

**FOR INFORMATION**

## FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

**Matters relating to the Joint Inspection  
Unit: Reports of the JIU <sup>1</sup>****Report of the Joint inspection Unit for 2008  
and programme of work for 2009**

1. This report <sup>2</sup> consists of the Unit's annual report for 2008 (Chapter I) and its programme of work for 2009 (Chapter II). The first chapter highlights the application of results-based management to the Unit's strategic framework (2010–19), increased cooperation with the United Nations System Executives Board for Coordination (CEB), and detailed reporting on recommendation follow-up, among others.
2. The ILO's contribution to the JIU budget in 2008 represented 2.3 per cent of the total costs. For 2008–09, it amounted to some US\$234,693. <sup>3</sup>

**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 CEB and the Office. There are five such reports to submit to the current GB session:
  - JIU/REP/2007/6, "Knowledge management in the United Nations system"; <sup>4</sup>
  - JIU/REP/2007/10, "Liaison offices in the United Nations system"; <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The reports are available on the JIU web site in English, French and Spanish, as well as in other UN official languages. The relevant link is provided for each report cited.

<sup>2</sup> UN General Assembly, Official Records, 63rd Session, Supplement No. 34 (A/63/34 and A/63/34/Corr.1); [www.unjiu.org/data/en/annual\\_reports/enAR2008\\_WP2009.pdf](http://www.unjiu.org/data/en/annual_reports/enAR2008_WP2009.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> The figure incorporates adjustments to the ILO's contribution in 2006–07.

<sup>4</sup> [www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2007/en2007\\_06.pdf](http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2007/en2007_06.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> [www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2007/en2007\\_10.pdf](http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2007/en2007_10.pdf).

- JIU/REP/2007/12, “Review of the progress made by the United Nations system organizations in achieving Millennium Development Goal 6, Target 7, to combat HIV/AIDS”;<sup>6</sup>
- JIU/REP/2008/2, “Junior Professional Officer/Associate Expert/Associate Professional Officer Programmes in United Nations system organizations”;<sup>7</sup> and
- JIU/REP/2008/3, “Management review of environmental governance within the United Nations system”.<sup>8</sup>

### **“Knowledge management in the United Nations system”(JIU/REP/2007/6 and A/63/140/Add.1)**

4. Three recommendations are applicable to the ILO. Recommendation 2 asks the executive heads of the UN system organizations to develop or revise a knowledge management strategy based on specific preparatory work and in accordance with CEB guidelines to be developed. Recommendation 5 asks executive heads to establish knowledge-sharing competencies as an assessment criterion in the staff performance appraisal system. These two recommendations are applied in the ILO to the extent possible in the absence of CEB guidelines. Recommendation 3 is addressed to the legislative bodies and asks that they make necessary provisions to establish dedicated knowledge management units.
5. CEB member organizations generally welcomed the report for its thrust and its timeliness, coinciding with their own efforts in this area. They observed however that the recommendations did not always address the complexity of the challenges in developing knowledge management strategies. There was limited support for Recommendation 3 in the absence of any cost-benefit analysis, despite the clear financial implications.
6. While fully recognizing the strategic importance of knowledge management for the ILO (as reflected in the knowledge strategy for 2010–15 submitted to the current session of the Governing Body<sup>9</sup>), the Office shares the CEB members’ observations.

### **“Liaison offices in the United Nations system” (JIU/REP/2007/10 and A/63/151/Add.1)**

7. The report describes the role, functions and financing of the liaison offices of the UN system organizations located in Geneva and in New York. It contains seven recommendations addressed to executive heads. They are asked to: thoroughly assess the strategic importance of their liaison office(s) and define priorities for them (Recommendation 1); ensure a balanced post structure and grading of staff (Recommendation 3); conduct a cost-benefit analysis prior to posting additional staff to liaison offices (Recommendation 4); ensure timely and proper succession planning for the heads of liaison offices (Recommendation 5); ensure learning opportunities for liaison office staff (Recommendation 6); ensure dissemination of relevant information between liaison offices and their organizations as well as within liaison offices

<sup>6</sup> [www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2007/en2007\\_12.pdf](http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2007/en2007_12.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> [www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2008/JIU\\_REP\\_2008\\_02.pdf](http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2008/JIU_REP_2008_02.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> [www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2008/sp2008\\_03.pdf](http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2008/sp2008_03.pdf).

<sup>9</sup> GB.306/PFA/12/3.

(Recommendation 7); and to request the heads of oversight services to ensure adequate audit and evaluation coverage of liaison offices (Recommendation 8). The report also addresses one recommendation to the legislative bodies of the organizations, asking them to recognize the strategic role of liaison offices and provide core funding from the organizations' regular budgets commensurate with established priorities (Recommendation 2).

8. CEB member organizations welcomed the report on the whole. Many of them noted that the recommendations included items that had already been applied or decided. For instance, with respect to Recommendation 2, organizations noted many instances where adequate funding is already provided.
9. The Office concurs with CEB members' comments on the report and the recommendations. The Office continues to follow appropriate elements of the recommended practices for the ILO Office in New York, as a strategic component of the Organization's partnership and development cooperation operations.

**“Review of the progress made by the United Nations system organizations in achieving Millennium Development Goal 6, Target 7, to combat HIV/AIDS”  
(JIU/REP/2007/12 and A/63/152/Add.1)**

10. The report assesses the progress made in the achievement of Goal 6, target 7, including the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies and programmes implemented and the bottlenecks in achieving the target. The recommendations focus on the structure and functions of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) secretariat and the co-sponsors, and other stakeholders. Eight of the total 11 recommendations concern the ILO, as one of the UNAIDS co-sponsors, and they are all addressed to the executive heads of the concerned UN system organizations.
11. CEB members noted that the report described only the challenges faced by Member States, without analysing the co-sponsors' efforts and activities in the area. They observed that many of the recommendations included practices that were already in place, as integral components of the ongoing work of the UNAIDS co-sponsors. Such recommendations relate to a reporting mechanism and effective implementation of joint programmes (Recommendation 3(b) and (c)); activities to enhance effective implementation of universal access to antiretroviral therapy (Recommendation 5(a) through (c) and Recommendation 6); assistance to Member States in developing policies and procedures to address the problem of stigma and discrimination (Recommendation 7); activities that support affected Member States in HIV prevention (Recommendation 8); activities that support affected Member States in developing innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable antiretroviral therapy programmes (Recommendation 9); and the engagement of civil society partners (Recommendation 10). On the other hand, CEB members did not support Recommendation 3(a) which concerns the selection of UNAIDS country coordinators and agency heads in each country of accreditation. They consider that the recommendation does not reflect the realities of the operations of country teams and joint United Nations teams on HIV/AIDS, nor the kinds of skills and experience required for agency heads who have a much broader responsibility than HIV-related matters. Furthermore, CEB member organizations observed that Recommendation 4(a) through (c) included actions to be taken by, and within, affected Member States, such as the revision of national strategic plans and establishment of national AIDS councils, etc. In fact, UN organizations already provide significant support in those areas.

12. The Office agrees with the CEB's comments. It particularly regrets that the report did not adequately take into account the ongoing efforts and good practices of the UNAIDS co-sponsors, including the ILO, which, in addition to its extensive technical cooperation programme and ongoing advisory services on HIV/AIDS, is currently working towards the adoption of an international labour standard on HIV/AIDS and the world of work. The Office also believes that the report and the recommendations could have been strengthened by including analysis of areas in which UNAIDS co-sponsors' activities could improve.

**“Junior Professional Officer/Associate Expert/Associate Professional Officer Programmes in United Nations system organizations” (JIU/REP/2008/2 and A/64/82/Add.1-E/2009/82/Add.1)**

13. This report provides an assessment of the current situation of the Junior Professional Officer/Associate Expert/Associate Professional Officer (JPO/AE/APO)<sup>10</sup> programmes in the UN system organizations and includes a set of recommendations on measures to improve conditions of those programmes. Four of the total nine recommendations concern the ILO, all addressed to the executive heads of the organizations concerned. They are asked to ensure: a clear policy and priorities on the use of JPOs/AEs/APOs, in the framework of human resources strategies (Recommendation 4); an adequate mandate and resources of the units responsible for the operation of the JPO/AE/APO programmes (Recommendation 5); adequate monitoring and controls (Recommendation 8), and support for the various supervisory and administrative aspects of the programmes by human resources management services (Recommendation 9).
14. CEB member organizations welcomed the report for its excellent review and analysis, capturing the programmes' strengths, challenges and opportunities in a concise manner. While accepting the recommendations in general, the organizations noted difficulties in fully implementing some of the recommendations that have clear financial implications, notably Recommendation 5.
15. The Office also supports the report and agrees with the thrust of its recommendations. It particularly recognizes the relevance of implementing Recommendations 8 and 9 and will continue its efforts to make improvements in those areas. The Office's recent efforts include the organization of career development workshops for JPOs/AEs/APOs in collaboration with other Geneva-based international organizations.

**“Management review of environmental governance within the United Nations system” (JIU/REP/2008/3 and A/64/83/Add.1-E/2009/83/Add.1)**

16. The review identifies measures to promote enhanced coordination, coherence and synergies between Multilateral Environmental Agreements and the United Nations system with a view to strengthen the UN contribution to a more integrated approach to international environmental governance and management at national, regional and international levels.

<sup>10</sup> Different titles are used for similar programmes in the UN system organizations. The title used in the ILO is Associate Expert (AE)

17. The report indicates that the ILO should take action on two recommendations among those contained in this report. However, it actually addresses them to the UN Secretary-General, asking him to submit to the UN General Assembly a clear understanding of the division of labour among the UN entities concerned (Recommendation 1) and to encourage the executive heads of the UN organizations to develop a joint system-wide planning framework and indicative planning document for the management and coordination of environmental activities (Recommendation 7(a) and (b)). The Office is ready to join in an initiative of the Secretary-General in the environmental sphere, in light of the ILO mandate and as part of the UN system.

Geneva, 4 September 2009.

*Submitted for information.*