Audit of support functions in the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe

Overall results relating to the effective management of support functions by the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe were initially assessed as partially satisfactory. Implementation of six important recommendations remains in progress

FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY
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ANNEX I Status of audit recommendations

APPENDIX I Management response
AUDIT REPORT

Audit of support functions in the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of support functions in the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe (RSCE).

2. In accordance with its mandate, OIOS provides assurance and advice on the adequacy and effectiveness of the United Nations internal control system, the primary objectives of which are to ensure: (a) efficient and effective operations; (b) accurate financial and operational reporting; (c) safeguarding of assets; and (d) compliance with mandates, regulations and rules.

3. As part of the global field support strategy, the General Assembly approved the establishment of the RSCE to consolidate administrative and support functions from geographically grouped field missions in East Africa. The RSCE is a regional, shared-services operation that is strategically linked to its following stakeholder missions:
   - United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUSCO);
   - African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID);
   - United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS);
   - United Nations Interim Security Force in Abyei (UNISFA);
   - United Nations Support Office for AMISOM (UNSOA);
   - United Nations Integrated Peace Building Office in the Central African Republic (BINUCA); and
   - United Nations Office in Burundi (BNUB).

4. The RSCE was mandated to improve service delivery by streamlining processes and enhancing compliance, while also deriving economies of scale through the concentration of resources. The RSCE had entered into operational service level agreements (SLAs) for the support provided to the missions in the region. The RSCE worked closely with the host mission, MONUSCO, and benefited from the support and infrastructure provided by the MONUSCO Entebbe Support Base (ESB). This support was governed by an operational level agreement (OLA) entered into between MONUSCO, RSCE, UNMISS, UNAMID, BNUB, BINUCA, UNISFA and UNSOA.

5. The estimated cost for the RSCE in 2011/12 was $9.8 million ($4.4 million for staff costs and $5.4 million for operational costs) and in 2012/13 was $29.5 million ($19.3 million for staff costs and $10.2 million for operational costs). The staff members conducting functions for the RSCE were redeployed from stakeholder missions and were funded by those missions’ budgets. The redeployment of staff and assets from the participating missions to the RSCE were governed by the OLA, and non-staff costs were shared by the missions receiving services from the RSCE in proportion to the size of their budgets.

6. Comments provided by RSCE are incorporated in italics.
II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

7. The audit was conducted to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of RSCE governance, risk management and control processes in providing reasonable assurance regarding the effective management of support functions by the RSCE.

8. The audit was included in the 2012 OIOS risk-based work plan due to identified strategic and operational risks because of the criticality of providing effective and efficient services for the participating missions’ operations.

9. The key controls tested for the audit were: (a) performance monitoring; (b) mandates and delegation of authority; (c) joint and coordinated oversight; and (d) needs assessment. For the purpose of this audit, OIOS defined these key controls as follows:

   (a) **Performance monitoring** - controls that provide reasonable assurance that metrics for the RSCE are: (i) established and appropriate to enable measurement of the efficiency and effectiveness of operations; (ii) prepared in compliance with rules and are properly reported on; and (iii) used to manage operations appropriately.

   (b) **Mandates and delegation of authority** - controls that provide reasonable assurance on clarity of the authority, roles and responsibilities of the RSCE and other entities involved in a programme to ensure effective and efficient services to the participating missions.

   (c) **Joint and coordinated oversight** - controls that provide reasonable assurance that a joint, coordinated oversight mechanism exists for coordinated projects of the RSCE involving multiple internal and external parties/entities.

   (d) **Needs assessment** - controls that provide reasonable assurance that there is a proper assessment of the RSCE’s needs to ensure that functions/programmes have sufficient capacity to support operations.

10. The key controls were assessed for the control objectives shown in Table 1.

11. OIOS conducted this audit from September to December 2012. The audit covered the period from 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2012.

12. OIOS conducted an activity-level risk assessment to identify and assess specific risk exposures, and to confirm the relevance of the selected key controls in mitigating associated risks. Through interviews, analytical reviews and tests of controls, OIOS assessed the existence and adequacy of internal controls and conducted necessary tests to determine their effectiveness.

III. AUDIT RESULTS

13. The RSCE governance, risk management and control processes examined were assessed as **partially satisfactory** in providing reasonable assurance regarding the effective management of support functions. OIOS made nine recommendations to address issues identified. The RSCE was working on improving processes and developing systems to enhance its operations. The governance, management and reporting arrangements and the responsibilities between the Department of Field Support (DFS) Headquarters, the RSCE and participating missions were stipulated and defined in terms of reference and service level agreements. Key performance indicators (KPIs) were developed for some areas and were
being developed for finance and human resources. However, the RSCE in conjunction with stakeholder missions needed to ensure that all operationally feasible and economically viable functions were transferred to the RSCE. The RSCE also needed to centralize human resources; develop and implement additional standard operating procedures (SOPs); improve the timeliness of the certification process; and strengthen controls over accounting for assets.

14. The initial overall rating was based on the assessment of key controls presented in Table 1 below. The final overall rating is partially satisfactory as implementation of six important recommendations remains in progress.

Table 1: Assessment of key controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business objective</th>
<th>Key controls</th>
<th>Control objectives</th>
<th>Compliance with mandates, regulations and rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficient and effective operations</td>
<td>Accurate financial and operational reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective management of support functions by the RSCE</td>
<td>(a) Performance monitoring</td>
<td>Partially satisfactory</td>
<td>Partially satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Mandates and delegation of authority</td>
<td>Partially satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Joint, coordinated oversight</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Needs assessment</td>
<td>Partially satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY

A. Performance monitoring

Processes were being streamlined to achieve efficiencies

15. The RSCE was established to achieve cost effectiveness, economies of scale and reduced transaction times through improvements in practices, processes and systems. However, processes were still fragmented and transactions were either processed on stand-alone systems or done manually. The lack of streamlined processes was raised by the Board of Auditors in 2012, and the RSCE was addressing the issue by reviewing and re-engineering processes, and developing and implementing systems to streamline and track processes from start to finish. Moreover, the RSCE had proposed to create in the budget year 2013/14, a Quality Assurance and Business Intelligence Unit that would be responsible for conducting performance reviews and reporting on efficiencies made through the implementation of a new regional structure. OIOS was satisfied that action was being taken to improve processes and develop systems to enhance RSCE operations.

Further development of key performance indicators and business metrics were required

16. The support provided by the RSCE to participating missions was governed by the June 2012 SLAs, which included KPIs and a business metric for education grants, the check-in and check-out
process and training services. The finance and human resources functions were transferred to the RSCE in April 2012 and were covered by the June 2012 SLAs; however, the related KPIs and business metrics were not annexed to the relevant SLAs. Also, the General Assembly report A/67/723 dated 31 January 2013 deemed mission staff recruitment functions to be strategic and therefore, effective 15 April 2013, the process was transferred from the RSCE back to participating missions. The RSCE continued processing some human resources transactions related to travel, benefits and entitlements.

17. The SLAs were signed in June 2012, and KPIs were established in the 2010/11 and 2011/12 budget documents. However, no periodic reviews and monitoring of quality and effectiveness of the service delivery had been conducted from 2010 to 2012. Participating missions were requested to provide data to be used as a baseline to monitor the RSCE’s performance; but no such data was available and no systems were implemented by missions to capture it.

| (1) RSCE should include in service level agreements with participating missions key performance indicators and business metrics for human resources and finance to enable the Centre to measure and monitor performance. |

The RSCE accepted recommendation 1 and stated that the most recent SLAs signed in April 2013 included KPIs. The preparation of the annex pertaining to finance was pending clarification of the roles of RSCE and missions for IPSAS, and the human resources annex was being finalized. Recommendation 1 remains open pending receipt of copies of the amended SLAs including the annexes for human resources and finance KPIs and business metrics.

B. Mandates and delegation of authority

Governance, management and reporting arrangements were in place

18. Adequate governance, management and reporting arrangements were established by the RSCE, and were stipulated in the terms of reference of the RSCE governance framework. The RSCE also developed a document titled “functions and activities distribution”, which stipulated the division of roles and responsibilities among the RSCE, participating missions and related sections in DFS for finance, human resources, and the operations of the Transportation and Movements Integrated Control Centre (TMICC). This document was approved by the RSCE Steering Committee in December 2012. OIOS was satisfied with the mechanisms in place.

The transfer of the check-in check-out process had not been completed

19. Only three of the seven participating missions had transferred their check-in check-out of staff function to the RSCE, even though this function had been included in all SLAs. MONUSCO and UNMISS had only partially transferred the function because of differences in the check-in check-out requirements in remote locations. UNAMID had not transferred this function due to the host country’s political situation. The RSCE also considered the transfer of BINUB, BINUCA and UNSOA check-in check-out functions as uneconomical due to the lack of regular United Nations flights between Entebbe and these missions and therefore, the travel costs of incoming and outgoing staff would increase significantly.

20. With the partial transfer of check-in check-out functions by MONUSCO and UNMISS, there was a need to ensure that there was adequate coordination in the process to mitigate the risk of functions being duplicated. In addition, there was a need to formalize this process with clear division of roles and
responsibilities between RSCE and missions, as well as for a partial transfer of check-in check-out functions.

(2) RSCE, in consultation with participating missions, should ensure that all operationally feasible and economically viable check-in check-out functions are transferred to the Centre.

The RSCE accepted recommendation 2 and stated that it was in discussions with MONUSCO to transfer the remaining check-in check-out functions to Entebbe. Recommendation 2 remains open pending completion of the transfer of all operationally and economically viable check-in check-out functions, as required by the SLAs.

(3) RSCE, in consultation with participating missions, should ensure that the division of roles and responsibilities in the check-in check-out functions between the missions and the Centre are clearly stipulated.

The RSCE accepted recommendation 3 and stated that the Field Support Suite check-in check-out module had been implemented in all missions and this included a clear division of the roles and responsibilities between RSCE and missions. Based on the action taken by the RSCE, recommendation 3 has been closed.

Processing of human resource transactions were not centralized

21. The RSCE had centralized the processing of finance functions. However, human resource transactions relating to travel, benefits and entitlements were still processed separately per participating mission. RSCE took this approach as transactions were processed differently in participating missions, and cross-training of staff was necessary before these processes could be centralized. The RSCE was addressing this as part of the project of re-engineering of processes, and subsequent training of staff. Also, while the RSCE had developed a new structure, which clearly defined services and staff requirements, the required posts and staff to implement the revised structure had not been deployed from participating missions.

(4) RSCE should centralize the processing of human resource transactions relating to travel, benefits and entitlements to achieve economies of scale.

The RSCE accepted recommendation 4 and stated that human resource functions had been integrated and processing was done without segregation by mission. Based on the action taken by the RSCE, recommendation 4 has been closed.

Standard operating procedures needed to be further developed and finalized

22. The RSCE had developed draft SOPs to guide staff in the processing of finance and travel functions, which were to be finalized following the re-engineering of the relevant processes. SOPs had not yet been developed for the processing of education grants, check-in check-out of staff and training.

(5) RSCE should develop and issue standard operating procedures for the check-in check-out process, education grants and training functions, and finalize all draft procedures once the relevant processes are in place.

The RSCE accepted recommendation 5 and stated that SOPs for the check-in check-out process,
C. Joint and coordinated oversight

Adequate coordinated oversight mechanisms were in place

23. There were adequate coordinated oversight mechanisms established over the RSCE operations, including: (a) the RSC Steering Committee, which ensured compliance with established policies and procedures, provided strategic guidance and ensured coordination with the GFSS Implementation Coordination Team; and (b) the integrated transportation governance regulatory framework and the Operational and Technical Board, which ensured coordination with the TMICC, participating missions, the Global Service Centre in Brindisi and DFS.

D. Needs assessment

There was an inadequate number of certifying officers to ensure processes were not delayed

24. The RSCE had an insufficient number of certifying officers to ensure that processes were certified in a timely basis. The RSCE had only one certifying officer for the Education Grant Unit, which dealt with 6,000 transactions annually, and this was insufficient to cope with the workload during the peak season. For example, from a sample of 30 education grant transactions processed over the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012, the processing time for those transactions in the low season ranged between 37 to 46 days and in the peak season it was from 58 to 209 days, resulting in accumulating a large backlog. To reduce this backlog, additional certifying officers/assistants were needed.

25. The RSCE had requested the United Nations Controller for multiple mission certification authority to be given to RSCE officers who processed transactions for missions in the region. However, this was not granted, as it was concluded that certification still required close integration between the missions’ cost centers, the requisitioners and Directors/Chiefs of Mission Support to facilitate proper monitoring of the utilization of funds. While this may be relevant for processing vendor invoices from missions, the cross-mission certification authority for processing human resource transactions and RSCE’s expenditures would enable the RSCE to be more effective in processing transactions, as it did not require the same level of integration with missions’ cost centers, as in the case of processing vendor invoices and similar payments.

(6) RSCE, in coordination with DFS, should further review and present its case to the United Nations Controller for cross-mission certification authority for human resource transactions and RSCE expenditures, as well as determine the number of certifying officers needed for RSCE functions to ensure that transactions are certified in a timely manner.

The RSCE accepted recommendation 6 and stated that the Controller in June 2013 had delegated a Certifying Officer Panel for RSCE resource management including expenditures. Also, DFS granted in May 2013, two staff members in RSCE the certification rights for education grant. A request for cross-mission certification authority for human resource transactions was being finalized. Recommendation 6 remains open pending receipt of copies of the memorandum granting certification authority to RSCE and the response from the Controller on RSCE’s request for cross-mission certification for human resource transactions.
Asset management needed to improve

26. The OLA required that the RSCE maintain a record of all assets under its use. However, assets used were owned by participating missions, and as such were recorded in their respective Galileo database.

27. The RSCE’s current process for issuing assets such as office equipment, vehicles and mobile phones was cumbersome, as it was linked with the mission financing the staff member's post and to the United Nations identity number (ID) issued to the staff member. Therefore, a staff member on a post financed by UNAMID could only receive or use its assets, and RSCE staff, who did not belong to any of the participating missions, were issued an official visitor United Nations ID providing them access to MONUSCO assets. On occasion, when the required assets were not in stock of the staff member’s mission, but available in another mission, the staff member obtained the equipment through another staff member who was linked to that mission. For example, from a sample of assets assigned to 15 RSCE staff; two staff members had two desktop computers each registered in their name; and one staff member had four desktop computers registered in her/his name (one computer for her/his individual use and three computers for her/his colleagues’ use). There were no written procedures on the allocation and use of assets such as mobile phones and vehicles.

(7) RSCE, in coordination with DFS, should implement measures that enable the Centre to effectively issue and manage assets under its control.

*The RSCE accepted recommendation 7 and stated that it was working with DFS to find a common solution to address the effective management of assets in the RSCE. Recommendation 7 remains open pending receipt of evidence of the measures implemented to enable RSCE to effectively issue and manage assets.*

Limited capacity to be operational outside of the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe normal working hours

29. The RSCE used the Integrated Management Information System (IMIS) for post management and processing of entitlements. However, IMIS was only accessible to RSCE users from about midday since it was in the United Nations Headquarters, and from 8 pm to 5 am New York time, the system ran its batch processing and was not available to users to process transactions. This resulted in delays when the RSCE processed education grants, which involved about 1,200 transactions per month during peak periods. IMIS would not be enhanced in the short-term, due to the pending launch of Umoja. Moreover, three of the seven participating missions had different working days and hours, and therefore RSCE staff were not always available to address the missions’ needs in a timely manner. Consequently, the RSCE needed to explore other arrangements such as introducing flexible working hours to ensure that adequate time was available for the timely processing of transactions, and serving other requests from participating missions.

(8) RSCE should explore alternative working arrangements such as flexible time arrangements, to ensure that adequate time is available for the timely processing of transactions and responding to the missions’ needs.

*The RSCE accepted recommendation 8 and stated that it had introduced flexible working arrangements effective 29 April 2013. A standby duty roster had also been instituted to respond to emergencies and requests outside the normal working hours. Based on the action taken by the RSCE, recommendation 8 has been closed.*
A consolidated training plan had not been developed.

30. No training needs assessment had been done at the RSCE. Training had been conducted for staff in the RSCE, which included: (a) attendance at courses organized by participating missions and Headquarters; and (b) a work performance improvement training. Developmental needs had been included in staff members’ e-performance plan, and the RSCE client support helpdesk had identified training needs. However, there was no central mechanism to ensure identified training requirements were captured, and a consolidated plan developed.

(9) RSCE should conduct a training needs assessment and develop a plan for the Centre’s staff

The RSCE accepted recommendation 9 and stated that it had designed a training needs assessment that would be disseminated to staff. The results of the assessment would be taken into account in preparing the staff development plan. Recommendation 10 remains open pending receipt of the training needs assessment and a copy of the staff development plan.
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Assistant Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services
## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of support functions in the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Critical¹/ Important²</th>
<th>C/ O³</th>
<th>Actions needed to close recommendation</th>
<th>Implementation date⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RSCE should include in service level agreements with participating missions key performance indicators and business metrics for human resources and finance to enable the Centre to measure and monitor performance.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of copies of the amended SLAs that include the annexes with human resources and finance key performance indicators and business metrics.</td>
<td>31 December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RSCE, in consultation with participating missions, should ensure that all operationally feasible and economically viable check-in check-out functions are transferred to the Centre.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Confirmation of the completion of the transfer of all operationally and economically viable check-in check-out functions to the RSCE</td>
<td>31 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RSCE, in consultation with participating missions, should ensure that the division of roles and responsibilities in the check-in check-out functions between the missions and the Centre are clearly stipulated.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Action taken</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RSCE should centralize the processing of human resource transactions relating to travel, benefits and entitlements to achieve economies of scale.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Action taken</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RSCE should develop and issue standard operating procedures for the check-in check-out process, education grants and training functions, and finalize all draft procedures once the relevant processes are in place.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of copies of SOPs for check-in check-out process, education grants and training functions.</td>
<td>31 March 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Critical recommendations address significant and/or pervasive deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.
² Important recommendations address important deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.
³ C = closed, O = open
⁴ Date provided by RSCE in response to recommendations.
## Status of Audit Recommendations

Audit of support functions in the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Critical/Important</th>
<th>C/O</th>
<th>Actions needed to close recommendation</th>
<th>Implementation date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RSCE, in coordination with DFS, should further review and present its case to the United Nations Controller for cross-mission certification authority for human resource transactions and RSCE expenditures, as well as determine the number of certifying officers needed for RSCE functions to ensure that transactions are certified in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of copies of the memorandum granting certification authority to RSCE and the response from the Controller on RSCE’s request for cross-mission certification for human resource transactions.</td>
<td>31 December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RSCE, in coordination with DFS, should implement measures that enable the Centre to effectively issue and manage assets under its control.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of evidence of the measures implemented to enable RSCE to effectively issue and manage assets.</td>
<td>31 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RSCE should explore alternative working arrangements such as flexible time arrangements, to ensure that adequate time is available for the timely processing of transactions and responding to the missions’ needs.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Action taken</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RSCE should conduct a training needs assessment and develop a plan for the Centre’s staff.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of the results of the training needs assessment and a copy of the staff development plan.</td>
<td>30 September 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5. Critical recommendations address significant and/or pervasive deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

6. Important recommendations address important deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

7. C = closed, O = open

8. Date provided by RSCE in response to recommendations.
APPENDIX I

Management Response
CONFIDENTIAL

Routine

TO: Ms. Eleanor Burns, Chief Peacekeeping Audit Service, Internal Audit Division, OIOS

DATE: AUG 2 3 2013

REFERENCE: 2013-UNHQ-013387.01

THROUGH:

S/C DE:

FROM: Anthony Banbury, Assistant Secretary-General Department of Field Support

SUBJECT: AP2012/616/01 - Audit of support functions in the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe

1. I refer to your memorandum dated 9 May 2013 regarding the above-mentioned audit. We note that OIOS has taken into account the comments provided by the RSCE in March 2013. The Department is providing additional comments on the findings and recommendations in the attached matrix. In formulating our response, we have conferred with the respective officials in DPKO/DFS and the RSCE and their comments, where appropriate, have been incorporated in this reply.

2. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft report. We stand ready to provide any further information that may be required.

cc: Ms. Anna Halasan
## APPENDIX I

### AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of support functions in the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Critical/ Important</th>
<th>Accepted? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Title of responsible individual</th>
<th>Implementation date</th>
<th>Client comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RSCE should include in service level agreements with participating missions key performance indicators and business metrics for human resources and finance to enable the Centre to measure and monitor its performance.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Director, RSCE</td>
<td>Fourth quarter of 2013</td>
<td>All service level agreements (SLAs) have Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The most recent service level agreements were signed in April 2013. The annex of the SLAs includes KPIs for each of the service areas. The annex pertaining to Finance was awaiting the clarification of mission vs. RSCE roles for IPSAS, and the annex pertaining to human resources is currently being finalized, subject to DFS’ approval of the division of roles and responsibilities between RSCE and the client missions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RSCE, in consultation with participating missions, should ensure that all operationally feasible and economically viable check-in check-out functions are transferred to the Centre.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Director, RSCE</td>
<td>First quarter of 2014</td>
<td>Discussions are ongoing with MONUSCO to transfer remaining check-in check-out functions to Entebbe. As noted earlier, UNAMID will not transfer this function due to the political circumstances in Sudan, which requires the Mission to travel its staff to Khartoum prior to entering Darfur. For BNUB, BINUCA and UNSOA, it is not economically viable to transfer this function as there are no regular United Nations flights between Entebbe and these missions. If this function was to be transferred to RSCE, the costs of travelling incoming and outgoing staff would significantly increase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Critical recommendations address significant and/or pervasive deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

2 Important recommendations address important deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Critical / Important</th>
<th>Accepted? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Title of responsible individual</th>
<th>Implementation date</th>
<th>Client comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RSCE, in consultation with participating missions, should ensure that the division of roles and responsibilities in the check-in check-out functions between the missions and the Centre are clearly stipulated.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>The recommendation has been implemented. Since the check-in check-out process takes place in the Field Support Suite (FSS) application, the division of roles and responsibilities between the missions and the Centre is clearly defined in FSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RSCE should ensure that human resources transactions are processed centrally without segregation by mission to achieve economies of scale.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>The recommendation has been implemented. Human resources functions have been integrated and the processing is done without segregation by mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RSCE should develop and issue standard operating procedures for the check-in check-out process, education grants and training functions, and finalize all draft procedures once the relevant processes are in place.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Director, RSCE</td>
<td>First quarter of 2014</td>
<td>The standard operating procedures for check-in check-out process, education grant and training are being developed and will be finalized by the first quarter of 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RSCE, in coordination with DFS, should further review and present its case to the United Nations Controller for cross mission certification authority for human resources transactions and RSCE expenditures, as well as determine the number of certifying officers needed for RSCE functions to ensure that transactions are certified in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Director, RSCE</td>
<td>Fourth quarter of 2013</td>
<td>DFS presented a case to the Controller on behalf of RSCE to set up a cross-mission Certifying Officer Panel for RSCE, noting that existing work arrangements for missions did not involve cross-mission certifying authority. Subsequently, the Controller in June 2013 delegated a Certifying Officer Panel for RSCE resource management, including expenditures. Concerning Education Grant, DFS granted in May 2013 IMIS certification rights to two staff members in RSCE. RSCE is finalizing a request for cross missions certification authority for human resources transactions taking into account transfer of staff and volume of transactions. Copies of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. no.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Critical/ Important</td>
<td>Accepted? (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Title of responsible individual</td>
<td>Implementation date</td>
<td>Client comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RSCE, in coordination with DFS, should implement a dedicated Galileo database that enables the Centre to effectively issue and manage assets under its control.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes, if amended as requested</td>
<td>Director, RSCE</td>
<td>First quarter of 2014, if amended as requested</td>
<td>DFS requests that the recommendation be reworded to read: &quot;RSCE, in coordination with DFS, should implement measures that enable the Centre to effectively issue and manage assets.&quot; RSCE is working with DFS to find a common solution to address the concerns raised by OIOS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RSCE, in coordination with participating missions, should establish procedures as part of the check-in check-out process to ensure that staff deployed to the Centre hand over assets to their missions before their reassignment to Entebbe.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes, if amended as suggested</td>
<td>Directors of Mission Support of MONUSCO, UNAMID and UNMISS</td>
<td>First quarter of 2014, if amended as suggested</td>
<td>DFS wishes to clarify that check-in/check-out procedures are only applicable to staff joining or leaving a mission. The RSCE forms part of MONUSCO, UNAMID and UNMISS’ area of operations. Staff transfers from these participating missions to the RSCE are thus considered within missions transfers. Based on the above explanation, DFS suggests that the recommendation be reworded to read “MONUSCO, UNAMID and UNMISS should implement measures to ensure that the user location status is updated in a timely manner in the Galileo Inventory Management System upon transfer of staff to the RSCE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RSCE should explore alternative working arrangements, such as flexible time arrangements, to ensure that adequate time is available for the timely processing of transactions and responding to the missions’ needs.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>The recommendation has been implemented. RSCE introduced new service hours from Sundays to Fridays as of 29 April 2013. In addition, RSCE is establishing a standby duty roster to respond to emergencies and requests outside of the Sunday to Friday schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSCE should conduct a training needs assessment and develop a plan for the Centre's staff.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Director, RSCE</td>
<td>Third quarter of 2013</td>
<td>The training needs assessment has been designed and will be disseminated to RSCE staff members via VOVICI online survey tool. The staff development plan will take into account the results of the training needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>