



Governing Body

309th Session, Geneva, November 2010

GB.309/PFA/10

Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee

PFA

FOR INFORMATION

TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Matters relating to the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU): Reports of the JIU ¹

Overview

Issues covered

This paper summarizes the JIU's annual report for 2009, its programme of work for 2010 and its reports on the following UN system-wide issues: (1) national execution of technical cooperation projects; (2) information and communication technology hosting services; and (3) management of Internet websites.

Policy implications

None.

Financial implications

None.

Action required

The Committee is invited to take note of the information provided in the paper.

References to other Governing Body documents and ILO instruments

This paper is submitted annually and in accordance with the established procedure as decided in November 2005 (GB.294/PV, paragraph 210).

GB.306/TC/1, GB.306/PFA/12/3, GB.306/PFA/ICTS/1.

¹ The reports are available on the JIU websites in English, French and Spanish, as well as in other UN official languages. The URL of each JIU report cited in the present document is found in the corresponding footnote.

Report of the JIU for 2009 and programme of work for 2010

1. The report² consists of the Unit's annual report for 2009 (Chapter I) and the programme of work for 2010 (Chapter II). The first chapter describes internal reform of the JIU, lists reports issued in 2009 and provides details on follow-up of recommendations. Chapter II contains a plan for new reviews to be conducted in 2010, including on UN system-wide issues such as multilingualism, the audit function, medical services, lump-sum payments in lieu of entitlements, procurement reform, administration of trust funds, and financing for humanitarian operations.
2. As provided in Annex II of the report, the ILO's contribution to the JIU budget in 2009 represented 2.3 per cent of the total costs, or US\$147,358.70.³ The net contribution for 2008–09 was US\$276,514.⁴

Other JIU reports

3. In accordance with the established procedure, the Office submits to the Governing Body on an annual basis a summary of JIU reports that contain recommendations addressed to the ILO Director-General or the Governing Body, either specifically or among the UN system organizations, along with the comments of the UN System's Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) and the Office. There are three such reports to submit to the current session:
 - *National execution of technical cooperation projects (JIU/REP/2008/4)*;⁵
 - *Review of information and communication technology (ICT) hosting services in the United Nations system organizations (JIU/REP/2008/5)*;⁶ and
 - *Review of management of Internet websites in the United Nations system organizations (JIU/REP/2008/6)*.⁷

² UN General Assembly, Official Records, Sixty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 34 (A/64/34). Available at: http://www.unjiu.org/data/en/annual_reports/arwparA6434en.pdf.

³ Prior to the adjustment made in 2010, for the 2008–09 period.

⁴ The net amount excludes adjustments made in 2008 for 2006–07, and includes adjustments made in 2010 for 2008–09.

⁵ Available at: http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2008/en2008_04.pdf.

⁶ Available at: http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2008/en2008_05.pdf.

⁷ Available at: http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2008/en2008_06.pdf.

National execution of technical cooperation projects
(JIU/REP/2008/4 and A/64/375/Add.1-E/2009/103/Add.1) ⁸

4. In this JIU report, national execution is defined as “a method of carrying out programmes and projects where national entities retain the main responsibility for planning, formulating and managing the programme or project supported or funded by the United Nations system, for carrying out the activities and for the achievement of objectives and impact. The national authority becomes accountable for the formulation and management of programmes and projects by the programme country, in close cooperation with other national and United Nations entities”. ⁹ While the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) uses a similar modality whereby national partners carry out action programmes as implementing partners, the ILO as a whole is not involved in a major way in national execution as defined by the JIU. This is mostly due to the fact that ILO projects involve capacity building for constituents and not direct interventions. Indeed the CEB comments that “the report occasionally conveys the impression that the national execution modality is equally valid for the specialized agencies, their related organizations, and the funds and programmes”, ¹⁰ whereas various conditions necessitate a different implementation modality.
5. The JIU identifies eight recommendations as applicable to the ILO among other UN system organizations.
6. *Recommendations 1, 3, 9 and 11* ask for clarification of the definitions governing national execution, urgent harmonization of the associated guidelines, and dissemination of lessons learned and good practices of national execution programmes and projects amongst the UN system organizations. These recommendations are supported by the Office. They involve UN system-wide coordination through the CEB and its subsidiary organs, in which the ILO continues to participate actively.
7. *Recommendation 4* asks legislative bodies to reiterate that donors should provide less conditioned, and more flexible, predictable and geographically balanced extra-budgetary contributions including for national execution. The Office supports this recommendation. It is in line with the ILO’s Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA) modality. The Governing Body has already taken action by endorsing the Technical Cooperation Strategy in November 2009. ¹¹
8. *Recommendations 5, 6, and 8* address national capacities to be strengthened, in the areas of accounting and audit, partnership with civil society, and evaluation. While taking note of these recommendations which focus on the capacity of the governments in recipient countries, the Office will orient its work and services primarily in the framework of the capacity development strategy for ILO tripartite constituents, which is under discussion in the Committee on Technical Cooperation at the current session.

⁸ Available at: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N09/538/18/PDF/N0953818.pdf?OpenElement>.

⁹ JIU/REP/2008/4, table 1, p. 3.

¹⁰ A/64/375/Add.1-E/2009/103/Add.1, para. 3.

¹¹ GB.306/TC/1.

Review of information and communication technology (ICT) hosting services in the United Nations system organizations (JIU/REP/2008/5 and A/64/96/Add.1) ¹²

9. The report contains six recommendations. The UN system organizations, including the ILO, are asked to work with the CEB's High-Level Committee on Management (HLCM) towards defining a consistent method of recording ICT expenditures and costs (*recommendation 1*); to ensure that an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats is undertaken prior to selecting a particular ICT hosting service (*recommendation 2*); to explore external hosting solutions for enterprise resource planning systems (*recommendation 3*); to establish an ad hoc working group or to use internal ICT governance structure within each organization to come up with suggestions and plans for improving cooperation with and use of ICT hosting services provided by the International Computing Centre (*recommendation 4*); and to pursue joint procurement of ICT hosting services (*recommendation 5*). Furthermore, the legislative bodies of the organizations are asked to request the executive heads to report on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report (*recommendation 6*).
10. CEB members generally agree with the recommendations. Their specific comments for each recommendation reflect that the recommendations are usually already addressed, often in better ways than recommended by the JIU. For instance, they expressed reservations concerning the need for an ad hoc working group in each organization (*recommendation 4*) in view of the existing ICT governance structures. The ILO concurs with this observation, given the internal structure in place, including the Information Technology Application Advisory Board, ¹³ the IRIS Governance Board ¹⁴ and IRIS Management Task Team. ¹⁵

Review of management of Internet websites in the United Nations system organizations (JIU/REP/2008/6 and A/64/95/Add.1) ¹⁶

11. This report contains eight recommendations. Six of them concern institutional arrangements within each UN organization, namely: adoption of clear policies and corresponding mechanisms for the good governance and management of the organization's website (*recommendation 1*); regular update of and reporting on the website strategy

¹² Available at: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N09/542/78/PDF/N0954278.pdf?OpenElement>.

¹³ Chaired by the Chief of the Information Technology and Communications Bureau, and responsible for: advising the Executive Director of Management and Administration (ED/MAS) on the coordination of the development of IT applications and the acquisition of application software; assisting those work units wishing to develop their own applications; and providing guidance and advice to enable the Office to exercise the necessary oversight of IT development and expenditure of IT resources.

¹⁴ Chaired by ED/MAS, and responsible for approval and prioritization of IRIS activities and overall risk management.

¹⁵ Chaired by the Director of the Bureau of Programming and Management, and responsible for the operational management of projects approved by the IRIS Governance Board.

¹⁶ Available at: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N09/542/72/PDF/N0954272.pdf?OpenElement>.

(*recommendation 2*); having policies and guidelines in place as regards (a) web layout and design, (b) editorial control and review of web content and (c) web accessibility, among other requirements and standards (*recommendation 3*); allocation of sufficient and sustained funding for staffing and training to website management (*recommendation 5*); establishment of an ad hoc committee dealing with the implementation of multilingualism on their corporate websites, including on their financial implications (*recommendation 6*); and request to be made by the legislative bodies of the organizations to the executive heads, to report on the implementation of the recommendations contained in this report (*recommendation 8*).

12. The other two recommendations involve inter-agency coordination. They relate to the implementation of a content management system (CMS) which offers full support to Latin, non-Latin and bidirectional scripts, while considering the adoption of common information exchange standards and the benefits of a common CMS across the UN system (*recommendation 4*), and to the establishment of a mechanism reporting to the HLCM for coordination purposes and to establish common policies, standards and guidelines on websites (*recommendation 7*).
13. CEB members expressed support for most of the recommendations, including those on which many already take action or have alternative mechanisms in place, such as *recommendations 4 and 8*. They expressed reservations on *recommendation 6*, in view of both the costs involved in its implementation and the need to integrate language requirements into the overall Web strategy, as well as on *recommendation 7*, in view of existing inter-agency coordination bodies that serve this purpose. The Office supports these views.
14. In the ILO, strategy on the website is an integral part of the results-based Knowledge Strategy 2010–15,¹⁷ particularly for the achievement of *Outcome 3: Dissemination of ILO knowledge is improved*. The Office reports to the Governing Body on the implementation of the strategy and results achieved, along with those on the other management strategies, in the biennial programme implementation reports. Any technological issues are addressed to the Information and Communications Technology Subcommittee in line with the Information Technology Strategy 2010–15,¹⁸ which was endorsed by the Governing Body in November 2009.

Geneva, 22 September 2010

Submitted for information

¹⁷ GB.306/PFA/12/3.

¹⁸ GB.306/PFA/ICTS/1.