INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION

REPORT 2016/112

Audit of the provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by the Department of Field Support

Overall results relating to the effective provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety were initially assessed as partially satisfactory. Implementation of seven important recommendations remains in progress

FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY

30 September 2016
Assignment No. AP2016/615/03

CONTENTS

AUDIT REPORT

Audit of the provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by the Department of Field Support

I.   BACKGROUND

1.   The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of the provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by the Department of Field Support (DFS).

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 United Nations aviation fleet is a diverse mix of military and civilian aircraft consisting of 56 fixed wing and 154 rotary wing aircraft, and 26 unarmed, unmanned aerial vehicles operating within 17 peacekeeping and special political missions. The aviation fleet operates in challenging operational conditions, often marked by depleted and marginal infrastructure, complex and expansive geography and in circumstances of combat, military, or security threats.

4.   The Under-Secretary-General for Field Support is primarily responsible for aviation safety management, ensuring that air operations and air assets within United Nations peace operations meet applicable international, national and United Nations safety standards. The Aviation Safety Section, reporting to the Director of the Logistics Support Division (LSD) at DFS Headquarters, advises senior management within DFS and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) on all aviation safety matters. The Section is also responsible for continuous oversight of all DFS-supported missions with air assets, through the establishment and management of the DPKO/DFS Aviation Safety Programme.

5.   Two Regional Aviation Safety Offices (RASOs), based in Brindisi, Italy and Monrovia, Liberia, are responsible for developing and implementing aviation safety-related policies, guidelines and procedures in the missions to which they are affiliated, as well as overseeing aviation safety structures established within those missions. Heads of missions are responsible for implementing aviation safety-related policies within their respective missions.

6.   As at 1 January 2016, there were six authorized posts within the Aviation Safety Section at Headquarters (five at the Professional level and one General Service), as well as eight posts within the two RASOs.

7.   Comments provided by DFS are incorporated in italics.

II.   OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

8.   The audit was conducted to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of DFS governance, risk management and control processes in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effective provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety within peace operations by DFS**.

9.   The audit was included in the 2016 risk-based work plan of OIOS due to the high operational risk related to aviation safety in peace operations.

10.	The key control tested for the audit was regulatory framework. For the purpose of this audit, OIOS defined this control as one that provides reasonable assurance that policies and procedures: (i) exist to guide aviation safety within peace operations; (ii) are implemented consistently; and (iii) ensure the reliability and integrity of operational and safety information.

11.	The key control was assessed for the control objective shown in Table 1.

12.	OIOS conducted the audit from March to June 2016. The audit covered the period from 1 January 2014 to 1 May 2016. The audit examined the policies, procedures, programmes and plans used to provide guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations.

13.	The audit team 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

14.	The DFS governance, risk management and control processes examined were initially assessed as **partially satisfactory**[1] in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effective provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by DFS**. OIOS made seven recommendations to address issues identified in the audit.

15.	The Aviation Safety Section had devoted significant efforts to updating the approach to managing aviation safety in peace operations. The Section had led the development of the recently approved policy on aviation safety that aligned safety management with developments in international practice. The Section had also implemented an electronic system for missions to record and report aviation safety hazards and occurrences, and in conjunction with the RASO in Brindisi was implementing a system that would provide real-time information on aviation risk management and safety assurance activities. However, aviation safety within some missions was undermined by inadequate resources dedicated to supporting aviation safety management practices, as well as resources at DFS Headquarters to develop practical guidance and performance standards, disseminate safety information, provide training, and monitor and oversee mission practices.

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

---

[1] A rating of **"partially satisfactory"** means that important (but not critical or pervasive) deficiencies exist in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review

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
Effective provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by DFS	Regulatory framework	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory
FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY					

Regulatory framework

<u>Further development and revision of policy and guidance are necessary to support implementation of the aviation Safety Management System concept</u>

17.   The new DPKO/DFS Aviation Safety Policy, issued in May 2016, aims to align the United Nations approach to aviation safety with developments in international practices. The approach is based on the concept of a Safety Management System, which recognizes the role that all those involved in aviation-related activities play in proactively identifying and managing aviation safety risks. The Policy requires that detailed guidance on its implementation be further elaborated.

18.   DFS had issued a number of policies and guidelines relevant to aviation safety, including the Aviation Safety Manual (2012) and the Aviation Risk Management Policy (2014). These will need to be updated and supplemented by additional guidance to support implementation of the new Policy.

19.   While the new Aviation Safety Policy is premised on a holistic approach to aviation safety requirements that balances aviation safety with operational needs, the Aviation Manual, which is the key document that elaborates the policy and guidance on aviation operations was last updated in 2005 and does not reflect these latest developments.

20.   In addition, other Headquarters processes performed by DFS, DPKO and teams outside the Aviation Safety Section impact on and make important contributions to the overall system of aviation safety. This includes those relating to acquisition of aviation services and equipment (including from troop-contributing countries), adoption of new technologies (such as tools for improved aircraft tracking or the use of remotely piloted aircraft), as well as those relating to staff security (including during official travel by air). To ensure consistent application of the approach to aviation safety encompassed by the new Policy, relevant policies and procedures in these areas need to be reviewed and, where necessary, further developed or revised.

> **(1) DFS should develop and implement a plan to complete a holistic policy and guidance framework for aviation safety that includes revision of the Aviation Safety Manual and other supporting policies, processes and guidance, as well as allocate resources required to implement them.**
>
> *DFS accepted recommendation 1 and provided the plan to promulgate a holistic policy and*

<table>
<tr><td>guidance framework for aviation safety. Recommendation 1 remains open pending receipt of evidence of the implementation of the framework, including allocation of the resources required for its implementation.</td></tr>
</table>

Need to clarify the role, responsibilities and funding of RASOs

21.   The Aviation Safety Policy, the RASO Directives and the Aviation Safety Manual assign various responsibilities to RASOs. These responsibilities are global, regional, and local in nature. For example, regional functions include providing common training or materials to help guide and support aviation safety activities of regional missions. Local responsibilities include assistance in developing and managing individual mission aviation safety programmes. The development and piloting by the RASO at the Global Service Centre in Brindisi of the Aviation Safety Programme Integrated Data, a new system for recording information on aircraft inspections and other safety-related activities, is an example of a global function performed for, or on behalf of DFS Headquarters.

22.   Although the Aviation Safety Manual provides guidance on the level of resources that should be assigned to each RASO, neither the RASO in Brindisi nor the one in West Africa was currently budgeted at these levels. For example, the RASO in West Africa was operating with fewer resources than when it was established. In both cases, improvements in the overall DPKO/DFS approach to aviation safety, including the implementation of the Safety Management System, had increased roles and responsibilities of the RASOs for global and regional functions. General reductions in resources assigned for aviation safety in each of the missions affiliated with the RASOs had also increased the local activities each RASO was performing.

23.   The Aviation Safety Policy and Manual make clear that the Aviation Safety Section at DFS Headquarters is responsible for providing advice on the proposed budgets for RASOs. However, since RASO funding was provided by the hosting mission/service centre, the resources available to the respective RASOs was subject to changes to those entities' status and funding, irrespective of the regional or local functions performed for other affiliated missions, or the global functions performed on behalf of DFS Headquarters. For example, the downsizing of the United Nations Mission in Liberia, which houses and provides the resources for the RASO in West Africa, had left that RASO with fewer resources than when it was established, despite the increase in overall global and regional functions that it now performs.

24.   The lack of adequate resources at DFS Headquarters to conduct Aviation Safety Assessment Visits (ASAVs) also placed a greater reliance on RASOs for surveying and reporting on mission safety practices. However, since some missions depended on the RASOs for the development and management of their aviation safety programmes, the impartial surveying of practices in these missions was made more difficult.

25.   The need to better clarify the core RASO functions and to put in place mechanisms that ensure they are resourced to adequately perform these functions is made more urgent by the fact that DFS is considering establishing a third RASO at Entebbe, Uganda to support a future East Africa regional aviation hub and peace operations in East Africa. Otherwise, as is the case for the RASO in West Africa, the effectiveness of this new RASO could be overly dependent on the resources provided to it by the hosting service centre, to the detriment of the missions that it serves.

<table>
<tr><td>(2) DFS should review and clarify the purpose, roles, funding and responsibilities of Regional Aviation Safety Offices (RASOs), including: (a) the role of the Aviation Safety Section and DFS Headquarters in determining the resources and work priorities assigned to each RASO; and (b) mechanisms for ensuring that RASO funding is commensurate with its assigned functions and is not overly dependent on resources from any individual affiliated</td></tr>
</table>

> **mission/service centre.**
>
> *DFS accepted recommendation 2 and stated that the required clarifications would be incorporated in the revised DPKO and DFS Aviation Safety Manual (draft to be completed by December 2016) and in the revised LSD/DFS Directives for the RASOs in Brindisi and West Africa.* Recommendation 2 remains open pending receipt of the revised Aviation Safety Manual and relevant LSD/DFS Directives.

Need to further refine policy and procedures on the provision of safety advice relating to air services provided by brokers and freight forwarders

26. The United Nations Aviation Standards for Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Air Transport Operations states that the responsibilities of Aviation Safety management include identifying and analyzing safety hazards, and issuing safety recommendations. Upon request, the Aviation Safety Section conducts safety evaluations and provides comments on potential vendors for short and long-term charter agreements, including on agreements with brokers for air operators.

27. OIOS review noted that the Aviation Safety Section was not always able to provide complete comments on the safety of aircraft and air operators offered by brokers because the operators were either not registered with the United Nations or the broker had not provided sufficient information on the carriers proposed. Although the aviation standards require that any broker desiring to provide freight forwarding services to the United Nations must first be registered and listed with the United Nations, they do not specify similar requirements for the aircraft and carriers proposed by brokers.

28. Moreover, because DFS had not formalized procedures for assessing and using safety recommendations in respect of brokers and freight forwarders who provide services using third party carriers, the Section was not routinely provided with information about air operators offered by brokers but not registered with the United Nations.

29. In the absence of sufficient information, especially where operators proposed by a broker are subsequently changed, the Aviation Safety Section was unable to comprehensively assess the safety management and safety records of unregistered carriers or to identify any potential safety or other risks associated with the use of potentially unsuitable carriers.

> **(3) DFS should formalize procedures for, and develop guidance on, the assessment, communication and use of safety recommendations in respect of brokers who provide services using third party carriers.**
>
> *DFS accepted recommendation 3 and stated that the Air Transport, Movement Control and Aviation Safety Sections of DFS have held preliminary discussions to limit the use of air operators offered by registered brokers for transporting United Nations- and contingent-owned equipment, and intend to develop clear guidance to implement this recommendation. DFS would also work closely with the Procurement Division to finalize such procedures.* Recommendation 3 remains open pending receipt of the revised procedures and guidance on assessing third party aircraft and carriers proposed by brokers.

<u>DFS needed to develop a formal system of cataloguing and sharing guidance material on aviation safety with relevant actors at Headquarters or missions</u>

30.   The Aviation Safety Section is responsible for developing and providing guidance on aviation safety, including sharing lessons learned and best practices through the active exchange of safety information.

31.   The Section, together with the RASOs, developed and collected a wealth of information, including aviation safety newsletters, magazines, posters and educational material, as well as reference and training information. The Section also developed and accumulated significant other material on aviation safety during the course of its activities.

32.   However, much of this information was not easily accessible or centrally catalogued and stored. In addition, since each mission is also responsible for aviation safety within their own operations, much mission-specific guidance was not easily available to others.

33.   This occurred because there was no formal systematic approach for cataloguing and sharing materials, both within and outside the Section. Therefore, information already developed and existing was not effectively used and shared with those who might benefit from it.

> **(4) DFS should implement a system for formal cataloguing and sharing of information relevant to aviation safety, both within the Aviation Safety Section, as well as more broadly to the Regional Aviation Safety Offices, missions and beyond.**
>
> *DFS accepted recommendation 4 and stated that a cataloguing system would be developed for implementation in the revised DPKO and DFS Aviation Safety Manual.* Recommendation 4 remains open pending receipt of the revised Aviation Safety Manual that includes a system for cataloguing and sharing aviation safety information.

<u>Need to conduct required assessment visits to missions and vendors</u>

34.   The DPKO/DFS Aviation Safety Manual provides that Headquarters Aviation Safety staff are to conduct ASAVs to missions with air assets at least annually. RASOs (if requested by LSD) are also to undertake Air Operator Assessment Visits (OAVs) to registered (or prospective) vendors' operations as well as conduct Aviation Safety Surveys.

35.   OIOS noted that not all ASAVs, OAVs or safety surveys had been conducted as required or planned. For example, only 23 of the planned 45 visits were conducted over the last three years, with only 5 of the proposed 15 ASAVs carried out in 2015/16. Similarly, only three operators were subject to OAVs during 2015/16, with only 8 of the planned 19 OAVs being completed since 2013/14. This gap between planned and actual visits was primarily attributed to a lack of resources for travel and available staffing within both the Aviation Safety Section and the Aviation Quality Assurance and Standards Unit.

36.   OIOS also noted that, while funding of safety assessment visits relating to military aviation units (for example, under Letters of Assist, troop-contributing country assessments, or pre-deployment visits) were included in mission budgets, initial and ongoing visits to commercial vendors and the missions were not. Instead, these latter visits were funded by DFS Headquarters, which had not allocated sufficient resources for that purpose.

37.   In the absence of available resources, DFS had taken steps to maximize the level of oversight coverage by, for example, conducting OAVs jointly with the Aviation Quality Assurance and Standards

Unit, combining multiple visits into single trips, and adopting a risk-based approach to identifying which missions and which operators would be subject to oversight visits. However, the factors and methodology used in developing this approach were not documented in the Aviation Safety Policy or Guidelines, nor were visits to operators systematically planned or coordinated to ensure adequate longer-term oversight coverage. Discussions with DFS noted that the Department was considering maximizing resources for aviation safety oversight and quality assurance by potentially incorporating the quality assurance function within the Aviation Safety Section, thereby bringing aviation assessment expertise and human resources into one entity. If implemented, this may assist in mitigating the risks associated with the limited performance of assessment visits.

> **(5) DFS should develop a risk-based methodology for conducting aviation safety and air operator assessment visits as well as quality assurance visits to peacekeeping missions and vendors providing air services to the United Nations, to provide assurance that requisite aviation safety requirements are being implemented. This should also include allocating sufficient resources to undertake the visits and assessing the feasibility of combining quality assurance and aviation safety functions at DFS Headquarters.**
>
> *DFS accepted recommendation 5 and noted that to improve the use of resources for aviation surveillance it was considering consolidating the functions currently performed by the Aviation Quality Assurance and Standards Unit into the Aviation Safety Section.* Recommendation 5 remains open pending receipt of evidence that a risk-based methodology for conducting aviation safety and air operator assessment visits has been developed and sufficient resources allocated to undertake them.

A comprehensive tool and set of indicators for monitoring and reporting on mission aviation safety performance were not yet in place

38.   The Aviation Safety Policy requires the development and implementation of guidance on safety assurance that allows continuous oversight of field mission operations. Among other things, the guidance is to establish key safety performance indicators as part of a formal system for safety performance monitoring and measurement.

39.   The Aviation Safety Section, working in conjunction with the RASO in Brindisi, was conducting a pilot of an electronic system for collecting and reporting safety data from participating pilot missions. This system, the Aviation Safety Programme Integrated Data (ASPID), is intended to replace several existing processes and databases that track the results of safety management activities within missions, allowing for more readily accessible, timely and automated monitoring and generation of performance reports. The system also provides scope for integrating the results of quality assurance activities conducted at Headquarters and in the field.

40.   The development and piloting of ASPID represents a substantial achievement, particularly given that it had been accomplished within existing resources. However, the system had not yet been implemented at all missions; nor had a set of comprehensive performance indicators and targets been defined that would provide management with a snapshot and comparison of aviation safety quality and assurance across missions and aviation service providers. These indicators should focus not only on incident and accident rates, but also on other factors that might contribute to the overall safety environment, such as the number and frequency of assessment visits and surveys, the rate of implementation of aviation oversight recommendations, the frequency and coverage of training activities, and the level and turnover of key aviation staff. Without this system, management would not have timely access to the information necessary for assessing the relative safety of aviation operations across missions.

> **(6) DFS should prioritize the speedy implementation of the Aviation Safety Programme Integrated Data and the development of a set of indicators for monitoring and reporting on mission aviation safety performance.**
>
> *DFS accepted recommendation 6 and stated that the work would be given priority by the Information and Communications Technology Division.* Recommendation 6 remains open pending the full implementation of ASPID and the development of indicators to monitor and report on mission aviation safety performance.

Need to provide the training required by the new aviation safety policy and guidelines

41.   The Aviation Safety Policy requires that management at DFS Headquarters and in missions support aviation training activities. The Aviation Safety Section is tasked with developing and periodically reviewing standardized training requirements to ensure that staff members involved in aviation activities are able to effectively perform their safety functions. The Policy also requires that sufficient resources be dedicated to providing training on safety requirements to relevant staff, at Headquarters and in the field.

42.   OIOS review noted that inadequate resources for travel and training had limited the ability of DFS to develop and deliver the range of training necessary to ensure staff remained aware of relevant safety requirements and developments in practice. DFS had attempted to mitigate this risk through the development of online and e-learning training tools, as well as development of partnerships with external actors for the provision of training at no cost on specific aspects relevant to aviation safety. The recent conference at Headquarters on remotely piloted aircraft systems involving an external expert organization is one such example. DFS had also promulgated a policy on training that outlines the minimum training and skills requirements expected of aviation staff within missions.

43.   The frequent movement of aviation-related staff within missions, coupled with shortages in required numbers of staff dedicated to aviation safety functions within missions, made it important that adequate resources be devoted to initial and ongoing training on aviation safety. The introduction of a new policy and guidelines that place greater emphasis for safety on all staff in aviation operations further amplified this need.

> **(7) DFS should develop and implement a plan to provide the training required by the Aviation Safety Policy, including on related aviation safety guidelines and systems such as the Aviation Safety Programme Integrated Data.**
>
> *DFS accepted recommendation 7 and stated that it would be implemented in line with the revision of the DPKO and DFS Aviation Safety Manual.* Recommendation 7 remains open pending receipt of evidence that the training plan on the Aviation Safety Policy has been implemented.

V.   ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

44.   OIOS wishes to express its appreciation to the management and staff of DFS for the assistance and cooperation extended to the auditors during this assignment.

<div align="right">

(*Signed*) Eleanor T. Burns
Director, Internal Audit Division
Office of Internal Oversight Services

</div>

STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of the provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by the Department of Field Support

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical[2]/ Important[3]	C/ O[4]	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date[5]
1	DFS should develop and implement a plan to complete a holistic policy and guidance framework for aviation safety that includes revision of the Aviation Safety Manual and other supporting policies, processes and guidance, as well as allocate resources required to implement them.	Important	O	Submission of evidence of the implementation of the aviation safety policy and guidance framework, including allocation of the resources required for its implementation.	31 December 2017
2	DFS should review and clarify the purpose, roles, funding and responsibilities of Regional Aviation Safety Offices (RASOs), including: (a) the role of the Aviation Safety Section and DFS Headquarters in determining the resources and work priorities assigned to each RASO; and (b) mechanisms for ensuring that RASO funding is commensurate with its assigned functions and is not overly dependent on resources from any individual affiliated mission/service centre.	Important	O	Submission of the revised Aviation Safety Manual and relevant LSD/DFS Directives	31 December 2017
3	DFS should formalize procedures for, and develop guidance on, the assessment, communication and use of safety recommendations in respect of brokers who provide services using third party carriers.	Important	O	Submission of the revised procedures and guidance on assessing third party aircraft and carriers proposed by brokers.	31 December 2017
4	DFS should implement a system for more formal cataloguing and sharing of information relevant to aviation safety, both within the Aviation Safety Section, as well as more broadly to the Regional Aviation Safety Offices, missions and beyond.	Important	O	Submission of the revised Aviation Safety Manual that includes a system for cataloguing and sharing aviation safety information.	31 December 2017

---

[2] Critical recommendations address critical and/or pervasive deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided with regard to the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

[3] Important recommendations address important (but not critical or pervasive) deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

[4] C = closed, O = open

[5] Date provided by DFS in response to recommendations.

STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical[2]/ Important[3]	C/ O[4]	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date[5]
5	DFS should develop a risk-based methodology for conducting aviation safety and air operator assessment visits as well as quality assurance visits to peacekeeping missions and vendors providing air services to the United Nations, to provide assurance that requisite aviation safety requirements are being implemented. This should also include allocating sufficient resources to undertake the visits and assessing the feasibility of combining quality assurance and aviation safety functions at DFS Headquarters.	Important	O	Submission of evidence that a risk-based methodology for conducting aviation safety and air operator assessment visits has been developed and sufficient resources allocated to undertake them.	31 December 2017
6	DFS should prioritize the speedy implementation of the Aviation Safety Programme Integrated Data and the development of a set of indicators for monitoring and reporting on mission aviation safety performance.	Important	O	Submission of evidence of the full implementation of ASPID and the development of indicators to monitor and report on mission aviation safety performance.	31 December 2017
7	DFS should develop and implement a plan to provide the training required by the Aviation Safety Policy, including on related aviation safety guidelines and systems such as the Aviation Safety Programme Integrated Data.	Important	O	Submission of evidence that the training plan on the Aviation Safety Policy has been implemented.	31 December 2017

APPENDIX I

Management Response

CONFIDENTIAL

Immediate

TO:
A:

Muriette Lawrence-Hume, Chief, New York Audit Services, Internal Audit Division OIOS

DATE: **SEP 2 8 2016**

REFERENCE: 2016.UNHQ.AR-BOI.MEMO.26154.2

THROUGH:
S/C DE:

FROM:
DE:

Lisa Buttenheim, Assistant Secretary-General for Field Support

SUBJECT:
OBJET:

Draft report on an audit of the provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by the Department of Field Support (Assignment No. AP2016/615/03)

1. I refer to your memorandum, dated 14 September 2016, regarding the above-mentioned audit. We note that OIOS has taken into account our comments provided earlier. Please note that DFS does not have any further comments on the findings in the report. We have, however, updated Appendix I to reflect our comments and the individual responsible for the implementation of the recommendations with the deadline.

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: Cynthia Avena-Castillo

Management Response to the Draft Report

Audit of the provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by the Department of Field Support

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical[1]/ Important[2]	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
1	DFS should develop and implement a plan to complete a holistic policy and guidance framework for aviation safety that includes revision of the Aviation Safety Manual and other supporting policies, processes and guidance, as well as allocate resources required to implement them.	Important	Yes	Director, LSD/DFS	Fourth quarter of 2017	The plan to promulgate a holistic policy and guidance framework for aviation safety is as follows: - DPKO/DFS Aviation Safety Policy: 2016; - DFS Aviation Safety Program: 2016; - DFS Aviation Safety Assurance Guidelines: 2017; and - DPKO/DFS Aviation Safety Manual, new edition: 2017.
2	DFS should review and clarify the purpose, roles, funding and responsibilities of Regional Aviation Safety Offices (RASOs), including: (a) the role of the Aviation Safety Section and DFS Headquarters in determining the resources and work priorities assigned to each RASO; and (b) mechanisms for ensuring that RASO funding is commensurate with its assigned functions and is not overly dependent on resources from any individual affiliated mission/service centre.	Important	Yes	Director, LSD/DFS	Fourth quarter of 2017	DFS' comments are reflected in the report.

---

[1] Critical recommendations address critical and/or pervasive deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided with regard to the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

[2] Important recommendations address important (but not critical or pervasive) deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

16 Sep 2016

Management Response to the Draft Report

Audit of the provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by the Department of Field Support

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical[1]/ Important[2]	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
3	DFS should formalize procedures for, and develop guidance on, the assessment, communication and use of safety recommendations in respect of brokers who provide services using third party carriers.	Important	Yes	Director, LSD/DFS	Fourth quarter of 2017	DFS' comments are reflected in the report.
4	DFS should implement a system for more formal cataloguing and sharing of information relevant to aviation safety, both within the Aviation Safety Section, as well as more broadly to the Regional Aviation Safety Offices, missions and beyond.	Important	Yes	Director, LSD/DFS	Fourth quarter of 2017	DFS' comments are reflected in the report.
5	DFS should develop a risk-based methodology for conducting aviation safety and air operator assessment visits as well as quality assurance visits to peacekeeping missions and vendors providing air services to the United Nations, to provide assurance that requisite aviation safety requirements are being implemented. This should also include allocating sufficient resources to undertake the visits and assessing the feasibility of combining quality assurance and aviation safety functions at DFS Headquarters.	Important	Yes	Director, LSD/DFS	Fourth quarter of 2017	DFS' comments are reflected in the report.

16 Sep 2016

Management Response to the Draft Report

Audit of the provision of guidance and oversight of aviation safety in peace operations by the Department of Field Support

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical[1]/ Important[2]	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
6	DFS should prioritize the speedy implementation of the Aviation Safety Programme Integrated Data and the development of a set of indicators for monitoring and reporting on mission aviation safety performance.	Important	Yes	Director, LSD/DFS	Fourth quarter of 2017	DFS' comments are reflected in the report.
7	DFS should develop and implement a plan to provide the training required by the Aviation Safety Policy, including on related aviation safety guidelines and systems such as the Aviation Safety Programme Integrated Data.	Important	Yes	Director, LSD/DFS	Fourth quarter of 2017	DFS' comments are reflected in the report.

16 Sep 2016