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An integrated set of planning and performance management tools and systems to
improve performance remains an integral part of the Secretary-General’s
action for Peacekeeping (A4P) and the A4P+ plan, the implementation strategy of A4P for 2021-2023. The
A4P+ plan operationalizes the A4P+ implementation strategy through December 2023 by articulating a
focused set of deliverables. The priority projects outlined in the Integrated Peacekeeping Performance
and Accountability Framework (IPPAF) have been integrated

1. Improving performance remains an integral part of the Secretary-General’s Action for Peacekeeping (A4P) and the A4P+ plan, the implementation strategy of A4P for 2021-2023. The A4P+ plan operationalizes the A4P+ implementation strategy through December 2023 by articulating a focused set of deliverables. The priority projects outlined in the Integrated Peacekeeping Performance and Accountability Framework (IPPAF) have been integrated
in and aligned with the A4P+ plan. Progress against the priority projects is also tracked in the A4P+ Monitoring Framework and in the Results Reports as appropriate.

2. In 2018, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping (C34) requested the development of an “integrated performance policy framework”. This was followed by Security Council Presidential Statement 2018/4 and resolution 2436 (2018), which reaffirmed support for the development of such a framework. The Secretariat briefed the C34 on the development of the framework on several occasions and the C34 took note of the framework in its 2021 report (A/75/19, para 93), calling upon the Secretariat to continue implementing and reviewing it, providing regular updates to the C34, and maintaining close consultations with Member States (para 97).

3. During the High-Level Event on Peacekeeping Performance on 6 December 2019, the Secretary-General committed “to build a framework, in cooperation with Troop and Police-Contributing Countries (T/PCCs), to better systematize performance evaluation and accountability”. Under-Secretary-General (USG) Lacroix emphasized the need to “enhance every link in the chain of standards, selection, evaluations, recognition of outstanding performance, remedial action and accountability”. He outlined work to further “refine and tailor our in-mission evaluations and ensure that every Force Commander, Police Commissioner and evaluated unit has a performance improvement plan”. USG Lacroix also mentioned “a new system to evaluate Force and Sector Headquarters.”

4. As the C34 reaffirmed in its 2020 and 2021 report, the effective implementation of peacekeeping mandates is contingent upon several critical factors, including well-defined, realistic, and achievable mandates, political will, leadership, performance and accountability at all levels, adequate resources, policy, planning and operational guidelines, and training (A/74/19, para 84, A/75/19, para 92). Through the A4P declaration, Member States also committed to pursue clear, focused, sequenced, prioritized and achievable mandates by the Security Council matched by appropriate resources; to seek measures to enable greater coherence between mandates and resources; and to support the implementation of Security Council resolutions through their bilateral and multilateral engagements.

5. Performance in UN peacekeeping is a collective effort that involves Member States, including Host States, the Secretariat, and missions. Each have distinctive responsibilities for performance. In line with their commitment in the A4P declaration, host governments have an important role to cooperate with peacekeeping operations in the pursuit of Security Council mandates, including facilitating access, and national responsibilities related to the safety and security of peacekeepers.

6. This paper describes the IPPAF, as well as key initiatives by DPO, DOS and DMSPC to strengthen performance and accountability in UN peacekeeping. The Framework will help strengthen linkages between these initiatives and identify areas where additional efforts are required. Given the broad scope of the framework and its applicability to all

---

1 The C34 also encouraged the use of data gathered through the Comprehensive Planning and Performance Assessment System (CPAS) to support implementation of the framework (para 100) and for medical standards of hospital units to be assessed in line with the framework (para 169).
peacekeepers, its development and implementation requires the combined efforts and strong ownership across DPO, DOS and DMSPC and Member States.

**Elements of the Framework**

7. The requests by the C34 and the Security Council for an integrated performance policy framework are not identical, but they do include some common core elements. These are:

- The framework should apply to all categories of personnel working in and supporting peacekeeping operations.
- It should be comprised of clear standards that facilitate effective mandate implementation.
- The framework should include a comprehensive and objective methodology based on clear benchmarks or indicators.
- The framework should detail accountability for underperformance and incentives and recognition for outstanding performance.

8. As shown in the visual in Annex 1, the IPPAF is comprised of four elements:

   A. Mandates and other intergovernmental guidance
   B. Policies, guidance, and standards (including personnel and unit selection)
   C. Methodologies and tools for performance assessment
   D. Accountability and remedial measures and incentives

9. The IPPAF is a living document that will be updated regularly. It lists the key policies and standards (see Annex 2) and explains, in as much detail as possible, the consequences of failures to meet those standards (underperformance) and incentives and recognition for outstanding performance, as well as the related steps that are taken by all parties for different types of personnel and areas. These are included in Annexes 3A (military), 3B (police), 3C (civilian), 3D (contingent owned equipment or COE), and 3E (sexual exploitation and abuse or SEA).

10. The IPPAF also identifies areas where the standards and the consequences and related steps should be clarified or strengthened (with a clear allocation of responsibility and timelines to do so). In some areas both the standards and processes are relatively clear but generally do not result in accountability for poor performance. The priority areas are listed in the table of contents on page 1 and each project includes a detailed description in Annex 4. Following progress and a decision among the involved offices to continue working on these priority areas going forward, three priority projects were closed in the June 2021 revision of the IPPAF².

11. A key additional challenge is to enhance coherence among the different performance assessment systems, which serve different purposes, were established by different legislative bodies and are managed by different departments. Key goals of the development and implementation of the IPPAF are to ensure that the tools give a

---

² These include the previous Annex 4D: Strengthening remedial and accountability mechanisms for formed units, including through performance improvement plans for every evaluated unit, Annex 4F: Review and update of military and police guidance documents related to performance and Annex 4N: Strengthening reporting to the Security Council on peacekeeping performance and accountability issues.
comprehensive and coherent picture of peacekeeping performance and, where possible, to reduce the burden on missions by limiting redundancy and data collection requirements between the tools.

**Mandates and other intergovernmental guidance**

12. At the organisational performance level, Member States have a responsibility for mandating the Secretariat and peacekeeping missions and providing intergovernmental guidance. Missions require Member States, legislative and intergovernmental bodies, and the Secretariat to work together to achieve the objectives of peacekeeping mandates. Security Council mandates provide the basis to establish peacekeeping operations and set out reporting requirements. The C34 is responsible for undertaking a comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects and to make proposals to enhance the peacekeeping capacities of the United Nations (UN). The reports of the Special Committee allow for the tracking of the progress made in the implementation of its various recommendations.

13. Security Council resolution 2436 (2018) emphasizes the need to have clear performance standards for evaluating all UN civilian and uniformed personnel working in peacekeeping and calls for more accountability on the part of missions’ senior leadership. Specific mandate resolutions also request the Secretary-General to report on, inter alia, missions’ performance and actions taken to address performance challenges.

14. Member States also have a responsibility to provide adequate funding for missions to implement their mandated tasks. The General Assembly’s Fifth Committee and Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) play important roles to ensure missions are resourced appropriately.

15. Host-state support to facilitate implementation of the mandate of peacekeeping operations is essential and includes responsibilities such as respecting the privileges and immunities of the UN, protecting the status of the mission and its personnel, guaranteeing their safety and to ensure freedom of movement of mission personnel and assets. Host state support on visa and customs clearances, as well as adherence to the status of forces agreement (SOFA) is equally critical.

16. Through Security Council and General Assembly (GA) resolutions, Member States have addressed a number of issues related to the Conduct and Discipline framework, in addition to the stipulations of the UN Charter, staff rules and other administrative issuances and policy documents applicable specifically to uniformed personnel. Security Council resolution 2272 (2016), for example, endorses the decision of the Secretary-General to repatriate a particular unit when there is credible evidence of widespread or systemic sexual exploitation and abuse and sets out the steps and measures expected from the Secretariat, as well as contributing countries. Further, in GA resolution 76/274, Member States emphasized the importance of adequate energy and waste management in order to minimize risk to people, societies and ecosystems, and requested the Secretary-General to intensify the efforts aimed at reducing the overall environmental footprint of missions, including through the implementation of environmentally responsible waste
management and power generation systems, also working towards a potential positive legacy for host communities.

17. The Manual on Policies and Procedures concerning the Reimbursement and Control of Contingent Owned Equipment of Troop/Police Contributors Participating in Peacekeeping Missions (the COE Manual) details the procedures authorized by the GA for determining reimbursement to Member States for contingent owned equipment. The COE Manual, and the procedures and rates of reimbursement included in it, are subject to review every three years through the COE Working Group and the Fifth Committee of the GA. The recommendations of 2020 COE Working Group as endorsed by General Assembly resolution 74/279, have been reflected in the current version of the COE Manual (A/75/121). The 2023 meeting of the Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment concluded in January 2023. The decisions of the GA on the recommendations of the 2023 COE Working Group will take effect on 1 July 2023 and will be reflected in a new version of the COE Manual.

18. For UN staff, the GA provides Staff Regulations that set out the broad principles of human resources policy and form the basis of Staff Rules issued by the Secretary-General (ST/SGB/2014/2), promulgated through ST/SGBs. ST/AIs further elaborate the regulations and ST/SGBs, such as the administrative instructions on the performance management system (ST/AI/2021/4). Uniformed personnel seconded on professional posts follow UN staff rules and regulations, while the rules and regulations for experts on mission apply to individual police officers (IPOs), formed police unit (FPU) members, military observers, staff officers and government-provided personnel. Individual members of military contingents are also governed by relevant intergovernmental guidance applicable to them.

**Policies, guidance, and standards**

19. Together with Security Council mandates and intergovernmental guidance, policies and other types of guidance define parameters and standards for the work of peacekeeping operations against which performance can be assessed. To complement the legislative directives, other types of guidance are developed internally by DPO, DOS and DMSPC (often in consultation with Member States) or are the result of decisions by the Secretary-General. Policies provide an articulation of the institutional position, intent and/or direction on an issue or activity in UN peacekeeping and help ensure institutional consistency. Other guidance, which may include SOPs, Guidelines, Manuals, Handbooks etc., provide instructions or direction on how to implement specific tasks, processes, or activities. In the area of peacekeeping, DPO, DOS and DMSPC have developed more than 230 policies and SOPs, over 60 manuals and 170 guidelines covering all sectors and mandate areas, including both substantive and mission support.

---

3 The Security Council has echoed this language in several resolutions, including the 2022 mandates for Somalia (S/RES/2628) and Mali (S/RES/2640), mentioning the concept of positive legacy and noting the goal of expanded renewable energy use in missions to enhance safety and security, save costs, offer efficiencies and benefit the mission.
20. Key guidance documents are listed in Annex 2. DPO is working on additional and updated guidance and standards for uniformed personnel, including:

- Military tasks, standards, and indicators to be included in all military unit manuals (completed for six of the UN Military Unit Manuals and three are ongoing\(^4\)).
- Operational Readiness Assurance and Performance Improvement Policy and the Guidelines on Operational Readiness Preparation for Troop Contributing Countries in Peacekeeping Missions (revision started in Dec 2022).
- Policy and SOP on Pre-Deployment Visits (revision started in Nov 2022).
- DPO Counter-Explosive Ordnance Strategy to streamline the role of relevant stakeholders and ensure accountability.
- Review of the Policy on Formed Police Units in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations (2016.10)
- Review of the SOP for Assessment of Operational Capability of Formed Police Units for Service in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions (2017.09)
- Review of the Policy on United Nations Police (2014.01) and the Guidelines on Police Administration (2016.26), Police Capacity-Building and Development (2015.08), Police Command (2015.14) and on Police Operations (2015.15), as well as the manuals on United nations border policing, criminal intelligence gathering, and investigative interviewing, which form part of the Strategic Guidance Framework for International Policing and are being operationalized through the UN Police Training Architecture Programme.

21. The Accountability Framework on Conduct and Discipline, established in 2014, applies to all field missions and is designed to monitor performance of individual missions in addressing conduct and discipline in an effective manner. It is reflected in the Policy on Accountability for conduct and discipline in field mission, which details roles and responsibilities in addressing conduct and discipline of all UN personnel serving in field missions. The Framework established reporting requirements for field missions and outlined indicators and related expectations concerning the performance of activities related to prevention of misconduct, enforcement of UN standards of conduct and policies applicable for the handling of misconduct, and remedial action for victims of sexual exploitation and abuse. It covers training, outreach and awareness raising, risk assessment, effective case management, timeliness of investigations, and actions taken to assist victims of SEA. A variety of special measures have been put into place to eradicate sexual exploitation and abuse. The SEA flowchart (Annex 3E) explains the management of reports and allegations involving UN Personnel in peacekeeping operations.

\(^4\) Military tasks, standards and indicators were included in the 2020.01 UN Infantry Battalion Manual, the 2020.03 UN Military Engineer Unit and CET Search and Detect Manual, the 2021.11 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal Unit Manual, the 2021.04 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Aviation Unit Manual, the 2022.13 UN Peacekeeping Missions Logistics Unit Manual, and the 2022.12 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Peacekeeping-Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Unit Manual. The UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Signals Unit Manual is being finalized and will be promulgated shortly and the revision of the following manuals is ongoing: Jan 2016 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military/Combat Transport Unit Manual, Sept 2015 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Maritime Task Force Manual, and the Jan 2015 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Special Forces Manual. For a full list of military manuals, please see Annex 4C.
22. The 2016 Anti-Fraud and Anti-Corruption Framework of the UN Secretariat (ST/IC/2016/25) sets out the responsibilities to combating fraud and corruption including the investigations through the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS).

23. The Environmental Performance and Risk Management Framework, established under the Environment Strategy for Peace Operations, applies to all missions that manage their own facilities and infrastructure. Building on the implementation of the 2009 DPKO/DFS Environmental Policy, the Strategy began roll-out in 2017 with a vision of deploying responsible missions that achieve maximum efficiency in the use of natural resources, operate at minimum risk to people, societies and ecosystems, and leave a positive legacy. The KPIs in each of the five pillars of energy, water and wastewater, solid and hazardous waste, wider impact/positive legacy, and environmental management system are showing results in meeting mandates such as reducing each mission’s environmental footprint (A/RES/70/286). As further explained in Annex 3F, the Environmental Performance and Risk Management Framework includes a biannual data collection exercise that generates an annual Environmental Scorecard, which is reported to Member States through the performance reports of peacekeeping missions, the UN Support Office for Somalia (UNSOS) and the UN Global Service Centre (GSC). In the spirit of the Environmental Strategy’s wider impact pillar, Member States adopted a resolution recognizing a clean, healthy and sustainable environment as a human right (A/RES/76/300).

24. In addition to supporting the publication of the COE Manual as an official UN document through DGACM, the Uniformed Capabilities Support Division of the Department of Operational Support develops and promulgates derivative guidance to implement the decisions of the triennial meetings of the Working Group on Contingent-owned Equipment.

Methodologies and tools for performance assessment

25. DPO, DOS and DMSPC have a range of tools for performance assessment. Some tools are specifically geared towards assessing the progress of missions in meeting their mandates (e.g., CPAS), while others assess the performance of uniformed components (e.g., Force Commander evaluations of military units and Police Commissioner evaluations of FPUs) and individual staff in both the Secretariat and missions (e.g., performance documents and senior managers compacts).

26. Drawing on a variety of tools for performance assessment and data generated by them, the A4P+ Monitoring System is enabling UN Peacekeeping to assess progress and challenges strengthening UN Peacekeeping. The data-driven framework was designed to measure progress against the seven priority areas and two cross cutting issues. The development and rollout of the A4P+ monitoring framework is enabling more ongoing and in-depth assessment of the successes, challenges and obstacles associated with the work of UN Peacekeeping. They also feed into decision-making for peacekeeping leadership as well as communication with peacekeeping stakeholders. As such it contributes to more systemic results-based management within peacekeeping. Reports on A4P+ results are being shared with the C34 on a bi-annual basis, and thus far in the summer of 2022 and the beginning of 2023. The framework is facilitating the
Secretariat’s regular briefings to Member States on progress implementing A4P+, such as to the Fourth Committee, C34, and Security Council.

27. For organizational performance, these tools include:

- Results-based Management (RBM) is a budgeting and management tool that provides Member States with information on performance against agreed expected accomplishments, indicators, and targets. The RBM covers the entire lifecycle of budget planning, implementation, performance monitoring and reporting, including resources (both HR and financial resources) and relates to the programme and resource performance. In line with the strategic objectives of the mission, organizational units, such as Political Affairs Divisions in missions, plan their resource requirements based on mandated activities, implement them, monitor activity progress and report against the indicators through respective SG reports. All divisions are accountable for progress to the SRSG and subject to reviews of the implementation of their work plans and their contribution to mission strategic and operational plans.

- The results-based frameworks are part of results-based management. The results chains embedded in those frameworks show a chain from inputs to outputs, which contribute to the collective achievement of the objective through results. The frameworks should clearly reflect the results and how they contribute to the collective achievement of the objective. In addition to planning and budgeting, the Secretariat will focus on improving monitoring, reporting and evaluation in order to demonstrate the results to which the Organization contributes.

- CPAS is a planning and performance assessment tool to help missions strengthen mandate delivery. It enables peacekeeping missions to regularly assess their context, develop and update whole-of-mission plans for influencing that context in order to deliver mandated tasks, and uses data to help assess progress. It is helping to better integrate mission civilian, military and police components, and the systematic collection and analysis of data is enabling missions to better assess and show their impact and see trends over time. CPAS also helps missions identify where operations can be strengthened and where their impact is hindered due to factors beyond their control. The data and analysis generated through CPAS is in turn used to support evidence-based decision making by mission leadership and managers, inform operations and planning, and strengthen and streamline reporting and communications.

- Management key performance indicators and dashboards help monitor performance across missions according to defined indicators, many of which relate to strategic and operational elements including areas such as financial or human resources management.

- Umoja, in particular through the Extension 2, provides strategic planning, budgeting and performance management support for the full programme management life cycle, covering strategic planning, resource planning, programme
execution and performance monitoring and management. A performance dashboard has also been launched to all Secretariat entities to provide a 360-degree view of programmes or frameworks and performance for Peacekeeping and Regular Budgets. Umoja Extension 2 also covers the second and third phases of supply chain management, which include tracking and tracing of materials and transportation management (release for these was in December 2019), as well as demand planning (providing visibility to future requirements for materials and services) and supply network planning (planning for supplier networks, replenishment, and safety stocks, among others). Further, the uniformed capabilities management (UCM) solution initially launched in December 2018 ties together the end-to-end planning and associated processes of uniformed capabilities management, such as the definition of unit requirements, memorandums of understanding with troop- and police-contributing countries, field inspections and verifications of contingent-owned equipment, troop strength reporting, and the calculation of claims and reimbursements to troop and police-contributing countries (T/PCCs). UCM enables military and police planners, force generators, finance officers and logisticians to undertake core activities related to troop- and police-contributing countries in a common system that automates labor-intensive processes and eliminates redundant data re-entry, clearly links input and output documents, and facilitates reporting on contingent-owned equipment and military and police personnel.

- The Office for Peacekeeping Strategic Partnership (OPSP) conducts regular integrated reviews of gaps in mandate implementation and performance issues in peacekeeping operations. These reviews include detailed assessments of uniformed units and offer recommendations for the consideration of both UNHQ and field missions. The OPSP also carries out thematic or special reviews and investigations into performance failures, as requested by USG DPO.

- Peacekeeping operations are also the subject of several cross-cutting assessments and audits that cover field operations and UNHQ, including Special Investigations and external oversight through the Board of Auditors and OIOS.

- Special investigations are established by the Secretary-General to examine grave incidents in missions that result in a significant number of casualties, including due to potential failure to protect civilians or UN personnel, or which involve alleged significant performance failings, or potentially have significant implications for mandate implementation. In line with the request by the Security Council in resolution 2436 (2018) and as outlined in the guidelines on Special Investigations, the Secretariat should report on the findings and implementation plans of special investigations to the Security Council and relevant Member States.

---

5 The UN Budget Results Dashboard (results.un.org), updated with all new results presented in the proposed programme budget for 2022, enables users to utilize its search function to enhance accessibility and transparency with regard to the results.

6 The UCM solution includes Status of Unit Requirements (SURs) since December 2018 with the SUR module for Military and Police Planners and significant enhancements to COE Inspection and Verification Reporting Modules. In August 2019, Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs) and COE and Non-COE Claims were added. In December 2020, the Uniformed Strength Reporting and Personnel Cost Reimbursement functionality was added in UCM.
• Boards of Inquiry (BoI) are convened by the Head of Mission, or USG DOS at UNHQ level, to assist in identifying the causes of serious occurrences (such as death of a mission member, kidnapping, PoC-related contravention of rule of engagement or directive on the use of Force) and conducting an after-action review of their management. BoIs also serve to identify gaps in procedures and policies, strengthen internal controls and improve financial and managerial accountability, while helping managers draw lessons that will help prevent similar incidents and improve their management as well as minimize consequences of incidents.

• Environmental scorecards of missions’ environmental performance and risk management provide an indication of policy compliance and progress towards achieving the vision and objectives of the 2017-2023 Environment Strategy for Peace Operations.

• The established systems for knowledge management and organizational learning and for guidance development in peacekeeping – while not a performance assessment tool per se – support ongoing performance improvements by ensuring that lessons-learned and best practices are continuously being documented and can be incorporated into policies and guidance, the delivery of training, and the management of planning and business processes in support of field missions.

28. For civilian staff, these tools include:

• At the senior leadership level at UNHQ and missions, the Secretary-General signs a compact with senior managers (including SRSG) defining their objectives and commitments, including on conduct and discipline. DSRSGs and other senior mission leaders at the ASG-level sign a compact with their respective SRSG or HoM. DSRSG/RC/(HCs) are also subject to additional appraisal and performance management mechanisms implemented by the Development Coordination Office (DCO) and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) specifically for their RC and HC responsibilities. As part of the process, senior leaders submit their self-evaluation on their performance and identify achievements, challenges and remedial actions. In addition, DMSPC monitors how heads of entities (including SRSGs) exercise their delegated decision-making authority over the use of resources in compliance with the applicable legal and policy framework and internal controls.

• For civilian staff at D-2 level and below, the performance management process and framework require staff to set annual goals with their managers and have performance conversations throughout the cycle with their managers who provide ongoing feedback and end-of-cycle evaluations.

• The performance management pilot launched by DMSPC/OHR in 2019 provided an opportunity to test agile concepts and reflect on staff opinions about a new approach. The pilot explored ways to increase feedback practices by (i) encouraging ongoing conversations between First Reporting Officers (FROs) and direct reports, as well as (ii) implementing 360-degree feedback among teams. Overall, there were promising trends toward potential growth and development as a result of feedback practices. The pilot demonstrated an increased awareness and
ease receiving feedback about their performance and leveraging constructive feedback as an opportunity for development.

- The outcome of the agile pilot was reviewed in tandem with the Secretary-General’s performance management reform agenda and enhancements have been made to performance management to shift it from a compliance-driven process to one focused on accountability for results, to foster a culture of ongoing dialogue between managers and staff and to promote collaboration. The new approach, launched for the 2021-2022 cycle, has streamlined the process for establishing work plans, encourages performance conversations between managers and staff and provides the opportunity for upward feedback using a 360-degree feedback mechanism. Performance conversations enable the opportunity to provide recognition, discuss career aspirations and development, mentor and guide and address underperformance. Initially, the 360-feedback mechanism, the People Management Index was applied to D1/D2 levels and for the 2022-2023 performance management cycle is applied to all FROs regardless of level (with four or more direct reports or secondary reports, as appropriate).

- Other tools and mechanisms related to performance and accountability for civilian staff include informal resolution, investigations, and the internal justice system. An important precondition for the performance of senior leadership is their identification, selection, and onboarding as well as support throughout their assignment. This is supported by outreach through Global Calls for SRSGs/DSRSGs and placement of candidates in the senior leadership database.

- Personnel under different contract modalities include UN Volunteers and consultants or contractors. The tools for their assessments vary, depending on the contract status.

29. For uniformed components, assessment tools and related processes include:

- Planning and conduct of Assessment and Advisory Visits (AAVs) prior to deployment and Verification Visits for those pledges that aim to meet the requirements of the rapid deployment level and as part of the PCRS process.

- COE verification (conducted quarterly for military units and FPU’s); COE/MOU Management Review Boards (CMMRB) process (oversees the implementation of the mission’s COE program, ensuring that deployed capabilities remain aligned with the requirements of the mission).

- Conduct and discipline is fully integrated into key assessment tools and processes for uniformed components, including the pre-deployment visit process, in-mission assessment process, Force Commander evaluation process and FPU evaluations, including the Police Division Performance Assessment and Evaluation Team (PAET) visits.

- Quarterly and Monthly Integrated Performance meetings with the DPO, DOS and DMSPC leadership to review performance data, trends, track progress and take decisions on remedial measures.
• Meetings of the Standing Review Committee for the implementation of Security Council resolution 2272 (2016), as supported by an inter-departmental Technical Working Group.

Assessment tools and processes specifically for the military component include:

• Operational readiness and training and preparation from TCC prior to deployment and In-Mission (As stipulated in the Guidelines for Operational Readiness Preparation for Troop Contributing Countries in Peacekeeping).

• Military Skill Validations (MSVs) for new units during Pre-deployment visits (PDVs) and during pre-rotational visits (PRVs) for units with identified performance shortfalls before rotation. MSVs include validation of both individual- and collective tasks and functions of military units as derived from respective Statements of Unit Requirements (SURs). Validations also focus on understanding of Mission’s environment, command and control, situational awareness, and Protection of Civilians (POC).

• Force Commanders evaluation of subordinate military units (SOP on Force and Sector Commander’s Evaluation of Subordinate Military Entities in Peacekeeping Operations). The revised SOP will be in line with the new evaluation standards and Military Unit Evaluation Tool that was rolled out in 2021 for the in-mission evaluations of infantry units by the field missions. It generates Military Performance Improvements Requirements following completion of evaluations and ensures mission evaluators follow up Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) of the evaluated unit. In collaboration with the missions, specialized unit evaluation standards were subsequently piloted and rolled out.

• Deployed military headquarters evaluation (SOP on Evaluation of Military Headquarters in Peacekeeping Operations) to be finalized. A test evaluation for FHQs in low-intensity missions was conducted in UNFICYP in January 22. The test evaluation for FHQ deployed in a high-intensity missions was conducted in December 22.

• A reinforced training package (RTP) for UN Military performance evaluators.

Building on the on-going efforts of the Police Division Performance Task Force with a view to further harmonising the UN Police performance assessment system of all deployment types from the pre- through post deployment phases, assessment tools and processes specifically for the police component include:

Formed Police Units:

• Prior to deployment: pre-deployment visits to a specific PCC, assessing a country’s capacity to deploy FPUs by considering the specific capacities and capabilities of an FPU identified for deployment to a specific mission through an assessment of operational capability (AOCs) and a COE inspection conducted by UN Formed Police Assessment Team (FPATs).

• During deployment:
  o Induction, internal and external in-mission training sessions.
o Monthly assessments by FPU coordinators of weapons, ammunition, crowd and riot control and other specialized equipment, as well as the operational skills of FPU personnel since 2010 in line with the FPU Policy (2016.10 under review); and

o Quarterly FPU evaluations with findings illustrated in performance assessment and evaluation reports (PAERs), triggering performance improvement plans (PIPs) for all units overseen by Heads of Police Components (HOPCs) as per the Revised SOP on the Assessment and Evaluation of FPU Performance (2022.13), which are included in the T/PCC knowledge management system operated by DPET. Recognition of outstanding performance and or remedial actions proposed in the PIPs are first and foremost addressed at the FPU commander and HOPC levels, with UNHQ engagement in cases of serious and systemic performance issues or in form of PAET visits.

o Quarterly verification reports (VRs) of a unit’s COE trigger Police Division (PD) and Uniformed Capabilities Support Division (UCSD) engagement with the concerned Member State if the COE status is below 70 percent.

o PD plays a key role in the integrated performance analysis of PAERs and subsequent PIPs and VRs and serious and systematic performance issues can be considered during monthly performance meetings, including to validate mission-conducted assessments and evaluations conducted under the FPU Policy and the FPU Performance Assessment SOP.

Individually recruited police officers, including Specialised Police Teams:

- Prior to deployment: Assessment for mission service (AMS) of IPOs, including through Selection Assistance and Assessment Team (SAAT) visits, which assess personnel against clear standards.

- During deployment: IPOs and specialized police teams (SPTs): performance appraised quarterly by the supervisor of the respective pillar every in line with the SOP on Performance Appraisals of UN Police Officers (2021.13). The SOP establishes the convening of quarterly reviews in line with current practices of performance reviews of FPUs, as well as the use of Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs), to consistently improve performance, in line with Security Council resolution 2436 (2018) and ST/AI/2021/4. The SOP incorporates the rating of performance based on the guiding principles of the relevant pillars – police capacity-building and development, police command, police operations and police administration – of the Strategic Guidance Framework for International Policing (SGF).

- Heads of police components and police officers with UN contracts follow the UN performance management and use the electronic tool (ST/AI/2021/4). The same applies for seconded officers with UN contracts in PD at UNHQ.

**Accountability and remedial measures and incentives**

30. The Secretariat is institutionally - and the Secretary-General individually - accountable for the effective implementation of the Organization’s mandates, including those of
peacekeeping operations. For organizational performance, accountability measures include reporting by the Secretary-General to the Security Council, C34, and the GA\(^7\), including through mission-specific reports with stand-alone paragraphs on performance and accountability, budget, or programme performance, conduct and discipline or accountability reports, as well as follow-up to OPSP recommendations.

31. Senior leadership at UN Headquarters and in mission are accountable for both their own strategic actions and guidance and for ensuring that organizational and individual performance management systems are fully utilized to ensure that all relevant personnel in missions are accountable for their responsibilities for the delivery of mandates, including if mandated to protect civilians\(^8\). Senior leadership in missions must set the strategic direction and ensure accountability for effective mandate delivery. They are accountable to the SG through the USG for Peace Operations for the implementation of the mandate, including the mission’s PoC mandate. Senior leadership performance for mandate delivery is assessed through their Compact with the Secretary-General. For USG/ASG/D-2 Heads and Deputy heads of mission accountability measures include:

- Revocation of delegated authorities
- Contract termination
- Personal financial liability

32. Currently, the accountability measures that are in place for civilian staff cover human resource management, administrative aspects, compliance with staff and financial rules and regulations, procurement rules, and ethics and conduct and discipline issues.

33. Under the Performance Management and Development System, remedial measures for staff with performance shortfalls “may include counselling, transfer to more suitable functions, additional training and/or the institution of a time-bound performance improvement plan, which should include clear targets for improvement” (ST/AI/2021/4). If the performance shortcomings are not rectified following the remedial actions, a number of administrative actions may ensue, including the withholding of within-grade salary increments, the non-renewal of an appointment or the termination of an appointment for unsatisfactory service. In recent years, less than 0.5 per cent of Secretariat staff received a performance rating of either “partially meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations.” For the 2021-2022 performance cycle, 9,475 field mission staff completed the cycle. In their rating, 3,366 (35\%) exceeded, 5,515 (58\%) fully met, 45 (0.4\%) partially met and 6 (0.06\%) did not meet the expectation. Overall, 32,005 staff members are subject to the performance management system and 92\% completed the cycle in the 2021-2022 period\(^9\). In regard to low performance, decisions are taken on

---

\(^7\) The Eleventh progress report on accountability: strengthening accountability in the UN Secretariat (A/76/644), published in December 2021 provides an update on the efforts made to strengthen the accountability system of the Secretariat.

\(^8\) As per the Policy on POC, senior leaders in missions with POC mandates who have a Compact shall include a strategic objective on POC in their Compact aligned with mandate priorities, the mission’s strategic objectives and their oversight role (para 91 in 2019.17 Policy on the Protection of Civilians in UN Peacekeeping) and similar responsibilities should be included in the workplans and performance appraisals of other key staff, as appropriate, based on the mission strategic and operational plans.

\(^9\) Data provided by OHR.
administrative actions at the discretion of managers and heads of entities at a local level on a case-by-case basis. Since 2007, administrative actions were taken in 74 cases, including increment withheld (24), non-renewal / extension (39) or termination (11). OHR data does indicate that, although sanctions are still very limited, it is being taken more seriously through withholding salary increments, non-extension of contracts and termination of staff based on poor performance as demonstrated by the 74 cases. The number of staff that received the lowest two ratings in their performance document fluctuates every year and has ranged from 0.40 to 0.97% since 2010.

34. Administrative and disciplinary measures for staff include step reduction, suspension, fine, demotion, separation, and dismissal (see relevant Staff Rules and AIs for details). Staff members can also be placed on administrative leave with or without pay pending completion of an investigation or disciplinary measures should the relevant factors be in place. Of all actions taken in cases of established misconduct and/or criminal behaviour and the disciplinary action in 2018, 129 cases were completed, covering 124 dispositions. Of the 124 dispositions, the result were 6 dismissals, 28 separations from service, 26 other disciplinary measures, 3 administrative measures, 5 were closed with no measure, 22 were not pursued as a disciplinary matter and 26 separations of the staff members prior to or after referral to the Office of Human Resources and 8 Other (A/74/64). This is a slight reduction from the 136 cases in 2017, 143 cases in 2016 and 143 cases in 2015. Of all actions taken in cases of established misconduct and/or criminal behaviour and the disciplinary action in 2018, 129 cases were completed, covering 124 dispositions. Of the 124 dispositions, the result were 6 dismissals, 28 separations from service, 26 other disciplinary measures, 3 administrative measures, 5 were closed with no measure, 22 were not pursued as a disciplinary matter and 26 separations of the staff members prior to or after referral to the Office of Human Resources and 8 Other (A/74/64). This is a slight reduction from the 136 cases in 2017, 143 cases in 2016 and 143 cases in 2015. 12 appeals were registered in 2018 (20%), 12 in 2017 (22%) and 17 in 2016 (25%).

35. For uniformed components, accountability measures, remedial measures and incentives include:

- Awards, such as the Captain Diagne medal, the Military Gender Advocate or the UN Woman Police Officer of the Year Award\(^{10}\), the Trailblazer Award and commendation letters by the HOM or HOPC (including the Outstanding Leadership Award, Certificate of Commendation, and Letter of Appreciation)
- SG/USG DPO Recognition of Outstanding Performance
- Risk premiums
- Extended Temporary Operating Bases Deployment Premium
- Force Commander “blame” and “warning” letters (used by some FCs)
- Performance Improvement Plans for all deployed units
- Formed unit personnel reimbursement deductions on account of absent or unserviceable COE
- Operational Preparation Improvement Plans (established after an unsatisfactory PDV)
- Repatriation, relocation, or strength reduction of units, or continued Military skill validations to address performance shortfalls.
- Repatriation of individual contingent personnel
- Repatriation of Staff Officers/MilObs/IPOs (individual officers that do not pass the assessment upon arrival in mission can be repatriated at national expense at the Force Commander’s/Heads of Police Component’s discretion)
- Remedial and accountability measures taken by T/PCCs themselves

\(^{10}\) UN police components also increasingly identify and recognize good practices related to environmentally responsive policing.
- Facilitation of training support and partnerships (Light Coordination Mechanism)

36. Uniformed components are subject to investigation for possible misconduct, either by the Secretariat in the case of police personnel, including members of FPUs, and military observers, or by the TCC in the case of military contingent personnel and subject to sanction by the T/PCC. Where an allegation of misconduct by uniformed personnel is substantiated, the UN will take the administrative measure of repatriating personnel on disciplinary grounds or deeming their repatriation to have been on disciplinary grounds should they have already left the field mission, and they will no longer be eligible for service with the UN.

37. Uniformed personnel deployed with the status of experts on mission may be subject to criminal prosecution by Member States, including the host State. Referral for criminal accountability (initially A/RES/62/63 of 8 January 2008) which requested that “the Secretary-General to bring credible allegations that reveal that a crime may have been committed by UN officials and experts on mission to the attention of the States against whose nationals such allegations are made, and to request from those States an indication of the status of their efforts to investigate and, as appropriate, prosecute crimes of a serious nature, as well as the types of appropriate assistance States may wish to receive from the Secretariat for the purposes of such investigations and prosecutions” and associated follow-up processes on referrals for criminal accountability (managed by the Office of Legal Affairs).

38. A separate additional accountability mechanism is in place for sexual exploitation and abuse, whereby the Secretary-General has also outlined that payments’ to implicated military or police personnel would be suspended from the time the troop- or police-contributing country was notified of an incident until the end of the investigation or the earlier departure of the implicated individual from the mission. If the investigation substantiated the allegation, the previously suspended payments would be withheld. The moment from which payments could be withheld was established as the date of incident itself. Any payments already made would be recovered against future payments to the Member State. For military and police personnel, payments that can be suspended include personnel reimbursement, daily allowance, recreational leave allowance and/or any exceptional premium for risk which may have accrued to these individuals.

39. The implementation process for Security Council resolution 2272 (2016) through the Standing Review Committee and in association with the Operational Guidance for the implementation of the resolution – can set out accountability measures. These will vary but can include replacing “all military units and/or formed police units of the troop- or police-contributing country in the UN peacekeeping operation where the allegation or allegations arose with uniformed personnel from a different troop- or police-contributing country, as applicable and further requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the replacement troop- or police-contributing country has upheld standards of conduct and discipline and appropriately addressed allegations against or confirmed acts, if any, of sexual exploitation and abuse by its personnel.” The Secretary-General has further signed a Commitment to Eliminate Sexual Exploitation and Abuse with 103 Heads of State or government (103 as of May 2020).
40. In paragraph 43 of the Report on *Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (A/76/702)*, the Secretary-General has committed ensuring that Member State personnel deployed to UN peacekeeping and special political mission must be subject to national prohibitions against sexual exploitation and abuse, as defined by the United Nations, and that sanctions imposed for such conduct must be commensurate with the gravity of the acts. Where this is not already the case, Member States contributing personnel are expected to enact legislation that specifically prohibits such acts by those personnel, with sanctions commensurate with the gravity of the acts. As of 1 January 2024, the Secretary-General will consider such measures to be required enabling criterion for deployment to United Nations peacekeeping operations and special political missions.
Annex 1: Visual of the Peacekeeping Performance and Accountability Framework (IPPAF)

### Peacekeeping Performance & Accountability Framework

Mapping of performance and accountability measures for all personnel, including leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Mandates &amp; Intergovernmental Guidance</th>
<th>Policies, guidance &amp; standards</th>
<th>Methodologies &amp; tools for performance assessment</th>
<th>Accountability / remedial measures &amp; incentives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>• Financial Regulations &amp; Rules (GA), Administrative issuances, Cad &amp; Discipline framework, SC mission mandates, SC res. 2436, 2272, C34 reports, Fifth Committee</td>
<td>• 230 policies / SOPs, 170 guidelines, 60 manuals, training materials</td>
<td>• RBB / Budget, CPAS, Management KPis &amp; Dashboards, Umoja, OPSP reviews, OIOS Audits / Evals</td>
<td>• Board of Auditors, Special Investigations, Joint Inspection Unit, Anti-Fraud &amp; Anti-Corruption Framework, Self-evaluation policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Staff</td>
<td>• Relevant ST/AIs on human resources, Staff selection system, Policy on Accountability for CD and SG Bulletins on UN Standards of Conduct</td>
<td>• Staff performance appraisal (E-PAS), Conduct &amp; Discipline, incl. investigations</td>
<td>• USG / SRSG KPis for delegated authorities / Acc. Framework, USG / SRSG Compacts / 360° evals</td>
<td>• USG / ASG, Review of Compacts by Performance Management Board, Revocation of delegated authorities, Personal financial liability, Staff Staff Awards, E-PAS, Administrative &amp; disciplinary measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformed personnel</td>
<td>• A/RES/74/279, A/RES/76/276 &amp; A/RES/67/261, COE Manual (GA), Non-staff rules &amp; regulations (Experts on Mission)</td>
<td>• HRDDP, CPTM/STMs, Military &amp; FPU Eval SOPs, CD standards, ORA Policy, ORP Guidelines, UNMUMs, w. T5Is for all military units, Deployed Military HQ standards, Guidance for IPOs / MIIObs / Staff Officer (incl. interviews of key senior SOs), UN Police Standards, SOP on unit selection</td>
<td>• Quarterly &amp; Monthly Performance meetings, COE verification, CMMRB process, FPATs, FPU evals and mission inspections, Deployed Military HQ Evals, FC evaluations</td>
<td>• Captain Diagne, Military Gender Advocate, UN Woman Police Officer of the Year Award, Trailblazer Award, Risk premiums / Extended Temporary Operating Bases Depl. Premium, Training support &amp; partnerships (LCM), COE reimbursement &amp; deductions, PIPs for all units, Relocation, strength reduction, repatriation, Military Skill Validations during PDVs/PRVs, Repatriation of Staff Officers / MIIObs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: New initiatives or initiatives currently being revised listed in Blue Italic.*
Annex 2: List of Key Policies, Guidance and Standards related to performance

Accountability / Oversight
- A/72/773 Accountability system in the United Nations Secretariat, Annex I to the report of the Secretary-General on the Seventh progress report on the accountability system in the United Nations Secretariat: strengthening the accountability system of the Secretariat under the new management paradigm, 1 March 2018
- ST/SGB/2013/4/Amend.1 Financial Regulations and Rules, 4 December 2018
- 2019.22 Guidelines on Special Investigations
- DOS/2020.10 SOP on Boards of Inquiry
- Administrative Instruction on Evaluation United Nations Secretariat
- 2012.13 Policy on Internal Evaluations and Inspections of UN Police
- ST/IC/2016/25 Anti-Fraud and Anti-Corruption Framework of the UN Secretariat

Accountability for Peacekeepers
- DPO, DOS, DPPA, OHCHR SOP on Prevention, Investigation and Prosecution of Serious Crimes Committed against UN Personnel in Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions (2020.18)

Civilian personnel
- ST/SGB/2018/1 UN Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations
- ST/SGB/2016/9 Status, basic rights and duties of UN staff members
- ST/SGB/2017/2/Rev.1 Protection against retaliation for reporting misconduct and for cooperating with duly authorized audits or investigations
- ST/AI/2021/4 on the Performance Management and Development System

COE
- 2020 Contingent-owned equipment manual (A/75/121)

Command and Control
- 2019.23 Policy on Authority, Command and Control in UN Peacekeeping Operations

Conduct and Discipline
- 2015.10 Policy on Accountability for Conduct and Discipline in Field Missions
- 2014 Conduct and Discipline Accountability Measurement Framework and Reporting
- ST/SGB/2003/13 Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
- ST/SGB/2019/8 Addressing discrimination, harassment, including sexual harassment, and abuse of authority

Conduct and Discipline documents applicable to uniformed personnel
- A/76/702 Report of the Secretary-General on Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse, 15 February 2022

---

11 Guidance documents are accessible to UN staff on the Policy and Practice Database at: [https://unitednations.sharepoint.com/sites/PPDB/SitePages/Performance-and-Accountability.aspx](https://unitednations.sharepoint.com/sites/PPDB/SitePages/Performance-and-Accountability.aspx)
• 2011.01 SOP on Implementation of amendments on conduct and discipline in the model Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations and Troop Contributing Countries; 2/28/2011; DFS/CDU
• Revised draft model Memorandum of Understanding between the UN and Troop Contributing Countries, incorporating the annex “We are the UN Peacekeeping Personnel”, published in Chapter 9 of the 2020 COE Manual (A/75/121)
• ST/SGB/2002/9 Regulations Governing the Status, Basic Rights and Duties of Officials other than Secretariat Officials, and Experts on Mission
• ST/SGB/1999/13 Observance by United Nations forces of international humanitarian law
• Directives for Disciplinary Matters involving Civilian Police Officers and Military Observers (DPKO/CPD/DDCPO/2003/00, DPKO/MD/03/00994)
• Ten Rules/Code of Personal Conduct for Blue Helmets
• 2018 Military Aide Memoire: UN Measures to Combat Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
• A/71/818/Annex V, 2017: System-wide matrix of responsibilities to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse

Environment
• DOS-DPO-DPPA 2022.01 Environmental Policy for PKOs and Field-based SPMs
• 2022.02 Waste Management Handbook for PKOs and Field-based SPMs
• 2021.16 Water and Wastewater Manual for Peacekeeping and Special Political Missions
• ST/SGB/2019/7 Environmental policy for the UN Secretariat
• Environment Strategy for Peace Operations (2017-2023)
• 2019.09 SOP on Environmental Impact Assessment for UN Field Missions
• 2018.28 Guidelines on Environmental Clearance and Handover of Mission / Field Entity / Field Entity Sites
• 2021.02 Handbook on UN Environmental Management for Military Commanders in UN Peace Operations
• 2019 UN Police Environmental Management Framework

Gender
• 2017 UN System-wide Strategy on Gender Parity
• 2018.01 Policy on Gender Responsive UN Peacekeeping Operations
• DPO Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy 2018-2028
• DPO Gender Equality and Women, Peace and Security Resource Package
• 2015 United Nations Police Gender Toolkit Handbook (under review)

Guidance Development, Knowledge Management and Organizational Learning
• DPO 2020.11 / DPPA 2020.2 Policy on Knowledge Management and Organizational Learning
• DPO 2019.29 / DPPA 2019.08 Policy on Guidance Development
• DPO 2019.30 / DPPA 2019.09 SOP on Guidance Development

Human Rights
• 2011.20 Policy on Human Rights in UN Peace Operations and Political Missions
• 2011 Human Rights Due Diligence Policy on UN support to non-UN security forces (HRDDP)
• 2015 Guidance Note on Human Rights Due Diligence Policy on UN Support to non-United Nations security forces
• Note on Reporting and Follow-Up Obligations in Response to Allegations of Serious Human Rights Violations Committed by International Security Forces
• Mission-specific SOPs on implementation of the United Nations Human Rights Due Diligence Policy on Support to non-UN Security Forces (HRDDP)
• A/RES/72/112 resolution on criminal accountability of UN officials & experts on mission
• July 2015 Human Rights Up Front: An Overview

Improvised Explosive Devices
• 2018.05 Guidelines on United Nations Improvised Explosive Device Disposal Standards
• 2021.08 Guidelines on Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Threat Mitigation in Mission Settings

Peacekeeping-Intelligence
• 2019.08 Policy on Peacekeeping-Intelligence
• 2019.36 Military Peacekeeping-Intelligence Handbook
• 2020.05 Guidelines on Acquisition of Information from Human Sources for Peacekeeping-Intelligence (HPKI)
• *NEW 2022.03 Guidelines on Open-Source Peacekeeping Intelligence
• *NEW 2022.08 Guidelines on Gender and Peacekeeping-Intelligence

Leadership and management
• ST/SGB/2019/2 Delegation of authority in the administration of the Staff Regulations and Rules and the Financial Regulations and Rules
• DPO 2022.04 / DPPA 2022.1: In-briefings and Debriefings of Senior Mission Leaders and DPPA-supported Envoys
• 2011 Policy on Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control

Medical
• DOS/2020.7 Policy on Casualty Evacuation in the Field
• 2015.12 Medical Support Manual for United Nations Field Missions
• 2012.14 Policy on Field Occupational Safety Risk Management
• 2012.16 SOP on Field Occupational Safety Incident Reporting
• 2019.25 SOP on Establishing Non-United Nations Hospital Support
• ST/AI/2000/10 on MEDEVAC
• ST/SGB/2018/5 Introduction of an occupational safety and health management system
• 2019 Guidelines on Healthcare and Patient Safety for Level 1, 2 & 3 Hospitals (Set of 3 manuals)
• 2022 Guidelines on Technical Clearance Review of Medical Personnel for Deployment to UN Field Duty Stations
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Planning, Budgeting and Monitoring

- ST/SGB/2018/3 Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation
- A/72/492 Add.1 Results-based budgeting methodology, outlined in the report of the Secretary General on Shifting the management paradigm in the UN: improving and streamlining the programme planning and budgeting process, 26 September 2017

Planning

- 2016.09 Policy on Planning and Review of Peacekeeping Operations
- *NEW 2023 Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning
- 2014.04 Guidelines on Mission Concept

Protection

- 2017.12 Guidelines on the Role of UN Police in the Protection of Civilians
- Decision No 2010/30 on Conflict-Related Sexual Violence
- 2019.35 Policy on United Nations Field Missions: Preventing and responding to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence
- 2020.08 Handbook for UN Field Missions on Preventing and Responding to Conflict-related Sexual Violence

Reporting

- 2019.10 Integrated Reporting from Peacekeeping Operations to UNHQ (SOP)
- 2019 Guidelines on Applying an A4P Lens in Reporting to the Security Council

Training

- 2021.10 Conducting Peacekeeping Training Needs Assessments
- *NEW 2022.09 SOP on Member State-provided Military Mobile Training Teams

Uniformed personnel

- 2019.15 Guidelines on Award of Risk Premium (Formed Units)
- 2005.03 Policy on Pre-Deployment Visits to T/PCCs
- 2020.10 SOP on Planning and Conducting Assessment and Advisory Visits (AAVs)
- 2005.06 Policy on Reconnaissance Visits by T/PCCs
- 2005.07 SOP on Planning and Implementing Contributing Country Reconnaissance Visits
- 2019.03 Policy on Weapons and Ammunition
- 2019.04 SOP on Loss of Weapons and Ammunition in Peace Operations
- 2019.27 UN Manual on Ammunition Management
- Mission-specific SOPs on Handling, Storage and Destruction of Ammunition, Weapons and Explosives during the cantonment ad DDR process
• 2015.17 Policy on National Support Element
• 2019.16 Guidelines on Combined Military and Police Coordination Mechanisms in Peace Operations
• 2009.21 Directive on support to Military and Police Pre-Deployment Training for UN Peacekeeping Operations
• 2021.05 UN Manual for Generation and Deployment of Military and Police Units to Peacekeeping Operations
• 2017.18 UN IED Threat Mitigation Military and Police Handbook

Military
• 2015.16 Policy on Operational Readiness Assurance and Performance Improvement
• 2018.29 Guidelines on Operational Readiness Preparation for Troop Contributing Countries in Peacekeeping Missions
• 2016.16 SOP on Evaluation of Force Headquarters in Peacekeeping Operations
• 2016.02 SOP on Force and Sector Commanders Evaluation of Subordinate Military Entities in Peacekeeping Operations Guidelines
• 2016.18 Guidelines on Awarding the Captain Mbaye Diagne Medal for Exceptional Courage
• OMA SOP on Selecting and Awarding of the Military Gender Advocate of the Year, 11 Feb 2021
• 2015.02 Protection of Civilians: Implementing Guidelines for Military Components of UN Peacekeeping Missions
• 2016.24 Guidelines on Use of Force by Military Components in Peacekeeping Operations
• 2016.25 Guidelines on UN Military Observers in Peacekeeping Operations
• 2016.23 Guidelines on Military Support for Public Order Management in Peacekeeping Missions
• 2019.05 Guidelines on UN Generation of Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Capabilities
• 2019.13 Guidelines on UN Command Post Exercise (CPX) in Force Headquarters of UN Peacekeeping Missions Handbook
• 2010.22 Integrating a Gender Perspective into the work of the UN Military in Peacekeeping Operations
• Nov 2014 UN Force Headquarters Handbook
• 2022.06 SOP on Weapons and Ammunition Management in Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) Processes
• 2022.01 Policy on Civil-Military Coordination in UN Integrated Peacekeeping Missions
• 2021.03 Guidelines on Force Protection for Military Components of United Nations Field Missions
• New* 2022.11 Engagement Platoon Handbook

Military Unit Manuals
• 2020.01 United Nations Infantry Battalion Manual
• Jan 2016 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military/Combat Transport Unit Manual
• 2020.03 UN Military Engineer Unit and CET Search and Detect Manual
• 2021.11 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal Unit Manual
• 2021.04 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Aviation Unit Manual
• Sept 2015 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Riverine Unit Manual
• Sept 2015 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Maritime Task Force Manual
• July 2015 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Police Manual
• *New 2022.13 UN Peacekeeping Missions Logistics Unit Manual
• May 2015 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Signal Unit Manual
• *New 2022.12 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Peacekeeping-Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Unit Manual.
• Jan 2015 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Special Forces Manual
• Mar 2015 UN Peacekeeping Missions Military Force Headquarters Support Unit Manual

Police
• *NEW 2022.02 SOP on Directives for Heads of Police Components of Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions
• 2014.01 Policy on UN Police in Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions
• 2015.14 Guidelines on Police Command in UN Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions
• 2016.26 Guidelines on Police Administration in UN Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions
• 2015.15 Guidelines on Police Operations in UN Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions
• 2015.08 Guidelines on Police Capacity-Building and Development
• 2017.12 Guidelines on the role of UNPOL in protection of civilians
• 2012.13 Policy on Internal Evaluations and Inspections of UN Police
• 2018.04 Manual on Community-Oriented Policing in UN Peace Operations
• 2019 Guidelines on Police Planning during a COVID-19 Pandemic
• Nov 2015 UNPOL Gender Mainstreaming Toolkit Handbook (under review)
• 2019.34 Guidelines for Specialized Police Teams on Assignment with UN Peace Operations

Formed Police Units (FPUs)
• *NEW 2022.10 SOP on Assessment and Evaluation of Formed Police Unit Performance
• 2016.10 Policy on Formed Police Units in UN Peacekeeping Operations
• 2017.09 SOP on Assessment of Operational Capability of FPUs for service in in PKOs and SPMs
• Pre-deployment training materials for FPUs (2009)

Individual Police Officers (IPOs)
• 2019.19 SOP on Assessment for Mission Service of Individual Police Officers
• 2006.00135 Guidelines for UN police officers on assignment with peacekeeping operations
• 2021.13 Revised SOP on Performance Appraisals of UN Police Officers
• Pre-deployment training materials for IPOs (2020)
**Annex 3: Triggers and steps related to military, police, civilian, contingent owned equipment, sexual exploitation and abuse and environmental performance**

**Annex 3A: Triggers and Steps related to Military Performance**

**Enhancing the recognition for outstanding performance of military units**

The Office of Military Affairs (OMA), together with the Police Division, have developed a process to enhance the recognition of outstanding performance. Force Commanders and leadership in missions are encouraged to identify units for recognition and recommend to the SRSG for endorsement and submission to UNHQ, when and as appropriate. Upon review of the recommendation, mention of the instance of exceptional service will be proposed for inclusion in the next mission-specific SG report to strengthen the recognition of outstanding performance and a letter of recognition will also be submitted to the TCC.

To support missions with identifying a unit that should be recognized for its outstanding performance in the context of the mission mandate, OMA has developed a detailed table that provides examples and considerations for evaluating a unit as outstanding across several performance areas, including comprehension and support of the mission mandate, operational tasks, training standards, COE standards, and command and control. The table also includes criteria that may exclude a unit from being considered for recommendation for outstanding performance.

The examples listed in the table include, among others, particular instances in which the unit far exceeded its operational tasks through:

- Exceptional actions or initiative that contributed to a positive change in local communities, particularly Protection of Civilians (POC).
- Significant effectiveness in collection of peacekeeping-intelligence.
- Eviction of armed groups (AGs) from an area through military action.
- Avoidance of escalation and violence through negotiation and establishment of a secure environment, possibly by area denial to armed groups.
- Exemplary performance in securing a main supply route, clearing roadblocks, clearing accident sites, etc.
- Exemplary performance and contribution in medical treatment of UN personnel.
- Accomplishment of mandated tasks despite significant limitations (i.e., large AOR, numerous POB/TOBs, restriction of movement, hostile environment etc.).

Once the commendation is provided to UNHQ, OMA will validate the evaluation report, suggest to the USG DPO the level of the letter of commendation (by the USG or Secretary-General), include the details of the recognition in the respective mission-specific SG report and provide an update on the units that were recommended during the next Integrated Quarterly Performance meeting.
Triggers and Steps related to Military Performance

1. Integrated performance analysis includes information and data from e.g. DPO/OPSP, DOS/UCSD (COE / Personnel Deductions data) and DMSPC/CDS (SEA and Misconduct).
### Serious and Systemic Performance Issues for Military Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/FHQ/FC</th>
<th>STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY UNHQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Civilians</td>
<td>• Systemic lack of knowledge of POC (policy, ROEs, etc.)&lt;br&gt;  • Continuous In-Mission Training and remedial measures at mission level&lt;br&gt;  • Re-evaluation of unit</td>
<td>• OMA engagement with PM, including advise for pre-deployment training&lt;br&gt;  • Consider performance PRV, LCM engagement&lt;br&gt;  • Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repeated and sustained failure to adopt appropriately preventive and proactive posture</td>
<td>• MILAD (and potentially USG) engagement with PM, including on unit leadership and training&lt;br&gt;  • Consider performance PRV, LCM engagement, senior visit to TCC&lt;br&gt;  • Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Serious POC related failure, e.g., failure to respond to major incident in close vicinity to unit</td>
<td>• Discussion in MPM&lt;br&gt;  • MILAD (and potentially USG) engagement with PM&lt;br&gt;  • Conduct special investigation with findings reported to the Security Council or BOI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 The table should be read in conjunction with the visual that displays the triggers and steps related to military performance, as well as the matrix on Recognition of Outstanding Performance by Military Units.

13 Each of these issues must be reported to UNHQ when they arise, either through faxes or cables, or through the FC evaluation summaries submitted to UNHQ. Conduct related issues, including SEA, are also reported through separate channels (CDS), and COE related reporting and date is submitted to UCSD/DOS.

14 The Monthly Performance Meeting will consider a variety of remedial measures. Following due consideration of the efforts made by the TCC to address serious or systemic issues, and after exploring whether additional support can be provided by the Secretariat or other Member States, this may include relocation, re-tasking and partial or full repatriation of the relevant unit.

15 The Monthly Performance Meeting will consider a variety of remedial measures. Following due consideration of the efforts made by the TCC to address serious or systemic issues, and after exploring whether additional support can be provided by the Secretariat or other Member States, this may include relocation, re-tasking and partial or full repatriation of the relevant unit.
### ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/FHQ/FC</th>
<th>STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY UNHQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favouritism</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated favouritism to one party</td>
<td>• Consider accountability measures for relevant officers, other mission personnel (military, police and civilian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform Unit commander involved</td>
<td>• MILAD (and potentially USG) engagement with PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct appropriate investigation</td>
<td>• Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Report appropriately if culpable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Command and Control and Caveats</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refusal to follow legitimate order</td>
<td>• MILAD (and potentially USG) engagement with PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal communication to unit/unit commander</td>
<td>• Discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Validate the refusal with SUR tasking</td>
<td>• Consider accountability measures for relevant officer(s), including repatriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revisit unit’s deployment state and other limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caveat raised despite tasking being in line with SUR</td>
<td>• [See draft caveats procedure]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct unit commander to state caveat in written and confirm if it is in line with SUR</td>
<td>• Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform UNHQ officially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Force or Violation of IHL/HR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unjustified use of force</td>
<td>• MILAD (and potentially USG) engagement with PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collateral damage involving civilian casualties</td>
<td>• Discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Violation of IHL or HR law</td>
<td>• Conduct special investigation with findings reported to the Security Council or BOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiate investigation</td>
<td>• Consider accountability measures for relevant personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform UNHQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violations of UN standards of conduct, including SEA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Misconduct and Serious Misconduct, including SEA</td>
<td>• [The below is in addition to and in coordination with steps taken by CDS and DMSPC leadership, including in accordance with resolution 2272 in the case of SEA]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Report to SRSG (through Mission CDT), for required notification of UNHQ and for investigations to be undertaken in accordance with applicable procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/FHQ/FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Loss of weapons or ammunition unrelated to hostile action\(^{16}\)  
• Claims of paternity and child support | • Command structure, with Mission CDT, to ensure induction and ongoing training on UN standards of conduct  
• Force to support Mission CDT in developing and implementing a risk management approach, including identifying and responding to risks of SEA and misconduct  
• Direct unit commander to be more vigilant and conduct motivational lectures  
• Frequent visits by mission leadership  
• Inform UNHQ if it is habitual/consistent  
• Assistance and support to victims and children born of SEA | • USG DMSPC formally notifies TCCs of allegations of serious misconduct and requests investigations and facilitation of paternity claims  
• DMSPC regularly follows-up on pending allegations of misconduct and paternity claims, formally via Note Verbale and engagement by USG DMSPC and USG DPO with PRs, and at the technical level between CDS and MILAD in PMs  
• MILAD (and potentially USG) engagement with PM  
• Consider discussion in MPM  
• Consider accountability measures for relevant personnel |

Training shortfalls

| • Systemic training deficiencies | • In-Mission Training  
• PIPs  
• Re-evaluation  
• Inform UNHQ | • MILAD (and potentially USG) engagement with PM  
• Consider discussion in MPM  
• Consider performance PDV, LCM engagement, senior visit to TCC |

COE (ME/SS) shortfalls

| • Serious and persistent COE shortfalls that are not being addressed adequately by the TCC | • Identify operational implications of COE shortfalls and report to UNHQ through the quarterly verification reports and CMMRB processes. | [The below is in addition to and in coordination with steps taken by UCSD and DOS leadership, including through the UNHQ CMMRB.]  
• Quarterly letters by USG DOS to Permanent Missions on COE shortfalls  
• MILAD (and potentially USG) engagement with PM  
• Consider discussion in MPM  
• Consider LCM engagement, senior visit to TCC |

---

\(^{16}\) It is noted that this may amount to misconduct under certain circumstances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/FHQ/FC</th>
<th>STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY UNHQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Environmental Standards** | - Non-compliance with UN guidance on environment, water, sanitation, hygiene, and waste management resulting in serious environmental risk<sup>17</sup> | - Direct unit to immediately cease the malpractice, and properly remediate the contaminated area  
- In collaboration with the Mission Support Division, jointly develop an environmental risk mitigation plan with the unit aimed at preventing reoccurrence, including improving wastewater and solid waste management facilities, providing training to relevant stakeholders, and promulgating unit standard operating procedures  
- Direct unit to implement the environmental risk plan and regularly follow-up on the progress  
- Inform the CMMRB and UNHQ | - DPO/OMA together with DOS/Environment Section to validate that the environmental risk mitigation plan  
- MiAd (and potentially USG) engagement with PM  
- Consider discussion in MPM  
- Consider accountability measures for relevant personnel in case of negligence |
| **Health and hygiene** | - Severe health and hygiene shortfalls that hamper operational effectiveness | - Direct CMO/ Force Hygiene Officer to frequently visit the unit to ensure SOPs and guidelines are adhered  
- Inform UNHQ | - MILAD engagement with PM  
- Consider discussion in MPM |

<sup>17</sup> Examples of serious violations of the UN environmental management include the discharge of untreated wastewater the unit is responsible for in the environment, illegal dumping, or burial of hazardous material, biomedical waste and other hazardous substances outside UN designated area, open burning of hazardous waste, biomedical waste or other hazardous substances (as opposed to controlled disposal in proper incinerators) or other incidents resulting in serious environmental damage, or potential causing harm to the host community.
Annex 3B: Triggers and Steps related to Police Performance

Enhancing the recognition for outstanding performance of UN Police Personnel¹⁸

The PD Performance Task Force, in consultation with OMA counterparts, have developed a process to enhance the recognition of outstanding performance of UN Police personnel and is collaborating with OMA on joint guidance. Police Commissioners and leadership in missions are encouraged to identify UN Police personnel for recognition and recommend to the SRSG for endorsement and submission to UNHQ, when and as appropriate. Upon review of the recommendation, mention of the instance of exceptional service will be proposed for inclusion in the next mission-specific SG report and a letter of recognition will also be submitted to the PCC. To support missions with identifying an individual, team, or unit¹⁹ that should be recognized for its outstanding performance in the context of its knowledge, willingness and readiness to implement its core responsibilities and functions in relation to the mission mandate, PD has developed a detailed table that provides examples and considerations for evaluating a unit, teams or individuals as outstanding across several performance areas, including mandate comprehension, operational core tasks, training standards, COE standards, and command control, in line with the Strategic Guidance Framework for International Policing and related documents, including the FPU Policy (2016.10), the SOP on the Assessment of Operational Capability of FPUs (2017.09), the SOP on the Assessment and Evaluation of Performance of FPUs (2033.10), the Revised SOP on Performance Appraisals of UN Police Officers (2021.13), and the Guidelines for Specialized Police Teams on Assignment with United Nations Peace Operations (2019.34). It also includes criteria that may exclude a unit from being recognized. The examples listed in the table include, among others, particular instances in which the FPU:

- Displayed an exceptional standard of performance in the areas of police tactics and techniques, including the use of force; adherence to UN standards of conduct, including the prevention of SEA; compliance with environmental standards and policy; or the protection and promotion of human rights and international humanitarian law.
- Undertook actions that contributed to positive change in local communities, particularly in the area of POC, as reflected in communities or others’ feedback.
- Conducted operational activities, such as public order management either on a mutually operational supportive role with the host-State police service or other law enforcement entity, or in situations where the host-State authorities are not present or incapable in unfamiliar and hostile environments where the security situation can easily deteriorate.
- Undertook emergency first responder activities in support of mandated tasks.
- Restored police and state legitimacy through enhanced outreach to local communities.
- Provided exceptional levels of protection beyond mandated tasks.
- Managed to avoid escalation of violence through negotiation and establishment of a secure environment.

Once the commendation is provided to UNHQ, PD will validate it and then suggest to the USG DPO the level of the letter of commendation (by the USG or Secretary-General), include the details of the recognition in the respective mission-specific SG report and provide an update on the units that were recommended during the Integrated Quarterly Performance meeting.

¹⁸ This includes: (i) IPOs, including specialized police teams, deployed as experts on mission in UN peacekeeping operation, special political missions, and/or other settings, (ii) FPUs, and (iii) civilian police experts.

¹⁹ The table should be read in conjunction with the table on Serious and Systemic Performance Issues for FPUs, as well as the visual that displays the triggers and steps related to police performance.
Triggers and Steps related to Formed Police Unit Performance

1. Integrated performance analysis includes information and data from e.g., DPO/OPSP, DOS/UCSD (COE / Personnel Deductions data) and DMSPC/CDS (SEA and Misconduct).

UNITED NATIONS | Department of Peace Operations (DPO)
### Serious and Systemic Performance Issues for Formed Police Units

#### ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIOR TO DEPLOYMENT</th>
<th>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/UNPOL HQ/HOPC/FPAT/ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION TEAMS</th>
<th>STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY UNHQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Some PCCs do not use FPUs in their domestic settings | • Endorse in Assessment report  
• Re-evaluation after initial remedial/on-the-spot guidance | • PD training support during FPAT (assessment of operational readiness) visits to facilitate leadership and command skills, cohesiveness during deployments  
• Review and roll-out of the revised FPU Policy (2016.09) and FPAT SOP (2017.09) currently under review to reflect strengthened language on cohesiveness, specialized pre-deployment training and preparedness |
| • Systemic lack of competencies/levels of COE at time of pre-deployment assessments/validations | • Endorse in PDV report  
• Re-evaluate/validate on next PDV | • PD engagement with Permanent Missions (PM), PCC visit (FPAT/PDV/VV) including on training and equipment (e.g., specialized equipment like Mine resistant vehicles, APCs for more asymmetric environments, embedded SWAT units) and specialized teams |
| • Need for increased participation of females in police peacekeeping to facilitate gender-responsive policing | • Police Gender Strategy  
• Insist on gender representation at time of assessment  
• Endorse in Assessment report | • Revision of FPU Policy underway  
• PD (and potentially USG) engagement to promote gender equality including through the increased participation of women police officers at all levels  
• Encourage PCCs to facilitate the participation of female officers through training and other incentives |
| • Lack of participation of PD staff members in all Formed Police Assessment Teams | • Assessment Team Leader to raise with UNHQ | • USG engagement with Controller/legislative bodies to allocate appropriate resources  
• Facilitate for additional XB funding |

20 The table should be read in conjunction with the visual that displays the triggers and steps related to police performance.
21 Each of these issues must be reported to UNHQ when they arise, either through faxes or cables. Conduct related issues, including SEA, are also reported through separate channels (CDS/DMSPC), and COE-related reporting and data is submitted to UCSD/DOS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/UNPOL HQ/ HOPC/ FPAT/ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION TEAMS</th>
<th>STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY UNHQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Support expertise** | • Insufficient numbers of interpreters to enhance interaction with local populations | • Head of Police Components’ (HOPC) engagement on mission budgets proposals prior to submission to UNHQ | • PD engagement on mission budgets proposals prior to submission to Controller  
• PD in mission assessment and inspection |
| **POC** | • Serious POC related failure, e.g., failure to respond to major incident in close vicinity to unit | • Implementation of POC police procedures in line with SGF  
• Ensure the issues being reflected in Unit Performance Improvement Plans (PIP)  
• Continuous In-Mission Training  
• Re-evaluation of unit  
• Submit appropriate recommendations to UNHQ | • Discussion in MPM22  
• PolAd (and potentially USG) engagement with PM  
• Conduct special investigation with findings reported to the Security Council or BoI  
• Consider accountability measures for relevant officers, other mission personnel (military, police and civilian) |
| **Command and Control** | • Repeated and sustained failure to adopt appropriately preventive and proactive posture | • Action relevant recommendation in Evaluation report  
• Re-evaluation after PIP  
• Inform UNHQ and endorsed this in evaluation report | • PolAd (and potentially USG) engagement with PM, including on unit leadership and training  
• Consider performance PDV, LCM engagement, Mobile Training Teams.  
• Consider discussion during the monthly performance meetings (MPMs) |
| **Weak Command and Control due to unit being split by HOPCs despite policy/ SUR/MOU restrictions** | • UNHQ Validation/ assessment teams/ OPSP to raise with HOPC and SRSG  
• Specific notation in the Performance Assessment and Evaluation Report (PAER) | • PolAd (and potentially USG) engagement with missions  
• Consider discussion during the monthly performance meetings (MPMs)  
• PD regular VTC with mission to implement recommendations |
| **Refusal to follow legitimate order** | • Formal communication to FPU commander  
• Validate the refusal with SUR tasking | • PolAd (and potentially USG) engagement with PM |

---

21 The Monthly Performance Meeting will consider a variety of remedial measures. Following due consideration of the efforts made by the PCC to address serious or systemic issues, and after exploring whether additional support can be provided by the Secretariat or other Member States, this may include relocation, re-tasking and partial or full repatriation of the relevant unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES²¹</th>
<th>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/UNPOL HQ/ HOPC/ FPAT/ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION TEAMS</th>
<th>STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY UNHQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caveats</td>
<td>• Revisit FPU’s deployment state and other limitations</td>
<td>• Discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider accountability measures for relevant officer(s), including repatriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Caveat raised by FPU despite tasking being in line with SUR</td>
<td>• Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct FPU commander to state caveat in written and confirm if it is in line with SUR</td>
<td>• Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform UNHQ officially</td>
<td>• Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PCC caveats raised by FPUs that do not appear in the SUR or MOU</td>
<td>• Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct FPU commander to state caveat in written and confirm if it is in accordance with PCC guidance line with SUR</td>
<td>• Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform UNHQ officially</td>
<td>• Consider discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Force or Violation of IHL/HR</td>
<td>• Violation of the Directives on the Use of Force (DUF)</td>
<td>• PolAd (and potentially USG) engagement with PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collateral damage involving civilian casualties</td>
<td>• Discussion in MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Violation of IHL or HR law</td>
<td>• Conduct special investigation with findings reported to the Security Council or BoI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider accountability measures for relevant personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violations of UN standards of conduct, including SEA</td>
<td>• Misconduct and Serious Misconduct including SEA</td>
<td>• [The below is in addition to and in coordination with steps taken by CDS and DMSPC leadership, including in accordance with SCR2272 (2016) in the case of SEA]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Claims of paternity and child support</td>
<td>• USG DMSPC formally notifies PCCs of allegations of serious misconduct and shares results of investigations conducted by the UN Secretariat, and requests facilitation of paternity claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report allegations of misconduct to SRSG (through Mission CDT) for investigations to be undertaken in accordance with applicable procedures</td>
<td>• Initiate investigation in coordination with Mission CDT as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Initiate investigation in coordination with Mission CDT as appropriate</td>
<td>• Command structure, with Mission CDT, to ensure induction and ongoing training on UN standards of conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Command structure, with Mission CDT, to ensure induction and ongoing training on UN standards of conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/UNPOL HQ/ HOPC/ FPAT/ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION TEAMS</td>
<td>STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY UNHQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Police Component to support Mission CDT in developing and implementing a risk management approach, including identifying and responding to risks of SEA and misconduct  
• Direct unit commander to be more vigilant and conduct motivational lectures  
• Frequent visits by mission leadership  
• Inform UNHQ if misconduct is habitual/consistent  
• Assistance and support to victims and children born of SEA | • DMSPC regularly follows-up on pending allegations of misconduct and paternity claims, formally via Note Verbale and engagement by USG DMSPC and USG DPO with PRs, and at the technical level between CDS and PolAds in PMs  
• PolAd (and potentially USG) engagement with PM  
• Consider discussion in MPM  
• Consider accountability measures for relevant personnel | |

**Environmental standards**

| • Non-compliance with UN guidance on environment, water, sanitation, hygiene, and waste management resulting in serious environmental risk | • Direct unit to immediately cease the malpractice, and properly remediate the contaminated area  
• In collaboration with the Mission Support Division, jointly develop an environmental risk mitigation plan with the unit aimed at preventing reoccurrence, including improving wastewater and solid waste management facilities, providing training to relevant stakeholders, and promulgating unit standard operating procedures  
• Direct unit to implement the environmental risk plan and regularly follow-up on the progress  
• Inform the CMMRB and UNHQ | • DPO/Police Division together with DOS/Environment Section to validate that the environmental risk mitigation plan  
• PolAd (and potentially USG) engagement with DOS and PM  
• Consider discussion in MPM  
• Consider accountability measures for relevant personnel in case of negligence | |

---

23 Examples of serious violations of the UN environmental management include the discharge of untreated wastewater the unit is responsible for in the environment, illegal dumping, or burial of hazardous material, biomedical waste and other hazardous substances outside UN designated area, open burning of hazardous waste, biomedical waste or other hazardous substances (as opposed to controlled disposal in proper incinerators) or other incidents resulting in serious environmental damage, or potential causing harm to the host community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/UNPOL HQ/ HOPC/ FPAT/ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION TEAMS</th>
<th>STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY UNHQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **In-mission training shortfalls** | • In-mission training deficiencies, including on CPX/TTX  
  • In-Mission Training  
  • PIPs  
  • Re-evaluation following month  
  • Inform UNHQ | • Consider discussion in MPM  
  • Consider deployment of mobile training team |
| **COE (ME/SS) shortfalls** | • Serious and persistent COE or Self-sustainment (SS) shortfalls that are not being addressed adequately by the PCC  
  • Identify operational implications of COE shortfalls and report to UNHQ through the quarterly verification reports and CMMRB processes. | • [The below is in addition to and in coordination with steps taken by UCSD and DOS leadership, including through the UNHQ CMMRB.]  
  • Quarterly letters by USG DOS to Permanent Missions on COE shortfalls  
  • PolAd (and potentially USG) engagement with PM  
  • Consider discussion in MPM  
  • Consider LCM engagement |
| **Welfare and Accommodation** | • Lack of support from the UN to FPUs, particularly regarding the provision of UN standard accommodation  
  • Mission DMS to ensure that all mission-level efforts are being made to provide UN standards of accommodation according to the COE manual  
  • HOPC to identify operational implications of COE shortfalls and report to UNHQ through the quarterly verification reports and CMMRB processes | • PolAd (and potentially USG) engagement with missions and DOS  
  • Consider discussion during MPM |
| **Inequality in the provision of welfare conditions between units** | • Mission DMS to provide equitable welfare supplies  
  • HOPC to identify operational implications and report to UNHQ | • PD engagement with PM  
  • Consider discussion in MPM  
  • Secretariat to remind T/PCCs of welfare and living conditions during meeting of COE Working Group in 2020 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ISSUES</strong>&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th><strong>ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY SRSG/UNPOL HQ/ HOPC/ FPAT/ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION TEAMS</strong></th>
<th><strong>STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY UNHQ</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Under-reporting of outstanding performance of specific individuals, units or sections/offices | • Direct unit commander to be more vigilant on noting outstanding performance  
• Frequent visit by HOPC to Units  
• Inform UNHQ if it is habitual/consistent | • Consider discussion in MPM |
| **Health and hygiene** | | |
| • Severe health and hygiene shortfalls that hamper operational effectiveness | • Direct CMO/ Force Hygiene Officer to frequently visit the unit to ensure SOPs and guidelines are adhered  
• Inform UNHQ | • PolAd engagement with PM  
• Consider discussion in MPM |
Triggers and Steps related to IPO Performance

### Prior to Nomination or Deployment

**Assessment for Mission Service**

- HOPC informs PD about IPO requirements for requests to Member States.
- Pre-deployment training is conducted by Member States prior to nominations*.
- Some Member States request the support of a PD selection, assessment and advisory team (SAAT), which will conduct an assessment for mission service (AMS), language, interview**, driving and shooting exams, which are valid for a period for two years.
- Member States nominate candidates and provide mandatory certifications (e.g., human rights, corruption) and PD undertakes eligibility review, including previous performance.
- For candidates not having not cleared by SAAT, PD conducts interviews.
- PO authorizes successful candidates to travel, pending medical clearance.

### During Deployment

**Evaluation of performance**

- Induction training conducted by the mission
- Internal and external in mission training by the mission

### Post Deployment

- IPO work plan based on the UNPOL component/unit plan
- In-mission AMS for personnel not cleared by SAAT.
- Bi-annual performance assessment
- Positive evaluations trigger extensions and/or support possible future deployments

---

* Specialized training materials are being revised as part of the UNPOL Training Architecture Programme.

** In line with the Strategic Guidance Framework for International Policing and a forthcoming mandatory SGP-test.
Annex 3C: Triggers and Steps related to Civilian Performance

Figure 1 ST/AI/2021/4 on the Performance Management and Development System set out the performance cycle, applicable for all civilian staff, as well as seconded police and military officers on contracted posts.

The annual performance management cycle is required for civilian staff and begins with the work planning stage over the period 1 April to 31 March of a given year. Supervisors meet with the staff under their direct supervision, ideally as a work unit group and then individually, to ensure that the objectives of the work unit are understood. Following this discussion, individual workplans are prepared by staff, discussed and agreed upon by both supervisors and staff. The work planning stage includes: (a) establishing individual performance evaluation criteria by setting goals/key results/achievements, including determining; core competencies, managerial competencies (where applicable), and job-related competencies (where applicable) to be incorporated in workplans and (b) formulating a personal development plan.
During the cycle, supervisors and staff under their direct supervision should have ongoing performance conversations which should be used to acknowledge good performance and address any shortcomings. The supervisor should also have milestone discussions/check-ins at regular intervals agreed upon with their staff based on the work of the unit. Milestone performance conversations include discussions on progress to date of the goals/key results set in the workplan and justification of any updates to the workplan goals/key results. Supervisors note the progress made in demonstrating the competencies and the progress on the personal development plan. Staff members may note the progress made on the goals set in the workplan, the competencies and the personal development plan.

The end of cycle review takes place from 1 April to 30 June. Supervisors and their staff members meet to discuss the overall performance during the cycle. Prior to the end-of-cycle discussion between supervisors and staff, the staff member is encouraged to conduct a self-appraisal of the manner in which he or she has carried out the workplan defined at the beginning of the performance cycle. The self-appraisal can contain a short description of the progress to date related to each goal/key result/achievement, and comments on his/her competencies demonstrated during the period and the achievement of the personal development plan. The supervisor evaluates the extent to which the staff member has achieved the goals/key results/achievements as set out in his/her workplan. The supervisor may also evaluate and comments on the way the staff member has demonstrated the core values and competencies and comment on the staff member’s self-appraisal in his/her evaluation of the staff member. Supervisors meet with their staff to discuss their evaluation and rating of the staff member’s performance. Supervisors are also encouraged to discuss the career aspirations of staff during the end-of-the year discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triggers for accountability measures</th>
<th>Accountability measures for underperformance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Staff receiving “partially meets” or “does not meet expectations” | At the discretion of managers and heads of entities at a local level on a case-by-case basis, decisions are taken on administrative actions. As per the ST/AI/2021/4 Administrative Instruction Performance Management and Development System, the following sanctions can be taken following a poor performance rating. These include:  
  • withholding of the within-grade salary increment,  
  • non-renewal of an appointment, or,  
  • termination of an appointment for unsatisfactory service. |
| Each year since 2010 less than 1% of staff (ranging from 0.40 to 0.97%) have received a rating of partially or does not meet expectations. | Since 2007, administrative actions were taken in 74 cases, including  
  • increment withheld (24),  
  • non-renewal / extension (39),  
  • termination (11). |
Annex 3D: Triggers and Steps related to Contingent-owned Equipment (COE)

1. Reimbursement is calculated against the MoU requirements (quantity and standards) and funds are disbursed based on availability of cash.
2. Proportional deductions to personnel reimbursement for absent / non-functional COE are subject to several provisions established by GA res. 67/281, incl. a 2 quarters grace period, and a 35% ceiling on the amount that can be deducted from personnel payments. No deductions apply where causes are deemed outside the T/PCC’s control.
3. Premium can be requested by Force Commander or Police Commissioner and needs approval in mission, by the Secretariat and by the HQ CMMRB.
4. Premium was approved by the 2020 COE working group and is effective 1 July 2020.
Contingent Owned Equipment (COE) is the equipment brought by T/PCCs deployed as formed units to peacekeeping missions. In line with the decisions of the GA, T/PCCs are reimbursed for their contributions of uniformed personnel, major equipment, and for self-sustainment services.

After the contingents have deployed, staff in the mission commence Verification Inspections to ensure each party is meeting its obligations under the terms of the MOU. After each inspection, a quarterly Verification Report is prepared and signed by substantive and support Mission leadership. At UNHQ, the report is reviewed against the MOU and the applicable reimbursement is calculated and dispersed to the contributing country subject to the availability of cash. If the MOU has not been formally signed before deployment, as sometimes occurs, the UN reimburses the contributing country for the provision of uniformed personnel. Reimbursements for the provision of major equipment and self-sustainment services are only certified and disbursed after the MOU is signed.

DOS leads on and manages the COE Verification Process. As agreed by the GA, verification and control procedures are intended to ensure that the terms of the memorandum of understanding between the UN and the troop/police contributor are met by both parties at the outset and throughout the period of effect of the memorandum. Major equipment and self-sustainment standards are defined to ensure operational capability. These standards are addressed in greater detail in chapter 3 of the COE Manual. Additionally, the derivative Field Verification and Control of Contingent-Owned Equipment and Management of Memorandum of Understanding Guidelines describes the procedures and best practices to be implemented in the mission for the verification and control of COE.

In line with the decision of the GA, proportional deductions to personnel reimbursements due to absent or non-functional equipment are made after two consecutive unsatisfactory quarterly contingent-owned equipment verification reports, in order to provide contributing countries with sufficient opportunity to address shortfalls. If major equipment is absent or non-functional for reasons deemed by the Secretariat to be beyond the control of the T/PCC, then no deductions to personnel reimbursements will be made. No personnel reimbursement deductions will be made related to absent or non-functional vehicles unless over 10 per cent of the vehicles specified in relevant memorandums of understanding are absent or non-functional. Further, the personnel reimbursement deductions on account of absent or non-functional contingent-owned equipment shall not exceed 35 per cent of personnel reimbursements for any unit in one instance.

**COE/MOU Management Review Boards (CMMRB) process**

The mission CMMRB is established as a senior management decision-making mechanism to ensure an integrated and systematic approach in executing COE/MOU management and control functions in the mission. The mission Review Board provides high-level, cross-functional guidance on the assessment of COE and periodically reviews the capability of contingents, their major equipment holdings and their self-sustainment capabilities needed to meet the operational requirements of the mission. The mission Review Board reviews and provides mission’s inputs and recommendations to DPO/DOS on COE policy issues, creation/amendment of MOUs, and actions requiring the attention of T/PCCs.
The UNHQ CMMRB provides a forum for collective and consultative deliberation leading to the development of recommendations on issues related to MOUs, COE and the reimbursement for formed units deployed to UN missions. The UNHQ Review Board considers mission-specific capability and reimbursement issues requiring cross-Departmental coordination as well as those systemic issues that cut across missions and require policy/guidance. The UNHQ Review Board develops advice with regard to MOUs, reimbursement and COE performance and changing requirements based on new mandates or concepts of operations, the associated statement of unit requirements, and proposed or requested changes to MOUs, including the deployment of new units and adjustments to existing units. The UNHQ CMMRB also reviews mission CMMRB recommendations, proposals related to the application of the reimbursement framework, and major operational or policy issues of relevance affecting one or more missions with a view to providing recommendations and advice to the relevant decisionmakers in DPO and/or DOS.

Risk premiums

The GA has also established a process on awarding bonuses (a risk premium) to formed military or police units that have acquitted themselves well despite exceptional levels of risk and operate without restrictions and caveats. The risk premium can amount up to 10 percent of the standard monthly reimbursement rate paid per contingent member. In addition to the risk premium, each member of the unit will receive non-monetary recognition through a special clasp to be affixed to the ribbon of the UN Medal and a letter of commendation from the Under-Secretary General for Peace Operations. A streamer will also be awarded to the unit.

The premium can be requested by the Force Commander or Police Commissioner and needs to be approved by the SRSG and subsequently forwarded to the Secretariat and considered by the UNHQ CMMRB, which issues a recommendation to the USGs of DPO and DOS on disbursement of the premium.

Extended Temporary Operating Bases Deployment Premium

The premium was recommended by the 2020 COE Working Group and is effective 1 July 2020. It is an incentive provided to military and police units that have been ordered to deploy to more than three (3) temporary operating bases for a cumulative period of more than twelve months for mandate-related tasks and operational requirements. These extended deployments should be caused by extreme and unpredictable situations that 1) result in a broader than anticipated deployment footprint; and 2) create a dynamic mission operational environment preventing the timely update of the statement of unit requirements.

The request for the premium should be approved by the Force Commander of the mission where the units are deployed. The premium shall be equal to five (5) percent of the quarterly reimbursement owed to the troop/police contributor for five key self-sustainment categories as agreed in Annex C of the memorandum of understanding for the number of personnel deployed to locations exceeding three (3) temporary operating bases for more than a year. These five self-sustainment categories are Catering; Communication; Explosive Ordnance Disposal; Field Defence stores and Tentage.
The Secretariat will implement any revisions to this Premium as agreed by the COE Working Group.

Operational Engagement Factor

The 2020 COE working group also reviewed the Operational Engagement Factor. While the COE Working Group did not recommend an applicable Factor during its 2020 session, the Secretariat was requested to conduct a study and propose, by the 2023 COE Working Group, options for implementation mechanisms for the factor that would reflect wear and tear of equipment related to the level of activity in the mission area.

As agreed by the General Assembly in its resolution 74/279, the Secretariat conducted a study and proposed, to the 2023 Working Group, options for implementation mechanisms for a new operational engagement factor that would reflect wear and tear of equipment related to the level of activity in the mission area. The Secretariat will implement the decisions of the General Assembly on the recommendations of the Working Group.
Annex 3E: SEA Flowchart
Annex 3F: Environmental Performance and Risk Management Framework

This Framework was established under the Environment Strategy for Peace Operations (2017-2023) as a global Environmental Management System (EMS) for peacekeeping operations and special political missions that manage their own facilities and infrastructure. It is aligned with the UN Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control Policy and enables compliance with the UN Secretariat Environmental Policy.

Continuous performance improvement

Department of Operational Support (DOS)
- Develop, update, maintain and monitor effectiveness of system and tools
- Support provision of technical assistance from GSC/REACT to peace operations
- Mainstream environment in operational support functions, e.g. category management

Site-level Assessments by Mission

Data collection by each mission

At minimum every 6 months

Online Platform (eAPP)
- Qualitative indicators
  - Processes evaluation
  - Performance evaluation
- Quantitative indicators
- Risk indicators
  - Risk levels

Continuous monitoring

Mission-level Oversight
- Senior management review, actions and accountability
- Use of data and insights to inform decision-making, e.g. management plans, budgets
- Prioritized and immediate risk mitigation as required

Effective management

Environmental Action Planning
- Agile “live” action plans for planning, tracking and improving
- Tool for target setting and estimating resourcing needs

Accountability and Financing
- SG Reports to the Security Council
  - On policy compliance and performance as per S/RES/2436 and the AIP framework (para 23)
- Performance Reports (RBB) & Budget Reports to the ACABO and Fifth Committee
  - On the Environmental Scorecard and implementation of the environmental action plan. Missions with any sites operating at unacceptable levels of environmental risk for wastewater or waste management will receive a non-score to indicate the priority of risk mitigation.
- HOM/SRSG Reports on Senior Manager Compacts
  - On the Environmental Scorecard and policy compliance.
- Mission Reports for Auditors
  - As requested, e.g. data, scorecard, action plan

Mandates, budget approvals, performance evaluations, audit recommendations

NOTE: Refer to the Environmental Policy for Peace Operations (Ref. No: DOS/2022.01) for further guidance, including reporting standards.
Effective environmental management is central to responsible engagement with host countries and communities in operational settings. As required by the Environmental Policy for Peacekeeping Operations and Field-Based Special Political Missions (DOS.2022.01), each peacekeeping operation and field-based special political missions shall uphold the principle of “do no harm” and seek to achieve maximum efficiency in their use of natural resources and operate at minimum risk to people, societies and ecosystems, contributing to a positive impact on these whenever possible. The pursuit of responsible deployment continues to be a major organizational priority, and progress continues in implementing the Environment Strategy for Peace Operations.

As shown in the visual on the Peace Operations Environmental Performance and Risk Management framework, there is a cyclical process of environmental management (in blue) that runs from regular site-level assessments by the mission to data collection and reporting to mission management oversight and decision-making to reporting on accountability and financing to environmental action planning and back to on-the-ground monitoring and continuous performance improvement; all supported by DOS (in orange).

To highlight one aspect of the framework, Peacekeeping Missions have been reporting their overall score on the Environmental Management Scorecard in their annual performance report in the RBB (now RBM) framework since 2017/18. This score, which provides a basis for the evaluation of mission environmental performance and an indication of where mission priorities lie for improvement, is derived from data collected by each mission on key indicators across the five pillars of energy, water, waste, wider impact/positive legacy, and environmental management system. In particular, where a significant level of risk involving either wastewater management or solid waste disposal is identified in even one site in the mission’s area of operations (regardless of the total number of sites a mission may have), that mission’s score is nullified, regardless of its overall score across the five pillars, and reported as such to Member States. In the mission, a Risk Mitigation Plan is immediately initiated, and DOS also prioritises support to these situations.
Annex 4: Priority projects

Annex 4A: Enhancing recognition for outstanding performance

- In line with the framework, the Secretariat agreed to reinforce the existing measures to recognize outstanding performance.

Offices involved
- DPO (OMA, PD, DPET, OPSP), DOS (UCSD)

What has been done so far
- Feb-Mar 2020: OMA and PD conducted a mapping of existing measures to recognize performance in field missions and together with DPET reviewed the existing measures to recognize performance to identify good practices across missions.
- Apr-Jun 2020: OMA and PD developed a table with performance areas, evaluation criteria for the mission and steps to be taken by UNHQ to enhance the recognition of outstanding performance. A summary is provided in 3A and 3B.
- Jun-Aug 2021: OMA and PD conducted informal discussions on drafting guidance on outstanding performance (uniformed units) and associated key parameters. OMA and PD re-engaged with missions to enhance the recognition of outstanding performance and to recommend units for recognition by UNHQ.

Ongoing work
- March 2022 – today: PD and OMA are drafting guidance on awarding outstanding performance, to facilitate high calibre proposals and public commendations.

Deliverables
- Missions to identify and recommend outstanding performance to UNHQ. UNHQ to recognize outstanding performance through reference in mission-specific SG reports and letters to T/PCCs by the USG of DPO or the Secretary-General, as appropriate.
  - Outcome: Strengthened morale of uniformed personnel, as well as better recognition of outstanding performance
- Recognition to act as incentive for outstanding performance for units
  - Outcome: Improved performance by all units as all compete in a positive atmosphere to be the “next awardee”.
- T/PCC seconding units will benefit from positive coverage
Annex 4B: Strengthening senior leadership performance management and accountability, including for Force Commanders and Police Commissioners

- Ensuring capable and accountable leadership in missions including through improving transparent selection processes that are based on merit, competence, and needs of the mission is critical. Improving training and mentoring programs for selected and prospective leadership, and developing a cadre of experienced future candidates, particularly women, for senior leadership positions is equally important.
- At a High-level event on Peacekeeping Performance on 6 December 2019, USG Lacroix shared DPOs plans to refine and tailor performance evaluations, through performance improvement plans for every Force Commander and Police Commissioner.

Offices involved
- DMSPC, DOS, DPO (OMA/MPET, OMA/FGS, PD, SFGC)

What has been done so far
- Sept 2019: A first discussion took place among OMA, PD, UCSD and DPET on 26 September, focusing on performance improvement plans for units
- May 2020: Management Performance Board reviewed Compacts of senior leadership
- Jul 2020: CdC has written to Heads of Missions to inform them of the results of the performance assessment of their 2018/19 compacts. Enhancements to 2020/21 compact template were made with strengthened language related to conduct and discipline, including SEA, internal controls, a safe and healthy workplace for mission personnel by ensuring reliable evacuation and medical care, and staff engagement, among others.
- Jan 2022: In collaboration with subject matter experts, DMSPC revised the template used for 2022 and 2022/23 compacts with a focus on streamlining, avoiding of duplication of elements contained in other monitoring and reporting instruments, and minimal reliance on self-defined indicators evaluated through self-assessment.
- Dec 2022: Management Performance Board reviewed performance against 2021/22 Compacts. The Secretary-General approved a revised compact template for 2023 and 2023/24 incorporating a centrally assessed indicator on leadership for UN Coherence.

Ongoing work
- BTAD in DMSPC and OMA and DPET in DPO continue collaboration with Field Missions to establish compacts between SRSGs and Force Commanders at ASG level.

---

24 Although the stated impact of COVID-19 in 2020/21 makes comparisons with prior periods difficult, trend analysis using 2019/20 as a baseline indicates that there have been positive developments in the areas of Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and Gender Parity. The modest increase in representation of women at most international staffing levels realized during the 2019/20 period has continued during the 2020/21 period. While efforts to ensure compliance with OSH core requirements need to continue, the majority of missions made significant progress in 2020/21. In contrast, performance against indicators concerning recruitment, end-of-cycle evaluations and oversight body recommendations (OIOS) decreased when compared to 2019/20.
• The expansion of the online Inspira-based platform to include compacts for managers at the ASG level reporting to an SRSG/HoM at the USG level has been deployed in the test environment with a launch in production scheduled for the end of Q1 2023.

Next steps
• DMSPC will brief Missions on using Inspira to create compacts between SRSGs and managers at the ASG level reporting to the SRSG.

Deliverables
• Strengthened performance management for FCs and HOPCs
  o Outcome: better performance management for senior leadership and better oversight of targets and improvements by UNHQ and gender-responsive operations.
Annex 4C: Improving Operational Performance Reports/in-mission unit performance evaluation methodologies and analysis

- Since 2017 Force Commanders have evaluated military units and submitted summaries to UNHQ in line with the 2016 SOP on Force and Sector Commander’s evaluations of Subordinate Military Entities. To enhance UN military performance evaluations, OMA developed a new process based on Task, Standards, and Indicators (TSI).
- Since 2019 FPUs are evaluated. FPUs are assessed in line with the SGF.

Offices involved
- DPO (OMA / MPET and PD)

What has been done so far

Military
- MPET developed TSIs for infantry units, which were included in the 2020 UN Infantry Battalion Manual (UNIBAM). TSIs were embedded in a new Military Unit Evaluation Tool (MUET) which was piloted and rolled out to missions in 2021.
- Feb 2022: MPET developed a Performance Improvement Plan Process to be included in the Military Performance Evaluation Tool and delivered training to missions.
- TSIs were developed and rolled out in 2022 for other infantry and enabling units, including Quick Reaction Force (QRF) Company, Military Engineer, Military Aviation, Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal, Signals, Logistics, and Peacekeeping-Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance units.

Performance Evaluators Course
- Nov 2021: MPET conducted a training event for UN Performance Evaluators as part of one of the MSV for units under MPET performance tracking.
- Jan 2022: MPET developed a concept proposal and course materials for a pilot UN Performance Evaluators course.
- Mar 2022: MPET conducted a pilot course for Military performance evaluators in Entebbe, Uganda for 9 TCCs and 3 training partners. In May 2022 MPET refined the training materials and concept proposal for the training.

Police
- FPU Commanders Courses in Oct 2020 and Nov 2021. Aug 2021-Feb 2022: UN Police leadership training courses (i) MINUSCA on professional development (13-17 Sep 2021); UNMISS on police capacity-building and development and police monitoring, mentoring and advising (5-6 Aug 2021); (iii) MINUSCA leadership cadre (17 Feb 2022).
- Nov 2021-Dec 2022: Police Division performance assessment and evaluation inspection visits conducted in MINUSMA (Nov 2021) and MINUSCA (Dec 2021), MONUSCO (Mar 2022), UNMISS (May 2022); MINUSCA (Nov 2022).
- Jun-Dec 2022: 8th & 9th Deputy Commissioners, FPU Coordinators, Chief of Operations course in Vicenza, Italy.

Ongoing work and next steps

Military
- Q1 2023: Cooperation between MPET, OICT, and DOS to embed military performance evaluation tool in UN enterprise and provide support to field missions.
• Q1 2023: Development of standards for Special Forces and Maritime Task Force, units and revision of respective unit manuals.

• Following a DPET-OMA workshop conducted September 2022, DPET/Director and OMA/MILAD called for an in-depth review of the in-mission evaluation framework, including standards, scoring and drafted SOP.

Police

• 2022: Advancement of SGF compliant performance improvements, including through the enhancement of relevant performance indicators, and development and rollout of courses under the UNPOL Training Architecture Programme.

• Mar 2023: PD performance assessment and evaluation inspection visit in MONUSCO.

• Jun 2023: 10th Course for Deputy Commissioners, FPU Coordinators, Chief of Operations in Vicenza, Italy.

• 2023: Convening of further UN Certified Instructor Development courses of the UN Police Training Architecture Programme and finalisation of related online courses.

Deliverables

Military

• Results and trends from military unit evaluations analysed by MPET, to support decision-making, and facilitation of partnerships.

• MUET used by all missions to conduct in-mission evaluations. Performance improvement plans are generated following each evaluation and implemented by the FHQs and leadership of the evaluated units.

• Revised SOP on Force and Sector Commander’s Evaluation of Subordinate Military Entities in Peacekeeping Operations.

• Military performance standards for all types of units developed, piloted, rolled out and included in UN military unit manuals.

• Evaluator’s training reinforcement package finalised, disseminated and utilized by TCCs.

Police

• Development of UN Police performance assessment methodologies on the basis of the objective norms and standards provided under the SGF.

• Roll out of the UN Police Training Architecture Programme training courses, including the first certification of Member State trainers by the UN.

Support required from Member States

• TCCs to deploy qualified evaluation officers to missions for at least 12 months' time.

• TCC continued engagement and support to follow-up on recommendations of new evaluation process.
Annex 4D: Developing a new system to evaluate military headquarters at Force, Sector and Brigade level.

- At a High-level event on Peacekeeping Performance on 6 December 2019, USG Lacroix shared DPO’s plans to evaluate Force and Sector headquarters.

Offices involved
- DPO (OMA / MPET)

Ongoing work
- OMA/MPET has developed guidance material on evaluation and associated Functions, Tasks, Standards and Indicators for Deployed Military Headquarters at Force, Sector- and Brigade level, in parallel with the review of the FHQ handbook to ensure consistency between doctrine and evaluation methods, to be published by end Q2 2023.
- OMA/MPET has been coordinating this with all Force Headquarters to get feedback on the draft SOP and associated TSIs. UN stakeholders and MS were also consulted. In January 22, MPET tested the Deployed Military HQs/FHQ Tasks, Standards and Indicators in UNFICYP Force HQ. A second pilot evaluation took place in MINUSMA in December 22.

Next steps
- MPET to roll out online data tool-based evaluation of Deployed Military HQs in MINUSMA, UNMISS, MINUSCA, MONUSCO, UNISFA, UNFICYP, UNIFIL (starting from Q2 2023).

Deliverables
- Standards for Deployed Military Headquarters Evaluation (Force-, Sector-, and Brigade level) completed (Q1 2022) and rolled out (2023).
- SOP revised and released (Q2 2023).
- Pilot evaluations of an FHQ were conducted in two missions (UNFICYP and MINUSMA) (Q1 2022/Q4 2022).
- Online Evaluation roll-out in eight (8) missions, (MINUSMA, UNMISS, MINUSCA, MONUSCO, UNISFA, UNFICYP, UNIFIL) (from Q2 2023).
Annex 4E: Comprehensive Planning and Performance Assessment System

- CPAS has been launched in all twelve peacekeeping operations since Dec 2021.

Offices involved
- DPO (DPET, OROLSI, OMA), DPPA (regional desks), DMSPC (UE2), DOS/DMSPC (OICT), UNOCC and DPO field missions

What has been done so far
- Using CPAS, all missions are developing have developed prioritized, whole-of-mission plans for delivering their mandates (“results frameworks”).
- Periodic impact assessments bring together uniformed and civilian components to evaluate the impact of their work and towards the missions’ priority objectives. Following extensive consultations with field colleagues, including in a workshop in fall 2021, the CPAS methodology was streamlined to take less time and lead to more concrete recommendations.
- Impact assessments, based on data and analysis inform mission leadership of areas of success and those that require attention, including future planning and budgets (RBB).
- CPAS data and analysis helps strengthen reporting and communications by more concretely showing how missions contribute to positive change; for example, CPAS data is used for mission-specific SG reports and factsheets for Security Council meetings.
- CPAS team and the broader gender community in peacekeeping have collaborated to house WPS data on 15 core and elective WPS data indicators on the CPAS IT platform.
- CPAS has continued to deliver regularly training on the methodology and IT platform.

Ongoing work
- Support to missions implementing CPAS including results framework review, methodology and IT training, and support in conducting impact assessments;
- Supporting missions in using CPAS to inform key planning documents, including the missions’ RBB as per UNHQ guidance.
- Development of relevant documents to support institutionalization of CPAS such as policy, guidelines and SOPs, in line with CPAS guidance document and existing policies.
- Ongoing improvements to the information technology platform in close consultation with OICT and UE2 for a long-term enterprise solution.
- Development and implementation of a senior leadership engagement strategy.
- Continued engagement with key stakeholders in DPO and UNHQ, including IOTs/desks, OROLSI, OMA, UNOCC etc.
- Conduct reviews of CPAS data and analysis in priority thematic areas, such as protection of civilians; women, peace and security; and civic engagement.

Next steps
- Institutionalize CPAS in all missions and at UNHQ by mainstreaming CPAS into mission and UN-wide planning, reporting and communications.
- Increase use of CPAS indicators, assessments and factsheets in Mission reporting and briefings to Security Council and for strategic communications by mission and UNHQ.
• Update, expand and formalize policy, guidance and training, capturing the methodology and best practices of CPAS and developing a CPAS policy.
• Expand CPAS training: senior leadership, chiefs of staff, train-the-trainers, uniformed pre-deployment, reporting officers and PIOs, self-paced online.
• Utilize CPAS data and analyses across missions to identify successful approaches and challenges in common mandated areas and cross-cutting themes such as protection of civilians and policing, and to highlight the impact and utility of peacekeeping as a whole.
• Facilitate data and analysis sharing among missions; regional analyses using CPAS data.
• Support mission-internal transition planning and monitoring of progress against transition benchmarks with CPAS data & analysis.
• Use CPAS to advance data integration, centralization, sharing and use in line with the SG’s Data Strategy.

Deliverables
• All 12 peacekeeping missions use CPAS.
• Missions will be able to assess the impact their outputs are having on the context and senior leadership to take evidence-based decisions to enhance mandate implementation
• Missions are using CPAS to inform other mission planning documents, e.g., workplans, strategies and budgets.
• Missions to better use data and analysis to inform reporting and communications.
  o Outcome: Ability to assess impact of a peacekeeping operation.

Accountability measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triggers for accountability measures</th>
<th>Accountability measures for underperformance</th>
<th>Process for follow-up on accountability measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPAS impact assessments will identify areas where missions as a whole are having greater and lesser impacts on the context and why; this analysis will be used to inform future planning and resourcing</td>
<td>CPAS itself does not have accountability measures (other tools are triggered in the event an accountability problem is identified), however, CPAS enables senior leadership to take more evidence-based decisions to enhance mandate implementation and more easily identify and address areas where the mission is facing difficulties delivering its mandate.</td>
<td>CPAS cycles vary, including on the size and tempo of a mission. A large multi-dimensional mission will conduct between 2 and 4 performance assessments a year. Each cycle provides an opportunity to see if impact has improved and identifies where resources could be better allocated to increase the impact the mission is having.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4F: Strengthening the conduct of personnel, particularly efforts to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse from a victim-centred perspective, including greater support for paternity claims

(1) Engaging with Member States to further develop and share good practices on preventing and responding to misconduct, including sexual exploitation and abuse, and providing assistance and support to victims, including on facilitating paternity claims

Offices involved
- DMSPC (CDS), Office of the Victims' Rights Advocate (OVRA)

What has been done so far
- The Conduct and Discipline Service (CDS) has been engaging with Member States on innovative, effective, and promising good practices and lessons learned in upholding the UN’s standards of conduct, for several years.
- Some best practices were published in the Secretary-General’s report on Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse in 2017 (A/71/818, 28 February 2017)
- CDS organized a High-Level meeting of Member States, co-chaired by USG DMSPC and USG DPO on 28 June 2021. It served as a forum to renew the commitment of Member States and the UN on issues pertaining to conduct and discipline, including SEA, and to share and exchange good practices. The meeting was attended by approximately 80 Member States. In connection with the high-level meeting, Member States continue to submit good practices through an online survey established by CDS, in which they share good practices and lessons learned in the prevention, enforcement, and the provision of support to victims of sexual exploitation and abuse.
- Notes Verbales sent to Member States in May 2021 and September 2021, included a link to the survey for Member States to submit good practices.
- Developed and launched a page dedicated to good practices in conduct and discipline on the website “Conduct in UN Field Missions” to highlight the high-level meeting and create a space for Member State and Secretariat good practices as a means of greater transparency.
- A series of videos highlighting certain Member States’ good practices are available to view on the dedicated page for good practices on the “Conduct in UN Field Missions” public website; other digital communications tools, are available on a publicly accessible Trello board.
- On 28 June 2022, CDS held a technical-level briefing for Member States on the ongoing interest in gathering and sharing good practices which can strengthen collective efforts to prevent and respond to misconduct, and to support victims of sexual exploitation and abuse. In tandem with this briefing, CDS asked Member States to complete the survey on good practices so that good practices can be disseminated, which has been updated and is now available in both English and French.

Next steps
• Continue to engage Member States, through communication via Note Verbale and targeted bilateral follow-up, to continue to share good practices that can be built on further and serve as models to address challenges.
• Development of an online platform for Member States to access information on good practices and follow-up directly with the implementing Member State to determine where a good practice can be adapted or replicated.

Deliverables
• CDS continues to add new good practices from Member States to the dedicated webpage (https://conduct.unmissions.org/good-practices-conduct-and-discipline).
• Develop a mechanism to allow Member States to access information on good practices in conduct and discipline to enable direct engagement between Member States and allow for adaptation of good practices to address existing challenges.

Support required from Member States
• Ongoing engagement with Member States to share good practices in conduct and discipline and in facilitating paternity and child support matters to use these to address specific challenges faced by individual Member States; this activity is ongoing.

(2) Continue serving as the Secretariat for the implementation of Security Council resolution 2272 (2016)

Offices involved
• DMSPC (CDS), DPO (OUSG, OMA, PD)

What has been done so far
• Operational Guidance for the implementation of SCR 2272 (2016) was developed. A Standing Review Committee was established as the implementing structure and Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the work of the Committee was developed
• Composition of the Standing Review Committee adjusted and revision of Operational Guidance and Terms of Reference following management reform on 1 January 2019.
• A dedicated database for the management of SCR 2272 implementation was initiated

Ongoing work
• Full operationalization of the 2272 database and of the technical working group. The database that was developed to support the implementation of Security Council resolution 2272 (2016) was finalized. DMSPC will be training key stakeholders to input required data into the database in 2022.
• Manage the Secretariat that supports the Standing Review Committee in its implementation of SCR 2272.

Next steps
• Continue ongoing work of the Standing Review Committee

Support required from Member States
• The work of the Secretariat represents a mandate for CDS/ALD/OHR/DMSPC that was not previously budgeted and demands considerable effort. CDS would welcome Member State support through funding for a JPO to support this work. A request has been circulated with Member States through the usual channels.

(3) Continue development of the Pipeline to Peacekeeping Command project to support troop and police-contributing countries in preparing commanders to lead on conduct and discipline in UN peace operations.

Offices involved
• DMSPC (CDS)

What has been done so far
• Extra-budgetary funding (Government of India) has been secured; consultant has been engaged for the project; scoping study completed in 2020, which included consultations with key stakeholders within the UN (CDS, OMA, ITS/DPET), peacekeeping training institutions and officers who formerly held command positions in UN peace operations.
• Continue development of the Pipeline to Peacekeeping Command project based on the outcomes of the scoping study.
• Consultations with UN experts on conduct issues from Headquarters and field missions.
• On 16 June 2022, CDS hosted a technical-level briefing on the Reinforcement Training Package.
• In 3rd quarter 2022 CDS held consultations with technical experts from Member States to solicit feedback on the draft reinforcement training package for commanders of military and police contingents.
• Piloting of the Reinforcement Training Package began with CoESPU in Italy, followed by Jordan.

Next steps
• Finalize development of a reinforcement training package for commanders of military and police contingents (RTP)

Piloting of the Reinforcement Training Package will continue in India in March 2023.

Deliverables
• Specific products emanating from the project will be articulated, with outcomes and timelines to develop, including with consideration of support required by Member States.

Support required from Member States
• Consultations with T/PCCs to feed into the development of the training activities/tools.

(4) Develop a strategy to strengthen engagement and cooperation between the Secretariat and Member States for the facilitation and resolution of claims of paternity and child support involving military, police, and civilian United Nations peace operation personnel.

Offices involved
• DMSPC (CDS), DPO (ODCSS, Military Advisor), OLA, OSC, OVRA

What has been done so far
• Study of Claims of Paternity and Child Support (CDS)
• Draft Framework of Action to Facilitate Claims of Paternity and Child Support Involving United Nations Peace Operation Personnel (the draft Framework) (CDS, OVRA)
• High Level Task Force (USG DMSPC-Chair, USG DPO, USG OLA, USG OSC, Military Advisor, VRA) has been established

Next steps
• Build on the findings of the Study of Claims of Paternity and Child Support as well as the draft Framework to identify concrete actions required by the Secretariat and by Member States to facilitate the successful resolution of claims.
• Develop outreach and awareness-raising strategies in cooperation with Member States, including at the highest levels, multilaterally and bilaterally.
• Develop a Communications Plan as a core component, for Member States, for the public, and other key stakeholder.
• Consider Member State accountability to facilitate the successful resolution of claims as part of an overall assessment of suitability for participation in United Nations peace operations.

Deliverables
• Final Framework and Communications Plan

Support required from Member States
• Consultations with T/PCCs to feed into the development of the Framework and institutionalization of framework accountabilities and processes into relevant United Nations policies
Annex 4G: Engaging Member States on the implementation of Paragraph 43 of the 2021 Report of the Secretary-General on Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse (A/76/702)

- The effectiveness and performance of UN peace operations is directly linked to the high standards of conduct and discipline of the personnel deployed. The Secretary-General has called on all Member States to ensure that “personnel deployed to UN peacekeeping and special political mission be subject to national prohibitions against sexual exploitation and abuse, as defined by the UN, and that sanctions imposed for such conduct be commensurate with the gravity of the acts” (para 43 of A/76/70225). As of 1 January 2024, the Secretary-General will consider such measures to be required enabling criterion for deployment.
- Member States are asked to review if their administrative rules, regulations and codes specifically prohibit sexual exploitation and abuse, with sanctions commensurate to the gravity of the acts26.
- In many instances national military and police administrative rules, regulations and codes do not specifically and explicitly prohibit sexual exploitation and abuse, as defined by the UN, while serving as a UN peacekeeper. While an individual found to have committed sexual exploitation or sexual abuse may face administrative action and sanction under a generic or "catch-all" provision, such as one requiring good conduct generally, this type of provision may not provide for a suitably serious sanction in line with the gravity of the conduct.

Offices involved
- DMSPC (CDS), DPO (OUSG, DPPA/DPO/SS, OMA, PD)

What has been done so far
- May 2022: CDS/ALD/OHR/DMSPC briefed DPO (OMA, PD and DPPA/DPO/SS) on the new requirement and on plans to sensitize Member States.
- April-May 2022: CDS/ALD/OHR/DMSPC developed a survey for Member States aimed at capturing information on compliance with the requirement contained in Paragraph 43 of A/76/702.
- 28 June 2022 and 5 December 2022: CDS/ALD/OHR/DMSPC briefed Member States at the technical level on the requirement in Paragraph 43 and the survey.

26 The term “sexual exploitation” means any actual or attempted abuse of a position of vulnerability, differential power, or trust, for sexual purposes, including, but not limited to, profiting monetarily, socially or politically from the sexual exploitation of another. Exchange of money, employment, goods or services for sex, including sexual favours or other forms of humiliating, degrading or exploitative behaviour, is prohibited. This includes any exchange of assistance that is due to beneficiaries of assistance. The term “sexual abuse” means the actual or threatened physical intrusion of a sexual nature, whether by force or under unequal or coercive conditions. Sexual activity with children (persons under the age of 18) is prohibited regardless of the age of majority or age of consent locally. Mistaken belief in the age of a child is not a defence. These definitions are incorporated by reference into the revised model Memorandum of Understanding for both military and police contingent personnel and also apply to those personnel with the legal status of Expert on Mission.
• 17 November 2022, DMSPC sent a formal communication to Member States following to draw their attention to the requirement in Paragraph 43 of A/76/702 and to the survey being used to collect related information. Member States were asked to complete the survey by 28 February 2023.

Ongoing work
• DMSPC notifies Member States of the requirement in Paragraph 43 of A/76/702 in Note Verbale communications when informing of a new allegation of sexual exploitation and abuse.
• DMSPC will receive and review data resulting from Member State survey submissions and engage Member States, as necessary.

Next steps
• DMSPC will continue to follow up on the survey being used to collect related information. Member States are asked to complete the survey. For further information or access to the survey please contact cdt-misconduct@un.org.
• DMSPC will continue to engage with Member States to support implementation.
• Q2 2023: Expected closure of survey and DMSPC briefing on results and next steps.

Support required from Member States
• Undertake necessary action to review and comply with the requirement in Paragraph 43 of A/76/702.
• Provide information to the Secretariat, through the survey, on their status of compliance with the requirement in Paragraph 43 of A/76/702.
Annex 4H: Enhancing accountability for civilian staff performance

- OHR supports the performance management and development framework through continually analysing its strengths and weaknesses and making refinements to its components, which include policy, the electronic tool, training content, monitoring and reporting on compliance and global communications to ensure the elements of this framework remain relevant. DOS supports as part of its advisory role and capacity building in support of entities.

Offices involved
- DMPSC (OHR), DOS (OSO)

Ongoing work
- The performance management pilot launched by DMSPC/OHR in 2019 provided an opportunity to test agile concepts and reflect on staff opinions about a new approach. The pilot explored ways to increase feedback practices by (i) encouraging ongoing conversations between First Reporting Officers (FROs) and direct reports, as well as (ii) implementing 360-degree feedback among teams. Overall, there were promising trends toward potential growth and development as a result of feedback practices. The pilot demonstrated an increased awareness and ease receiving feedback about their performance and leveraging constructive feedback as an opportunity for development.
- The outcome of the agile pilot was reviewed in tandem with the Secretary-General’s management reform agenda and enhancements have been made to performance management to shift it from a compliance-driven process to one focused on accountability for results, to foster a culture of ongoing dialogue between managers and staff and to promote collaboration. The new approach, launched for the 2021-2022 cycle, has streamlined the process for establishing work plans, encourages performance conversations between managers and staff and provides the opportunity for upward feedback using a 360-degree feedback mechanism. Performance conversations enable the opportunity to provide recognition, discuss career aspirations and development, mentor and guide and address underperformance. Initially, the 360-feedback mechanism, the People Management Index (PMI) had been applied to D1/D2 levels for the 2021-22 cycle and has now been rolled out to all eligible FROs, with four or more direct reports and/or secondary reports, regardless of levels, as appropriate starting with the 2022-23 performance cycle.
- The Human Resources Services Division in the Office of Support Operations in the Department of Operational Support continues to provide guidance and support to entities in the resolution of complex performance management queries, in particular regarding underperformance and termination for unsatisfactory performance. In its operational support function, it also continues to provide briefings and training to managers and rebuttal panels when Secretariat entities lack the capacity to do so themselves.

Next steps
- The upward feedback mechanism of the new performance management approach has been applied for all eligible FROs with four or more first/second reports in the 2022-2023 performance cycle.
Annex 4I: Results-based Management (RBM)/budget related aspects

- The General Assembly has approved the implementation of the RBM for the UN Secretariat 2018–2021 (A/72/773, annex II). To align to this, supporting framework indicators, including CPAS will inform the Mission Budget Document and related resource expenditures with performance in line with PPBME regulations, which in turn, will help strengthening measurements of DOA and financial performance and programme performance.
- Develop operational frameworks in line with the RBB framework, including monitoring of programme performance through Umoja Strategic Planning, Budget Formulation and Performance Management (SPPM) Applications.
- Monitoring of delegated managerial authority and financial performance and programme performance through SPPM Applications, regular in-year, performance reports and KPIs.
- Improve the linkage of programmes with resources through the development of the Umoja SPPM tool, the Integrated, Planning, Management and Reporting solution (IPMR).
- Submission of timely, complete, and accurate performance reports and budget proposals.

Offices involved
- DMPSC (OPPFB and BTAD)

Ongoing work
- Monitoring of delegated managerial authority includes monitoring of financial performance and programme performance through Umoja
- Revisions to the Financial Regulations and Rules of the UN and the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation as requested by GA resolution 77/267.
- Monitoring of delegated managerial authority by BTAD through KPIs and the internal use of the Resource Stewardship Executive Group
- MINUSMA, MINUSCA, UNIFIL and UNFICYP started to use CPAS to inform their RBBs, as requested by the Controller and the USG of Peace Operations

Next steps
- Assisting missions in improving the 2022/23 RBM framework, including using the CPAS framework to inform the RBM framework.
- Assisting missions to use the Strategic Management Application (SMA) to monitor their progress towards their Expected Accomplishments and Outputs on a semi-annual basis. Feedback from Missions’ users will be used to inform future improvements.
- Assist missions to use IPMR as a programme management tool on a voluntary basis. The solution is being piloted in some missions to aid in the adaptation of its functionality.

Deliverables
- Assisting missions in improving the RBB framework within SPPM, including using the CPAS framework to inform the RBB framework.
- The development of an SAP analytics cloud prototype of a new programme performance management dashboard is in progress. It would integrate programmatic data with transaction data seamlessly and combines capabilities for business intelligence and enterprise planning with augmented analytics capabilities.
Annex 4J: Leveraging Umoja and other enterprise solutions, to provide real-time support on performance for senior managers in peacekeeping operations

Offices involved

- DMPSC (ERPSD, OPPFB and BTAD), DOS (OSO), field missions

What has been done so far

- The Management Dashboard has been enhanced with Accountability Indicator Monitoring (or ‘AIM’), where managers can access quarterly reports on the Delegation of Authority KPIs. The releases in 2022 include OIOS Recommendations and enhanced the performance management monitoring report, in compliance with the new performance management approach and policy of ST/Al/2021/4.
- The UN Business Intelligence (UNBI) project manages the certification of Inspira and Umoja data models. It also enables additional reports in human resources, finance, and supply chain, including equipment/inventory, procurement, and shipments.
- Since 2020/21, SPPM has enabled the peacekeeping budget planning and performance management, visualizing results-based progress against approved programme plans. Enhancements include document generation, alignment with the CPAS, and the ability to construct, and link every level of the logical framework with resources as well as tagging thematic areas to meet UN system-wide and intergovernmental reporting requirements.
- 2022: UCSD and ERPSD developed and launched the Uniformed Capabilities Support Portal for Member States in early 2022. It provides key information about the UN’s engagement with T/PCCs. T/PCCs can access secure information about memorandums of understanding, verification reports, claims and payments, as well as new analytics, views and insights.
- In addition ERPSD developed Umoja Analytics dashboards to support Secretariat staff, including the enterprise risk management dashboard and the IPMR dashboard.

Next steps

- ERPSD through Umoja Analytics is in the process of implementing SAP analytics cloud solution for Umoja, which combines capabilities for business intelligence and enterprise planning with augmented analytics capabilities. These capabilities will provide managers and Member States with tools to go beyond understanding complex data to develop predictive models that help them analyse potential scenarios for planning and evaluation.
- More information and access to verification reports, calculation reports and payment letters will be made available to T/PCCs in the Uniformed Capabilities Support Portal.
- Following the pilot launch of the UN Secretariat Workforce Portal for Member States in mid-2022, the full roll out is planned for Q1 2023\(^27\).

\(^{27}\) It provides insights into data on the workforce, including the geographical diversity of United Nations personnel. Providing comprehensive information on the composition of the United Nations workforce, it is based on regularly updated data, which were previously available only on an annual basis in the reports on the composition of the Secretariat. Monthly snapshots support trend analysis and determine the geographical representation status of Member States. The portal has advanced features for data segmentation, visualization and analysis.
• Throughout 2023 ERPSD will be rolling out Umoja self-service analytics, which will benefit users at all levels of the Organization by enabling them to access Umoja data and visualizations for themselves, without having to rely on technical experts.
• The Umoja business intelligence solutions are being modernized by migrating all reports and dashboards to Umoja Analytics, which has more advanced and powerful functions. Existing reports are being redesigned to take advantage of the new capabilities offered by this technology, as well as of the enhanced data sets available, which have greater coverage and access to richer historical data.
• Joint Umoja HR Support Team is working to enhance HR reporting available via UNBI.

**Deliverables**

• The IPMR dashboard, an integrated project manager's dashboard, is an Umoja Analytics based interactive dashboard with data analytics capabilities which was rolled out in 2022 in order to enhance visibility of administrative and substantive data for management analyses and oversight. The dashboard established linkages between substantive information and financial data at multiple levels. Managers now have access to cross-functional, business critical data from various modules of Umoja, which would help them better communicate the impact of their work and manage the Organization's resources more efficiently and effectively. During 2023, the scope of the integrated dashboard will expand to include programme performance and multiple funding sources.
• Deployment of the enhancements to the Uniformed Capabilities Support Portal for Member States
• Roll out of the UN Secretariat Workforce Portal for Member States
• Roll out of Umoja self-service analytics to Secretariat staff
• Deployment of the enterprise risk management dashboard.

**Support required from Member States**

• The continued support of Member States for the enhancement of Umoja is required, to ensure that it matures and remains fit for purpose as technologies and business needs evolve.
Annex 4K: Implementing hospital evaluations to ensure minimum standards are met, identify areas for improvement, and share good practices

- The Hospital Performance Assessment Evaluation will help ensure that Healthcare quality and Patient Safety Standards are met, identify gaps and areas for improvement.
- The evaluation report gathers, and analyses tailored and healthcare-specific indicators to allow for the identification of best practices and areas for improvement in UN medical services. It complements the Force Commander evaluation. The Force Commander evaluation assesses military hospitals, however, not in terms of the medical service they are providing to patients, as well as how well they are compliant with UN medical policies, guidance, and standards.

Offices involved
- DOS (DHMOSH), DPO (SFGC)

What has been done so far
- Sept 2019: DHMOSH and SFGC launched first version of hospital evaluation tool
- Sept – Nov 2019: 16 hospital evals received via online tool, analysed initial findings, and decided to enhance scope of evaluation following first set of data
- Nov 2019: Held workshop in Entebbe on 23 Nov with CMOs & Hospital Commanders to receive feedback and identify new areas of interest where medical data could improve medical information, analysis, and insights; workshop also resulted in agreement on a standard workflow to clarify responsibility and accountability, including the need for verification documents
- Jan 2020: DHMOSH and SFGC drafted a SOP and revised the evaluation questionnaire
- Mar 2020: SOP currently being consulted by Policy focal points and Chief Medical Officers / Force Medical Officers (CMOs / FMOs) in missions
- Planned rollout of the new was postponed from June 2020 to February 2021 due to lack of medical capacity in field missions caused by COVID-19.
- Mar 2021: UNHQ sent the UN Hospital Performance Assessment Evaluation Report and missions submitted the first evaluations.
- Oct-Nov 2021: DHMOSH and SFGC conducted a detailed analysis of the evaluations, including follow-up with Hospital Commanders, Force and Chief Medical Officers.
- Nov 2021: UN senior leadership was briefed on data, analysis, and findings of the first round of evaluations.
- Feb-Mar 2022: Review of the evaluation tool in February and March to refine it based on the data and feedback from the first round of evaluations.
- May 2022: A revised version of the Hospital evaluation was shared with missions in, including a timeline for conducting the next evaluation.

Ongoing work
- Since June 2022: Follow up is ongoing to ensure facilities are submitting information to the tool at the appropriate intervals. DHMOSH also continues to provide support and reviews incoming evaluations for consistency and accuracy.
- Strategic outreach to mission CMOs / FMOs by DHMOSH to consolidate mission plans to conduct hospital evaluation reports in 2023.
Annex 4L: Improving performance by implementing the 2020 and prior COE Working Group recommendations through required studies, derivative guidance, and COE field workshops

Offices involved
- DOS/UCSD, DPO/OMA, DPO/PD, Field Missions.

What has been done so far
- The 2020 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment met from 20 to 31 January 2020 to conduct a comprehensive review of reimbursement rates and to update the major equipment, self-sustainment, and medical support services categories.
- Key outcomes from the 2020 Working Group include the introduction of buddy first aid kits, field medical assistance kits and mobile surgical modules; reimbursement for the extended deployments of military and police units in temporary operating bases; expanding the categories of ageing equipment eligible for rotation at UN expense; strengthening the provision of environmental management by encouraging the use of synchronised generator banks for greater efficiency and requiring the construction of berms around concrete platforms under generators and fuels storage areas for preventing soil pollution; and the inclusion of new major equipment, including two types of unmanned aircraft systems (micro and mini) and explosive ordnance disposal capabilities.
- The 2020 Contingent-owned Equipment (COE) Manual has been published in ODS in all six official languages (A/75/121)
- Derivative guidance to implement the decisions of the 2020 COE Working Group has been issued.

Ongoing work
- The 2023 COE Working Group took place from 16-27 January 2023. The Secretariat will implement the decisions of the General Assembly on the recommendations of the 2023 COE Working Group.
Annex 4M: Strengthening the performance of the Secretariat in guiding and supporting peacekeeping missions

- In its 2020 and 2021 reports, the C34 underscored that “performance evaluation systems should assess and hold accountable all stakeholders at all levels”, and that such systems should include “performance of the Secretariat in guiding and supporting missions”.
- The performance of the Secretariat is being assessed and evaluated through a number of tools, which are also reflected in this framework. However, the formal feedback mechanisms for missions in relation to the guidance and support provided can be further strengthened, as can feedback from T/PCCs.

Offices involved
- DPO (DPET, OMA, PD), DOS, DMSPC, missions

What has been done so far
- July 2020: DPET convened an interdepartmental working group on 9 July to map out existing tools and discuss how to implement the recommendations of the C34 report. It was agreed that efforts should be sustainable and within existing resources and build on and potentially improve existing tools.
- July – Aug 2020: DPET consulted a background paper to consolidate the existing tools and the specific responsibilities of DPO, DOS and DMSPC as well as identify next steps.
- Nov – Jan 2021: Consultations of DPO, DOS and DMSPC on the scope and composition of the board to allow a formal and institutionalized feedback mechanism from peacekeeping missions to DPO (complementary to and separate from the Management Client board).
- First Peacekeeping Operations Client Board took place on 12 April 2021. The implementation of the points and suggestions raised by missions were subsequently discussed by UNHQ and a detailed implementation plan was sent to missions.
- Second Board meeting took place on 15 Nov 2021. It took stock of the implementation since the first Board meeting and discussed new issues raised by Heads of Mission.

Ongoing work and next steps
- Implementation of points raised by Heads of Mission.

Deliverables
- Board to be constituted and bi-annual meetings to be held to promote continuous improvements to guidance and support arrangements, and policies and procedures, including process improvements and identification of areas requiring additional support to missions.
- First T/PCC feedback meeting held.