

Check Against Delivery

Statement

By

**H.E. Ambassador Mahlet Hailu, Deputy Permanent
Representative of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
to the United Nations**

At

**The 71st Session of the General Assembly, Fifth Committee
Meeting on Item 134 of the provisional agenda - Programme
budget for the biennium 2016-2017, Global Service Delivery
Model (A/71/417 and A/71/666)**

13 December 2016

New York

Madam Chairperson,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important item of the agenda. While this statement aligns with the views of G-77 and Africa, at the outset, I wish to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his commendable initiative of introducing the Global Service Delivery Model (GSDM) in the organization. Let me also thank Mr. Yukio Takasu, Under-Secretary General for Management and Mr. Carlos Ruiz Massieu, Chairman of the ACABQ, for introducing their respective reports.

It is our strong conviction that the United Nations system would have the necessary resources and business solutions to ensure that its various entities will continue their operations efficiently and deliver according to their mandates. In this regard, we hope the GSDM project will pass a test of time and meet expected results by providing system-wide support at global, regional and local levels.

Madam Chairperson,

Before going into specifics about the substance of the Reports, I wish to preface my statement by offering broader considerations.

First, the General Assembly requested in its resolution 70/248 section XIX that the Secretariat finalize a detailed proposal regarding the *Global Service Delivery Initiative*; consisting of an end-state vision and objectives as well as a business case, along with a detailed cost-benefit analysis, containing information on qualitative and quantitative benefits.

Second, it is worth noting that the ACABQ recommendations in 2015, endorsed by the General Assembly (A/70/436), regarding the progress of the GSDM - particularly, the *Target Operating Model* (TOM) - underlined the imperative of sound management based on its two defining attributes of **effectiveness** (doing the right thing) **and efficiency** (doing the right thing the right way). It was also underlined that the most cost effective and efficient distribution of functions among the different structures of the United Nations Secretariat will remain a priority.

Third, the resolution also requested that future proposals related to the global service delivery model, including budget proposals, should take into account *qualitative and quantitative* benefits from the development and implementation of the model. That entails the project will be evaluated in terms of clear benefit realization plan, which would have been contained in the report of the SG before us.

Against these backgrounds, especially considering the need to provide detailed cost-benefit analysis, it is imperative to ask ourselves, what exactly are those benefits? and does the Report respond in that direction? In view of *these*, the Report contains neither a clear business case, nor a specific cost-benefit analysis.

Madam Chairperson,

With respect to specific issues:

1. the recommendation for a Global Service Delivery location is a critical matter, which should be examined in a comprehensive and detailed manner on the basis of solid empirical data. We should also know how exactly one duty station is preferred over another.

The choice of a proposed duty station should have a logical and scientific link to the assessment conducted, which we do not have at this juncture. If we are serious about reducing costs, then obviously, high-cost duty stations would not be considered preferable unless otherwise, there is a hugely convincing reason for taking such course of action. A thorough discussion to identify where low-cost duty stations situate, compared to the proposed high-cost locations is necessary. It is also important to consider cost-driven hard facts and, proper balancing of costs and risks.

2. The explanation about the “stability” factor is a notion that our delegation wishes to contest strongly. We consider that the location assessment outcomes presented in the Report are not exhaustive, and thus we would like to see further elaboration of the costs-benefits analysis among duty stations, as well as the associated cost implications of the choice.
3. The Report proposes, for 2018-2019, the initial consolidation of services in *six locations*, among which are listed the most expensive ones. We believe that this approach would not lead to meaningful quantitative benefits, and therefore should be reconsidered. Equally important, we foresee the need for detailed explanation regarding the location arrangements envisioned for Phase 2 of consolidation. Beyond the six initial locations, are more locations be included in the future? and if so what exactly is the methodology for their selection?
4. The Report doesn't provide detailed indications on how the specific clients' needs of the various Secretariat entities, especially the

Regional Commissions that would adopt GSDM at the initial stage, have been taken into consideration. Therefore, the fundamental question is: how do we weigh our criteria? what is the benchmarking of the evaluation? Do we consider the paramount relevance of the capacity to expand offices for some additional personnel, transportation and/ or availability of medical services when we choose a post?

We will raise further queries during the informal debate, and hope that the merit of launching new change initiatives before implementing those before them will be considered very seriously.

Madam Chairperson,

Let me conclude by reaffirming that we are very much committed to contributing to the success of changes that are designed to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of all UN System entities. But we believe it is very proper to insist that the contemplated change produces results in practice, and that plans be implemented in a way that what is promised is delivered in empirically verifiable manner.

I thank you,