

**Chief Executives Board
for Coordination**

CEB/2017/HLCM/FB/8

8 August 2017

29th Meeting of the CEB Finance and Budget Network
27-28 June 2017, United Nations, New York

**CONCLUSIONS OF THE 29th MEETING
OF THE FINANCE AND BUDGET NETWORK****Table of Contents**

	Page
I. Introduction	2
II. Update from the Working Group on Common Treasury Services (WGCTS).....	2
III. Presentation from the Panel of External Auditors on developments in external audit ...	4
IV. Global service centers	5
V. Funding model for jointly financed security costs.....	11
VI. Cost sharing methodologies for JFA budgets of ICSC, JIU, CEB Secretariat and IPSAS Project (Task Force on Accounting Standards)	13
VII. Management and funding of the After Service Health Insurance (ASHI) liability- Update from the ASHI Working Group.....	15
VIII. US tax reimbursement methodologies	17
IX. Continuation of FB Network work on measuring the cost and impact of oversight and accountability systems in the UN system	18
X. Update from the HLCM Cross-functional Task Force on common definitions related to fraud and implementing partners - Operationalization of the definition of 'fraud' and 'presumptive fraud' as approved by HLCM update on the common definition of 'implementing partner', 'vendor' and 'grant recipient'	20
XI. Risk management and fraud risks	22
XII. Unrecorded exchange on fraud risks.....	23
XIII. Any other business	23
Annex I – List of participants	25

I. Introduction

1. The Finance and Budget Network (FBN) held its 29th session on 27th and 28th June 2017 at the United Nations in New York and the meeting was co-hosted by the UN and UNDP. The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Nick Jeffreys, Comptroller, WHO and Mr. Darshak Shah, Deputy Assistant Administrator and Chief Finance Officer, UNDP. The agenda is available in document CEB/2017/HLCM/FB/2/Rev2.
2. Ms. Bettina Tucci Bartsiotas, Controller, United Nations and Ms Susan McDade, Assistant Administrator and Director of Bureau for Management Services, UNDP opened the meeting and welcomed participants.
3. All documents related to the session are available on the FBN website at <https://www.unsceb.org/content/june-2017>.

II. Update from the Working Group on Common Treasury Services (WGCTS)

Presenter: Mr. Nick Jeffreys, Co-Chair, FB Network

Documentation:

✓ *None*

Discussion:

4. The Co-Chair of the Working Group on Common Treasury Services (WGCTS) provided an update on the work being carried out, noting that the WGCTS is currently focused on three main projects in the ongoing commitment to improve Treasury Service across the UN System through collaborative implementation of effective and efficient solutions for operational activities.
5. In the area of Banking Services, RFP's for Mozambique and Zambia are currently in progress and are scheduled to be finalized by end of June, with Iraq scheduled to be finalized by end of July/August 2017. In addition, the WGCTS is completing surveys for seven potential RFPs for the second half of 2017. The countries being considered for selection are Madagascar, Serbia, Bolivia, Honduras, Equatorial Guinea, Spain and the United Kingdom.
6. An update was also provided on outstanding Master Banking Agreements (MBAs). Agreements for Standard Chartered Bank and Ecobank were completed in 2016 however, negotiations are in progress for an additional ten subsidiaries of Ecobank. Citibank negotiations are in progress to include both parent and subsidiaries. The WGCTS has decided to discontinue further MBA contract negotiations with Standard Bank and Barclays as their overall business model has changed since the initiation of the project.
7. The Co-Chair referred to the factors that had led to the success of the WGCTS in the area of banking harmonization, including that it is a small group that has grown to trust

each other and speak a common language, while also noting the challenges associated with the lengthy legal reviews required for their work.

8. In the area of investment of ASHI reserves, the WGCTS has identified three areas for further analysis with a view towards a potential harmonized approach and/or exchange of information:

a) Common ASHI Investment Policy: there will be a review of ASHI investment guidelines posted on the WGCTS platform to find commonalities on general principles regarding investment guidelines in selected areas;

b) Roster of External Managers: the WGCTS members will be requested to provide selected data on their external managers;

c) Investment Committee Comments regarding ASHI Investments: the WGCTS members will be requested to share, where possible, the minuted comments regarding ASHI investments from their Investment Committee meetings over the past year.

9. In the area of Cash - Based Transfers, the Co-Chair updated the FBN on a new project that has been initiated following discussions in the WGCTS meeting of October 2016. This project will be led by WFP, UNHCR and UNICEF, with financial and technical support from The Better Than Cash Alliance, and will work toward an ultimate goal of exploring the development of a harmonized approach across the UN organizations for cash transfers.

10. The initial phase of the project will be divided into three deliverables:

a) Stock Taking – review current needs and use of cash based assistance within each entity to include assessing and identifying common challenges, bottlenecks and barriers;

b) Comparative Analysis – high-level analysis of current costs and potential efficiency gains from collaboration and review of the governance and financial risk management implication of common approaches;

c) Opportunities and Next Steps – propose steps on the potential opportunities for alignment and harmonization. This will include exploration of the potential for maximizing the use of financial services providers' agreements across participating entities and other humanitarian partners including NGOs and Local Governments. A proposed action plan will then be developed to allow the WGCTS to make informed decisions on how to pursue cash collaboration and coordination.

11. It was recalled that donors are strongly pushing to have cash replace traditional payments, and that significant effort is being put into innovation in this area to deliver cash to beneficiaries in a much more efficient way.

Conclusions and follow up actions:

12. The FBN took note of the update.

III. Presentation from the Panel of External Auditors on developments in external audit

Presenter: Mr. Salhina Mkumba, Convenor Technical Group, Mr. Anand Bajaj, Chair, Audit Operations Committee, and Mr. Rolf-Dietrich Kammer, Audit Operations Committee

Documentation:

- ✓ *Letter from Panel of External Auditors to the Secretary-General dated 22 November 2016*
- ✓ *Letter from USG for Management to the Panel of External Auditors dated 7 December 2016*

Background:

13. At its 28th meeting in November 2016, the FBN received an overview from the FBN Co-Chair of his recent presentation to the Panel of External Auditors Technical Group, and requested that the Panel of External Auditors be invited to provide a briefing to the FBN at the upcoming face-to-face meeting, to enhance the collaboration with the UN Board of Auditors and the Panel of External Auditors

Discussion:

14. The representatives from the Panel of External Auditors welcomed the opportunity to present to the FBN and their presentation covered a number of issues and recent developments in external audit.

15. The presentation covered the revised format for the Short Form Audit Report (SFAR), based on revised ISA 700, noting that it was mandatory to adopt for financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2016. The presenters noted that the Panel's Technical Group had established a working group to agree on a revised format, which was approved by the UN Board of External Auditors. In the revised format SFAR, the audit opinion will appear first and there will be a new section where the auditors will report on information other than financial information contained in the financial statements. In this new section, auditors will have a responsibility to read the other information and, in doing so, consider whether the other information is materially inconsistent with the financial statements. It was clarified that an example of "other information" could be an organization's annual report, or anything more or less than that.

16. Regarding Key Audit Matters (KAM) and the new ISA 701, the presenters noted that the Panel has agreed that application of ISA 701 will not be mandatory for UN entities, recognising that a lot of information is already provided under the long form audit report, however the Panel will keep this issue under review. The presenters further clarified that KAM should essentially be very significant issues which, in the professional judgement of the auditor, need to be highlighted. Traditionally, the short form report is where the audit opinion is conveyed, and includes any important issues which, in the opinion of the auditors, should be conveyed to governing board and General Assembly. The UN Board of Auditors had a discussion as to whether they should also highlight KAM in the SFAR (picked up from the long form report and highlighted in the SFAR), and for now the Board has decided to maintain the practice of placing all information in the long form report.

17. The presenters also touched on presentation of previous recommendations, noting that the revised presentation had been taken up by the Board of Auditors but not yet by the Panel of External Auditors.

18. In response to a request raised to consider changing the practice of including sub-recommendations, in order to avoid the situation where progress has been made to implement many sub-recommendations but the whole recommendation is still shown as outstanding, the presenters noted that some reports have already changed significantly on reporting sub-parts, but that the Panel has decided not to abandon completely reporting on sub-recommendations, as some recommendations are closely related and it would not be appropriate to abandon the possibility to split recommendations in presentation. However the Panel is working continuously on making recommendations less complicated and acknowledged the point that the more comprehensive recommendations are, the harder it is for organizations to implement.

19. Regarding IPSAS harmonization, the presenters note that this is an issue always under consideration and that the Panel endeavours to take a consistent and uniform approach in application of IPSAS issues across entities.

20. In response to a question regarding situations where organizations are obtaining services from other entities and whether independent attestations on those services will be required by the external auditors, the presenters noted that this is a question of judgement as to how the auditors will determine what level of assurance is required for them to be confident. Auditors will evaluate the risk associated with that kind of assessment and engagement, and the required level of assurance may vary from case to case depending on the risk that auditors see if such attestation cannot be provided.

Conclusions and follow-up actions:

21. The FBN took note of the update, and particularly with regard to the revised format of the Short Form Audit Report, expressed a hope that the new format remains as concise as possible.

IV. Global service centers

Presenters: Mr. Sylvain St. Pierre, Chief, FAO Shared Service Center, Budapest (via VTC); Mr. Mark Beatty, Director, UNICEF Global Shared Services Centre; Mr. Nick Jeffreys, Comptroller and Director, Department of Finance WHO; Mr. Bruce McCarron, Director, Operations, Legal and Technology Services UNDP

Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2017/3 Conclusions of the Thirty-third session of the High Level Committee on Management*
- ✓ *CEB/2017/HLCM/3 – Update on Global Service Delivery Solutions in the UN System*
- ✓ *CEB/2017/HLCM/3/Add.1 Use of Key Performance Indicators for Performance of Service Centers*
- ✓ *CEB/2015/HLCM/11 Progress with global service delivery solutions in the UN System*
- ✓ *JIU/REP/2016/11- The role of service centres in redesigning administrative service delivery*

Background:

22. At its 33rd session in March 2017, HLCM had a thematic discussion on global service centers. HLCM concluded its discussion by agreeing to establish a task force to prepare a paper on a number of issues, as set out in CEB/2017/3 Conclusions of the Thirty-third session of the High Level Committee on Management. The Task Force has not yet been established, however areas that the Task Force will cover with direct relevance to the Finance and Budget Network include developing an inventory of needs for operational services and an availability and capacity assessment of potential service providers; Conducting a review of cost recovery, cost sharing and pricing models, per service or service line; Proposing approaches to maintaining and sharing Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for comparability among organizations and transparency with stakeholders; and proposing approaches to inter-agency learning and sharing of best practices between Service Centres. HLCM also requested the Finance and Budget Network to develop proposals for UN standards for inter-agency funding and drawdown, with the aim to provide a clearing mechanism for services provided across entities.

Discussion:

23. Four organizations that have established global service centres with financial operations (FAO, UNICEF, UNDP and WHO) presented an overview of the financial services provided at their centres, the KPIs that are used for measuring performance, existing challenges being faced, and cost recovery and pricing models. FBN members then discussed the presentations and exchanged views on collaboration on shared services across the UN system. The main areas that were discussed are as follows:

Governance of shared service centres and ownership of processes

24. From the presentations, it was highlighted that while there are many similarities across the existing shared service centres, there exists differences in governance models, and also some differences when it comes to ownership of business processes. Some centres have taken full ownership of end-to-end processes whereas others still have responsibility resting with HQ process owners.

25. For FAO, all processing is centralised in the back office at the Shared Service Center in Budapest, where the Centre is responsible for end-to-end process design and helps in identifying areas of weaknesses in processes and any inefficiencies. FAO has a Shared Service Centre Board which sets the agenda for the Centre and membership includes directors from across FAO. It was noted that the Centre has the ability to optimise processing, even processes they don't perform in the centre, through assisting in the design of the processes to avoid having weak connection points that present inefficiencies. For the UNICEF Global Shared Services Centre there is no separate governance mechanism, rather existing mechanisms are used and there are quarterly review meetings with representation from regional, headquarters and country offices. The UNICEF Centre has become a process owner, separating out policy from procedures, however unlike FAO, the UNICEF Centre does not have end to end ownership of processes, although it is very involved in most processes.

26. For the UNDP service centres, policy ownership for finance and HR rests with the respective directors at headquarters, which means that by necessity, directors are very closely engaged across all branches, and regional bureaus each have established a governance board for their regions. The WHO service centre in Kuala Lumpur has a global governance board, however there is only limited opportunity for business process transformation taking place within the centre, as process owners are located in Geneva (with the exception of the Payroll function).

Performance management and KPIs

27. During the presentations and the following discussion, emphasis was placed on the performance of service centres, making it clear that good performance is very important to customers and that measuring performance is core to the success of a service centre. It was agreed that there is a need for service providers to ensure that they have SLA targets in place if they want to provide services to other organizations, and that the ability to enforce SLAs is critical. FBN members discussed that it would be helpful to find a way to provide incentives for good performance and also some penalties for poor performance.

28. The FAO Centre has a performance monitoring function which tracks SLAs and conducts trend analysis, with workplans to address performance issues on an ongoing basis. The Centre has KPIs that measure two dimensions – qualitative (Two surveys per year to measure satisfaction and ask about opportunities for improvement) and quantitative (For example the number of straight through processing, number of bank rejections, number of complaints). The Centre can track performance all the way down to the individuals performing the services.

29. The UNICEF Centre has a service quality management section that is responsible for SLA performance oversight and meets every week on continuous business improvement. The Centre has SLAs in place with all customers with hundreds of KPI targets, and it was noted that having a case management tool is critical to track cases. It was noted that the Centre has a separate set of measures and targets for emergency and humanitarian countries, where the targets are set lower.

30. The UNDP Centres use a balanced scorecard with monthly reporting to clients against KPIs. The Centres have automated KPI dashboards for pipeline management that are linked to the ERP. The WHO Centre also prepares regular KPI reports, and SLAs are attached to all the various transaction types with regular reporting against the SLAs which is monitored by the governance committee.

Staffing and knowledge management

31. During the discussion, it was noted that staff recruitment and retention can be a challenge for some service centres. Both UNDP and WHO described the challenges of recruiting and retaining talented staff in Kuala Lumpur, where there is a competitive market and working for the UN is not in itself a drawcard, therefore there is a need to invest in recruitment and to highlight the benefits of a career in shared services to provide incentives to attract staff.

32. During the discussion, UNHCR also noted that staff sustainability is a challenge for its service Centre in Budapest, with turnover of Professional Staff being high due to the

repetitive nature of the work. In addition, the pool of available talented General Service staff is not large enough and it was proposed that as a group, organizations could look together at the pool of staff coming through from universities that can be shared. For FAO, it was noted that an important part of its model is knowledge retention, and a core team has been established where they try to maintain a low turnover rate, and that team is responsible for maintaining the knowledge base and transmitting knowledge back to the main contributors in the Centre.

Financial services currently provided

33. The FAO, UNICEF, UNDP and WHO Centres currently provide finance services in a number of areas including invoice management and accounts payable, payments, bank reconciliations, management of banking information master data, performance of accounting adjustments, GL clearing, fixed asset management, payroll services for staff and non-staff, staff recoveries and travel payments.

Importance of communication within the Centres and across the organizations

34. The importance of strong communication was noted, including the need to formalise informal communication channels when moving to a service centre. It was noted that sharing of ideas needs to be structured and organised through active discussion and active meetings. The challenge of integrating shared service centre staff into the broader organization was raised, and UNICEF and UNHCR described some solutions that their Centres have put in place. UNICEF has formed a field reference group with subject matter experts where they continually pull people in from the field to interact with staff and clients, which enables the Centre staff to feel connected and engaged with the programme. UNHCR has established its global learning center in Budapest which brings the field staff to Budapest for training and fosters integration of the Centre staff.

Drivers behind establishing global shared service centres

35. While some service centres may have been established with cost savings as an initial main driver, the FBN discussion found that driving for cost efficiencies is not enough, and that these Centres also need to strive for improvements in quality of service, process improvements, improved responsiveness to field operations and risk reduction.

36. For UNICEF, it was noted that the main driver for establishing its Centre was to pull away administrative functions from the field to give field staff more time for oversight of programmes. UNICEF noted that it has found from experience that it is more effective to move a process to the global service centre and then fix it there, rather than trying to fix the process and then move it.

37. The FBN noted during its discussion that while process improvements are important, there has to be financial incentives to drive organizations towards shared service centres. It was noted that it would be useful to collect some data from established service centres as to what savings have been achieved, what the headcount shifts were from HQ or field to the centres, and whether there has been a notable elimination of posts. The issue was also raised as to whether organizations should have an exit strategy/trigger for a point when costs get too high, and whether, in the case where costs become excessive, there is a plan to move to another service centre or another location.

38. During the discussion it was noted that when looking at cost savings, if an organization moves functions from a headquarters location to a service centre you have the potential for significant savings, however when moving functions from a country office that has reasonable costs, it may be cost neutral in the short term. However, organizations must also look at benefits from improved quality of services in the long term. In general, it was recognized that the potential savings to be achieved will depend on where you are locating services from and to and the composition of the shared service centre in terms of international vs local staff.

39. The FAO presenter noted that for the FAO Centre in Budapest, there was a period of 18 months from the investment being made to cost recovery, noting that cost arbitrage is a big factor, but also as the Centre matures it is starting to enable function absorption through process design. The UNICEF presenter noted that UNICEF prepared a business case to measure time to do processes in field and the service centre, finding that if you lift and shift processes, savings in the range of 50-60 per cent can be achieved even without process reengineering.

Cost recovery models and pricing of services

40. During the discussion, FBN members noted that shared services have to be priced correctly, and also discussed whether there may be services that can be provided at a lower cost by the private sector.

41. The FAO presenter noted that the FAO Centre has many costing options available as the Centre tracks cost at the level of each type of individual transaction, which provides powerful information to help make decisions in terms of the value that these structures can provide. UNICEF noted that when considering whether to establish its Center, it also reached out to private sector shared service centres in Budapest and hired a consultancy company to do a benchmarking study with industry peer reviews, and the Centre continually measures itself against the private sector. Regarding cost recovery, the UNICEF Centre would look at productivity benchmarks together with the volumes being provided to determine the appropriate staffing requirements. Generally, the Centre would charge back finance processes based on transactions and HR processes based on headcount. The costs would be based on direct costs plus a small overhead amount and a small investment amount.

42. For the WHO Centre, the cost recovery approach is not directly linked to the Centre's transactions, instead a post occupancy charge is levied through payroll and that is used to fund the centre.

Challenges of operating under different ERP systems

43. During the discussion, the challenges of operating shared service centres with different ERP systems was recognised. While having a single ERP platform would be valuable, given the difficulties in reaching that goal, some FBN members were of the view that the challenges associated with operating under different ERPs can be overcome, although perhaps at a cost. Some examples of services that operate with different ERPs in place were given, including the UN Medical Insurance services and the UN Income Tax Reimbursement services.

44. It was noted that further consideration should be given to possibilities such as grouping based on ERP type, and that the FBN should capture statistics on how many agencies will be replacing ERPs in the coming years and see whether there can be any coordination in this regard.

Opportunities for improved inter-agency collaboration on shared service centres

45. Regarding inter-agency collaboration, it was noted that among the existing service centres of UNICEF, FAO, WHO, UNDP there is already a finance network and a HR group that meet regularly to informally collaborate, share ideas and learn from each other, and also from private sector service centres.

46. When discussing the factors that are taken into account when deciding to establish new service centres, the issue was raised as to whether consideration is being given to using existing centres and building on what has already been established. Some FBN members noted that if there is a proliferation of new shared service centres being established in the UN system, it will come to a point where Member States may question the value of each Centre. It was suggested that organizations need to consider how efficient it is to establish new centres and whether other existing centres are in a better position to provide services.

47. The practical barriers to using the same service centres were discussed, including having different ERP systems, space limitations and different business processes and policies, however in general it was agreed that organizations need to take a pragmatic approach to addressing these barriers. It was noted that, as evidenced through discussions with Member States, it has become difficult to defend why UN organizations need to have different administrative policies and procedures in areas such as accounts payable.

Clarification of roles and responsibilities

48. It was agreed that it is a fundamental requirement to define roles and responsibilities between the service provider and service recipient and to identify who is responsible for what and in which location – which is viewed as being critical for accountability for performance, and for audit purposes.

Conclusions and follow-up actions:

49. The FBN agreed that all organizations have a responsibility to look at how they are working and whether things can be done more efficiently, and it was generally recognized that the existence of different business policies and procedures across UN organizations can no longer be viewed as an unsurmountable barrier to increased collaboration on shared services.

50. It was agreed that further discussions would be required to identify potential issues that prevent UN organizations from having shared services, and where the limiting factors are from a finance perspective, as well as to identify further opportunities for collaboration on shared services, including potential areas for harmonization of processes and common policies. It was recognized that the FBN members are in a position of some authority over financial policies and procedures and a pragmatic approach needs to be adopted.

51. While there was general support for shared services, it was agreed that it would be unrealistic to have a single agency providing services for all UN entities through one shared service centre. It was also noted that the UN system cannot consider moving towards increased shared services without recognising that there are many incremental steps that would need to be considered first, including, among others:

- Review of business processes and areas that could be harmonized
- Clarification of roles, responsibilities and accountability for processes
- Determining an appropriate governance model
- Identifying an optimal pricing/cost recovery model
- Standardising KPIs for performance against SLAs
- Addressing the challenge of operating under different ERPs

52. There was general support for the proposal to consider piloting one process that has a common basis for all organizations as a global shared service for the UN system. The pilot would need to cover the process in its entirety in order to gain efficiency benefits. Travel, payroll and procurement (vendor selection, vendor follow-up, vendor procedures, creation of vendor bank accounts etc) were suggested as processes that would be suitable to pilot, and it was suggested that the informal finance network of the existing shared service centres could explore this proposal further.

53. The issue of global shared service centres will be a standing item on the agenda of the FBN sessions going forward.

V. Funding model for jointly financed security costs

Presenter: Ms. Fadzai Gwaradzimba, Assistant Secretary-General and Ms. Menada Wind-Andersen, Executive Officer, UN Department of Safety and Security (DSS)

Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2017/HLCM/FB/4 Note on recent FB Network discussions on the cost sharing methodology for jointly financed security costs*
- ✓ *Conclusions of the Finance and Budget Network review of the 2018-2019 proposed budget for JFA Security costs (CEB/2017/HLCM/FB/5)*

Background:

54. During the review of the 2018-2019 JFA Security budget proposal, the FBN expressed appreciation for DSS' agreement to review the JFA funding model in 2017, in consultation with the FBN and IASMN. At that meeting DSS also confirmed its commitment to work with the FBN on a review of the funding methodology to better support programme delivery.

Discussions:

55. The FBN received a presentation from DSS on the JFA funding mechanism and the emerging trends. The presentation noted that there has been increased levels of armed conflict and terrorism, and tremendous increases in surge deployment to support crises on the ground. Surge deployment days have increased from 800 in 2012 to 5,500 deployment days in 2016. To address the increase in surge deployments, DSS has had to redeploy JFA

resources from one country to another which leaves a gap in coverage. Increased humanitarian needs have also led to increased security needs.

56. DSS explained that the existing funding mechanism has operated since the time of inception of DSS in early 2000's, with three streams of financing including UNA (Regular budget), JFA (Jointly financed budget) and QSA (support from peacekeeping accounts). The presentation covered some of the challenges associated with the current funding model, including that the current model does not allow flexibility to redeploy from one funding stream to another. Another challenge relates to the increased security challenges in OECD countries, which are currently covered by 1 P4 post in Brussels who is responsible for 11 European countries. OECD countries are currently excluded from the headcount used to apportion the JFA security budget, and there is currently an IASMN Working Group reviewing the security requirements for OECD countries.

57. The presentation also raised the issue of the minimum contribution level paid by smaller organizations of \$75,000 per biennium, suggesting that the minimum amount may need to be revised. It was noted by DSS and some FBN members that even those organizations without a field presence still need UNSMS support for mission travel.

58. Regarding the headcount methodology that is used to apportion the JFA budget among organizations, the headcount timing is not aligned with budget period, and in addition, consideration needs to be given to whether headcount is reflective of real needs. DSS suggested that there are three important variables for the funding model, including i) location and security environment; ii) intensity and frequency of activities; and iii) UN presence/headcount. There are 5 levels of security, ranging from locations at level 1 (normal setting) to high risk locations such as Afghanistan (Level 4) and Mali, Yemen and Syria (Level 5). As security levels progress and the environment becomes more volatile and complex, increased security resources are required to provide hazard danger pay, and also due to the changing nature of security coverage such as close protection etc.

59. The presentation also touched on locally cost shared security budgets, with DSS emphasizing that these local budgets are a supplementary funding tool to fund additional security requirements at Designated Areas within the country for activities specific to the security requirements of the location. However the FBN expressed a strong view that, when looking at revising the funding model and having a pay per use mechanism, the locally cost shared budgets should not be treated separately and should be included in any discussion of the funding model. In addition, a number of organizations noted that they also have their own security offices and that the review should be comprehensive and transparent, covering all security resources including JFA security costs, locally cost shared budgets, the security resources budgeted within organizations and the UNA (regular budget) and QSA security resources. FBN organizations would have a responsibility to provide DSS with the data on security resources budgeted within their own organizations.

60. DSS proposed that a Working Group be established, with membership that includes IASMN and FBN, to review the funding methodology to better support programme delivery, and noted that the proposal for the Working Group had been discussed by IASMN at its meeting the prior week and that IASMN members had agreed to participate in the Working Group

61. During the discussion, FBN members generally agreed that a review of the funding model for the jointly financed safety and security management system is required and that it would make sense to move towards a transparent “user-pays” system, and agreed that the FB Network should participate together with IASMN and DSS in the Working Group. The FBN suggested that in light of the technical expertise that DSS and the IASMN can provide, it would be helpful for DSS, as the security experts, to come forward with a proposal that could be discussed by the Working Group, rather than the Working Group starting with a blank slate.

62. The option of having a single source of funding for security for the whole UN system was raised, noting that this should be seen in the context of the UN reform that the Secretary-General will be undertaking, to eliminate the current messy and inflexible model where financing comes from three different sources. It was suggested that it would make more sense that entire costs of security for the whole UN system be presented to Member States in one single budget.

Conclusions and follow-up actions:

63. FBN members agreed to participate in a working group to be initiated by DSS with joint representation from the FBN, IASMN and DSS, to review the funding methodology. The organizations that volunteered to be part of the group include FAO, IOM, WFP, UNHCR, UN, UNDP and UNFPA, and these organizations will provide their nominated focal points through the CEB Secretariat to DSS.

64. It was agreed that the review of the funding model should be comprehensive and transparent, covering all security resources including JFA security costs, locally cost shared budgets, the security resources budgeted within organizations and the UNA (regular budget) and QSA security resources. When agreeing to review the funding methodology, the FBN emphasized that preliminary inputs from DSS and IASMN will be required to identify the drivers and trends of security demand, and that IASMN, DSS and FBN will need to have a collective engagement in developing a revised proposal.

VI. Cost sharing methodologies for JFA budgets of ICSC, JIU, CEB Secretariat and IPSAS Project (Task Force on Accounting Standards)

Presenter: Mr. Nick Jeffreys, FBN Co-Chair

Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2017/HLCM/FB/3/Rev.1 Note on cost sharing methodologies for JFA budgets of ICSC, JIU, CEB Secretariat and IPSAS Project.*

Background:

65. During the FBN review of the 2018-2019 JFA budget proposals of ICSC, JIU, CEB Secretariat and the Task Force on Accounting Standards, the issue of the cost sharing methodologies for these budgets was raised and the FBN agreed to discuss the methodologies at the next FBN session.

Discussion:

66. The FBN Co-Chair introduced a note on cost sharing methodologies currently in place, recalling that the existing methodologies have the benefit of simplicity and verifiability. The CEB Secretariat also recalled that the principles of simplicity, verifiability and objectivity were previously agreed by the FBN¹ as critical elements of the JFA cost sharing arrangements, and that the expenditure figures used in the methodology are sourced from the audited financial statements of each organization.

67. FBN members considered the note and a number of organizations indicated that, in their view, there was a need to review the existing methodology to determine if it is still appropriate or if it should be updated. Some suggestions were made as to elements of the methodology that could be considered for potential amendment. One of these was to examine inter-organizational transfers and how to consistently and transparently reflect these in the expenditure amounts used in the calculations. Another was to consider the impact of unpaid assessed contributions on reported expenditures. A further suggestion was to review the rationale for excluding expenditure from peacekeeping operations from the cost apportionment calculations. It was also noted that there are different treatments for expenditures across the financial statements of UN system organizations.

68. Regarding the methodology for cost sharing of the IPSAS Project (Task Force on Accounting Standards) budget, there was a suggestion from several organizations to allocate the budget on the basis of expenditure only, with no staffing element.

69. The timing of the headcount and expenditure data used in the calculations was also raised, noting that the data is not current at the time that budget implementation begins, and some organizations expressed a view that more current data should be used where possible. In this regard, it was recalled that the timing of the UN regular budget cycle needs to be considered during any discussion on timing of personnel and expenditure data.

70. Regarding the budget of the ICSC, it was noted that in addition to the jointly financed budget, organizations are also required to cover local costs for ICSC.

71. There was also a request for clarification of the criteria used for determining the number of personnel, as used in the calculations. A revision to the background note (*CEB/2017/HLCM/FB/3/Rev.1*) was issued to include this clarification.

Conclusions and follow-up actions:

72. FBN members agreed to establish a small working group to review the current methodologies for cost sharing of the JFA budgets of ICSC, JIU, CEB Secretariat and TFAS to determine if there is a need to revise any of the methodologies. The UN, FAO, UNDP, UNHCR and UNAIDS volunteered to be part of the Working Group,

73. The FBN requested that, prior to any proposal for changes to the methodologies being submitted to the FBN for consideration, a comparison of the share of each organization before and after the proposed changes be prepared in order to assess whether the changes would be material enough to warrant an amendment to the methodology(ies). It was understood that any proposed changes to the methodologies would not be applicable until

¹ 80th session (4 March 1994), CCAQ(FB)

the 2020-2021 biennium, as many organizations have already submitted their 2018-2019 budget proposals to their respective governing bodies.

VII. Management and funding of the After Service Health Insurance (ASHI) liability- Update from the ASHI Working Group

Presenter: Mr Pedro Guazo, Director Accounts Division/Acting Deputy Controller, United Nations

Documentation:

- ✓ *Managing after-service health insurance liabilities, follow-up report of the Secretary-General (A/71/698)*
- ✓ *Minutes of the ASHI Working Group face to face meeting, February 2017, Geneva*
- ✓ *Proposal for establishing an Insurance Group- Draft Terms of Reference*

Background:

74. In the period leading up to the seventy-third session of the General Assembly in 2018, the ASHI Working Group plans to continue its work, focusing its efforts on collective negotiations with third-party administrators; on opportunity, cost and benefit analyses regarding the incorporation of coverage under certain national health insurance schemes into United Nations system agency health insurance plan designs; on revisiting health insurance plan design and eligibility for after-service health insurance; and on achieving critical scale. The Working Group on ASHI considers that, by the time it submits its final report to the seventy-third session of the General Assembly in 2018, it will have completed its work, and will have provided impetus for the ongoing efforts and initiatives aimed at containing health insurance-related costs and controlling obligations in respect of ASHI.

75. The ASHI Working Group has proposed that an Insurance Group be established to coincide with the completion of the work of the ASHI Working Group and the delivery of the Secretary-General's report on Managing after-service health insurance to the General Assembly at its seventy-third session. The Insurance Group is proposed to be a standing body, established to ensure that the efforts and initiatives of the Working Group on ASHI are perpetuated and that United Nations system entities have a forum for extending their cooperation to other lines of insurance in relation to which efficiency and effectiveness can be strengthened, and to address insurance related matters globally and on an ongoing basis

Discussions:

76. The Chair of the Working Group provided an update from the most recent discussions with ACABQ and the General Assembly (GA) regarding ASHI, highlighting the main outcomes from the 71st session of the GA which included, among others, the GA reconfirming the Pay As You Go approach, making no commitment to funding of the ASHI liability; Member States challenging the cost apportionment of the ASHI premiums between staff and organizations, as well as the legal basis for the terms and conditions of ASHI with a view to reducing their liabilities; the GA welcoming the work that has been done with the Task Force on Accounting Standards on standardizing and harmonising

assumptions for valuation of ASHI liabilities; and discussions on inter-agency cooperation including the role of the UNJSPF.

77. The Chair of the Working Group also provided an update on the status of the work of the Group and the planned activities and related timelines until the final report is submitted to the General Assembly in the Fall of 2018, as discussed and agreed at a face-to-face meeting of the Working Group in Geneva in February 2017. An update was provided on the national health insurance surveys, noting that responses have been received from 10 countries to date, and that work in this area is planned to be completed in November 2017. An update was also provided on the achievements that have been made through collective negotiations with Third Party Administrators Allianz and Cigna, which has led to organizations being in a better position to leverage providers, leading to dollar savings, with work in this area scheduled to be completed by August 2017. Regarding plan design and eligibility, the Chair noted that discussions within the Working Group will be initiated in June 2017, in coordination with the HR Network, in an attempt to proactively come up with reasonable proposals to pre-empt any potential requests from Member States regarding plan design or eligibility.

78. Regarding the issue of portability, including transfer of entitlements and solvency, it was noted that coordination with the HR Network needs to be reinforced in this area, and that currently the default arrangement is that the recipient entity bears the liability, which can act as an obstacle to the transfer of staff within the UN system. During the FBN discussion, it was agreed that a more formal position on transfer of liabilities could be beneficial, to have a standard for all UN organizations rather than having bilateral negotiations, and that it is worth studying the volume of inter-organizational transfers and the associated ASHI liabilities to determine if the amounts are significant enough to warrant further work in this area.

79. The Chair of the Working Group also noted some of the critical challenges related to ASHI going forward including funding of the liabilities, inconsistencies in terms and conditions of insurance across the UN system, and insurance fraud prevention. Regarding inter-agency cooperation and coordination after the conclusion of the ASHI Working Group in August 2018, the Chair of the Working Group noted some areas that would be desirable for the UN system to continue looking at, including information sharing, the collection of statistics and breakdowns of costs, and analysis on the comparability of plans. In this connection, the Chair noted that the Working Group sees scope for continued inter-agency coordination and cooperation in the area of personnel insurance (including health, workers compensation, PA, Term Life, MAIP, Non-standard/aggravated risk insurance); as well as other non-personnel insurance such as property and casualty insurance, liability and special risk insurance. The Chair introduced the proposal of the Working Group to establish an Insurance Group, presenting Terms of Reference for two alternative models that had been proposed by the Working Group. The first model is to establish two separate groups to focus on personnel and non-personnel insurance, and the alternate model proposed was to establish a single group with two sub-groups. It was noted that the Working Group had considered the option of entrusting this work to the existing informal roundtable health-insurance group, however the Working Group was not in favour of this and preferred the option of establishing a formal institutional arrangement to ensure that the work continues and that there are formal reporting lines to the necessary bodies of the CEB. The Chair noted that the Working Group did not reach consensus on

whether the Insurance Group(s) should be led by the FBN or the HR Network, and this would ultimately depend on the final model chosen.

80. During the FBN discussion it was noted that there are currently no statistics available on other types of insurance across the UN system and that this is one of the reasons behind the proposal to establish an Insurance Group, to collect data on how much each agency pays for premiums in order to assess whether there are any opportunities for collective negotiations or to achieve savings through economies of scale.

81. In general, the FBN recognized the validity of looking at other types of non-personnel insurance, however decided that it would be appropriate to defer the decision on the proposed establishment of an Insurance Group until 2018, closer to the time when the ASHI Working Group will conclude, in order to have a more accurate picture of what has been delivered and in which areas work needs to continue. It was recognized that in addition to the achievements made so far, the ASHI WG still has a lot of open deliverables. Some core issues that organizations still need to address include plan design and eligibility, including some potentially difficult decisions on structure and benefits; leveraging national health insurance schemes; and ASHI reserves and IPSAS compliance.

Conclusions and follow-up actions:

82. The FBN expressed appreciation for the work of ASHI Working Group and the achievements of the Group so far, recognizing that the nature of the work is very complicated and involves varied stakeholder groups including human resources, finance, staff unions and Member States. The Network encouraged the Working Group to communicate regularly back to the FBN, particularly on any new recommendations of the Group, including in the areas of negotiations with Third Party Administrators and leveraging national health insurance schemes. The FBN also requested the Group to obtain more data related to portability of ASHI liabilities in order to determine if additional work needs to be undertaken by the FBN in this area, in coordination with the HR Network.

83. The FBN agreed to keep as an open issue whether establishing an Insurance Group was necessary given the existence of other bodies such as the FBN, the HR Network and the roundtable health insurance group, and deferred further discussions on this proposal until closer to the time when the ASHI Working Group will conclude in 2018, in order to have a more accurate picture of what has been delivered and in which areas work needs to continue.

VIII. US tax reimbursement methodologies

Presenter: Mr. Greg Johnson, Treasurer and Financial Comptroller, ILO

Documentation:

✓ *Summary table of US tax reimbursement methodologies*

Discussion:

84. ILO provided a brief overview of the results of the survey that had been undertaken to capture the various arrangements currently in place across the UN system for US income tax reimbursement, noting that there are some differences in treatment across

organizations, and that the ultimate objective is that any US tax paying official is treated equitably when compared to non-US tax paying officials. The survey results show that some organizations are able to recover completely the amount of the reimbursement from US government funds, while others have a Tax Reimbursement Agreement (TRA) where they request reimbursement from the US government, and they may in some cases be reimbursed on the basis of UN income being first income, resulting in the organization receiving a lower amount from the US government than they reimburse to their staff members.

85. The objective of the survey was for all organizations to be well informed of the current practices, and FBN members were requested to please review their responses to the survey, and in particular the column on basis of claim from US authorities, and inform the CEB Secretariat if any updates to the table are required.

86. The issue of payment modality was raised, with some organizations having a TRA that obliges them to send payments to the US through checks rather than electronic payments. The UN Tax Reimbursement Unit confirmed that they make electronic transfers to IRS for New York State but other States are currently paid by check, however the UN is currently trying to make arrangements to use electronic payments with other States.

87. The UN Income Tax Unit offered to provide assistance to any organizations that may require it with regards to reimbursement of US income taxes.

Conclusions and follow-up actions:

88. The FBN members took note of the update and agreed to keep the issue of US income tax reimbursement methodologies under review.

IX. Continuation of FB Network work on measuring the cost and impact of oversight and accountability systems in the UN system

Presenter: Mr. Andrew Saberton, Director, Division for Management Services, UNFPA

Documentation:

- ✓ *Report of the Finance and Budget Network – Quantifying the costs of oversight and accountability structures in the UN system (CEB/2016/HLCM/21)*

Background:

89. HLCM at its 32nd session in October 2016 requested the FBN to continue with its previous exercise in quantifying the costs of oversight and accountability mechanisms by considering quantification of costs for 2016 with a view to developing a time series for the third line of defense. HLCM also requested the FBN to explore the possibilities for measuring the impact of oversight and accountability structures in place across the UN System and report back to HLCM thereon. When the FBN discussed the HLCM requests at its 28th session, it was agreed that further discussion is required on the next steps and activities to be carried out in order to respond to HLCM's requests, and that UNFPA will continue to co-lead this exercise, together with WHO.

Discussions:

90. UNFPA presented the agenda item, recalling the previous HLCM discussions in this area which date back to 2013 and the QCPR mandate towards ensuring coherence and complementarity in the oversight functions across the UN². The presentation highlighted the two main elements of work to be done by the FBN, namely to quantify costs for 2015 and 2016, and to explore possibilities for measuring the impact of the oversight and accountability structures in place. Regarding the quantification of costs, and the issue of whether to include all lines of defense or only the third line, the reservations that had previously been expressed by HLCM regarding the difficulties and labour intensive efforts in obtaining robust data on the costs of the 1st and 2nd lines of defense were recalled, noting that third line costs are much more ring-fenced and easier for organizations to identify and reliably quantify without the need for introducing assumptions. The third line of defense includes internal audit, inspection, ethics activities, investigation activities and centralized independent evaluation.

91. Regarding the possibilities for measuring the impact of oversight and accountability structures, UNFPA noted that there is not a lot of research or data available on the impact of audit or oversight, even within the private sector. It was suggested that one option for the FBN to consider would be to conduct a survey from both an external and internal angle.

92. During the FBN discussion on measuring impact, consideration was given as to whether the FBN should try to approach the exercise from a value for money viewpoint, however caution was urged so as not to be seen as questioning the assurance mechanisms that that have oversight of the UN system organizations.

93. Support was expressed for conducting a survey, and UNFPA agreed to review and revise the previous narrative template that had been used by the FBN in its first attempt to measure the impact of oversight and accountability mechanisms in 2016. The intention of the exercise is to demonstrate that UN organizations are not the same as they were 20 years ago, and that the investment that has been made in oversight and accountability mechanisms is sufficient, and that effective internal controls are in place.

94. Regarding the quantification of costs for 2015 and 2016, while it was recognized that ideally it would be best to look at the costs of oversight in totality, it was agreed that given the reservations expressed by HLCM, for the purposes of the current request, organizations would collect data on the costs of the third line of defense only, without precluding the option of the FBN considering a full costing exercise for all lines of defense at some point in the future.

95. A suggestion was received from one organization to start looking to the future, and whether it would be valuable to start collecting data every year or every two years on the cost structures of oversight and the amounts being spent, to potentially consider looking at standard costs of what organizations should be spending on each line of defense and the variances between organizations. It was also suggested that the FBN follow the JIU report currently being prepared on donor led assessments, particularly with regards to the single audit principle and increased requests for verification.

² A/Res/67/226 paragraph 167

Conclusions and follow-up actions:

96. The FBN agreed to gather costs for the third line of defense for 2015 and 2016, with a view to combining the data with the previously collected data for the years 2012-2014, to facilitate the creation of a time series. When displaying costs for the third line, it was agreed to separately show each element, and compare against total expenditure. The exercise will be coordinated by UNFPA and the CEB Secretariat. The FBN kept open the possibility of gathering data again on the costs of all lines of defense at some point in the future.

97. UNFPA agreed to work on an updated narrative template which each organization would complete to show evidence that, over time, internal oversight structures have improved and internal controls have been strengthened. The CEB Secretariat will coordinate the distribution of the template to all organizations and collect the results.

X. Update from the HLCM Cross-functional Task Force on common definitions related to fraud and implementing partners - Operationalization of the definition of 'fraud' and 'presumptive fraud' as approved by HLCM update on the common definition of 'implementing partner', 'vendor' and 'grant recipient'

Presenters: Ms Linda Ryan, Controller and Director, Division of Financial and Administrative Management, UNHCR and Mr Pedro Guazo, Director Accounts Division/Acting Deputy Controller, United Nations

Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2016/HLCM/22 Terms of Reference of the HLCM Task Force on Common Definitions related to Fraud and Presumptive Fraud*
- ✓ *CEB/2017/3 Conclusions of the thirty-third session of the High Level Committee on Management*
- ✓ *CEB/2017/HLCM/11 Common definitions of fraud and presumptive fraud*

Background:

98. In response to repeated requests from the General Assembly, HLCM established a Task Force to identify "[...] a single agreed definition, across the United Nations system, of what constitutes fraud, as well as cases of suspected or presumptive fraud", which "is essential in order to develop effective counter-fraud policies to ensure compatibility and comparability of related data across entities and to improve overall transparency".

99. At its March 2017 session, HLCM adopted the common definition of fraud for the United Nations system as proposed by the Task Force: "Any act or omission whereby an individual or entity knowingly misrepresents or conceals a fact (a) in order to obtain an undue benefit or advantage or avoid an obligation for himself, herself, itself, or a third party, and/or (b) in such a way as to cause an individual or entity to act, or fail to act, to his, her or its detriment". HLCM also adopted the common definition of presumptive fraud for the United Nations system as: "Allegations that have been deemed to warrant an

investigation and, if substantiated, would establish the existence of fraud resulting in loss of resources to the Organization". When adopting these common definitions, HLCM noted that individual organizations would be expected to operationalize the agreed common definitions within their respective regulatory frameworks, legal instruments and policies, as appropriate, according to their specific requirements and within a timeframe appropriate to the circumstances of each organization.

100.HLCM had also previously discussed, at its October 2014 session, the need to harmonize system-wide approaches to fraud risk when engaging with implementing partners. In light of this, the HLCM Task Force is now continuing its work on developing common definitions of vendor, implementing partner and grant recipient.

Discussion:

101.The FBN Co-Chair introduced the item and recalled that HLCM had been concerned as to how the common definitions of fraud and presumptive fraud would be operationalized. It was clarified that the agreed common definitions would replace the existing definitions of fraud and presumptive fraud that organizations have adopted, and that the spirit of what the Task Force was trying to achieve was to establish high level definitions that were as wide in scope as possible, recognising that further elaboration of the definitions could be integrated into the policies and/or frameworks of individual organizations as appropriate. The Task Force Co-Chairs explained that there must be a pragmatic approach to operationalization of the common definitions and that it is not possible to offer a single approach for all organizations – it will be up to the management of each entity to decide on the best approach and the additional elements that organizations may want to add to their accompanying policies or procedures.

102.The current drafts of the other common definitions that the Task Force is working on were also shared with the FBN. Regarding the definition of grant, the Co-Chairs noted that good progress had been made, with a drafting group having tentatively agreed on a common definition which is now being reviewed by OLA. The draft definition of implementing partner is still under discussion by the Task Force drafting team, and the draft definition of vendor has been sent to the Procurement Network for comments. The Task Force Co-Chairs noted that the goal of the Task Force is to have a proposed set of common definitions for vendor, implementing partner and grant recipient ready for submission to HLCM at its upcoming Fall session.

103.The Task Force Co-Chairs also provided an update on the planned work related to implementing partners going forward, including establishing common internal control parameters and criteria to be applicable to arrangements with implementing partners, and developing a common platform for tracking and managing partners. It was noted that the HACT organizations have been represented by UNFPA in the Task Force discussions related to implementing partners.

104.Regarding the working modalities of the Task Force, the Co-Chairs highlighted the need for Task Force members to have delegated authority to make decisions on behalf of their organizations and emphasized the importance of Task Force members consulting internally with the required parties within their organizations before presenting a position to the Task Force. It was recalled that the Task Force already has broad representation with members with finance, legal, programmatic and procurement backgrounds, however

all organizations are welcome to nominate additional members to the Task Force via the CEB Secretariat if they deem it appropriate.

105. During the FBN discussion, the complexity of the definition of implementing partner was raised, and it was proposed that rather than agreeing on a common definition of implementing partner that would be mandatory for all organizations, the Task Force could instead establish some guidance related to implementing partners that would assist organizations in clearly differentiating implementing partners from vendors. It was suggested that having an agreed guidance document would be sufficient in working towards the HLCM objective of having a common platform for tracking and managing implementing partners, if the guidance was able to assist organizations in determining which entities should be captured in the tracking tool. It was noted that the ultimate objective of the work related to implementing partners is to ensure that appropriate internal control frameworks are in place to manage implementing partners and that a mechanism for sharing of information on implementing partners between organizations is established.

106. The Partner Portal that is currently being used by UNHCR, UNICEF and WFP was mentioned in the discussion, and it was clarified by UNHCR that the Partner Portal is a tool for registering NGOs for self-assessment, however it is not a portal that will report on performance of implementing partners.

Conclusions and follow-up actions:

107. FBN members took note of the update related to the common definitions of fraud, presumptive fraud, vendor and grant. With regards to implementing partners, the FBN agreed that the Task Force should focus on establishing and agreeing on a guidance note to assist organizations in clearly differentiating implementing partners from vendors, rather than proposing a common definition of implementing partners that would be mandatory across the UN system.

108. The FBN requested the Task Force to arrange a VTC to update the FB Network on the outcomes of the Task Force before any final proposal is submitted to HLCM.

XI. Risk management and fraud risks

Presenter: Ms Magdi Bona, Assistant Controller, WIPO and Mr Nicholas Nelson, Director, Finance and Treasury Division, WFP

Documentation:

- ✓ *Presentation from WIPO*
- ✓ *Presentation from WFP*

Discussion:

109. In this information-sharing session, two FBN organizations, WIPO and WFP, shared information on their ERM practices and the link between risk management and fraud risks. The presentation from WIPO covered ERM implementation in WIPO, including risk reporting and lessons learned; risk categories, fraud risks and assurance; and work currently in progress including continuous improvement of systems, processes, quality of analytics and internal controls. The WFP presentation covered WFP's ERM and internal

control frameworks policy, including the linkages between governance, ERM and internal controls; Monitoring and assessing risks and internal controls; and recent developments at WFP including the new Proactive Integrity Review tool that examines WFP operations, processes or activities to ensure that funds and assets are being utilized for their intended purpose, to help mitigate financial and reputational risk.

110. During the FBN discussion, the issue of disclosure of risk appetite was discussed, with both WFP and WIPO noting that they have disclosed their risk appetite statements to Member States and had very active and meaningful discussions with Member States to heighten their understanding of each organization's risk appetite. Other issues raised included the importance of analysing oversight findings to loop back and compare against risks that had been identified, with WFP explaining that a bridge between corporate risks and oversight findings had recently been introduced at WFP to enable such analysis. The issue of using risk to determine the appropriate interventions to be undertaken to prevent fraud, and the concept of assessing cost versus benefit for investing in ERM and controls was also raised, with this being recognized as a challenge for some organizations.

Conclusions and follow-up actions:

111. FBN members expressed appreciation for the presentations and the opportunity to learn more about the ERM practices at each organization.

XII. Unrecorded exchange on fraud risks

Discussion:

112. The FBN had an informal exchange of information on current investigations of cases of fraud.

XIII. Any other business

a) Date and venue of the the 30th and 31st meetings of the Finance and Budget Network

113. FBN members agreed that the 30th session of the FBN would take place via videoconference in the first week of December 2017.

114. FBN members accepted the kind offer of the International Atomic Energy Agency to host the 31st session of the FBN in 2018 in Vienna. After email consultation following the meeting, it was agreed that the 31st session will take place on 12th and 13th June 2018.

b) United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund

115. The UN Controller informed the FBN that at the upcoming Pension Board meeting in July, many organizations will be represented by HR colleagues, and suggested that all FBN members become as up to date as possible with current Pension Board issues and become engaged in the proceedings and agenda items. Given that the Pension Board discussions include assessing the soundness of financial figures on assets, liabilities and investments, involvement should not be limited only to HR professionals.

116. It was proposed that in the longer term, the FBN should consider having a dedicated session to share information on pension issues, both from the liability and asset side, and that it would be a welcome development to have a UNJSPF representative attend future FBN meetings.

Annex I – List of participants

Organization	Name and Title
FAO	Mr. Elkhan Aliyev Strategy and Planning Officer, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management (OSP)
	Mr. Silvain St.Pierre (via VTC) Chief of FAO Shared Service Center in Budapest
IAEA	Mr. Tristan Bauswein Director, Chief Financial Officer, Division of Budget and Finance, Department of Management
ICAO	Ms. Lynette Lim Chief, Financial Services Section
IFAD	Mr. Advit Nath Director and Controller, Accounting and Controller's Division, Financial Operations Department
ILO	Mr. Greg Johnson Treasurer and Financial Comptroller
IMO	Ms. Annabelle Viajar Head Financial Services, Administrative Division
IOM	Ms. Andrea Verhas Chief of Accounting, Accounting Division
ITC	Mr. K.C. Tan Chief, Financial Management Section, Division of Programme Support
ITU	Mr. Alassane Ba Chief, Financial Resources Management Department
UN	Ms. Bettina Tucci Bartsiotas Assistant Secretary-General, Controller, Department of Management
	Mr. Pedro Guazo Deputy Controller and Director, Accounts Division
	Ms. Frances Kamikamica Chief, Financial Reporting Service, Accounts Division
	Ms. Menada Wind-Andersen Executive Officer, Department of Safety and Security
	Ms. Zhengfan Sun Senior Finance and Budget Officer, Department of Safety and Security
	Mr. Christophe Monier Project Lead, Global Service Delivery Model Project
	Ms. Helene Thorup-Hayes Senior Management Officer, Office of the Controller
	Mr. Moses Bamuwamye Executive Secretary, Independent Audit Advisory Committee
	Mr. George Kostakis Assistant to the Executive Secretary, Independent Audit Advisory Committee
	Ms. Unis Valencia Williams Chief of Service, Programme Planning and Budget Division, Section II
	Mr. Yacine Hamzaoui Chief of Service III, Programme Planning and Budget Division
	Mr. Clifford Kunstler Senior Finance Officer, Accounts Division
Ms. Sunitha Korithiwada	

Organization	Name and Title
	Chief, Payroll and Disbursement Section, Accounts Division
	Mr. Quazi Islam
	Chief, Income Tax Unit, Accounts Division
	Ms. Brigitta Kuehling
	Financial Management Officer, Office of the Controller
	Ms. Taeko Shiori-Sarvaiya
	Financial Management Officer, Office of the Controller
UNAIDS	Ms Ljiljana Todorovic Senior Budget and Resource Management Adviser
	Ms. Susan McDade
	Assistant Administrator and Director of Bureau for Management Services
	Mr. Darshak Shah
	CFO and Deputy Assistant Administrator, Deputy Director Bureau for Management Services
	Mr. George Kyriacou
	Deputy Director, Finance and Administration, Office of Financial Resources Management, Bureau of Management
UNDP	Mr. Bruce McCarron
	Director, Operations, Legal & Technology Services
	Ms. Helen Hall
	Chief, Financial Performance Management and Reporting.
	Ms. Julie Anne Mejia
	Treasurer
	Mr. Marco DeLuca
	Programme Analyst, Strategy & Policy Unit, Office of Financial Resources Management
UNEP	Mr. Moses Tefula
	Chief, Budget and Finance
UNESCO	Ms. Nutan Wozencroft
	CFO, Bureau of Financial Management
	Ms. Lopa Guha-Giacobbi
	Chief of the Financial Policy and Compliance Section
	Mr. Andrew Saberton
	Director, Division for Management Services
UNFPA	Mr. Roberto Fernandez
	Chief, Finance Branch
	Ms. Iva Goricnik
	Chief, Resource Planning and Budgeting Branch, Division for Management Services
UNHCR	Ms. Linda Ryan
	Controller and Director, Division of Financial and Administrative Management
UNICEF	Mr. Thomas Asare
	Comptroller & Director, Division of Financial and Administrative Management
	Mr. Mark Beatty
	Director, Global Shared Services Centre
UNRWA	Mr. Shadi Al-Abed
	Director of Finance
UNWTO	Ms. Monica Gonzalez
	Chief, Budget and Finance

Organization	Name and Title
UN Women	Ms. Donna Grimwade Chief of Accounts, Finance Section
WFP	Mr. Nicholas Nelson Director, Finance and Treasury Division
WHO	Mr. Nick Jeffreys Comptroller and Director, Department of Finance
WIPO	Ms. Magdi Bona Assistant Controller
	Ms. Janice Cook Robbins Director, Finance Division
WTO	Mr. John Breckenridge Financial Controller, Performance Management
UNFCCC	Mr. Frank Rauch UNFCCC Team Lead for Budget
UNJSPF	Mr. Enzo Iaderosa Chief of Operations, Investment Management Division
CTBTO	Ms. Mikyung Ha LACHS Head of Accounts
UN Panel of External Auditors	Mr. Salhina Mkumba Convenor, Technical Group
	Mr. Anand Bajaj Chair, Audit Operations Committee
	Ms. Anjana Das Executive Secretary
CEB Secretariat	Ms. Laura Gallacher Inter-Agency Officer, Finance and Budget Network