



WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD
111th Session
Provisional agenda item 9.4

EB111/24
13 December 2002

Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit

Previous JIU reports: implementation of recommendations

Report by the Secretariat

1. The United Nations General Assembly and a number of legislative organs of other Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) participating organizations, including WHO, have endorsed a new follow-up system on the reports of the JIU, as contained in Annex I of the 1997 JIU annual report.¹
2. Under this new system, a systematic process is established for tracking each step taken towards consideration of the reports by the appropriate legislative organs, including follow-up measures by the relevant officials of the participating organizations, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4 of the JIU Statute.
3. The JIU has recently devised a tracking system using a follow-up matrix or tracking chart for each report given consideration by a legislative organ. This matrix indicates the recommendation; the unit responsible for implementation; the official in charge of implementation; the timetable for implementation; and the initial impact of implementation. The completed chart is to be submitted to the JIU and to the bureau of the appropriate legislative organs.
4. The purpose of the present document is to present to the Board the new tracking chart (Annex). It contains further detailed information about the progress made by WHO in implementing the recommendations of the JIU report entitled Review of management and administration in WHO (document JIU/REP/2001/5), which was submitted to the 109th session of the Executive Board in January 2001.²

ACTION BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

5. The Executive Board is invited to take note of the report.

¹ Report of the Joint Inspection Unit (covering the period 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997). *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-second Session, Supplement No. 34 (A/52/34)*.

² Document EB109/30.

ANNEX

IMPLEMENTATION OF APPROVED/ACCEPTED RECOMMENDATIONS

JIU/REP/2001/5: Review of management and administration in WHO

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 1: A wide review of delegation of authority and related accountability in the Organization should be undertaken and reported to the Executive Board, including, as a first stage, a definition of where administrative authority needs to be retained at headquarters and a comparative analysis of authority delegated to the clusters and regional offices. In a second stage, following the implementation of upgraded information systems, a more specific study is required of the division of labour between management support units and central services in the light of experience within the United Nations system.</p>	Accepted	General Management (GMG) cluster	Executive Director GMG	Phase I: 2002-2003; Phase II: 2004-2005. While important groundwork on a review of delegations of authority has already been made with a view to harmonizing, standardizing and improving delegation practices within WHO, the more strategic aspects of the balance of authority between headquarters and regions/countries or the division of labour and authority between management support units and central services are still under discussion.	Clear levels of delegation of authority, when properly correlated to the decision-making process and related accountability, avoid both confusion and duplication.	

¹ Recommendations approved by legislative organs.

² Recommendations accepted by executive heads without legislative action.

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 2: (a) A consolidated department of information technology should be established at headquarters; (b) a comprehensive information technology strategy should be submitted to the Executive Board at its 111th session, indicating estimated resource requirements, planned phases of implementation and funding scenarios, as well as the implications of maintaining current legacy systems; (c) the Director-General should report periodically to the Board on its implementation and the status of the Information Technology Fund.</p>	Accepted	General Management (GMG) cluster	Executive Director GMG	<p>Rec. 2(a): Implemented as per DG Note 2002/4 of 7 March 2002.</p> <p>Rec. 2(b): The unusually heavy agenda of the 111th session of the Executive Board, coupled with the finalization of the reorganization of GMG, has led to the postponement of the submission of a document on this issue to a subsequent session of the Board. This will afford more opportunity for in-depth discussion of this important matter.</p> <p>Rec. 2(c): The Information Technology Fund has been set up under Financial Regulation 9.3, with related funding request contained in the Proposed programme budget for the financial period 2004-2005. The Director-General will report annually on the use and status of the Fund to the Health Assembly in the Financial Report.</p>	<p>Rec. 2(a): Better integration of all information technology-related aspects of WHO's operations; enhanced leadership for information technology strategy formulation.</p> <p>Rec. 2(b): Not applicable.</p> <p>Rec. 2(c): More transparency and better communication with the governing bodies.</p>	

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 3: The common set of objective criteria called for by the Board to determine the nature and extent of WHO country representation should be finalized after broad consultation and submitted to its 111th session for approval. The criteria should also include: the level of foreseen country activities; the ratio of operating costs to overall programme resources; expected extrabudgetary resources; and the nature and level of services and activities of WHO partners.</p>	<p>Accepted in principle, but with some reservations as detailed in document EB109/30: difficult to achieve one set of common, Organization-wide criteria for WHO representation at country level, given the wide variations between WHO regions; and the proposed timetable too ambitious, given the need for wide-ranging regional consultations of any related proposal.</p>	<p>Department of Cooperation and Communication (CCO), Sustainable Development and Healthy Environment (SDE) cluster</p>	<p>Director CCO</p>	<p>Objective criteria were first defined for the 101st session of the Executive Board in 1998 (document EB101/5) and then taken forward in a flexible manner by regional offices. These criteria have recently been elaborated to help guide extent of representation. The intent, however, is not to submit them for formal endorsement, but rather to use the recently introduced country cooperation strategy as a mechanism to provide a more comprehensive review of the extent of country presence, in close consultation with individual Member States. The country cooperation strategy is being rolled out in regions at a variable rate: as of 30 October 2002, 30 reviews had been completed; another 25 to 30 will be completed in 2003.</p>	<p>The country cooperation strategy covers a two-to-five-year strategic framework for all country-level activities, including the implications regarding resources for WHO as a whole, as well as an assessment of partner activities. Its main expected benefit is a more rational allocation of WHO resources to countries, taking into consideration a comprehensive range of factors of relevance for maximizing the impact of WHO's interventions.</p>	

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 4: Through the global cabinet framework, a review of WHO's decentralized network should be undertaken and guidelines provided for (a) the reporting lines between the three levels of the Organization and information-sharing; (b) level of authority delegated to country offices; and (c) measures for their strengthening through human resource development.</p>	<p>Accepted, with the proviso that the level of authority to be delegated to WHO country offices would need to be graduated and to be handed down via the regional offices.</p>	<p>Global cabinet, all regional offices</p>	<p>All Executive Directors and Regional Directors</p>	<p>Rec. 4(a) and Rec. 4(b): These two recommendations have to be seen in the context of Rec. 1, as the reporting lines between the three levels and the delegation to country offices are part of the overall delegation of authority issue.</p> <p>Rec. 4(c): A conscious effort to strengthen WHO country presence has been undertaken in the Proposed programme budget for the financial period 2004-2005.</p>	<p>Better performance of WHO at all levels, particularly at country level, as seen in its evaluation framework for country offices; faster response time through more local empowerment.</p>	
<p>Rec. 5: At the first Board session in the second year of each biennium, as well as at the subsequent Health Assembly, a final performance report on expected results of the previous biennium should be submitted in tabular form, starting with the Board's 111th session.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Department of Programme Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME), General Management (GMG) cluster</p>	<p>Director PME</p>	<p>Final report for 2000-2001 completed; mid-term review for 2002-2003 to be completed early in 2003.</p>	<p>Lessons learned from implementation of previous and current programme budgets will help discussion of the Proposed programme budget for the financial period 2004-2005.</p>	<p>Tabular form should be considered for the 2002-2003 report.</p>

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 6: Greater discipline in implementing and using the activity management system (AMS) is required, as well as additional efforts such as: (a) developing an interface between AMS and the systems of the Regions of the Americas and the Western Pacific; (b) priority access by country offices to a simplified web-based AMS interface; and (c) AMS-related training needs of clusters to be identified by Budget and Management Reform (BMR).</p>	Accepted	Department of Programme Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME), General Management (GMG) cluster	Director PME	Plan for remodelling the activity management system designed and implementation started in March 2001; mechanisms and procedures for operating a global database being tested since January 2002.	More comprehensive and accurate programme management information reflecting Organization-wide work.	

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 7: The internal evaluation function should be strengthened by: (a) defining clearly the respective responsibilities of Budget and Management Reform (BMR) and the Office of Internal Audit and Oversight (IAO) and allocating resources accordingly; (b) presenting all or part of the findings of evaluation studies on WHO's web site, a disclosure policy already adopted by other organizations of the United Nations system; and (c) elaborating a clearer policy and assessment criteria concerning WHO's use of private management consulting firms.</p>	<p>Accepted, except for Rec. 7(c). Concerning the modalities of using private management consulting firms, this issue has already been discussed at length in document JIU/REP/99/7, which dealt specifically with this topic and was transmitted to the Executive Board at its 107th session in January 2001. The Board noted that "WHO's policies and guidelines for use of management consultancies follow the procedures applicable to all outside contractors and service providers. In view of the difficulty of delineating managerial consultancy from technical consultancy, definition of policies, standards and procedures for management consultants would be neither feasible nor desirable" (document EB107/32).</p>	<p>Office of the Director-General (DGO); General Management (GMG) cluster</p>	<p>Executive Director GMG</p>	<p>Rec. 7(a): Implemented as per a Memorandum of Understanding between IAO and BMR, signed on 8 January 2002.</p> <p>Rec. 7(b): The evaluations on eradication of poliomyelitis and the strategic budgeting process have been made available on WHO's web site.</p> <p>Rec. 7(c): Not applicable.</p>	<p>A clearer delineation of respective mandates for evaluation-related work, as well as more transparency of evaluation findings.</p>	

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 8: The personnel function should be reinforced by: (a) assigning it to a single department within the General Management cluster and providing it with strong leadership; (b) redefining its role <i>vis-à-vis</i> regional offices and clusters; and (c) providing it with an integrated and up-to-date human resources information technology system as an integral part of the information technology strategy discussed in Rec. 2 above.</p>	Accepted	Department of Human Resources Services (HRS) and Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications (ITT), General Management (GMG) cluster	<p>Rec. 8(a) and Rec. 8(b): Managing Director HRS; Rec. 8(c): Director Global Management System</p>	<p>Rec. 8(a): Implemented as per DG Note 2002/4 of 7 March 2002, which reorganized the HRS Department into four main services, including the formerly independent staff development and training function.</p> <p>Rec. 8(b): The role of HRS <i>vis-à-vis</i> clusters has been redefined and strengthened, following its reorganization as per DG Note 2002/4 of 7 March 2002. Certain human resources functions and, notably, classification and some recruitment functions are foreseen to be transferred to HRS from the management support units. The upgrading of the Director HRS function to Cabinet rank as of October 2001 has also strengthened the role of the department <i>vis-à-vis</i> regional offices and clusters.</p> <p>Rec. 8(c): A new time-limited project office was established in March 2002 with responsibility for introducing a new global management system, which will include major improvements in its human resources component. A director-level position is in the process of being filled.</p>	A more modern, proactive and responsive human resources function striking a good balance between central guidance and standard-setting and decentralized human resources services “close to the customer”.	

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 9: The new HRS department should:</p> <p>(a) undertake a staff skills inventory at all levels;</p> <p>(b) conduct annual staffing reviews with clusters and regional offices and assist them in achieving agreed gender, geographical and staff development targets;</p> <p>(c) project the effect of scheduled retirements on equitable geographical distribution; (d) ensure the actual use of existing rosters; and (e) institute a genuine rotation system among WHO's professional staff.</p>	Accepted	Department of Human Resources Services (HRS), General Management (GMG) cluster	Managing Director HRS	<p>Rec. 9(a): A global framework for WHO (core and managerial competencies) will be completed in early 2003. A staff skills inventory project has started with a view to documenting staff skills on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Rec. 9(b): Clusters and regional offices are encouraged to build annual staffing plans for this purpose (see also (c) below) and annual reports are presented.</p> <p>Rec. 9(c): New workforce planning tools that allow managers, <i>inter alia</i>, to project the impact of staff retirements are being tested at headquarters with a view to wider implementation in 2003.</p> <p>Rec. 9(d): A web-based recruitment tool will facilitate the building and management of rosters.</p> <p>Rec. 9(e): Policies and procedures for a fully functioning rotation and mobility system have been developed; these are being considered by senior management and will be discussed with staff representatives.</p>	Improved human resources planning; a better match of available skills with identified organizational needs; more rational use of available staff complement and easier targeting of required inputs from outside.	

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 10: The Board may wish to review Article VIII of the Staff Regulations (“Staff Relations”) so as to institutionalize the Global Staff Management Council and similar mechanisms in all regional offices.</p>	Accepted	Department of Human Resources Services (HRS), General Management (GMG) cluster	Managing Director HRS	Implemented as per Cluster Note 2002/29 of 22 August 2002, providing the terms of reference of the Global Staff Management Council.	Stronger institutional anchoring of a new staff/management consultation mechanism that has proved its usefulness.	
<p>Rec. 11: The Board and Health Assembly may wish to: (a) encourage the separate External Auditors appointed by WHO and PAHO to maintain and reinforce their collaboration; and (b) consider limiting the External Auditor’s term of office to a non-consecutive term covering several financial periods in order to allow reasonable rotation while preserving some needed continuity.</p>	As explained in document EB109/30, implementation of this recommendation is a matter for the Board and the Health Assembly. At present, WHO does not see the need for major changes, as collaboration between the two External Auditors is already proceeding well.					

JIU recommendation number	Approved ¹ or accepted ²	Unit responsible for implementation	Official in charge of implementation	Timetable	Expected impact of implementation	Remarks
<p>Rec. 12: Should the governing bodies decide that specific IAO reports should be made available to the Audit Committee on a regular basis, they may wish to request the Director-General to propose the necessary amendments to the Financial Rules.</p>	<p>As stated in document EB109/30, the Organization's view is that the current practice is working well.</p>					

||
||
||