



STUDY INTO DELAYS IN THE DEPLOYMENT OF T/PCC – DEPLOYMENT TIMELINES PROJECT

Secretariate Issue Paper # 5 – Mandated Study

Issue Paper Theme: **Cross-Cutting**

BACKGROUND

The 2020 Contingent Owned Equipment (COE) Working Group considered the issue of delays in deployment of military and police units to and its impact on the mandate of the United Nations field missions. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that the Under-Secretary-General of the Department of Operational Support (DOS) has asked the Director Uniformed Capabilities Support Division (UCSD) to undertake a study into the issues affecting timelines of United Nations organized deployments of uniformed personnel and COE to field missions. Accordingly, a project team was convened to conduct the study. The Working Group recommended the Secretariat to continue the study and present its findings at the 2023 COE Working Group¹.

The project team convened meetings with stakeholders from DOS, Department of Peace Operations (DPO) and Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA) with a view to identify and address critical chokepoints in the timelines of generation and deployment of formed military and police units and recommending areas of improvement. With the aim of co-creating solutions, the project team also held extensive discussions with four field missions (MINUSCA, MINUSMA, MONUSCO and UNMISS) and five troop- and police- contributing countries (T/PCCs) (Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Indonesia, Morocco and Rwanda). The study determined delays are not systematically applicable to all deployments, however, factors that do contribute to delays could be categorized into those related to *United Nations Headquarters, Member States, and Field Missions*. They could then be further segregated into those that involve *Upstream Processes* (selection and pre-deployment readiness) and *downstream processes* (physical deployment of formed units). The purpose of this paper is to outline the key findings of that study, its recommendations, and the proposed implementation of those recommendations.

PROPOSAL

The findings and recommendations Deployment Timelines Project are organized into upstream and downstream processes.

¹ 2020 COE Working Group Report, page 14, paragraph 40. (b).



Upstream Processes

A full list of Upstream Process findings and recommendations, including lead agencies for implementing, are contained in Annex A to this paper. It includes two recommendations that are subject to separate issue papers:

- Increase in the number and types of units on RDL, including funding support through the GA. This will be subject to a separate paper: Secretariat issue paper #34: Expansion of the RDL.
- Introduce phased deployment when urgent deployment of uniformed personnel is needed due to operational exigencies – subject to a separate paper: Secretariat issue paper #35: Phased deployment of T/PCC due to exigencies (at additional cost).

Downstream Processes

A full list of Downstream Process findings and recommendations, including lead agencies for implementing, are contained in Annex B to this paper.

A joint implementation team from DOS, DPO and DPPA has been formed to implement the recommendations.

PROPOSED MANUAL TEXT

Specific changes to the COE manual will be recommended in separate issue papers: *Secretariat issue paper #34 Expansion of the RDL*, and *Secretariat issue paper #35: Phased deployment of T/PCC due to exigencies (at additional cost)*.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications to this proposal other than those included in IP# 34 and 35.

PREVIOUS HISTORY

This issue was previously considered by the 2020 COE Working Group who recommended a detailed study be completed into delays in the force generation process and a report provided to 2023 COE Working Group for their considerations. This study and issue paper meets that request.



Annex A– Key Findings and Recommendations on Upstream Process of the Deployment Timelines Project				
PCRS Stage				
#	Process/Step	Findings	Recommendations	Lead and (Support)
1	PCRS	<p>A. Lack of availability of some types of units in PCRS (e.g. Med utility helicopter, Armed utility helicopter, Heavy Transport Coy, Combat convoy company or battalion); Lack of TCC pledges for specialized units.</p> <p>B. Unlike RDL, no set timelines for readiness to deploy for units at PCRS-2 and 3.</p> <p>C. Units at level 2 or 3 from T/PCCs with SEA allegations or long-term critical COE shortfalls, or issues that hamper their deployment</p>	<p>A. Concerted efforts to encourage TCCs to pledge for units UN is facing shortfalls in.</p> <p>B. Set timelines for readiness for Level 3(90-120 days). (For Level 2 see AAV recommendations in serial 4 and 6).</p> <p>C. Regular revision of PCRS for pledged units against a set of criteria (e.g. SEA cases, critical COE shortfalls in deployed units, etc.)</p>	<p>SFGC</p> <p>(OMA, PolDiv, UCSD)</p> <p>Under implementation (Under Imp)</p>
2	RDL	<p>A. Limited authorized number and type of units that can be elevated to RDL (one infantry brigade).</p> <p>B. Some member states are unable to pledge for RDL due to national regulations.</p>	<p>Increase number and types of units on RDL to meet the latest operational requirements. Seek extra funds through COE WG and GA resolution.</p>	<p>(Under Imp) SFGC, UCSD</p> <p>(OMA, PolDiv)</p>



3	PCRS SUR	Differences between generic PCRS SURs and mission specific SURs. Last minute procurement process of equipment and training of additional personnel cause delays.	Revise generic PCRS SURs – make realistic to current requirements taking into consideration the physical environment (climate and terrain) and security requirements. Aim at minimizing changes during deployments to less than 10%.	(Under Imp) SFGC, OMA, PoIDiv (UCSD, DHMOSH LD)
4	Strategic AAV	A. Lack of information on how much time a T/PCC would take to prepare (except those on RDL).	A. Expand the aim of strategic AAVs to make it more comprehensive and support the decision making: a. Briefings to include: (i) differences between generic and mission specific requirements of critical/key items, such as APC specifications for key missions (mobility, mine protection); (ii) ammunition specifications; b. Informed assessment of time (in months/weeks) the T/PCC would take to prepare the unit if asked to deploy based on PCRS SUR, taking into consideration the readily available equipment and procurement time for balance; c. Assessment of time (in months/weeks) the T/PCC would take to prepare the unit with requirements specific to key missions due to differences in generic SURs and mission specific SURs; d. Inclusion of above assessment in the AAV report.	(Under Imp) OMA, PoIDiv, SFGC (UCSD, DHMOSH LD)



4	Strategic AAV	<p>B. Need for enhanced coordination between DPO and DOS while planning AAVs.</p> <p>C. Lack of funding to include all participants. Currently strategic AAVs and RDL VVs funded from extra-budgetary funds and PDVs by missions.</p>	<p>B. DOS involvement in planning and conduct of AAV through enhanced coordination between DPO and DOS stakeholders.</p> <p>C. Funding for AAVs, PDVs and RDL VVs to be included in HQ support account budget.</p> <p>(Also Refer to Mission specific AAV at # 6)</p>	<p>OMA, PoIDiv, SFGC</p> <p>(UCSD, DHMOSH LD)</p>
Selection Stage				
#	Process/Step	Findings	Recommendations	Lead and (Support)
5	Mission SUR	<p>A. Differences between generic PCRS SURs and mission specific SURs. Procurement of equipment by T/PCCs and training of additional personnel cause delays.</p>	<p>A1. Revise generic PCRS SURs (refer to PCRS SUR at # 3).</p> <p>A2. Mission specific SURs to take into consideration the type of equipment available with active T/PCCs in PCRS.</p>	



5	Mission SUR	<p>B. Need for phased deployment when urgent deployment of uniformed personnel is needed due to operational exigencies, but the selected Member State does not yet have 100% readiness to deploy.</p> <p>C. Last minute changes in mission specific SUR</p> <p>D. Delays in coordination of SUR across multiple parties including inputs from Mission.</p> <p>E. Delays in seeking concurrence from T/PCC.</p>	<p>B. Seek approval through 2023 COE WG for phased deployment, to be undertaken only in exigencies (at additional cost).</p> <p>C. Avoid last minute changes in SURs unless critical and if so, consider phased deployment.</p> <p>D1. Lay down clear review processes and strict timelines for various procedural actions.</p> <p>D2. Use the existing working groups in UNHQ and each mission composed of all stakeholders and technical experts (refer to # 8).</p> <p>D3. SUR annexes B and C must continue being generated from UCM thus ensuring accuracy of equipment and self-sustainment based on COE Framework. Inclusion of a special case should continue being first discussed with UCSD.</p> <p>E. SURs are T/PCC agnostic and must not be sent for T/PCC review and concurrence.</p>	<p>A1, A2, C, D2, D3, (Under Imp) SFGC, OMA, PoIDiv, UCSD, LD, Mission</p>
6	Mission Specific AAV	<p>A. Lack of accurate information in AAV report on how much time a T/PCC would take to prepare.</p>	<p>(Also refer to strategic AAV at # 4)</p> <p>A. Expand the aim of AAV to make it more robust and support decision making:</p> <p>a. Briefings to include ammunition specifications;</p> <p>b. Assessment of time (in months/weeks) the T/PCC would take to prepare the unit;</p> <p>d. Inclusion of above assessment in the AAV report.</p>	<p>OMA, PoIDiv, UCSD, LD, Mission</p>



6	Mission specific AAV	<p>B. Too many visits add to force generation time (Issue raised by T/PCCs)</p> <p>C. Need for enhanced coordination between DPO and DOS while planning AAVs.</p> <p>D. Lack of funding to include all participants (funded from extra-budgetary funds)</p>	<p>B. Units at PCRS level 2, 3 should not have an additional Mission specific AAV. An additional visit would only be required when the difference in requirements (COE/personnel/tasks) between PCRS and mission specific SUR is 20% or more, and if decided by the leadership.</p> <p>C. Conduct remote AAVs to seasoned TCCs, unless it is for a new type of unit not deployed by the T/PCC.</p> <p>D1. DOS involvement in planning and conduct of AAV.</p> <p>D2. Funding for AAVs, PDVs and RDL VVs to be included in support budget.</p>	<p>OMA, PoIDiv, UCSD, LD, Mission</p>
7	Selection	<p>A. Decision on the number or type of units to be generated for a mission.</p> <p>B. (a) Delays in selection of T/PCC due to lack of availability in PCRS (b) Political decision to deploy from a particular TCC (c) Unit cleared through AAV found lacking the readiness. (d) T/PCCs highlighted the need to establish parameters to help in transparent and faster decision-making process.</p> <p>C. Selected unit did not have strategic AAV and was selected from PCRS level 1</p>	<p>A. Set timeframes, monitoring and escalation mechanism.</p> <p>B. Select from PCRS (RDL/Level 3/Level 2), unless not available. B2. Follow a data driven and methodological process for the selection of the unit to dictate decision making including political considerations, past COE performance of T/PCC, past FC/PC evaluations, and status of readiness of T/PCC assessed during the AAV (refer # 4).</p> <p>C. Select from PCRS Level 2 or above, unless not available.</p>	<p>IOT, OMA, PoIDiv (Under imp)</p>



7	Selection	<p>D. Host country refusal for specific T/PCCs even after vetting by UN based on geo-political situation and relations with host country.</p> <p>E. Human Rights vetting</p> <p>F. Delays from third party ME contribution - ECC or private company)</p>	<p>D. Take into consideration relations between host country and probable T/PCCs.</p> <p>E. Advance clearance process for T/PCC with HR issues.</p> <p>F. Selection process should take into consideration the status of COE availability and procurement timelines of T/PCCs or provision timelines of the third party/country (refer # 4)</p>	<p>IOT, OMA, PolDiv</p> <p>(Under imp)</p>
Pre-deployment Stage				
#	Process/Step	Findings	Recommendations	Lead and (Support)
8	Pre-deployment	<p>A. Lack of dedicated force generation coordination teams in UNHQ and field missions to coordinate on - political constraints, SUR inputs, MOU inputs, funds availability, camp availability/readiness, in-mission transportation availability, weather or terrain constraints, etc.</p>	<p>A1. Dedicated working groups in UNHQ -DPO (FGS, MPS, PolDiv), DPPA (IOT), DOS (MRPS, MCS, DSA) and in missions (MSC, Force HQ, Police HQ).</p> <p>A2. Coordination on deployment timelines among DPO/DOS/DPPA/Mission/T-PCC. Prioritization of deployments, in coordination with mission team, to avoid bottlenecks on borders/airports and ensure availability of Engineering/Transportation assets for preparation of camps or roads and transportation of COE and personnel. If required, an integrated task force (ITF) to be established for complex or time-sensitive deployments (e.g. MINUSCA and UNISFA).</p>	<p>OMA, PolDiv, IOT, UCSD, LD, DSA, Missions</p> <p>(A1 under imp)</p>



8	Pre-deployment	<p>B. Lack of time plan for different steps in pre-deployment stage - Recce visits, MOU, PDV, T/PCC preparations, CLL.</p> <p>C. Disjointed and step by step action by various stakeholders, working in silos, instead of simultaneous.</p> <p>D. Lack of an integrated force generation SOP with steps, timelines and responsibilities of all stakeholders including T/PCCs.</p>	<p>B. Selection NV to include - copy of SUR, deployment location, template for CLL and information on tentative timelines for recce visit, MOU negotiations, initial CLL, PDV, (including MSV if TCC has been previously identified with shortfalls), final CLL, camp readiness and cargo and personnel readiness for deployment. Timelines to be binding on all stakeholders including missions. Copy, shared with all stakeholders.</p> <p>C. Simultaneous action on all steps following the Selection NV – Recce visit, MOU, ammunition list, PDV, CLL, camp readiness.</p> <p>D. Joint DOS-DPO-DPPA SOP with expected timelines for all end-to-end steps, including response time from missions for inputs on operational and logistic aspects for SUR and MOU, would benefit both UN stakeholders and T/PCCs.</p>	OMA, PoIDiv, IOT, UCSD, LD, DSA, Missions
9		<p>Delays by T/PCC due to:</p> <p>A. lack of knowledge or experience in - preparing units for PKMs, container safety certification, dangerous goods packing and handling;</p>	<p>A. Encourage the T/PCCs for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National processes for faster approvals by reducing bureaucratic delays; 2. Senior national planners' course; 3. Adherence to UN performance standards 4. Certified container inspector course; (https://www.iicl.org) 5. Handling and packing of dangerous goods course (https://www.cargotraining.com/index.php) 	OMA, PoIDiv, ITS, LD, SFGC UCSD



9	Pre-deployment	<p>B. long bureaucratic approval process;</p> <p>C. disagreement by T/PCC on deployment location due to political reasons</p> <p>D. lack of MILAD or POLAD in the Permanent Mission of a T/PCC due to non-deployment.</p>	<p>B1. Accurately assess during AAV and report the time needed by T/PCC to be ready (refer to AAV at # 4 and 6).</p> <p>B2. Establish timelines for each force generation step in the selection NV (refer to # 8).</p> <p>B3. Timeline trigger to move to plan B/C if the first T/PCC fails to meet it.</p> <p>C1. Selection NV to mention likely/proposed location with the possibility to change based on FC/PC assessment before or after deployment (refer to # 8).</p> <p>C2. Mission to avoid change in deployment location once the negotiations have started, unless the operational situation has changed dramatically.</p> <p>D. Need to have both MILAD and POLAD in permanent missions of T/PCCs.</p>	<p>OMA, PoIDiv, ITS, LD, SFGC UCSD</p> <p>C1 under imp</p>
---	----------------	---	---	--



10	Pre-deployment	<p>Delays by T/PCC contd.:</p> <p>Long time taken by T/PCCs to procure all required COE and prepare for deployments.</p> <p>Deployments in 2021/22 reflected delays due to lack of ammunition with minimum 50% self-life.</p>	<p>A. Assess during AAV the time needed by T/PCC to be ready (refer to serial 4 and 6).</p> <p>B. Selection NV to provide timelines (refer to # 8).</p> <p>C. Weigh between timeliness of having uniformed personnel on ground versus 100% operating capability.</p> <p>D. Missions to accept units at RDL without major changes to troop levels and COE holdings (refer to # 3).</p> <p>E. Accept deployment in two phases during exigencies (refer to # 5).</p> <p>F. Ask T/PCCs to create structures and procedures to reduce approvals for procurement.</p> <p>G. Sensitize T/PCCs on ammunition requirements through member state briefings, note verbale, AAVs, and verify during PDVs and RDL VVs.</p>	OMA, PoIDiv, SFGC, UCSD, Missions
11	Recce Visits	Delays from host country to provide visa/clearances for recce visits as well for personnel and COE.	<p>A. Visa and clearance functions – move to the office of SRSG. Mission MOVCON to work directly with SRSG office to ensure coordination with local authorities at all levels.</p> <p>B. Timely escalation to USGs for interactions with Permanent Representatives.</p>	OMA, PoIDiv, IOT, Missions



12	PDV	<p>A. Too many visits (AAVs and PDVs) add to the time to complete the force generation processes.</p> <p>B. T/PCC delays in readiness for PDV.</p> <p>C. T/PCC fails to inform readiness before PDV or fails to present at least 90% of critical equipment or self-sustainment facilities.</p> <p>D. Visit led by OMA/PD and funded by Missions. Team selection dictated by Missions. Non-inclusion of UCSD and MCS leads to delays in finalization of MOU and cargo documentation.</p>	<p>A1. Avoid PDV if 90% readiness of COE and personnel was verified during the AAV or RDL VV, the visit had happened within the last 18 months, and there has been no significant reconfiguration requested of the unit by the mission (refer to AAV at # 4 and 6).</p> <p>A2. Avoid PDV for units at RDL, unless the differences in PCRS and Mission SUR reflect 20% or more changes in tasks/personnel/critical COE (refer to PCRS SURs at # 3) and if decided by leadership.</p> <p>A3. Combine mission specific AAV and PDV, if and when possible.</p> <p>B. Establish timelines for each force generation step in the selection NV (refer to Selection NV at # 8). Timeline trigger to move to plan B/C if the first T/PCC fails to meet it.</p> <p>C1. Capture in PDV report - shortfalls, status of readiness in percentage terms, expected procurement timelines (ask for documentary proof) and the challenges faced during the PDV.</p> <p>C2. Move to Plan B when a T/PCC fails to meet required criteria (refer to IOC in SUR at # 5).</p> <p>D. Clearly define HQ and Mission responsibilities in PDVs. Funding for HQ representatives (DPO and DOS) in HQ support account budget. (Also refer # 4 and 6)</p>	<p>OMA, PoIDiv, (SFGC, UCSD, Missions)</p>
----	-----	---	--	---



13	MOU	<p>A. Delays in completion of MOU due to delays in inputs from stakeholders - UNHQ, field missions and T/PCCs.</p> <p>B1. Last minute changes in MOU requested by field missions leading to extra time for T/PCCs to adjust personnel and COE and resulting delays in finalizing the CLL.</p> <p>B2. Last minute changes in MOU requested by T/PCCs.</p> <p>C. Lack of flexibility during MOU negotiations for deviations from SUR.</p> <p>D. Longer MOU negotiation time during work-from-home. Direct face-to-face negotiations between UN and T/PCC teams normally took 3-5 days. Remote negotiations through emails and MS teams meetings took 1 to 2 months.</p>	<p>A1. Set timelines and escalation matrix for responses from stakeholders and T/PCCs.</p> <p>A2. Have plan B and C (another T/PCC) when a T/PCC fails to provide inputs beyond a reasonable timeframe.</p> <p>A3. Include in selection NV - timeframes and the right of UN to select another T/PCC if the selected T/PCC fails to provide MOU inputs within a set timeframe or takes too long to procure (refer to Selection NV at # 8).</p> <p>B1. Avoid last minute changes unless inevitable. Consider phased deployment, if required. (Refer # 5)</p> <p>B2. Resist last minute changes requested by T/PCC unless it has a major impact on operations or logistic support aspects.</p> <p>B3. Any changes to be clarified prior the PDV to avoid last minute changes. Deviations can be accepted following discussions.</p> <p>C. Greater flexibility to accept deviations from SUR, based on T/PCC doctrine, operability of in-lieu-of (ILO) COE and acceptance of non-critical deficiencies.</p> <p>D. As COVID restrictions are minimized, insist T/PCCs to restart sending MOU negotiation teams with decision making authority for face-to-face meetings. The Mission team should be on stand-by during these 3-5 days to provide inputs in real time.</p>	<p>UCSD</p> <p>(OMA, PoIDiv, DHMOSH LD, Mission)</p>
Cargo Load List Stage				



#	Process/Step	Findings	Recommendations	Lead and (Support)
14	Cargo Documentation	<p>A. Delays in getting correct final CLL and cargo documentation from T/PCCs.</p> <p>B. Many T/PCCs have limited understanding of UN transportation rules, regulations, and process.</p> <p>C. UN procurement processes requires 2-3 weeks for solicitation</p>	<p>A. Regular training of T/PCCs in CLL preparation, cargo documentation and transportation LOA procedures.</p> <p>B. Briefing and guidance to T/PCCs during AAVs and PDVs. DOS (MOVCON) to deploy pre-CLL/packing teams to support inexperienced / poor-performing T/PCCs in ensuring they meet timelines and standards for strategic movement.</p> <p>C. Encourage T/PCCs to have longer postings of personnel dealing with cargo documentation.</p> <p>D. T/PCCs to send initial CLL along with acceptance letter in response to the selection NV stating COE readiness date. (Refer to Selection NV at # 8).</p> <p>E. Allow expediated procurement processes for urgent deployments.</p>	LD, Procurement Div., ITS,
Miscellaneous				
#	Process/Step	Findings	Recommendations	Lead and (Support)
15	Coordination and Planning	<p>A. Re-hatting AU to UN - political issues, host country delays (DPO has created an SOP on re-hatting procedures).</p> <p>B. Lack of continuity in OMA due to 2-year limit and exceptional extensions.</p>	<p>A1. Political issues including host country reservations to be resolved prior to selection process.</p> <p>A2. Based on experience, re-hatting is complex and takes years to resolve the tasking, organization and COE shortfalls. On the other hand it provides readily available existing military/Police personnel. Re-hatting decision should take into consideration all pros and cons, including availability of units in PCRS that can deploy at short notice.</p> <p>B. OMA to explore mechanism to ensure continuity.</p>	IOT, OMA, PolDiv, UCSD, LD, DSA, Mission



15	Coordination and Planning	<p>C. Late assessment of new requirements for upcoming key milestones (e.g. elections in host country - DRC, CAR, Ivory Coast).</p> <p>D. Delays in finalizing new CONOPS and political concerns with new concept, such as rapidly deployable battalion (RDB).</p> <p>E. Delays due to shortage of funds with missions.</p>	<p>C. Advance planning for requirements for upcoming important milestones, such as elections, to give sufficient time for selection and deployment of new units.</p> <p>D1. Set CONOPS timelines for internal stakeholders. D2. Tracking mechanism and escalation matrix to reduce political delays, e.g., selection of TCC, negotiation with host country.</p> <p>E. Controller has option of funding up to US\$ 150m for urgent/emergency deployments for new missions.</p>	<p>IOT, OMA, PoIDiv, UCSD, LD, DSA, Mission</p>
----	---------------------------	---	---	---



Annex B – Key Recommendations on Downstream Process in Deployment Timelines Project				
#	Delay noticed	Cause of Delay	Key Recommendations	Lead and (Support)
1	33 months	<p>Host/Transit country clearances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In two missions clearance delays were related to host government policies and delays from various government agencies involved. In another mission delays were noticed for getting clearances from transit countries. 	<p>A. Mission MOVCON as focal point for clearance process, to directly work with stakeholders in SRSG Office.</p> <p>B. Mission to monitor potential changes in regulations and advise UNHQ in timely manner.</p> <p>C. T/PCCs to submit clearance documentation in requested time (requests, letters of support, tax exemption). Develop T/PCC training and manual on proper documentation for transit.</p> <p>D. Missions to initiate and prioritize host country clearances at the time of receiving cargo load list.</p> <p>E. Mission & HQ: create / amend framework agreements with host/transit country(ies) to pre-clear units.</p> <p>F. HQ, in coordination with missions, to co-create SOP or timeframe matrix on elevating clearance delays to SRSG in missions and USG DOS in HQ.</p> <p>G. Consider alternative routes through other transit countries.</p>	MCS/LD (Mission MOVCON)



2	20 months	<p>Vendor management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainly the delays from local sub-contractors responsible for within mission transportation. Delay due to legal conflict between the contractor and its sub-contractor. 	<p>A. Divide the deployment process, with MCS arranging the strategic move up to the port or a transit point and the Mission MOVCON arranging the tactical move up to the camp location (raise NTE of 3PL contracts).</p> <p>B. HQ involve mission during technical evaluation in selection of the subcontractors, e.g. Mission Force involvement in developing truck requirements.</p> <p>C. Involvement of mission MOVCON representatives in the management of sub-contractors in mission AOR. Mission dispatch MOVCON specialist to oversee movements when required delivery date not met and on key logistical bottlenecks.</p> <p>D. Missions (PD, MOVCON, MSC) to advise UNHQ on unreliable vendors to disqualify them, even if cheapest (set against extra delay-driven COE reimbursement charges).</p> <p>E. Feedback into vendor selection: Mission submit timely formal documentation (template) to DOS / MOVCON when vendor performance not satisfactory, for formal reconsideration and inclusion into future requirements.</p> <p>F. UNHQ to blacklist vendors that fail to deliver on time due to their internal issues including legal issues with their sub-contractors.</p> <p>G. Increase number of vendors to create more competition and thereby avoid bad vendor performance.</p> <p>H. Ensure timely request for weather and terrain resilient transportation vehicles.</p>	<p>MCS/LD, Procurement Div.</p> <p>(Mission MOVCON)</p>
3	15 months	<p>Security escorts. Mainly with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> capacity issues; frequency issues 	<p>A. Planning and coordination for timely arrival of security escorts during upstream process.</p> <p>B. Assess and where required, increase the capacity of Force to ensure availability of security escorts.</p> <p>C. Increase frequency of patrols on main supply routes and plan availability in coordination with MSC.</p>	<p>Force HQ</p> <p>(MSC/MSD, OMA, PoIDiv, MCS/LD)</p>



4	10 months	<p>Weather related delays:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weather and its impact on road conditions 	<p>A. Incorporation of cushion time as a buffer in the planning phase to avoid running into rainy season deployments.</p> <p>B. SUR to highlight vehicle requirements - 4x4/6x6, ground clearance, etc. To be reiterated during MOU negotiations and verified during PDVs.</p>	<p>OMA, PoIDiv, MCS/LD</p>
5	Other Issues	Miscellaneous	<p>A. Mission to provide/fix infrastructure (e.g. mobile bridges, generators at customs office in case of power outage).</p> <p>B. Use of Airlift (small) cargo in special circumstances.</p> <p>C. Timely completion of camp readiness to receive COE and troops.</p>	<p>SFGC, OMA, PoIDiv, UCSD, LD, Field Mission</p>

