	<b>Mr. Jean-Luc Sintès</b> , Secretary General
	<b>Mr. Stephan Flaetgen</b> , Vice-President, Staff Council
<b>CCISUA</b>	<b>Mr. Stefano Berterame</b> , Vice President
	<b>Mr. Sidiki Coulibaly</b> , President of UNESCO International Staff Association Union, member of CCISUA
<b>WTO</b>	<b>Ms. Mira Bancelj</b> , Human Resources Division
<b>CTBTO</b>	<b>Mr. Sylwin Gizowski</b> , Acting Director, Division of Administration
<b>CEB Secretary</b>	<b>Mr. Thomas Stelzer</b> , ASG, Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs, United Nations
<b>CEB Secretariat</b>	<b>Mr. Remo Lalli</b> , Secretary, HLCCM
	<b>Ms. Marta Lechner-Boyce</b> , Snr. Inter-Agency Advisor on HR Management
	<b>Mr. Ronny Lindstrom</b> , Senior Business Practices Adviser
	<b>Mr. Richard Maciver</b> , ICT Specialist and Webmaster
<b>UN Global Pulse</b>	<b>Mr. Robert Kirkpatrick</b> , Director
<b>Harvard Humanitarian Initiative</b>	<b>Mr. John Crowley</b> , Crisis Dynamics Research Coordinator
<b>Department for International Development (DFID)</b>	<b>Mr. Anthony Smith</b> , Director International Relations
	<b>Ms. Sarah Boulton</b> , International Directors' Office

**ANNEX II – CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS**

Title	Document Symbol
Revised Provisional Agenda	CEB/2011/HLCM/1/Rev.3
Revised Provisional Programme of Work	CEB/2011/HLCM/1/Add.1/Rev.1
Dialogue with the Staff Federations: Proposed ToR	CEB/2011/HLCM/11
Programme Criticality - status report from the Working Group	CEB/2011/HLCM/4
Report of the IASMN January 2011 - Interim policies	CEB/2011/HLCM/2/Rev.1
Report on HR implications related to operationalization of the new Security Level System (SLS)	CEB/2011/HLCM/3
Mandatory Age of Separation - Presentation by the CEO, UNJSPF	CEB/2011/HLCM/5
HLCM Proposed Programme of Work	CEB/2011/HLCM/6
Joint Funding and Business Operations Network - programme of work	-
Human Resources: ToR of the Study on “non-staff personnel”	CEB/2011/HLCM/7
Model Policy Framework (MPF) for determining vendor eligibility	CEB/2011/HLCM/8
Draft Approach to Collaborative Procurement by HLCM Procurement Network	-
Letter from ITU Secretary-General on Procurement matter	dated 28 February 2011
IPSAS Progress Report and Results of the External Review	CEB/2011/HLCM/9
Social Media and the UN System	CEB/2011/HLCM/10
Auditing as one - concept paper for auditing Delivering as One programmes	-

### ANNEX III – STATEMENT BY FICSA

FICSA is coming to this session of the HLCM with the expectations that it will represent a significant turning point in the ongoing evolution of staff/management relations.

Last year, we came back from the twentieth session in Washington deeply disappointed by the utter silence our questions were met with. Since then, some encouraging initial steps have been taken to modify the terms of our dialogue. Therefore, we are here today to express our availability to contribute to this process, firmly convinced that the end result will benefit the entire UN system.

FICSA participated in the HLCM videoconference with staff federations and the CEB secretariat on 19 November 2010. The purpose of the meeting was to engage in an effort towards improved dialogue with HLCM. You have the official report prepared by the CEB secretariat, which focuses on the procedural aspects of establishing a discussion and proposing terms of reference to govern a dialogue.

FICSA took the opportunity of the videoconference to speak openly and frankly about its frustrations with the dialogue element of your agenda. FICSA does not consider the silence we were faced with at the latest HLCM sessions - most notably in Turin and Washington - to be a result of a procedural or operational flaw in the way HLCM organizes its meetings. In our opinion, the root cause of such silence has to be found in a certain reluctance to engage with staff; a joint effort to build trust shall address the problem and set the scene for its resolution.

A lot has already been said and written on this subject. For example, the introduction to the UN Handbook on Competencies (2009) has this to say:

*“In ‘Building the Future’, the Secretary-General has indicated that the Organization’s greatest strength—and the key to our success—is the quality of our staff and managers. He has stressed that, to capitalize on this strength, we need to create an organizational culture and environment that enables staff to contribute to their maximum potential.*

*“Experience in other organizations has shown that when seeking to create a new culture and build human resources capacity for the future, it is important to define organizational core competencies—the combination of skills, attributes and behaviours which are essential for all staff—as well as the additional managerial competencies required by all those who manage others. Once organizational competencies have been defined, they can be used as a base on which to build and strengthen other human resources systems such as recruitment, placement, development and performance appraisal.”*

Teamwork has been identified as a core competency required by all staff and managers. In addition, six competencies have been identified specifically for managers. These are: Leadership, Vision, Empowering others, Building trust, Managing performance and Judgment/decision-making.

While fully realizing the extent of the responsibilities placed on your collective shoulders, and the extreme limits placed on your time, FICSA would like to see this forum as an expression of two of those competencies, namely, empowering others and building trust. Your leadership would also be appreciated, in engaging staff in open and frank discourse.

FICSA welcomes its participation in the HR Network and its sub-machinery such as task forces and working groups. A great deal of our membership’s contributions are spent on participating in these meetings and putting forward the positions of staff. Many times, we reach consensus on issues at the Network, only to have the recommendations rejected by HLCM.

This is one of the reasons that FICSA considers it important to speak with you at HLCM, to explain our thinking, and listen to yours. Perhaps we would even understand your positions and decisions, if only they were communicated to us.

FICSA believes that our effort for improved dialogue has to look into the style of governance of our organizations, as outlined in the ICSC Framework for Human Resources Management, which quotes: *“The concept of good governance relates to management styles and relations. It is applied to all decisions taken by senior managers and the impact of those decisions on various stakeholder groups. It embraces accountability, transparency, communication, participation, teamwork (there’s that word again), consultation, staff morale, multiculturalism, commitment to the organization and loyalty. Good governance, in addition to empowering staff to participate in decision affecting the organization, also has an impact on all aspects of conditions of service.”*

This is to say that the principles we are expected to uphold have been defined and accepted in many fora: we have now an opportunity to turn them into a concrete reality.

Efficient staff representation is a fundamental component of true and effective dialogue. However, this is an area where we are assisting at a progressive deterioration, both at local and federative level.

The recently concluded 64<sup>th</sup> session of the FICSA Council was apprised that in some organizations facilities and time release for staff representation are being reduced - allegedly in response to budget constraints (which is an item on your agenda that unfortunately we will not be allowed to attend at this session).

Turning to the release of FICSA officers, I believe you are all aware of the difficulties the Federation has experienced this past year. Our General Secretary worked for free the last year of her mandate since, following the rejection of the HR Network proposal for cost-sharing in Turin, any attempt to find a satisfactory solution failed, due to lack of sufficient attention or to a persistent attitude to postpone a concrete discussion on the matter.

Not surprisingly, as we warned at the HLCM in Washington, the problem is not going to fade away; on the contrary, it is now escalating. Today, FICSA is operating in the absence of a General Secretary since the latest Council was unable to identify candidates who could provide proof of the required agreement to paid full-time release and relocation to Geneva and remunerated at the Geneva rate. In accordance with our Statutes and Rules of Procedure, we have initiated a procedure to run by-elections through a postal vote. The deadline for candidates is 28 March 2011. This situation is putting the operational ability of our secretariat in Geneva in an unsustainable condition. Our plea to you is to take the necessary measures to enable the timely submission of qualified candidates.

FICSA needs to be able to elect its officers freely from its entire membership. To do so, we need the renewed commitment of the highest level of management of FICSA member organizations to release and fully fund our two main officers: the President and the General Secretary.

We have made a number of proposals over the years: a common fund for staff representative bodies, cost-sharing, individual organizations carrying the full costs; a USD 1 default deduction on every staff member each month to cover staff representation costs, etc. However, we remain back in 1980s when, in 1984, CCAQ agreed to the full release of the two principal officers funded by their releasing organization, or by an ad hoc cost-sharing arrangement. We have proposed a task force to look at this situation, we have presented what we thought was a business case, we have shared our budget with you in full transparency: all to no avail.

We would very sincerely appreciate your urgent attention to this issue.

I would like to conclude by briefly anticipating our position on some other agenda items.

Concerning item 3 and the relevant sub-items, we maintain our interest and commitment to cooperate in the field of safety and security of our colleagues serving under hazardous conditions. Unfortunately the recent social unrest in Middle East and North Africa constituted an immediate test case for the recently introduced Security Level System. We look forward to attending the relevant discussion to discuss on the lessons learned, as FICSA is receiving mixed messages and signs of concern, particularly on the system's responsiveness for local staff.

As for the review of the mandatory age of separation, FICSA participated in the videoconferences on this subject and will continue to provide its input in the HLCM working group. For the time being, we are still in the fact-finding stage and it is not clear to us what direction the discussions are taking. For FICSA, the situation is quite straight forward: the determination of the mandatory age of separation needs to be part of an overall strategic approach to staffing and human resources management. We shall expand our views on the matter under agenda item 4.

Finally, under item 7A, we shall attend for the first time the briefing on the HR Network and ICSC main areas of activities: grading, classification, performance appraisal and contractual arrangements are all matters directly impacting on our conditions of employment. Other matters, such as the identification of the highest paid civil service under the Noblemaire principle and the adoption of revised methodologies for salary surveys applicable to locally recruited staff, are also issues of primary concern. FICSA is alarmed by the climate created by global financial crisis, which may call for undue reactions based on perceptions more than hard fact. We are also calling your attention to the procedural inconsistencies resulting from different survey procedures envisaged under the proposed methodology I, a matter that the HLCM/HR Network may wish to consider in detail.

## ANNEX IV – STATEMENT BY CCISUA

Madame Chair, ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by thanking HLCM for once again giving CCISUA the opportunity to speak with you. We are also grateful that since the last session a discussion has begun between the HLCM Secretariat and the Staff Federations on what a true “dialogue” would look like. We view the terms of reference which have been developed as only the “beginning of the beginning” to misquote Winston Churchill. CCISUA believes that nothing less than full inclusion in HLCM will be satisfactory, because, as we have said before, staff are involved in and will be ultimately responsible for implementing, everything that is discussed and agreed in HLCM. However, we are glad to note that more of the HLCM session is now open to the Staff Federations. The arrangements for this session, therefore, while not being in our view “the absolute best”, represent a big step in the right direction.

I would like to take a few minutes now to now to flag one or two items on your agenda which are currently occupying the minds of staff.

### **Staff Security**

The first, as usual, is **staff security**. Madame Chair, as you know CCISUA represents a large number of staff in the field, thus staff security is always at the top of our agenda. At this time, we wish convey loud and clear our concern with the situation in the Middle East/North Africa and its potential impact on staff.

We have noted the attention and swift action for international UN staff in the countries affected. We have had occasion to remind this meeting in the past, however, about the unequal treatment of national staff, and the lack of protection for them in the question of evacuation and other security provisions. The current situation reawakens our fears. We have been in close touch with DSS in the past few weeks, and it has appeared to us that there is less focus, less information even, in the matter of national staff. This many years after the Brahimi report, we had hoped for better. The UN *must* change this *modus operandi*. All UN staff regardless of grade, level or place of recruitment must be protected by the organisation.

Recently the Secretary-General publicly condemned the Libyan leader and government for launching attacks on the Libyan people. We appreciate that the Secretary-General must speak out in a situation such as this, and we have no comment on the merits or the content of the speech. We hope, however, that the organization made sufficient assessment of and provision for any potential negative impact for locally recruited UN staff still remaining in Libya. On the 2nd of March, major press agencies ran stories that the UN had called for mass evacuations of Libyan people, yet we understand that UN staff of Libyan nationality still remain in the country. This appears somewhat paradoxical to us in CCISUA.

We, along with the rest of the world, are concerned that the risk of the spread of civil unrest in this region is extremely high. Without wishing to compromise any security arrangements DSS may have made, we call for urgent dialogue between management and the staff federations in the matter of a workable plan and protocol concerning the UN locally recruited staff. The Organization must prepare for, and to the extent we can, prevent the eventuality of UN staff being attacked, driven from their homes, or in the worst case scenario, killed, simply due to the employment contract they hold.

We would like to comment one other security concern. At the most recent IASMN meeting hosted in UNICEF New York, the subject of the use of private security companies for UN operations was raised. As we voiced in the IASMN meeting, CCISUA does not agree with this proposal. We reiterate that if operations cannot be conducted with UN Security staff, the military from contributing Member States or the national security forces, then UN staff should not be deployed in those areas. The UN’s decision should not be “when to stay”, but “*whether* to stay”. We believe that the use of private security contractors would carry a higher risk to UN staff, opening them to the possibility of public anger or retaliatory violence through no fault or action of their own. A private security contractor would have unknown principles or accountabilities and could, for example, employ

mercenaries, or people who have been involved in war crimes. We trust that this and every proposal which concerns staff security is carefully scrutinized for all possible ramifications for staff before a decision is made.

On a much more positive note, CCISUA would like to express appreciation for the improvement in direct communication lines with DSS. Our representatives now have direct channels to relay concerns and to receive information on security and safety throughout the UN's global operations. This is indeed helpful to allay the fears our members have about their fellow staff members in crisis situations.

### **Mandatory Age of Separation**

Madame chair, we await the presentation from the Pension Fund, and note that the participants' representatives to the Pension Fund and the General Assembly delegates have by and large considered it prudent to review the retirement age provisions. In this they have recognized: (a) the worldwide trends on increases in the retirement age taking note of increasing longevity; (b) the trend that the differential between the years worked at the UN and the retirement years will continue to increase for the UN staff—a demographic whose life expectancy is one of the highest in the world; (c) the potential positive impact on the financial position of the Fund; and (d) that this would keep pace with similarly placed funds. At a time when national governments are increasing, or eliminating their retirement age, this move in the UN would certainly be understood by the Member States.

We also understand that some of our organizations do not think that normal retirement age should be increased as it would negatively impact the UN's efforts to rejuvenate the system. In plain English, the people you would like to go are the ones who will stick around much too long. We wonder, though, what should be the uppermost consideration in the increase of the normal age of retirement: human resources concerns, or the needs of the Fund? We also wonder whether some organizations are looking at retirement to solve a performance management problem they might have. It might be easier to wait out someone who is not performing rather than bite the bullet and do a real review of that person, or worse still, take the corrective and coaching measures needed to help him/her once again be a top performer. A golden handshake may be easier for some managers to contemplate.

We await the thorough review that is to take place, and do not mind revealing that, though we have done no scientific study, by and large staff seem supportive of a hike in the retirement age. Of course it goes without saying that the closer you are to the mandatory age of separation, the more supportive you tend to be. However we believe that our position will remain the same as we have reiterated to you in the past: that should the normal age of retirement increase, it should be without prejudice to the acquired rights of those who are currently in the system to retire with full benefits at 60 or 62.

### **Contractual arrangements and harmonization of conditions of service in non-family duty stations**

In December the General Assembly's resolutions on continuing contracts and on harmonization dealt a blow to a number of our members. We deplore the fact that our colleagues in ICTY and ICTR have been expressly excluded from consideration for continuing contracts. In addition, although they had agreement in SMCC on their inclusion for consideration for permanent contracts in the one-time review, they seem to be effectively excluded, in that so far no such contracts have been awarded to them. The General Assembly has also deferred to the distant future the consideration for separation payments for staff on fixed term assignments. At the same time, we do not have assurances that these capable, long-serving, hardworking, and dedicated staff members are to be considered internal candidates for UN vacancies. So they have lost on the swings, they have lost on the roundabouts, and they are being thrown out of the fair for good measure. We appeal to the Secretary General to use his good offices and to the HLCM to make the utmost effort to help our staff in ICTY and ICTR.

Other staff, especially those in the Secretariat bodies, while being grateful that continuing contracts are finally in the staff rules, find themselves with scarcely more to celebrate. There is a great deal of disappointment at the fact that the continuing contract, which should have replaced and bettered the permanent contract by covering a larger cross-section of staff, in fact remains extremely limited. For the Funds and Programmes, according to the

Secretary-General's proposal in A/65/305/Add.1, they "...will continue to have flexibility in the implementation of the new continuing appointment in regard to their own staff, taking into account their respective operational needs, as long as their use of the continuing appointment is in accordance with the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations." We trust that these organizations will apply this flexibility in the interest of staff. For organizations represented here which use the UN's staff rules as a model, we remind you that continuing contracts are now in the rules and can also be modelled in your organizations.

On harmonization, we are ready to concede that we and some of our organizations fought as hard as we could have but did not prevail. We are however grateful for the fact that the axe has been stayed for a year or two, and we look forward to the ICSC's measures to mitigate the impact somewhat in the meanwhile. We are deeply disappointed in the provisions related to rest and recuperation. In fact to sum up, this whole situation is one in which the "undo" button would be extremely welcome.

**Finally...**

Madame Chair, let me end by thanking you again for the opportunity to address this gathering, and to remain for some agenda items. We will maintain our commitment to work with the different parts of the CEB to foster a better environment for staff.

## ANNEX V – STATEMENT BY UNISERV

We gather today for the twenty-first session of the High Level Committee on Management, and we see ourselves compelled to admit an unfortunate truth : although the United Nations is considered all over the world to be at the forefront in defending human rights and fighting against discrimination, the Organization seems to be still in the nineteenth, or even the eighteenth century, with regard to dialogue with the representative bodies of United Nations staff members.

As a matter of fact, I have to ask you a straight forward question: do you believe, truly and wholeheartedly, that the prevailing lack of dialogue would be possible in any of the democracies you come from ? I am confident that your genuine, true and honest question will be a resounding no.

The current situation is demotivating. Nevertheless, let us be hopeful, move forward and try to see the light at the end of the tunnel.

Just today, in the light of this agenda, we all have a historical opportunity (if I could allow myself to use this expression which is somehow a cliché) to put an end to those mistakes made during the last decades. The theme of our meeting clearly reads, «Dialogue between United Nations Secretary-Generals and Staff Federations ».

Therefore, it is a unique moment which may never come up again:  
After the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) decided in December 2008, upon the recommendation of Under-Secretary General for Management, Ms. Angela Kane, and a number of staff representative bodies, to include in its programme a report on staff-management relations in the United Nations. Today you have a unique opportunity to write a new page in the history of social dialogue in the United Nations.

I hereby call upon you to seize this opportunity for the benefit of us all; future generations will remember your action today, and they will be grateful to you.

This shall be our the main concern of UNISERV during this meeting, as all other matters shall depend on it. For now, however, let me say a few words about the extention of the retirement age:

Due to economic and demographic prevailing conditions, and in reference to established practices in all western democracies, we consider the extention of the retirement age to sixty-five at least to be necessary and inevitable.

If need be, we will discuss our position and shed light on the matter with representatives of the Pension Fund.

Finally, a few words about Security: it is such a serious matter that needs to be dealt with by professionals.

We are delighted to see this item on the HLCM agenda today, as our Federation has suggested in the past.

Furthermore, there is no doubt that an increase in information exchange is possible and desirable. In all cases, you may always rely on UNISERV support for any initiative aimed at enhancing the security of our staff ... and how could it be otherwise when we talk about human lives?

Ms. Chairperson, honorable Secretary-Generals, distinguished Directors and colleagues, let me express to you how grateful I am for your kind attention.