



ERM Enterprise
Risk Management

Risk Register 2021
UNECE

January 2021

Overview

Preamble

High risk is, by nature, an inherent component of the operation of the United Nations. While other organizations evaluate possible projects and, based on their risk assessment finally decide whether to engage or not, the United Nations must accept all mandates from the Member States, regardless of the circumstances and time. The resulting risk profile of the Secretariat is therefore high and unique, making Enterprise Risk Management the inherent core responsibility of management.

Background

- A *Secretariat-wide enterprise risk assessment* was carried out in 2014 under the direct guidance of the Management Committee to identify, evaluate and prioritize the top strategic risks for the Organization, based on the analysis of the strategic objectives of the Secretariat, the analysis of previous risk assessments, and the consideration of cross-cutting issues emerging from recommendations of oversight bodies.
- The Management Committee validated the Risk Register at the meetings of 21 May 2014 (expanded to include all the senior managers of the Organization at the head of department or office level, under the co-chairmanship of the Deputy Secretary-General and Chef de Cabinet), and 27 June 2014, and came to a common, shared understanding of risks and their criticality.
- Following a dedicated meeting of the Policy Committee, on 9 September 2014, the Secretary-General formally approved the Risk Register as the instrument that summarizes the top strategic risks for the Organization, and the governance structure to support the implementation process.
- With Resolution 69/272, the General Assembly noted with appreciation “the progress made towards strengthening the enterprise risk management system, including the development of a risk register” and “the establishment of a governance structure for enterprise risk management”; and requested “the Secretary- General to continue his efforts to implement and embed enterprise risk management throughout the United Nations”.
- Furthermore, in the most recent Resolution of April 2019 (73/289), the General Assembly stressed the importance of risk management under the new system of delegation of authority and requested the Secretary-General to report comprehensively on progress made towards embedding risk ownership and risk management in Secretariat entities.
- Following a separate dedicated risk assessment, at its meeting of 28 February 2018, the Management Committee endorsed a *focused Fraud and Corruption Risk Register* for the Secretariat.

The Risk Register

- The Risk Register includes risk definitions, a full analysis of key risk drivers, a description of the controls already established by management, and an outline of potential risk response strategies. As a part of the risk assessment, each risk was scored in terms of the risk likelihood and

impact (risk exposure). Following an evaluation of the effectiveness of controls in place to mitigate the risk, the level of residual risk was determined, as the starting point for defining the appropriate treatment response.

- Risks are classified into tiers based on the qualitative evaluation of exposures and control effectiveness as well as contributing factors gathered during the risk assessment process. As visually represented in the Risk Dashboard (page 4) following the desk review and the analysis of the results of the previous assessments, of the 7 risks identified, 4 were categorized as “very high”, requiring the immediate attention of senior management, and 3 either as “high” or “medium”.
- UNECE has updated its Risk Register each biennium since 2010-2011. As part of UNECE’s Accountability Framework, it is endorsed by senior management, and is publicly available on the UNECE website.
- The present document was finalized in December 2020, in line with the latest guidance prepared by DMSPC, as outlined in the memorandum from the USG DMSPC dated 12 November 2020. UNECE Risk Register is tailored at UNECE level and complementary with the overarching Secretariat-wide Risk Register approved by the Management Committee on 15 July 2020.
- In addition to Secretariat-wide initiatives, OIOS conducted its latest annual risk-based planning for UNECE on 27 October 2020. An audit of mainstreaming of the sustainable development goals and COVID-19 response into the programme of work of the Economic Commission for Europe is planned between October 2020 and February 2021.

The way forward

- UNECE will update its Risk register in 2022 based on the findings from the above-mentioned audit. UNECE will also be informed by the Secretariat-wide guidance developed by DMSPC and continue to consider organizational-level identified risks and mitigation measures.
- In compliance with the process outlined in the memorandum from the USG DMSPC dated 12 November 2020, UNECE will also report annually on the progress of implementation of the risk treatment plans.



Risk Dashboard¹

STRATEGIC	GOVERNANCE	FINANCIAL
<p>Planning and Resource Allocation</p>	<p>Governance</p>	<p>Funding and Investments</p>
<p>Strategic Planning & Organizational Transformation (1.1.2 & 1.1.10)</p>	<p>Organizational Structure (2.1.3)</p>	<p>Extrabudgetary Funding (5.1.2)</p>
<p>Budget Allocation (1.1.4)</p>	<p>Accountability & Empowerment (2.1.5 & 2.1.6)</p>	<p>Trust Funds Management (5.1.3)</p>
<p>Reputation</p>		
<p>Public Perception, Support and Reputation (1.4.1)</p>		


Legend: Red – Critical and Very High; Orange – High; Yellow – Medium risks


¹ Numbers associated with each risk refer to the risk number in the overall Risk Universe of the Secretariat (Annex II).


Risk Register: Very High Risks


1. Extrabudgetary Funding (5.1.2)	Risk category	Impact	Likelihood	Internal Control Effectiveness	Residual Risk	Risk Owner
	<i>Financial</i>	<i>5 – Critical</i>	<i>4 – Highly likely</i>	<i>3 – Significant improvement needed</i>	Very High 	<i>Executive Secretary</i>
Risk Definition		<i>The inability to obtain extra budgetary funding may impact the ability of certain Departments to achieve their objectives. Reliance upon extra budgetary funding may jeopardize or appear to impact the independence of the UN as projects that obtain earmarked funding are given higher priority.</i>				
Key Drivers		Internal Controls		Risk Response		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Donors might change priorities or move resources to other actors. Inherent instability of the operations and impact on the ability to plan strategically. - Lack of predictable funding may be perceived as potentially influencing the Organization to focus on donor countries' priorities as opposed to the wider group of Member States, thereby distorting programme priorities ("UN a la carte") and impacting credibility. - Loss in extra-budgetary funding will impact the programme support accounts and may also significantly affect the Organization's regular programme of work. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual Report on Technical Cooperation to EXCOM - ECE Resource Mobilization Strategy and Resource Mobilization Action Plans - Technical Cooperation strategy and internal Directive on RPTC and Regional Advisers 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Technical Cooperation report informs member States of ECE technical cooperation activities and main results achieved; it also provides comprehensive information on the extrabudgetary funding - Resource Mobilization Action Plans are realistic and updated - Update the UNECE Technical Cooperation Strategy and the internal Directive on RPTC 		
2. Trust Funds Management (5.1.3)	Risk category	Impact	Likelihood	Internal Control Effectiveness	Residual Risk	Risk Owner
	<i>Financial</i>	<i>5 – Critical</i>	<i>4 – Highly likely</i>	<i>3 – Significant improvement needed</i>	Very High 	<i>Executive Secretary</i>
Risk Definition		<i>Inability to identify, establish and maintain the optimal structure and controls for trust funds resulting in loss or misuse of assets.</i>				
Key Drivers		Internal Controls		Risk Response		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trust fund managers may have limited mechanisms to ensure stewardship of funds by implementing agencies and to enforce proper reporting on the use and impact of funds. - Potential weaknesses in the establishment and maintenance of adequate controls on the use & impact of funds, and to mitigate fiduciary or corruption risks, could expose the Organization to significant reputational issues. - Inadequate performance and accountability frameworks, including effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and appropriate results indicators, may impact the ability to measure the outcomes of funding activities. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UMOJA - Financial reporting on donor contributions - Project Monitoring Tool - EXCOM, Conventions and Governing bodies - Directive on the management of extrabudgetary funding - Grants Committee - Donor Agreements - Internal Audit - Evaluation Policy and Evaluation workplan approved by EXCOM - Risk Register & Risk Treatment Plan 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extrabudgetary projects are approved in line with established framework - Technical Cooperation projects presented by the Secretariat are approved by EXCOM - Essential review and approval of projects relating to Conventions is first performed by the respective governing bodies - Extrabudgetary projects are managed in line with established framework - Financial and performance monitoring and reporting as per donor agreements and UN financial rules and regulations - Annual reporting of the Grants Committee - Accountability mechanisms are in place to inform member States, senior leadership, donors, and beneficiaries - Continuous self-evaluation, management response, and progress reports are available on ECE public website - Risk register and Risk Treatment Plans are monitored and adjusted as necessary. 		

Risk Register: Other Risks Areas

3. Public Perception, Support and Reputation <i>(1.4.1)</i>	Risk category	Impact	Likelihood	Internal Control Effectiveness	Residual Risk	Risk Owner
	<i>Reputation</i>	<i>5 – Critical</i>	<i>4 – Likely</i>	<i>3 – Significant improvement needed</i>	<i>High</i> 	<i>Executive Secretary</i>
Risk Definition		<i>The Organization may lose key staff, contributors, and other partners or alliances and Member States' support due to negative publicity, reported illegal acts, inability to meet set operational objectives, and/or non-compliance with rules and regulations. Inability to appropriately react and respond to adverse publicity.</i>				
Key Drivers		Internal Controls		Risk Response		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tools to properly analyse and then monitor the integrity profile of donors, partners and officials working for them, or their capacity to deliver might not be effective. - Personal interest of staff in entities doing business with the Organization, use of internal knowledge and connections for personal interest, or acts committed by UN staff, experts or partners for their personal benefit impede the Organization's reputation. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Due diligence from Project Managers, Secretaries of intergovernmental bodies - ECE framework for engagement with the private sector - Global Compact - ECE Evaluation Policy - regular audit of ECE activities - Mandatory trainings - Protection against retaliation for reporting misconduct and for cooperating with duly authorized audits or investigations (ST/SGB/2017/2/Rev.1) - Risk Register & Risk Treatment Plan 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous monitoring of the external stakeholders involved in ECE activities - Due diligences of all stakeholders are conducted by Project Managers, Secretaries of intergovernmental bodies and respective directors before presenting Technical Cooperation projects or Memoranda of Understanding - Protection is enhanced for individuals who report misconduct or cooperate with duly authorized audits or investigations Oversight mechanisms are in place - Evaluations are conducted in line with the Evaluation policy, management responses are signed by directors, implementation of recommendations is tracked and reported to EXCOM - OIOS performs regular audits of ECE activities, guided by the risk register - Senior managers are accountable to implement recommendations in a timely manner - Risk register and Risk Treatment Plans are monitored and adjusted as necessary ECE Staff Members keep abreast of existing rules and regulations - Mandatory trainings are completed by all Staff - Regular broadcast recall the regulatory framework 		


4. Budget Allocation <i>(1.1.4)</i>	Risk category <i>Strategic</i>	Impact <i>3 – High</i>	Likelihood <i>5 – Expected</i>	Internal Control Effectiveness <i>3 – Significant improvement needed</i>	Residual Risk <i>High</i> 	Risk Owner <i>Executive Secretary</i>
Risk Definition	<i>Budget requests are not completely fulfilled impeding ability to effectively carry out mission, objectives, duties, plans and strategies. Day to day operations or unanticipated surges in workload can be affected by insufficient resources to carry out planned objectives and mandates. Budgetary requirements may not be appropriately articulated or evaluated relative to perceived objectives or needs. Existence of a rigid budget structure which prevents redeployment of funds and encourages over-use.</i>					
Key Drivers	Internal Controls	Risk Response				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient support from Member States leads to budget reductions voted by the General Assembly. - Low implementation rates in XB projects entail budget reductions in the following year. - Liquidity situation of the Organization prevents the issuance of full allotments. - Freeze on recruitment has an impact on the planned deliverables and activities of the programme. - Liquidity situation reduces meeting servicing capabilities and capacity to implement planned deliverables and activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EXCOM, Commission, sectoral Committees - Umoja: financial and performance monitoring systems - Proactive discussions with UNOG and DGACM to ensure that ECE intergovernmental meetings are adequately serviced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Secretariat of ECE continues to build trust with member States during the sessions of sectoral Committees, EXCOM and Commission. - Alternate measures are identified, as necessary, to organize key intergovernmental meetings, the Regional UN system meeting and other key sub-regional events in different format if not possible in-person. - Alternate measures are identified, as necessary, to deploy ECE technical cooperation activities in a different format if travel is not possible - Implementation of projects and programme of work are regularly monitored - Activities and recruitment are prioritized during budget constraints 				

5. Accountability & Empowerment (2.1.5 & 2.1.6)	Risk category Governance	Impact 3 – High	Likelihood 4 – Highly likely	Internal Control Effectiveness 3 – Significant improvement needed	Residual Risk High 	Risk Owner Executive Secretary
Risk Definition		<i>Failure to promote accountability or otherwise hold responsible parties or constituents (UN Secretariat, agencies, Member States, staff and others) accountable for actions or inaction. Lack of alignment between the authority given to staff commensurate with their responsibilities.</i>				
Key Drivers		Internal Controls		Risk Response		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An effective accountability system linking performance & reporting mechanisms (compacts, programme performance reports, audits, evaluations & performance management), & providing transparency to managers & staff, Member States, stakeholders, may not always be clearly articulated. - Potentially unclear delegation of decision-making responsibilities instituted for programme managers - Limited consequences in place to sanction staff and managers for not meeting goals. - No consequence to management for not making the right decision as a result of the tendency to rigidly follow the "small print" of regulations rather than the spirit - Management & work planning process & culture may not be results-driven or guided by requirements and funding potential - Managers may be afraid of and discouraged from taking decisions due to a risk-averse culture. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UNECE Accountability Framework - Delegation of authority for HR and finance - Senior Manager's Compact - e-Performance - System of internal justice - Proposed programme budget - Risk Register and Risk Treatment Plan 		<p>The Accountability Framework and the Delegation of Authority clarify roles and responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Accountability Framework is updated as necessary - The Delegation of Authority is fully implemented: certifying, authorizing and approving officers ensure full compliance with UN Financial Regulations and Rules - HR officer ensures full compliance with UN HR policies <p>The Senior Manager Compact summarizes the key commitments of the organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compact is prepared in collaboration with the Directors - HR and finance objectives and targets contained in the Senior Manager Compact are met. - Senior Manager Compact is monitored and reported as per EOSG established deadlines. <p>A critical linkage is maintained between institutional and individual accountability through the Executive Secretary's Compact and e-Performance of managers and staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Directors ePAS reflect objectives defined in the ES Compact - Senior managers and all staff performance are assessed annually in a fair and consistent manner in line with the OHR guidance - e-Performance implementation is monitored and reported annually. - Mandatory trainings on project management for UNECE staff in charge of projects - Staff performance is monitored and addressed regularly, not limited to the formalized ePAS system - Staff concerns are effectively addressed by managers during discussions <p>The Proposed programme budget reports on the implementation of results agreed on previous period.</p> <p>Risk register and Risk Treatment Plan are monitored and adjusted as necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mandatory risk management training for all senior managers - Proactive mitigation of risks outlined in the Risk Register 		

6. Organizational Structure (2.1.3)	Risk category	Impact	Likelihood	Internal Control Effectiveness	Residual Risk	Risk Owner
	<i>Governance</i>	<i>3 – High</i>	<i>3 – Likely</i>	<i>3 – Significant improvement needed</i>	<i>Medium</i> 	<i>Executive Secretary</i>

Risk Definition *The overall structure of the UN Organization does not support the achievement of strategic, mandated, operational and other organizational and operating objectives in an efficient and effective manner. Lack of clarity as to organizational structure and responsibilities and objectives of the UN Secretariat and other UN departments or agencies leads to confusion, conflicting or redundant activities, and ultimately, loss of public and Member State trust and confidence in the Secretariat’s ability to achieve stated objectives.*

Key Drivers	Internal Controls	Risk Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Silo” organizational structure mentality. - Objectives and priorities of the different offices and departments may be divergent, as effective coordination may be weak. - Departments/offices compete for funds / resources & look to achieve their individual objectives without understanding the Organization’s overall objectives. Lack of adequate mechanisms to work towards common goals, increasing difficulty of implementing cross-cutting activities. - Staff members may receive conflicting messages from different heads of offices or departments and may be reluctant to work together. - Some offices or organizational units may not have clearly defined organizational functions and reporting lines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mandates & Accountability Framework - Programme Budget 2021 (sect 20, 23, 35) and Proposed Programme Budget 2022 - ST/SGB/2008/9 Organisation of the Secretariat of the ECE - Executive Secretary’s Compact; Workplans of Directors of Divisions; Staff ePAS - Directors’ Meetings; Section Chiefs & Division Staff meetings - Townhall meetings and regular communication with all staff, and staff representatives - Working Group on Technical Cooperation - The CEB and its subsidiary mechanisms - SMG, Coordination between the Regional Commissions - Regular exchange of information with the UN Development Coordination Office (DCO) and UNSDG - Regular discussions with UNOG and DCM to ensure delivery of the Programme of Work. 	<p>Synergy & coherence established between policy & operational work at all levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workplans and strategy of the organization are streamlined and aligned to the Programme Plan. - All staff ePAS are aligned to the subprogrammes of work contained in the approved Programme Budget - The Nexus Approach is consistently referred to in strategic documents and programme-wide results are strengthened. <p>Senior Management commits to achieving programme objectives and delivering the expected results contained in the Senior Manager’s Compact with the Secretary General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Senior Manager’s Compact is prepared in consultation with Directors - Strategic objectives of the organization are clearly communicated to senior management, and all staff on regular occasions <p>Regular communication mechanisms are in place with key partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ECE participates regularly in the CEB discussions - Communication mechanisms are in place with DCO and UNSDG - Regular consultation with other regional commissions at all levels. - Regular discussions with UNOG and DCM to ensure delivery of the Programme of Work.

7. Strategic Planning & Organizational Transformation <i>(1.1.2 & 1.1.10)</i>	Risk category	Impact	Likelihood	Internal Control Effectiveness	Residual Risk	Risk Owner
	<i>Strategic</i>	<i>5 – Critical</i>	<i>3 – Likely</i>	<i>4 – Limited improvement needed</i>	<i>Medium</i> 	<i>Executive Secretary</i>
Risk Definition	<i>Inability of the Organization to respond to the needs of a changing environment. Conservative, risk-averse culture hinders the ability of the Organization to be flexible and responsive to change.</i>					
Key Drivers	Internal Controls		Risk Response			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change fatigue, Organization is involved in different simultaneous transformation projects (Umoja, reform of the UNDS, Management reform) - Redefinition of relationship between the regional, subregional and country levels of the UN Development System and related coordination functions - Layering of additional mandates & shrinking resources from the regular budget. Lack of systematic review of the implications of funding gaps. - Tendency to devise subprogrammes without taking Organization-wide view. - Highly risk-averse culture. Fear of taking responsibility and making decisions. - Senior managers & staff at all levels could resist change and have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. - A substantial number of legacy practices are followed without critical re-examination of their adequacy. - Inadequate tools to facilitate cultural change, e.g. flexibility to move resources. - Limited understanding of Umoja's enterprise-wide impact. - Future mobility policies may affect credible workforce planning, the retention of technical expertise & institutional knowledge, & impact the quality & relevance of the work of the Organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic vision and direction - Proposed programme budget - EXCOM and ECE Commission - USG Membership of Internal Review Team to define the new roles and functions - Senior Manager's Compact - Senior Management Team - e-Performance - Compliance with OICT policies - Knowledge management and staff learning opportunities - Flexible Working Arrangements are in place - All UMOJA modules as rolled out 		<p>Strategic vision is reflected in corporate documents and supported by member States:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Executive Secretary establishes strategic direction of ECE within the context of the broader Secretariat mandate and vision. - Proposed programme budget is prepared in consultation with ECE member States, supports change and responds to Member States reform proposals - Active engagement of ECE Secretariat in proposals for formulating options to Member States in adoption of the UNDS reform - UN Secretariat provides Member States feasible inputs to negotiations for GA decisions - Strategic support and direction from EXCOM and Commission for roles and functions in in the ECE region <p>ECE senior management supports and implements programme objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programme of Work implementation is regularly monitored to ensure that senior managers are achieving programme objectives and delivering in accordance with the Secretariat's mandates. <p>Harmonised UN Secretariat internal directions for implementation of new policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UMOJA training for all staff - FWA are formalised, monitored and adjusted as necessary. - knowledge management systems are enhanced and opportunities for learning are sought 			

Annexes

Annex I	Strategic Objectives of the Department
Annex II	Secretariat Risk Universe
Annex III	Scoring Criteria for the measurement of Impact, Likelihood and level of Control Effectiveness

Annex I

Strategic Objectives of the Economic Commission for Europe

As per the proposed programme plan for 2021 (*A/75/6(Sect.20)*)², recommended for approval by the Committee for Programme and Cooperation (*E/AC.51/2020/L.4/Add.19*)³ and subsequently approved by the General Assembly in its resolution *75/252*⁴, the strategic objective of the Economic Commission for Europe is to promote regional cooperation and integration as a means of achieving sustainable development in the ECE region.

The objectives of the subprogrammes are defined as follows:

- (i) To improve environmental governance and performance for safeguarding the environment and health;
- (ii) To advance a regionally and globally sustainable inland transport (road, rail, inland waterway and intermodality) system by making it safer, cleaner, more efficient and more affordable, both for freight transport and people's mobility;
- (iii) To advance official statistics at the national and international levels for evidence-based policymaking and assessing progress towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and to ensure the coordination of statistical activities in the ECE region under the Conference of European Statisticians;
- (iv) To strengthen policies on innovation, competitiveness and public-private partnerships in the ECE region;
- (v) To improve access to affordable and clean energy for all and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the carbon footprint of the energy sector in the region;
- (vi) To strengthen trade facilitation and electronic business, regulatory cooperation and standardization policies, agricultural quality standards and trade-related economic cooperation in the ECE region and beyond;
- (vii) To strengthen the sustainable management of forests and enhance the contribution of forests and forest products to sustainable development in the ECE region;

² [https://undocs.org/a/75/6\(Sect.20\)](https://undocs.org/a/75/6(Sect.20))

³ <https://undocs.org/E/AC.51/2020/L.4/Add.19>

⁴ <https://undocs.org/A/res/75/252>

- (viii) To strengthen member State-owned programmes and policies promoting decent, adequate, affordable, energy-efficient and healthy housing for all, smart sustainable cities, sustainable urban development and land management, and to advance evidence-based population and social cohesion policies.

Annex II

Secretariat Risk Universe

1 STRATEGIC	2 GOVERNANCE	3 MANAGERIAL	4 OPERATIONS	5 FINANCIAL	7 FRAUD and CORRUPTION
1.1 Planning	2.1 Governance	3.1 General Management	4.1 Support Services	5.1 Funding and Investments	7.1 Fraud Control Environment
1.1.1 Vision and Mandate	2.1.1 Tone at the Top	3.1.1 Mgmt of Org. Transformation	4.1.1 Translation and Interpretation	5.1.1 Financial Contributions	7.1.1 Organizational Culture & Envirmt
1.1.2 Strategic Planning	2.1.2 Control Environment/ Risk Mgmt	3.1.2 Leadership and Management	4.1.2 Procurement	5.1.2 Extra-budgetary Funding	7.1.2 ICT Governance & Cyber Security
1.1.3 Budgeting	2.1.3 Organizational Structure	3.1.3 Staff/Management Relations	4.1.3 Supplier Management	5.1.3 Trust Fund Management	7.1.3 Umoja System Control Envirmt
1.1.4 Budget Allocation	2.1.4 Transparency		4.1.4 Asset and Inventory Management	5.1.4 Donor Fund Mgmt & Reporting	
1.1.5 Prog Performance Measurement	2.1.5 Accountability	3.2 Programme Management	4.1.5 Facilities and Real Estate Mgmt	5.1.5 Cash Management	7.2 Programme Delivery
1.1.6 Planning Execution & Integration	2.1.6 Empowerment	3.2.1 Advocacy	4.1.6 Capital Master Planning	5.1.6 Investments	7.2.1 Political Influence on Prog Reprtn
1.1.7 HR Strategy and Planning		3.2.2 Outreach Activities	4.1.7 Business Continuity	5.1.7 Financial Markets	7.2.2 Implementing Partners
1.1.8 Organizational Synchronization	2.2 Ethical behaviour	3.2.3 Economic and Social Development	4.1.8 Commercial Activities	5.1.8 Insurance	7.2.3 Contingent-Owned Equipment
1.1.9 Outsourcing	2.2.1 Ethics	3.2.4 Research, Analysis and Advisory			7.2.4 Theft: Fuel, Rations, Inventory
1.1.10 Org. Transf.n & Mgmt Reform	2.2.2 Sexual Exploitation and Abuse	3.2.5 Human Rights	4.2 Human Resources	5.2 Accounting and Reporting	7.3 Human Resources
	2.2.3 Professional Conduct	3.2.6 Humanitarian Assistance	4.2.1 Resource Allocation & Availability	5.2.1 Financial Mgmt and Reporting	7.3.1 Educational/Professional Creds
1.2 Principal Organs, Partners	2.2.4 Sexual Harassment	3.2.7 Disarmament	4.2.2 Recruiting, Hiring and Retention	5.2.2 General Accounting	7.3.2 Recruitment
1.2.1 GA and Member States		3.2.8 Combatting Terrorism	4.2.3 Training and Development	5.2.3 Financial Controls	7.3.3 Payroll: Attendance, Travel, Leave
1.2.2 Partners and Donors	2.3 Communications and PR	3.2.9 Crime Prevention/Drug Control	4.2.4 Performance Management	5.2.4 Liability Management	7.3.4 Benefits and Allowances
1.2.3 Inter-Agency Coordination	2.3.1 Media Relations and PI	3.2.10 Policy Development	4.2.5 Succession Planning & Promotion	5.2.5 Staff Tax Reimbursements	7.3.5 Medical Insurance
	2.3.2 Crisis Communications	3.2.11 Inter-agency Programme Coop.	4.2.6 Mobility		7.3.6 Gifts, Entertainment, Travel
1.3 Internal & External Factors	2.3.3 Internet, Soc Media, Radio, TV	3.2.12 Conference Management	4.2.7 Compensation and Benefits		7.3.7 Conflicts of Interest
1.3.1 Political Climate - External	2.3.4 Technology Communication		4.2.8 Discipline and Conduct		
1.3.2 Political Climate - Internal		3.3 Mission activities	4.2.9 Healthcare Management	6 COMPLIANCE	7.4 Central Services
1.3.3 Economic Factors - Commodity		3.3.1 Peacekeeping/SPM Mandates	4.2.10 Occupational Safety and Health	6.1 Legal	7.4.1 Procurement
1.3.4 Unique Events (i.e. Pandemic)		3.3.2 Electoral Support	4.2.11 Security	6.1.1 Contract	7.4.2 False Statements & Laissez Passer
1.3.5 Climate Change		3.3.3 Rule of Law		6.1.2 Intellectual Property	
		3.3.4 Mission Planning	4.3 Intellectual Property	6.1.3 Anti-Corruption	
1.4 Reputation		3.3.5 Mission Start-up	4.3.1 Knowledge Management	6.1.4 International Law	
1.4.1 Public Perception & Reputation		3.3.6 Mission Liquidation	4.3.2 Information and Document Mgmt	6.1.5 Privacy	
1.4.2 Crisis & Contingency Mgmt		3.3.7 Logistics			
		3.3.8 Air, Land and Sea Operations	4.4 Information Resources & IT	6.2 Regulatory	
		3.3.9 Engineering	4.4.1 IT Strategy	6.2.1 Internal Policies and Resolutions	
		3.3.10 Communications	4.4.2 IT Security and Access	6.2.2 UN Labour Relations	
		3.3.11 Mission staffing	4.4.3 IT Availability and Continuity	6.2.3 Host country regulations	
		3.3.12 Mission Creep	4.4.4 IT Integrity		
			4.4.5 IT Infrastructure		
		3.4 International tribunals			
		3.4.1 Investigations and Prosecution	4.5 Environmental Sustainability		
		3.4.2 Trials and Appeals	4.5.1 Environmental Management		
		3.4.3 Legal Aid			
		3.4.4 Court Mgmt & Legal Support			
		3.4.5 Witness Protection			
		3.4.6 Detention Unit Management			
		3.4.7 Completion Strategy			
		3.4.8 Residual Capacity and Activities			

Annex III

Scoring Criteria for the measurement of Impact, Likelihood and Level of Control Effectiveness

Impact

Score	Rating	Description of impact						Recovery
		Safety and security	Duration	Organizational and operational scope	Reputational impact	Impact on operations	Financial impact (measured in terms of budget)	Required action to recover
5	Critical	Loss of life (staff, partners, general population)	Potentially irrecoverable impact	Organization-wide: inability to continue normal business operations across the Organization.	Reports in key international media for more than one week	Inability to perform mission or operations for more than one month	>5 per cent >\$500 million	Requires significant attention and intervention from General Assembly and Member States
4	Significant	Loss of life due to accidents/non-hostile activities	Recoverable in the long term (i.e., 24-36 months)	Two (2) or more departments/offices or locations: significant, ongoing interruptions to business operations within 2 or more departments/ offices or locations	Comments in international media/forum	Disruption in operations for one week or longer	3-5 per cent \$300 million-\$500 million	Requires attention from senior management
3	High	Injury to United Nations staff, partners and the general population	Recoverable in the short term (i.e., 12-24 months)	One (1) or more departments/offices or locations: moderate impact within one or more departments/offices or locations	Several external comments within a country	Disruption in operations for less than one week	2-3 per cent \$200 million-\$300 million	Requires intervention from middle management
2	Moderate	Loss of infrastructure, equipment or other assets	Temporary (i.e., less than 12 months)	One (1) department/office or location: limited impact within department/office or location	Isolated external comments within a country	Moderate disruption to operations	1-2 per cent \$100 million-\$200 million	Issues delegated to junior management and staff to resolve
1	Low	Damage to infrastructure, equipment or other assets	Not applicable or limited impact				<1 per cent <\$100.000	Not applicable or limited impact

Scoring Criteria for the measurement of Impact, Likelihood and Level of Control Effectiveness

Likelihood

Score	Rating	Certainty	Frequency
5	Expected	>90 per cent	At least yearly and/or multiple occurrences within the year
4	Highly likely	<90 per cent	Approximately every 1-3 years
3	Likely	<60 per cent	Approximately every 3-7 years
2	Not likely	<30 per cent	Approximately every 7-10 years
1	Slight	<10 per cent	Every 10 years and beyond or rarely

Level of Internal Control / Management Effectiveness

Score	Rating	Description
5	Effective	Controls are properly designed and operating as intended. Management activities are effective in managing and mitigating risks
4	Limited improvement needed	Controls and/or management activities are properly designed and operating somewhat effectively, with some opportunities for improvement identified
3	Significant improvement needed	Key controls and/or management activities in place, with significant opportunities for improvement identified
2	Ineffective	Limited controls and/or management activities are in place, high level of risk remains. Controls and/or management activities are designed and are somewhat ineffective in efficiently mitigating risk or driving efficiency
1	Highly ineffective	Controls and/or management activities are non-existent or have major deficiencies and do not operate as intended. Controls and/or management activities as designed are highly ineffective in efficiently mitigating risk or driving efficiency