Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit

Report by the Director-General

1. In 2016, the Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations System (JIU) issued 11 reports, three of which were not of direct relevance to WHO or did not call for any specific action from WHO, and two of which had already been included in the 2017 report by the Secretariat. Of relevance to WHO were the following 2016 reports: Evaluation of the contribution of the United Nations development system to strengthening national capacities for statistical analysis and data collection to support the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally-agreed development goals (document JIU/REP/2016/5); Comprehensive review of United Nations system support for small island developing States: final findings (document JIU/REP/2016/7); State of the internal audit function in the United Nations system (document JIU/REP/2016/8); Safety and security in the United Nations system (document JIU/REP/2016/9); Knowledge management in the United Nations system (document JIU/REP/2016/10); and Administrative support services: the role of service centres in redesigning administrative service delivery (document JIU/REP/2016/11).

2. By September 2017, JIU had issued two reports, one of which was not of direct relevance to WHO. Of relevance is the report on Donor-led assessments of the United Nations system organizations (document JIU/REP/2017/2).

3. The Secretariat’s comments to the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination on the JIU reports are summarized in reports available on the JIU website.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IN PREVIOUS REPORTS

4. Paragraphs 5–23 below summarize progress made in implementing the recommendations to executive heads of United Nations Organizations of JIU reports issued during the period October 2016

---

1 Review of Management and Administration in the International Telecommunication Union (document JIU/REP/2016/1); Comprehensive review of United Nations System support for small island developing States: initial findings (document JIU/REP/2016/3); and Meta-evaluation and synthesis of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework evaluations, with a particular focus on poverty reduction (document JIU/REP/2016/6).


4 www.unjiu.org.
to September 2017 that are of direct relevance to the Organization and call for specific action at this stage.

**Evaluation of the contribution of the United Nations development system to strengthening national capacities for statistical analysis and data collection to support the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally-agreed development goals (document JIU/REP/2016/5)**

5. With regard to the only recommendation of this report for executive heads, the United Nations Statistical Commission has established an Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators, which meets regularly to discuss data development and methods for indicator monitoring. WHO is well represented at these meetings. The Department of Information, Evidence and Research coordinates WHO’s engagement by monitoring the health-related Sustainable Development Goal indicators, and providing support to strengthen the capacity of Member States to generate, analyse, disseminate and use high-quality health data and information to plan and monitor universal health coverage, and progress towards meeting the Sustainable Development Goals and other national and subnational priorities. This involves: increasing the impact of global public goods to address critical gaps and inadequacies in current country data systems and capacities to meet the data and monitoring requirements of universal health coverage and the broader health agenda of the Sustainable Development Goals; convening and working with regional and national institutes, global partners, academia and other networks to strengthen country-level capacity to generate, analyse and use high-quality public health data; and developing a well-aligned network of health observatories at the global, regional and country levels, with enhanced functionality for data collection, transfer, analysis, communication and accessibility. The Secretariat is also developing a collaborative platform to establish and promote data standards and tools for strengthening country health information systems. It has also established a health data collaborative network across United Nations agencies and development partners to develop harmonized approaches to data standards and national capacity-building.

**Comprehensive review of United Nations system support for small island developing States: final findings (document JIU/REP/2016/7)**

6. With regard to JIU’s recommendation 5 that executive heads should ensure the participation of their organizations in the process led by the Inter-Agency Task Force on Financing for Development to actively contribute to addressing the specificity of small island developing States (SIDS) as a special case with tailor-made solutions, and should also ensure that new parameters of eligibility are designed for better access to financing for development for such States, WHO has participated in this process, both contributing to the report of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Financing for Development and its online annex (primarily in the “Domestic Public Resources” and “International Development Cooperation” sections).

---


State of the internal audit function in the United Nations system (document JIU/REP/2016/8)\(^1\)

7. With regard to JIU’s recommendation 2 on the involvement of the oversight committees in the hiring of heads of internal audit/oversight, and in the termination of their tenure, the Director-General consults with the Executive Board on the appointment and termination of the head of internal oversight, as per WHO Financial Rule XII.112.2.

8. Concerning JIU’s recommendation 5 on ensuring that internal audit services have adequate financial and human resources to expand the use of information technology auditing techniques, and to employ, as appropriate, advanced data analytics and remote auditing, with a view to leveraging technology to provide more economical and comprehensive audit coverage, the Office of Internal Oversight Services recruited a data analyst in October 2015 and a dedicated information technology auditor in December 2016.

9. On JIU’s recommendation 6 on the allocation of adequate financial and human resources to the internal audit services to ensure sufficient coverage of high-risk areas and adherence to established auditing cycles, audit coverage objectives are systematically discussed with the Independent Expert Oversight Advisory Committee during consideration of the proposed annual workplan, based on a rolling three-year plan.

10. With regard to JIU’s recommendation 3 on the development of internal audit strategies to provide vision and direction on how internal audit should be strategically positioned in the Organization and operationalized to achieve its mandate, the Office of Internal Oversight Services reports periodically to the Independent Expert Oversight Advisory Committee on implementation of the workplan. A new charter for internal oversight services is currently being developed, which will include updates to that vision and direction.

11. Finally, as regards JIU’s recommendation 8 on the provision of adequate funding for professional development, including coverage of costs for maintaining professional certification, WHO agrees that staff of the Office of Internal Oversight Services shall be accorded time for professional training and other personal development each year (up to 5% − 10 days), to be monitored through the Organization’s Performance Management and Development system. WHO policy does not, however, include the payment of membership fees of professional bodies.

Safety and security in the United Nations system (document JIU/REP/2016/9)\(^2\)

12. With regard to JIU’s recommendation 1 on host country agreements, WHO recognizes the value of agreements with host countries that comprehensively address and assign responsibility for the protection of the personnel and assets of the United Nations system. However, WHO shares the concerns reflected in the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination’s inter-agency response to the JIU report regarding the feasibility of implementing the recommendation, particularly by the deadline of April 2018, as well as the potential unintended consequences of each

---


13. Concerning JIU’s recommendation 2 on a comprehensive system-wide policy for road safety, WHO has contributed to the development of the Road Safety Strategy for the United Nations, which will be launched in New York in May 2018, and is discussing with a United Nations-wide group the implementation of the Strategy’s key recommendations.

14. With regard to JIU’s recommendation 3 on security compliance mechanisms, following changes in the security risk management approach, the Inter-Agency Security Management Network has set up a technical working group to develop a security compliance assessment mechanism. In the interim, work is under way to ensure that all offices and senior officials are in compliance with the United Nations Security Management System Policy by the end of 2018.

15. Finally, as regards JIU’s recommendation 5 on safety and security compliance indicators, work is ongoing to establish common indicators, appropriate to the level and function of staff, that can be applied in performance management across the Organization.

Knowledge management in the United Nations system (document JIU/REP/2016/10)\(^1\)

16. With regard to JIU’s recommendation 1 on the development of knowledge management strategies, a working group on initiatives for change, under the leadership of the Director-General, has identified knowledge management as a potential enabler, within a set of eight enabling initiatives, to be considered under the Director-General’s transformation plan.

17. Concerning JIU’s recommendation 3 on embedding knowledge management skills and knowledge-sharing abilities in staff performance appraisal systems, this is currently not part of the performance appraisal system. It will be considered next time the appraisal system is reviewed.

18. As regards JIU’s recommendation 4 on the retention and transfer of knowledge as part of succession planning processes, a system of handover notes provided to their successors by all those departing from a position is being piloted through the mobility exercise.

Administrative support services: the role of service centres in redesigning administrative service delivery (document JIU/REP/2016/11)\(^2\)

19. With regard to JIU’s recommendation 1 on the tracking of customer service, WHO’s Global Service Centre defines and tracks its services through a service catalogue with target turn-around times, key performance indicators and quarterly reports providing information on other volumetric and trend indicators. A client satisfaction survey, which aims to evaluate customer satisfaction and

---


improve the definition of customer service-specific indicators to be tracked on a regular basis, will also be initiated in 2018.

20. As regards JIU’s recommendation 2 on the definition of efficiency benchmarks, in 2016 the Global Service Centre developed new key performance indicators in the areas of procurement, finance, human resources and payroll. Regular review of these indicators by the WHO Global Service Centre Advisory Group has also helped establish performance targets and some benchmarks. The identification of relevant benchmarks remains difficult in some areas (human resources and procurement) as most readily available benchmarks come from private shared services companies, the scope of activities of which might differ from that of United Nations organizations and because benchmarking with other United Nations agencies would require a comprehensive and neutral study looking at the comparative scope of shared service activities between organizations.

21. Concerning JIU’s recommendation 3 on strategic oversight, WHO’s Global Service Centre has a governance mechanism to provide strategic oversight in the following areas of responsibility: strategic direction, scope of work, structural and operational issues, performance and evaluation, and harmonization and alignment of administrative service delivery across the Organization. In relation to the role of service centre managers, it reviews the functions and scope of activity of the Global Service Centre and addresses particular challenges and areas of concern with regard to its role and responsibilities.

**Donor-led assessments of the United Nations system organizations (document JIU/REP/2017/2)**

22. With regard to JIU’s recommendation 3 on a central function for coordinating donor assessments, since 2015, the WHO Evaluation Office has facilitated donor assessments. Recommendations from donor assessments are dealt with on a bilateral basis and form part of the bilateral discussions led by the Secretariat’s Coordinated Resource Mobilization Unit.

23. JIU’s recommendation 4 concerns engagement with donors to determine the key elements in their assessments and encouraging United Nations organizations’ audit and evaluation bodies to consider taking these elements into account in their risk assessments and workplans in order to avoid potential duplication and overlap. In this regard, it is envisaged that a mechanism will be established by the Secretariat to review the consolidated findings and recommendations coming from audits, evaluations and donor-led external reviews and assessments, for the purposes of organizational learning to strengthen effectiveness and to inform future activities.

**ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION RATES OF JIU RECOMMENDATIONS**

24. WHO continues to ensure that it follows up on all relevant JIU recommendations. The graphics in the Annex to this report show the rates of acceptance and implementation for recommendations made between 2014 and 2017.

---

ACTION BY LEGISLATIVE/GOVERNING BODIES

25. The following recommendations of JIU reports, issued during the period October 2016 to September 2017, are directed at the legislative/governing bodies.

Comprehensive review of United Nations system support for small island developing States: final findings (document JIU/REP/2016/7)

26. Seven of the eight recommendations of this report are addressed to the legislative/governing bodies of the United Nations system organizations:

(a) JIU’s recommendation 1 proposed that governing bodies of the United Nations system and of the multilateral environment agreements, taking into account the findings of the comprehensive review, should give precise system-wide coordinated guidance to the organizations so as to ensure that the priorities of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway are mainstreamed in the strategic plans, within the realm of the organizations’ mandates, and should encourage all stakeholders to make sufficient and predictable resources available for the effective and accelerated implementation of the Pathway.

(b) JIU’s recommendation 2 proposed that governing bodies should ensure that the strategic plans and work programmes of the system organizations include specific objectives related to the implementation of the SAMOA Pathway, within the realm of their respective mandates, to be measured against a set of established key performance indicators to monitor and report on the achievements.

(c) JIU’s recommendation 3 proposed that governing bodies, in adopting the strategic plans and work programmes of the organizations, should encourage the organizations to ensure that the activities in support of sustainable development of SIDS, within the realm of the mandate of each organization, are aligned with the regional and national priorities identified by the Governments of those States, regional organizations and SIDS development partners, so as to foster the implementation of the SAMOA Pathway, as the blueprint of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development of SIDS.

(d) JIU’s recommendation 4 proposed that governing bodies should request the organizations to coordinate the planning and implementation of their capacity-building activities in close consultation with the small island developing States and all partners for development so as to strengthen effectiveness and efficiency in providing support to achieve the goals defined in the SAMOA Pathway, while avoiding saturation of the absorptive capacity of SIDS at the country level.

(e) JIU’s recommendation 6 proposed that governing bodies should encourage the allocation of predictable multi-year funding to facilitate the effective implementation of programmatic activities in support of the small island developing States, based on needs assessments prepared by the United Nations system organizations in consultation with SIDS and their relevant partners.

(f) JIU’s recommendation 7 proposed that legislative and governing bodies should ensure, based on the ongoing work of the United Nations Statistical Commission and, when relevant, on the work of the inter-agency forums and expert groups created to advise Member States, that the specificity of SIDS is explicitly considered in defining the elements of monitoring and
accountability frameworks to report on progress made on the Sustainable Development Goals, so that processes and indicators are adapted to their needs and priorities identified at the national and regional levels.

(g) JIU’s recommendation 8 proposed that governing bodies should coordinate their efforts in designing monitoring and accountability frameworks and tools adapted to the capacity of SIDS to monitor and report on the implementation of the SAMOA Pathway and other sustainable development-related global mandates, while avoiding the burden of multiple reporting frameworks.

State of the internal audit function in the United Nations system (document JIU/REP/2016/8)

27. JIU’s recommendation 1 proposed that governing bodies should direct executive heads to ensure that their heads of internal audit/oversight and oversight committee chairs attend the meetings of the governing bodies at least annually and are given the opportunity to respond to questions raised about their respective annual reports. The Secretariat notes that this is currently the practice as the head of the Office of Internal Oversight Services presents an annual report to the Programme, Budget and Administration Committee of the Executive Board and the Health Assembly, and is available to respond to questions that may arise.

28. JIU’s recommendation 9 proposed that governing bodies should ensure that the conditions for effective, independent, expert oversight committees are in place, and that the committees are fully functional in line with previous JIU recommendations, as reinforced in this report. The Secretariat notes that the Chair of the Independent Expert Oversight Advisory Committee reports to every meeting of the Programme Budget and Administration Committee of the Executive Board.

Administrative support services: the role of service centres in redesigning administrative service delivery (document JIU/REP/2016/11)

29. JIU’s recommendation 4 proposed that legislative bodies, in support of their oversight and monitoring functions, should request their technical advisory bodies to examine the results, including benefits realized, of administrative service reform when considering relevant organizational budget proposals, starting with the next budget cycle.

Donor-led assessments of the United Nations system organizations (document JIU/REP/2017/2)

30. JIU’s recommendation 1 proposed that legislative/governing bodies should encourage better access to, and dissemination and exchange of information concerning donor assessments among the Member States and should, in this context, call upon the executive heads to make such assessments publicly available by uploading them in an online global repository to be established by the Secretary-General of the United Nations for that purpose not later than 2018.

31. JIU’s recommendation 5 proposed that legislative/governing bodies should request executive heads to identify and provide adequate resources and support to the internal audit and evaluation offices of their respective organizations to enable them to provide the required levels of assurance that would help minimize duplication and overlap with external reviews, verifications and assessments conducted by third parties.
ACTION BY THE PROGRAMME, BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

32. The Committee is invited to take note of this report and to consider the recommendations contained in the JIU reports requiring action by WHO’s legislative/governing bodies.
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