

## REGIONALIZATION RISKS MITIGATION PLAN

### Part II – Risks related to Regionalization Outcome (to be used as background information by the consultants in their Risk Assessment)

Risk	Mitigating action	Timeline	Primary/support responsibility
Regionalization does not result in actual strengthening of operations at country level	- Identification of what makes an effective country office, based on consultations with the COs	January 2006	RT/GDs/COs
	- Identification of which of the COs needs could be addressed from the region, in order to pool capacity and make it financially viable	January – April 2006	RT/GDs/RRG/EC
	- Definition of a regional office structure that reflects the identified functions to performed from the regional office	April – June 2006	RT/GDs/EC/ED
	- Ensuring that the proposed RO and SRSO structure, and the relative delegation of authority, do not lead to the creation of an additional layer between HQ and the countries, therefore worsening rather than improving support to COs	April – June 2006	RT/RRG/EC/ED
	- Validation of the proposed RO and SRSO structures with the COs	June 2006	RT/RRG
	- Revision of current processes to ensure that they support the regionalized structure	Start July 2006	RT/Task Forces
	- Identification of necessary mechanisms to complement designed structure	Start August 2006	RT/CMC/RRG
	- Revision of current systems to ensure that systems and tools enable the designed processes	Start June 2006	MIS/RT/Systems Task Force
Regionalization does not result in actual strengthening of UNFPA’s presence at the regional level	- Identification of which functions are necessary to strengthen UNFPA’s positioning at the regional level	January – April 2006	RT/GDs/RRG/EC
	- Definition of a regional office structure that allows to perform the identified functions	April – June 2006	RT/GDs
	- Careful internal validation of the proposed RO and SRSO structures	April – June 2006	Senior Managers/EC/ED

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating action</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Primary/support responsibility</b>
	- Choice of locations for the ROs and the SRSOs that allow the best possible liaison with regional and sub-regional institutions	July 2006	ED/EC/RT
Regionalization is inconsistent with UN Reform - Co-location - JOM at regional level - “Tightly Managed Entities”	- Ongoing formal and informal consultations with members of the UNDG ExCom agencies	Continuous	DEDs/ED/IERD/RT
	- Active participation in all inter-agency working groups on JOM	Continuous	DEDs/GDs/IERD/RT
	- Informal liaison with missions and other sources of information to understand trends/ direction of High Panel on UN Reform	Continuous	All units
	- Identification of the most suitable locations for the ROs and SRSOs based on location of other UNDG ExCom agencies	July 2006	EC/ED/RT
	- Constant liaison of RT with UN Reform Taskforce within UNFPA to ensure constant flow of information on relevant issues	Continuous	RT/UN Reform Task Force
Loss of “oneness” - Loss of cohesion in vision, strategy, action, etc. - Creation of “mini-kingdoms”	- Finalization and dissemination of the ED vision	January 2006	OED/ED
	- Ensure adequate discussion among Senior Management and ED to ensure that Senior Management is committed to Vision implementation	Continuous	OED/CMC
	- Definition of links between current change initiatives and Vision and identification of potential additional change initiatives that might be necessary to ensure the Vision implementation	Continuous	CMC
	- Provision of adequate mechanisms for Senior Management to communicate and discuss (ie. quarterly Global Management Team meetings as in UNICEF )	Continuous	OED/CMC
	- Provision of adequate ICT systems, such as videoconferencing, to support effective communication and involvement of Senior Management in internal communications	Continuous	MIS
	- Definition of adequate mechanisms to ensure that HQ is kept constantly abreast of what happens in the field	Continuous	OED/ROs/Regional Desks Coord. Branch
	- Application of rotation policy to Regional Directors		DHR
	- Creation and enforcement of a policy according to which the Regional Director cannot come from the same region for which he/she is the Director		DHR

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating action</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Primary/support responsibility</b>
	- Definition and implementation of functional reporting lines in the regionalized structure, to ensure consistency in the way operations are conducted in the different region		DHR/RT
	- Development and implementation of Internal Communication Strategy	January 2006	OED
Worsening of all staff security levels within the organization due to the choice of location with higher security risks	- Liaising with Security Coordinator in choosing locations for Regional and Country Support Offices	April – July 2006	RT/Security Coordinator/EC/ED
	- Inclusion of detailed security analysis to guide choice of locations that would not compromise security levels for staff and their families	April – July 2006	Security Coordinator
Loss of profile in New York - Weakened positioning of UNFPA and ICPD - Weakened positioning on NYC inter-agency issues	- Definition of a clear mechanism/ structure to ensure adequate representation of UNFPA's field perspective with Member States and other agencies in New York	April – June 2006	RT/GDs/EC/ED
	- Adequate assessment of the role and functions of the Regional Liaison Officers	April – June 2006	RT/GDs/EC/ED
	- Ensure clear communication of UNFPA position on relevant issues so as to send coherent messages outside the organization	Continuous	OED/IERD/EC/ED
Support systems and processes not in place for increased effectiveness of the regionalized UNFPA - Organizational structure (i.e. creation of an additional layer, etc.) - Processes - Mechanisms - Systems	- Adoption of a sound methodology to ensure that the appropriate structure, processes, mechanisms and systems to provide support to COs and strengthen UNFPA regional positioning are provided, and involvement of all divisions and levels (HQ, RO, CO) of the organization in the consultation process	January – April 2006	All units
	- Functional analysis to identify where functions should be allocated between HQ, RO and CO to better support COs and strengthen UNFPA regional positioning	January – April 2006	RT/GDs/COs/RRG
	- Definition of the best structure to ensure the identified functions are performed	June 2006	RT/GDs/EC/ED
	- Process review to highlight how the functions will be performed, and the different organizational units will relate to each other		All units

Risk	Mitigating action	Timeline	Primary/support responsibility
	- Definition of the necessary mechanisms (i.e. committees, workgroups, etc.) to supplement defined processes and create integration between relevant organizational units on specific functions/activities	Continuous	OED/CMC/RT
	- Identification of the ICT requirements necessary to support the defined processes	Continuous	MIS/Systems Task Force
Ongoing costs of regionalized UNFPA outweigh or is not justified on the basis of the expected benefits	- Identification of all ongoing costs associated with the regionalized structure (i.e. staff, administrative costs, costs to maintain UNFPA's visibility, etc.)	Start June 2006 until August 2006	All units/DMS
	- Performing of an accurate cost-benefit analysis comparing the current situation with the regionalized structure to be	Start June 2006 until August 2006	DMS/RT
	- Involve all relevant division to ensure that the most accurate hard-data are collected and use of estimates is limited to a minimum	Start June 2006 until August 2006	DMS/Relevant division/RT
	- For the structure to-be, evaluation of ongoing financial implications of regionalization over a period of 2-5 years	August – October 2006	DMS/RT
	- Targeting of a regionalization model in which increase in costs is justified on the basis of proven gains in effectiveness	August 2006	EC/ED/RT