



## INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION

### REPORT 2014/047

---

Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

Overall results relating to the effectiveness of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions were initially assessed as partially satisfactory. Implementation of seven important recommendations remains in progress

FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY

10 June 2014  
Assignment No. AP2013/615/04

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE	2
III. AUDIT RESULTS	2-3
A. Regulatory framework	3-10
IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	10
ANNEX I Status of audit recommendations – DFS	
ANNEX II Status of audit recommendations – DM	
ANNEX III Status of audit recommendations – MONUSCO	
ANNEX IV Status of audit recommendations – UNAMID	
ANNEX V Status of audit recommendations – UNFICYP	
ANNEX VI Status of audit recommendations – UNMIL	
ANNEX VII Status of audit recommendations – UNOCI	
APPENDIX I Management response	

# AUDIT REPORT

## **Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions**

### **I. BACKGROUND**

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of field central review bodies (FCRBs) within the Department of Field Support (DFS) and the staff selection process in selected field missions.
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. FCRBs were established in 2009, and comprised: field central review boards, field central review committees, and field central review panels. The objective of FCRBs was to ensure the integrity of evaluation of candidates for field positions by reviewing and endorsing recruitment cases prepared by: (a) occupational group managers of DFS in respect of generic job openings used to establish rosters for use by field missions; and (b) field missions in respect of position-specific job openings, the primary purpose of which was to select candidates with unique skills not possessed by individuals already on the roster. The FCRBs were required to endorse qualified candidates based on their review of the evaluations and assessments conducted by occupational group managers / missions. From 1 May 2009, the inception of FCRBs, to 30 June 2013, FCRBs received 2,160 recruitment cases from occupational group managers and field missions and endorsed some 21,000 candidates for hiring or to be placed on rosters.
4. The FCRBs Secretariat was established by the Under-Secretary-General for DFS, and was responsible for the day-to-day backstopping and administration of FCRBs. Its duties included: (a) designating a four-member panel for each recruitment case from a long list of FCRBs members; (b) assigning cases to panels; (c) ensuring the availability of all documentation; (d) compiling the recommendations of FCRBs; (e) recording recommendations of FCRBs in the Nucleus System and transmitting them on behalf of the chairperson to the Heads of DFS and missions; and (f) maintaining records and statistics. The FCRBs Secretariat was also responsible for transmitting to the Office of Human Resources Management (OHRM), Department of Management (DM) the findings of FCRBs. The FCRBs Secretariat reported to the Director of the Field Personnel Division (FPD) of DFS on substantive matters and to the Director of the United Nations Global Service Centre on administrative matters.
5. The staff selection process in field missions was governed by the administrative instruction on staff selection system (ST/AI/2010/3). Heads of field missions were delegated recruitment authority including for the selection of candidates endorsed by FCRBs. Field missions had Chief Civilian Personnel Officers that were responsible for supporting the heads of missions and directors/chiefs of mission support in executing their delegation of authority.
6. Comments provided by DFS, DM and field missions are incorporated in italics.

## II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

7. The audit was conducted to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of DFS and field missions' governance, risk management and control processes in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effectiveness of field central review bodies within DFS and the staff selection process in selected field missions.**

8. The audit included in the OIOS 2013 risk-based work plan due to the operational risks related to the activities of the FCRBs and the staff selection process.

9. The key control tested for the audit was regulatory framework. For the purpose of this audit, OIOS defined this key control as the one that provides reasonable assurance that policies and procedures: (a) exist to guide FCRBs and staff selection activities; (b) are implemented consistently; and (c) ensure the reliability and integrity of operational information.

10. The key control was assessed for the control objective shown in Table 1. The control objective (shown in Table 1 as "Not assessed") was not relevant to the scope defined for this audit.

11. OIOS conducted this audit from June to November 2013 in DFS and in the following five field missions: the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO); the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID); the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP); the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL); and the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI). The audit covered the period from January 2009 to September 2013. Out of 2,160 recruitment cases received by the FCRBs, OIOS reviewed a judgmental sample of 94 cases including 5 cases initiated in 2013, 10 cases in 2012, 13 cases in 2011, 51 in 2010 and 15 in 2009.

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 DFS and field missions' governance, risk management and control processes examined were initially assessed as **partially satisfactory** in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effectiveness of field central review bodies with DFS and the staff selection process in selected field missions.** OIOS made 11 recommendations to address the issues identified.

14. FCRBs were contributing to the integrity of the evaluations of candidates carried out by occupational group managers of DFS and field missions by reviewing applications and profiles of applicants on the basis of the pre-approved evaluation criteria and ensuring compliance with applicable procedures. A review of the function of FCRBs, for which discussions were generally held virtually, indicated there was a need to elect chairpersons to lead deliberations and to reconsider the policy to include ex-officio and gender representatives as non-voting members. Additionally, FCRBs needed to: (a) report to the Under-Secretary-General of DFS occupational group managers and field missions' improper application of evaluation criteria and non-compliance with applicable policies; and (b) ensure that there was evidence that position-specific job openings were initiated for purposes other than to select candidates with unique skills not possessed by individuals already on the roster. There were also delays in

processing cases presented to FCRBs, missions were delayed in responding to FCRBs' queries and missions did not always maintain adequate recruitment records.

15. The initial overall rating was based on the assessment of the key control presented in Table 1 below. The final overall rating is **partially satisfactory** as the implementation of seven important recommendations remains in progress.

**Table 1: Assessment of key control**

Business objective	Key control	Control objectives			
		Efficient and effective operations	Accurate financial and operational reporting	Safeguarding of assets	Compliance with mandates, regulations and rules
<b>Effectiveness of field central review bodies within DFS and the staff selection process in selected field missions</b>	Regulatory framework	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Not assessed	Partially satisfactory
<b>FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY</b>					

## Regulatory framework

### The composition and deliberations of the field central review bodies needed to improve

16. According to the policy establishing the FCRBs (ST/SGB/2011/7): (a) the Secretary-General and the Staff Union were responsible for selecting all voting members of the FCRBs; and (b) the FCRB for each recruitment case was required to include four voting members and two non-voting members to be provided by DFS. One of the two non-voting members was required to play the role of an ex-officio and the other the role of a gender representative. Additionally, the FCRB Rules of Procedure required members of the FCRB for each recruitment case to elect a chairperson to lead their deliberations.

17. A review of 94 out of 2,160 recruitment cases indicated that the FCRBs Secretariat selected all four voting members from the master list of voting members established by the Secretary-General and the Staff Union. However, in all 94 reviewed cases, there were no ex-officio members and no gender representatives. For all recruitment cases from mid-2012, the FCRBs also did not select chairpersons as members repeatedly declined the role.

18. DFS advised that it was not practical to have an ex-officio member and a gender representative for each recruitment case as the FRCBs deliberated in a virtual environment through emails when their individual work schedules permitted. Therefore, DFS designated a human resources management policy expert to deal with FCRBs' queries. OIOS was unable to determine whether the FCRBs were aware of this change as it had not been communicated to the FCRBs in writing, and also, there were no records of FCRBs' consultations with the designated expert. DFS acknowledged the value of a chairperson as a consensus-builder and tie-breaker during deliberations of an FCRB; but indicated that it was of the view that in a virtual environment, the role of the chairperson was limited.

19. Non-compliance with FCRBs policy and procedures regarding composition and leadership of the review bodies impacted on efforts to ensure balanced representation in the deliberation of recruitment cases.

**(1) DFS should consistently comply with or initiate the process to amend the requirements of ST/SGB/2011/7 and Rules of Procedures for field central review bodies (FCRB) regarding the participation of an ex-officio member and a gender representative in FCRB meetings and selection of a chairperson to lead each FCRB deliberation.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 1 and stated that it was complying with the requirement in ST/SGB/2011/7 relating to the selection of a chairperson to lead each FCRB deliberation, and a chairman was now being nominated by each panel. DFS also stated that it would propose an amendment to OHRM that recognized and reflected the virtual nature of FCRBs and addressed the impracticality of having an ex-officio and gender representative in such an environment. Recommendation 1 remains open pending receipt of evidence that the requirements regarding the participation of an ex-officio member and a gender representative in FCRB meetings and selection of a chairperson by each FCRB panel to lead its deliberations have been complied with or amendment to removing these requirements from ST/SGB/2011/7.*

The field central review bodies did not report to the Department of Management as required

20. The Secretary-General's bulletin ST/SGB/2011/7 required that when an FCRB has questions or doubts regarding the proper application of evaluation criteria and/or applicable procedures, it shall request the necessary information from the field mission. If, after obtaining the additional information, the FCRB found that the evaluation criteria were not properly applied and/or that the application procedures were not followed, it shall transmit its recommendation to DM.

21. A review of 94 recruitment cases indicated that, in nine cases, the FCRBs queried field missions' non-compliance with recruitment regulations, rules and procedures. However, the FCRBs did not report these cases to DM and had never informed DM of any such case since their establishment in 2009. This was due to the lack of adequate procedures regarding the operation of the FCRBs. For example, the checklist used by FCRBs when reviewing cases did not require them to transmit their findings and recommendation to DM. That checklist only required FCRBs to approve, not approve, or not decide on a case; this requirement also being inconsistent with the mandate of FCRBs, which was to endorse (not approve) candidates.

**(2) DFS should modify the procedures used by field central review bodies (FCRB) when reviewing recruitment cases to more accurately reflect the mandate of the FCRBs including the requirement that an FCRB transmits its findings and recommendations to the Department of Management when it finds, after obtaining additional information, that a field mission had not properly applied evaluation criteria and/or followed applicable procedures.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 2 and issued guidelines for cases where the FCRB was unable to approve one or more candidate. Based on action taken, recommendation 2 has been closed.*

The assessments of candidates for position-specific job openings and generic job openings were inconsistent and lacked similar degree of difficulty

22. The administrative instruction on staff selection process (ST/AI/2010/3) required: FCRB-endorsed candidates that were not selected to fill the specific job opening they applied for to be placed on the roster of pre-approved candidates for similar functions at the level of the position-specific job opening; and all FCRB-endorsed candidates for generic job openings to be placed on the relevant

occupational roster. To enhance the reliability of rosters, the assessment methods used for position specific job openings and generic job openings should be similar or have the same degree of difficulty.

23. A review of 94 cases (81 position-specific job openings and 13 generic job openings) indicated that all FCRB-endorsed candidates, including those already selected for the position-specific job openings they applied for, were placed on the rosters. However, a review of the assessment methods used for position-specific and generic job openings indicated that they were not similar and had different degrees of difficulty. For example, DFS occupational group managers used a combination of evaluation techniques including multiple choice questions, essays and written exams and competency-based interviews to assess candidates for all 13 generic job openings. On the other hand, in 76 of the 81 position-specific cases, field missions used only competency-based interviews to assess candidates. Both DM and DFS acknowledged the need for consistency in assessment methods; however, they had not initiated actions to address the situation.

**(3) DM should review and, if necessary, revise ST/AI/2010/3 regarding the assessment of candidates for roster purposes to ensure greater uniformity in the assessment methods including similar degrees of difficulty for position-specific job openings and generic job openings.**

*DM accepted recommendation 3 and stated that while the current ST/AI/2010/3 did not specify the format or structure of substantive assessments, OHRM was making efforts to develop assessment exercises that would allow more standardized screening of applicants. As the Organization was implementing two very large strategic priorities (Umoja and Mobility) and was faced with resource constraints, the ST/AI governing the Staff Selection system would be considered within the frame of the terms of reference/assessment stream being considered under the mobility project. Recommendation 3 remains open pending receipt of evidence that action has been taken to ensure greater uniformity in the assessment methods of applicants.*

Candidates were not always promptly selected for the position-specific job openings they were endorsed for

24. DFS standard operating procedures on staff selection required field missions to establish a position-specific job opening when the position required unique skills not possessed by individuals already on the roster. They also specified that justification for position-specific job openings was to be adequately documented by field missions and only the FCRB-endorsed candidate for the position-specific job opening was to be recruited to fill the specific job opening within 30 days of the FCRB endorsement. In addition, DFS was required to place all FCRB-endorsed candidates on the roster.

25. A review 81 position-specific job openings processed by FCRBs indicated the need for clearer procedures to ensure that position-specific job openings were established and used for the intended purpose as follows:

(a) In four cases, individuals other than the FCRB-endorsed candidates for the position-specific job openings were selected. This included: (i) two candidates for MINUSTAH and UNAMID who were selected from an existing roster; (ii) one candidate for the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) who was selected from a P-4 roster of a job class other than the one for which the position-specific job opening at the P-5 level had been established; and (iii) the candidate selected for a post in UNSMIL was not on any roster and not on the FRCB-endorsed list of candidates for the specific position.

(b) Six posts (two each for MONUSCO and the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan and one each for United Nations Assistance Mission in Iraq and United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Guinea-Bissau) remained vacant up to 11 months after the FCRBs endorsements of the respective position-specific job openings. Delays in filling position-specific job openings after FCRBs endorsement were not justified in writing and could not be adequately explained; and therefore raised questions about whether the posts were needed.

26. At the field level, review of the process and relevant documentation on the establishment of position-specific job openings and the selection of candidates indicated that MONUSCO, UNFICYP, UNMIL and UNOCI, adequately justified their requirements for position-specific job openings. However, in UNAMID, the required justification for establishing 8 out of the 10 position-specific job openings reviewed by OIOS was not available.

**(4) DFS should clarify procedures and monitor accordingly to ensure that position-specific job openings are used consistently to select candidates for specific posts.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 4 and issued a facsimile in March 2014 to all missions providing guidance on the roles and responsibilities of hiring managers in missions with respect to the position-specific job opening process as well as the conditions under which position-specific job openings would be approved. Based on the action taken by DFS, recommendation 4 has been closed.*

**(5) UNAMID should comply with the requirements of the standard operating procedures on staff selection to assess the need for position-specific job openings and maintain sufficient documentation of such assessment.**

*UNAMID accepted recommendation 5 and stated that it would take action to comply with the guidelines on position-specific job openings received from DFS in March 2014. Recommendation 5 remains open pending OIOS verification that position-specific job openings are consistently justified in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by DFS in March 2014.*

There were delays in the review of recruitment cases

27. The FCRB was required to: (a) complete the review of each case within a week of receiving it from the FCRBs Secretariat, although additional time could be allocated depending on the FCRB workload; and (b) report to the Under-Secretary-General of DFS when field missions and occupational group managers of DFS failed to provide missing information within seven calendar days of the FCRBs requesting for such information. The FCRBs Secretariat was responsible for transmitting the requests of the FCRBs for information to occupational group managers / missions. DFS was responsible to implement appropriate procedures to ensure compliance with established targets and hence the timeliness of the FCRB process.

28. A review of a judgmental selected sample of 94 cases from 2009 to 2013 indicated that FCRBs did not always complete reviewing cases in a timely manner mainly due to missing information and delays by FCRBs Secretariat in requesting field missions to provide missing / additional information and delays by field missions in providing the missing information. For example, FCRBs requested for missing / additional information in 81 of the 94 cases (or 86 per cent) reviewed by OIOS. In 73 of the 81 cases, the Secretariat requested for the required information 14 days or more days after the respective FCRBs queries and, in nine other cases, there was no evidence that the Secretariat requested for the required information. In 52 of the 81 cases, field missions / occupational group managers provided the required information 15 or more days after the Secretariat requests. DFS acknowledged that delays had occurred when FCRBs were just established; however, the audit results showed delays related to cases initiated

nearly two years after FCRBs were established. For example, 16 of the 73 and 20 of the 52 delayed cases were related to the period February 2011 to June 2013. A review at the field level indicated that UNAMID and UNMIL did not always address FCRB queries promptly as follows:

(a) In UNAMID, a review of all 45 cases returned by the FCRB indicated that it took on average 162 days for the FCRB to complete 32 of the reviewed cases mainly due to delays by UNAMID in addressing FCRB queries. A review of 10 of the 45 cases returned by the FCRB indicated discrepancies in the comparative evaluation reports and matrix. Nineteen of the 45 cases were cancelled / withdrawn by hiring managers due to the large number of FCRB queries. The poor quality of submissions to the FCRB and delays by UNAMID in addressing queries were attributed to the lack of training of staff responsible for preparing cases for submission and addressing FCRB queries; and

(b) In UNMIL, a review of all 12 cases returned by the FCRB indicated that the Mission took on average 62 days to address FCRB queries. This was attributed to the lack of monitoring by the Human Resources Management Section.

29. Noncompliance with established targets was due to the lack of adequate monitoring procedures. For example: (a) DFS lacked the tools and hence was not periodically analyzing and processing statistics to identify delays and take corrective actions; (b) there was no pre-defined timeframe within which the Secretariat was to transmit FCRBs requests to field missions; (c) the Secretariat was not specifying in its requests the specific dates it was expected to receive the required information; and (d) the Secretariat did not report to DFS field missions' failure to provide the missing information.

**(6) DFS should ensure that the field central review bodies (FCRB) Secretariat and field missions achieve established milestones by implementing additional procedures to prevent delays in FCRB processing of recruitment cases.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 6 and issued guidelines to missions on timelines within which to respond to FCRB queries in March 2014. DFS further stated that it had revised the FCRB Rules of Procedure to include timelines for review of cases. Based on the action taken by DFS, recommendation 6 has been closed.*

**(7) UNMIL should establish a monitoring mechanism to ensure that its hiring managers respond in a timely manner to the field central review bodies' queries on recruitment.**

*UNMIL accepted recommendation 7 and stated that it would establish a monitoring system within its Human Resources Management Section by the fourth quarter of 2014 to track the response timeframe to FCRB queries. Recommendation 7 remains open pending receipt of evidence that a system has been established for tracking response time to FCRB queries.*

**(8) UNAMID should provide training to staff involved in the recruitment process and conduct quality reviews of recruitment cases to reduce the number of queries from the field central review bodies and the time taken to complete the process.**

*UNAMID accepted recommendation 8 and stated that it had trained staff involved in the recruitment process. In June 2013, three human resource officers attended the training-of-trainers at the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe that provided training to programme managers prior to deployment of Inspira in November 2013. Based on the action taken by UNAMID, recommendation 8 has been closed.*

Recruitment timelines were not consistently achieved by field missions

30. DFS standard operating procedures required that the maximum days it should take missions from identification of vacancy to selection be: (a) 21 days if selecting from the personnel roster; and (b) 98 days if using position-specific job openings. Primarily, due to the lack of adequate monitoring of recruitment cases and hence the failure of Missions to take prompt corrective actions, the established milestones were not always achieved as follows:

(i) In MONUSCO, a review of 28 recruitments (26 from the roster and two through position-specific job openings) indicated that MONUSCO took an average of 50 days to select a candidate from the roster and 166 days to select a candidate through the position-specific job opening process. MONUSCO attributed the delays to the lack of responsiveness by hiring managers;

(ii) In UNAMID, a review of 40 out of 333 recruitments during the audit period indicated that that 30 recruitments from the roster took an average of 258 days and 10 recruitments through position-specific job openings took 168 days;

(iii) In UNFICYP, a review of all 25 recruitments during the period from January 2009 to April 2013 indicated that in 12 cases the Mission selected candidates from the roster within the established timeframe. However, for the other 13 cases, the selection period ranged from 44 to 417 days;

(iv) In UNMIL, a review of 53 out of 80 recruitments during the audit period indicated that in 10 cases the Mission selected candidates from the roster within the established timeframe, and in 43 cases, UNMIL exceeded the timeframe by 24 to 730 days; and

(v) In UNOCI, a review of 29 out of 60 recruitments during the audit period indicated that the Mission took an average of 42 days to select a candidate from the roster. Additionally, the three position-specific job openings raised during the audit period indicated that UNOCI took an average of 141 days to select candidates.

**(9) MONUSCO, UNAMID, UNFICYP, UNMIL and UNOCI should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.**

*MONUSCO, UNAMID, UNMIL and UNOCI accepted recommendation 9 and stated that they had begun closely monitoring their respective recruitment timelines to ensure they were met. UNFICYP accepted recommendation 9 and established a Joint Monitoring Committee for mission vacancies and recruitments to monitor the recruitment process and ensure prompt corrective actions were taken. Based on action taken by UNFICYP, recommendation 9 has been closed. Recommendation 9 remains open pending OIOS verification that MONUSCO, UNAMID, UNMIL and UNOCI are adequately monitoring the recruitment process and are taking prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.*

There was a need for proper constitution and additional training for recruitment panel members

31. The administrative instruction on staff selection process, ST/AI/2010/3, required that assessment panels be comprised of three staff members including at least one female and a staff from outside the work unit where the job opening was located. In addition, the panel needed to include individuals at higher or same level as the post being recruited for. DFS standard operating procedures also required panel members to undertake competency-based interviews training.

32. A review of the composition and training records of panel members for the cases reviewed in the respective field missions indicated that MONUSCO, UNMIL, and UNOCI generally complied with the provisions of ST/AI/2010/3 and DFS standard operating procedures. However:

(a) In UNAMID, primarily, due to the lack of oversight by the Human Resources Management Section, the provisions of the standard operating procedures relating to recruitment panels were not always complied with. A review of 10 position-specific job openings in UNAMID indicated that five recruitments did not include at least one female panel member and two recruitments did not include a panel member from other sections / units. Moreover, not all panelists attended mandatory competency-based interviewing and selection skills training. The Human Resources Management Section did not maintain training records of staff and four of the nine panelists interviewed by OIOS had not attended the training; and

(b) In UNFICYP, five of six members on assessment panels during the period January 2009 to March 2010, did not complete the required competency-based training prior to being a panel member. In 2012, UNFICYP took action and provided training to several staff members who would be part of future assessment panels.

**(10) UNAMID should ensure members of assessment panels that are involved in the recruitment process complete the required competency-based interviewing and selection skills training in compliance with the standard operating procedures for staff selection.**

*UNAMID accepted recommendation 10 and stated that it was in the process of implementing it. Recommendation 10 remains open pending receipt of evidence that staff involved in the recruitment process have completed the required training.*

#### Adequate supporting documents were not maintained of recruitment processes in field missions

33. The administrative instruction on staff selection process, ST/AI/2010/3 and DFS standard operating procedures required missions to maintain records of the recruitment process to allow for review by FCRBs and to support selection decisions by the respective heads of departments/offices. The required documentation included, but was not limited to: (a) requests to short listed candidates to express interest in job openings; (b) hiring managers' requests to initiate recruitment against vacancies; and (c) shortlists of candidates established through roster searches.

34. Reviews of recruitment case files maintained in the various field missions indicated that MONUSCO and UNFICYP had adequate documentation of their recruitment processes since 2012. However, human resources officers in UNAMID, UNMIL and UNOCI did not always comply with documentation guidance resulting in incomplete case files as follows:

(a) In UNAMID, a review of 40 recruitment case files indicated that all of them were incomplete as they lacked documentation including: (i) requests to short listed candidates to express interest in job opening; (ii) requests from hiring managers to initiate recruitment; and (iii) results of the roster search list;

(b) In UNMIL, a review of 35 recruitment cases indicated that 17 files lacked adequate documentation including records of justifications of hiring managers' decisions for: (i) expanding roster searches; and (ii) rejecting entire lists of rostered candidates; and

(c) In UNOCI, a review of 41 recruitment case files indicated that only one file was maintained, with the relevant information on others maintained in the email system.

**(11) UNAMID, UNMIL and UNOCI should maintain documented evidence of the recruitment process in accordance with Administrative Instruction ST/AI/2010/03 on the staff selection process to allow for effective review by the field central review bodies and to support selection decisions made by the respective heads of departments/offices.**

*UNAMID, UNMIL and UNOCI accepted recommendation 11. UNAMID stated that all recruitment files were updated both manually and electronically through the use of supporting systems such as Nucleus, but agreed that some files had not been physically available since they had been moved to the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe. UNMIL stated that it would introduce a checklist to ensure that all documents required in a recruitment file are available, and UNOCI stated that it would improve the electronic filing system. Recommendation 11 remains open pending receipt of evidence that UNAMID, UNMIL and UNOCI are maintaining adequate recruitment case files*

#### **IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

35. OIOS wishes to express its appreciation to the Management and staff of DFS, DM, MONUSCO, UNAMID, UNFICYP, UNMIL and UNOCI for the assistance and cooperation extended to the auditors during this assignment.

*(Signed)* David Kanja  
Assistant Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

### Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

#### Department of Field Support

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>1</sup> / Important <sup>2</sup>	C/ O <sup>3</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>4</sup>
1	DFS should consistently comply with or initiate the process to amend the requirements of ST/SGB/2011/7 and Rules of Procedures for field central review bodies (FCRB) regarding the participation of an ex-officio member and a gender representative in FCRB meetings and selection of a chairperson to lead each FCRB deliberation.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that the requirements regarding the participation of an ex-officio member and a gender representative in FCRB's meetings and selection of a chairperson by each FCRB panel to lead its deliberations have been complied with or amendment to removing these requirements from ST/SGB/2011/7.	31 March 2015
2	DFS should modify the procedures used by field central review bodies (FCRB) when reviewing recruitment cases to more accurately reflect the mandate of the FCRBs including the requirement that an FCRB transmits its findings and recommendations to the Department of Management when it finds, after obtaining additional information, that a field mission had not properly applied evaluation criteria and/or followed applicable procedures.	Important	C	Action taken	Implemented
4	DFS should clarify procedures and monitor accordingly to ensure that position-specific job openings are used consistently to select candidates for specific posts.	Important	C	Action taken	Implemented

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>4</sup> Date provided by DFS in response to recommendations.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

## Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

## Department of Field Support

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>5</sup> / Important <sup>6</sup>	C/ O <sup>7</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>8</sup>
6	DFS should ensure that the field central review bodies (FCRB) Secretariat and field missions achieve established milestones by implementing additional procedures to prevent delays in FCRB processing of recruitment cases.	Important	C	Action taken	Implemented

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>8</sup> Date provided by DFS in response to recommendations.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

## Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

## Department of Management

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>9</sup> / Important <sup>10</sup>	C/ O <sup>11</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>12</sup>
3	DM should review and, if necessary, revise ST/AI/2010/3 regarding the assessment of candidates for roster purposes to ensure greater uniformity in the assessment methods including similar degrees of difficulty for position-specific job openings and generic job openings.	Important	O	Pending receipt of assessment exercises that would allow more standardized screening of applicants.	30 September 2017

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>12</sup> Date provided by DM in response to recommendations.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

### Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

#### United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>13</sup> / Important <sup>14</sup>	C/ O <sup>15</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>16</sup>
9	MONUSCO should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	O	Verification that MONUSCO has established and implemented systems to monitor the recruitment process and taken prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	31 December 2014

<sup>13</sup> 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.

<sup>14</sup> 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.

<sup>15</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>16</sup> Date provided by MONUSCO in response to recommendations.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

## Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

## African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>17</sup> / Important <sup>18</sup>	C/ O <sup>19</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>20</sup>
5	UNAMID should comply with the requirements of the standard operating procedures on staff selection to assess the need for position-specific job openings and maintain sufficient documentation of such assessment.	Important	O	Pending OIOS verification that position-specific job openings are consistently justified in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by DFS in March 2014.	30 September 2014
8	UNAMID should provide training to staff involved in the recruitment process and conduct quality reviews of recruitment cases to reduce the number of queries from the field central review bodies and the time taken to complete the process.	Important	C	Action taken	Implemented
9	UNAMID should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	O	Verification that UNAMID has established and implemented systems to monitor the recruitment process and taken prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	31 December 2014

<sup>17</sup> 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.

<sup>18</sup> 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.

<sup>19</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>20</sup> Date provided by UNAMID in response to recommendations.

### STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

#### African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>21</sup> / Important <sup>22</sup>	C/ O <sup>23</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>24</sup>
10	UNAMID should ensure members of assessment panels that are involved in the recruitment process complete the required competency-based interviewing and selection skills training in compliance with the standard operating procedures for staff selection.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that staff involved in the recruitment process have completed the required training.	31 December 2014
11	UNAMID should maintain documented evidence of the recruitment process in accordance with Administrative Instruction ST/AI/2010/03 on the staff selection process to allow for effective review by the field central review bodies and to support selection decisions made by the respective heads of departments/offices.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that UNAMID is maintaining adequate recruitment case files.	30 September 2014

<sup>21</sup> 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.

<sup>22</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>24</sup> Date provided by UNAMID in response to recommendations.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

### Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

#### United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>25</sup> / Important <sup>26</sup>	C/ O <sup>27</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>28</sup>
9	UNFICYP should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	C	Action taken	Implemented

<sup>25</sup> 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.

<sup>26</sup> 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.

<sup>27</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>28</sup> Date provided by UNFICYP in response to recommendations.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

## Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

## United Nations Mission in Liberia

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>29</sup> / Important <sup>30</sup>	C/ O <sup>31</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>32</sup>
7	UNMIL should establish a monitoring mechanism to ensure that its hiring managers respond in a timely manner to the field central review bodies' queries on recruitment.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that a system has been established for tracking response time to FCRB queries.	31 December 2014
9	UNMIL should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	O	Verification that UNMIL has established and implemented systems to monitor the recruitment process and taken prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	31 December 2014
11	UNMIL should maintain documented evidence of the recruitment process in accordance with Administrative Instruction ST/AI/2010/03 on the staff selection process to allow for effective review by the field central review bodies and to support selection decisions made by the respective heads of departments/offices.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that UNMIL is maintaining adequate recruitment case files.	30 September 2014

<sup>29</sup> 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.

<sup>30</sup> 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.

<sup>31</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>32</sup> Date provided by UNMIL in response to recommendations.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

## Audit of field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

## United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>33</sup> / Important <sup>34</sup>	C/ O <sup>35</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>36</sup>
9	UNOCI should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	O	Verification that UNOCI has established and implemented systems to monitor the recruitment process and taken prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	31 December 2014
11	UNOCI should maintain documented evidence of the recruitment process in accordance with Administrative Instruction ST/AI/2010/03 on the staff selection process to allow for effective review by the field central review bodies and to support selection decisions made by the respective heads of departments/offices.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that UNOCI is maintaining adequate recruitment case files.	30 September 2014

<sup>33</sup> 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.

<sup>34</sup> 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.

<sup>35</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>36</sup> Date provided by UNOCI in response to recommendations.

# **APPENDIX I**

## **Management Response**

CONFIDENTIAL

Routine

TO: Ms. Eleanor Burns, Director  
A: Internal Audit Division, OIOS

DATE: 16 May 2014

THROUGH:  
S/C DE:

REFERENCE: UNHQ-AR-BOI-Memo-2-  
2014-937

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



SUBJECT: **AP2013/615/04 – Audit of field central review bodies within the**  
OBJET: **Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected**  
**field missions**

1. I refer to your memorandum dated 22 April 2014 regarding the above-mentioned audit. Please find enclosed our comments on the recommendations and issues contained in the report. In formulating our response, we have conferred with the respective officials in DFS and field missions, 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

**Management response - Department of Field Support**

**Audit of the field central review bodies within the Department of Field support and the staff selection process in selected field missions**

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>1</sup> / Important <sup>2</sup>	Accepted ? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
1	DFS should consistently comply with or initiate the process to amend the requirements of ST/SGB/2011/7 and Rules of Procedures for field central review bodies (FCRBs) regarding the participation of an ex-officio member and a gender representative in FCRBs meetings and selection of a chairperson to lead each FCRB deliberation.	Important	Yes	Director, FPD	First quarter of 2015	In addition to the comments in the draft report, DFS has complied with the requirement in ST/SGB/2011/7 relating to the selection of a chairperson to lead each FCRB deliberation. A Chairperson is being nominated by each panel of reviewers as soon as a case is assigned. Concerning the ex-officio member and gender representative, DFS comments are reflected in the draft report.
2	DFS should modify the procedures used by field central review bodies (FCRBs) when reviewing recruitment cases to more accurately reflect the mandate of the FCRBs including the requirement that an FCRBs transmits its findings and recommendations to the Department of Management when it finds, after obtaining additional information, that a field mission had not properly applied evaluation criteria and/or followed applicable procedures.	Important	Yes	N/A	Implemented	The recommendation has been implemented. DFS, in a facsimile issued in March 2014, provided further guidance for cases where the FCRB is unable to approve one or more candidates among those recommended. A procedure has been established in these situations to submit the case to the Under-Secretary-General for management for review and determinations pursuant to Section 4.9 of ST/SGB/2011/7. A copy of the facsimile has been provided to OIOS under a separate cover.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>1</sup> / Important <sup>2</sup>	Accepted ? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
4	DFS should clarify procedures and monitor accordingly to ensure that position-specific job openings are used consistently to select candidates for specific posts.	Important	Yes	N/A	Implemented	The recommendation has been implemented. Following the audit, DFS issued a facsimile in March 2014 to all missions providing clear guidance on the roles and responsibilities of the Department and those of hiring managers in missions with respect to the position specific job openings (PSJO). The facsimile clearly indicates the conditions under which PSJOs will be approved as well as the PJSO process. Furthermore, the deployment in all missions has been completed and all PJSOs are now circulated through the system. In this regard, DFS has been monitoring, since the last quarter of 2013, to ensure that the selected candidates for PSJOs are those approved by FCRB. A copy of the facsimile has been provided to OIOS under a separate cover.
6	DFS should ensure that the field central review bodies (FCRB) Secretariat and field missions achieve established milestones by implementing additional procedures to prevent delays in FCRB processing of recruitment cases.	Important	Yes	N/A	Implemented	The recommendation has been implemented. DFS has provided guidance to missions on the timelines in the facsimile issued in March 2014. The facsimile states that, where the FCRB returns a case with queries, missions have five (5) working days to respond while the FCRB rules of procedure provide a general time frame of one week for the review of a particular case by the FCRB. Concerning the recommended action plan, DFS notes that the Standard Operating Procedure on Staff Selection includes an annexed Flowchart (Annex IV, p.47), setting out

APPENDIX I

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical/ Important <sup>2</sup>	Accepted ? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
						<p>the proposed timelines in a selection process. Moreover, since Inspira was deployed in missions, DFS has been monitoring with the help of the system to ensure that the timelines for recruitment are adhered to. Copies of the facsimile and the revised Rules of Procedure have been provided to OIOS under a separate cover.</p>

**Management response - United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo**

**Audit of the field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions**

<b>Rec. no.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Critical<sup>3</sup>/ Important<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Accepted? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Title of responsible individual</b>	<b>Implementation date</b>	<b>Client comments</b>
9	MONUSCO should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Fourth quarter of 2014	The deployment of Inspira in all missions has been completed and provides the tool to monitor recruitment process against established timelines. The Mission is closely monitoring to ensure that established recruitment timelines are met.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

**Management response - African Union - United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur**

**Audit of the field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions**

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>5</sup> / Important <sup>6</sup>	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
5	UNAMID should comply with the requirements of the standard operating procedures on staff selection to assess the need for position-specific job openings and maintain sufficient documentation of such assessment.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Third quarter of 2014	As stated in recommendation number 4 above, DFS issued a facsimile in March 2014 clarifying the position specific job openings (PSJO) process, the roles and responsibilities of hiring managers in missions with respect to the PSJO process and the conditions under which PSJOs will be approved. UNAMID is taking action to comply with the established requirements and expects to complete the action by the third quarter of 2014.
8	UNAMID should provide training to staff involved in the recruitment process and conduct quality reviews of recruitment cases to reduce the number of queries from the field central review bodies and the time taken to complete the process.	Important	Yes	N/A	Implemented	The recommendation has been implemented. UNAMID has trained staff involved in recruitment. In June 2013, three human resource officers attended the training-of-trainers at RSCE prior to implementation of Inspira in the Mission. Subsequently, the trainers have provided trainings to programme managers in the Mission prior to the deployment of Inspira in November 2013. A list of the staff trained was provided to OIOS under a separate cover.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

APPENDIX I

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>5</sup> / Important <sup>6</sup>	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
9	UNAMID should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Fourth quarter of 2014	The deployment of Inspira in all missions has been completed and provides the tool to monitor recruitment process against established timelines. The Mission is closely monitoring to ensure that established recruitment timelines are met.
10	UNAMID should ensure members of assessment panels that are involved in the recruitment process complete the required competency-based interviewing and selection skills training in compliance with the standard operating procedures for staff selection.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Fourth quarter of 2014	The Mission's comments are reflected in the draft report. UNAMID does not have any further comments.
11	UNAMID should maintain documented evidence of the recruitment process in accordance with Administrative Instruction ST/AI/2010/03 on the staff selection process to allow for effective review by the field central review bodies and selection decisions by the respective head of department/office.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Third quarter of 2014	The Mission's comments are reflected in the draft report. UNAMID does not have any further comments.

## Management response – United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus

## Audit of the field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>7</sup> / Important <sup>8</sup>	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
9	UNFICYP should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	Yes	N/A	Implemented	The recommendation has been implemented. The deployment of Inspira in all missions has been completed which provides the tool to monitor recruitment process against established timelines. UNFICYP established a 'Joint Monitoring Committee for Mission Vacancies and Recruitment' to monitor, on a regular basis, the recruitment process in UNFICYP and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved. Copies of the memorandum establishing the Committee and the Terms of Reference of the Committee were provided to OIOS in a separate cover.

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

## Management response - United Nations Mission in Liberia

## Audit of the field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>9</sup> / Important <sup>10</sup>	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
7	UNMIL should establish a monitoring mechanism to ensure that hiring managers respond timely to the field central review bodies' queries on recruitment.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Fourth quarter of 2014	The Mission's comments are reflected in the draft report. UNMIL does not have any further comments.
9	UNMIL should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Fourth quarter of 2014	The deployment of Inspira in all missions has been completed and provides the tool to monitor recruitment process against established timelines. The Mission is closely monitoring to ensure that established recruitment timelines are met.
11	UNMIL should maintain documented evidence of the recruitment process in accordance with Administrative Instruction ST/AI/2010/03 on the staff selection process to allow for effective review by the field central review bodies and selection decisions by the respective head of department/office.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Third quarter of 2014	The Mission's comments are reflected in the draft report. UNMIL does not have any further comments.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

**Management response - United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire**

**Audit of the field central review bodies within the Department of Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions**

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>11</sup> / Important <sup>12</sup>	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
9	UNOCI should establish and implement systems to monitor the recruitment process and take prompt corrective actions to ensure that established milestones are consistently achieved.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Fourth quarter of 2014	The deployment of Inspira in all missions has been completed and provides the tool to monitor recruitment process against established timelines. The Mission is closely monitoring to ensure that established recruitment timelines are met.
11	UNOCI should maintain documented evidence of the recruitment process in accordance with Administrative Instruction ST/AJ/2010/03 on the staff selection process to allow for effective review by the field central review bodies and selection decisions by the respective head of department/office.	Important	Yes	Chief Civilian Personnel Officer	Third quarter of 2014	The Mission's comments are reflected in the draft report. UNOCI does not have any further comments.

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> 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.



TO: Ms. Eleanor Burns, Director  
A: Internal Audit Division  
Office of Internal Oversight Services

DATE: 20 May 2014

THROUGH: ~~Christian Saunders, Director~~  
S/C DE: Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management

FROM: Mario Baez, Chief  
DE: Policy and Oversight Coordination Service  
Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management

SUBJECT: **Draft report on an audit of field central review bodies within the Department of**  
OBJET: **Field Support and the staff selection process in selected field missions (Assignment**  
**No. AP2013/615/04)**

1. We are pleased to provide the comments of the Department of Management in response to your memorandum dated 22 April 2014 on the above subject in the attached Appendix I.
2. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide comments to the draft report.

14-01345  
21 May 2014

**APPENDIX I**

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical/ Important <sup>2</sup>	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
3	DM should review and, if necessary, revise ST/AI/2010/3 regarding the assessment of candidates for roster purposes to ensure greater uniformity in the assessment methods including similar degrees of difficulty for position-specific job openings and generic job openings.	Important	Yes	Director, Strategic Planning and Staffing Division, OHRM	30 September 2017	Section 7.5 of ST/AI/2010/3 states that "shortlisted candidates shall be assessed to determine whether they meet the technical requirements and competencies of the job opening." It further states that "the assessment may include a competency-based interview and/or other appropriate evaluation mechanisms, such as, for example, written tests, work sample tests or assessment centres. While the current ST/AI/2010/3 does not specify the format or structure of substantive assessments, OHRM is currently making efforts to develop assessment exercises that will allow for a more standardised and coherent screening of applications using an online platform. As the Organization is implementing two very large strategic priorities (Umoja and Mobility) and faced with resource constraints, the ST/AI governing the Staff Selection system will be considered within the frame of the terms of reference/assessment stream being considered under the mobility project. OHRM will take advantage of lessons learned from the mobility scheme, after which the ST/AI will be revised, if necessary.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.