



## INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION

### REPORT 2014/136

---

Audit of the implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy by the Department of Field Support

Overall results relating to the effective implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy by the Department of Field Support were initially assessed as partially satisfactory. Implementation of eight important recommendations remains in progress

FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY

15 December 2014  
Assignment No. AP2013/615/10

# CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE	1-2
III. AUDIT RESULTS	2-9
A. Oversight	3-4
B. Regulatory framework	4-5
C. Programme management	5-8
D. Coordinated management	8-9
IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	9
ANNEX I      Status of audit recommendations	
APPENDIX I   Management response	

# AUDIT REPORT

## Audit of the implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy by the Department of Field Support

### I. BACKGROUND

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of the implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy (GFSS) 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. DFS initiated GFSS in 2010, as a five-year programme, to expedite and improve support and service delivery for peacekeeping and special political missions and to facilitate effective implementation of their mandates. The strategy was also aimed at strengthening stewardship of resources, improving safety and life conditions of field staff, utilizing local and regional capacity and reducing environmental impact. A key element of GFSS was the global management approach in coordination with other change initiatives of the Organization. The Under-Secretary-General of DFS was responsible for the overall management of GFSS and was supported by the Assistant Secretary-General for Field Support.
4. Initially, the strategy had the following four integrated pillars: (a) service centres, including the United Nations Global Service Centre in Brindisi (UNGSC) and the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe (RSCE); (b) predefined modules and service packages/modularization; (c) financial framework; and (d) human resources framework. In 2013, as GFSS evolved, DFS refined its end-state vision into the following six specific end-states: (a) financial framework and strategic resourcing; (b) human resources framework; (c) shared services; (d) supply chain and modularization; (e) process re-engineering and alignment with other change initiatives; and (f) functional specialization and organization.
5. The activities relating to GFSS were funded mainly using existing resources of DFS and field missions and general temporary assistance funding for the position of Head of the GFSS Implementation Coordination Team. As part of GFSS, UNGSC was re-profiled and RSCE was established with funding from client missions. As indicated in the Secretary-General's overview report on the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations, total costs attributed to GFSS in the three fiscal years from 2010/11 to 2012/13 was \$4.1 million for Headquarters and \$17.3 million for RSCE.
6. Comments provided by DFS are incorporated in italics.

### II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

7. 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 implementation of GFSS**.
8. The audit was included in the 2013 risk-based work plan of OIOS because of the operational, financial and reputational risks related to the implementation of GFSS.

9. The key controls tested for the audit were: (a) oversight; (b) regulatory framework; (c) programme management; and (d) coordinated management. For the purpose of this audit, OIOS defined these key controls as follows:

(a) **Oversight** – controls that provide reasonable assurance of adequate supervision and evaluation of the activities of GFSS, including direction, coordination and oversight over GFSS implementation through the governance mechanisms to ensure that risks and opportunities are identified and appropriate action plans are drawn to minimize risks or take advantage of opportunities;

(b) **Regulatory framework** – controls that provide reasonable assurance that policies and procedures: (i) exist to guide the implementation of GFSS pillars; (ii) are implemented consistently; and (iii) ensure reliability and integrity of financial and operational information;

(c) **Programme management** – controls that provide reasonable assurance that DFS has the financial and human resources required to effectively implement GFSS, and a system to plan, monitor and report on programme performance in a timely, accurate and complete manner; and

(d) **Coordinated management** - controls that provide reasonable assurance that coordinated mechanisms exist for joint, coordinated projects and actions involving multiple entities with regard to the integrated processes of GFSS, including new processes initiated by the Organization such as Umoja, the International Public Sector Accounting Standards and Inspira.

10. The key controls were assessed for the control objectives shown in Table 1. Certain control objectives shown in Table 1 as “Not assessed” were not relevant to the scope defined for this audit.

11. OIOS conducted this audit from March to June 2014. The audit covered the period from 1 November 2012 to 31 March 2014.

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 and analytical reviews, OIOS assessed the existence and adequacy of internal controls and conducted necessary tests to determine their effectiveness.

### III. AUDIT RESULTS

13. The DFS governance, risk management and control processes examined were initially assessed as **partially satisfactory**<sup>1</sup> in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effective implementation of GFSS**. OIOS made eight recommendations to address the issues identified. DFS had made good progress in implementing GFSS including the establishment of RSCE, re-profiling of UNGSC, the development of the standardized funding model, access to reserve resources, use of expanded rosters and development of a workforce planning framework, and civilian staffing reviews of major peace operations. However, important activities were still in progress related to shared services, supply chain management and modularization pillars. Also, DFS needed to: (a) finalize policies and procedures for guiding GFSS processes; (b) enhance the monitoring and measurement of performance against the programme plan; (c) improve reporting on GFSS cost/saving analysis; (d) develop a strategy to mainstream GFSS processes

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

into the activities of DFS, service centres and field missions; and (e) enhance communication and information sharing tools.

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

**Table 1: 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
<b>Effective implementation of GFSS</b>	(a) Oversight	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Not assessed	Partially satisfactory
	(b) Regulatory framework	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Not assessed	Partially satisfactory
	(c) Programme management	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially satisfactory
	(d) Coordinated management	Partially satisfactory	Not assessed	Satisfactory	Partially satisfactory
<b>FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY</b>					

## A. Oversight

### Governance mechanisms were established and applied effectively

15. Pursuant to the GFSS Governance Framework, DFS established the following oversight bodies: the GFSS Steering Committee, the GFSS Client Board, the RSCE Steering Committee and the GSC Steering Committee. The roles and responsibilities of these governance bodies were outlined in their respective terms of reference. A review of minutes of GFSS governance bodies' meetings indicated that they were held in accordance with their terms of reference, discussions were well documented and, to ensure accountability, action points were assigned and periodically followed up. OIOS concluded that adequate governance mechanisms were in place for the implementation of GFSS.

### Development of field support structure model was delayed

16. DFS stated in the fourth GFSS progress report to the General Assembly that it had added to the GFSS end-state the development of a model mission support structure to serve as strategic guidance for field missions starting with the 2015/16 budget.

17. DFS, in 2012, had already piloted the proposed structure in the United Nations Mission in South Sudan. DFS, in conjunction with Directors/Chiefs, based on the results of the pilot, decided that a generic model should be developed and used as strategic budget guidance for all missions. In February 2014, DFS established a working group to further review field mission support structures and to develop a set of parameters to guide mission business models and structures. The working group's recommendations were discussed in March 2014 at the Directors/Chiefs of Mission Support conference. However, at the time of the audit, the field support structure model had not been finalized. The delay in finalizing the

standard mission support structure would result in field missions using inconsistent approaches in preparing budgets, and failure to fully realize the expected efficiency gains.

**(1) DFS should assign dedicated resources to finalizing the field support structure to guide missions in applying new business models and in preparing budget submissions.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 1 and stated that it would issue guidelines to missions on the development of mission structures. Recommendation 1 remains open pending receipt of a copy of the field support structure guidance issued to field missions.*

## **B. Regulatory framework**

### Policies and procedures were not finalized in a timely manner

18. DFS and GFSS governance bodies developed the GFSS Governance Framework, the GFSS Risk Management Framework, and the GFSS Performance Management Framework to direct and manage the implementation of GFSS. According to the GFSS Implementation Plan and the established frameworks, DFS, service centres and missions were required to develop management tools, policies and procedures for implementing the activities of GFSS pillars.

19. DFS developed a number of policies and procedures, including: (a) a global asset management policy; (b) a performance management framework and key performance indicators for support services provided by RSCE; and (c) standard operating procedures for the Strategic Air Operations Centre of UNGSC. Moreover, as a part of the GFSS Risk Management Framework, DFS developed a risk register for GFSS activities in 2013.

20. However, at the time of the audit, DFS, service centres and field missions had not yet developed or updated policies and procedures for activities such as supply chain management, scalability of service centres, RSCE movement and control functions, air operations, vendor payments and other support operations that were impacted by the implementation of GFSS. The delay in updating and finalizing policies was due to other priorities related to the implementation of GFSS, expansion of GFSS pillars in the third year of the reform, operational and structural changes in GFSS processes and alignment of GFSS processes with Umoja. The delay in finalizing policies impacted the timeliness and consistency of processes implemented as a result of GFSS.

**(2) DFS, in coordination with service centres and field missions, should finalize and further develop policies, procedures and guidelines on GFSS processes to ensure consistency in support operations.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 2 and stated that it would continue to develop relevant policies, procedures and other guidance on GFSS processes. Recommendation 2 remains open pending receipt of copies of finalized policies and procedures for supply chain management and other RSCE and UNGSC support operations.*

### Non-compliance with service-level agreements

21. RSCE was established as a component of the GFSS shared services pillar to consolidate and perform non-location dependent administrative and support functions for client missions. Accordingly, RSCE established service-level agreements with the respective missions, clarifying the division of roles and responsibilities between missions and RSCE. Most client missions had transferred the agreed services

and staffing resources to RSCE, including 332 posts (169 professional, 142 national and 21 United Nations volunteer posts).

22. However, not all missions had implemented the requirements of service-level agreements and transferred administrative functions and related posts to RSCE. For example, the United Nations Office in Burundi, the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Central African Republic, the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei, and the United Nations Support Office for the African Union Mission in Somalia had not transferred any of their vendor payment functions to RSCE. Also, at the time of the audit, three administrative staff in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo were performing functions in the mission, although their posts had been approved for transfer to RSCE. Delays in transferring functions and posts were because of inaction by mission management. Continuous processing of administrative transactions by the missions reduced the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the provision of integrated support.

**(3) DFS should request the Regional Service Centre Steering Committee to ensure that all administrative functions and back office responsibilities of client missions are transferred to RSCE, as approved by the GFSS governing bodies and required by the respective service-level agreements.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 3 and stated that at the 26th RSCE Steering Committee meeting, client missions committed to completing the transfer of agreed functions and responsibilities to RSCE. DFS also stated that it would monitor implementation and issue further instructions to the missions as required. Recommendation 3 remains open pending receipt of evidence that all agreed administrative functions have been transferred to RSCE.*

### **C. Programme management**

#### GFSS Implementation Plan needed to be properly updated

23. The GFSS Implementation Plan required GFSS activities to be properly planned and monitored. The GFSS Implementation Coordination Team was responsible for updating the GFSS Implementation Plan based on inputs from entities responsible for implementing GFSS activities.

24. The GFSS Implementation Plan did not include some tasks that were still in progress and information that was required for effective monitoring. For example, primarily because GFSS implementing entities were not providing information to the GFSS Implementation Coordination Team in a timely manner, the Plan: (a) did not include all implementation targets and the correct status of some GFSS activities; and (b) included revised target dates for overdue activities without indicating the originally set targets and explanation as to why such targets had not been achieved. As a result, DFS and GFSS governing bodies could not always ensure that activities were implemented in accordance with the initial targets and changes to such targets were justified.

**(4) DFS should implement adequate procedures to facilitate the monitoring of GFSS implementation and to ensure that all original and revised targets as well as the reasons for their revision are updated in the GFSS Implementation Plan in a timely manner.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 4 and stated that it would update the GFSS Implementation Plan on a regular basis and provide additional fields to facilitate recording and monitoring of implementation. Recommendation 4 remains open pending receipt of evidence of the procedures implemented by DFS to ensure that all activities in the GFSS Implementation Plan are being*

effectively tracked.

#### Important activities still needed to be completed

25. GFSS was established as a five-year reform initiative to be completed by July 2015. In 2013, as GFSS evolved, DFS defined six specific end-states: (a) financial framework and strategic resourcing; (b) human resources framework; (c) shared services; (d) supply chain and modularization; (e) process re-engineering and alignment with other change initiatives; and (f) functional specialization and organization. DFS had advised the General Assembly that it did not plan to extend GFSS beyond the five-year period and intended to mainstream GFSS-related tasks, including unfinished ones, into the activities of respective entities in DFS and in the field.

26. DFS had made good progress in implementing GFSS in each of the initial reform pillars, and in initiating new, cost-effective ways of supporting field missions in almost all areas. These reform activities were reported in the Secretary-General's reports and included the establishment of RSCE and re-profiling of UNGSC, standardized funding model, access to reserve sources, expanded rosters and the development of a workforce planning framework and civilian staffing reviews of major peace operations.

27. However, important GFSS activities such as shared services, supply chain management and modularization pillars still had considerable outstanding work. For example, DFS had identified the need to strengthen enabling capacities, as the shortfall was impacting on the ability of the Organization to rapidly deploy to new and expanding missions and construct modularized camps. There were cases, when insufficient enabling capacities in assets (aircraft) and in expertise (engineering, construction and other specialized labor skills) did not allow missions to reach required operational levels in a timely manner. To address this, DFS was developing a global mission support team concept to have a wider pool of expertise from missions to strengthen enabling capacities and to deploy staff at short notice to address specific and urgent needs. DFS and DM were also seeking commercial solutions for enabling capacities. DFS advised that to further develop and finalize pending concepts and policies, working groups, such as the Shared Services Task Force and a cross-functional working group were established in 2014. Slow progress in completing these tasks was because of their complexity and some changes in operational requirements due to evolving GFSS processes.

28. Moreover, DFS had not developed a follow-on strategy to GFSS to ensure that all tasks were mainstreamed into the activities of DFS and field missions, and that the benefits of GFSS were realized in a sustained manner.

**(5) DFS should develop a strategy to mainstream the processes initiated by GFSS into the activities of DFS and field missions to ensure that benefits of GFSS are realized in a sustained manner.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 5 and stated that it would issue the relevant guidance for mainstreaming GFSS processes into new missions. Recommendation 5 remains open pending receipt of evidence that the guidance for mainstreaming GFSS processes has been issued.*

#### Performance measurement tools needed further refinement

29. The GFSS Performance Management Framework required the development and monitoring of quantitative and qualitative key performance indicators (KPIs) for the end-states of the strategy.

30. DFS had developed KPIs for all GFSS pillars in line with the reform objectives at the strategic and operational levels including the: (a) human resources pillar on the administration of staff,



performance management, career development and workforce planning; (b) finance pillar to measure budget implementation and related processes and efficiencies from using the standard funding model and access to strategic reserves; and (c) modularization and supply chain management pillar. In addition, RSCE established a comprehensive performance management framework with KPIs for each service line, albeit areas for enhancing KPIs were identified.

31. However, although RSCE launched a new structure based on 11 service lines for the provision of administrative support to regional missions, there was no mechanism to measure the performance of end-to-end processes of its activities. This was because missions serviced by RSCE had not established KPIs for their activities such as, for example, the receiving and inspection of goods, that needed to be completed before RSCE commenced its processes.

**(6) DFS should request the Regional Service Centre Steering Committee to ensure that the Centre and its client missions establish key performance indicators to measure end-to-end processes of the support activities involving both missions and providers of shared services.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 6 and stated that it would work with RSCE and partners to develop a standardized approach for developing KPIs for end-to-end services that involved missions and providers of shared services. Recommendation 6 remains open pending receipt of a copy of the KPIs developed to measure end-to-end services.*

#### Reporting on cost savings and cost reductions needed improvement

32. In its resolution 64/269, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit an annual progress report on the implementation of GFSS, detailing the status of each initiative, including timelines, performance measurement benchmarks, and costs and achievements.

33. In the audit period, the Secretary-General submitted two annual progress reports on the implementation of GFSS to the General Assembly with annexes to the overview reports on the financing of United Nations peacekeeping operations, which reported that the total savings after deduction of costs attributed to GFSS for fiscal years 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13 were \$384.7 million.

34. A review of these reports indicated that costs, savings and cost reductions attributed to GFSS were incomplete. For example, RSCE cost of \$7.1 million for the establishment of the Regional Information and Communication Technology Centre in 2013 as a component of GFSS was not included in the overview report (A/68/731), resulting in the overstatement of the savings reported. Also, the OIOS audit of the Transportation and Movement Integrated Control Centre in 2013 indicated that \$107.5 million reported in the overview report (A/67/723) as savings attributed to GFSS was overstated, as it included amounts that related to action taken prior to the formal approval of GFSS and the establishment of the Transportation and Movement Integrated Control Centre. DFS subsequently adjusted its reported savings by \$7.1 million in its overview report (A/68/731). These shortcomings were mainly due to a lack of adequate tools and procedures to capture and collate data, which was being provided by entities responsible for identifying and calculating the costs and benefits of GFSS.

35. The Directors/Chiefs of Mission Support, at their conference held in September 2013, agreed to further improve the reporting of GFSS benefits by identifying direct and indirect benefits, and reporting benefits against the original objectives of GFSS in each fiscal year and cumulatively from the start of GFSS, a process that was recommended by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Board of Auditors. However, to implement this, DFS needed to further develop performance reporting/business intelligence tools.

**(7) DFS should develop adequate reporting tools and procedures to improve reporting on GFSS implementation in the remaining period of the initiative and ensure that data for all reported benefits and cost/saving analysis provided by entities responsible for GFSS pillars are complete, accurate and supported by sufficient evidence.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 7 and stated that it would further strengthen the benefits and cost/savings reporting in the fifth GFSS progress report and issue instructions on reporting requirements for future costs/benefits reporting. Recommendation 7 remains open pending receipt of evidence that adequate reporting tools were developed to properly report benefits and costs related to GFSS.*

## **D. Coordinated management**

### Coordination mechanisms were properly established

36. The GFSS Governance Framework committed DFS to establish coordination tools for entities and partners involved in the implementation of GFSS and other reforms of the Organization. The coordinated management function was one of the core responsibilities of the GFSS Steering Committee, which included high-level representatives from Secretariat departments involved in the ongoing change initiatives of the Organization.

37. The GFSS Implementation Coordination Team that was established in 2010 to assist the GFSS Steering Committee performed functions relating to the coordination of programme management activities for GFSS and led various working groups and task forces to ensure coordination of efforts among the stakeholders involved in GFSS and other change initiatives. Other forms of coordinated effort included topical conferences, retreats and direct meetings of process owners and experts at various managerial and operational levels. OIOS reviewed related minutes and observed that, in general, the working groups met regularly and maintained records of meetings. OIOS concluded that adequate controls were in place to ensure the coordination of GFSS activities between relevant entities and related Organization-wide initiatives.

### Communication and information sharing needed improvement

38. The GFSS Change Management and Communication Strategy established in May 2013 committed DFS to establishing communication tools to deliver key messages to targeted audiences at the strategic, operational and reporting levels. The GFSS Governance Framework required the GFSS Implementation Coordination Team to capture lessons learned and track corrective actions relating to the implementation of the strategy.

39. DFS used communication tools such as POINT (on the DPKO/DFS Intranet) as a repository of GFSS documents. DFS also issued GFSS briefings/reports, fact sheets and results of client surveys, and disseminated information at DPKO/DFS Town Hall meetings and on the DPKO/DFS public website. Progress reports on GFSS implementation were also issued in a timely manner, and provided current status, achievements, challenges and targeted activities for the completion of the reform.

40. DFS reported a number of lessons learned in the Secretary-General's reports on GFSS implementation. However, the GFSS Implementation Coordination Team, due to other priorities, had not fully populated POINT with relevant documents or established a central repository for documents on GFSS issues. While these documents were located in various databases with those entities responsible for certain GFSS activities, they were not easily accessible to all those involved in the implementation of

GFSS as well as other interested stakeholders. The GFSS Client Board in January 2013 and February 2014 advocated for better communication on GFSS within the missions to ensure that cross-cutting and broader views were captured and considered. The Board further stated that numerous missions voiced for more support from Headquarters in communicating GFSS messages to personnel in the missions.

**(8) DFS should better organize and maintain important GFSS documents for use: in improving communication and information sharing on the implementation of GFSS; and during the post-GFSS period.**

*DFS accepted recommendation 8 and stated that at the end of the GFSS period, the GFSS Implementation Coordination Team would assemble a full set of all the key GFSS documents as a repository of practices and lessons and source documents for review. Recommendation 8 remains open pending receipt of evidence that a full set of GFSS documents has been maintained as a repository of GFSS practices and lessons learned.*

#### **IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

41. 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.

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

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

## Audit of the implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy by the Department of Field Support

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>2</sup> / Important <sup>3</sup>	C/ O <sup>4</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>5</sup>
1	DFS should assign dedicated resources to finalizing the field support structure to guide missions in applying new business models and in preparing budget submissions.	Important	O	Receipt of a copy of the field support structure guidance issued to field missions.	First quarter of 2015
2	DFS, in coordination with service centres and field missions, should finalize and further develop policies, procedures and guidelines on GFSS processes to ensure consistency in support operations.	Important	O	Receipt of copies of finalized policies and procedures for supply chain management and other RSCE and UNGSC support operations.	Second quarter of 2015
3	DFS should request the Regional Service Centre Steering Committee to ensure that all administrative functions and back office responsibilities of client missions are transferred to RSCE, as approved by the GFSS governing bodies and required by the respective service-level agreements.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that all agreed administrative functions have been transferred to RSCE.	First quarter of 2015
4	DFS should implement adequate procedures to facilitate the monitoring of GFSS implementation and to ensure that all original and revised targets as well as the reasons for their revision are updated in the GFSS Implementation Plan in a timely manner.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence of the procedures implemented by DFS to ensure that all activities in the GFSS Implementation Plan are being effectively tracked.	First quarter of 2015
5	DFS should develop a strategy to mainstream the processes initiated by GFSS into the activities of DFS and field missions to ensure that benefits of GFSS are realized in a sustained manner.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that the guidance for mainstreaming GFSS processes has been issued.	Second quarter of 2015
6	DFS should request the Regional Service Centre Steering Committee to ensure that the Centre and	Important	O	Receipt of a copy of the KPIs developed to measure end-to-end services.	Second quarter of 2015

<sup>2</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>3</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>4</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>5</sup> Date provided by DFS in response to recommendations.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

## Audit of the implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy by the Department of Field Support

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>2</sup> / Important <sup>3</sup>	C/ O <sup>4</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>5</sup>
	its client missions establish key performance indicators to measure end-to-end processes of the support activities involving both missions and providers of shared services.				
7	DFS should develop adequate reporting tools and procedures to improve reporting on GFSS implementation in the remaining period of the initiative and ensure that data for all reported benefits and cost/saving analysis provided by entities responsible for GFSS pillar activities are complete, accurate and supported by sufficient evidence.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that adequate reporting tools were developed to properly report benefits and costs related to GFSS.	Second quarter of 2015
8	DFS should better organize and maintain important GFSS documents for use: in improving communication and information sharing on the implementation of GFSS; and during the post-GFSS period.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that a full set of GFSS documents has been maintained as a repository of GFSS practices and lessons learned.	Second quarter of 2015

# **APPENDIX I**

## **Management Response**

CONFIDENTIAL

Routine

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

DATE: 2 December 2014

THROUGH:  
S/C DE:

REFERENCE: UNHQ-AR-BOI-Memo-2-  
2014-2803

FROM: Rudy Sanchez, Acting Assistant Secretary-General,  
DE: Department of Field Support

*Rudy Sanchez*

SUBJECT: **Audit of the implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy by**  
OBJET: **the Department of Field Support (Assignment No. AP2013/615/10)**

1. I refer to your memorandum dated 11 November 2014 regarding the above-mentioned audit. We note that OIOS has substantially taken our comments provided on 2 October 2014 into account. Nevertheless, the Department is providing additional comments on the recommendations contained in the draft report as Appendix I.
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. Cynthia Avena-Castillo

## Management Response

## Audit of the implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy by the Department of Field Support

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 assign dedicated resources to finalizing the field support structure to guide missions in applying new business models and in preparing budget submissions.	Important	Yes	USG, DFS	First quarter of 2015	DFS' comments are reflected in the draft report. The Department wishes to clarify that the guidelines referred to in paragraph 19 would be issued by the first quarter of 2015.
2	DFS, in coordination with service centres and field missions, should finalize and further develop policies, procedures and guidelines on GFSS processes to ensure consistency in support operations.	Important	Yes	USG, DFS and Chief, RSCE	Second quarter of 2015	DFS' comments are reflected in the draft report. The Department does not have any further comments.
3	DFS should request the Regional Service Centre Steering Committee to ensure that all administrative functions and back office responsibilities of the client missions are transferred to RSCE, as approved by the GFSS governing bodies and required by the respective service-level agreements.	Important	Yes	USG, DFS	First quarter of 2015	DFS' comments are reflected in the draft report. The Department will issue a facsimile/code cable to all client missions requesting the transfer of all service level agreement functions to RSCE.
4	DFS should implement adequate procedures to ensure that all tasks in the GFSS Implementation Plan are updated in a timely manner showing revised and original targets, reasons for their revision and overdue activities to facilitate the monitoring of the GFSS implementation.	Important	Yes	USG, DFS	First quarter of 2015	DFS' comments are reflected in the draft report. The Department is updating the implementation plan and will maintain it updated for the duration of its existence.
5	DFS should develop a strategy to mainstream the processes initiated by GFSS into the activities of DFS and field	Important	Yes	USG, DFS	Second quarter of 2015	DFS' comments are reflected in the draft report. The Department does not have any further comments.

<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 implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy by the Department of Field Support

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical <sup>1</sup> / Important <sup>2</sup>	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
	missions to ensure that benefits of GFSS are realized in a sustained manner.					
6	DFS should request the Regional Service Centre Steering Committee to ensure that the Centre and its client missions establish key performance indicators to measure end-to-end processes of the support activities involving both missions and providers of shared services.	Important	Yes	USG, DFS	Second quarter of 2015	DFS' comments are reflected in the draft report. The Department will issue a facsimile/code cable to the RSCE and its partners requesting the establishment of end-to-end key performance indicators.
7	DFS should improve reporting on GFSS implementation and ensure that data for all reported benefits and cost/saving analysis provided by entities responsible for the strategy's pillar activities are complete, accurate and supported by sufficient evidence.	Important	Yes	USG, DFS	Second quarter of 2015	DFS' comments are reflected in the draft report. In addition, the Department will issue instructions on reporting requirements for future costs/benefits reports.
8	DFS should better organize and maintain important GFSS documents to improve communication and information sharing on the implementation of GFSS and to use in the post-GFSS period.	Important	Yes	USG, DFS	Second quarter of 2015	DFS' comments are reflected in the draft report. In addition, the GFSS Implementation Coordination Team will re-organize its documents library to better capture the implementation of GFSS processes.