



CF Item = Barcode Top - Note at Bottom =
CF_Item_One_BC5-Top-Sign

Page 1
 Date 07-Sep-2003
 Time 6:48:14 PM
 Login ask



CF/NYH/EPP/RAM/1999-0424

Full Item Register Number [auto] **CF/NYH/EPP/RAM/1999-0424**

ExRef: Document Series/Year/Numb

Record Item Title

UN Common Services Evaluation Framework Consultancy April-May 1999

Date Created/ Date on Item
 18-Oct-1999

Date Registered
 18-Oct-1999

Date Closed/Superceeded

Primary Contact **Bill Cooke**
 Owner Location **Record & Archive Manage Related Functions=80669443**
 Home Location **Record & Archive Manage Related Functions=80669443**
 Current Location **CF/RAF/USAA/DB01/2000-14477 > Record & Archive Man**

d1: In, Out, Internal Rec or Conv Copy
 Fd2: Sender Ref or Cross Ref
 Fd3: Format

Container Record
 Container Record (Title)

CF/RAF/USAA/DB01/2000-14477
1999 RAM Chron Log, Part IV RAM 99-406 To RAM 99-538

N1: Numb of Pages
 0

N2: Doc Year
 0

N3: Doc Number
 0

Full GCG Code Plan Number
 Record GCG File Plan

Da1: Date Published

Da2: Date Received

Date 3

Priority

Record Type **A01 Item Corr - CF/RAI/NYHQ/DPP/RAM was ITD/RAM**

Electronic Details

No Document

DOS File Name

Alt Bar code = RAMP-TRIM Record Number

CF/NYH/EPP/RAM/1999-0424

Notes

The Consultant's Final Report on the Establishment of an Evaluation Framework for the Common Services Project

Print Name of Person Submit Images

Signature of Person Submit

Number of images
 without cover

A. Koc ✓ ✓

Alan K. Koc

2

Institute for Development Policy and Management

I
D
P
M

CF/WYU/EPD/RAM/1994-0424

UN COMMON SERVICES

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK CONSULTANCY

APRIL - MAY 1999

Bill Cooke, IDPM
University of Manchester, UK



THE UNIVERSITY
of MANCHESTER

**UN COMMON SERVICES
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK CONSULTANCY**

APRIL - MAY 1999

**Bill Cooke, IDPM
University of Manchester, UK**

COMMON SERVICES EVALUATION FRAMEWORK CONSULTANCY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction, terms of reference and methodology

1. This report is an output of a consultancy being conducted by William (Bill) Cooke, of the Institute for Development Policy and Management, Victoria University of Manchester, UK. The consultancy is in respect of Common Services in UN New York headquarters organisations
2. Summarised, the overall purpose of the project is to “[d]evelop a generic evaluation framework for use of Common Services (CS) Task Force and CS Working Groups. This evaluation framework will enable the Task Force to assess and evaluate the varied options” proposed by Working Groups.
3. The methodology consisted of reviewing documentary materials (in relation to performance evaluation frameworks in general, UN reform, and the Common Service initiatives), interviews of Task Force, Working Group members, along with other key stakeholders, and the initial construction of the framework, proposed implementation process, and this report

Recommendation

4. This report recommends that the evaluation framework proposed in this report is piloted with one or all of the Travel, Procurement, and/or Facilities Management Common Services, according to the suggested action.

Progress and challenges for Common Services

5. The report outlines the evident progress made through the Common Services project, in terms of service improvements, and in developing the UN culture. In trying to achieve service improvement through inter-organizational reform, the Common Services project locates the UN at the leading edge of managerial reform. Common Services parallels private sector initiatives to build “strategic alliances”, and public sector multi-agency “partnerships”. The challenge now faced is the common one of maintaining the impetus of the Common Services project in the light of the inter-agency complexities within which Common Services have to operate.

The context of the framework

6. The analysis carried out for this report suggests that:
 - i) Performance evaluation should be seen as a process. Evaluation frameworks develop and adapt as they are used. The framework designed for this consultancy should therefore be seen as work in progress which will be refined as the project develops.
 - ii) Evaluation frameworks should be simple and straightforward, comprehensive, yet easy to understand and use.
 - iii) Setting performance measures and standards is however complex; perceptions of service quality are subjective, and desired service quality outcomes often have to be traded off between one another (eg speed v. accuracy) and between stakeholders.
 - iv) According to interview findings, a framework should address *what is delivered* - service quality outcomes and *how these outcomes* are delivered.
 - v) The delivery and management of Common Services is located in a complex organisational framework, where line management authority and accountability is not clear. That there has been good progress to date is indicative of commitment and goodwill on the part of Task Force and Working Group members.
 - vi) Given this organisational complexity it is important that senior Executive level guidance and policy direction is provided to the project as a whole.

The Framework

7. The performance evaluation framework designed for this consultancy is deliberately simply structured, and its content is straightforward. It proposes three tiers of questions which it is proposed both Working Groups and Task Force use to structure their work in relation to Common Services.
8. At the highest level it begins by posing two simple, open questions, one about processes of delivery, and the other about performance and quality of outputs. The two broad headings of the framework are:
 - i) Do we have the ability to effectively deliver what is required for this area of Common Services ?
 - ii) Does this Common Service meet its customers' expectations?
9. At the second tier the framework then proposes a series of supporting questions which are intended to bring the general questions into sharper focus.
10. The third tier questions are about "performance measures". Building on the supporting questions, they are intended to provide an analysis of what is actually happening in

terms of performance management in the Common Service in question, and of where performance “gaps” might be.

Applying the framework

11. It is proposed that testing and developing the chosen framework(s) should happen through at least one pilot workshop, after initial comments from key stakeholders. The objectives for the workshop are provided in the report, and an outline workshop agenda is in the appendices. The report also provides an indicative workplan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Introduction and acknowledgements	1
2. Terms of reference and recommendation	1
3. Methodology	2
4. Common Services progress and challenges	4
5. Background Findings	5
6. UN Specific Findings	7
7. The Proposed Evaluation Framework	11
8. Action Plan	14
Appendices	Appendix
Terms of Reference	1
Work Schedule	2
Indicative Outline Workshop Process	3

1. INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 1.1 This report is an output of a consultancy being conducted by William (Bill) Cooke, of the Institute for Development Policy and Management (IDPM), Victoria University of Manchester, UK. The consultancy is in respect of Common Services in UN New York headquarters organisations, and the component to which it refers ran from 7 - 19 April 1999 in New York; and 26 - 30 April and 3-5 May 1999 in Manchester.
- 1.2 The consultant would like to thank the Assistant Secretary General/CSS and Executive Coordinator for Common Services, Mr Toshiyuki Niwa for his direction and support in setting up the exercise, and particularly his insights into the complexities of the Common Services Project. The day to day support and guidance of Mr Luis Mendez, Project Coordinator for Common Services, and the advice of Mr Jim Provenzano (Policy Adviser, OCSS), is also acknowledged. Gratitude is also expressed to all Task Force members, Working Group chairpersons, Controller and Assistant Secretary General Halbwachs, Mr. David Woodward of the External Board of Auditors, and Ms Ellen Abrenica and Mr David Curzon of the OIOS, Mr Jonathan Childerly of MPO, Mr Norman Sanders of UNOPS, all of whom made the time to be interviewed and were without exception constructive and helpful in their comments

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RECOMMENDATION

Purpose of the consultancy

- 2.1 Terms of reference for the consultancy are at Appendix 1. Summarised, the overall purpose of the project is to "[d]evelop a generic evaluation framework for use of Common Services (CS) Task Force and CS Working Groups. This evaluation framework will enable the Task Force to assess and evaluate the varied options" proposed by Working Groups. The intention also is that working groups use the framework to evaluate options to be put to the task force.
- 2.2 In discussions with the Project Co-ordinator it was agreed to adapt point (1) of the terms of reference, to review, but not to establish a summary profile, of the varied decision making and evaluation criteria by UN organizations. This was due to logistical complexities and the limited timeframe. The actual framework is presented and discussed in further detail in section 7 of this report.

Benefits of an evaluation framework

- 2.3 The development of a standard framework for the evaluation of Common Services should help in the following:
- i) Better informed judgements about the efficiency and effectiveness of Common Services.
 - ii) A process for assessing "subjective" views of Common Service delivery.
 - iii) Clearer prioritisation and negotiation processes with respect to what Common Services are delivered by whom.

iv) Increased comparability of Common Service processes.

v) A basis for service improvements.

2.4 The process of implementing a standard framework will also indicate just how far it is possible to take the Common Services concept (see section 4 below)

Recommendation

2.5 **It is therefore recommended that the evaluation framework proposed in this report is piloted with one or all of the Travel, Procurement, and/or Facilities Management Common Services, according to the action plan in section 8 below.**

3. METHODOLOGY

Overview

3.1 A work schedule for the consultancy is attached as Appendix 2. Activities can be split into three categories:

i) Review of documentary materials.

ii) Interviews.

iii) Constructing the framework and report.

Review of documentary materials

3.2 In the period before the New York phase of the consultancy, and particularly in the Manchester based phase, a range of general materials - publications, documents and websites - on performance frameworks, evaluation, and measurement in private and public sector organisations were reviewed. While the UN is a unique organisation, there are nonetheless relevant general points about what can and cannot be done with performance measurement. These are discussed below as "background findings".

3.3 Throughout the consultancy a substantial range of materials from the UN were reviewed. These included:

i) General materials on UN reform (for example, the Secretary General's Report "Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform" A/51/950) and on specific reform initiatives (eg RBB).

ii) Documents which illustrated the existing planning, decision making, evaluation, and oversight processes within the UN in general (eg UNICEF's Office Management Plans).

iii) Background papers on Common Services, for example the 1996 JIU report on Common Services at the UN Headquarters, the "Common Services Strategy Paper",

and most recently, the Common Services Task Force Terms of Reference agreed in the Task Force of 10 March 1999.

- iv) Minutes of the meetings of the Task Force, and of the individual working groups, and associated documents, for example summaries of deliverables.

Interviews

- 3.4 As the work schedule shows, interviews were conducted with all the members of the Task Force or their representatives, with one exception. It was not possible to arrange an appointment with the Office of Legal Affairs.
- 3.5 Interviews were also conducted with the chairpersons of nine of the ten working groups, with Mr Hesling of UNFPA substituting for K. Bhalla of UNDP with respect to the Facilities Management Working Group . The consultant also attended a meeting of the Transportation Services working group scheduled during his time in New York, where he presented his progress to date, as well a presentation on IMIS by the chairperson of the working group.
- 3.6 While the focus of each individual interview varied, according to the role and responsibilities of the person being interviewed, the purpose of the interview process as a whole was to identify:
 - i) The context in which Common Services in general and the evaluation framework in particular have to operate, in terms of strategic and operational priorities, and governance and decision making processes within the Secretariat and the Funds and Programmes.
 - ii) Whether there were any commonly recurring broad themes or headings which could form the basis of the evaluation framework.
 - iii) What performance management processes (eg business planning) were already in place.

4. COMMON SERVICE PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

- 4.1 At the very start it is important to be clear about both progress to date and the challenges facing Common Services. It should be recognised from the start, therefore, that in trying to achieve improved efficiency and effectiveness through networks of *inter-organisational* (rather than *intra-organisational*) processes, the Common Services project locates the UN at the leading edge of managerial reform. Common Services are a UN equivalent to private sector "strategic alliances", and public sector "partnerships".
- 4.2 However, the jury is still out on alliances and partnerships. Because of their novelty there are few tried and tested approaches to the management of these networks. While there have been early successes, it is far from clear how successful they will ultimately be, unless tricky issues of governance and control are tackled. This also is the case with Common Services. There has been a lot of progress. However the Common Services project can be seen as being on the point of moving to a second phase where these bigger challenges have to be addressed.

Progress to date in Common Services

- 4.3 Generally, where networks of organisations do work successfully, a significant determining factor is the shared commitment and sense of purpose amongst the individuals involved. This was clearly evident during the consultancy, helped by the divesting of Chairpersons' roles to the Funds and Programmes, and the personal dedication of all those involved in Common Services. This development of UN culture, which many Task Force and Working Group members acknowledge, is an intangible yet extremely important advance achieved through the Common Services project.
- 4.4 Identifying other areas of progress is invidious, in that space limits the examples which can be cited. The following are of recent note:
- i) The activity of the procurement WG relating to the development of common financial regulations for procurement.
 - ii) The identification of staff entitlement issues to be harmonised, and the work on trimester reviews of AMEX service quality by the Travel WG.
 - iii) The Financial Services WG work in relation to common Treasury functions and security safeguards with respect to cash/cheque disbursements.
 - iv) The work of the Archives and Records Management WG on guidelines for the archiving of email and electronic documentation, and on a common UN archives centre (although the latter has stalled in relation to finding a suitable location).

Challenges for Common Services

- 4.5 Generally, research on strategic alliances and on public sector partnerships suggests, however that once obvious gains have been identified, further progress becomes more difficult. There are questions of "who is the boss", and of which partners' needs take priority. Investment decisions can also be problematic, and degenerate into arguments

about who pays. Sometimes these issues can only be resolved by the agreement of new inter-organizational governance structures, which reintroduce a clarity of management accountability, formalise issues of co-ordination and provide a mechanism for agreements about services levels to be reached.

- 4.6 Further, for alliance/partnerships approaches to work, a strong performance measurement and evaluation culture, in which comparisons between partners about service management and delivery are made, is necessary. Underpinning this is the need for a methodology, or framework which enables parties to identify with transparency precisely how their processes operate, to what standards and with what resources.
- 4.7 Achieving this transparency can be problematic. This is not just because, generally speaking, people naturally feel the need to "protect their patch". Existing mechanisms for internal accountability often make sharing performance information with partners problematic (managers can often be told "don't share this information outside the organisation until it has been seen and cleared internally"). Compiling information for a new evaluation framework can also appear to duplicate work carried out for internal processes, eg business planning. This reinforces the argument that governance structures may also have to be addressed.
- 4.8 The challenges that the UN faces in Common Services are not therefore unusual, but they are nonetheless real. There was a common concern in the interviews about how early successes would be built on; and as the example of IMIS suggests the need for changes in governance in some areas has been recognised. Likewise, the very existence of this consultancy, and the implementation of the framework it recommends are steps in establishing a performance measurement and evaluation culture.
- 4.9 At the same time, the success or otherwise with which the framework is implemented will demonstrate how far it is possible to go with the Common Services approach. Specifically, it will show how far respective partners can achieve the level of mutual collaboration and transparency that Common Services requires.
- 4.10 However, given the collaborative nature of Common Services, it is also important that guidance in terms of future direction is provided from a level of the UN which carries weight with all actual and potential Common Service partners. This can only be the senior Executive level.

5. BACKGROUND FINDINGS

- 5.1 Although the review of the general literature and resources on performance management covered material that was not UN specific, it nonetheless highlights a number of points of direct relevance.

Existing evaluation frameworks

- 5.2 There are a number of existing, "off the shelf" performance evaluation frameworks. Some of these have been developed by organisations for their own internal use. Others have been developed for generic use. In the US, the GAO has developed the "Balanced Scorecard" framework, but probably the best known is that associated with the

Baldrige Award. In Europe, the equivalent is the EFQM's Business Excellence Model. This is a framework for assessing performance results and the "enablers" which should help achieve these results. Despite its title, it is applied internationally in the public sector.

- 5.3 While one option would be to use one of these frameworks, the strong recommendation here is that **the framework developed for this project, which is more straightforward and developed with the UN context in mind is applied**. The rationale for this recommendation is summarised in table 1 further below, addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the "off the shelf" approach. The proposed framework is not inconsistent with the existing frameworks, however, and would not preclude their adoption at a later date, nor learning best practice lessons from them.

Performance evaluation as a process

- 5.4 The development of performance measurement and evaluation in organisations has to be understood as a *process*. Successful performance management is not simple a question of developing an evaluation framework one day, specific performance measures the next, and implementing them the next. There is an always continuing process of development and refinement, which can only work with the committed participation of those using the framework.

The need for simplicity

- 5.5 It is best to start with and maintain a simple framework which is relatively easy to understand and apply. The cost of performance evaluation should not outweigh the potential benefits achieved, nor should it distract from core objectives. At the same time, any framework has to be consistent with, and work alongside existing performance management processes, for example those associated with strategic and/or business planning and management information systems.

Setting measures and standards is complex

- 5.6 While any evaluation framework should be simple, the processes of identifying what should be measured, and what good or bad performance standards are, is complex. This complexity is not avoided by developing an evaluation framework because:
- i) Service delivery is notoriously difficult to manage, and service levels difficult to specify. This is because perceptions of quality on the part of the consumer are subjective; the consumer participates in the delivery of the service; and services are intangible.
 - ii) The process of defining what "good service" is requires negotiation among stakeholders who may have different sets of priorities depending on their own different operational and strategic goals.
 - iii) Desired levels of service standards often have to be set off against one another (a typical example being speed versus accuracy) and again, this trade-off can trigger negotiation between stakeholders.

- iv) There can be a trade-off between service improvement and costs, although this is not inevitable. Initiatives to improve service quality which do not initially factor in cost can be counterproductive; commitment to improving service quality can be undermined if it becomes apparent late in the day that there are funding constraints.

6. U.N. SPECIFIC FINDINGS

- 6.1 There are also a set of findings specifically related to the operation of Common Services within the UN in New York. It is recognised in recording these here there is a danger of the consultant telling Task Force and Working Group Members what they already know. However these findings are significant in that (along with those above) they do inform the construction of the framework itself, the proposed process for implementing it, and decisions about broader framework options.

Key framework headings

- 6.2 Throughout the interviews the issues which arose in terms of performance management and evaluation consistently fell within two very broad headings. These were
- i) Performance in terms of *what is delivered*, that is the performance and quality of service as perceived by its customers.
 - ii) Performance in terms of *how the service is delivered*; that is the efficiency of the processes through which service delivery is achieved.
- 6.3 It is proposed that these two headings form the basis of the framework, which is presented in detail below.

Organisational complexity and interdependence

- 6.4 Most obviously, there is an organisational complexity surrounding actual and potential Common Services, evident with respect to the dispersed nature of line management accountability and ownership. It means that improving Common Services cannot be achieved by the traditional process of line management direction and leadership. Rather what is required is a collaborative ethos, in which persuasion, negotiation and goodwill are required.
- 6.5 There is also a complexity in the range of services provided within some supposedly "common" services areas. For example, while procurement appears a common activity, timescales and the nature of the goods and services being procured vary considerably. Opportunities for economies of scale are at their greatest when outputs - in the form of goods and/or services - are standardised, and conversely, diminish as outputs become more varied. Having said that, it is still possible to generate standard elements of a service delivery process.
- 6.6 Finally there are interdependencies - particularly between Common Services themselves, and Common and Central Services. These operate at two levels. The first is where ongoing service delivery is dependent on another service. The second relate to

service improvement, where Working Group proposals are dependent on support or authorisation from others. The obvious example in both cases is IMIS; but OLA also figured in discussions with respect to the latter.

Existing performance management processes

- 6.7 While the terms of reference with respect to this point were adapted, it is clear that there are existing planning, monitoring and evaluation processes, and associated measures or indicators, in the Secretariat and the Funds and Programmes. The "Guidelines for Programme Monitoring and Evaluation" of 12 November 1997 (ref 11220/97) issued by Under-Secretary General Connor (Management) and Under-Secretary General Pashke (Internal Oversight Services) requires, inter-alia:

"Each department and office should have a system for monitoring progress in all assignments under its responsibility, including the outputs and services listed in the programme budget narrative, against schedules or norms...."

A concerted effort should be made by each department and office to identify the major users of its outputs and services, and to track indicators of the use made of its work"

- 6.8 The issue for Common Services, and this consultancy in particular is not that these systems do not exist, but that they are the responsibility of more than one "department and office". Consequently, the format of these systems in the Secretariat and in the Funds and Programmes is not common. This makes comparability of CS processes and outputs more difficult. It also means that a new evaluation framework has to recognise and build on these systems, rather than duplicate their work in a different format.
- 6.9 Evidence of these systems which it was possible to consider in some detail were:
- i) The "Guide to Results Based Budgeting (RBR)" produced by the Programme Planning and Budget Division, which sets out a clear and coherent methodology for specifying objectives, outputs, and performance indicators. The objectives and performance indicators the consultant has seen (in relation to the Travel and Transportation Service and Management Policy Office in the Secretariat) provide evidence that this methodology works for planning purposes at least. It is also worth noting that RBB also has its basis in a very simple and clear initial framework ("the Logical Framework").
 - ii) UNICEF's established, systematic and organisation wide Office Management Plan (OMP) process, which requires functions to identify major goals, objectives, primary clients, key strategies and indicators to monitor progress on objectives. The OMP is an already established and working planning, monitoring and evaluation process. Much of the ground covered by the evaluation framework proposed below can be covered within the OMP process.
 - iii) At a more operational level, the Service Performance Monitor report for the Secretariat produced in the past by American Express, reviewing performance in

terms of access/responsiveness, customer focus, knowledge/expertise, airfare (ie price) and so on.

- 6.10 It should be stressed that these are not the only processes of this nature within the Secretariat and the Funds and Programmes; UNOPS, for example, also has a sophisticated business planning process. In addition the various oversight bodies evaluate performance in some depth across the UN. An example from OIOS is Secretary General's Note to the ECOSOC Committee for Programme and Coordination E/AC.51/1997/2, an in depth evaluation of the statistics programme.
- 6.11 Discussions with Mr Woodward made it clear that the external auditors also assesses service delivery using indicators. An example of the assessment of common services at the United Nations Offices at Geneva and Vienna (pp 37 - 43, Financial Report and audited financial statement for biennium ended 31 December 1997 (A/53/5)), which retrospectively (of necessity) measured key aspects of service delivery in recruitment and selection, preparation of conference documentation, and procurement.
- 6.12 It is also the case that existing and proposed management information systems, most notably, but not exclusively, IMIS, have the capacity to provide data, and this needs to be incorporated into the evaluation framework.
- 6.13 As with the existing "off the shelf performance" evaluation frameworks discussed in 5.2, it might be possible to use or adapt an existing UN performance planning and management process - for example the "Logical Framework" which is the basis of Results Based Budgeting, or UNICEF's Office Management Planning Process (OMP) - as a performance evaluation framework. Again, the balance of strengths and weaknesses summarised in table 1 suggests that the framework proposed below is the one that should be used, albeit in a way that builds on and takes account of the existing UN processes.

Table 1: Comparative Strengths and Weaknesses of Framework Options

Framework	Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>The framework designed for this project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed “in-house” - with an understanding of the UN system • Designed with the specific organisational complexities of UN common services in mind • Common UN heritage more likely to make it acceptable to other specialized organisations • Designed to fit with existing UN performance management processes • Simpler and easier to apply <u>and adapt</u> than most “off the shelf” frameworks • Covers processes and outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has no track record of application • No national/international standing among stakeholders (eg member states)
<p>An “off the shelf” framework (eg Baldrige, EFQM)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National/international credibility among stakeholders (eg member states) • Track record of international application in not-for-profit organisations • Can be seen in operation • Allow internal/external benchmarking comparisons • Materials available in different (European) languages (EFQM) • Designed to require very little consultant support (EFQM) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not designed with UN system or Common Services in mind • Not tested under under Common Service organisational complexity • Overly complex as a starting point • Each framework has regional associations • Which framework to select becomes a bigger issue than Common Service improvement
<p>Adapting an “in house” framework eg OMP, Logical Framework (RBB)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already used within the UN system – familiar to Task Force and Working Group members • In house expertise already existing • Less dependency on consultants • Credibility, as can be seen in operation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not designed with Common Services in mind • Assumes clear line accountabilities – adaptation may be required for Common Service organisational complexities • Not designed as a performance evaluation framework. • Which framework to select becomes a bigger issue than CS improvement

7. THE PROPOSED EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The context of the framework

7.1 In sum, the analysis carried out for this report suggests that:

- i) Performance evaluation should be understood as a process. This means that the proposed initial framework should be seen as a starting point and understood in the context in which it is to be used. It is a work in progress to be refined as project developments occur.
- ii) That any evaluation framework should be simple and straightforward.
- iii) That it should recognise that setting performance measures and standards is complex.
- iv) That the framework should address *what is delivered* - service quality outcomes and *how these outcomes* are delivered.
- v) That the delivery and management of Common Services is located in a complex organisational framework.
- vi) The performance evaluation framework should recognise and build on existing and proposed performance management processes (eg RBB, OMP, business planning, MIS).

The structure of the proposed framework

7.2 The performance evaluation framework developed in relation to this project's terms of reference is very deliberately simply structured, and its content is straightforward. It proposes three tiers of questions which it is suggested both Working Groups and Task Force use to structure their work in relation to common services.

7.3 At the highest level it begins by posing two simple, open questions, one about processes of delivery, and the other about performance and quality of outputs. These are the two broad headings of the framework:

- i) Do we have the ability to effectively deliver what is required for this area of common services ?
- ii) Does this Common Service meet its customers' expectations?

7.4 At the second tier the framework then proposes a series of supporting questions which are intended to bring the general questions into sharper focus.

7.5 The third tier questions are about "performance measures". Building on the supporting questions, they are intended to provide an analysis of what is actually happening questions specifically about performance management.

THE COMMON SERVICES EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

LEVELS 1 and 2

LEVEL	PROCESSES	PERFORMANCE AND QUALITY
1) General question:	Do we have the ability to effectively deliver what is required for this area of common services ?	Does this Common Service meet its customers' expectations?
2) Supporting questions:	1) What are the processes involved in the delivery of this common service ? 2) How are these processes managed in terms of - planning - goals/targets/objectives - decision making and accountability 3) What are the resource requirements - human - financial - information - buildings and plant - other ?	1) How are the required standards of performance specified ? 2) How do we measure quantity/volume of performance ? 3) How do we manage and meet our customers expectations ? 4) How do we relate performance and quality to resource inputs ("value for money") ?

THE COMMON SERVICES EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

LEVEL 3

LEVEL	PROCESSES	PERFORMANCE AND QUALITY
3) Performance measures	<p>1) What are the processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are service delivery processes mapped ? • Is ownership of each stage of the process clear ? • Are there time and other measures for each stage of the process ? • Are there "end to end" performance measures ? <p>2) How are processes managed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an operational/ business plan ? • Are there goals/targets/ objectives at the unit/subunit/ individual levels ? • Is there a clear decision making and review procedure? <p>3) Resource requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the number of people at each grade known? • Is the organisational structure defined ? • Is budget allocation and accountability clear ? • Are information and other resource requirements clearly mapped ? • Do we analyse economy and efficiency in use of resources? 	<p>1) Performance specification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we specify according to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - technical requirements - timeliness - dependability - courtesy - ease of access/use ? <p>2) Quantity/volume of performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we quantify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - number of transactions - number of people served - number of satisfactory transactions - number served satisfactorily ? <p>3) Manage and meet out customers expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we know who the customers are • Do we know and manage what our customers want and get/ want and don't get/ don't get and want ? <p>4) Resourcing performance and quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we analyse effectiveness in use of resources • Are we able to relate cost/ resource to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - client group - unit of output - per transaction?

- 7.6 It should be noted that while the framework considers performance measures, it does not directly address performance indicators, which enable the qualitative management of processes and outputs. This would mean developing the framework to too complex a level. However, it is anticipated that performance indicators would be addressed in the application of the framework.
- 7.7 It should also be noted that although designed with Common Services in mind, the framework is also applicable to other central support services.

8. ACTION PLAN

- 8.1 What follows assumes that the original terms of reference hold, and that the framework designed in this project is applied. It is intended that the framework is used as the terms of reference suggest, for assessing and evaluating the options put to the Task Force by the Working Groups. The framework should facilitate the identification of "gaps" in processes and in performance and quality, and hence priorities for action.
- 8.2 It is proposed that testing and developing the framework should happen through at least one pilot workshop, after initial comments from key stakeholders. The objectives for workshop for a given Common Service area would be, using the evaluation framework:
- i) To raise awareness of methods and techniques of performance management
 - ii) To review existing performance management processes
 - iii) To identify preliminary/existing service quality measures and indicators
 - iv) To identify process performance indicators
 - v) To agree next steps for service improvement, to be fed back to the task force
- 8.3 Circumstances change, but at the time of the consultant's New York visit, the most propitious areas for the application of the framework appeared to be Travel, Procurement and/or Facilities Management. An outline agenda for the workshop is attached as Appendix 3.

Workplan

- 8.4 Subject to initial comments on the report on the proposed evaluation framework, a suggested indicative workplan would be:
- i) Week 1: Presentation of the report to Common Services Task Force, assessment of outstanding IMIS matters.
 - ii) Weeks 2 – 6: Ongoing presentation of report summary to WG's; amendment of report/ framework/ implementation plan post-presentation
 - iii) Week 7: Selection of pilot WG's; presentation of detailed workplan

iv) Week 8/9: Pre-workshop preparation

v) Week 10 : Pilot performance management workshop

vi) Week 11: Presentation of workshop results to Task Force,

vii) Week 12- 14: Evaluation of process to date; agreement of further next steps.

9.2 It should be stressed that these times are notional, and will require adjusting in the light of further discussions , and existing plans for Task Force and Working Groups.

APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

SSA Proposal - Common Services

NAME:

William (Bill) Cooke (*CV attached*)
Institute of Development Policy & Management
Victoria University of Manchester
Manchester, UK
Tel: 44-161-275-2800
Fax: 44-161-273-8829
Email: bill.cooke@man.ac.uk

OBJECTIVE:

Under the direct supervision of the Project Coordinator for Common Services (CS) with overall policy direction provided by the Executive Coordinator for Common Services; the consultant is to:

WORK ASSIGNMENTS:

Project : *EVALUATION FRAMEWORK*

Develop a generic Evaluation framework for use of the Common Services Task Force and the CS Working Groups.

This Evaluation framework will enable the Task Force to assess and evaluate the varied options provided by the CS Working Groups in order to reach a suitable management decision and recommendation. The Working Groups will be using the same framework as benchmark indicators or guidelines for purposes of evaluating options to be provided to the Task Force for their consideration and action.

1. Establish a summary profile, by United Nations organization, of the varied decision-making and evaluation criterion applied in order to reach policy-action decisions. Interviews with Task Force core members required.
2. Based on this summary profile, develop a generic Evaluation framework acceptable and agreed to by all members of the Task Force as standardized benchmarks for reviewing options provided by the WG's. *This same framework to be used by the Working Groups in evaluating options on common services proposals to be presented to the Task Force.*
3. Implement a pilot-test of the Evaluation framework with one Working Group (ie. Procurement), thereafter facilitate the use of the same framework with the Task Force members while deliberating on WG options.

APPENDIX 2: WORK SCHEDULE

Tuesday 6 April 1999

Depart Manchester
Arrive New York

Wednesday 7 April

09.00 Meeting Mr Luis Mendez, Project Coordinator and Ms Eriko Takahashi,
Secretary on Administrative Arrangements

Initial Briefing

14.00 Initial Briefing (continued)

15.00 Mr Jim Provenzano, Policy Advisor, OCSS

16.30 Mr Toshiyuki Niwa, Assistant-Secretary General/CSS/DM, Executive
Coordinator for Common Services

Thursday 8 April

08.15 Briefing/review meeting, Mr Luis Mendez

09.00 Reading background documents

11.00 Ms Guptil, Mr Keefe, Chairpersons, Archives and Records Management
Working Group

14.00 Mr Dossal, Director, MPO/DM

Friday 9 April

08.15 Briefing/Progress Review, Mr Luis Mendez

10.00 Mr R. Helmke, Executive Director, UNOPS

11.00 Ms V. Lavorel, Assistant Administrator, UNDP

14.00 Review of documents/interview results

15.00 Mr Ando, Mr Rao, Mr Hesling, UNFPA

16.00 Mr Saunders UNFPA (Chairperson), Mr Nardi UNOPS, Procurement Services
WG

Monday 12 April

- 08.15 Briefing/Progress Review, Mr Luis Mendez
- 09.30 Mr J Childerly, MPO/PM
- 10.30 Mr A. Toh, Director, Procurement Division
- 11.30 Ms E. Abrenica, Deputy Director and Mr D. Curzan, Chief Central Evaluation Unit, OIOS
- 12.30 Ms Sham Poo, Deputy Executive Director, UNICEF
- 14.30 Mr Crosa, Director, Interpretation, Meetings and Publishing and Chairperson, Printing Working Group
Mr Kazarov, Chief, Reproduction Section, Printing WG
- 16.00 Mr G.P. Roz, Ms J McDonald, Chairperson IMIS WG

Tuesday 13 April

- 08.15 Briefing/Progress Review, Mr Luis Mendez
- 10.30 Mr N. Lannana, Chief, Travel and Transport, UNICEF and Chairperson Travel and Transport Working Group
- 12.00 Mr N. Sanders, Chief Information Officer, UNOPS
- 14.00 Mr Bronner, Chief, Travel and Transportation, CSS/DM
- 15.00 Mr N. Sardegna, Deputy to ASG/CSS/DM

Wednesday 14 April

- 08.15 Briefing/Progress Review, Mr Luis Mendez/Review of data
- 10.30 IMIS Demonstration
- 14.30 Mr Mbaidjol (for Mr Asomani), Deputy Director, UNHCR
- 15.30 Mr El Kouhere, Deputy Director, WFP
- 16.30 Mr A. Dossal, MPO/DM

Thursday 15 April

- 08.15 Briefing/Progress Review - Mr Luis Mendez
Review of documents
- 10.30 Transport and Travel Working Group meeting
- 14.00 Progress Review - Mr Mendez, Mr Provenzano
Preparation of aide-memoire
- 17.00 Mr David Woodward, External Auditors/NAO (UK)

Friday 16 April

- 08.15 Briefing/Progress Review, Mr Luis Mendez
- 9.30 Review of documentary data; review of interview data
Preparation of aide-memoire
- 15.30 Presentation of aide memoire to Mr T. Niwa, ASG, CSS/DM

Monday 19 April

- 08.15 Briefing/Progress Review, Mr Luis Mendez
- 10.00 Ms J. Beagle, Director, SSD/OHRM/DM, (Chairperson, Personnel Services WG)
- 11.30 Mr C. Hesling, UNFPA, (Member, Facilities WG)
- 14.00 Mr Halbwachs, Controller and Assistant Secretary General
- 15.00 Final debriefing, collation of documents

Tuesday 20 April

- 08.15 Final debriefing, Mr Luis Mendez
- p.m. Depart New York

Wednesday 21 April

- a.m. Arrive Manchester, UK

Monday 26 - Friday 30 April

- Review and analysis of data and documentary materials collated in New York

Review of documentary material forwarded from New York

Preliminary draft of Report

Tuesday 4 - Friday 7 May

Ongoing review

Finalising report

Correspondence/communication with New York

APPENDIX 3: COMMON SERVICE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP

INDICATIVE PROCESS

Components of the workshop process

- i) Pre-workshop WG briefing and preparation (data/information collection)
- ii) Two day workshop
- iii) Post workshop report back to Task Force
- iv) Action plan implementation

Objectives

With respect to a given Common Service area, the workshop will:

- i) Raise awareness of methods and techniques of performance management
- ii) Review existing performance management processes
- iii) Identify preliminary/existing service quality measures and indicators
- iv) Identify process performance indicators
- v) Agree next steps for service improvement

WORKSHOP AGENDA

Day 1

Session 1 Introduction

Objectives

Welcome by WG chair

Revisiting WG achievements and issues to date

Revisiting background/overview of the evaluation framework

Session 2 What do we do already/where are the gaps ?

What is already in place in terms of the questions identified in the framework, using pre-workshop data collected ?

What is not in place ?

Session 3 Issues and techniques in managing service quality

Reviewing the differences between goods and service management, particularly in not-for profit situations

Techniques for managing and specifying service quality

Day 2

Session 4 Filling the performance and quality gaps

Review of day 1

What are the key gaps in service quality ?

What steps do we take to bridge them ?

What are the key service quality performance indicators ?

Session 5 - Issues and techniques in managing delivery processes

Process and accountability mapping exercise

Session 6 - Filling the service delivery gaps

What are the key gaps in service delivery ?

What steps do we take to bridge them ?

What are the key service delivery indicators ?

Session 7 - Action planning and review

Combining results of sessions 4 and 6 into an action plan.

Agreeing feedback to task force and ongoing review mechanisms

Review of evaluation framework and workshop process

Close

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICY AND MANAGEMENT



The Institute is a multi-disciplinary group within the University of Manchester. Its objective is to promote social and economic development, primarily within lower-income countries, by enhancing the capabilities of individuals and organisations through postgraduate education, professional training, research, consultancy, and policy analysis.

The activities of the Institute include:

- Research into major issues of development policy and practice including rural development, human resource development and management, public sector reform, institutional change, economic policies, gender relations, poverty-alleviation and the environment.
- The provision of formal award courses at the University of Manchester leading to the award of Diplomas, Masters degrees and PhDs.
- The provision of professional development courses and study seminars in various aspects of development policy and management, based in Manchester or overseas.
- Consultancy, research and training work for international agencies, for national governments and institutions, for NGOs and other organisations.

Enquiries about the facilities of the Institute are warmly welcomed, and should be made by direct enquiry to the Administrator, IDPM.

Institute for Development Policy and Management
University of Manchester
Crawford House, Precinct Centre
Oxford Road, MANCHESTER M13 9GH UK
TEL: +44-161 275 2800/2804 FAX: +44-161 273 8829
Email: IDPM@MAN.AC.UK
Web: <http://www.man.ac.uk/idpm/>