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Introduction

1. The High Level Committee on Management held its twenty-third session on 15-16 March 2012 in Madrid, hosted by the World Tourism Organization. The meeting was chaired by the Committee’s Vice-Chair, Ms. Jan Beagle, UNAIDS Deputy Executive Director.

2. The Committee was welcomed by Mr. Taleb Rifai, Secretary General of the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). He noted that the UNWTO is one of the latest additions to the UN system and was very happy to host the meeting. He emphasized the importance of synergies among the organizations of the system, which needs to strategize and deliver in an integrated manner, while still preserving the advantages and core competencies of individual organizations. Mr. Rifai further stressed the importance of the work of HLCM to address one of the major challenges for the UN system: how to remain relevant. Delivering as one is key to successfully address the challenge of relevance, as it is the perception of the outside world about the UN system’s commitment towards such objective.

3. The Committee was then addressed via teleconference by its outgoing Chair, Ms. Josette Sheeran, WFP Executive Director. She said she would have loved nothing more than to be there with everyone, but as she was on the last weeks of her term, that was simply not possible. She thanked the Committee for its work during her tenure, emphasizing the importance of HLCM towards building a stronger United Nations, increasing its credibility and its ability to help those who need it most. She stressed how the work of HLCM, sometimes not so visible to the outside world, provides the backbone for building a more effective, efficient and transparent UN System. In this respect, Ms. Sheeran underlined the importance of the Secretary General’s change management agenda as a critical initiative which the work of HLCM would have to feed into.

4. Ms. Sheeran concluded by entrusting the Committee to move ahead on the range of critical issues under its consideration, and by thanking the HLCM Vice-Chair for her knowledgeable and insightful advice and support during the course of her entire tenure – she had been an invaluable asset in promoting the broad-ranging management reforms that are needed to ensure all HLCM member organizations serve their missions as effectively and efficiently as possible.

5. The Vice-Chair thanked Ms. Sheeran and noted that, since her first session as HLCM Chair in February 2009, she had led the Committee with great energy and commitment, very conscious of the importance of the work of HLCM in making the UN system more effective and efficient in achieving results. She wished her well in her new functions with the World Economic Forum.

6. Before opening the session, the Vice-Chair expressed appreciation to the Spanish Authorities for the generous welcome that they had reserved to HLCM. She thanked the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, Sr. Gonzalo de Benito, for the nice welcoming reception at the Palacio de Viana, and the Visitors and Conventions Bureau of the City of Madrid for the attractive activities and events that had been offered for HLCM members.
I. Adoption of the agenda and programme of work

Documentation:
- CEB/2012/HLCM/1 – Provisional Agenda
- CEB/2012/HLCM/1/Add.1 – Programme of work
- Checklist of Documents

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

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

9. The checklist of documents is in Annex II. The Statement by FICSA is in Annex III; the statement by CCISUA is in Annex IV. All documents related to the session are available on the CEB website at: http://www.unsceb.org/ceb/mtg/hlc/march-2012/

II. Dialogue with the Staff Federations

Documentation:
- Statements: CCISUA & FICSA

10. The Staff Federations and HLCM entertained a “dialogue” around all the items scheduled in the regular agenda for the first day (items one through five). The “dialogue” therefore took place during the actual discussions, with interventions by the Federations on all agenda items where they wished that their views be considered.

11. One of the key messages put forward in the introduction of the “dialogue” by the Federations was that the staff and the organizations, while appreciating the difficulties of the current financial environments, were reaching the limit of how much is being asked to be done with less resources. The Federations also stressed the importance of working on reinforcing the trust and confidence of the outside world in the United Nations, and in engaging staff and improving working methods. The full statements prepared by the Staff Federations are annexed to the present report.

III. Security and Safety of Staff

Documentation:
- CEB/2012/HLCM/3 – New Policies adopted by IASMN

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

12. Emphasizing the inter-agency character of the UN Security Management System (UNSMS) and the pivotal role of the Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) in formulating policy for safety and security in the UN system, the Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security (DSS) informed HLCM members that security had become an increasingly difficult issue for many places in the world for the UN system. Despite the fact that the past two years have presented many challenges for the Agencies, Funds and Programmes that went far beyond only budgetary challenges, there were still many questions from Executive Heads as to why so much security is needed. But it was clear that
the UN no longer serves only in places plagued by insecurity and crime or in post-conflict environments, and that it is increasingly being asked to stay in areas of conflict which present challenges that must be balanced with a responsibility to personnel.

13. The USG stressed that while he is a great proponent of due diligence, it nevertheless must be understood that the UN is being targeted even when carrying out development and humanitarian programmes, as evidenced in Abuja. What is needed therefore is a culture change in the UN as it begins to understand the threats and risks it faces. At present, there are tremendous concerns about the entire Sahel region where recently teams had been sent to review facilities. In this regard, the USG urged that the resulting DSS’ recommendations to Designated Officials and country focal points not be ignored.

14. The USG described some of the achievements of the UNSMS in the last year, including the abolition of the security phase system, the change to the ‘how to stay’ paradigm and the implementation of the security level system (SLS) which allows for threats to be analysed, and the development of a more robust threat analysis programme. He stressed that the SLS did not replace the phase system but was part of one approach that allows the analysis and rating of the threats globally using common criteria, aiding in prioritizing where security funding is applied. He then reminded HLCM members that the UNSMS is a jointly funded security system with the organizations providing about half the funding for the system and pointed out that DSS was running less than a 2% vacancy rate against the 2010-2011 biennium budget.

15. Making the point that DSS is not a national government security entity but rather a structure focused only on the security of UN system personnel, premises and assets, there is a reliance on Member States to provide protection. As such, greater threat and risk analysis, and a greater openness with Member States about the security situation in country is needed. In this respect, DSS would continue to promote openness and transparency with Member States through specific security outreach efforts.

16. The USG then turned to the issue of survivor support which still remained a challenge for the UN system. Acknowledging that there is in place a more timely and better response to attacks, as evidenced post-Abuja, much still remains to be done in supporting victims of terrorist attacks and other crises, including addressing medical and psycho-social support especially in places where transport and medical facilities are difficult. Victims support was recognized as a multifaceted issue, far beyond security and, thus, strongly linked also to human resources (HR) aspects. HLCM was informed that the Secretary-General’s Policy Committee would soon be holding a meeting on the issue of survivor and family support in order to bring the conclusions of this meeting to the next session of the CEB to encourage the organizations to work collectively in crisis response modes. Recognizing that the UN system is already facing issues with those injured in the Abuja attack, the USG asked that flexibility be applied across the UN system when considering working arrangements for those persons.

17. The USG highlighted the fact that the IASMN has become more relevant and timely in facilitating the formulation of policies. In addition, improvement in the quality of training for international and local personnel and a focus on training in high threat missions served to improve the quality of security personnel. As personnel at large also needed to assume responsibility for their own security, DSS had recently rolled out a new Basic Security in the Field CD-ROM. Soon there would be a new version of the Advanced Security in the Field CD-ROM. For the UN system’s implementing partners, outreach programmes had been conducted through the Saving Lives Together framework which aims to provide best guidance, practices and advice to NGOs.
18. In the face of more serious and deeply profound security issues, the USG indicated that he is acutely aware that security costs money and security programmes are expensive. However, it was imperative to ensure due diligence for our personnel and turning again to the Sahel, he insisted that the concerns he expressed be taken to heart, which included necessary investments.

19. In conclusion, the USG noted that in future, there will be issues balancing resources and the need to provide the necessary levels of security. Advance and non-reactive thinking was necessary to prioritize where the threats really are to ensure that the most is obtained for the funds available where it is needed.

20. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the update on security, stressing that it was important to recognize that safety and security will have a growing impact on the management of UN organizations. Therefore, HLCM members need to be fully informed on developments in this area. Concurrently organizations should, internally as well as collectively, continue looking at the most suitable approaches to integrate safety and security requirements into programmes, in a manner that is sustainable, financially sound, and politically acceptable.

B) Update on Private Security Companies and on the Security Level System (SLS)

21. The USG informed the meeting that the UN is currently using private security companies in certain situations but that there is no common approach concerning the use of such companies, nor any special contractual modality in place for doing so. A Policy Committee meeting in May 2011 recognized that the use of armed private security companies comes with reputational risk to the UN and should be used as a last resort, after first looking at what support may be provided by the host country, Member States, and by the UN staff. Only if any of those options was not feasible would the UN consider using private security companies. Subsequently, the Policy Committee tasked the IASMN to put together a clear policy and guidelines for the use of private security companies. The USG acknowledged that this has and continues to be a very controversial issue, with certain organizations absolutely opposing their use and the Staff Federations expressing real concern. Despite sharing such concerns, he recognized that if there is a need to resort to private security companies, then there is a need to ensure they are used properly. There was consensus within the UNSMS that the use of private security companies should be the last possible resort. If organizations feel that they have no other choice, it is important that their use falls under clear policies and guidelines, which makes the ongoing work to codify the use of such companies critical.

22. HLCM was further informed that an IASMN working group, that also included the staff federations, had drafted a policy, as well as guidelines on the use of armed PSCs. OCHCR had been asked to address issues in the draft policy with human rights implications A model contract had also been produced and, in addition, the UNSMS already has in place a universal Use of Force policy for civilian personnel in the UN, as well as provisions for guard training. The industry itself was working on self-policing regulations, e.g. a code of conduct for PSCs.

23. At its 16th session, the IASMN had extensively discussed all the work produced so far and had been asked to consult within their organizations to provide further comments on the policy and guidelines by 15 March. It was the intention over the next two months to have an agreed upon package to submit to the Secretary-General, with a view to bringing this to the HLCM and the CEB at their Fall 2012 sessions. While emphasizing that even if one organization uses private security companies, this
poses reputational risks to the UN at large, the USG strongly urged the organizations to consult widely within and provide their comments, noting that there is a need to have an agreed upon and strict policy in place, no less so because private security companies were already being used within the UN system.

24. The Staff Federations, while appreciating the openness of DSS in the discussions that have taken place so far and their participation in the IASMN working group on this issue, noted that they oppose the use of private security companies. The Federations’ view is that if they are needed, then that raises the question about whether staff should be present at all. In this context, the Federations also re-iterated their concern with the concept of “how to stay” as opposed to when to leave. A concern was also expressed that the use of private security firms could lead to the inadvertent use of mercenaries or individuals who have participated in crimes against humanity. The UN system cannot be associated with such individuals, even through outsourcing mechanisms.

25. Recognizing the sensitivity and complexity of the issues at hand, the Committee underlined the importance of continued and detailed consultations, looking carefully at issues, such as thorough screening of private security companies to be engaged in cases when all other options have been exhausted, as the system moves forward.

**Security Level System (SLS)**

26. The USG summarized the discussions at the last IASMN meeting when the security level system had been reviewed after being in place for just over one year. Although he had supported abolishing the single aggregate security level as he believed having a single weighted number created confusion, he informed HLCM that the IASMN, after a very robust discussion, did not wish to tinker with the SLS system after a year and decided to continue with a single weighted number. Although he still believed that the single aggregate security level for a given location should be abolished, he did support the IASMN decision that the single number would from now on be downplayed in threat and travel advisories and that the individual security level for each category of threat would be indicated, with the category with the highest number highlighted.

27. The Committee agreed with DSS that it is important to not give too much weight to the total numerical security rating provided by the SLS, but to look at the different component numbers. Not doing so, can lead to the misinterpretation of security risks and failure to take appropriate mitigation measures.

C) Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) – UNSMS policies approved by the IASMN at its 16th session

28. The USG introduced the five UNSMS policies that had been approved by the IASMN at its 16th session for which HLCM endorsement was requested.

A. **Arrest and Detention** – The policy is premised on the understanding that the arrest and detention of UN personnel is a legal rather than a security issue. HLCM was assured that DSS would still continue to track arrests and detentions and include this in its annual report on the Safety and Security of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

B. **Close Protection** – The policy reflects a previous policy that had been put in place in 2008, with minor modifications.
C. **Hostages Incident Management** - The policy, which was already in the *Field Security Handbook*, reaffirms DSS management of hostage incidents which is critical. There was a need to articulate that DSS takes control in hostage situations, while working with the AFPs.

D. **Relations with Host Country on Security** - The policy, which also applies to HQ locations as well as field locations and allows for those differences, serves to reaffirm the notion that the UN operates in a host country and is meant to ensure that while it may not be possible to hold host countries accountable, the host country nevertheless understands its obligations to the UN.

E. **Fire Safety Policy** – The UNSMS has an existing remit for aviation, road and fire safety and until now the UN system had never had in place a uniform fire safety policy. Fire safety concerns cover large installations to the smallest offices in the field and while the policy has some cost implications, the safety of personnel is an overwhelming priority.

29. HLCM was supportive of the work of IASMN and its initiatives, including the fire safety policy and the road safety policy. However, the Committee indicated the need for better system-wide communication to staff on these topics.

30. With respect to concerns raised on host country relations when it comes to security, the Committee recognized that the capacity of host countries to protect varies significantly. There is a universal need for a dialogue with relevant parts of host governments. This need does not only apply to programme countries only, but also to Headquarters duty stations. Such discussions would also benefit from including items such as fire safety etc.

The Committee:

31. Expressed appreciation to the Under-Secretary-General and to DSS for their effective work on behalf of the UN system.

32. Took note of the update on Private Security Companies, noting the progress achieved and the importance of on-going considerations and consultations as we move forward on this issue. The Committee further expressed its appreciation of the timeliness of the update received and urged organizations to provide input on the proposed policy and guidelines.

33. Took note of the review by the IASMN of the Security Level System one year after its implementation and of the IASMN’s recommendation not to amend the SLS at this time, but to emphasize in travel advisories the five component categories of threats and hazards, with attention drawn to the threat category with the highest rating.

IV. Improving Efficiency and Effectiveness of the UN System

Documentation:
- The Change Plan – Final report UN Change Management Team

35. At its Workshop of 17 November 2011, HLCM completed its discussion, started in the spring of 2011, on high-yielding measures in the pipeline or put in place across the UN system with the aim to improve efficiency and control costs, as well as on difficult and recurring issues with which HLCM member organizations are confronted when working on improving efficiency and effectiveness.

36. Some preliminary work by HLCM on this matter was discussed at the CEB Breakfast session in April 2011, after which the Secretary-General requested HLCM to support the overall change management process that he had asked the Deputy Secretary-General to lead, by undertaking further work on how the UN System can ‘do more with less’.

37. Concurrently with the HLCM’s work, the UN Secretariat, under the auspices of the Deputy Secretary General established a Change Management Team (CMT). The aim of the CMT is to further develop the ways in which the UN can modernize operations, make efficiency gains, and deliver its work faster and more effectively.

United Nations Change Management Team

38. The Committee received a presentation by the Chair of the UN Secretariat Change Management Team, Mr. Wonsoo Kim, Deputy Chef de Cabinet. The presentation was delivered using the ITU procured Remote Participation platform.

39. The Change Plan builds on the Secretary General’s vision for the organization: a modern, engaged and efficient Secretariat, founded on improved transparency, accountability, quality and confidence in the UN and its ideals. The Committee was briefed on the four principal areas being addressed by the Change Plan, namely:

- Enhancing trust and confidence: towards a more stakeholder and client-oriented organizational culture;
- Engaging staff: a global, dynamic, adaptable, meritocratic and physically secure workforce;
- Improving working methods: a more open and accountable UN with streamlined procedures;
- Rationalizing structures and functions: optimal locations, common services and expanded partnerships.

40. The Committee was reminded by Mr. Kim that for the first time in recent history, the UN budget had been reduced by 5% and that underpinning the change management programme was the requirement of the Secretary General to deliver to the same level with fewer resources.

41. Members of HLCM recognized that changes put forward by the UN Secretariat would have an inevitable impact on all organizations, most notably the Funds and Programmes. Close collaboration was requested to ensure that the Secretariat considers the diverse business models and mandates of the organizations of the system in moving to implement the changes.
42. Members gave examples of change management initiatives underway in their organizations and emphasised the need to share lessons learned and best practices with the Secretariat’s Change Management Team. Clarity was sought on how a meaningful level of interaction, within the short timeframe, would best be managed. In addition, the need for on-going monitoring and evaluation of change management programmes was considered an important requirement.

43. Interest was expressed in the Secretariat’s approach to the re-investment of savings. Concurrently with initiatives to improve cost and time efficiencies, build on common services, and outsource within the system, some organizations were now planning to include assessments of value for money and, more generally, impact, in their approaches.

44. Inter-agency mobility was highlighted as an area which needs more attention. Clear and explicit accountability on the implementation phases of any change processes, it was argued, is a key requirement for their success, as it is the wider engagement of staff. The need to be coherent when communicating what priorities are being pursued and how they are being achieved was also emphasised.

45. With respect to expectations to deliver more with fewer resources, FICSA underlined the importance of engaging with and gaining the confidence of staff, by not undermining the role of Staff Representatives within the overall change management framework.

46. In his closing remarks, Mr. Kim echoed the importance of building trust and confidence between staff and senior management in developing the detail of the plan. In this regard, he recognized that enhanced collaboration and knowledge sharing would be beneficial given that organizations face similar issues, have learnt from a series of approaches and all report to Member States. In furtherance of a coherent position, the Change Management Team is convening senior management cluster meetings. He assured the Committee that the UN system would be included within this process. The subject would be further discussed by members of the CEB at its next meeting in April.

**HLCM Sub-Committee on Improved Efficiency and Cost Control Measures**

47. Mr. Alexander Aleinikoff (UNHCR) reported on the conclusions of the HLCM Sub-Committee, an exercise carried out in close consultation with the UN Change Management Team.

48. This phase of the Sub-Committee’s work centred on those areas considered most promising in the search for economies of scale and improved administrative efficiencies. A workshop was organized by the CEB Secretariat, which took place on 17 November 2011, with 10 duty stations connected via video/audio conference and 20 HLCM member organizations represented. The objectives were to share experiences about what does and does not work in increasing efficiency and cutting costs, as well as to identify barriers - system-wide or agency-specific - to putting in place efficiency measures. The workshop was designed to increase understanding and awareness among participants of successful (and unsuccessful) measures that have been taken to improve efficiency and cut costs. The workshop also provided an opportunity to share experiences and lessons learned regarding feasibility, value-added, obstacles, visibility/recognition and timing that can be applied across the system or within individual organizations, as appropriate. A central point in the discussion was that the focus on cost-savings and improved efficiency should lead to reinvestment into organizations’ core programmes.
49. A summary of initiatives (either proposed or implemented), which furthered the achievement of efficiency gains and cost avoidance were presented in the following areas:

- Collaborative Procurement
- Common Treasury Systems
- Procurement Solutions in the Field
- ICT Solutions in the Field
- Conference Services
- Reducing Travel Expenses
- Effective ICT Service Sourcing
- Outsourcing/Out-posting
- Single Layer Procurement
- Delayering/Freezing of posts/Delay of recruitment

**Remote Participation**

50. As an example of ICT enabled cost controlling and efficiency improvement measures, ITU demonstrated their Remote Participation platform. This initiative was presented as a step towards client-orientation and a platform on which to change an organizational culture that is no longer financially viable for stakeholders.

51. ITU noted that, while technical solutions are readily available, challenges cited as impeding the uptake of best practices, including paperless meetings and remote participation, tend to be cultural, procedural and legal in nature. As an early adopter, ITU has responded to the emerging trend of access independent of location.

52. The Committee was informed that the ITU governing body had mandated the use of electronic working methods. After having introduced mostly paper-free meetings, in 2010 ITU delegates passed a resolution mandating the introduction of Remote Participation for Governing Body meetings, as well as other events. Since then, ITU has been piloting various forms of Remote Participation technologies in more than one thousand meetings, some of which have involved several thousand remote participants.

53. The discussion that ensued reflected the interest of many organizations in the practical considerations and financial benefits of leveraging the remote participation platform. While it was recognized that the ITU constituency is of a largely technical nature, the needs addressed by such technologies are now common to all organizations. Dialogue continued on a range points raised during the presentation, particularly on how ITU overcame the challenges encountered.

The Committee:

54. Expressed its appreciation to the Chair of the UN Change Management Team, to the Chair of the HLCM Sub-Committee on Improved Efficiency and Cost Control Measures and to ITU for their presentations.

55. Noted that, while organizations have different business models, many change management initiatives underway in the system converge and/or are complementary. The Committee agreed to continue to share best practices.
56. Agreed to take up, on a voluntary basis, the challenge to implement at least three cost-cutting and efficiency measures in their organizations, building on the experience of other organizations as shared in the course of the HLCM exercise. HLCM members agreed to share progress made and lessons learned after one year.

57. Took note of the report of the UN Change Management Team and agreed to consider any follow up action with respect to issues that may require alignment or coordination at the system-wide level.

58. Requested the Change Management Team to engage organizations of the system in all phases of the change management process and to include other organizations in the steering committee.

V. HLCM Networks

A) Human resources

- **Documentation:**
  - A/RES/66/235 – GA resolution on UN common system
  - CEB/2012/HLCM/8/Rev.1 – Outcome of the ICSC 74th Session: Pay Freeze
  - CEB/2012/HLCM/8/Add.1 – Outcome of the ICSC 74th Session: Other Matters
  - CEB/2012/HLCM/4 – Inter-agency Mobility Agreement

(i) **Outcome of ICSC 73rd Session**

59. The Co-Chair of the Human Resource Network, Ms. Ana Luiza Thompson-Flores (UNESCO) presented the outcome of the ICSC’s 74th session, noting that the Network’s collaboration with the ICSC had been working well during the last six months and that concerns of the organizations had, in general, been taken into due consideration by the Commission.

60. The central issue for discussion of the Commission was related to General Assembly Resolution A/RES/66/235 of 24 December 2011 on the “Feasibility and suitability of possible measures to reflect in the administration of the post adjustment system the pay freeze of the comparator civil service” (Section B.1: Conditions of service of staff in the Professional and higher categories - Post adjustment matters).

61. In the conclusions of its deliberations, the Commission decided to report to the General Assembly that:

   a. The Commission did not have the authority to take measures in the administration of the post adjustment system that were not consistent with the United Nations/United States margin methodology, as established by the General Assembly;

   b. The existing mechanisms for adjusting United Nations salaries were working well and it was therefore not convinced of the suitability of introducing additional measures to reflect, in the administration of the post adjustment, the pay freeze in the comparator civil service;
c. If the General Assembly decided that such additional measures were necessary, it would be technically possible to implement them in the post adjustment system on the basis of the margin management arrangements already in place. In that case, it would be desirable that any such measure be a one-time event, with a finite duration.

62. The Human Resources Network was in agreement with the ICSC that the current mechanisms for adjusting salaries are working well. The Network Co-Chair also indicated that such mechanisms were likely to lead to a freeze from 1 January 2013, as the ceiling of 120% to the comparator was being reached.

63. There was broad consensus in the Committee that the decision of the Commission was in line with the views of organizations. The members fully recognized the financial pressure that member states are under and the financial realities in the civil service of the comparator. Thus, they were confident that the existing methodology would promptly reflect these realities. Furthermore, there was broad support for the Commission’s recommendation that it is not advisable to make ad-hoc changes to a methodology that appears to be producing the results that many member states are looking for.

64. The Human Resource Network also supported the ICSC decision to increase danger pay for locally recruited staff to 30% of net mid-point and to delink danger pay from pay scales. This measure recognizes the risks that national staff is exposed to. The decision was also supported by the Staff Federations who noted how local staff that run the same, or greater risk, than international staff.

65. Ms. Thompson-Flores further presented the Commission’s decision on the new Standard of Conduct for UN staff. Organizations are expected to incorporate the new standards into legal frameworks and the Commission requested speedy implementation.

66. In the ensuing discussion there was consensus that the final decision on a salary freeze is the purview of member states, and the need for the UN to react to and reflect global financial realities was clearly recognized. Also, there was agreement regarding the fact that as long as the existing methodology works to mirror realities in the comparator, it is not necessary to make ad-hoc changes. Furthermore, the Committee agreed with the ICSC that if ad-hoc changes are made, these need to be time-bound.

67. Furthermore, the Committee noted that all organizations have taken a wide range of austerity measures to respond to the financial realities that they are facing. This has already triggered work on cost savings and efficiency. There was a feeling by a number of organizations that cost cutting in other areas than human resources is a way to reflect financial realities without risking the loss of high performing staff and without reducing the ability to attract new, talented staff. Nevertheless, it was recognized that there is a need for data when it comes to how the system is doing related to the ability to recruit.

68. The Human Resource Network then reported to the Committee on the discussion related to Inter-Agency Mobility. The HLCM approved Inter Agency Mobility Accord from 2005 has been very difficult to implement. After many years of concerted efforts to find agreeable text, at its fall sessions in 2011, the Network took note of the persisting legal obstacles related to the applicability of the Accord, and agreed to reinstate the “Inter-Organization Agreement Concerning the Transfer, Secondment or Loan of Staff among the Organizations Applying the UN Common System of Salaries and Allowances” as of 1 January 2012, with some minor modifications.
69. The edited text of the Agreement, as approved by the Human Resource Network at its February 2012 meeting was submitted to HLCM for its endorsement. The recommendations of the Network also included continued work on specific modalities that might enhance further inter-agency mobility. In this context, the Network agreed to the need for continued discussions amongst the organizations on specific topics in need of clarification; including on compliance and inter-agency mobility in general as well as under the regulated schemes of transfer, secondment and loan, possibly to be addressed in a guidance paper outside the actual Agreement itself.

70. The Committee approved the approach proposed by the Network. However, it was clearly stated that the continued work on inter-agency mobility and on topics that might enhance mobility was a key priority. The Committee also noted that without organizations’ active participation, no mobility scheme will work.

71. Following up on the ongoing work on the Mandatory Age of Separation, the Spokesperson of the Working Group, Mr. Pedro Guazo (WFP) offered a briefing on the Group’s final report. The Mandatory Age of Separation Working Group was convened by HLCM with a mandate to review all aspects of an increase in Mandatory Age of Separation (MAS), including innovative and flexible modalities in applying the MAS. The final report takes a comprehensive approach to the issue of possible changes in the MAS and impacts on Organizations, from a human resources and finance perspective, and on Staff Members, including both actual Pension Plan members and future members. The document also considers case studies of flexible retirement modalities and succession planning programs that some Organizations have introduced and discusses a possible change to the UNJSPF rules that would facilitate further development of flexible and phased retirement programs. The report of the Working Group, as approved by HLCM, will be transmitted to the International Civil Service Commission in view of its consideration of this matter at its summer 2012.

72. The Working Group recognized that there is no pressing financial need to increase the retirement age from the perspective of the Pension Fund. Harmonization of practices and the introduction of flexible retirement programmes represent, on the contrary, attractive endeavours. However, if flexible programmes are to work and be attractive to staff, there is a need to make adjustments so that staff can continue to provide full contributions to the Pension Fund.

73. The Human Resources Network concluded that its ongoing role should be an annual or bi-annual analysis looking at trends in different organizations, recognizing the difficulty in obtaining accurate and complete data. The Network has therefore already started by identifying data tables that organizations would need to supply.

74. In its deliberations, the Committee supported the work by the Working Group, indicating consensus on the desirability of flexible arrangements, such as part time options, that help both staff and organizations. However, any schemes put in place should be fair and equal and should not become an obstacle to rejuvenation and career development for other staff.

75. Related to the topic of the mandatory age of retirement, it was noted that a review and possible harmonization of post retirement income limits might be desirable. This could be a future area of work for the Human Resources Network.¹

¹ Some editorial changes to the Inter-Agency agreement and to the final report on Mandatory Age of Separation were requested by FAO, UNFPA and WHO. Both final documents would be shortly issued after clearance by the relevant organizations.
The Committee:

76. Fully recognized and appreciated the severity of the present economic crisis and noted that organizations are undertaking measures to identify and implement efficiency savings and to increase effectiveness. The Committee also emphasized the importance of maintaining the competitiveness of the UN system as an employer.

77. Took note of the decision of the ICSC, in the context of its deliberations on the “Feasibility and suitability of reflecting the pay freeze of the comparator civil service in the administration of the post adjustment system”, that existing mechanisms for adjusting United Nations salaries work well.

78. Strongly supported the ICSC decision on danger pay for locally recruited staff.

79. Endorsed in principle the revised text of the Inter-agency Agreement concerning Transfer, Secondment or Loan of Staff for application by all HLCM member organizations as of 1 January 2012. The Committee requested the Human Resource Network to continue to explore ways to expedite implementation of the Agreement and to promote inter agency mobility in the context of the harmonization of business practices in the UN system.

80. Endorsed the recommendations of the Working Group on Mandatory Age of Separation.

B) Finance and budget

Documentation:

- CEB/2012/HLCM/6 – IPSAS Task Force status report
- CEB/2012/HLCM/7/Rev.1 – Common Treasury Services - status report

(i) Update on FB Network Activities:

81. The Committee received an update from the co-Chair of the FB Network, Mr. Darshak Shah from UNDP on the progress of initiatives being undertaken by constituent working groups.

   a) System-wide Financial Statistics database

82. Funded as part of the Harmonization of Business Practices (HBP) group of projects, this initiative aims to simplify, improve and modernize the collection and reporting of system-wide financial statistics.

83. The Committee was informed that this project remains under budget and on target for completion by the end of 2012. The Committee reaffirmed its commitment to this project and looked forward to seeing the result.

   b) Safety and Security Costs

84. The Working Group on Safety and Security Costs seeks to develop an approach that guarantees a transparent, consistent, predictable and equitable method for the allocation of the UN Security
Management System (UNSMS) portion of the UN Department of Safety and Security (DSS) budget amongst participating agencies.

85. The Working Group has been working on a discussion paper which provides a comprehensive review of all identified cost-sharing options and creates a framework for evaluating each option against the agreed principles and objectives.

86. In November 2011, the Working Group Chair presented the preliminary evaluation criteria and cost-sharing options to the Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) Steering Group. With comments from IASMN incorporated, a draft document was circulated to the Working Group in December and members were invited to provide feedback to several key questions. Responses received from twenty agencies served to greatly strengthen the evaluation criteria, scope of cost-sharing options and associated advantages and disadvantages. After having revised and shared the draft document at the 16th Session of the IASMN, the Working Group presented its status of work at the Finance and Budget Network Video-conference held on 16 February 2012.

87. The FB Network Co-Chair suggested that organizations should, internally as well as collectively, continue looking at the most suitable approaches to integrate safety and security requirements into programmes, in a manner that is sustainable, financially sound, and politically acceptable.

88. During the discussion that followed, organizations expressed the need to understand better how the UNSMS cost-shared budget is calculated for shared security services, what the costs elements are, and the detail on the use of security budget at the country level.

89. The need for DSS to notify organizations of adjustments in a timely manner was raised by many, since late requests run the risk of a reduced budget being made available. Action on this point would help avoid discrepancies arising in figures being reported to organizations’ governing bodies. The Finance and Budget Network Co-Chair reiterated the need to base the apportionment of the 2012-2013 UNSMS budget on actual vacancy rate.

(ii) Common Treasury Services

90. With the completed launch of the Treasury Community of Practice website, in January 2010, the Working Group on Common Treasury Services initiated a Feasibility Study to identify areas for harmonization. The consultancy firm KPMG was appointed for the realization of a full feasibility study, which was firstly presented as scheduled in June 2011. Thereafter, an executive summary of KPMG’s findings was presented to the FB Network meeting in Turin on 21 September 2011. Since the subsequent endorsement of the project implementation plan by HLCM, also in September 2011, the UN Treasury harmonization project has moved into the implementation phase.

91. The Committee was informed that, at the implementation planning meeting held in New York from 5-6 December 2011 each of the four harmonization initiatives – Banking services, Foreign Exchange Management, Investments and Payments - was discussed in detail, and agreement was reached as to which opportunities to pursue, and which agencies would participate, and lead. The project implementation teams have been established, each with a project implementation plan. As the Feasibility Study moves into implementation, effort are made to ensure leveraging of the full potential of the UN as a client, providing for adoption of leading (best) practice, working toward the introduction of consistent reporting and plan for increased uses of the website.
92. The Finance and Budget Network’s presentation emphasised the transformative nature of this initiative, providing unique potential to save costs. It has been established on an opt-in and opt-out basis but, in order to be effective, a quorum of organizations is needed to achieve critical mass. The Network Co-Chair stressed the need for organizations to remain committed since a lot of effort and money has been invested already in this initiative.

93. The Network Co-Chair recognized that risk mitigation and management deserves priority attention. In the course of discussions, it became clear that organizations have different business models that are characterized by different risk profiles. The Committee was informed that further work on assessing the different risk profiles, sharing information on risk and discussing risk-mitigation approaches and risk-management frameworks would be pursued by the Treasury Working Group.

(iii) IPSAS Task Force

94. IPSAS remains a key reform activity for the UN system. The Committee was presented with the IPSAS adoption progress report, which provided an update from the Task Force on Accounting Standards and the system-wide IPSAS project team on the status of IPSAS implementation and post-implementation in the UN system. All organizations report that their overall implementation is proceeding according to plans.

95. The following additional agencies have completed key implementation steps and are on target to issue IPSAS-compliant financial statements for 2012: ILO, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNOPS, UNRWA, UNWOMEN, WHO and UNAIDS. Some organizations have made considerable progress in staffing key posts and many organizations now have a fully staffed IPSAS team in place. The priority is to now leverage the benefits of IPSAS at operational levels. HLCM was informed that organizations targeting 2013-2014 have completed several critical implementation steps and the alignment of their ERP systems with IPSAS requirements remains a key focus. Due to a larger pool of implementers and more organizations approaching their implementation dates, UN system organizations have a wealth of experience to draw on bilaterally or through the Task Force.

96. Some organizations indicated the need, as the next phase of IPSAS adoption, to conduct an analysis of feasibility and opportunity for the implementation of accrual budgeting. The Committee tasked the FB Network to revert on this matter. It also underlined the need that, in discussions with Member States on the benefits of IPSAS, due consideration be given also to the costs, particularly recurring costs.

The Committee:

97. Took note of progress made by the Financial Statistics project and recommended timely compilation as per the agreed implementation plan.

98. Took note of progress made by the Working Group on Common Treasury Services and requested the Working Group to proceed with the agreed implementation plan, noting the voluntary nature participation in respective common services, while emphasising the importance of gaining and maintaining the critical mass of participating organizations required to reap the expected benefits within the estimated timeframes.
99. Took note of the recent achievements in implementation and post-implementation of IPSAS and of the support provided by the system-wide IPSAS project team.

100. Took note of the update on the recent activities of the Working Group on Safety and Security Costs, and requested the Finance and Budget Network to convene an ad-hoc video-conference to review the cost-shared budget of the UN Security Management System for the biennium 2012-2013.

101. Requested the Finance and Budget Network to take up the issue of accrual budgeting and revert to the Committee with its recommendations on the matter.

C) Procurement

Documentation:

- CEB/2012/HLCM/10 – Updated inter-agency Guidelines for country level procurement

102. The Procurement Network Chairperson, Mr. Vanja Ostojic (ILO) presented the work of the Procurement Network to the Committee.

(i) Enabling modalities for collaborative procurement & Progress on the HBP project “Procurement Process and Practice Harmonization in Support of Field Operations”.

103. The objectives of the project “Procurement Process and Practice Harmonization in Support of Field Operations” (“Harmonization Project”) are to a) Create a common framework for harmonization of procurement related regulations, rules, policies, procedures and business practices; b) document and include country level outcomes and best practices in collaboration with the UNDG Reference Group on Common Services and procurement in (selected) countries; and c) develop a standardized toolkit for country level procurement practitioners taking into account the best practices, needs and insights from the country level.

104. The Network recommended the integration of specific “considerations” enabling UN cooperation into the regulatory frameworks of UN organizations. These “considerations”, that have the objective of promoting and facilitating common procurement at the country level, are:

- Cooperation with UN organizations: A dedicated section on UN cooperation in the organization-specific procurement manual based on template texts;
- Long-Term Agreement/Framework Agreement/System Contracts: Use and sharing of LTAs is encouraged and explained in detail;
- Restrictions when cooperating: Cooperating with UN organizations is encouraged and not limited by restrictions;
- Conducting procurement on behalf of other UN organizations: Detailed provisions for providing or using procurement services of other UN organizations.

105. The Procurement Network further recommended that members specify the conditions under which a secondary procurement review may be waived when cooperating with UN entities (as outlined in the first bullet above), while ensuring appropriate internal control.
(ii) Collaborative Procurement

106. Cooperation in procurement can deliver substantial (monetary and non-monetary) benefits. Collaborative procurement is therefore one of the key priority areas for the Network.

107. At its Spring 2011 session, the Network agreed to adopt a more concerted approach to collaborative procurement of products or services that are cross-cutting to Network members. Since then, the Network has completed two such initiatives in the areas of freight forwarding and cargo insurance, while several organizations are collaborating in the area of insurance for consultants, which can also yield considerable cost avoidance. Furthermore, in July 2011, the HBP Steering Committee approved funding for a new project on collaborative procurement of vehicles. The project on vehicles could generate cost avoidance of between US$ 20 and 30 Million annually with full system buy-in.

108. The Procurement Network is currently in the process of carrying out a UN system-wide procurement spend analysis to identify additional areas for possible collaboration. The most promising areas identified in the analysis are IT hardware and software, travel, IT and management consultancies.

109. In order to present the benefits of cooperation in procurement in a coherent manner, the Network is also in the process of agreeing on common terminology and methodologies to reliably measure benefits from collaborative procurement. In fact, such benefits can be overstated, and organizations have to make programmatic decisions about when collaborative procurement makes sense.

110. Finally, significant attention has been given to improving collaboration in large duty stations and identifying the benefits that have been realized. The Network recommends that initiatives such as those in Geneva, Rome and Copenhagen are replicated elsewhere where the UN has a large Headquarters presence.

(i) Update to guidelines on “Common UN Procurement at the Country Level”

111. The final item presented by the Network was the document “Common UN Procurement at the Country Level”. This document provides assistance to UN country teams in identifying and developing strategies to implement procurement initiatives in which several UN organizations are involved. By supporting common procurement initiatives, the guidelines promote harmonization of business practices and contribute to improve both the effectiveness and the efficiency of UN procurement activities.

112. The document is the successor of the “Guidelines for Harmonized UN Procurement at the Country Level”, which was endorsed by UNDG-DOCO in 2009. Since then, the document has undergone a substantial revision based on user feedback. The Procurement Network recommended its members to apply, consistent with their regulations and rules, the modalities of the “Common UN Procurement at the Country Level” in their organization-specific operational framework.

113. The use of this document should result in more effective and efficient cooperation in procurement among UN organizations both at country level and HQ. The use should also lead to increased benefits for UN country teams through more value for money and efficiency by combining needs (e.g. joint solicitations), reduced administrative costs by eliminating duplication of tasks.
114. Furthermore, the document also reflects the Procurement Network’s recognition of the need to adopt guidance on cooperation among UN organizations at all relevant levels of the regulatory frameworks of its members. The approval of the document also builds on the adoption of the enabling modalities under item (i).

115. The PN Chair also expressed his appreciation to UNDP for providing a staff member to support the Network.

116. In the ensuing discussion the Committee expressed strong support for the ongoing work. It expressed some concern regarding the complexity of the “Common UN Procurement at the Country Level”, and asked the Network to continue its work to simplify the document to facilitate use by UN Country Teams.

117. Several organizations noted that the work of the Network on collaboration is particularly useful for smaller organizations.

The Committee:

118. Took note of the status report of the project Procurement Process and Practice Harmonization in Support of Field Operations.

119. Endorsed the recommendation made by the Procurement Network on the considerations which enable UN cooperation in procurement.

120. Requested the organizations to provide regular updates through the Procurement Network on the status of implementation of these enabling considerations.

121. Appreciated the continuing efforts by the Procurement Network to deliver cost savings and improved effectiveness through collaborative procurement initiatives, and recommended to intensify investments in this direction. HLCM also supported the Procurement Network initiative to agree on common terminology and methodologies to measure benefits from collaborative procurement.

122. Endorsed the Procurement Network’s decision on the document “Common UN Procurement at the Country Level”.

123. Recommended its members to use, consistent with their regulations and rules, the modalities of the “Common UN Procurement at the Country Level” in their organization-specific operational framework and to encourage organizations to apply them. Furthermore, the Committee requested the Procurement Network to continue its work with a view to further simplification and user friendliness of the guidelines and the establishment of measures to monitor performance and the benefits of common procurement.
D) Information and communication technology

124. The UN Secretariat presented an update on behalf of ICT Network Chair, Angela Kane. The Committee was reminded that the data communications study completed in 2010 proposed several initiatives intended to increase coherence and efficiency in the system-wide application of global telecommunications services. One of these initiatives, common country office data communications, is currently underway under the leadership of WFP as an initiative for the harmonization of business practices. A second initiative proposed by the study, a UN Core Gateway, has begun as a pilot led by the UN Secretariat and includes participation by several agencies.

125. This project will link agencies together within a private network, leading to benefits that include improved communication and reduced network operating costs. The pilot will use existing resources with the agencies involved and once operational, testing will proceed for utilizing the service for telephone and video conference services, as well as for shared network access from country offices. Subsequently, a complete project plan will be developed, including a business case and governance components.

126. The Committee was updated on progress made within the ICT Costing Project, an initiative funded by the Harmonization of Business Practices, without any additional costs in order to include additional agencies in the project. This project is being led by UNODC and has so far engaged nine organizations in the calculation, tracking and benchmarking of their total ICT expenditure. Challenges associated with this project were explained as deriving from data availability and comparability, since not all organizations operate ERP systems and some ICT functions are outsourced by some organizations.

127. In addition, cyber-security remains a critical component of the Network work plan, and the working groups continue to develop the priority areas of awareness, incident response and policies and standards as well as support to the HLCP working group on cyber-crime and cyber-security. The ICT Network continues to be involved in the support to country-level ICT activities, through its working group in that area and in conjunction with the UNDG.

128. The Committee took note with appreciation of the briefing provided by the ICT Network. The Vice-Chair expressed appreciation to the outgoing chair of the ICT Network. Consultations would be conducted on a successor.

VI. CEB Secretariat’s dual location

Documentation:

- CEB/2012/HLCM/XXIII/INF.3 – Terms of Reference for Study on CEB Secretariat consolidation

129. The HLCM Vice-Chair recalled the resolution of the General Assembly (A/C.5/66/L.18, paragraph 111) requesting “[...] the Secretary-General, in his capacity as the Chairman of the CEB, to consult all the participating organizations on consolidating the CEB Secretariat in the United Nations Headquarters in New York and report thereon to the General Assembly at its sixty-seventh session.”
130. Mr. Thomas Stelzer, Secretary of CEB, provided the Committee with the results from the survey conducted in late February on the consolidation of the CEB Secretariat. He recalled that on 24 February he had written to CEB Sherpas informing them of the Secretary-General’s intention to consult with CEB members on this matter at the forthcoming spring 2012 session of CEB. In the meantime the Secretary-General had decided that at the spring 2012 session of CEB, coinciding with the first year of his second term, he would initiate the second phase of the CEB review, which had been foreseen upon completion of the most recent review of the role and function of the CEB, initiated in 2007. This second phase of the review would look into the wider context of many CEB issues, including the issue of dual-location. Mr. Stelzer noted that the Secretary-General would consult with CEB members on this matter at the forthcoming spring 2012 session of CEB.

131. In the discussion that followed, the Committee indicated that looking at the location issue in the broader context of a more strategic and comprehensive review about the role of the CEB represented a sensible approach.

132. Many HLCM members expressed strong support for maintaining the current dual-location arrangements of the CEB Secretariat, as correctly responding to practical and political considerations, as well as to cost-efficiency arguments.

133. The Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security noted that there is a strong perception in the UN system that the UN is already too New York centric, and consolidating the CEB secretariat in New York would add to that feeling. He added that the Inter-Agency Security Management Network would not appreciate seeing the CEB Secretariat operate only in one location, as the Network appreciates the fact that it serves the Chief Executives of the agencies, funds and programmes in locations other than New York.

134. The Vice-Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission indicated that the present arrangements of the CEB Secretariat are working well for ICSC.

The Committee:

135. Noted that the issue of the dual location will be considered in the context of the next phase at the CEB review, and requested that the issue be analysed in a comprehensive manner, including taking into account the needs of organizations located outside of New York. Considerable support was expressed for the current dual location arrangements.

VII. Any other business

A) UNESCO’s current financial situation and what the UN system can do to help

Documentation:  
✓ CEB/2012/HLCM/XXIII/INF.4 – Letter from UNESCO DG to UN SG on contribution to the UN Joint Machinery

136. The Committee was given a briefing by Mr. Getachew Engida (UNESCO) on the current financial situation of the organization. The presentation referred to the letter mentioned above from the
Director General of UNESCO to the Secretary General regarding payments for inter-agency bodies and activities.

137. UNESCO provided further clarification to the Committee, confirming that the United States remain a committed member of UNESCO and an active member of the Executive Board.

The Committee:

138. Took note of the presentation by UNESCO.

B) Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Equality: System-wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women – An Accountability Framework

Documentation:

✓ CEB/2012/HLCM/11 – System-wide action plan
✓ CEB/2012/HLCM/XXIII/INF.1 and INF.2

139. In 2006, the CEB had endorsed a system-wide policy on gender equality and the empowerment of women (GEEW), in accordance with ECOSOC Agreed Conclusions 1997/2. It also requested the Inter-agency Network on Women and Gender Equality (IANWGE) to prepare, in a participatory and consultative manner, a UN system-wide action plan (SWAP) as a means to operationalize the policy and accelerate gender mainstreaming within the policies and programmes of the UN system. The plan - reflecting a system-wide understanding of concepts, norms, standards and indicators – was to be implemented by strengthening the UN system’s work on GEEW at both system-wide and individual entity levels. Ms. Aparna Mehrotra (UN Women) reported on the SWAP to the HLCM.

140. Consultations for development of the SWAP, co-ordinated by UN Women, have engaged, in a highly participatory manner, 51 entities, UN Secretariat Departments and Offices, and inter-agency coordination bodies, often involving multiple consultations with each entity. The process comprised two phases: Phase I of the SWAP development yielded a draft framework ready for testing by pilot entities, while Phase II comprised testing the SWAP for feasibility and viability, by eight pilot entities, constituting a representative sample of the Funds and Programmes, the Specialized agencies and the offices and regional commissions of the Secretariat.

141. During 2012 entities will be expected to prepare, with the support of UN Women, for first reporting in 2013, which will set a baseline for the UN system. Entities will be expected to meet all requirements in the SWAP between 2017 and 2019. Reporting by entities (to UN Women) on the SWAP will be expected. UN Women will consolidate individual entity reporting, to feed into the Report of the Secretary-General to ECOSOC on “Mainstreaming a gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the UN system”. It would thus facilitate and substantiate accountability to Member States for the work of the UN system on GEEW. The SWAP also includes a roll-out strategy to ensure both continued engagement of all UN system entities backstopped by UN Women, as appropriate and feasible, and adequate capacity across the UN system for implementation of the SWAP. The centrality of the roll-out phase for the sustainability and success of the SWAP cannot be overly emphasized.
142. During the discussions, organizations congratulated UN Women on its organizational capabilities, the extensive and participatory consultative process, and the high quality of the final product. Organizations that participated as pilots reported that the exercise was feasible and very positive and rewarding. Some also reported that it had significantly enhanced their own internal capacity to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women. Overall, the SWAP, as an instrument and process, was considered excellent and the action plan was strongly supported. While one member raised concerns about the costs of reporting and collecting data, others offered their partnership to entities of the UN system in the context of implementing the SWAP. Still others noted that the system is already beginning alignment with the SWAP as a result of the SWAP development process.

The Committee:

143. Took note of the progress achieved in the development of the system-wide action plan for implementation of the "United Nations system-wide policy on gender equality and the empowerment of women", and encouraged organizations to continue their collaborative approach to accelerate gender mainstreaming across policies and programmes, and gender equality in the UN system.

C) UN System Staff College: Training and Learning Programmes for the UN system

144. The Deputy Director of the UN System Staff College provided a briefing on the activities of the College. In his presentation, he noted the success of the College’s Operations Managers Course, which has had 250 participants so far. This course combines programme and operations and its content grew out of collaboration between UNSSC and HLCM under the Harmonization of Business Practices Plan of Action.

145. The Committee was also briefed on the UN Leaders course which is carried out in collaboration with leading educational institutions.

146. The current funding for the UNSSC consists of 71% from fees and contracts, 23% from bilateral support and 6% from the UN system (USD 500,000/year). Noting this financial framework, the College asked for support from HLCM organizations by promoting courses and encouraging staff to take advantage of available training and development programmes.

147. In his presentation, the Deputy Director also asked for a more strategic partnership with organizations when it comes to staff participation in courses. Putting in place systematic arrangements for course participation is in the interest for both the college and the organizations, as it improves planning.

148. The Committee appreciated the presentation and noted that UNSSC courses are relevant and of high quality. It was noted that targeting managers is a good building block for sound management skills in organizations. However, several organizations stated that funds for training and learning activities are scarce, and underlined the need for non-traditional learning methods. In this context, a proposal was made to have a strategic discussion on learning in the UN at one of the future HLCM meetings.
The Committee:

149. Took note of the report from the UN System Staff College on its work in support of the HLCM agenda.

D) EMG Sustainability Report

Documentation:
- CEB/2012/HLCM/13 – A framework for advancing environment and social sustainability
- CEB/2012/HLCM/14 – Information Note by the EMG Secretariat

150. The EMG Sustainability report was presented to HLCM by Mr. Christophe Bouvier (UNEP). The report is the product of an inter-agency consultative process to help ensure greater environmental and social sustainability in the work of the UN system as a whole. Currently, the application of environmental and social sustainability measures by UN organizations is uneven. Several entities within the UN system are already utilizing measures, but these practices are not consistent or readily comparable.

151. The Senior Officials of the Environment Management Group (EMG) requested the EMG to undertake a consultative process and prepare a report with options for a UN system-wide approach to “environmental and social safeguards.” The terminology was later changed to “environmental and social sustainability framework”. The report contains a broad policy framework for joint action and a Heads of agencies statement.

152. The rationale for this work is that the systematic use of an environmental and social sustainability framework across UN entities will allow the UN system to demonstrate sustainability leadership and will also enhance the UN system’s accountability for the environmental and social sustainability of its policies and practices. Efforts towards this end have advanced in the area of sustainability of UN management.

153. At this point in time, the costs for each UN entity from implementing environmental and social sustainability measures are not known and can be expected to be highly variable. However, implementation of a common framework will facilitate further sharing among agencies of costs and other resource needs.

The Committee:

154. Took note of the EMG report, with a view to reviewing it in connection with its financial and other implications related to management.
VIII. Conclusions from the Executive Session

155. Under the guidance of the new HLCM Chair, to be appointed by CEB at its Spring 2012 session, the CEB Secretariat will undertake consultations with HLCM member organizations and develop a proposal on possible new formats for HLCM meetings, with specific focus on the need to prepare and conduct discussions of strategic nature on subjects of key relevance for the most senior administrative managers of the UN System organizations. The proposal would also address the issue of format and timeliness of HLCM documentation, as well as the relationship with HLCM networks.
## Annex I

### List of Participants

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name – Title – Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>Mr. Gregory Starr, USG, Department of Safety and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Kim Won-Soo, ASG and Deputy Chef de Cabinet, Executive Office of the Secretary-General (by remote participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Simona Petrova, Principal Officer, Executive Office of the Secretary-General (by remote participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Vivian van de Perre, Chief, Office of the USG for Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Anne Marie Pinou, Special Assistant to the USG for Safety and Security and Secretary of the IASMN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Eddie Yee Woo Guo, Member of the Change Management Team (by remote participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Steven Siqueira, Member of the Change Management Team (by remote participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>Ms. Telma Viale, Director, ILO Office and Special Representative to the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Vanja Ostojic, Senior Procurement Advisor &amp; Procurement Network Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Mr. Nick Nelson, ADG, Corporate Services, Human Resources &amp; Finance Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>Mr. Getachew Engida, Deputy Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Ana Luiza Thompson-Flores, Director, HR Management and Co-Chair of the HR Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Helen Assefa, Senior Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Mr. Mohamed Jama, ADG, General Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Nicole Krüger, Management Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Simpson, Global Security Operations Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Harnischfeger, Director, Technology and General Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU</td>
<td>Ms. Julia S. Watt, Chief, Human Resources Management Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Anders Norsker, Chief, Information Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMO</td>
<td>Mr. Joachim Müller, Director, Resource Management Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO</td>
<td>Mr. Jo Espinoza-Ferrey, Director, Administrative Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIPO</td>
<td>Mr. Ambi Sundaram, ADG, Administration and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>Mr. Iain Kellet, Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>Mr. Georgios Anestis, Director, Operations Support Services Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAEA</td>
<td>Ms. Janice Dunn Lee, Deputy Director-General and Head of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name – Title – Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNWTO</td>
<td>Mr. Taleb Rifai, Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Emi MacColl, Chief of Cabinet</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name – Title – Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICSA</td>
<td>Mr. Mauro Pace, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Michel Julian, Chair, UNWTO Staff Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCISUA</td>
<td>Ms. Peggy Nelson, President of the WFP Professional Staff Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEB</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Stelzer, CEB Secretary &amp; ASG for Policy Coordination &amp; Inter-Agency Affairs, UN-DESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEB Secretariat</td>
<td>Mr. Remo Lalli, Secretary, HLCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ronny Lindstrom, Senior Advisor on Harmonization of Business Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Richard Maciver, ICT Specialist and Webmaster</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference for study of CEB Secretariat consolidation</td>
<td>CEB/2012/HLCM/XXIII/INF.3</td>
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ANNEX III

Statement by FICSA

Let me first thank you for the opportunity to address this Committee and join previous speakers in wishing the former Chair, Ms. Sheeran, all the best in her future endeavours. We appreciated Ms. Sheeran’s efforts to improve our dialogue and we hope this will continue under the new leadership of the HLCM. In recent years, FICSA has been trying new approaches on agenda item (2): “dialogue with staff federations”. Our presence in discussions on additional items are proof of our interest in engaging in substantive exchange with you, the management of the common system organizations. Your offices are administering the financial and the human resources; you are in charge of the most important asset of the organizations, the staff, and in most cases you are also the primary interlocutors of the staff representative bodies. Talking to each other is absolutely essential.

Today clear and open communication is a matter of a vital importance: the economic crisis is affecting the budgets and the operations of our organizations to a considerable extent; staff and management are coping with a series of measures aimed at realizing savings; the call for efficiency measures by the Member States is increasing. We need to understand each other’s reasons and what the Member States want from us.

Let us recall here that international organizations are intended as vehicles for socio-economic development and this does not necessarily translate into the pursuit of Member States’ individual interests; actually, it is quite the opposite.

Article 100 of the UN Charter, reaffirming the independence of the UN and its distance from individual governments’ instructions, is of a particular importance this respect.

We, as organizations, operate on global challenges which require global solutions and we, as staff, are committed to working together in mutual respect and cooperation to help countries create the political, social and economic conditions for development. Nevertheless, it is our impression that political interference is increasingly affecting the functioning of the common system.

The recent events in the Fifth Committee, which led to the approval of Resolution 66/235 and to difficult discussions in the session of the International Civil Service Commission, concluded last week in Bangkok, led me to some reflections.

The economic downturn is currently being evoked as a reason to cut our conditions of service and force changes – generally unwanted – in the way we work. The formula “doing more with less” is cited continuously as a key solution to our problems. However, this has been going on for years and we should not forget that “quantity” is not the only dimension of our work. We should ask ourselves if we have reached the break-even point where the “quality” standards of our output are being affected and, eventually, if the existence of the international civil service is at risk.

Some donor countries are seeking even further cuts to be made in the UN budget and our conditions of employment. If we just think that the world military expenditure in 2010 was USD 1.6 trillion, and that the objective of committing 0.7 per cent of GNP to official development assistance is still far from being achieved, it is difficult to comprehend how the priorities are determined, and even more difficult to explain to staff, especially those at the forefront of maintaining the peace and feeding the poor.

The Commission, in examining the feasibility and suitability of reflecting the comparator’s freeze in UN pay, decided that it “did not have the authority to take measures in the administration of the post adjustment”. Thus, the issue will now be returned to the Member States. FICSA intends to intensify its lobbying on the issue and would like to request the administrations to do the same. As I previously said, aside from the financial aspects, this issue is a question of principle – of safeguarding the independence of the international civil service and of its advisory and decision-making bodies.
On other issues in your agenda we shall say a few words during the relevant discussions: we shall intervene on safety and security matters, to express our appreciation for the cooperation with the UN Department for Safety and Security and the interaction with the IASMN, as well as to reiterate our strong reservations on the use of Armed Private Security Companies. A related issue is that of danger pay for locally recruited staff; FICSA welcomed the ICSC decision to increase the level to 30 per cent of the midpoint of the salary scale, but was disappointed that danger pay would subsequently be de-linked from the salary. We are concerned at the absence of a methodology governing its future adjustments. We shall continue asking for a proper methodology at the next session of the ICSC, seeking at the same time more information on the impact of the transition from hazard to danger pay. Finally, our position on the Mandatory Age of Separation is accounted for in the report of the Working Group submitted for your consideration.

Please allow me one last observation about your agenda item (6), concerning the arrangements for the CEB secretariat’s dual location. Unfortunately FICSA shall not be present in the discussion, included in the executive session tomorrow, despite the interest we have in the conclusions the HLCM will be drawing; as you will appreciate, this issue may have consequences on the quality and frequency of the relations between FICSA and the CEB organizations. In fact, the headquarters of many CEB members is in Europe, as well as the FICSA secretariat, based in Geneva. Therefore, we are of the opinion that the CEB should keep part of its secretariat in Geneva: not only this arrangement appears still to be justified in terms of opportunity costs; it is also desirable from a governance standpoint, since it prevents an excessive centralization of system-wide activities in New York. We hope that the above factors shall be taken into consideration.

While in Bangkok for the ICSC session, we were made aware of the great dissatisfaction of the approximately 1,000 local staff who had recently learned that the results of the salary survey showed that the salaries of GS staff were 27 per cent higher than those of the local market, and those of National Professional Officers (NPOs) were more than 40 per cent higher. These results are unprecedented and we need to understand what the causes are. What we certainly learned through this experience is that FICSA’s constant call for more transparency in the salary survey process, at every step and particularly in field locations, is fully justified.

Finally, I would like to briefly bring to your attention several issues that were raised at the 65th FICSA Council on which staff are keen to see action: (i) Organizations should consistently carry out exit interviews, and share the data and analyses with the staff associations/unions at regular intervals, such as quarterly or annually; (ii) Staff would like to stress the importance of securing staff association/union participation in any re-definition of an organization’s core functions; (iii) With regard to the recognition of dependency status, organizations should respect FICSA Resolution 64/1 and make every effort to implement best practice and to eliminate the deficiencies, unfairness and inequality existing in some organizations; (iv) Staff are also concerned about career development, particularly opportunities to advance from one category to another, and urge the organizations to facilitate internal upward advancement; and (v) The issue of non-staff is similarly of concern: non-staff should not carry out core functions, and the organizations should make provision for social protections for them.

In looking at a major document being discussed at this session, the Change Plan, we noted that two main deliverables are: increased trust and staff engagement.

FICSA agrees that there is a crisis of confidence to be addressed: the staff representatives are able and willing to work with you on the achievement of these objectives.
ANNEX IV

Statement by CCISUA

Madame Chair, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of CCISUA and its 17 Member Organizations representing more than 60,000 staff members, let me begin by thanking HLCM for once again inviting us to speak with you about our concerns regarding the important issues on your agenda for this session. We welcome the opportunity for a dialogue on these points, and we express our deep appreciation for the progress in fostering an exchange of views.

There are several items during these two days that are of the utmost importance to staff, and thus also of very immediate importance to the organizations in order to making the best use of their primary resource – their staff – to ensure achievement of goals and mandates.

Security and Safety of Staff

Concerns about staff security and safety continue to rise as we see unsettled global situations that are becoming more frequent. As you all know, CCISUA represents a growing number of field-based staff. Concerns about their security and safety have not abated, but rather increased. UN working environments are becoming even more challenging. CCISUA remains very committed to working with the Inter-Agency Security Management Network to find swift and full responses to security challenges.

CCISUA was pleased to participate in discussions at the recent IASMN meeting in Bangkok, and welcomes the progress heralded with the introduction of minimum fire regulations. This is basic and an important step forward. We do believe, however, that we can and should move even further by looking at all of the UN accommodations that we occupy – including buildings, tents or other temporary shelters - that we occupy, and by putting the health and safety of staff, especially in field locations, at the forefront of our concerns. We know of instances where simple preventive measures could have facilitated evacuation of unsafe premises, and we urge that worldwide awareness of fire and safety considerations is ensured, along with concerted efforts to evaluate premises and to undertake simple steps to modify working environments, clear exits, and ensure that all staff are aware of steps to follow in emergency situations.

Again at the most recent IASMN meeting, the subject of the use of private security companies for UN operations was raised. As we have voiced there and on many previous occasions, CCISUA does not agree with the use of private security companies to protect UN staff. We reiterate that if operations cannot be conducted by utilizing 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 carries 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 could have unknown connections or accountabilities and could, for example, employ mercenaries, or people who have been involved in war crimes. Using private security contractors raises concerns about reporting lines, quality control, the use of replacement staff and other critical issues. We trust that every proposal that concerns staff security will be carefully scrutinized for all possible ramifications on staff before a decision is made.

We suggest that a comparative analysis of costs for employing internal security, and backing up special needs with temporary recruitment of security, should be undertaken as soon as possible. While we recognize the current financial constraints under which the United Nations organizations operate, we do not believe that safety and security are areas where cost-cutting will serve us well, and we would like assurance that all steps have been taken to address CCISUA’s top concern vis-à-vis safeguarding staff. When staff lives are at stake, there is no room for compromise.
We take this opportunity to once again highlight that all UN staff, regardless of contractual status, grade, level or place of recruitment must be protected by the organisation. We also wish to stress that Security Risk Assessments should be mandatory for every location where UN staff are working.

**Mandatory Age of Separation**

CCISUA continues to advocate review of the retirement age provisions. As we have noted on past occasions, there are several elements that call for this: (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 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 UN Joint Staff Pension Fund; and (d) recognition 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 ring true to Member States.

We also understand that some UN organizations do not think that normal retirement age should be increased as it may negatively impact the UN’s efforts to rejuvenate the work force. However, we stress that retirement age issues are not a solution to performance management problems that need to be properly addressed by dialogue, training or corrective measures to help a staff member reach high performance levels.

The staff federations have asked our members what they think of this issue. By and large, staff seem supportive of a hike in any mandatory age of separation. Our position also continues to be that should the normal age of retirement increase, it must be without prejudice to the acquired rights of those who are currently in the system to retire with full benefits at 60 or 62. Our statement on this subject from last year’s meeting is again attached to this statement.

**Harmonization of conditions of service**

Not long ago, the General Assembly resolution on harmonization dealt a severe blow to many of our members, most especially those working in hardship duty stations while separated from their families in the interests of helping others. Even support systems that had been in place to allow these staff to maintain family relationships and to refresh themselves with new energy for the job at hand have been undermined. We suggest that the UN System consider harmonization by undertaking to adopt best practices from among agencies to maximize lessons learned and reduce stress on staff resulting from varying conditions of service in field duty stations.

New challenges are following on the heels of those just mentioned. Any future discussion of a pay freeze should be undertaken only alongside an examination of whether the agreed methodology to attract staff to the international civil service has been properly followed over the past years. We think that an argument can be made that staff have already been subject to inadequate scaling of salaries to the comparator. We further advocate that while finances and cost-savings be kept in mind, they cannot be the compelling factors. Instead the thinking should start from the perspective of staff welfare and morale, and of attracting the most talented work force as foreseen in the Noblemare principle. We would like to recall that this issue is also linked to encouraging mobility and attracting senior staff to difficult duty stations. Focusing on staff and staff productivity eventually contributes to better and, arguably, more effective and efficient programs. We also welcome the work that is being undertaken regarding improvements that will allow staff to move more freely among organizations with fewer barriers and disincentives.

CCISUA has on a number of occasions highlighted the importance of the education grant as an essential element to effectively implement staff mobility, and has welcomed the fact that the underlying philosophy of the education grant has remained sound, as confirmed over time and through multiple reviews. We caution against reducing this grant. At the same time, we draw attention to the fact that locally recruited staff (who may be required to work at long distances from their actual home), do not have access to similar measures for their children. The education grant delivers value for money and compares very favourably to the comparator civil
service. Regarding the education grant, it is important to ensure the same value of the grant to staff members as a proportion of his or her expenses in order to avoid that staff members make choices concerning mobility (a priority of the Secretary General) on the basis of the proportion of education expenses that they would assume in a particular duty station.

**Interagency mobility**

Regarding interagency mobility, we note that there must be an emphasis on harmonizing conditions in order to make this attractive to staff and to ease the administrative burdens for organizations. We are pleased to see that work is proceeding on ensuring that staff concerns are addressed and that possibilities are increased for secondments and other arrangements that benefit both organizations and staff development.

**Improving Efficiency and Effectiveness of the UN System**

CCISUA has read with interest the report of the Change Management Team that was set up by the Secretary-General to find ways to increase the efficiency, credibility and quality of the UN’s work. CCISUA appreciates the fact that staff representatives of the Staff Unions of the Secretariat and Funds and Programmes acted as observers to the work of the team.

However, without providing detailed comments on each recommendation, we would like to point out that many of them will have an impact on the conditions of service of staff. CCISUA wishes to make clear from the start that these are only recommendations, which we have insisted in communication with the Secretary-General, must be subject to consultations with staff representatives at every level and in every Organization of the UN Common system.

Also, we have to note that the focus of most recommendations is on reducing costs rather than increasing efficiency. We believe that a balance between cost-saving measures and measures to improve efficiency is more appropriate to ensure that the Organizations will be able to continue to deliver on the mandates assigned to them by the Member States.

**CEB Secretariat consolidation in New York**

CCISUA takes note of the terms of reference for a study on CEB Secretariat consolidation, and expresses a concern that while examining the internal structure and potential savings arising from consolidation, the proposal appears to take insufficient account of the fact that the CEB office in Geneva achieves efficiencies with respect to the large number of agencies based in Europe. We support the existence of the two CEB offices, which allows for a more cost-effective interaction on the part of many of CCISUA member organizations. We respectfully request that when undertaking this study, not only factors internal to the CEB’s functioning, but also with regard to its partners in the UN system, be taken into account. We think the findings will show cost-effectiveness as well as efficiency in continuing to have a Geneva-based section of the CEB secretariat.

**To conclude:** Again, on behalf of CCISUA, I thank you for the opportunity to address this distinguished group and to engage in a discussion on some of the agenda items. We reiterate our commitment to work with the various organs of the CEB and to find solutions that benefit both the staff and the organizations they serve, during these challenging times.
ANNEX V

Comments by UNISERV on the Report of the 23rd Session of HLCM
(as submitted on 30 March 2012)

With respect to the Secretary-General’s vision of an efficient Secretariat founded, inter alia, on improved accountability, UNISERV suggests that in order to achieve this aim there have to be mechanisms to ensure consistency of implementation. Currently, accountability is implemented inconsistently and normally in a punitive manner. If we are to meet the Secretary-General’s expectation then the Organization can no longer hold some individuals harmless while targeting others.

UNISERV welcomes the support of the Committee for the increase in danger pay for local staff.

UNISERV supports an expedited implementation of the Inter Agency Agreement concerning transfer, secondment and loan of staff between Organizations.

UNISERV fully supports a continuation of the current dual location arrangement of the CEB Secretariat.