

**REVIEW OF THE ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION  
OF JIU RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE UNITED NATIONS  
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)**

*Prepared by*

*Jorge T. Flores Callejas*

**Joint Inspection Unit**

**Geneva 2016**



**United Nations**

## CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>		<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
<b>I.</b> INTRODUCTION.....		1-9	3
<b>II. ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>		10-17	5
A. Rates of acceptance and implementation.....		10-11	5
B. Rates of acceptance and implementation of recommendations addressed to the executive head.....		12-13	5
C. Fluctuations in the trend of acceptance and implementation.....		14-15	5
D. Long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more .....		16-17	6
<b>III. CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS BY UNDP LEGISLATIVE BODY .....</b>		18-30	7
A. Dissemination of reports .....		20-22	7
B. Submission of CEB and executive head's comments .....		23-25	7
C. Consideration of JIU reports .....		26-27	7
D. Decisions taken by the legislative body on JIU recommendations .....		28	8
E. Follow-up and reporting on the implementation of JIU recommendations .....		29-30	8

## ANNEXES

<b>I.</b> Rates of acceptance and implementation (2006-2012) .....	9
<b>II.</b> Rates of acceptance and implementation by addressee .....	10
<b>III.</b> UNDP trend of acceptance and implementation of JIU recommendations (2006-2012) .....	11
<b>IV.</b> Long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more (2006-2010), as of May 2016 .....	12
<b>V.</b> Consideration of JIU reports by UNDP legislative body (2010-2012) .....	13

## 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.<sup>1</sup>

2. In its resolution 54/16, the General Assembly endorsed the proposal of the Unit to establish a system for 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 1996-1997.<sup>2</sup> Subsequently, the Unit undertook negotiation on specific follow-up agreements with the secretariats of its participating organizations, which were ratified by their respective governing bodies between 2000 and 2005. By decision 2002/8 of 27 June 2002, the Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) “requests that the Administrator continue to follow-up on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit”.<sup>3</sup>

3. In 1998, the Unit started tracking the action taken by legislative bodies on its 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.<sup>4</sup>

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 years 2013 onwards have been excluded from the analysis since it takes time for the reports to be considered by legislative bodies and for recommendations to be implemented by management. All recommendations issued prior to 2006 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.

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 are being presented in a series of management letters addressed to executive heads of participating organizations.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> A/52/34.

<sup>3</sup> See also joint letter UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF of 11 October 2002.

<sup>4</sup> OP.15.

7. The second phase will identify good follow-up practices at organizations and draw lessons to enhance the follow-up process.

8. The present management letter, which is addressed for action to the UNDP Administrator includes:

- A comparison of the acceptance and implementation rates for the period 2006-2012 in order to position UNDP within the spectrum of JIU participating organizations;
- A trend analysis of the acceptance and implementation rates at UNDP for the period 2006-2012;
- A review of recommendations formulated during the period 2006-2009 still outstanding 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 UNDP 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 UNDP management and taken into account in finalizing the letter. 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. Rates of acceptance and implementation**

10. At the time this review was initiated in February 2015, UNDP ranked 8th in the acceptance and 19th in the implementation of JIU recommendations among all participating organizations and entities considered in our review for the period 2006-2012. UNDP's acceptance rate was well above the average of all organizations and its implementation rate (of accepted recommendations) was considerably lower than the average rate.

11. In the draft management letter sent to UNDP for comments in February 2016, the Inspector invited UNDP management to take action to increase the rate of implementation. By the time comments were provided in April 2016 and the draft letter finalized, as of May 2016, both rates have increased, notably the rate of implementation (see annex I). UNDP currently ranks the 7th in acceptance and 2nd in implementation among all participating organizations. **The Inspector commands UNDP management for these results.**

### **B. Rates of acceptance and implementation of recommendations addressed to the executive head**

12. At the time this review was initiated, UNDP's rate of acceptance of recommendations addressed for action to the executive head during the period 2006-2012, likewise in the most of participating organizations, was higher than the rate of acceptance of recommendations addressed for action to the legislative body. However, the rate of implementation of recommendations addressed to the executive head was 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 Inspector encouraged UNDP management to analyse the reasons of this difference and take action, as appropriate.

13. As of May 2016, when the draft management letter was being finalized, both the rates of implementation of recommendations addressed to UNDP executive head and legislative body have increased and are now about the same (see annex II).

### **C. Fluctuations in the trend of acceptance and implementation**

14. It can be further noted that the rates of acceptance and implementation of recommendations fluctuated from 2006 to 2012, and generally decreased by 2012, as shown in the table in annex III. The Inspector requested UNDP management to undertake an analysis of the reasons of this trend and report to JIU. As of May 2016, the variable trend did not change but the rate of implementation sharply increased over the period (see annex III). **The Inspector commands UNDP for these results.**

15. In its comments on the draft management letter, UNDP indicated that the acceptance of recommendations is subject to the applicability of the respective recommendation in terms of relevance to the Organization's mandate and policies, whereas the implementation are also dependent on factors such as system-wide harmonization processes and policies. As JIU reports vary every year in terms of subject matter, there is no direct correlation year-on-year in these rates therefore conclusions on fluctuation cannot be credibly drawn. UNDP also indicated that their rates of acceptance between 2006 and 2012 were on par with all organizations on average and their rates of implementation over this period were higher than all organizations.

#### **D. Long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more**

16. A review of 158 recommendations in 24 JIU reports and notes addressed for action to UNDP during the period 2006-2009 showed that in January 2016 there were 51 outstanding recommendations (32 per cent) for five years or more, for which action should have already been taken by UNDP to either accept and implement or to reject them. The majority of these recommendations (67 per cent) was in progress of implementation. Action by UNDP was requested to clear these long-outstanding recommendations, as applicable.

17. Subsequently, UNDP updated the status of acceptance and implementation of these recommendations in the WBTS and, as of May 2016, there were only two recommendations in progress of implementation, which would be implemented later this year (see annex III). **The Inspector welcomes UNDP's efforts to clear long-outstanding recommendations.**

### **III. CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS BY UNDP LEGISLATIVE BODY**

18. JIU reviewed the handling of 25 reports issued by the Unit during the period 2010-2012 containing at least one recommendation addressed to UNDP Executive Board.

19. The review found that UNDP procedures for handling JIU reports were generally in compliance with the relevant provisions of the JIU statute (articles 11.4 and 12), to which UNDP has adhered to, and resolution 2002/8 of the Executive Board, except for the consideration of all JIU reports addressed for action to the organization.

#### **A. Dissemination of reports**

20. 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.

21. The annual report of the Administrator to the Executive Board on JIU recommendations lists all JIU reports of relevance to the Organization issued during the previous year and only provides a link to the Unit's website where these reports can be found. **From 2016, hyperlinks to the reports will be provided to facilitate access to them, as recommended by the JIU.**

22. The response of UNDP to the JIU questionnaire indicated that JIU reports are disseminated internally to units/bureaus who have contributed to the relevant JIU report during its preparation.

#### **B. Submission of CEB and executive head's comments**

23. 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.

24. The annual report to the UNDP Executive Board on JIU recommendations includes a brief summary and comments for each JIU report issued of direct relevance to the Organization and its recommendations. The report includes, in an annex, the recommendations addressed to this body for action, together with detailed management comments on the recommendations and their status of acceptance and implementation. In its section II, the report provides comments on the recommendations addressed to the executive head for action of relevance to the Organization.

25. No reference is made to the consolidated CEB comments. **The Inspector suggested that hyperlinks be provided to facilitate access to the CEB comments as well.** In its comments, UNDP indicated that the consolidated CEB comments are out of scope of UNDP's reporting to its Executive Board.

#### **C. Consideration of JIU reports**

26. There is a standing agenda item of the annual session of the Executive Board in June of each year dedicated to consider the recommendations contained in JIU reports issued during the preceding year and report on the status of recommendations issued during the two previous years. It appears however that comments on the recommendations contained in one third of the issued reports (8 of 25) could not be found in the next report to the Board; only the status of implementation of these recommendations was included in further reports. UNDP indicated that the JIU reports concerned had not been issued yet at the time of writing the document for the Board in January/February of the respective year. Actually, six reports were "considered" after one year of their issuance, and five of

them were indeed sent for action after the date of preparation of the annual report to the Board (see annex V).

27. The Inspector noted that no information had been provided in the WBTS on the consideration of some reports (documents reference and date of executive head's comments and action by the legislative body). **Action was requested to input the required data in the WBTS. By the time this management letter was being finalized, UNDP has taken action to update the information in the system.**

#### **D. Decisions taken by the legislative body on JIU recommendations**

28. The Inspector also noted that the annual report to the Executive Board on JIU recommendations contains a draft decision for action by the Board to take note of the report and the management response to the specific recommendations.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently, the Executive Board takes note of the report and the statistical annex.<sup>6</sup> This “note taking” of the report and 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 Inspector, this is a valid alternative solution since it triggers subsequent action by the UNDP secretariat.

#### **E. Follow-up and reporting on the implementation of JIU recommendations**

29. In line with article 12 of the JIU statute, the executive heads shall ensure expeditious implementation of approved/accepted recommendations. The annual report to the Executive Board on JIU recommendations contains a section and relevant annexes reporting on the status of implementation of recommendations contained in JIU reports issued during the two preceding years. This is considered a good practice.

30. We would appreciate receiving a response to this management letter and recommendations by 8 August 2016.

---

<sup>5</sup> DP/2011/22/Add.1 of 26/4/2011, DP/2012/7/Add.1 of 10/3/2012, DP/2013/11/Add.1.

<sup>6</sup> DP/2013/2 of 15/11/2012, Decisions adopted by the Executive Board in 2012, page 19, Overview of decisions adopted by the Executive Board at its annual session 2012.

## Annex I

Table 1  
**Rates of acceptance and implementation (2006-2012), as of February 2015\***

	<b>UNDP</b>	<b>All organizations</b>
Number of recommendations	311	7692**
Number of accepted recommendations	256	5000**
Number of implemented recommendations	178	4020**
<b>Rate of acceptance</b>	<b>82.3%</b>	65%
<b>Rate of implementation</b>	<b>69.5%</b>	80.4%

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

Table 1a  
**Rates of acceptance and implementation (2006-2012), as of May 2016**

	<b>UNDP</b>	<b>All organizations</b>
Number of recommendations	311	7679*
Number of accepted recommendations	266	5313*
Number of implemented recommendations	264	46661*
<b>Rate of acceptance</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	69.2%
<b>Rate of implementation</b>	<b>99.3%</b>	87.7%

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



## Annex II

Table 2

**Rates of acceptance and implementation by addressee (2006-2012), as of August 2015**

	<b>UNDP executive head</b>	<b>UNDP legislative body</b>
<b>Rate of acceptance</b>	85.9%	72.3%
<b>Rate of implementation</b>	66.8%	78.3%

Table 2a

**Rates of acceptance and implementation by addressee (2006-2012), as of May 2016**

	<b>UNDP executive head</b>	<b>UNDP legislative body</b>
<b>Rate of acceptance</b>	88.1%	78.3%
<b>Rate of implementation</b>	99%	100%

### Annex III

Table 3  
Trend of acceptance and implementation (2006-2012), as of February 2015

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Number of recommendations</b>	23	38	51	46	52	61	40
<b>Rate of acceptance</b>	<b>91.3%</b>	97.4%	92.2%	82.6%	92.3%	63.9%	<b>65.0%</b>
<b>Rate of implementation</b>	<b>81.0%</b>	56.8%	66.0%	44.7%	85.4%	87.2%	<b>65.4%</b>

Table 3a  
Trend of acceptance and implementation (2006-2012), as of May 2016

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Number of recommendations</b>	23	38	51	46	52	61	40
<b>Rate of acceptance</b>	<b>91.3%</b>	97.4%	92.2%	89.1%	92.3%	75.4%	<b>65.0%</b>
<b>Rate of implementation</b>	<b>100%</b>	100%	95.7%	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>

## **Annex IV**

Table 4

**Long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more (2006-2012), as of May 2016**

<b>Report/note/ML</b>	<b>Recommendations number</b>	<b>Status</b>
JIU/NOTE/2008/4	16	Implementation in progress
	18	Implementation in progress

## Annex V

### Consideration of JIU reports by UNDP legislative body (2010- 2012)

Report	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization) (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date of issuance of CEB comments and document reference (c)	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months) (d)=(c) – (b)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and document reference (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 (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2012/12	SWR	15/02/2013	23/05/2013 A/67/873/Add.1	3.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	1 month	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	3.5 months	DP/2014/2 4/11/2013  Decision 2013/26: Took note of the report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2012 (DP/2013/11/Add.1); Took note of the statistical annex (DP/2013/11/Add.2).	Note taken

Report	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization)	Date report sent for action	Date of issuance of CEB comments and document reference	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and document reference	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months)	Action taken by legislative bodies (j)	Remarks (k)
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)=(c) – (b)	(e)	(f)=(e) –(b)	(g)	(h)=(g) –(b)		
JIU/REP/2012/11	SWR	07/03/2013	20/05/2013 A/67/867/Add.1	2.5 months	14/5/2014 DP/2014/11 Add.1	14 months	27/6/2014 DP/2014/11 /Add. 1	<b>15.5 months</b>	DP/2015/2  Decision 2014/23:  Took note of the report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2013 (DP/2014/11/Add.1); Took note of the statistical annex (DP/2014/11/Add.2).	Report considered > 1 year, received after preparation of document for the Board  Only status of implementation reported.
JIU/REP/2012/9	SWR	28/02/2013	19/09/2013 A/68/373/Add.1	6.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	21 days	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	3 months	Same as above	Note taken

Report	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization)	Date report sent for action	Date of issuance of CEB comments and document reference	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and document reference	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months)	Action taken by legislative bodies (j)	Remarks (k)
JIU/REP/2012/8	SWR	28/06/2013	04/09/2013 A/68/344/Add.1	2 months	14/5/2014 DP/2014/11 Add.1	10.5 months	27/6/2014 DP/2014/11 /Add. 1	12 months	DP/2015/2  Decision 2014/23: Took note of the report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2013 (DP/2014/11/Add.1); Took note of the statistical annex (DP/2014/11/Add.2).	Note taken  Only status of implementation reported
JIU/REP/2012/5	SWR	28/02/2013	19/09/2013 A/68/67/Add.1	6.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	21 days	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	3 months	DP/2014/2 4/11/2013  Decision 2013/26: Took note of the report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2012 (DP/2013/11/Add.1); Took note of the statistical annex (DP/2013/11/Add.2).	Note taken  Only status of implementation reported

Report	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization)	Date report sent for action	Date of issuance of CEB comments and document reference	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and document reference	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months)	Action taken by legislative bodies (j)	Remarks (k)
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)=(c) – (b)	(e)	(f)=(e) –(b)	(g)	(h)=(g) –(b)		
JIU/REP/2012/4	SWR	22/10/2012	21/06/2013 A/67/888/Add.1	8 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	5 months	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	7.5 months	Same as above	Note taken
JIU/REP/2012/3	SWR	09/08/2012	26/11/2012 A/67/400/Add.1	3.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	7 months	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	10.5 months	Same as above	Note taken
JIU/REP/2012/2	SWR	11/05/2012	28/09/2012 A/67/337/Add.1	4.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	10 months	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	12.5 months	Same as above	Report considered > 1 year; received after preparation of document for the Board  Note taken
JIU/REP/2011/11	SWR	12/04/2012	01/03/2013 A/68/63/Add.1	10.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	2.5 months	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	3 months	Same as above	Note taken.  Only status of implementation reported
JIU/REP/2011/10	SEV	15/03/2012	11/10/2012 A/67/136/Add.1	6.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	1 week	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	2.5 months	Same as above	Note taken.  Only status of implementation reported
JIU/REP/2011/9	SWR	09/03/2012	29/06/2012 A/67/119/Add.1	3.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	8.5 months	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	11 months	Same as above	Note taken.  Only status of implementation reported

Report	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization)	Date report sent for action	Date of issuance of CEB comments and document reference	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and document reference	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months)	Action taken by legislative bodies (j)	Remarks (k)
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)=(c) – (b)	(e)	(f)=(e) –(b)	(g)	(h)=(g) –(b)		
JIU/REP/2011/7	SWR	29/03/2012	29/08/2012 A/67/140/Add.1	5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	6.5 months	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	9 months	Same as above	Note taken.  Only status of implementation reported
JIU/REP/2011/6	SWR	21/02/2012	02/07/2012 A/67/83/Add.1	4 months	10/04/2012 DP/2012/7/ Add.1	1.5 months	29/06/2012 DP/2012/7/ Add.1	4 months	DP/2013/12 15/11/2012  Decision 2012/20: Took note of the report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2011 (DP/2012/7/Add.1); Took note of the statistical annex (DP/2012/7/Add.2).	Note taken
JIU/REP/2011/5	SWR	21/02/2012	28/02/2012 A/66/710/Add.1	7 days	10/04/2012 DP/2012/7/ Add.1	1.5 months	29/06/2012 DP/2012/7/ Add.1	4 months	Same as above	Note taken

Report	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization)	Date report sent for action	Date of issuance of CEB comments and document reference	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and document reference	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months)	Action taken by legislative bodies (j)	Remarks (k)
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)=(c) – (b)	(e)	(f)=(e) –(b)	(g)	(h)=(g) –(b)	(j)	(k)
JIU/REP/2011/4	SWR	29/03/2012	15/06/2012 A/67/78/Add.1	2.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	9 months	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	11.5 months	DP/2014/2 4/11/2013  Decision 2013/26: Took note of the report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2012 (DP/2013/11/Add.1); Took note of the statistical annex (DP/2013/11/Add.2).	Note taken  Only status of implementation reported
JIU/REP/2011/3	SWR	08/07/2011	29/02/2012 A/66/717/Add.1	7.5 months	10/04/2012 DP/2012/7/ Add.1	9 months	29/06/2012 DP/2012/7/ Add.1	11.5 months	DP/2013/12 15/11/2012  Decision 2012/20: Took note of the report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2011 (DP/2012/7/Add.1); Took note of the statistical annex (DP/2012/7/Add.2).	Note taken  Only status of implementation reported

Report	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization)	Date report sent for action	Date of issuance of CEB comments and document reference	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and document reference	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months)	Action taken by legislative bodies (j)	Remarks (k)
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)=(c) – (b)	(e)	(f)=(e) –(b)	(g)	(h)=(g) –(b)		
JIU/REP/2011/1	SWR	10/06/2011	23/03/2012 A/66/327/Add.1	9 months	10/04/2012 DP/2012/7/ Add.1	10 months	29/06/2012 DP/2012/7/ Add.1	<b>12.5 months</b>	Same as above	Report considered > 1 year; received after preparation of document for the Board  Note taken
JIU/REP/2010/8	SWR	29/03/2011	23/09/2011 A/66/355/Add.1	5.5 months	21/03/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	18 months	03/06/2013 DP/2013/11 /Add.1	<b>20.5 months</b>	DP/2014/2 4/11/2013  Decision 2013/26: Took note of the report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2012 (DP/2013/11/Add.1); Took note of the statistical annex (DP/2013/11/Add.2).	Report considered > 1 year.  Note taken  Only status of implementation reported

Report	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization)	Date report sent for action	Date of issuance of CEB comments and document reference	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and document reference	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months)	Action taken by legislative bodies (j)	Remarks (k)
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)=(c) – (b)	(e)	(f)=(e) –(b)	(g)	(h)=(g) –(b)		
JIU/REP/2010/7	SWR	16/12/2010	23/09/2011 A/66/348/Add.1	9 months	25.04.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	4 months	05.06.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	5.5 months	DP/2012/2 4/11/2011 Decision 2011/30: Took note of the report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2010 (DP/2011/22/Add.1); Took note of the statistical annex (DP/2011/22/Add.2).	Note taken
JIU/REP/2010/6	SWR	22/11/2010	17/08/2011 A/66/308/Add.1	9 months	25.04.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	5 months	05.06.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	6.5 months	Same as above	Note taken
JIU/REP/2010/5	SWR	04/01/2011	23/09/2011 A/66/73/Add.1	8.5 months	25.04.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	3.5 months	05.06.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	5 months	Same as above	Note taken
JIU/REP/2010/4	SWR	22/11/2010	17/08/2011 A/65/788/Add.1	9 months	25.04.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	5 months,	05.06.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	6.5 months	Same as above	Note taken
JIU/REP/2010/3	SWR	18/06/2010	09/09/2010 A/65/345/Add.1	2.5 months	25.04.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	10 months	05.06.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	11.5 months	Same as above	Note taken

Report	Type of report (System-wide, several or single organization)	Date report sent for action	Date of issuance of CEB comments and document reference	Time taken by CEB secretariat to issue comments (in months)	Date of issuance of executive head comments and document reference	Time taken by executive head to issue comments (in months)	Date report taken up by legislative body and symbol	Time between report sent for action and taken up by legislative body (in months)	Action taken by legislative bodies (j)	Remarks (k)
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)=(c) – (b)	(e)	(f)=(e) –(b)	(g)	(h)=(g) –(b)		
JIU/REP/2010/2	SWR	19/05/2010	01/09/2010 A/65/338/Add.1	3 months	25.04.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	11 months	05.06.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	<b>12.5 months</b>	Same as above	Report considered > 1 year; received after preparation of document for the Board.  Note taken
JIU/REP/2010/1	SWR	19/03/2010	07/09/2010 A/65/346/Add.1	5.5 months	25.04.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	13 months	05.06.2011 DP/2011/22 /Add.1	<b>14.5 months</b>	Same as above	Report considered > 1 year; received after preparation of document for the Board  Note taken

Total reports: 25