



## INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION

### REPORT 2014/069

---

Audit of the Performance Management and Development System at the United Nations Secretariat

Overall results relating to audit of the Performance Management and Development System at the United Nations Secretariat were initially assessed as partially satisfactory. Implementation of seven important recommendations remains in progress.

FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY

23 July 2014

Assignment No. AH2013/512/05

# CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. BACKGROUND	1-2
II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE	2-3
III. AUDIT RESULTS	3-8
A. Programme management	4-7
B. Electronic content management systems	7-8
IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	8
ANNEX I      Status of audit recommendations	
APPENDIX I   Management response	

# AUDIT REPORT

## Audit of the Performance Management and Development System at the United Nations Secretariat

### I. BACKGROUND

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of the Performance Management and Development System at the United Nations Secretariat.

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. The General Assembly, in resolution 48/218A, requested for a mechanism to ensure that programme managers were accountable for the effective management of the human resources allocated to them. The Secretariat established the Performance Appraisal System in October 1995 to encourage a higher level of involvement and motivation by inviting staff participation in the planning, delivery and evaluation of work. An electronic tool (e-PAS) was introduced in April 2003 to increase the efficiency of the process and to facilitate monitoring and reporting.

4. The Performance Appraisal System has undergone a number of revisions and was replaced with the Performance Management and Development System (PMDS) through an administrative instruction in 2010 to address the provisions of General Assembly resolution 63/250. PMDS shifted the focus from appraisal and compliance to other dimensions of performance management such as career and staff development. It was supported by an electronic application (e-performance).

5. PMDS applied to all staff with appointments of at least one year, except for staff at the levels of Assistant Secretary-General and Under-Secretary-General. According to the administrative instruction, the function of PMDS was to promote communication between staff members and supervisors on the goals and key results to be achieved and the success criteria by which individual performance was to be assessed. In addition, the purpose of PMDS was to improve the delivery of programmes by optimizing performance at all levels, which were to be achieved by:

- (a) promoting a culture of high performance, personal development and continuous learning;
- (b) empowering managers and holding them responsible and accountable for managing their staff;
- (c) encouraging a high level of staff participation in the planning, delivery and evaluation of work; and
- (d) recognizing successful performance and addressing underperformance in a fair and equitable manner.

6. OHRM records showed that approximately 85 per cent of staff members (30,166 out of a total of 35,433 staff members) completed their end-of-year evaluations for the 2011-2012 performance cycle by 31 December 2012. OHRM was unable to provide the comparative figures for the 2010-2011 performance cycle because the two electronic tools were in use during the period. The global distribution of the performance ratings for these cycles is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

**Global distribution of performance ratings**

(Percentage)

<i>Performance cycle</i>	<i>Does not meet</i>	<i>Partially meets</i>	<i>Successfully meets</i>	<i>Exceeds</i>
2010-2011	0.10	1	76	22.9
2011-2012	0.10	0.90	77.40	21.60

Source: A/67/714

7. Pursuant to the General Assembly resolution 68/252, a comprehensive performance management proposal, including all necessary modalities and recommendations was to be submitted for consideration at its sixty-ninth session. OHRM is currently revisiting the provisions of the administrative instruction on performance management.

8. Comments provided by OHRM are incorporated in *italics*.

**II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

9. The audit was conducted to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of United Nations Secretariat’s governance, risk management and control processes in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effective management of PMDS**.

10. The audit was included in the 2013 OIOS risk-based work plan due to risks that the objectives of PMDS may not be achieved and the e-performance application may not support the policies and procedures of the system.

11. The key controls tested for the audit were: (a) programme management; (b) performance monitoring indicators and mechanisms; and (c) electronic content management systems. For the purpose of this audit, OIOS defined these key controls as follows:

(a) **Programme management** – controls that provide reasonable assurance that a system exists to develop the strategies and procedures to implement PMDS. This also includes development of and training on guidance materials and staff/management communication.

(b) **Electronic content management systems** – controls that provide reasonable assurance that a system, including methods and tools, to organize and store the Organization’s PMDS documents is available, reliable and user-friendly.

12. The key controls were assessed for the control objectives shown in Table 2. One control objective (shown in Table 2 as “Not assessed”) was not relevant to the scope defined for this audit.

13. OIOS conducted this audit from June 2013 to February 2014. The audit covered activities relating to PMDS for the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 performance cycles.

14. 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. OIOS also assessed the overall PMDS oversight mechanisms and reviewed the timeliness of completing work plans, midpoint reviews

and end of year performance appraisals; training activities; and functionalities of the information technology systems supporting PMDS.

15. OIOS administered a survey of Executive/Administration Officers of departments and offices of the Secretariat, and Chiefs of Administration/Chiefs of Civilian Personnel Officers of peacekeeping field missions. The purpose of the survey was to obtain information on the following aspects of PMDS: (i) compliance with the performance management and development process; (ii) link between individual work plans and organizational strategy; (iii) fairness and consistency of ratings within and across the departments; (iv) involvement of senior management in the PMDS process; (v) staff development; (vi) guidelines on a structured rewards/recognition programme; and (vii) dealing effectively with underperformance. The response rate to the survey was 52 per cent, or 30 replies out of 58 questionnaires distributed.

### III. AUDIT RESULTS

16. The Secretariat's governance, risk management and control processes examined were **partially satisfactory** in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effective management of PMDS**. OIOS made seven recommendations in the report to address issues identified in the audit. The key control of programme management was assessed as partially satisfactory because OHRM needed to provide additional guidance to the senior management teams of departments/offices/missions on their role in implementing PMDS, and to second reporting officers to enable them ensure fairness and consistency when evaluating the performance of staff members. OHRM also needed to provide information to some departments/offices/missions on best practices regarding the optimal ratio of first and second reporting officers to staff members to enable an effective implementation of PMDS. The key control of electronic content management systems was assessed as partially satisfactory because functionalities in the e-performance tool needed to be implemented/enhanced to enable pertinent information to be obtained efficiently. OHRM accepted but is yet to initiate the necessary steps to implement the audit recommendations.

17. The initial overall rating was based on the assessment of key controls presented in Table 2 below. The final overall rating is **partially satisfactory** as implementation of seven important recommendations remains in progress.

**Table 2: Assessment of key controls**

Business objective	Key controls	Control objectives			
		Efficient and effective operations	Accurate financial and operational reporting	Safeguarding of assets	Compliance with mandates, regulations and rules
Effective management of PMDS	(a) Programme management	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Not assessed	Partially satisfactory
	(b) Electronic content management systems	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Not assessed	Partially satisfactory
<b>FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY</b>					

## A. Programme management

### Performance and development strategies were not widely developed nor were performance meetings held

18. According to the administrative instruction on PMDS, one of the functions of the senior management team of each department/office/mission was to assist the head of the department/office/mission to establish and implement a staff performance and development strategy. Furthermore, senior management teams were to hold dedicated performance meetings at least once a year to review staff development and career support needs in the light of strategic human resources management issues, including training and succession management.

19. There were no explicit guidelines on the contents of the performance and development strategy. The administrative instruction appeared to suggest that the strategy should detail how the heads of departments/offices/missions intended to implement PMDS and cover plans to ensure consistent and fair implementation of the system; however, the requirements were not clear. Sixty-three per cent of respondents to the OIOS survey indicated that there was a performance and development strategy for their department/office/mission. However, in the few comments provided, reference was made to the compacts signed between the Secretary-General and senior managers or the Mission Support Plan instead of a document covering the implementation of PMDS. Furthermore, when asked whether the senior management teams at departments/offices/missions held dedicated performance meetings, only 30 per cent of the respondents indicated that these meetings were held during the performance cycles 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Partial or non-performance of the required activities by senior management teams adversely impacted on the successful implementation of PMDS.

**(1) OHRM should provide additional guidance to senior management teams of departments/offices/missions on their role in implementing the Performance Management and Development System.**

*OHRM accepted recommendation 1 and stated that proposed changes to the performance management policy will clarify the role of senior managers, and that additional training and guidance will also be provided to them. Recommendation 1 remains open pending issuance of the revised performance management policy that clarifies the role of senior managers.*

### Need for management tools to identify staff training needs to meet current and future challenges of the Organization

20. Pursuant to the provisions of the administrative instruction on PMDS, every staff member is expected to complete a development plan and to set a minimum target of five days for professional development per year in accordance with the Secretary-General's bulletin on learning and development.

21. It was not possible to assess whether the e-performance application was used as a tool to plan and assess training and learning activities. In particular, it was not possible to evaluate if staff development plans were properly prepared and staff members had at least five days of learning, as required. Furthermore, training managers did not have access to staff development plans and could not use this information to plan training activities. This was because the launch in April 2012 of the e-performance module of the Inspira talent management system was not accompanied with the planned functional enterprise learning management module, which was intended to provide an integrated system for accessing and monitoring learning activities and allowing areas identified for development to be easily linked to learning opportunities.

22. According to the OIOS survey on performance management, 64 per cent of respondents indicated that there was no consolidated information on staff skills, while 57 per cent indicated that there was no formal process to evaluate the effectiveness of development actions. Furthermore, 64 per cent of respondents indicated that there were no mechanisms in place to translate development and career needs expressed in the performance development plans into training plans for the department/office/mission.

23. In order to align staff development plans with the needs of the Organization, reliable information on existing skills should be in place to produce a strategy which links development actions with needs of the organization objectives. Functionalities in the e-performance application should be explored to aggregate information in the individual development plans and training activities to be undertaken.

**(2) OHRM should develop and implement a process to obtain comprehensive information on staff development needs and learning activities.**

*OHRM accepted recommendation 2 and stated that OHRM will continue to explore the full potential of Inspira, including the learning management system, which will assist in obtaining information on staff development needs and learning. Recommendation 2 remains open pending notification of the process implemented to aggregate information on staff development needs and learning activities.*

Optimal ratio between staff members and first and second reporting officers needed to be clarified

24. First reporting officers were responsible for ensuring that all stages of the PMDS process were completed for supervised staff, while second reporting officers were responsible for overseeing the work of first reporting officers and for ensuring PMDS was applied consistently and fairly. In some instances, there was a high ratio of staff members to first and second reporting officers. For the 2012-2013 performance cycle, one first reporting officer had 180 staff members reporting directly to him/her (three officers had over 200 staff members each in the 2011-2012 performance cycle). The next top 10 first reporting officers with the highest number of direct reports had 65 or more staff reporting to each of them (around 56 or more for 2011-2012). Similarly, the top second reporting officer had responsibility for almost 300 staff members, and the next top 10 second reporting officers had 130 or more staff members reporting to each of them, for both performance cycles. The breakdown of staff members to first and second reporting officers is shown in Table 3. Such high ratios of staff members to first and second reporting officers might adversely impact the overall effectiveness of the PMDS, since managers may not be able to provide regular and constructive feedback to each staff member throughout the cycle.

Table 3

**Number of staff members to first and second reporting officers**

Performance cycle	Reporting Officer	Number of staff members				
		0-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	Over 200
2012-2013	First	7,524	16	1	1	-
	Second	2,975	55	12	4	3
2011-2012	First	7,207	12	2	-	3
	Second	2,981	46	15	5	2

Source: OHRM

25. OHRM did not have formal guidance on the recommended ratio of first and second reporting officers to staff. OIOS was informed that this was not practicable because of the differences in departmental requirements and activities. This was partly attributable to the organization structure of the departments/offices/missions; however, to ensure PMDS was implemented effectively, the number of staff members assigned to a first or second reporting officer must be reasonable.

**(3) OHRM should review the ratios of first and second reporting officers to staff members to identify those that may be too high to enable an effective implementation of the Performance Management and Development System and provide relevant best practice information to the concerned units for appropriate action.**

*OHRM accepted recommendation 3 and stated that research will be conducted to ascertain data and best practice. OHRM will then recommend suitable ratios but is not in position to determine the outcome, as decisions will be dependent on budgetary and other factors. Recommendation 3 remains open pending notification of the actions taken by OHRM to review and advise on the suitability of the ratios of first and second reporting officers to staff members.*

Procedures to support consistency and fairness of ratings within and across the departments needed to be improved

26. According to the administrative instruction on PMDS, second reporting officers had the broader responsibility of ensuring that the system was consistently and fairly applied throughout an evaluation cycle, especially when defining performance expectations and communicating performance standards. The second reporting officers also ensured consistency between the competency and core values ratings, the comments provided by first reporting officers and the overall rating of individual staff members for a given performance cycle.

27. According to the OIOS survey on PMDS, 77 per cent of the respondents indicated that there were no processes in place to support the second reporting officers in ensuring consistency and fairness in ratings across the department/office/mission. Processes were needed to assist second reporting officers in discharging their responsibilities. These processes might include independent reasonableness reviews of ratings by the senior management team, development of rigorous performance standards and requesting second reporting officers to justify particularly high or low ratings [prior to rating assignment]. The processes should be flexible enough to allow managers to decide on their own detailed approaches in conjunction with their staff as long as they abide by the guiding principles.

**(4) OHRM should provide further guidance to managers acting as second reporting officers on evaluating staff, defining ratings and codifying processes that support fairness and consistency in evaluating the performance of staff members.**

*OHRM accepted recommendation 4 and stated that the proposed performance management policy will contain provisions aimed at clarifying the role of second reporting officers and improving fairness and consistency. In addition, detailed guidelines will be provided on rating and evaluating staff. Recommendation 4 remains open pending issuance of the revised performance management policy incorporating further guidance on evaluating the performance of staff members.*

Monitoring the Performance Management and Development Learning Programme needed to be strengthened

28. The Secretary-General's bulletin on the Performance Management and Development Learning Programme stated that it was mandatory for all staff members, at all levels, who supervise at least one



staff member, to participate in the learning programme. The responsibility for ensuring the completion of the learning programme by staff members lay with the heads of department/offices/missions while OHRM was responsible for making the training and resources available through training of trainers and tracking attendance.

29. OHRM indicated that 746 managers attended the training in 2010 based on the information provided by the Executive Offices. Pending the deployment of the enterprise learning management module of Inspira Secretariat-wide, OHRM remained dependent on the information provided by the Executive Offices. OHRM did not maintain an overall database of managers who had attended the mandatory performance management training to date showing names, date of attendance, department/office/mission, or if they were first or second reporting officers. In addition, there was also lack of a formal process to monitor heads of department/offices/missions to ensure their managers/supervisors attended the mandatory performance management training.

**(5) OHRM should implement measures to improve its ability to track managers/supervisors who have attended the mandatory training on the Performance Management and Development System to ensure compliance with the relevant Secretary-General's bulletin.**

*OHRM accepted recommendation 5 and stated that once the learning management system has been fully deployed in the Secretariat, it will be possible to track global attendance in relevant performance management training. Recommendation 5 remains open pending notification that the learning management system has been fully deployed to allow for global attendance at performance management training courses to be tracked.*

## **B. Electronic content management systems**

Greater information technology functionalities to monitor compliance with performance management processes were needed

30. The e-performance application did not have a functionality to report on compliance with the different stages of the performance management process such as: work plan, mid-year review and end of year evaluation. OIOS was therefore unable to determine the timeliness of compliance with the PMDS process at the various stages. OHRM indicated that it was in the process of upgrading the functionalities of the application to ensure the dates of completion of these three phases can be monitored.

31. According to the OIOS survey on PMDS, only 28 per cent of the respondents (or 8 out of 30 respondents) rated the ability of their department/office/mission to collect data from the e-performance system on the timeliness of staff members' completion of the various stages of the performance cycle as effective or very effective, while the remaining 72 per cent (or 22 out of 30 respondents) rated it as somewhat effective or not effective. Comments to the survey referred to the lack of a reporting facility within the e-performance tool to extract action dates and to the fact that data had to be collected manually by accessing each staff member's file.

**(6) OHRM should reassess the functionalities of the e-performance tool in terms of reporting on the timing of completion of the various stages of the performance cycle.**

*OHRM accepted recommendation 6 and stated that an assessment is currently underway which is reviewing the functionalities of the e-performance tool. Recommendation 6 remains open pending notification of the results of the review and action plan to improve the reporting capability of the e-performance tool.*

The e-performance application needed to be enhanced to record activities related to managing underperformance

32. The administrative instruction on PMDS recommended a number of measures that may be undertaken to address underperformance (e.g. counselling, transfer to a more suitable function, additional training, performance improvement plan, withhold of within-grade salary increment, non-renewal of appointment, termination of appointment), but there was no facility to record their use in the e-performance application. It was therefore not possible to assess the extent to which the measures were used and how successful they had been in addressing underperformance.

33. During the 2011-2012 performance cycle, 251 staff members received a rating of “partially meets performance expectations” (2010-2011: 339), while 25 staff members received a rating of “does not meet performance expectations” (2010-2011: 26). According to OHRM records, for the last e-performance cycles 2011-2012 and 2010-2011, 53 staff members rebutted their appraisals, which resulted in two ratings being revised. However, OHRM was not certain whether this information was complete because the e-performance application did not keep track of rebuttal actions. OHRM contacted 65 departments/offices/missions to obtain information on rebuttals but only received responses from 38 of them. Therefore OHRM reporting on matters relating to underperformance may not be complete.

**(7) OHRM should build functionalities in the e-performance tool to provide an audit trail of activities related to addressing underperformance.**

*OHRM accepted recommendation 7 and stated that in order to implement the proposed performance management policy, the e-performance tool will be redesigned to include an enhanced audit trail of activities. Recommendation 7 remains open pending notification that the e-performance tool has been redesigned to provide an audit trail of activities related to addressing underperformance.*

#### **IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

34. OIOS wishes to express its appreciation to the Management and staff of the Department of Management 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 the Performance Management and Development System at the United Nations Secretariat

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.	OHRM should provide additional guidance to senior management teams of departments/offices/missions on their role in implementing the Performance Management and Development System.	Important	O	Issuance of revised performance management policy that clarifies the role of senior managers.	30 April 2015
2.	OHRM should develop and implement a process to obtain comprehensive information on staff development needs and learning activities and ensure staff members are being trained to meet the current and future challenges of the Organization.	Important	O	Notification of the process implemented to aggregate information on staff development needs and learning activities.	30 June 2016
3.	OHRM should review the ratios of first and second reporting officers to staff members to identify those that may be too high to enable an effective implementation of the Performance Management and Development System and provide relevant best practice information to the concerned units for appropriate action.	Important	O	Notification of the actions taken by OHRM to review and advise on the suitability of the ratios of first and second reporting officers to staff members.	30 April 2015
4.	OHRM should provide further guidance to managers acting as second reporting officers, on evaluating staff, defining ratings and codifying processes that support fairness and consistency in evaluating the performance of staff members.	Important	O	Issuance of the revised performance management policy incorporating further guidance on evaluating the performance of staff members.	30 April 2015
5.	OHRM should implement measures to improve its ability to track managers/ supervisors who have attended the mandatory training on the Performance Management and Development	Important	O	Notification that the learning management system has been fully deployed to allow for global attendance at performance management training courses to be tracked.	31 December 2015

<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 OHRM in response to recommendations.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

## Audit of the Performance Management and Development System at the United Nations Secretariat

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>
	System to ensure compliance with the relevant Secretary-General's bulletin.				
6.	OHRM should reassess the functionalities of the e-performance tool in terms of reporting on the timing of completion of the various stages of the performance cycle.	Important	O	Notification of the results of the review and action plan to improve the reporting capability of the e-performance tool.	31 December 2014
7.	OHRM should build functionalities in the e-performance tool to provide an audit trail of activities related to addressing underperformance.	Important	O	Notification that the e-performance tool has been redesigned to provide an audit trail of activities related to addressing underperformance.	31 December 2016

# **APPENDIX I**

## **Management Response**

United Nations

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM



Nations Unies

MEMORANDUM INTERIEUR

TO: Ms. Carmen Vierula, Chief  
A: New York Audit Service, Internal Audit Division  
Office of Internal Oversight Services

DATE: 14 July 2014

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

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

SUBJECT: **Draft report on an audit of the Performance Management and Development system**  
OBJET: **at the United Nations Secretariat (Assignment No. AH2013/512/05)**

1. We are pleased to provide the comments of the Department of Management in response to your memorandum dated 20 June 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.

14-01792  
15 July 2014

## Management Response

## Audit of the Performance Management and Development System at the United Nations Secretariat

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical/ <sup>1</sup> Important <sup>2</sup>	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
1.	OHRM should provide additional guidance to senior management teams of departments/offices/missions on their role in implementing the Performance Management and Development System.	Important	Yes	Staff Development Officer	30 April 2015	The proposed performance management policy will clarify the role of senior managers. Additional training and guidance will also be provided to senior managers.
2.	OHRM should develop and implement a process to obtain comprehensive information on staff development needs and learning activities and ensure staff members are being trained to meet the current and future challenges of the Organization.	Important	Yes	Staff Development Officer	30 June 2016	OHRM will continue to explore the full potential of Inspira, including the learning management system, which will assist in obtaining information on staff development needs and learning activities. The second part of the recommendation, whereby OHRM should 'ensure staff members are being trained to meet the current and future challenges of the Organization', is a fundamental on-going activity as reflected in our mandate; therefore this is not something that will be have a finite implementation date per se. We would suggest that this text be removed.

<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.

## Management Response

## Audit of the Performance Management and Development System at the United Nations Secretariat

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>1</sup> / Important <sup>2</sup>	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
3.	OHRM should review the ratios of first and second reporting officers to staff members to identify those that may be too high to enable an effective implementation of the Performance Management and Development System and provide relevant best practice information to the concerned units for appropriate action.	Important	Yes	Staff Development Officer	30 April 2015	Research will be conducted to ascertain data and best practice. OHRM will then recommend suitable ratios but is not in a position to determine the outcome, as decisions will be dependent on budgetary and other factors.
4.	OHRM should provide further guidance to managers acting as second reporting officers, on evaluating staff, defining ratings and codifying processes that support fairness and consistency in evaluating the performance of staff members.	Important	Yes	Staff Development Officer	30 April 2015	The proposed performance management policy will contain provisions aimed at clarifying the role of second reporting officers and improving fairness and consistency. In addition, detailed guidelines will be provided on rating and evaluating staff.
5.	OHRM should implement measures to improve its ability to track managers/supervisors who have attended the mandatory training on the Performance Management and Development System to ensure compliance with the relevant Secretary-General's bulletin.	Important	Yes	Staff Development Officer	31 December 2015	Once the Learning Management System has been fully deployed in the Secretariat, it will be possible to track global attendance in relevant Performance Management trainings.
6.	OHRM should reassess the functionalities of the e-performance tool in terms of reporting on the timing of completion of the various stages of the performance cycle.	Important	Yes	Staff Development Officer	31 December 2014	An assessment is currently underway which is reviewing the functionalities of the e-performance tool.
7.	OHRM should build functionalities in the e-performance tool to provide an audit trail of activities related to addressing underperformance.	Important	Yes	Staff Development Officer	31 December 2016	In order to implement the proposed performance management policy, the e-performance tool will be re-designed to include an enhanced audit trail of activities.