



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
29 January 2013

Original: English

---

## Sixty-seventh session

Agenda item 146

### **Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations**

## **Implementation of the report of the Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and other related issues**

### **Report of the Secretary-General**

#### **I. Introduction**

1. The Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and other related issues was established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 65/289. By that same resolution, the Assembly requested that the Group consist of five eminent persons of relevant experience appointed by the Secretary-General, five representatives from major troop contributors, five representatives from major financial contributors and one member from each regional group.
2. In its resolution 66/264, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to facilitate the completion of the work of the Senior Advisory Group in order to allow for the consideration of the outcome of its work at the first part of the resumed sixty-seventh session of the Assembly.
3. The report of the Senior Advisory Group was transmitted by the President of the General Assembly to the Chair of the Fifth Committee in a letter dated 9 November 2012 (A/C.5/67/10). In a statement, the Chair of the Committee said that the Secretary-General would prepare a note explaining how the recommendations contained in the report would be implemented and indicating their financial implications.
4. The present report provides supplementary information to facilitate consideration by the General Assembly of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group. Particular attention is paid to those recommendations that have immediate administrative and budgetary implications. Pending endorsement of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group by the Assembly, a more detailed report will be submitted on the implementation of the new system proposed, including on the creation of new mechanisms and processes for the structure of



reimbursement. A report on the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group on the other dimensions of the vital relationship between the United Nations and troop-contributing countries (see A/C.5/67/10, para. 120) will be submitted to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations in 2014.

5. As highlighted in the letter from the Chair of the Senior Advisory Group dated 11 October 2012 to the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Group, the recommendations reflect a consensus among the Group on an integrated package of issues designed to address the underlying problems in the reimbursement of uniformed personnel in peacekeeping.

## **II. Immediate steps**

6. At the core of the integrated package of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group is the proposal for a revised approach to collecting information about the essential and additional costs incurred in deploying uniformed personnel to United Nations peacekeeping operations, so that the decision on the rate of reimbursement has a clear empirical basis. The Group envisages that new data, based on the revised approach to the survey that it recommends, would be ready for review by the General Assembly at the second part of its resumed sixty-eighth session. Until the new data are presented to the Assembly and a revised rate is approved, the Group recommends the following three integrated immediate steps:

(a) Continuing the supplementary payment equal to 6.75 per cent of the base rate of \$1,028 per person per month, from 1 April 2013 to 30 June 2014;

(b) In the interest of effective peacekeeping and to facilitate the supplementary payment, setting the typical rotation period at 12 months, except in cases where the Secretary-General determines that operational circumstances and requirements demand otherwise, starting in April 2013;

(c) To the extent that major equipment specified in relevant memorandums of understanding is absent or non-functional, thereby affecting the ability of a contingent to perform the responsibilities required of it, reducing proportionally the rate of reimbursement to the troop- or police-contributing country, also starting in April 2013.

7. The Senior Advisory Group noted that the General Assembly had approved supplemental payments on account of troop costs in the previous two financial years while identifying savings in the peacekeeping budgets. The Group recommends that, in the period before new rates come into effect, the Assembly continue this dual-track approach. The recommended measure on the rotation period and the link between equipment and personnel reimbursement are part of this dual-track approach.

### **Supplementary payment**

8. The first step recommended by the Senior Advisory Group was the continuation of a supplementary payment from 1 April 2013 to 30 June 2014. For the period from 1 April to 30 June 2013, the 6.75 per cent supplementary payment is equal to approximately \$17.7 million across all missions. The budgets for the financial period from 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014 do not reflect the supplementary payment recommended by the Group. Pending approval by the General Assembly,

the payment would lead to an increase of \$69.7 million across all missions. While missions will make every effort to absorb these requirements through reductions that will be generated through the change in rotation period and any deductions that might be made in personnel reimbursement in the case of the contingents operating with absent and non-functional equipment, or other potential savings, if the additional amounts cannot be absorbed, an additional assessment will be requested.

### **Rotation period**

9. The second immediate step recommended by the Senior Advisory Group was that the typical rotation period be set at 12 months. At present, there is no standard or typical rotation period. The guidelines annexed to the standard memorandum of understanding between a troop-contributing country and the Organization currently provides that the United Nations will pay for 6-month rotations. Many troop-contributing countries rotate less frequently than every 6 months (some 9 months, some 12 months) while some rotate more frequently (every 3 months). Any determination on the length of rotation is governed, inter alia, by the national legislation of the troop-contributing country and operational concerns. The agreed frequency is reflected in each individual agreement. In the case of formed police units, the standard rotation is currently 12 months.

10. Were the General Assembly to approve the proposal, payments for 12-month rotations would be introduced on 1 April 2013 and the relevant portion of the annex to the memorandum of understanding on rotations would be adjusted to allow for rotations to be paid on a 12-month basis. It is expected that full implementation of the 12-month rotation period will occur by 30 June 2013. During this transition, no significant savings are expected in the period from April to June 2013. Reduced requirements for the period from 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014 are estimated at \$27.3 million and at \$54.5 million for the period from 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015. The Senior Advisory Group allows the Secretary-General some discretion to decide to have more frequent rotations, based on operational circumstances. Exceptions would be agreed in the context of a specific mission.

### **Absent or non-functional contingent-owned equipment**

11. Were the report of the Senior Advisory Group to be approved by the General Assembly, beginning on 1 April 2013 a proportional reduction would be made to personnel reimbursement to a troop- or police-contributing country in the case of absent or non-functional major equipment as specified in the memorandum of understanding, affecting the ability of contingents to perform the responsibilities required of them.

12. Currently, major equipment, along with self-sustainment support, is verified in missions through the contingent-owned equipment/memorandum of understanding management review boards, which include the Contingent Commander, the Force Commander and Police Commissioner, as well as the Director or Chief of Mission Support. When equipment authorized in the memorandum is either not functional or absent, the contingent is not reimbursed for this equipment. The Secretary-General notes that contingents may still be able to perform some functions even in the case of absent or non-functional equipment. Based on the verification reports for the past 12-month period (October 2011-September 2012), there was a difference of approximately 16 per cent between the amounts payable for full deployment of all

major equipment set out in the memorandums and the amounts actually paid across all missions.

13. If this situation were to continue throughout the 2013/14 period and a direct proportional reduction were to be made to personnel reimbursements, this would amount to a deduction of approximately 16 per cent, equal to \$177.1 million, in global uniformed personnel costs, projected in the budget proposals for the 2013/14 period. This would have a different impact on each troop- or police-contributing country, depending on its level of compliance with the major equipment specified in the memorandum for each contingent in each peacekeeping operation. Noting that these reductions may have an impact on the ability of troop- and police-contributing countries to address their shortfalls, the General Assembly may wish to apply a ceiling to the reduction made on personnel reimbursements of a percentage of the absent or non-functional major equipment.

14. The Secretary-General anticipates that this measure would serve as an incentive for troop- and police-contributing countries to ensure the full deployment of all the equipment specified in the memorandum of understanding and, therefore, eventually lead to a decrease in or the elimination of the need to apply the reduction. It is also expected that over time contingents will deploy equipment to address these shortfalls, resulting in increased capabilities. As these capabilities increase, there will be a corresponding increase in financial resource requirements to deploy and operate higher equipment levels and reimburse troop- and police-contributing countries accordingly.

### **III. The new system**

#### **Survey**

15. In its report, the Senior Advisory Group noted that, over the past two decades, the United Nations has encountered difficulty in putting in place a clear and predictable system to help determine and adjust the rates of reimbursement to cover the additional costs incurred by troop- and police-contributing countries deploying to United Nations peacekeeping operations. It also noted that such a system is required to ensure that the United Nations can provide fair and equitable compensation to troop-contributing countries and should support the common objective of more effective United Nations peacekeeping operations and the optimum use of resources (A/C.5/67/10, para. 11).

16. The Senior Advisory Group expressed the view that, in order to be credible and sustainable, the system for reimbursing troop-contributing countries must have a factual basis, grounded in the reality of the actual costs incurred, and that there needs to be a transparent process for periodic adjustment and review (A/C.5/67/10, para. 54). While noting that numerous attempts have been made to collect data from troop-contributing countries, including through the process approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 63/285, the Group identified a number of flaws in how the survey has been administered and proposed a revised approach to the collection and analysis of data.

17. The problems with the current survey process identified by the Senior Advisory Group included: a low response rate, incomplete data and a lack of

interaction between troop- and police-contributing countries and the Secretariat in the administration of the survey (A/C.5/67/10, para. 57). While wishing to retain the essential content of the questionnaire currently being used, the Group proposed a number of modifications to the survey and the mechanism for its administration with the aim of yielding more consistent and timely data.

18. The Senior Advisory Group recommended a more targeted and interactive approach that would link the data-collection process more closely with the analysis and would include the following (A/C.5/67/10, para. 60):

- (a) Data collection from a smaller sample of countries representative of the full range of troop contributions;
- (b) A more focused set of questions that would facilitate a more meaningful analytical review;
- (c) An interactive data-gathering exercise that would allow for explanations and clarifications, as well as direct engagement with sample countries;
- (d) The possibility of accessing open-source information for comparison;
- (e) A one-year time period for data collection, analysis and review;
- (f) Sign-off of the data by the highest-ranking financial official in the relevant ministry.

### **Sample**

19. The Senior Advisory Group recommended that, instead of the questionnaire being sent to every troop-contributing country, a targeted sample of 10 representative countries should complete the survey. The 10 countries would be drawn from the top-20 contributors over the previous three-year period and include countries from four broad income categories (high, high-medium, low-medium and low, based on World Bank data and classification). The number of sample countries in each income category would be in proportion to the total number of troops and formed police units coming from each of these income categories. As an illustration, based on contribution levels from 2009-2012, the sample 10 countries would include one high-income, two high medium-income, four low-medium-income and three low-income troop- and/or police-contributing countries. The sample countries would need to comprise a collective minimum of 50 per cent of troop and police contributions over the previous three-year period and must be willing to provide the required data with the assistance of the survey team (A/C.5/67/10, paras. 62-65).

20. The Senior Advisory Group stressed that there would be full transparency in the selection of the sample countries. Should the General Assembly approve the recommendation of the Group, the Secretary-General would immediately contact the top-20 troop- and police-contributing countries for the past three-year period and inquire about their willingness to participate. On the basis of their response, the Secretary-General would, as outlined by the Group, ensure that the composition of the sample meets the criteria, including that they collectively fulfil the threshold of 50 per cent of all troops contributed. In the event that there were more countries willing to participate, additional considerations would be taken into account, such as the range and type of contribution, in particular the contribution of formed police units and military personnel (see A/C.5/67/10, para. 66). The sample of 10 countries would be finalized in consultation with the eligible Member States (i.e. the top-20

troop- and police-contributing countries of the past three years) and transmitted to the Assembly. The top-20 contributors of uniformed personnel over the three-year period 2010-2012 are listed in the table below.

**Top-20 troop- and police-contributing countries, 2010-2012**

<i>State</i>	<i>Percentage of all troops contributed</i>
Bangladesh	11.05
Pakistan	10.92
India	9.28
Nigeria	6.04
Egypt	5.13
Nepal	4.50
Ethiopia	4.33
Rwanda	4.09
Jordan	3.64
Ghana	3.08
Uruguay	2.60
Brazil	2.42
Senegal	2.40
South Africa	2.24
China	2.07
Indonesia	1.99
Italy	1.79
Morocco	1.75
France	1.46
Sri Lanka	1.17

**Data**

21. The Senior Advisory Group proposed that the data be collected using a pared-down version of the survey approved in General Assembly resolution 63/285 (for details, see A/C.5/67/10, para. 70). It also proposed that, in addition to continuing to collect data on the categories of additional cost already included in the survey, information be collected on the costs of providing United Nations-mandated training specific to deploying to peacekeeping operations, since such training has a direct impact on the operational effectiveness of contingents and is therefore an essential additional cost. The Group recommended requesting information about overseas allowances and the costs involved in deploying senior officers. Sample countries would also be asked about any additional and unforeseen expenses that they may have incurred in deploying to peacekeeping within each category (A/C.5/67/10, paras. 67 and 68). A draft revised questionnaire has been developed for consideration by the Group.

## Method

22. The Senior Advisory Group recommended that the survey be administered by a small dedicated team with the relevant expertise, including in finance, military budgeting and statistics. The team would assist the data-collection process through visits to the sample countries and work with counterparts in those countries to gather the data. The team, working quickly and responsively, should be able to complete the data-collection exercise in 12 months (A/C.5/67/10, para. 69).

23. In order to respect this 12-month time frame, a team of consultants would need to be identified and engaged very quickly. To this end, the Secretary-General proposes that the team be composed of three experts, to be employed as consultants. The members of the team would have to possess a range of complementary skills and experience, and be able to engage effectively with officials in military, police and defence departments.

24. The consultants would need to be selected immediately following approval of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group by the General Assembly, on the basis of the criteria set out in the terms of reference. The Under-Secretaries-General for Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support would oversee the recruitment process, which would be managed by a panel of representatives of the Office of Military Affairs, the Police Division and the Department of Management.

25. Given the importance of the survey to the integrated structure of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group and in order to ensure that the survey yields results in the short time frame stipulated, backstopping support at Headquarters will be needed, in particular with regard to assisting the consultants with data analysis and presentation. It is proposed that general temporary assistance be provided under the support account for peacekeeping operations for two staff members (1 P-5 and 1 GS (OL)) to assist with research and data analysis.

## Presentation

26. The Senior Advisory Group recommended that the data collected through the survey from each of the sample countries would be collated and the aggregated costs would be presented by category (i.e. allowances, kit and equipment, predeployment medical expenses, in-country travel and training) for each contributing country. The overall monthly cost for each sample country would also be presented. Individual countries should not be identified in the presentation of the data. Once the survey process had been completed and the data had been collected, the Secretary-General would present the information in accordance with the criteria recommended to the General Assembly (see A/C.5/67/10, paras. 71-73). In addition, under the new rate, the various amounts currently paid for personal clothing, gear and personal weaponry would be consolidated into one base rate. The actual amounts paid under each category would be collected through the survey.

## Review

27. The Senior Advisory Group recommended that once a new base rate has been approved a full review should be conducted every four years with data gathered from a newly selected sample (A/C.5/67/10, para. 76). Upon endorsement by the General Assembly of the approach to data collection recommended by the Group, the process outlined in paragraphs 17 to 25 above would be repeated 12 months in

advance of the date on which the rate would have been in place for four years. The associated financial implications of the data-collection process would be presented in the support account budget for the relevant financial year. For example, if a new rate based on the revised survey process were to be approved in June 2014, the next review date would be June 2018 and the survey process would need to begin early in 2017 at the latest. Resources for the survey would be requested in the proposed budgets for the support account for 2016/17 and 2017/18.

28. Once a new base rate has been established on the basis of the revised data-collection exercise, the Senior Advisory Group proposed that, for simplicity, the different elements currently encompassed in the rate be consolidated into one payment.

#### **Financial implications**

29. The cost of administering and providing backstopping assistance for the survey would amount to \$1.9 million for a 12-month period for three consultants on 12-month contracts, travel to the 10 sample countries, two general temporary assistance posts (1 P-5 and 1 GS (OL)) for 12 months and associated overhead costs.

### **IV. Structure of reimbursement**

30. Under the proposed new system, the Senior Advisory Group recommended a number of other modifications and adjustments.

31. The Senior Advisory Group believes that there is an opportunity to revise the existing structure of the reimbursement system to better reflect the requirements of modern-day peacekeeping. Specifically, it noted that the current structure does not distinguish between types of mission or the risk levels assumed by countries contributing forces to those missions. It is also not designed to ensure that United Nations operations — more diverse, complex and dispersed than 40 years ago — have the right kinds of military and police expertise at their disposal (A/C.5/67/10, para. 80).

#### **Premiums**

32. The Senior Advisory Group recommended the introduction of two premiums to reflect the diversity and complexity of the mandated tasks and needs of contemporary peacekeeping operations: a premium for risk and a premium for key enablers.

##### **Premium for risk**

33. The first premium recommended by the Senior Advisory Group is for contingents that have acquitted themselves well despite exceptional levels of risk and that operate without caveats or restrictions (see A/C.5/67/10, paras. 24-26 for the reasoning in support of this recommendation). Specifically, the Group recommended that the Secretary-General be authorized to award bonuses to individual units that are operating without restrictions and caveats (A/C.5/67/10, para. 83).



34. The Senior Advisory Group recommended that the annual aggregate amount of such awards be no greater than an amount equal to a 10 per cent premium paid to 10 per cent of the average number of contingent personnel deployed during a peacekeeping fiscal year. The Group also recommended that the premium be paid at the conclusion of service directly to the individual contingent members (A/C.5/67/10, para. 83).

#### *Criteria*

35. The Senior Advisory Group identified a number of criteria for deciding whether to grant a risk premium. Noting the exceptional nature of the award, the Group recommended that in implementing the proposal, if approved, the Secretary-General should take into account whether there is an exceptional and sustained level of danger to life, property and premises from hostile actions by parties to a conflict, spoilers, potential aggressors or warlords (A/C.5/67/10, para. 85). While other criteria might also be present, this criterion would have to be met in order for the awarding of a premium to be considered since the other criteria, such as high levels of threat of death or injury from mines or the existence of lethal weapons systems in operations, contribute to raising the risk of death. The presence of the other criteria set out in paragraph 85 of the report of the Group would be taken into consideration to support a recommendation in favour of an award.

#### *Application*

36. Based on the operational circumstances on the ground, a recommendation to award a premium should be made by a mission only when it considers that the identified unit or units have met the criteria set out above. The recommendations would be made to a senior-level panel convened in the mission by the Force Commander and Police Commissioner under authorization of the Head of Mission or Special Representative of the Secretary-General. The recommendation would be reviewed at Headquarters and be accompanied by supporting documentation showing that the unit or units are performing in circumstances of exceptional risk. The Senior Advisory Group recommended that a decision on the award, if applicable, be made quarterly (A/C.5/67/10, para. 113). Given the exceptional nature of the award and the limited funds available, there would be no expectation that awards would be approved every quarter.

37. Each recommendation would be reviewed in four separate steps. First, a panel comprising senior civilian and uniformed personnel at the mission level would assess whether any units meet the criteria (see para. 35 above). Second, the panel's recommendation would need to be cleared by the Head of Mission before being forwarded for review to Headquarters. Third, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations would review the recommendation with support from the Office of Military Affairs, the Police Division and the Office of Operations before deciding whether the performance of the unit warrants the premium. The Under-Secretary-General would have delegated responsibility from the Secretary-General to approve recommendations on a quarterly basis. Fourth, if, after review, the recommendation is approved, a 10 per cent premium would be awarded to the members of the specific unit under consideration, for the period during which it had been documented that they were at risk.

38. The recommendation and the decision to grant the risk premium would be verified against existing information from sources originating in the mission, including daily situational reports, code cables, force and police daily activity reports and any other reports from the Force Commander or Police Commissioner providing official confirmation of the use of live ammunition.

39. Payment should be made in the mission area, before the repatriation of the troops, since it would not be possible to affect payment from New York to individual soldiers. Missions have a cashier's office and the structure to make local payments. In order to mitigate any risks owing to deployed contingents having large amounts of cash, the payment would be made only as part of the formal check-out process.

40. Should the decision to grant the award be made after deployment, payment would need to be made to the Government of the troop-contributing country, whose responsibility it would be to ensure payment to the individual soldiers of the unit.

#### *Financial implications*

41. The granting of a risk premium is contingent on a new rate of reimbursement being agreed to by the General Assembly, on the basis of data collected through the modified survey process. It is therefore not possible to provide precise information on the financial implications of the recommendation made by the Senior Advisory Group on the payment of risk premiums beyond stating that such implications would be limited to no more than 1 per cent of overall troop reimbursements. Were the Assembly to approve the recommendations of the Group, the Secretary-General would develop full proposals on the funding mechanism for the payment of such premiums.

#### *Review*

42. Subject to approval by the General Assembly, the Secretary-General proposes that an annual review be conducted of the application of the recommendation and that a report on the financial and other implications of its application be provided in the context of the peacekeeping overview report. The office of the proposed Director for the evaluation of field uniformed personnel, to be presented in the proposed budget for the support account for 2013/14, could be tasked with monitoring the awarding of the premium.

#### **Premium for key enablers**

43. The Senior Advisory Group noted that there are specialized capabilities that many peacekeeping operations require to fulfil their mandates and that are often in short supply (A/C.5/67/10, paras. 86-88). The Group also noted that the reimbursement system should be structured to support the contribution of a sufficient quantity of specialized capacities and units to meet the demands of contemporary peacekeeping mandates. This requires sustaining and supporting the current pool of countries offering troops while also expanding the base (A/C.5/67/10, para. 37).

44. The Senior Advisory Group recognized that, in the longer term, the structure of the reimbursement system should adapt with the times and examined the possibility of reimbursing countries for the provision of units rather than by

individual headcount. In its view, for such an approach to work, certain prerequisites would need to be met. The Group believes that the reimbursement system should evolve in line with progress in this area (A/C.5/67/10, para. 91). This is in keeping with the capability-driven approach articulated in the most recent report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (A/67/632) and through regular briefings and updates to that Committee.

45. While in favour of retaining a standard per-capita base rate structure to reimburse the costs of military and formed police, the Senior Advisory Group recommends that a premium be paid for key enablers that are in high demand and short supply. The Secretary-General would decide from time to time and mission by mission which enabling capacities, if any, would qualify and the size of the premium in each case. As with the risk premium, there would be a ceiling for the overall amount that could be awarded in any financial year. The annual aggregate amount of such premiums would be no greater than an amount equal to a premium of 15 per cent paid to 20 per cent of the average number of contingent personnel deployed during the peacekeeping fiscal year (A/C.5/67/10, para. 90).

#### *Application*

46. Any recommendation to award a premium for key enablers should be based on an analysis of the capability gap lists that have been maintained by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations since 2009. The assessment that a capacity is in short supply and high demand and therefore that the criteria for eligibility for the premium have been met would be based on evidence that there was a consistent gap in the mission concerned for a period of at least six months and that every effort was made to fill that gap. In the interest of transparency and equity, all contributions of the capacities judged to be eligible will receive the premium for the financial period.

47. In a new mission, premiums would not be granted unless every effort to find the capacity in short supply had been exhausted; only then would a recommendation be made for the premium to be granted.

48. The recommendation should be made on the basis of the exceptional nature of the premium and be mission specific. In line with the ceiling recommended by the Senior Advisory Group, the initial premium offered to units meeting the short-supply and high-demand criteria against reimbursements to troop- and police-contributing countries would be 15 per cent, to be paid for the relevant financial period and reviewed on an annual basis.

#### *Financial implications*

49. Once a decision has been made to award the premium to a specific contingent, disbursement would be made to the Government at the same time as the regular troop cost payments, subject to availability of cash in mission accounts.

50. As with the recommendation for the risk premium, an assessment of the financial implications is contingent on a new rate of reimbursement being agreed to by the General Assembly, on the basis of data collected through the modified survey process. Since no premium would be paid until after a decision on a revised rate has been made, it is not possible to provide detailed information on the financial implications. Total payments, however, would be limited to 3 per cent of overall

troop-related reimbursements. As noted in paragraph 41 for the premium for risk, were the Assembly to approve the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group, the Secretary-General would develop full proposals on the funding mechanism for the payment of premiums for key enablers.

#### *Review*

51. The awarding of the premium would be reviewed annually under the auspices of the Director for the evaluation of field uniformed personnel, if that post is approved. An analysis would be provided of where, for what capabilities and to which troop- and police-contributing countries the premium was paid and of the impact of the payment of the premium on contributions and individual mission mandates. In addition, the overall system of troop- and police-contribution would be monitored. It would also be important to assess how the possibility of receiving a premium affected force generation. As indicated in paragraph 42 for the premium for risk, the financial and other implications of paying a premium for key enablers would be reported in the context of the peacekeeping overview report.

### **Welfare and Internet access in missions**

52. The Senior Advisory Group expressed concern that the levels of expenditure on welfare arrangements were uneven and did not always enable the recommended minimum standards to be met. The Group believes that direct payment of sums to a mission for disbursement to individual commanders is more likely to ensure that the original intent of the reimbursement will be achieved and to improve consistency between different national contingents. The Group recommended that the amounts allocated for the provision of Internet access to contingents be administered at the mission level (A/C.5/67/10, paras. 95 and 98).

53. Were the recommendation of the Senior Advisory Group to be approved by the General Assembly, the amounts provided for welfare (\$6.31 per contingent member per month) and Internet access (\$2.76 per contingent member per month) would be disbursed directly at the mission level. Additional control measures would need to be put in place to monitor and record the appropriate use of these funds.

### **Payment to troop- and police-contributing countries**

54. In order to make more frequent reimbursements to troop and formed police contributors, the Controller decided that, while maintaining the current quarterly reimbursement schedule, the cash situation of peacekeeping missions would be monitored on a continuous basis so that peacekeeping missions for which troop-contributing countries could not be paid during the last quarterly payment due to cash insufficiency in their special account, but which have subsequently received sufficient cash influx, would have out-of-cycle reimbursements made to troop- and police-contributing countries. This would ensure that the balance owed to those countries would be kept at a minimum throughout the year.

### **Compliance**

55. The Senior Advisory Group recommended that systems be put in place to ensure effective monitoring of predeployment training, operational readiness and the evaluation of mandate delivery and that resources be made available for proper

verification and assessment throughout the life of the mission (A/C.5/67/10, paras. 118 and 119). The establishment of a Director-level post to evaluate field uniformed personnel would ensure enhanced monitoring and evaluation of the use of uniformed resources in peacekeeping, including training and operational readiness. The proposal for the establishment of such a post, whose incumbent would report to the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, will be submitted in the context of the proposed budget for the support account for 2013/14.

#### **Other aspects**

56. The Senior Advisory Group identified other dimensions of the vital relationship between the United Nations and troop-contributing countries that require attention and makes a number of recommendations in that regard. Were the General Assembly to approve the report of the Group, a report on these aspects will be submitted to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

### **V. Actions to be taken by the General Assembly**

57. **Should the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group be approved, the General Assembly is requested:**

(a) **To take note that the implementation of the immediate steps recommended by the Senior Advisory Group would result in expenditures of \$17.7 million for the period from 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013 and \$42.4 million for the period from 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014 across the budgets of peacekeeping operations;**

(b) **To approve additional resources in the amount of \$534,900 for the period from 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013 for the support account for peacekeeping operations, inclusive of two general temporary assistance positions (1 P-5 and 1 GS (OL)), and approve \$1,365,500 for the period from 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014 for the support account for peacekeeping operations, inclusive of two general temporary assistance positions (1 P-5 and 1 GS (OL)) for undertaking the revised survey;**

(c) **To discontinue the administration of the questionnaire mandated by General Assembly resolution 63/285.**