

**REVIEW OF THE ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION
OF JIU RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE WORLD FOOD
PROGRAMME (WFP)**

Prepared by

*Jorge T. Flores Callejas
Gerard Biraud*

Joint Inspection Unit

Geneva 2015



United Nations

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1-9	3
II. ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS	10-17	5
A. Above average rates of acceptance and implementation...	10	5
B. Higher rates of acceptance and implementation of recommendations addressed to the executive head.....	11	5
C. Trend of acceptance and implementation.....	12	6
D. Few long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more.....	13-14	6
III. CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS BY WFP LEGISLATIVE BODIES.....	15-30	7
A. Dissemination of reports.....	17-19	7
B. CEB and executive heads' comments not submitted	20-22	7
C. Consideration of JIU reports	23-26	7
D. Decision taken by the legislative body on JIU recommendations.....	27-30	8

ANNEXES

I. Rates of acceptance and implementation by organization (2006-2012)	9
II. WFP trend of acceptance and implementation of JIU recommendations (2006-2012).....	10
III. Milestones in the process of consideration of JIU reports by the WFP legislative body (2010-2012).....	12

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The General Assembly of the United Nations has noted repeatedly the importance of enhancing the effectiveness of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) and its follow-up system and has reaffirmed that the effectiveness of the JIU is a shared responsibility of the Unit, member States, and the secretariats of the participating organizations.¹

2. In its resolution 54/16, the General Assembly endorsed the proposal of the Unit to establish a system for the handling of JIU reports and recommendations by its participating organizations. The proposal, entitled “Towards a more effective system of follow-up on reports of the Joint Inspection Unit”, was attached as an annex to the Unit’s annual report for 1997.² Subsequently, the Unit undertook the negotiation of specific follow-up “agreements” with the secretariats of its participating organizations, which were ratified by their respective governing bodies between 2000 and 2005. The Executive Board of the World Food Programme (WFP) endorsed the follow-up scheme in 2002³ and requested the WFP secretariat to keep it informed of developments in the system’s application.

3. In 1998, the Unit started tracking the action taken by legislative bodies on JIU recommendations. This tracking system evolved over the years and a web-based tracking system (WBTS) was introduced in 2002. The WBTS serves as an online platform allowing participating organizations to access and update the status of consideration of JIU reports and the acceptance and implementation of recommendations. The General Assembly in its resolution 69/275 requests the heads of participating organizations to make full use of the web-based system and to provide an in-depth analysis of how the recommendations of the Unit are being implemented.⁴

4. The Unit is committed to further enhancing the effectiveness of its follow-up system and therefore decided to include in its programme of work for 2015 a review of the acceptance and implementation of JIU recommendations by its participating organizations for the period 2006-2012. The most recent years have been excluded from the analysis since it takes some time for reports to be considered by legislative bodies and for recommendations to be implemented by management. Prior to 2006, all recommendations had been closed and their acceptance/implementation was no longer tracked.

5. The review will be conducted in two phases. The objectives of the first phase are to review:
- The acceptance and implementation of recommendations by JIU participating organizations, based on the statistics provided in the WBTS, to prompt action to clear recommendations outstanding for five years or more; and
 - The process of consideration of JIU reports by the legislative bodies of organizations in order to identify shortcomings and delays in the process.

¹ General Assembly resolutions 50/233, 54/16, 62/246, 63/272, 64/262, 65/270, 66/259, 68/266 and 69/275.

² A/52/34

³ Decision/2002/EB.2/17 endorsed the pilot scheme contained in document WFP/EB.2/2002/8-A and Corr.1/Rev.

⁴ OP.15

6. A questionnaire on the process of handling JIU reports, notes and management letters was sent to the JIU focal points at each organization. The results of the first phase of the review will be presented in a series of management letters addressed to executive heads of participating organizations.

7. The second phase will aim at identifying good follow-up practices at organizations and drawing lessons to enhance the follow-up process.

8. The present management letter, which is addressed for action to the Executive Director of WFP includes:

- A comparison of the acceptance and implementation rates for the period 2006-2012 in order to position WFP within the spectrum of JIU participating organizations;
- A trend analysis of the acceptance and implementation rates at WFP for the period 2006-2012;
- A review of recommendations formulated during the period 2006-2009 still outstanding without any explanation, the acceptance of which is “not available” or “under consideration”, and/or the implementation of which is “in progress”, “not started” or “not available”; and
- An analysis of the process of handling JIU reports issued from 2010 to 2012 by the WFP secretariat and the Executive Board, and an analysis of the time taken for reports to be considered, taking into account the major milestones of the process (reports sent for action, the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) and executive head’s comments issued and reports taken up).

9. Comments on the draft were sought from WFP management and taken into account in finalizing the report. In accordance with article 11, paragraph 2, of the JIU statute, the present management letter was finalized after consultation among the Inspectors so as to test its conclusions and recommendations against the collective wisdom of the Unit.

II. ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Above average rates of acceptance and implementation of recommendations

10. As of February 2015, WFP ranked 3rd in the acceptance and 4th in the implementation of JIU recommendations among all participating organizations and entities considered in our review for the period 2006-2012. The WFP acceptance rate was considerably above the average of all organizations and its implementation rate (of accepted recommendations) was also much higher than the average rate of all organizations, as shown in the table below (see annex I for more details). The Inspectors are pleased to note this positive result and encourage WFP management to maintain it.

Table 1
Rates of acceptance and implementation (2006-2012)*

	WFP	All organizations
Number of recommendations	336	7692*
Number of accepted recommendations	301	5000*
Number of implemented recommendations	281	4020*
Rate of acceptance	89.6%	65%
Rate of implementation	93.4%	80.4%

* As of February 2015

** Number of recommendations multiplied by the number of organizations concerned, to which recommendations are addressed for action

B. Higher rates of acceptance and implementation of recommendations addressed to the executive head

11. Like most participating organizations, the WFP rate of acceptance of recommendations addressed for action to the executive head during the period 2006-2012 is higher than the rates of acceptance of recommendations addressed for action to the legislative body. Yet, the rate of implementation of recommendations addressed for action to the executive head is lower than the rate of implementation of recommendations addressed to the legislative body. In principle, recommendations addressed to executive heads are more easily accepted and implemented since they do not entail significant policy changes or costs requiring the approval of member States. **The Inspectors encourage WFP management to analyse the reasons for this difference in the rate of implementation and take action, as appropriate.**

Table 2
Rates of acceptance and implementation by addressee (2006-2012)*

	WFP executive head	WFP legislative body
Number of recommendations	250	86
Number of recommendations accepted	231	71
Number of recommendations implemented	216	69

Rate of acceptance	92.4	82.6%
Rate of implementation	93.5	97.2%

*As of December 2015

C. Trend of acceptance and implementation

12. It can be further noted that both the rates of acceptance and implementation of recommendations fluctuated from 2006 to 2012 although they generally increased over the period, as shown in the table below (see annex II for more details).

Table 3
Trend of acceptance and implementation (2006-2012)*

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Number of recommendations	27	36	58	57	54	59	45
Rate of acceptance	85%	92%	86%	91%	85%	97%	89%
Rate of implementation	87%	100%	90%	100%	87%	89.5%	100%

*As of February 2015

D. Few long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more

13. A review of 178 recommendations in 26 JIU reports, notes, and management letters, addressed for action to WFP during the period 2006-2009 showed that at the beginning of January 2015, there were only nine outstanding recommendations for five years or more, for which action should have already been taken by WFP to either accept and implement or to reject them (see table below).

Table 4
Long outstanding recommendations

Report/note/ML	Recommendation No.	Status
JIU/NOTE/2006/1	3	Implementation: In progress
	8	Implementation: In progress
	9	Implementation: In progress
JIU/NOTE/2008/3	5	Implementation: Not available
	8	Acceptance: Under consideration
JIU/NOTE/2008/4	3	Implementation: In progress
	6	Implementation: In progress
	10	Implementation: Not started
	11	Implementation: Not started

14. In its comments to the draft management letter, WFP indicated that action had been taken to close all the long outstanding recommendations in JIU/NOTE/2006/1 and JIU/NOTE/2008/3 and they were actively following up on the recommendations of JIU/NOTE/2008/4. In the forthcoming update to the WFP Executive Board scheduled for February 2016 only recommendation 6 will remain in progress.

III. CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS BY WFP LEGISLATIVE BODIES

15. The JIU reviewed the handling of 24 reports issued by the Unit during the period 2010-2012 containing at least one recommendation addressed to the WFP Executive Board.

16. The review found that WFP procedures for handling JIU reports are generally in compliance with both the relevant provisions of the JIU statute (articles 11.4 and 12), to which WFP has adhered, as well as with the provisions of the follow-up agreement approved by the WFP Executive Board. WFP has established alternative reporting and follow-up practices in order to provide the legislative body with action-oriented updates and ensure that legislative body recommendations are specifically addressed.

A. Dissemination of reports

17. Article 11.4(c) of the JIU statute provides that upon receipt of reports, the executive head(s) concerned shall take immediate action to distribute them to the member States of their organization.

18. Paragraph 9 of the follow up agreement approved by the WFP Executive Board reads that JIU reports will be made available by the WFP Secretariat to Board members in the official languages.

19. WFP annual reports on JIU recommendations sent to the Executive Board for consideration refer member States to the JIU public website for copies of the reports and translations. **The Inspectors suggest that hyperlinks to the relevant reports be provided to facilitate access to them.** The response to the JIU questionnaire indicates that reports are also distributed by email to the related divisions.

B. CEB and executive heads' comments not submitted

20. In the case of system-wide reports, article 11.4 (e) of the JIU statute calls for the preparation of joint comments of executive heads within the framework of the CEB for submission to the competent organs of the organizations together with any comments of the respective executive head on matters that concern his/her organization.

21. Although the Inspectors found reference to the CEB comments in relevant documentation prepared for the Executive Board, they noted that the CEB comments were not submitted as required; a hyperlink could facilitate access to them.

22. No separate executive head's comments to the legislative body were either submitted. Instead, comments on JIU recommendations were provided in the annual report to the Executive Board entitled "Reports by the Joint Inspection Unit relevant to the work of WFP". For the Inspectors, this is an acceptable alternative practice.

C. Consideration of JIU reports

23. The Executive Board has an agenda item dedicated to JIU during its first regular annual session, under which a list of most recent JIU reports (since the submission of the last annual report to the Board) are presented for consideration by this body, together with the WFP comments on the recommendations contained therein, as well as an updated status of the implementation and impact of JIU recommendations previously reported (in annexes). All the recommendations addressed to the executive head and the recommendations addressed to the Executive Board are reported therein. This is a good practice in terms of follow-up, transparency and accountability.

24. It shall be noted that the nature of the remarks made for each JIU recommendation is very detailed and helpful in better understanding the action taken or to be taken by the WFP secretariat. In this regard, the annual report for 2012 represents an improvement in that the proposed action by the Board is clearly spelled out. Still, the status matrix could also show the official unit responsible for implementation, which is considered a good accountability practice.

25. All JIU reports sent for action to WFP during the period 2010-2012 were listed in two respective WFP reports to the Board; they could therefore be considered as taken up by the legislative body.

26. The majority of the JIU reports were considered within the year of issuance. Three of the 24 reports were considered after one year. The JIU Inspectors commend WFP for its timely consideration of JIU reports.

D. Decision taken by the legislative body on JIU recommendations

27. WFP has implemented a process to ensure that every recommendation directed to the legislative body is specifically addressed with a formal Executive Board response. Management facilitates the process: functional area managers prepare the suggested Board responses, and an informal working group composed of the WFP Executive Board Bureau Alternates reviews them. The responses, as revised by the working group, are then presented to the Executive Board Bureau, which approves the final language. The approved Board responses are included in the annual report to the WFP Executive Board on JIU recommendations.

28. With regard to recommendations to the executive head, the aforementioned report includes a draft decision for the Executive Board: "The Board takes note of the information and recommendations in "Reports by the Joint Inspection Unit Relevant to the Work of WFP". The final decision is agreed during the Board proceedings.

29. This "note taking" of the management comments on JIU recommendations by the Executive Board constitutes the basis for recording the status of acceptance and implementation in the WBTS. For the Inspectors, this is a valid alternative solution since it triggers subsequent action by the WFP secretariat.


30. The Inspectors would appreciate receiving a response to this management letter and recommendations by 31 January 2016.

Annex I: Rates of acceptance and implementation by organization (in descending order)


From: 2006 - To: 2012 Type of Document(s): All

	<i>(percentage)</i>		<i>(percentage)</i>
	<i>Accepted</i>		<i>Implemented</i>
FAO	93.7	OHCHR	100.0
UNRWA	91.2	FAO	97.3
WFP	89.6	ICAO	94.1
UNHCR	86.2	WFP	93.4
UNFPA	85.7	WMO	92.8
WHO	83.6	UNIDO	92.6
UNIDO	82.9	UNESCO	90.4
UNDP	82.3	UNHCR	89.2
UNESCO	81.9	WHO	88.3
UNOPS	81.0	UNEP	86.7
ICAO	80.8	UNCTAD	86.6
UNICEF	80.4	UNRWA	82.4
UNEP	78.7	UNOPS	82.0
UNAIDS	77.8	ILO	80.5
IMO	72.8	All organizations	80.4
ILO	68.2	UNFPA	80.1
UN	67.0	WIPO	78.2
All organizations	65.0	UNWTO	73.7
WMO	63.9	UN	69.8
WIPO	56.3	UNDP	69.5
ITU	47.4	UNICEF	66.3
OHCHR	38.5	IAEA	61.3
IAEA	35.3	UN-Habitat	61.2
UNCTAD	32.8	UNODC	57.9
UPU	25.7	IMO	57.2
UNODC	22.4	UNAIDS	51.4
UN-Habitat	19.2	ITC	50.0
ITC	18.2	UPU	46.8
UNWTO	6.3	ITU	46.2
CEB	0.0	CEB	0.0
UN-WOMEN	0.0	UN-WOMEN	0.0

Annex II: WFP trend of acceptance and implementation of JIU recommendations



Implementation



%	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Implemented	87.0	100.0	90.0	100.0	87.0	89.5	100.0
In progress	13.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	10.9	10.5	0.0
Not started	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Not available	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Values	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Implemented	20	33	45	52	40	51	40
In progress	3	0	2	0	5	6	0
Not started	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
Not available	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Annex III: Milestones in the process of consideration of JIU reports by WFP legislative body (2010- 2012)

Report symbol	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization) (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date of issuance of CEB comments and symbol (c)	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months) (d)=(c) – (b)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and symbol (e)	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol (g)	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months) (h) = (g) –(b)	Action taken by legislative bodies (accept, reject, note taken, no action) (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2012/12	SWR	15/02/2013	23/05/2013 A/67/873/Add.1	3 months, 8 days	13/1/2014 WFP/EB.1/ 2014/9	10 months, 29 days	11/02/2014 WFP/EB.1/ 2014/9	11 months, 27 days	2014/EB.1/11 11/2/2014 The Board took note of the information and recommendations in WFP/EB.1/2014/9	Takes note= accept comments and suggestions made on JIU recommendations
JIU/REP/2012/11	SWR	07/03/2013	20/05/2013 A/67/867/Add.1	2 months, 13 days	13/1/2014W FP/EB.1/20 14/9	10 months, 6 days	11/02/2014 WFP/EB.1/ 2014/9	11 months, 4 days	2014/EB.1/11 11/2/2014	Same as above
JIU/REP/2012/10	SWR	01/05/2013	-	-	13/1/2014W FP/EB.1/20 14/9	8 months,12 days	11/02/2014 WFP/EB.1/ 2014/9	9 months, 10 days	2014/EB.1/11 11/2/2014	Same as above

Report symbol	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization) (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date of issuance of CEB comments and symbol (c)	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months) (d)=(c) – (b)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and symbol (e)	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol (g)	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months) (h) = (g) –(b)	Action taken by legislative bodies (accept, reject, note taken, no action) (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2012/9	SWR	28/02/2013	19/09/2013 A/68/373/Add.1	6 months, 22 days	13/1/2014W FP/EB.1/2014/9	10 months, 16 days	11/02/2014 WFP/EB.1/2014/9	11 months, 14 days	2014/EB.1/11 11/2/2014	Same as above
JIU/REP/2012/8	SWR	28/06/2013	04/09/2013 A/68/344/Add.1	2 months, 7 days	13/1/2014W FP/EB.1/2014/9	6 months, 16 days	11/02/2014 WFP/EB.1/2014/9	7 months, 14 days	2014/EB.1/11 11/2/2014	Same as above
JIU/REP/2012/5	SWR	28/02/2013	19/09/2013 A/68/67/Add.1	6 months, 22 days	13/1/2014W FP/EB.1/2014/9	10 months, 16 days	11/02/2014 WFP/EB.1/2014/9	11 months, 14 days	2014/EB.1/11 11/2/2014	Same as above
JIU/REP/2012/4	SWR	23/10/2012	21/06/2013 A/67/888/Add.1	7 months, 29 days	13/1/2014W FP/EB.1/2014/9	14 months, 21 days	11/02/2014 WFP/EB.1/2014/9	15 months, 19 days	2014/EB.1/11 11/2/2014	Same as above

Report symbol	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization) (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date of issuance of CEB comments and symbol (c)	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months) (d)=(c) – (b)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and symbol (e)	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol (g)	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months) (h) = (g) –(b)	Action taken by legislative bodies (accept, reject, note taken, no action) (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2012/2	SWR	11/05/2012	28/09/2012 A/67/337/Add.1	4 months, 17 days	6/2/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11/Re v.1	8 months, 26 days	19/02/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	9 months, 8 days	2013/EB.1/11 19/2/2013 The Board took note of the information and recommendations in WFP/EB.1/2013/11/Rev.1).	Same as above
JIU/REP/2011/11	SWR	12/04/2012	01/03/2013 A/68/63/Add.1	10 months, 17 days	6/2/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	9 months, 25 days	19/02/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	10 months, 7 days	2014/EB.1/11 19/2/1013	Same as above Report considered before CEB comments issued
JIU/REP/2011/9	SWR	09/03/2012	29/06/2012 A/67/119/Add.1	3 months, 20 days	6/2/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	10 months, 28 days	19/02/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	11 months, 10 days	2014/EB.1/11 19/2/1013	Same as above
JIU/REP/2011/7	SWR	29/03/2012	29/08/2012 A/67/140/Add.1	5 months	6/2/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	10 months, 8 days	19/02/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	10 months, 21 days	2014/EB.1/11 19/2/1013	Same as above

Report symbol	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization) (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date of issuance of CEB comments and symbol (c)	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months) (d)=(c) – (b)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and symbol (e)	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol (g)	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months) (h) = (g) –(b)	Action taken by legislative bodies (accept, reject, note taken, no action) (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2011/6	SWR	21/02/2012	02/07/2012 A/67/83/Add.1	4 months, 11 days	6/2/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	11 months, 16 days	19/02/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	11 months, 29 days	2014/EB.1/11 19/2/1013	Same as above
JIU/REP/2011/5	SWR	21/02/2012	28/02/2012 A/66/710/Add.1	7 days	6/2/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	11 months, 16 days	19/02/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	11 months, 29 days	2014/EB.1/11 19/2/1013	Same as above
JIU/REP/2011/4	SWR	29/03/2012	15/06/2012 A/67/78/Add.1	2 months, 17 days	6/2/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	10 months, 8 days	19/02/2013 WFP/EB.1/ 2013/11	10 months, 21 days	2014/EB.1/11 19/2/1013	Same as above

Report symbol	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization) (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date of issuance of CEB comments and symbol (c)	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months) (d)=(c) – (b)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and symbol (e)	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol (g)	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months) (h) = (g) –(b)	Action taken by legislative bodies (accept, reject, note taken, no action) (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2011/3	SWR	08/07/2011	29/02/2012 A/66/717/Add.1	7 months, 21 days	20/1/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	6 months, 12 days	14/2/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	7 months, 6 days	2012/EB.1/18 14/2/2012 The Board took note of the information and recommendations in WFP/EB.1/2012/12	Same as above
JIU/REP/2011/1	SWR	10/06/2011	23/03/2012 A/66/327/Add.1	9 months, 13 days	20/1/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	7 months, 10 days	14/2/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	8 months, 4 days	2012/EB.1/18 14/2/2012	Same as above Report considered before CEB comments issued
JIU/REP/2010/8	SWR	29/03/2011	23/09/2011 A/66/355/Add.1	5 months, 26 days	20/1/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	9 months, 23 days	14/2/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	10 months, 17 days	2012/EB.1/18 14/2/2012	Same as above

Report symbol	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization) (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date of issuance of CEB comments and symbol (c)	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months) (d)=(c) – (b)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and symbol (e)	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol (g)	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months) (h) = (g) –(b)	Action taken by legislative bodies (accept, reject, note taken, no action) (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2010/7	SWR	16/12/2010	23/09/2011 A/66/348/Add.1	9 months, 8 days	20/1/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	13 months, 5 days	14/2/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	13 months, 30 days	2012/EB.1/18 14/2/2012	Same as above
JIU/REP/2010/6	SWR	22/11/2010	17/08/2011 A/66/308/Add.1	8 months, 27 days	18/01/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12-A	1 month, 28 days	16/02/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12	2 months, 26 days	Decision 2011/EB.1/17 16/2/2011 The Board took note of the information and recommendations in WFP/EB.1/2011/12-A) and requested the Secretariat to present an action plan to the Executive Board Bureau in April and thereafter to the Annual session 2011 for information.	Same as above Report considered before CEB comments issued

Report symbol	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization) (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date of issuance of CEB comments and symbol (c)	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months) (d)=(c) – (b)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and symbol (e)	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol (g)	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months) (h) = (g) –(b)	Action taken by legislative bodies (accept, reject, note taken, no action) (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2010/5	SWR	04/01/2011	23/09/2011 A/66/73/Add.1	8 months, 20 days	20/1/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	12 months, 17 days	14/2/2012 WFP/EB.1/ 2012/12	13 months, 11 days	Note taken 2012/EB.1/18 14/2/2012	Same as above
JIU/REP/2010/4	SWR	22/11/2010	17/08/2011 A/65/788/Add.1	8 months, 27 days	19/01/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12-A	1 month, 29 days	16/02/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12	2 months, 26 days	Note taken Decision 2011/EB.1/17 16/2/2011	Same as above Report considered before CEB comments issued
JIU/REP/2010/3	SWR	18/06/2010	09/09/2010 A/65/345/Add.1	2 months, 23 days	19/01/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12-A	7 months, 2 days	16/02/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12	7 months, 30 days	Note taken Decision 2011/EB.1/17 16/2/2011	Same as above
JIU/REP/2010/2	SWR	19/05/2010	01/09/2010 A/65/338/Add.1	3 months 14 days	19/01/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12-A	8 months	16/02/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12	8 months, 28 days	Note taken Decision 2011/EB.1/17 16/2/2011	Same as above

Report symbol	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization) (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date of issuance of CEB comments and symbol (c)	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months) (d)=(c) – (b)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and symbol (e)	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol (g)	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months) (h) = (g) –(b)	Action taken by legislative bodies (accept, reject, note taken, no action) (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2010/1	SWR	19/03/2010	07/09/2010 A/65/346/Add.1	5 months, 19 days	19/01/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12-A	10 months	16/02/2011 WFP/EB.1/ 2011/12	10 months 28 days	Note taken Decision 2011/EB.1/17 16/2/2011	Same as above

Total reports: 24