

# **HLCM Retreat**

14-15 January 2013

United Nations System Staff College

Torino, Italy

---

A non-paper to guide discussions on the  
HLCM's Strategic Plan and the Committee's working modalities

*(7 January 2013)*

## Table of contents

	Page
Background .....	1
Introductory points .....	2
Priority issues emerging from consultations .....	5
A. The UN workforce: adjusting to the new environment .....	5
B. The efficiency agenda/re-designing business models: right-sourcing, common services, and new technologies.....	7
C. Delivering as one: Supporting its second generation .....	9
D. Accountability, oversight and risk management .....	10
E. Measuring & communicating Results .....	10
HLCM's methods of work .....	12
ANNEXES	
Annex I - List of consultations undertaken in preparation for the Retreat	
Annex II - Terms of Reference of the High Level Committee on Management	

## I. Background

1. At its 24th Session in September 2012, the High Level Committee on Management called for the development of a Strategic Plan to guide its work for the next three to five years, a plan which should also be useful in the context of the second phase of the CEB Review.
2. During November and December 2012, HLCM representatives and Network Chairs were invited to participate in a consultative process led, on behalf of HLCM Chair Francis Gurry, by David B. Waller, former Deputy Director General and Head of Management, IAEA.
3. Consultations focused on organizational change and management reform priorities that HLCM representatives saw confronting both their respective organizations *and* the broader UN system during the next three to five years – priorities concerning which they saw value in collective discussion and coordinated action through the HLCM. The objective was to initiate the process of identifying a set of priority issues around which to focus the work of the Committee in the medium term. The six clusters of issues that emerged are outlined in Section III of this non-paper.
4. The HLCM Retreat scheduled for 14-15 January 2013 would build on these consultations, paving the way for the development of a Strategic Plan – reflecting the collective vision of the HLCM membership – aimed at reinforcing the Committee's value and relevance for both the CEB and its member organizations.
5. The Strategic Plan – complemented by a set of agreed deliverables and corresponding timelines, accountabilities, and working arrangements – would be presented for discussion and approval at the HLCM's 25th Session in March 2013.
6. The full list of consultations undertaken in preparation for the Retreat is contained in Annex I.
7. All HLCM representatives (with one accompanying staff, if desired) have been invited to participate in the Retreat, together with HLCM Network Chairs (HR, FB, ICT, Procurement, and IASMN), and leaders of those UNDG groups and task forces the work of which is relevant to that of the HLCM (High Level Group in charge of the Standard Operating Procedures; Joint Funding & Business Operations Network; and, the Resident Coordinator System Issues). The Director of UN Development Operations Coordination Office was also invited.
8. The Terms of Reference of the High Level Committee on Management are attached as Annex II.

## II. Introductory points

9. Consultations with HLCM members highlighted general perceptions and assessments – common to many – on a number of points, as follows:
  - (a) The world has changed dramatically in recent years, but the UN system has failed to keep pace – regarding, for example, its use of information technology and its management of human, financial and other resources.
  - (b) A driving question is how, in this new setting, the HLCM can contribute to the building of a highly effective network of intergovernmental organizations.
  - (c) The HLCM gathers high-level talent and expertise in the area of management. It should better leverage this talent to drive a number of UN system-wide reforms. The Committee should be a respected source of inspiration, and a catalyst to action.
  - (d) A three to four year HLCM Strategic Plan, consisting of a limited number of priorities – with corresponding objectives and milestones – would set the tone for a common vision. And, CEB ratification of the Plan would reinforce that vision.
  - (e) The recently adopted Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) of operational activities for development of the UN system, together with General Assembly Resolution 64/289 on System-wide coherence, provide ample room for a bolder HLCM agenda focused on an administration and management function more adaptive and agile in delivering programmatic mandates.
  - (f) By determining the commonalities that can make a quantum difference we can identify the horizontal system-wide priorities for inclusion in the Strategic Plan – for linkage, as appropriate, to internal efforts by individual organizations.
  - (g) The priorities under consideration at the retreat and the concrete deliverables to be attached to them must take due account of the differences between organizations in terms of their business models; how far advanced, or lagging behind, they are in the various areas of management reform; the capacity and specific skills they have in such areas; and, any special investments they have already made.

- (h) All too often issues are discussed but not resolved by the HLCM. The Committee should be more decisive – take decisions and implement them. Committee meetings should avoid a format that mirrors that of governing bodies, i.e., long on courtesy, and striving to find consensus.
- (i) The dynamics within the HLCM too often exhibit damage control rather than constructive discussion.
- (j) In exercising leadership the HLCM/CEB should dare to formulate and put forward far-reaching, game-changing proposals, even in the absence of explicit mandates from Member States. Governing Bodies would then, at least, have to consider such proposals.
- (k) The degree of potential linkage among different areas of work of the UN system has become much greater. But, at the same time, the distinction between HQ and field based organizations is broadening. Among the reasons for this is the deterioration of security conditions making work in the field much more dangerous and the focus on safety and security much greater.
- (l) More generally, the HLCM dedicates considerable attention to issues pertinent to field-based operations; issues that sometimes have little relevance for HQ-based organizations, especially smaller ones.
- (m) There is direct relevance between the HLCM's Terms of Reference and one of the two "enablers" identified by the Secretary-General in his "Five-Year Action Agenda" for the UN itself. That "enabler" – referred to as "Strengthening the United Nations" – is outlined as follows:
  1. **Ensure the more effective delivery of mandates and do more within recognized resource constraints through innovation and change management initiatives**, including by facilitating a review of the current budget process.
  2. **Build a modern workforce supported by a global Secretariat** that shares financial, human and physical resources, knowledge and information technology more effectively, including through the robust implementation of the Umoja initiative.
  3. **Make the United Nations more open, flexible and accountable**, including by adopting a results-based planning, accountability and management system, streamlining budgeting and implementing a system-wide risk management approach.
  4. **Launch a second generation of "Delivering as one"**, which will focus on managing and monitoring for results, ensuring increased accountability and improved outcomes.

5. **Enhance the safety and security of UN staff** by mainstreaming security resource and personnel decisions through all relevant planning and budget processes, increasing security threat analysis capabilities at more UN field locations and improving national and international staff security training to match the threat environments in which the UN operates. The UN must also increase its support for staff affected by trauma.

(n) Discussion at the retreat should remain cognizant of the evolving post-2015 development agenda.

### III. Priority issues emerging from the consultation

#### A. The UN workforce: adjusting to the new environment

10. Human resources constitute by far the greatest expense of UN system organizations – often consuming 70% or more of organizations’ budgets. Thus, its effective management is unquestionably a priority for all UN system organizations.
11. The last few years have witnessed an increasing push – from both within and outside the UN system – to modernize its human resources management. The General Assembly adopted the new contractual framework, conditions of service in non-family duty stations have been harmonized, the normal retirement age has been increased to 65 for new staff members, and the UN Secretariat is striving to implement a mobility policy, but more needs to be done.
12. There is an increasing mismatch between the programmes the UN system organizations are called upon to deliver, and both the skills of their staff and the tools available to manage them – with respect to recruitment, performance, dismissal, compensation, motivation, and professional development.
13. The difficult global financial environment has brought greater attention to this mismatch, resulting in calls for game-changing action. The UN Common System has been called into question, and its governance and mechanisms challenged. Against this backdrop a number of organizations have moved ahead – outside of the official framework – adopting business models increasingly reliant on outsourced workers, non-staff personnel, and implementing partners.
14. There are key questions to be answered concerning the characteristics of an international civil service best able to function in the new environment. What is the ideal balance between younger and more mature staff, between generalists and specialists, and between internal and external sources of talent and expertise? Which and what percentage of positions should offer career potential? What and how many types of employment contracts should be utilized? Should there be term limits in regular staff contracts? And what are the appropriate levels of compensation?
15. Relevant actors are engaged in potentially significant initiatives: the ICSC with its recently launched review of UN Conditions of Service, and its review of the implications of applying the increased mandatory age to current staff members; and the Member States with the on-going pay-freeze negotiations and the increasing push for reduction of entitlements. UN top management can and should play a more active role in these initiatives.

16. The HLCM's HR management reform agenda has as its overarching goal the development of the international civil service as an independent, neutral, highly skilled resource to meet the ever-changing requirements of the international community.
17. The most immediate and obvious means to pursue this goal is by engaging in an aggressive and constructive dialogue with the ICSC in the context of its review of the Conditions of Service for UN system staff. However, HLCM could go further and direct its focus beyond the existing mechanisms that govern the UN Common System, and develop and put forward more innovative and game-changing proposals for consideration by all stakeholders, i.e. the ICSC itself, the Member States in the various governing bodies, and the staff.
18. One such proposal could be to move away from the existing administratively cumbersome and costly model to a modern compensation system – with simplified and streamlined administration, including lump-summing.
19. The fundamental challenge of an HR management reform agenda is to determine how to attract, retain, and promote the talent necessary to deliver the broad spectrum of programmatic activity in the multitude of geographic locations where the UN system operates. In that regard, the UN's competitiveness as an employer remains somewhat anecdotal. There is a widely shared perception of deterioration, particularly in the field and in hardship duty stations, reaching the extremes in the case of women. HLCM could conduct a more systematic gathering and monitoring of data on relevant trends, also assessing the impact of the new conditions of service in non-family duty stations, and more generally the gender-friendliness of staff policies. Using that information the Committee could develop recommendations for the General Assembly.
20. In this connection, as many organizations are striving to adjust their internal mobility policies in support of skill and career development, achieving true inter-agency mobility – including through practical means such as bilateral or multilateral exchanges from job pools – is an objective that many members assign to HLCM as its natural owner.
21. A key component of any grand compact is performance & accountability of management and staff: how best to empower staff and managers, ensure greater responsibility and accountability, reward strong performance, and improve and/or sanction poor performance.
22. A corollary to any meaningful HR management reform by the HLCM is an assessment of the administrative tribunals' jurisprudence and its impact on the ability of organizations to act effectively on performance management. An in-depth analysis of the tribunals' decisions could lead the HLCM to put forward to the General Assembly adjustments or, where appropriate, radical changes.



## B. The efficiency agenda/re-designing our business models: right-sourcing, common services, and new technologies

23. Considerable work has been carried out in this arena in the last four years by HLCM, through its *Plan of Action for the Harmonization of Business Practices*. The intent of that Plan was to launch seed projects to demonstrate the value of joint or collaborative work in operations, and to serve as a catalyst to spread a culture of collaboration through the successful initiatives. A quantum leap is now necessary – building on these foundations put in place through the Plan, and broadening its scope and ambition.
24. One focus area is the development of options for consolidation and/or pooling of support services. The QCPR provides an explicit mandate in this regard, inclusive of strict deadlines<sup>1</sup>. In pursuing this goal, HLCM will have to make a realistic assessment of the differences between organizations in terms of their business models; how advanced their expertise is in the selected field; the capacity they have; and, any investments they may have already made in any such fields.
25. Proven success in a given domain would lead to recognition of competitive advantage and, therefore, of natural leadership in that area. In exercising such leadership, any organization acting on behalf of others would have to do so within clear accountability frameworks and SLAs – a “service culture” must be developed and maintained. Customer organizations must be confident the services they are receiving are the best available.
26. A pre-condition for any successful undertaking in this arena is the active and constructive engagement of the Legal Services of each member organization, possibly in a coordinated manner through the Legal Network, to develop and conclude the necessary inter-agency frameworks and other agreements. Here, too, the QCPR provides a clear and strong mandate<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> **QCPR, paragraph 152:** “Requests the United Nations development system funds and programmes and encourages the specialized agencies and other entities of the United Nations to further pursue [...] the consolidation of support services at the country level, by either delegating common functions to a lead agency, establishing a common UN service centre or, where feasible, outsourcing support services [...], and to submit joint plans [...] in the first regular session in 2014”. See also **paragraph 155:** “Requests the Secretary-General through the High Level Committee on Management and the UN Development Group to present plans for the establishment of common support services at the country, regional and headquarter levels, based on a unified set of regulations and rules, policies and procedures, at the country, regional and headquarter levels, in the functional areas of finance, human resources management, procurement, information technology management and other administrative services for review by ECOSOC and approval by the Executive Boards of funds and programmes and governing bodies of specialized agencies by end of 2014 with a view of implementation by 2016”.

<sup>2</sup> **QCPR, paragraph 154:** “Requests funds and programmes, and encourages the specialized agencies and other entities of the UN system, to develop and conclude inter-agency framework agreements regarding the provision of support services regulating the mutual validity of agreements between UN entities and third parties at the country level and delegating the authority to country teams to establish and manage common services and long-term

27. The scope for the potential development of shared and common service models, including through leveraging the UN system's collective scale for joint purchasing, is wide – careful prioritization would therefore be required, as not all areas are equally ripe for exploitation.
28. One area which has seen significant advancements in the past two to three years, through the combined efforts of HLCM and UNDG, is Procurement – the QCPR recognizes that more can be achieved in this area.<sup>3</sup> Advancements have also been made in Treasury Services, with considerable potential for more. There have been system wide efforts to achieve greater synergies by aligning the purchasing and reviewing processes in the area of Human Resources - starting with job classification, the early parts of the recruitment process (e.g. common advertisement, testing, rostering), as well as contract administration. Most of these areas, nevertheless, lack the necessary underlying feasibility and cost-benefit analyses. One function, Payroll, is considered by many to be low-hanging fruit among the services with potential for consolidation.
29. Any forward-looking review of the UN business models should include an HLCM-driven effort to achieve measurable progress to enhance environmental sustainability of UN operations, through joint initiatives possibly focused on facilities management and procurement.
30. In considering innovative business models, the use of ICT as an agent of change, improved knowledge management and increased collaboration within the system and with other partners, are fundamental.
31. In some of the areas that have been analysed, the introduction of technology is a pre-condition for action, not an end in itself. In such cases, the technology-related initiatives must be driven by the underlying objective; focus must remain on the eventual benefit to be realized, not on the means to pursue it. For example, some degree of interoperability of ERP systems<sup>4</sup> would be necessary to consolidate certain support services, or to achieve consistency in financial and results reporting to the Member States.

---

agreements with third parties through standardized inter-agency agreements without further approval requirements by the end of 2013;

<sup>3</sup> **QCPR, paragraph 156:** "Recognizes that more cost-effective, efficient and harmonized procurement practices can help to achieve greater effectiveness [...]. In this regard, requests [...] to address the barriers to greater procurement co-operation, and to [...] to redirect efficiency savings, including from economies of scale, into programmes; and to make full use of the existing Long Term Agreements, develop new ones and to implement the guidelines on Common Procurement at the Country Level".

<sup>4</sup> On this subject, the QCPR (**paragraph 160**): "[...] requests the Secretary-General, to undertake a study to examine the feasibility of establishing interoperability among the existing ERP systems of the funds and programmes and report progress in achieving full interoperability in 2016 in the context of the QCPR".

32. In other cases, new technologies have value in themselves, as they open entirely new horizons to re-shape the operational models of UN organizations: cloud computing; meeting and conference services; compilation and availability of system-wide data and information, etc.

### C. Delivering as one: Supporting its second generation

33. The QCPR (paragraph 134) “Recognizes the achievements and experience of the implementation of the DaO by a number of pilot programme countries on a voluntary basis as an important contribution for enhancing the coherence, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the UN development system in those countries, strengthening national ownership and leadership in the operational activities for development of the UN system and achieving strategic results, especially on cross-cutting issues; and furthermore notes that a number of programme countries have adopted the “delivering as one” modality on a self-starter basis, and that their experience can positively contribute to enhancing United Nations operational activities at the country level”.
34. In his Five-year Action Plan, the Secretary-General includes as one of the “enablers” for “Strengthening the United Nations”: the “Launch of a second generation of "Delivering as one", which will focus on managing and monitoring for results, ensuring increased accountability and improved outcomes”.
35. Building on the considerable efforts and resources already dedicated to assisting UN Country Teams in their efforts to “Deliver as one”, HLCM, in coordination with UNDG, should be a driving force in shaping the next generation of this undertaking.
36. The relationship between HQ and regional/local levels is an increasingly important and challenging issue. For this reason, the HLCM should guide the efforts directed at following-up on lessons learned and solutions initiated, so as to address bottlenecks at the country level and develop system-wide solutions. This approach should help ensure the alignment of country-level operations with priorities at the HQ/policy level.
37. In so doing, it should be acknowledged that the interests and role of the HLCM go beyond Delivering as one, and beyond the development system; rather, they extend to the operational needs of the broader humanitarian and emergency sectors as a whole. At the same time, it should be recognized that some of the focus of Delivering as one is not directly relevant to all member organizations. Nevertheless, the work initiated through the Delivering as one, and the subsequent Joint UNDG-HLCM Mission, serves as a catalyst for further system wide-operations, not only at the country level. In this respect, the HLCM serves as the global management policy forum for the UN system.

## D. Accountability, Oversight Architecture, and Risk Management

38. Most UN system organizations have or are in the process of strengthening their internal control and risk management processes. The objectives are to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of operations, reliability of financial and performance reporting, and compliance with rules and regulations. This is about “better control”, not “more control”, through a process designed to identify events that could affect the entity, and manage the risk within its risk appetite, so as to provide reasonable assurance regarding achievement of the organization’s objectives. The recent initial sharing of approaches and best practices could lead the way for the HLCM to advance joint work on these subjects.
39. Concurrently, “more control” is being imposed on organizations through various mechanisms, , in particular the increasing frequency and scope of external performance auditing, leading to questions regarding organizations’ risk appetite.
40. The underlying challenge is to derive greater value from the UN’s audit and oversight architecture, by assessing its increasing costs and focusing, in partnership with oversight entities, on strengthening accountability – both corporate and individual - and managing and mitigating risks.
41. In this connection, the HLCM could add value in the area of crisis preparedness and response, business continuity and cyber-security. Despite some organization-specific requirements – such as the information security concerns facing WIPO and IAEA – UN system organizations recognize the critical role of ICT as the backbone of the operational system. They recognize considerable common ground with respect to how to best protect themselves from business disruptions and security threats; and how to do so while, at the same time, providing increasingly open and user-friendly ICT and web-enabled services and communications.

## E. Measuring and Communicating Results

42. The United Nations system must consistently and continuously nurture and maintain its constituencies. Governments and the general public alike, all-too-often, do not fully understand the scale and the universal nature of the system. Improving this understanding requires greater transparency and raising awareness of what the system does and the achievements it makes.

43. This priority moves in parallel with the efficiency agenda and is framed within the objective of ensuring that the UN system represents value for money and makes effective use of the limited resources at its disposal. Here, the linkages with the other two pillars of CEB, particularly HLCP, are evident.
44. The QCPR too, recognizes this priority and, in paragraph 36, “Encourages funds, programmes and specialized agencies to further improve their communication to the general public on their mandates and development results [...]”.
45. Because the UN system is not always good at telling its story, it risks being crowded out by institutions more skilled and forceful in getting out their message. In order to address this challenge, the system and its partners have to consider more direct, emphatic and compelling approaches to communication, so as to positively influence perceptions.
46. In this connection, it is important to develop strong communication campaigns providing government representatives and lawmakers in our Member States with tools to justify to their constituents support of United Nations organizations.
47. Stakeholders are evaluating more rigorously the impact and results delivered by UN organizations, and are continuously considering alternatives that might be capable of providing greater value. The global communities the UN system serves have become more sophisticated in their information needs and the organizations’ information content and the means by which it is delivered often seem inadequate and out-dated to younger and other intended mass audiences.
48. Given that much of the criticism is focused on management issues - including transparency, efficiency and best practices - the role the HLCM could play in this area is fundamental.
49. Advancing the conversation with the UN Foundation concerning external communication – as begun at the HLCM’s session in September 2011 – could be an effective first step in pursuing this objective.
50. Important in this undertaking would be the further integration of risk management into the programme planning processes (see part D above) and within the performance dialogue with legislative bodies and Member States.
51. Concurrently, the HLCM could continue sharing approaches that members have found useful in measuring their performance, and communicating it to donors, as well as its efforts to develop common methodologies for measuring and calculating efficiencies.
52. The HLCM could also pursue the development of approaches to demonstrate that savings have been translated into increased resources for the implementation of programmatic activities.

53. In this regard, the Common Results Reporting Principles, jointly developed by HLCM and UNDG, and endorsed by CEB in 2011, represent a first step towards more simplified, consistent, and measurable reporting on results by the UN system organizations. They would need to be further elaborated, with an active engagement by HLCP, leading to the development of a standard language in communicating results to Member States and the public.
54. Closely related to measurement and communication of results is the topic of competition for and scarcity of financial resources, and the related question of how the UN system can move from a classical “financial management” model towards more “strategic management” of resources. Given the breadth, complexity and political dimensions of this issue the HLCM would need to carefully define, plan and focus any related work.

#### **IV. HLCM’s Methods of Work**

55. A broad consensus emerged during the consultations regarding the value of formulating the HLCM’s agenda on the basis of subjects directly relevant to the Committee’s Strategic Plan – as developed based on discussions at the Retreat.
56. Each HLCM session could devote at least a half-day to comprehensive discussions on a single thematic topic of common interest. As several Committee members stressed, good policy level discussion of this nature requires considerable preparation. The CEB Secretariat in support of HLCM consists of three Professional advisors – one each for the HR, FB and ICT Networks – plus the HLCM Secretary, and limited resources for ad-hoc external capacity (\$40,000 for consultancy and temporary assistance, for the biennium). Thus, interested member organizations would need to take the lead and/or actively engage in the preparation of the substantive sessions, with the HLCM Secretariat continuing to offer coordination, data-gathering and – limited – substantive support.
57. A possible approach to pursue joint work could be an opt-in/opt-out approach, where initially a small group of members interested in advancing a particular topic would conduct groundwork to prepare for a discussion, and possibly pilot implementation, with others joining in at later stages, depending on the evolving scope and potential impact of the discussion/implementation. This approach could be useful, for example, in the case of issues that are location-specific.
58. HLCM could consider a more informal setting for its meetings – more of a retreat format. Also, presentations and/or other contributions by outside experts – both from the private sector and leading governmental and non-for-profit institutions – could be useful in advancing discussions of certain topics. In any case, representation should remain at the level of the member organization’s most senior official in management/operations/administration.

59. HLCM documentation would better serve its purpose if prepared along the lines of succinct executive briefs, such as those used within member organizations, ministries, etc.
60. There was also broad consensus that HLCM's agenda not include reports from the Networks (including IASMN) *per se*. Rather, Networks would contribute their input, were relevant, in the context of the discussion under the substantive thematic agenda items. This would contribute to a more a cross-functional approach to discussions – reducing the current more 'silo' approach of the Networks.
61. Similarly, the dialogue with the Staff Federations would not be a stand-alone item on the agenda. The Federations would, instead, contribute their views in the course of the discussion of those thematic agenda items in which they are invited to participate as observers. Regarding the most desirable extent of participation by Staff Federations, the prevailing view emerging from the consultations was to reduce the current level, and instead conduct dialogue with Staff through other designated mechanism(s). No consensus emerged as to what mechanism(s) would be best.
62. The new accountability framework would empower the Networks to take decisions on behalf of the Committee on matters delegated to them by the HLCM. In turn, the Networks would provide periodic written reports to the Committee on results achieved against agreed deliverables. Such reports would be subject to review and approval on a no-objection basis by HLCM, via electronic means, in advance of each session of the Committee. Only subjects that the Networks cannot resolve would be elevated for consideration by the Committee. In this context, the HLCM would function like a board of directors, and provide the Networks guidance and direction to solve those outstanding issues.
63. Effective functioning of this model would require organizations to ensure that their representation in Networks is at a level with full decision-making authority in the respective domains, i.e. the most senior manager in each function (HR, FB, ICT, Procurement, and IASMN). Also, Network meetings would have to be conducted sufficiently in advance of HLCM sessions.
64. Although the Networks' programmes of work would be driven by the HLCM Strategic Plan, Networks would retain the prerogative, indeed, they would be encouraged to flag or propose issues for the attention of HLCM.
65. Coordination among the three CEB pillars – HLCM, HLCP and UNDG – should be reinforced, and linkages more aggressively exploited. A useful model in this regard is the integration of operations in the UNDAF.

66. Finally, the HLCM must remain ever mindful of a fundamental point: *management serves the programmes.*



## **Annex I**

### **List of consultations undertaken in preparation for the Retreat**

WIPO:	Mr. Francis Gurry, Director General and HLCM Chair Mr. Ambi Sundaram, ADG, Administration and Management
UNAIDS:	Ms. Jan Beagle, Deputy Executive Director and HLCM Vice-Chair
UNHCR:	Mr. T. Alexander Aleinikoff, Deputy High Commissioner
ILO:	Mr. Greg Vines, Deputy Director-General for Management and Reform Mr. Greg Johnson, Treasurer and Financial Comptroller Mr. Juan Llobera, Director, a.i. HR Division Mr. David Macdonald, Chief, Procurement Bureau
WMO:	Mr. Joachim Müller, Director, Resource Management Department
ITU:	Ms. Julia Watt, Chief, HR Management Department
WTO:	Ms. Mira Bacelj, Director, HR Division
UNFPA:	Ms. Anne-Birgitte Albrechtsen, Deputy Executive Director (Management) Mr. Subhash K. Gupta, Director, Division for Management Services
UN:	Ms. Susana Malcorra, Chef de Cabinet Mr. Yuko Takasu, USG for Management Ms. Catherine Pollard, ASG, Office of HR Management, Co-Chair of the HR Network Ms. Gina Casar, ASG and Comptroller
UNICEF:	Mr. Martin Mogwanja, Deputy Executive Director
IAEA:	Ms. Janice Dunn Lee, Deputy Director-General and Head of Management
ICAO:	Ms. Fang Liu, Director, Bureau of Administration and Services
UNOV/UNODC:	Mr. Dennis Thatchaichawalit, Director, Division for Management
UNDP:	Mr. Jens Wandel, Assistant Administrator & Director, Bureau of Management Mr. Darshak Shah, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Deputy Director & Chief Finance Officer - Co-Chair of the FB Network
IMO:	Mr. Jo Espinoza-Ferrey, Director, Administrative Division
IMF:	Mr. Frank Harnischfeger, Director, Technology & General Services Department
World Bank:	Mr. Trikkur V. Somanathan, Director, General Services Department Mr. Adeyinka Okuwoga, Manager, Division for Support Services Mr. Jeffrey Culver, Manager, Division Manager for Corporate Security
WFP:	Mr. Robert Opp, Director, Business Innovation & Support
PAHO:	Mr. Guillermo A. Birmingham, Director of Administration
WHO:	Mr. Mohamed Jama, ADG for General Management Mr. Nick Jeffreys, Comptroller, Co-Chair of the FB Network Mr. Peters Mertens, Management Coordinator, Office of the Director-General
UNESCO:	Mr. Getachew Engida, Deputy Director General
IFAD:	Ms. Lakshmi Menon, Head of the Corporate Services Department
UNEP:	Mr. Christophe Bouvier, Chief, Office for Operations

FAO: Mr. Dan Gustafson, Deputy Director-General (Operations)  
Ms. Theresa Panuccio, Director, Administrative Services Division

UNOPS: Mr. Vitaly Vanshelboim, Deputy Executive Director

UNWTO: Mr. José G. Blanch, Director, Administration and Finance

## Annex II

### Terms of Reference of the High Level Committee on Management

1. The High Level Committee on Management (HLCM) is responsible to CEB for coherent, efficient and cost-effective management across the United Nations system of organizations. It is composed of the most senior administrative managers of each CEB member organization.
2. HLCM acts on behalf of and in the name of CEB on matters affecting the administrative management of all member organizations, both multi-sectoral and specific to a given area.
3. It is charged with identifying and analyzing administrative management issues of common concern, which require a system-wide response. It is authorized to take decisions on behalf of the Executive Heads and to identify, promote and coordinate management reforms that will improve services, achieve productivity improvements and increase efficiency and effectiveness across the United Nations system. It is also responsible for:
  - ensuring the frank sharing of knowledge and experiences in order to enable organizations to profit from best practices;
  - facilitating the continuing dialogue on the reform processes and the management of change underway in the organizations of the system;
  - reviewing issues of an administrative nature submitted to it by UN system groups within or outside the existing CEB machinery and
  - introducing measurable improvements and other administrative reforms.
4. Its work is carried out in the main through task-forces of experts in given administrative areas and also through groups of human resources managers, financial managers and Information Technology managers whose work is guided by HLCM.
5. Recognizing that CEB may from time to time enter into exchanges with the representatives of staff bodies, HLCM is responsible for maintaining an ongoing dialogue with staff representatives on concerns of a system-wide nature. It also interacts, as appropriate, with Member States in the UN's Fifth Committee and with the Chairpersons of ACABQ and ICSC on issues which have, or may have, system-wide implications for the management of resources.
6. Generally, HLCM meets once a year but may hold sessions more frequently if there is a common demand. The Chairperson and any other office bearers rotate among CEB member organizations.