



**Conclusions of the Twenty-eighth Session of the
High Level Committee on Management (HLCM)**

(UNICEF House, New York, 8 October 2014)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
Adoption of the agenda.....	2
I. HLCM’s contribution to the CEB Post 2015 – Fit for Purpose discussion.....	2
II. Outcome of the 79 th session of the ICSC.....	4
III. Reference Risk Management, Oversight & Accountability Model.....	6
IV. Harmonized system-wide approaches to fraud cases of implementing partners.....	8
V. Organizational Resilience Management System (ORMS).....	10
VI. UN System Internal Coordination Plan on Cybersecurity and Cybercrime.....	11
VII. System-wide Response to EBOLA	13
VIII. Any other business	15

ANNEXES:

Annex I – List of participants

Annex II – Checklist of documents

Annex III – UN System Policy on the Organizational Resilience Management System (ORMS)

Annex IV – Statement by FICSA

Introduction

1. The High Level Committee on Management held its twenty-eighth session at the UNICEF Headquarters in New York, on 8 October 2014. The meeting was chaired by the Committee's Chairperson, WIPO Director General, Francis Gurry, and Vice-Chair, UNAIDS Deputy Executive Director, Jan Beagle.
2. In his opening remarks, the HLCM Chair expressed his appreciation to UNICEF and to its Deputy Executive Director, Mr. Martin Mogwanja, for kindly hosting the meeting.

Adoption of the agenda



Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/9 – Provisional Agenda*
- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/9/Add.1 – Programme of work*
- ✓ *Checklist of Documents*

3. The agenda as adopted by the Committee is reflected in the table of contents.
4. The complete list of participants is provided in Annex I.
5. The checklist of documents is in Annex II. All documents related to the session are available on the CEB website at: <http://www.unsceb.org/content/october-2014>

I. HLCM's contribution to the CEB Post 2015 – Fit for Purpose discussion



Documentation:

- ✓ *HLCP/UNDG/HLCM Chapeau to the CEB Post 2015 – Fit for Purpose Strategy (May 2014)*
- ✓ *Summary of the responses by CEB Principals to the Secretary-General's letter of 30 May 2014*
- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/10 – Draft HLCM's contribution to the CEB – Fit for Purpose strategy*
- ✓ *Working Paper - Delivering on a transformative agenda: What will it take to become 'Fit-for-Purpose'?*
- ❖ *Summary sheet*

6. At the CEB first Regular Session for 2014, the UNDG, HLCP and HLCM presented a joint contribution - Chapeau - to the Board, framing the commitment of the three CEB pillars to support in a complementary and integrated manner the effort by the UN system to make the transition to a new post-2015 agenda. HLCP and UNDG also presented their individual contributions to this discussion, which were each developed around the five 'elements' of universality, equality, human rights, integration and data revolution.
7. Noting that the strategic repositioning of the organizations of the UN system on the management and operational sides needs to be pursued concurrently with the programmatic one, in order not to risk a disconnect between the goals and the means, the Board agreed that HLCM would subsequently prepare an input to the second regular CEB Session of 2014 around the value added of HLCM's work towards this discussion.
8. Subsequently, on 30 May 2014, the Secretary-General wrote to CEB Principals seeking their views and suggestions on "*actions in support of a coherent and coordinated system-wide approach to render the United Nations system competent in contributing to a transformative agenda*".
9. At the session on 8 October, the Committee had before itself a draft document (CEB/2014/HLCM/10), for review and discussion, and further submission to CEB as its contribution to the CEB Post 2015 – Fit for Purpose strategy.

10. While introducing this agenda item, the HLCM Vice-Chair underlined that the 2013-2016 HLCM Strategic Plan, with its five strategic priorities, provided a strong basis for the Committee's contribution to the CEB Post 2015 - Fit for purpose Strategy. HLCM had already made a start on this process during its retreat in early 2013 in Turin, and had subsequently launched its work on the Plan's priorities, delivering concrete and valuable outcomes.
11. The intense discussions of the recent months on the theme of Fit for Purpose had added a lot of material to HLCM's thinking. The Vice-Chair therefore indicated that, with its regular session and the joint HLCM-HLCP session of 9 October, the Committee would have an opportunity to adjust and refine the strategic directions set in its Strategic Plan, and deliver to the CEB a vision that is fully integrated with those of the other two CEB pillars.
12. The Vice-Chair stressed that the redesign of modern operational and management functions was instrumental in positioning the United Nations system's contribution to a transformative agenda, and represented a key area for collective system-wide action by the three CEB pillars, to ensure coherence and alignment of vision at global, regional and country levels, as well as strengthened coherence around common programmes and common operations.
13. The HLCM Vice-Chair explained that the draft document CEB/2014/HLCM/10 was developed around the value of HLCM's work towards building a modern workforce (the international civil service of the future), designing new business models (which include the second generation of Delivering as One, coherent and efficient approaches to service delivery, etc.) and strengthening the collective accountability of the UN system through modernized risk management and oversight approaches, as well as comprehensive provision and visualization of UN system-wide data on resource utilization, results and impact.
14. These could preliminary be identified as the three broad areas where HLCM could make a difference and deliver a distinctive contribution to the CEB. And, the Vice-Chair underlined that decisions and actions on the UN System's operational fit were almost entirely in the hands of senior managers, and did not require action by member states.
15. In the discussion that followed, the HLCM Chair reflected on some areas of transformational change where HLCM could have some direct impact:
 - a. A review of the UN system's "rules of engagement" with the non-governmental world, especially the private sector;
 - b. New methods of communication; and
 - c. Reconsidering the concept of development within a universal agenda.
16. Participants underlined that the Committee should set ambitious goals ahead of itself and propose bold transformational actions that would contribute to strengthen the collective ability to drive impact on the objectives that the Post 2015 agenda will set for the UN system. In the words of many, the starting point should be "what we need to deliver". In the responses of many Executive Heads to the letter of the Secretary-General, this coincided with a global sustainability agenda focused on the people and inspired by the principle of universality.
17. Many comments echoed the words of the HLCM Chair on the importance of a new vision towards partnerships and coalitions, on the related aspect of new funding modalities, as well as on embracing modern methods of communication focused on results and effective impact.
18. The Committee underlined the need for a complementary contribution by HLCM with those of HLCP and UNDG, to enhance programme delivery through strengthened and coordinated operational models and instruments.
19. There was also broad agreement on the need to integrate the concept of sustainability in the business models and operational solutions of organizations – the UN system should be a "good" consumer.

20. A global and diverse workforce, able to cater for the broad set of knowledge-intensive skills and profiles needed by organizations to deliver on their respective mandates, was underlined by many as the most fundamental asset of the UN system, the preservation and strengthening of which should be a central priority of HLCM's efforts to assess and adjust the organizations' fit for the new agenda.
21. The HLCM Vice-Chair concluded the discussion acknowledging the variety and richness of the views expressed, and the general consensus towards a vision for a more efficient, coherent and effective UN system as a whole, strengthening the linkages and the complementarity of its parts and its accountability for results.
22. HLCM would emphasise such vision in the elaboration of three main components of its contribution – workforce and skills; effective and efficient operations, including through partnerships and new funding modalities; and, communication and accountability - highlighting transitional measures to be put in place before 1 January 2016, as well as more transformational actions to aim for after that date. The scaling up and mainstreaming of the work already undertaken and in line with such vision would also be reflected in the HLCM's paper.

➤ *HLCM:*

23. **Agreed to allow HLCM members for some more time to contribute their written input to the draft HLCM's contribution to the CEB – Fit for Purpose strategy.**
24. **Requested the CEB Secretariat to finalize the paper based on the discussion at this session, on the discussion at the joint HLCM-HLCP session of 9 October, and on the written input that would be forthcoming from HLCM members.**

II. Outcome of the 79th session of the ICSC Progress and next steps with the ICSC Review of the UN Compensation Package

Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/11 – Note by the HR Network on the Review of the UN Compensation Package*
- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/12 – Briefing Note on the conclusions of the 79th session of the ICSC*
- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/13 - Statement by the HLCM Strategic Group for the 79th session of the ICSC*
- ❖ *Summary sheet*

25. The HLCM Vice-Chair introduced this agenda item by recalling that HLCM had committed to stay fully engaged in the ICSC Review of the UN compensation package, and in such spirit the Committee had hosted several discussions on this subject, especially at its last session. She noted that the Review had progressed significantly during recent months, and underlined the importance of continuing coordination between the organisations on this matter. In this regard, the Vice-Chair pointed to the latest discussions of the HLCM Strategic Group and the HR Network in July 2014, resulting in a statement that had been transmitted to ICSC prior to its 79th session in Rome.
26. The Vice-Chair noted that the 79th session of the ICSC had hosted a number of detailed discussions on the Compensation Review, based on the input received from two new Working Group meetings. A summary of these discussions could be found in document CEB/2014/HLCM/11. She put emphasis on the fact that the next couple of months would be critical for the Review's progress, and that continued engagement and efforts to develop joint positions of the organisations were important success factors.

27. The Co-Chair of the HR Network then noted that the Review had indeed progressed with a number of conceptual clarifications, many of which were in line with the organisations' thinking. However, the concrete financial proposals would only be developed and discussed over the next months. Only then, the organisations would be in a position to clearly evaluate whether proposals are agreeable, improve the organisations' fitness for purpose and meet the criteria as outlined in the CEB Statement on the Compensation Review. She highlighted that a number of organisations had stressed the need for more flexibility and that the ICSC requests concrete proposals for the next Working Group meeting in November, detailing how such flexibility could be implemented. She also highlighted few elements where further discussions are needed with ICSC, since the current progress does not contain proposals that are agreeable to the organisations. Emphasis was placed on the continued request from organisations to arrive at proposals that are simple and transparent and that contribute to a reduction of the administrative burden.

28. The Executive Secretary of the ICSC was then invited to give an update on the progress of the Review, from the point of view of the Commission. She confirmed that the Annual report of the ICSC had been published, including a progress update for Member States. This report will be discussed at the General Assembly and its 5th Committee during the next weeks. She highlighted that the Review remains work in progress, and that only next year the final proposal for a new compensation package will be agreed. She also confirmed that ICSC has an interest in simplification and in making budgeting for staff cost more predictable for organisations. On the topic of a potential Mandatory age of Separation of 65 for current staff, the Executive Secretary highlighted that the final decision will be made by the General Assembly towards the end of the year. With regard to the review of cost-sharing arrangements for health insurance premiums, she confirmed that this had concluded that the current arrangements are well within the practice of other International Organisations and Member States, and therefore no change had been suggested in this regard.

29. During the discussion, one representative highlighted the need to link the future compensation package to an improved "fitness for purpose" of the organisations, and the fact that the current approach seemed to favour incremental adjustments rather than a radical reform process. On mandatory age of separation, one organization noted that they were not in favour of raising it to 65 for current staff. The representative of FICSA suggested a more intense collaboration between organisations and staff federations during the compensation review which, in the view of staff federations, had turned into a mere cost cutting exercise. He also pointed out that staff federations were in favour of the implementation of the mandatory age of separation of 65 for current staff.

➤ *HLCM:*

30. Took note of the update on the progress of the review of the UN Compensation Package provided by the HR Network.

31. Confirmed its full support and commitment for an active engagement and collaboration with ICSC in this exercise.

32. Emphasised the need for all UN Common System organizations to arrive at jointly agreed positions on proposals put forward by the ICSC.

III. Reference Risk Management, Oversight & Accountability Model

Documentation:

- ✓ CEB/2014/HLCM/14 & Add.1 – Draft Reference Risk Management, Oversight & Accountability Model
- ❖ Summary sheet

33. The draft proposal for a reference Risk Management, Oversight & Accountability Model was developed by a working group led by UNFPA and UNOPS and approved by the Finance & Budget Network in June 2014, in response to the mandate contained in the HLCM Strategic Plan 2013-2016, which includes "Strengthening the risk management and oversight architecture" as one of its five priorities. The consultative process that led to the finalization of this proposal included all HLCM Networks, as well as UN-RIAS.

34. The HLCM Strategic Plan calls "*for the development of a consolidated and trust-based relationship with Member States on the level and quality of controls in place in Organizations to allow for rationalized oversight, focus on key risks and better internal resource allocation*". The QCPR resolution A/RES/67/226 paragraph 167 also calls "*for further efforts to ensure coherence and complementarity in the oversight functions, audit and evaluations across the United Nations development system*".

35. The HLCM Chair recalled that the objective of this work was to strengthen the common positioning of UN organizations with Member States in an environment with increasing pressure to expand oversight and monitoring, and to develop a strong and defensible reference model which all organizations can adhere to, with the necessary adjustments and variations that their differences require.

36. The Chair also noted the value of having collectively recognized the applicability of a model – the Three Lines of Defence - developed by a professional body, the Institute of Internal Auditors, building on work by the Federation of European Risk Management Associations (FERMA) and the European Confederation of Institutes of Internal Auditing (ECIIA). As it is the case for IPSAS, the adoption of internationally recognized standards adds to the credibility and legitimacy of our work.

37. He finally pointed to further steps that HLCM had also envisaged to undertake in its Strategic Plan, which would follow naturally from the work on the Reference Model, namely; a) an attempt at quantifying the costs that our organizations incur to maintain their oversight and accountability structures and; b) the development of a UN System Risk Register.

38. The draft Model was introduced to the Committee by the Chair of the working group. The Model endorses the Institute of Internal Auditors' "Three Lines of Defence Model" as a suitable governance and oversight model of reference for the common positioning of the UN System. The "Three Lines" consist of: (i) functions that own and manage risks; (ii) functions that oversee risks; and (iii) functions that provide independent assurance.

39. Results from an extensive survey across a sample of HLCM member organizations had guided the development of the Model. One of the key findings of the survey was that quality of risk management in the UN system has improved over the last five years. Furthermore, the introduction of IPSAS has considerably enhanced the transparency and oversight in the area of financial management.

40. The "Three Lines of Defence Model" provides a useful framework for organizations to map out their own processes and identify relationships and responsibilities of different actors with respect to the different lines of defence. This helps all levels of management to fulfill their responsibilities with clarity.

41. Although there are differences between organizations, most can fit into the framework, which can be applied to any organization as a reference model and used to educate stakeholders on the rationale of UN system's approach in this area.

42. In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted that the risk management and oversight functions are a core component of being fit for purpose, as they respond to the need of a trust-based partnership with member states. Risk is a recognized component of any relationship with both donors and implementing partners. Therefore, clarity in regards to risk and oversight is important to ensure that risk is not transferred instead of being shared in a transparent manner. Furthermore, the reference Model can be used as a powerful communications tool when dealing with stakeholders, as it provides a clear picture of how the risk management and oversight functions are structured.

43. While supporting the strengthening of risk management and oversight structures, the Committee stressed the need to concurrently enhance compliance as a key requirement to enable a trust-based relationship with stakeholders.

44. Concern was also expressed regarding the relationship between independent assurance activities, particularly the Internal Audit function and the other components of the Model. The application of the Model by organizations should consider the risk of weakening the role of the Internal Audit function in support of senior management and of creating an additional external audit-like layer. In this respect, the Committee acknowledged that the Three Lines of Defence was a “reference” model which could be adjusted to the specific characteristics and needs of each organization.

45. On the quantification of the costs of oversight and accountability structures, the Committee noted the sensitivity of this matter, but judged that an indicative assessment of these costs would be a necessary element of any analysis of the value and benefit that such structures bring. The Committee also agreed that any such costing exercise should include labour costs for staff engagement in oversight activities, as well as the cost of additional reporting requirements imposed by member states.

46. HLCM members noted that the UN system is trying to, and needs to, move in the direction of risk management instead of risk avoidance. With sound systems, a part of which is the proposed reference Model, managers would have tools to take calculated risks based on good information. This is essential in order to be able to capitalize on opportunities within acceptable risk boundaries.

47. On the establishment of a system-wide risk register, the Committee discussed its potential benefits, desirable scope, and how to manage and effectively maintain it.

48. UN-RIAS, who had participated in the development of the proposed framework, confirmed their agreement with the adoption of the Three Lines of Defence Model.

➤ *HLCM:*

49. Adopted the reference Risk Management, Oversight & Accountability model as approved by the Finance & Budget Network and outlined in document CEB/2014/HLCM/14.

50. Encouraged member organizations to communicate the adoption of the Model with internal and external stakeholders, in line with the original objective of strengthening the common positioning of UN organizations in the discussions on monitoring and oversight. In this respect, the Committee requested the CEB Secretariat to prepare a note of this discussion and transmit it to the Panel of External Auditors in advance of their annual meeting of 8-9 December 2014.

51. Requested the HLCM Working Group on Risk Management, Oversight and Accountability to conduct an assessment of costs related to the oversight and accountability structures and mechanisms, for the entire UN system.

52. Requested the existing Enterprise Risk Management Community of Practice to conduct, under the leadership of the UN Secretariat, a preliminary assessment of the feasibility of developing a UN system Risk Register, focusing on systemic risks, and within the scope of the post 2015 Fit for Purpose discussion.

IV. Harmonized system-wide approaches to fraud cases of implementing partners



Documentation:

- ✓ *Letter of USG Valerie Amos to HLCM and UNDG Chairs of 11 July 2014*
- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/15 – Briefing Note by UN-OCHA*
- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/16 – Professional advice by UN-RIAS and HLCM Procurement Network*
- ❖ *Summary sheet*

53. In a letter to the HLCM and UNDG Chairs of 11 July 2014, USG Valerie Amos of UN-OCHA highlighted the need to harmonize system-wide approaches to fraud cases of implementing partners. In consideration of the ongoing work by HLCM on risk management and oversight, HLCM discussed the subject with a view to developing an appropriate response to UN-OCHA's request, in coordination with UNDG.

54. In preparation for the discussion, professional advice on the matter was sought from UN-RIAS, as well as from the HLCM Procurement Network, with respect to the different modalities used by various organizations to contract implementing partners; to the corresponding monitoring and oversight approaches; and, to the possibility (and corresponding required actions) of building on the work already completed by the Procurement Network with the Vendor Eligibility Framework.

55. The Under Secretary General for Management underlined that, together with misconduct, fraud undermines the stakeholders' trust in the organization and damages its reputation for integrity. While even the most effective anti-fraud policies and procedures cannot guarantee that misconduct will not occur, a good anti-fraud programme can substantially assist the organization in fraud prevention, detection and response and protect the organization's assets, integrity and reputation. Ensuring that organizations have a strong anti-fraud programme in place is, therefore, the responsibility of managers.

56. The problems that had recently emerged in the context of programmatic operations in fragile states had highlighted the need to move towards an integrated strategic approach to tackling fraud. Assessing the effectiveness of the established controls of the organization; proposing mitigation strategies and risk treatment and response plans; and, preparing action plans for their execution, should be at the core of this integrated strategic approach.

57. The USG proposed that the discussions within the HLCM evolve towards the goal of a common strategy and the harmonisation of anti-fraud policies.

58. The Co-Chair of the UNDG Business Operations Working Group explained that UNDG had set up a time-bound task force on Risk Management in Fragile States to identify policy gaps and prepare recommendations on how to reinforce risk management practices in an interagency environment. The task force will focus on three key deliverables: (a) An overview of current UN risk management practice in an integrated programme and funding environment with special focus on conflict and transitions settings; (b) A gap analysis assessing policy gaps in the current risk management practice, based on an analysis of risk management deficiencies based on recent experiences; (c) Recommendations for additional policy content required to reinforce risk management practices, particularly in a conflict and transition settings. As a part of this work, the issue of sharing of information on fraud cases detected or investigated will be addressed.

59. UN-OCHA outlined its efforts to strengthen risk management for Country Based Pooled Funds. A number of mechanisms have been put in place, including corporate guidelines that define all financial and programmatic processes and accountability requirements for management of the funds, a set of key criteria to assess potential fraud cases, and Standard Operating Procedures for actions to be taken when cases are under investigation. Still, additional work is required, especially towards the common treatment of implementing partners when there exist an allegation of fraud. NGOs may continue to receive funding from one agency while being suspended by another as the result of detected fraud.

60. In respect to the delivery of humanitarian assistance, a distinction should be made between NGOs as implementing partners in a programmatic perspective as opposed to NGOs as vendors from a strict procurement perspective. The need was stressed to address the gap in terms of system-wide policies for communication and information sharing regarding fraud cases, so that the UN system as a whole can ensure good and timely communication and information sharing internally, as well as to donors, in a coherent manner.

61. UN-OCHA also underlined that further harmonization and coordination between development and humanitarian partners is necessary in terms of how NGO capacity assessments are carried out. In this regard, UN-OCHA recommended that a common approach be explored. An expanded version of the HACT could be a starting point for such discussions.

62. The ensuing discussion focused on the distinction between implementing partners and vendors. While some organizations use procurement processes for services from NGOs, in which case the same vetting, oversight and suspension procedures apply to both, most organizations agreed that the notion of implementing partner is radically distinct from that of a contractor, making the “procurement” approach neither feasible nor desirable.

63. In the view of the Procurement Network, although certainly not all partners can be treated as vendors - even if in some cases, in the modern world, an entity may be both - many of the principles of procurement can still be useful for the assessment, selection and monitoring of implementing partners. Knowledge of markets, comparative evaluations and strong oversight mechanisms, along with diligent programme management, are all principles that can apply across all different contexts. Furthermore, the existing United Nations Global Marketplace could be adjusted to track implementing partners in a similar way as it tracks suspect vendors, which could provide a platform for information sharing. The Committee also noted that many lessons that were learned in setting up the UN Global Market Place could be useful as we move forward, particularly in regards to the due diligence process.

64. The Committee also recalled the importance of the lessons from the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT), and the processes of assessment of implementing partners that it has put in place. It was noted that in most cases, strict application of HACT would address many of the issues under discussion. However, in many difficult locations full implementation of HACT may not effectively address these concerns.

65. UN-RIAS and UN-RIS (the Representatives of Investigation Services of the United Nations - a newly established professional network covering investigation functions within the UN System), supported the HLCM plans towards developing a common framework. They expressed willingness to continue to assist in the work as it moves forward. They supported the approach used by the UNGM on vendor eligibility and saw possibilities, if expanded, to apply it to implementing partners as well.

66. While unanimously supporting the key requirement of information sharing, HLCM noted that any mechanism towards this end should not compromise the ability of each organization to use the shared knowledge according to its programme criticality and other assessments, as appropriate. The Committee finally noted the importance of developing mechanisms that recognize the concept of risk sharing with non-contractual partners as well as with donors.

➤ *HLCM:*

67. Requested the establishment of a task force, which should include the Procurement Network and ideally members of the former HACT advisory committee, and should report on its progress at the spring 2015 session of HLCM, to:

- a. **Develop definition of use – when an NGO is considered a vendor, and when it should be considered as an implementing partner;**
- b. **Assess the feasibility of adapting the UN Global Marketplace as a platform to track fraud cases related to implementing partners;**
- c. **Explore alternative means of information sharing;**
- d. **Assess opportunities and limitations to expand areas currently covered by HACT assessments, and explore applicability of HACT risk management tools/instruments to vendors and implementing partners;**
- e. **Assess the value and feasibility of adapting procedures from the Vendor Eligibility Framework, as appropriate, for implementing partners; and,**
- f. **Propose common approaches to mitigating risks.**

68. Requested that this work be conducted in full coordination with the relevant bodies on UNDG and the audit and investigation professional networks.

V. Organizational Resilience Management System (ORMS)



Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/17 – Draft UN System policy on Organizational Resilience Management System (ORMS)*
- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/17/ Add.1 – Key Performance Indicators*
- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/17/ Add.2 –Maintenance, Exercise and Review Regime*
- ❖ *Summary sheet*

69. At its April 2014 session, HLCM received a presentation on the Organizational Resilience Management System (ORMS), approved by the General Assembly as the institution’s emergency management framework. Resolution 67/254 included a recommendation to “*expand the system to the specialized agencies, funds and programmes.*”

70. The General Assembly mandated the development of the Organizational Resilience Management System, recognizing the need to clearly articulate the roles, responsibilities and relationships of the actors involved in emergency preparedness and response.

71. The ORMS framework resonated throughout the UN System because it set the fundamentals to enhance organizations’ ability to manage the increasingly complex operational risks they all face. It also brought the system together around the common need to improve emergency preparedness and response and operational risk management.

72. To further these objectives, at its last meeting HLCM decided to establish a process to draft a UN System common organizational resilience policy, associated key performance indicators, and a supporting maintenance, exercise and review regime.

73. The HLCM Chair congratulated the interagency working group which had produced these deliverables under very tight timelines; demonstrating, in turn, significant alignment between agencies.

74. The ORMS policy was introduced by United Nations Secretariat. In the discussion that followed, organizations endorsed it, together with the associated KPIs and ME&R regime, and congratulated the working group on its excellent work.

75. Some participants asked whether the Programme Criticality Framework could be mainstreamed into ORMS to provide visibility, promote coherence and create synergies between operational and programme response. Further clarification was requested on the scope of integrating ORMS with exercises and contingency planning for identified risks. In response, the UN Secretariat indicated that the next phase of this work was to develop the links between operational and programme response, with a view to minimizing the burden on Country Offices preparing for, preventing, responding to and recovering from crisis events. Highlighting that the Programme Criticality Framework can be used to prioritize functions and activities that must be continued during a crisis, the UN Secretariat noted that this issue will be included in the review of the linkages between operational and programme preparedness and response. The UN Department of Safety and Security reinforced the importance of the link between operational and programme preparedness and the Security Risk Assessment.

76. HLCM members also supported a proposal to include the development of appropriate tools and guidance as part of the future tasks of the ORMS Working Group. The UN Secretariat further clarified that all of the KPIs are compulsory, while noting that under the ORMS principle of Flexible Standardization, agencies, funds and programmes should apply the KPIs that are appropriate to their particular context. The KPIs are not only indicators of ORMS policy implementation but, when implemented, have proven to be fundamental to effective prevention, preparedness, response and recovery at all levels. The Committee agreed to report on the KPIs at the headquarters level at the next session of the HLCM.

➤ *HLCM*

77. Approved the UN System ORMS policy, its associated key performance indicators, and the supporting maintenance, exercise and review regime.

78. Requested the continuation of the ORMS Working Group as a Community of Practice to support implementation by producing applicable tools and guidance.

VI. UN System Internal Coordination Plan on Cybersecurity and Cybercrime



Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM-HLCP/18– Draft UN System Internal Coordination Plan on Cybersecurity and Cybercrime*
- ✓ *Compendium of UN Mandates on Cybersecurity and Cybercrime*
- ❖ *Summary sheet*

79. At the CEB November 2013 session, the UN Secretary-General led a discussion on cybersecurity, cybercrime and policies on information. The Secretary-General, at the conclusion of the discussion, called upon ITU, UNESCO, UNODC, UNDP and UNCTAD, in collaboration with the chairs of the HLCP, HLCM and UNDG, to develop a system-wide comprehensive and coherent coordination plan for addressing the above issues, for discussion at CEB's second regular session of 2014.

80. The HLCM Chair noted that the elements considered at that stage had since been incorporated into the plan of action that was before the Committee. Characterizing the issue as one of the major systemic issues confronting the UN system, indeed, the entire world, the Chair noted that the plan included many components, only two of which were of relevance to the HLCM. Specifically, topic one addressed two issues: a joint capability for strengthening the UN system's ability to respond to threats, and training programs across the organizations to raise awareness amongst its workforce of the magnitude of the threat the system faces with respect to cyber security. In addition, topic five called for a harmonized approach to policies of transparency and privacy, which also had relevance to the work of the Committee. The Chair called upon the representative of the ICT Network to introduce the discussion.

81. The ICT Network representative noted that the recent CEB session had endorsed the Framework on Cybersecurity and Cybercrime and recalled the conclusion of the CEB that led to the action plan. He further reviewed the international landscape for cybersecurity, noting that over the past several years the number of cyber-attacks has escalated and the risks to international organizations have grown. The ICT Network representative then reviewed the topics contained in the document, noting that topic one contained activities, awareness training and inter-agency support to address cyber-attacks, that were already a part of the HLCM strategic plan. Topic five, addressing disclosure and transparency policies, also fell within the purview of HLCM.

82. During the discussion, many agencies expressed appreciation for the effort that developing the action plan entailed. Agencies also acknowledged the sensitivity of the topic, particularly among member states, but agreed with the sentiment expressed by both the HLCM Chair and the ICT Network representative that the issue presented agencies with significant challenges that demanded attention.

83. Some characterized cyber-security as the single biggest threat to the UN system's capacity to operate, especially given organizations' increasing dependency on technology, and linked this topic to the subject of organizational resilience. Other comments referred to the critical need to take action to protect agency internal technology environments, and to look for ways to mainstream cyber-security, privacy and related issues into organizations' programmatic activities. While acknowledging it fell outside the scope of HLCM, some stressed the need to include a wider society in the interactions, noting that it was crucial to advise CEB and Member States at large of the need to follow a multi-stakeholder approach on cyber-security.

84. The impact of technology on safety and security was noted, especially in connection with the introduction of cloud computing and the rapid accumulation, aggregations and accessibility of data, and the corresponding potential vulnerability of UN organizations. In this respect, it was suggested that the cyber-world has become an extension of the physical environment, in that it provides for accessibility across greater distances, without physical boundaries.

85. Some participants noted that topic five of the plan, regarding transparency policies, could benefit from additional review. Others expressed support for institutional training to raise awareness and suggested that other support activities related to cyber-security incident response could be effectively addressed through the sharing of long term contracts with appropriate vendors. The development of closer linkages between UN-DSS and the inter-agency work on cyber-security was supported, while others stressed the importance of emphasizing within the document the internal nature of its focus, i.e. inter-agency coordination on cyber-security and cyber-crime.

86. Thanking all participants for their comments, the HLCM Chair requested the CEB secretariat to make available to all HLCM members the comments that had been received and ensure an opportunity for additional comments, with a particular focus on topics one and five, which are of concern to HLCM. Further, the Chair suggested that the HLCM would transmit to CEB at its next meeting the substance of its discussion and emphasize the importance HLCM attaches to this issue.

➤ *HLCM:*

87. Expressed appreciation for the work done on the draft UN system Coordination Plan on Cyber-security and Cyber-crime.

88. Requested the CEB Secretariat to make available to all HLCM members the comments that had been received on the draft document and to ensure that all organizations be given an opportunity for additional comments, with a particular focus on topics 1 and 5, which are of concern to HLCM.

89. Decided that the Committee would transmit to CEB at its next meeting the substance of the discussion, emphasizing the importance HLCM attaches to this issue.

VII. System-wide Response to EBOLA

Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/19 – Briefing Note on the UN System’s response to EBOLA*

90. The HLCM Vice-Chair introduced the topic welcoming Dr. David Nabarro, Special Envoy of the Secretary General on Ebola. She pointed out that the Ebola outbreak had to be looked at not only from a purely medical perspective but would need to be put in a broader context, including social, economic and other aspects. She then invited Dr. Nabarro to brief HLCM on his perspective and initiatives on the matter.

91. Dr. Nabarro confirmed that the current situation was extremely difficult, despite the fact that the UN System had already gone through a range of preparations for future pandemics following earlier events such as SARS and swine flu. He pointed out that the decision to respond with approaches and modalities never before experienced also required immediate and close interaction of UN System staff, beyond conventional organisational borders.

92. Dr. Nabarro reported that, after his appointment in August, the magnitude and dynamics of the outbreak became increasingly clear. Following his visits in the regions and further internal discussions, the Secretary General decided to launch the first UN system-wide public health Mission ever, in order to create a mechanism to provide coordination and direction but also to structure and manage the implementation of the country support. WHO and other UN system organizations would be embedded inside this Mission, and the Secretary General also appointed crisis managers at ASG level for each of the three affected countries.

93. The Mission was looking to organize a fast increase in treatment, but also foster community engagement, strengthen laboratory services, ensure food availability, provide safety and organise other services. The logistical backbone would also need to be strengthened, so that these services can be effectively provided. To rapidly increase capacities, the Mission would need to establish contracts with inside and outside partners, and some agencies would become contractors with a clear set of responsibilities. This approach would model a new kind of explicit collaboration among UN agencies and external partners. The Special Envoy said that a global Ebola response coalition was about to be created with a broad range of stakeholders from governments in affected and donor countries, the private sector, civil societies, NGOs and others. The coalition would meet on 9 October for the first time. A trust fund, administered by UNDP, was also under creation. Dr. Nabarro stressed that the major prerequisite for scaling up UN presence in the affected countries was to ensure the health of staff. In order to do so, better on site health facilities for staff needed to be created in the affected countries.

94. The representative of the UN Secretariat / OHRM and the HR Network then briefed the audience on actions taken from an HR perspective. The HR Network had coordinated through an intense series of video-conferences throughout August, and all UN System organisations had agreed to a coordinated approach, both at Headquarter level and in the field. System-wide operational guidelines had been developed, agreed and published both for staff members and for personnel without a staff contract. The latter one was not to be seen as prescriptive but rather as a guidance note.

95. The representative of the UN Secretariat / OHRM furthermore highlighted that the ICSC, based on recommendations of the HR Network and of WHO, had approved danger pay on medical grounds for the first time ever, that would now be effective for all staff in the affected countries. Further discussions were currently taking place on how locally recruited staff could have access to financial assistance. As a third action item, additional measures were agreed to support staff members that wanted to transfer their families outside the duty stations, which are mostly family duty stations.

96. The biggest challenge remained the medical care for potentially affected staff. Both medical evacuations and medical facilities on the ground were discussed among HR Network and the Medical Directors Working Group. The UN Chief Medical Director illustrated that medical evacuations would only be a tool for a very limited number of staff in exceptional situations, given the scarcity of resources to conduct them, the limited

number of treatment facilities and staff available in other countries and the operational challenges with evacuation transport of highly infectious persons. He reported that WHO had and was still having intense negotiations with a number of potential Member States on the matter. However, focus should be placed on rapidly enhancing on site medical capacities for staff members.

97. The HLCM Vice-Chair thanked the representative of the HR Network and the Medical Directors Working Group for their updates, and invited the representative of the Department of Field Support, to provide a briefing from his angle. He confirmed that UNMIL had been tasked to operationalize the strategy as outlined by Dr. Nabarro. The aim was to avoid duplication and to leverage the system where strengths existed in areas such as supply chain, human resources, procurement and other areas. The Mission was collaborating with external bilateral partners, NGO and others. He stressed that this was a unique effort for which no template existed. He illustrated that so far, 61 vehicles and 5 helicopters had been deployed, 141 more were waiting for clearance. Currently, headquarter facilities in all three countries were about to be established. He indicated that the 5th Committee of the General Assembly had allocated a budget of \$50M and 283 posts.

98. In the subsequent discussions, representatives of many organisations displayed gratitude for the efforts of Dr. Nabarro and his team, and ensured their willingness to support the Mission in whatever way possible. They agreed that this was an unprecedented critical collective effort, which required a rapid upgrade of medical facilities on the ground, and to give assurance to all personnel that they are covered by adequate surge capacities in case of need.

99. CCISUA, on behalf of the Staff Federations, highlighted that the recent call for applications resulted in about 8,000 UN staff volunteering to support the Mission. They also highlighted that appropriate duty of care was an expectation and necessary prerequisite in the current situation.

100. Dr. Nabarro, in response to a number of questions received, stressed that every support from the UN System was welcomed, with a view to demonstrate flexibility and mutual support beyond current organisational boundaries. He also underlined the importance of duty of care for staff in the affected countries, and shared his hope that in a best case scenario transmission of the virus could be stopped early next year – a vaccine is currently in phase two of the clinical trials and looks promising so far. He pointed out that a lesson learned from the situation was that the lack of any operational emergency budget was preventing the system from a speedier response.

101. The CEB Secretary joined the participants in expressing his appreciation of the work, underlying the high expectations of the Secretary General, and pointing at the unprecedented support in the UN Security Council. The HCLM Vice-Chair noted that the Ebola Virus Disease Outbreak constituted a situation of great complexity for which no template existed, and reiterated the commitment from all HLCM members to support the work of the Mission in any possible way, in particular through expediting operational and staffing matters under their purview.

➤ *HLCM:*

102. Took note with appreciation of the briefings provided by Dr. Nabarro, the Department of Field Support and the HR Network.

103. Confirmed the commitment to follow-up on any requests for system-wide coordination on operational matters under the Committee's purview.

104. Recognizing the duty of care towards the personnel of the UN system as a key enabling factor in the overall UN system response in support of the countries affected by the Ebola crisis, decided that priority should be given to strengthening in-situ Ebola treatment facilities and mechanisms for UN personnel. Specifically, the HLCM decided to strengthen, on the most urgent basis, the UN clinics in all affected countries with special focus on Guinea and Sierra Leone. The effort will leverage pre-financing facilities, the procurement capacity, UN common services frameworks and other mechanisms to make this happen without delay.

VIII. Any other business

105. HLCM members did not undertake any discussion on items under “other business”. The HLCM Chairs explained that the Committee would note all of them as per respective summary sheets, in its Session report. The CEB Secretariat would collect any comments, via e-mail, after the session, prior to finalization of the report.

A. Update on the launch of the HLCM Strategic Group on “duty of care”

Documentation:

✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/22 – Briefing Note by UN-DSS*

106. The Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security briefed the Committee on the launch of the HLCM Strategic Group on reconciling the “duty of care” for UN system personnel with the need to “stay and deliver” in high risk environments.

➤ *HLCM:*

107. Noted with appreciation the launch of the HLCM Strategic Group on “duty of care” and the leadership provided by UN-DSS and by UNHCR.

108. Looked forward to the preliminary outcome of this work at its spring 2015 session.

B. IPSAS System-wide Progress Report for Jan-Jun 2014

Documentation:

✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/20 – IPSAS System-wide Progress Report for Jan-Jun 2014*

109. HLCM took note with appreciation of the work of the IPSAS Task Force.

C. ERP Inter-Operability Feasibility Study

Documentation:

✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/21 – Status Report on ERP Inter-Operability Feasibility Study*

➤ *HLCM:*

110. Welcomed the update on the study, as contained in the status report document.

111. Noted that the consultants will require support from relevant agencies and calls upon all agencies contacted by the consultants to respond quickly to requests for consultations and information.

112. Looked forward to receiving the results of the study at its next session.

D. UN Climate Neutrality



Documentation:

- ✓ *Letter by the Secretary-General to CEB Principals of 3 September 2014*
- ❖ *Summary sheet*

➤ *HLCM:*

113. Took note of the progress toward the goal of "enhancing environmental sustainability of UN operations" as supported by the EMG and the UNEP SUN facility.
114. Took note of the call from Secretary General for climate neutrality by 2020.
115. Looked forward to discussing a system-wide road map for UN climate neutrality by 2020, to be developed by the EMG and proposed to HLCM for its review at its spring 2015 session.

E. Update on progress with the HLCM Data Visualisation Project



Documentation:

- ✓ *CEB/2014/HLCM/23 – HLCM Data Visualisation Project Note*

➤ *HLCM:*

116. Took note of the progress being made by the Working Group on Data Visualization.
117. Requested the Working Group to present a detailed work plan at the next session, in spring 2015.

F. Dates and venues of 2015 sessions

118. The CEB Secretariat would consult with HLCM members on the dates and venue of the spring 2015 session.

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Chair: Mr. Francis Gurry, Director General, WIPO
Vice-Chair: Ms. Jan Beagle, Deputy Executive Director, UNAIDS
Secretary: Mr. Remo Lalli, HLCM Secretary

Organizations	Name – Title – Division
United Nations	Mr. Yukio Takasu, Under-Secretary-General for Management
	Mr. Peter Drennan, Under Secretary-General, Dpt of Safety and Security, Chair, IASMN
	Mr. Kim Won-Soo, Assistant Secretary-General, CEB Secretary
	Ms. Mbaranga Gasarabwe, Asst. Secretary-General, Department of Safety and Security
	Ms. Antigoni Axenidou, Director, General Legal Division, Rep. of the Legal Network
	Dr. Bernhard Lennartz, Chief Medical Officer, Representative of the Medical Directors WG
	Ms. Martha Helena Lopez, Director, Strategic Planning and Staffing Division, OHRM
	Ms. Ruth de Miranda, Chief, HR Policy Service, OHRM, HR Network
	Ms. Gwi-Yeop Son, Director, Corporate Programmes, UN-OCHA
	Ms. Shoko Arakaki, Chief, Funding Coordination Section, UN-OCHA
	Ms. Florence Poussin, Policy Planning and Coordination Unit, UN-DSS
	Mr. Andreas Vaagt, Senior Legal Officer, Office of Legal Affairs
	Mr. Brian Gray, Chief, Business Continuity Management Unit, UN-DM, ORMS
	Ms. Paula Reid, Specialist, Business Continuity Management, UN-DM
	Ms. Lynne Goldberg, Acting Special Assistant, Office of the ASG, OHRM
	Mr. Girish Sinha, Director of Mission Support, DFS
	Mr. Mohammed Parvez, Administrative Office, Office of the ASG, DFS
Ms. Daniela Wuerz, Business Continuity Coordinator, UNOG	
ILO	Mr. Gregory Vines, Deputy Director General
FAO	Mr. Denis Aitken, Assistant Director-General a.i., Corporate Services, HR & Finance Dept
UNESCO	Mr. Getachew Engida, Deputy Director General
	Ms. Ana Luiza Thompson-Flores, Director, Bureau of HR Management, Co-Chair, HR Network
WHO	Dr. Daniel Lopez-Acuña, Director Strategy, Policy and Resource Mgmt, Health Action in Crisis
	Ms. Hanne Raatikainen, Management Officer
	Ms. Suvi Huikuri, Technical Officer and Urban Health Governance

Organizations	Name – Title – Division
World Bank	Mr. Nicholas Jones, International Affairs Associate
IMF	Mr. Frank Harnischfeger, Director, Technology and General Services Department
ITU	Ms. Julia Watt, Chief, Human Resources Management Department
	Mr. Anders Norsker, Chief, Information Services, Representative, ICT Network
	Ms. Doreen Bogdan-Martin, Chief, Strategic Planning and Membership Department
WMO	Mr. Christian Blondin, Director, Head of Cabinet of the Secretary-General
IMO	Mr. Jesper Loldrup, Head, Executive Office of the SG and of Policy and Planning
WIPO	Mr. Ambi Sundaram, Assistant Director General, Administration and Management
	Ms. Chitra Narayanaswamy, Director, Program Planning and Finance Controller
UNIDO	Mr. Stefano Bologna, OIC, PSM and Director, Operational Support Service Branch
UNWTO	Mr. José G. Blanch, Director, Administration Division
IAEA	Ms. Janice Dunn Lee, Deputy Director-General and Head of Management
	Ms. Tracy Brown, Public Information Officer
UNCTAD	Ms. Marisa Henderson, OIC, UNCTAD New York Office
UNDP	Mr. Jens Wandel, ASG, Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau of Management
	Mr. Darshak Shah, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Deputy Director & CFO, Co-Chair, FB Net
	Mr. Dominic Grace, Director, Procurement Support Office, Chair, Procurement Network
	Mr. Patrick Tiefenbacher, Senior Adviser, Development Effectiveness
	Mr. Besian Xhezo, Intergovernmental and UN Affairs Officer
UNEP	Mr. Christophe Bouvier, Director, Office for Operations and Corporate Services
UNHCR	Mr. Alexander T. Aleinikoff, Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees
UNRWA	Mr. Neil Ashcroft, Director of Administrative Support

Organizations	Name – Title – Division
UNICEF	Mr. Martin Mogwanja, Deputy Executive Director
	Ms. Lori Issa, Coherence Specialist
UNFPA	Ms. Anne-Birgitte Albrechtsen, Deputy Executive Director (Management)
	Mr. Subhash K. Gupta, Director, Division for Management Services
	Mr. Daniel Mora-Brito, Coordination and Planning Specialist
	Mr. Andrew Saberton, Chief, Finance Branch
	Ms. Tsitsi Soko, Finance and Audit Specialist
WFP	Mr. Manoj Juneja, Assistant Executive Director and CFO
	Mr. Robert Opp, Director, Business Innovation & Support
UNOV/UNODC	Mr. Dennis Thatchaichawalit, Director, Division of Management
UN-HABITAT	Ms. Yamina Djacta, Director, New York Office
	Mr. Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza, Chief, Policy Analysis and Dialogue Branch
UNSSC	Mr. Jafar Javan, Director
ITC	Mr. David Curry, Director, Division of Programme Support
UNOPS	Mr. Vitaly Vanshelboim, Deputy Executive Director
UNWOMEN	Ms. Giovannie Biha, Director, Division of Management and Administration
	Ms. Soren Thomassen, Chief, Information Systems and Telecommunications
	Mr. Paul O’Hanlon, Global Security Advisor
UNU	Mr. James Cockayne, Head, UNU Office-New York
Other Representatives:	
United Nations	Dr. David Nabarro, Secretary-General’s Special Envoy on EBOLA
UNDOCO	Ms. Dena Assaf, Deputy Director
	Mr. Gerald Daly, Policy Adviser, Programming, Business Operations and Joint Funding
	Mr. Lars Tushuizen, Business Operations Specialist
IOM	Ms. Laura Thompson, Deputy Director General
ICSC	Ms. Regina Pawlik, Executive Secretary
UNISERV	Mr. Dimitri Samaras, President and Chair, Staff Council
	Mr. Stephan Flaetgen, Vice Chair, Staff Council
CCISUA	Mr. Egor Ovcharenko, Vice President, Conditions of Service
FICSA	Mr. Diab El Tabari, President

Organizations	Name – Title – Division
CEB Secretariat	Ms. Simona Petrova , Director
	Ms. Kayoko Gotoh , Secretary, HLCP
	Mr. Michael Rosetz , Senior Inter-Agency Advisor on HRM
	Mr. Ronny Lindstrom , Senior HBP Programme Coordinator
	Mr. Ken Herman , Senior Adviser on Information Management & Policy Coordination
	Ms. Xenia von Lilien , Programme Officer, HLCP
	Mrs. Cheryl Stafford , Programme Officer, HLCP
	Ms. Frederique Morice-Walker , Meeting Services Assistant
	Ms. Fabienne Fon Sing , Research Assistant
	Ms. Monica Abalos , Admin. Assistant, HLCM

ANNEX II

Checklist of Documents

Item no.	Title	Summary Sheet	Document Symbol
	Revised Provisional Agenda	n.a.	CEB/2014/HLCM/9/Rev.2
	Revised Provisional Programme of Work		CEB/2014/HLCM/9/Add.1
1	Reference Documents: (from the CEB Retreat of 9 May 2014 on Fit for Purpose) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HLCP/UNDG/HLCM Chapeau to the CEB Post 2015 – Fit for Purpose Strategy • Sherpa De-briefing of 13 May 2014 • HLCP Discussion Paper • UNDG Discussion Paper 	Yes	n.a.
	Summary of the responses by CEB Principals to the Secretary-General's letter of 30 May 2014		n.a.
	Working Paper: Delivering on a transformative agenda: What will it take to become 'Fit-for-Purpose'?		n.a.
	Draft HLCM's contribution to the CEB Post 2015 - Fit for Purpose strategy		CEB/2014/HLCM/10
2	Note by the HR Network on the progress of the Review of the UN Compensation Package	Yes	CEB/2014/HLCM/11
	Briefing Note on the conclusions of the 79 th session of the ICSC		CEB/2014/HLCM/12
	Statement by the HLCM Strategic Group for the 79th session of the ICSC (for reference)		CEB/2014/HLCM/13
3	Draft proposal for a reference Risk Management, Oversight and Accountability Model	Yes	CEB/2014/HLCM/14 & Add.1
4	Letter of USG Valerie Amos to HLCM and UNDG Chairs of 11 July 2014	Yes	n.a.
	Briefing Note by OCHA		CEB/2014/HLCM/15
	Professional advice by UN-RIAS and HLCM Procurement Network on possible courses of action on Harmonized System-wide Approaches to Fraud Cases of Implementing Partners		CEB/2014/HLCM/16
5	Draft UN System policy on Organizational Resilience Management System (ORMS)	Yes	CEB/2014/HLCM/17
	Key Performance Indicators		CEB/2014/HLCM/17/Add.1
	Maintenance, Exercise and Review Regime		CEB/2014/HLCM/17/Add.2
6	Draft UN System Coordination Plan on Cybersecurity and Cybercrime	Yes	n.a.
	Compendium of UN Mandates on Cybersecurity and Cybercrime (<i>for reference only – do not print</i>)		n.a.
7	Briefing Note by the HR Network on System-wide Coordination on the EBOLA Crisis	Yes	CEB/2014/HLCM/19
8	IPSAS System-wide Progress Report for Jan-Jun 2014	Yes	CEB/2014/HLCM/20
	Status Report on ERP Inter-Operability Feasibility Study	n.a.	CEB/2014/HLCM/21
	Briefing Note by UN-DSS on the Duty of Care Strategic Group	n.a.	CEB/2014/HLCM/22/Rev.1
	Letter by the Secretary-General to CEB Principals of 3 September 2014 on UN Climate Neutrality	Yes	n.a.
	HLCM Data Visualisation Project Note	Yes	CEB/2014/HLCM/23

ANNEX III

Policy on the Organizational Resilience Management System (ORMS)

Approved by: Chief Executives Board
Effective date: 1 December 2014
Contact: United Nations System, Department of Management, Business Continuity
Management Unit
Review date: December 2016

POLICY ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (ORMS)

A. INTRODUCTION

1. The UN Organizational Resilience Management System (ORMS) was approved by the General Assembly in June 2013, under A/RES/67/254, as the emergency management framework for the Organization. The UN system deals with crises on a daily basis. The ORMS aims to assist UN entities to build resilience by aligning and harmonizing preparedness efforts to enhance the Organization's ability to continuously deliver its mandates.
-

B. PURPOSE

2. This policy describes the ORMS and prescribes its adoption across the UN System.
-

C. SCOPE

3. This policy applies to all entities of the United Nations System.
-

D. RATIONALE

4. This policy gives effect to:
 - a) General Assembly Resolution A/RES/67/254 of 7 June 2013; and
 - b) Conclusions of the Twenty-seventh and Twenty-eighth Session of the High Level Committee on Management, CEB/2014/3, and CEB/2014/5.
-

E. Definition of ORMS

5. The UN ORMS is a comprehensive emergency management system, linking actors and activities across preparedness, prevention, response and recovery, to enhance resilience in order to improve the capacity of the Organization to effectively manage the risks of disruptive events.

ORMS PRIORITIES

6. Under ORMS, the UN system response to any event will be flexible and coordinated, reflecting prevailing circumstances and focus on the following priorities: ensure health, safety and security and well-being of personnel; maintain the continuity of critical processes and capacity to implement mandates and programmes; and protect assets.

ORMS PRINCIPLES

7. Applicable to the UN System; founded on an iterative process of continuous learning and improvement; and empowering UN personnel to influence and effect a structured, efficient implementation, the ORMS principles are:
 - 7.1. **Risk Management Based Planning and Practice:** duty station emergency management plans will be based on a joint assessment of risk;
 - 7.2. **Flexible Standardization:** the fundamental roles, responsibilities and practice are tailored to reflect the local context, leveraging existing resources and processes;
 - 7.3. **Harmonized and integrated implementation:** the planning, structures and behavioural change will be implemented in coordination with member states, host country authorities and other key partners; and
 - 7.4. **Maximized organizational learning:** lessons learned during implementation will be identified, recorded and shared.

ORMS CORE ELEMENTS

8. The core elements of the ORMS are:
 - a) Crisis management decision making and operations coordination framework;
 - b) Security support and response;
 - c) Crisis Communications;
 - d) Mass Casualty Incident Response;
 - e) IT Disaster Recovery;
 - f) Business Continuity; and
 - g) Support to Staff, Survivors and their Families.

PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION

9. The ORMS comprises integrated decision-making and coordination of operations. It will be implemented across the UN System and in the field. The implementation of ORMS includes the following five areas: policy development, establishment of a governance mechanism, the conduct of a comprehensive risk assessment, the development of the core elements of ORMS, and the implementation of Maintenance, Exercise & Review regime.
10. The Key Performance Indicators (see Annex) include detailed action items that outline how to achieve each of the areas mentioned above. They also include an indication of how to measure progress of implementation.

GOVERNANCE

11. The Chief Executives Board is the policy owner, and can delegate the administration of the policy to any entity they see fit. United Nations System Executive Heads are responsible for the implementation of this policy in their respective organizations.

F. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Business Continuity: The capability of the organization to continue delivery of products or services at acceptable predefined levels following a disruptive incident.

Crisis: An incident or situation, whether natural or man-made that: 1) presents an exceptional risk to the safety and security of UN personnel, premises and assets; 2) presents an exceptional threat to the effective functioning of a UN

mission or other field presence; 3) presents an exceptional threat to the effective implementation of the mandate of a UN mission or other field presence; 4) may have a significantly negative humanitarian impact; or 5) may give rise to serious violations of international human rights or humanitarian law.¹

Crisis communications: Internal communications (to UN staff and other UN offices/ duty stations) and external communications (to Member States, donors, cooperating partners and the media and the public at large) during a crisis.

Crisis management: Decision making in support of the identification, prioritization, coordination and execution of crisis response activities.

Crisis response: The spectrum of activities undertaken to respond to a crisis situation.

Emergency Management: The discipline of dealing with and avoiding both natural and manmade disasters, through preparedness, prevention, response and recovery.

Information Technology Disaster Recovery: The recovery of IT elements to support critical business processes to an acceptable level within a predetermined period of time following a disruption.

Maintenance, Exercise & Review (ME&R) regime: A structured regime designed to elicit the change necessary to ensure the Organization incorporates resilience measures into its day-to-day activities and that staff possess the requisite skills to execute their responsibilities in an emergency.

Mass Casualty Incident Response: The planned response to an incident in which medical resources – personnel, equipment and procedures – are overwhelmed by the number and severity of casualties.

Reconstitution: The return of business processes to a state of normal operations.

Resilience: The ability to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, and recover from the effects of a shock or stress in a timely and efficient manner.

Risk: The likelihood (possibility) of harm from a threat or hazard and the impact (extent) of this harm.²

Security: The condition of being protected against hazards, threats, risks, or loss.³

Situational awareness: Knowledge and understanding of the environment to anticipate potential crisis situations, enabled by information and analysis.

Support to Staff, Survivors and Families (formerly Staff & Victim Support): The provision of essential human resources support for Staff, Survivors and Families, comprising a multitude of services for those affected by malicious acts, natural disasters or other critical incidents.

¹ Working definition under consideration in the interagency and interdepartmental development process on crisis management.

² Working definition under consideration by the IASMN in developing a revised policy on security risk management.

³ From ASIS International

G. REFERENCES

Normative or Superior References

A/66/516 (14 Oct 2011): Report of the Secretary-General - Revised estimates relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 under section 29D, Office of Central Support Services, and section 30, Office of Information and Communications Technology, related to the organizational resilience management system: emergency management framework;

A/66/7/Add.10 (9 November 2011): Revised estimates relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 under section 29D, Office of Central Support Services, and section 30, Office of Information and Communications Technology, related to the organizational resilience management system: emergency management framework – Eleventh report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013

A/67/266 (7 Aug 2012): Report of the Secretary-General: Organizational resilience management system: emergency management framework;

A/67/608 (3 Dec 2012): Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions – Organizational resilience management system: emergency management framework;

A/RES/67/254 (7 June 2013): Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the report of the Fifth Committee (A/67/677/Add.1): Organizational resilience management system: emergency management framework.

Related Policies

United Nations System Programme Criticality Framework

H. MONITORING AND COMPLIANCE

Compliance with this policy is mandatory. The High Level Committee on Management (HLCM) will monitor compliance with this policy on behalf of the Chief Executives Board. All organizations in the United Nations System will provide an annual implementation update to the HLCM.

United Nations System entities shall adjust relevant internal policies and procedures to ensure implementation, and report accordingly to their respective governance bodies.

I. CONTACT

The point of contact for this policy is the United Nations Secretariat Department of Management.

J. HISTORY

This policy was approved on 20 November 2014. It shall be reviewed no later than 31 December 2016.

**Approved by the Chief Executives Board
20 November 2014**

APPROVAL SIGNATURE:

On behalf of the Chief Executives Board

ANNEX IV

Statement by FICSA



FEDERATION OF INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVANTS' ASSOCIATIONS (FICSA)

**WRITTEN STATEMENT BY
THE FEDERATION OF INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVANTS' ASSOCIATIONS (FICSA)
AT THE 28th SESSION OF THE HIGH-LEVEL COMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT (HLCM)**

(New York, 8 October 2014)

Mr. Chair, Members and Colleagues of the High-Level Committee on Management,

FICSA will provide its interventions on the substantive items as the session progresses.

FICSA looks forward to the continued sharing of views with the HLCM during discussions on items which are of utmost importance to the staff.

We would have hoped to unify the positions of the Members of the HLCM and the Federations with regards to the major challenges posed by the current review of the compensation package for both the organizations and staff respectively. However, after participating in the three ICSC working groups and the two ICSC sessions in 2014, the Federation has concluded that both the organizations and the staff need to work further together to ensure that any changes to the compensation package will not erode benefits and thereby have a negative effect on staff and on the ability to recruit highly qualified candidates in the future.

FICSA is fully aware that certain actions could also have repercussions on staff morale and motivation which would be counterproductive to the organizations' objectives of enhancing efficiency.

The Federation shares with the organizations the importance of maintaining the independence of the international civil service and will continue advocating that the compensation review, led by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), remains free of all political motivations.

FICSA is following closely the Secretary-General's plans in moving the common system forward through the implementation of the "Fit for Purpose Strategy". In this context, we have noted on the HLCM agenda references to various working groups, namely: the draft contribution on redesigning management and operational systems and developing business models; the draft proposal on risk management, oversight and accountability model; and the proposed UN system strategy on cyber security, cyber-crime and policies on information. FICSA would have hoped that the staff representatives would have been asked to participate in the working groups, which lead to the development of these proposals, in order to provide staff views. We would at this stage kindly ask to be provided with these proposals so as to share our comments with the HLCM. We believe that it can only provide value to the Organizations by having another perspective, and that

exclusion of the staff perspective can only do damage to the Organizations when the cost of inclusion is nil.

Other issues which have already been repeatedly raised by FICSA at the HLCM and which continue to preoccupy staff are: 1) the lack of a career development plan, which would provide equal opportunities to staff while taking into account the need for diversity and gender balance; 2) the frequently repeated call to do more with less; 3) the increasing use of non-staff contracts; and 4) the lack of succession planning. We hope that working groups to address these issues can be established and that staff representatives will be requested to participate therein.

FICSA remains concerned regarding the use of private security services and the outsourcing of numerous activities in an apparent effort to achieve financial savings. The Federation firmly believes that any short-term savings should not take priority over professional and well-trained security staff.

Last but not least, as it is a major issue of concern, is the blatant attack on the freedom of speech and the freedom of association recently demonstrated by the Chair of the HLCM himself in summarily dismissing the President of the WIPO Staff Association, without conducting any investigation or hearing, and where the sanction imposed is widely disproportionate to the accusations. The Director General of WIPO has weakly but repeatedly claimed that the action taken against the President of the WIPO Staff Association was against him as a staff member and not as a staff representative, an argument that rings especially hollow when considering that the President was performing his staff representative functions on a full-time basis. A communication on the subject has been sent to the Governing Bodies of WIPO and to the UN Secretary-General by the three Staff Federations. Further staff actions will follow. The Federations are thus requesting the UN Secretary-General, as a first step, to remove the Director General of WIPO from chairing the HLCM, and we reiterate this request today.

In closing, we wish to thank you for providing FICSA with this opportunity to address the HLCM on some of the concerns raised by the staff we represent and we look forward to continued dialogue, not only with the HLCM, but also with the ICSC, the HR Network and the UN Joint Staff Pension Board.

We wish you a successful session.

Thank you.
