

**REVIEW OF THE ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION
OF JIU RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE UNITED NATIONS
POPULATION FUND (UNFPA)**

Prepared by

Jorge T. Flores Callejas

Joint Inspection Unit

Geneva 2016



United Nations

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1-9	3
II. ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	10-16	5
A. Above-average rate of acceptance	10-11	5
B. Lower rate of implementation of recommendations addressed to the executive head.....	12-13	5
C. Fluctuations in the trend of acceptance and implementation	14	6
D. Long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more	15-16	6
III. CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS BY THE UNFPA LEGISLATIVE BODY	17-29	7
A. Dissemination of reports	19-21	7
B. Submission of CEB and executive head's comments	22-24	7
C. Consideration of JIU reports	25-26	7
D. Decisions taken by the legislative body on JIU recommendations	27	8
E. Follow-up and reporting on the implementation of JIU recommendations	28-29	8
ANNEXES		
I. Long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more (2006-2009)		9
II. Consideration of JIU reports and recommendations by the Executive Board of UNFPA (2010-2012)		10

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The General Assembly of the United Nations has repeatedly noted 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 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 negotiation of the 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 Fund (UNDP)/United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) “requests that the Administrator continue to follow-up on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit”.³ Starting in 2003, UNFPA harmonized its reporting arrangements with that of UNDP and began reporting yearly to the Executive Board on the UNFPA activities related to the Joint Inspection Unit as part of the report of the Executive Director to the Executive Board. The first UNFPA oversight policy (DP/FPA/2008/14), approved by the Executive Board by decision 2008/37 of 19 September 2008, formalized this reporting arrangement. The latter was reiterated in the revised UNFPA oversight policy (DP/FPA/2015/1) approved by the Executive Board by decision 2015/2 of 30 January 2015.

3. In 1998, the Unit started tracking actions taken by legislative bodies on JIU recommendations. That tracking system evolved over the years into a web-based tracking system (WBTS), which was introduced in 2012. 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 during 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. Prior to 2006, all recommendations had been closed and their acceptance/implementation was no longer tracked.

5. The review is being conducted in two phases. The objectives of the present 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

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 See also joint letter by UNFPA/UNFPA/UNICEF of 11 October 2002.

⁴ OP.15.

- The process of consideration of JIU reports by the legislative bodies of organizations in order to identify shortcomings and delays.

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.

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 UNFPA Executive Director, includes:

- A comparison of the acceptance and implementation rates for the period 2006-2012 in order to position UNFPA within the spectrum of JIU participating organizations;
- A trend analysis of the acceptance and implementation rates at UNFPA 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 UNFPA 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 of the present management letter were sought from UNFPA management and taken into account in finalizing the letter. In accordance with article 11, paragraph 2, of the JIU statute, the 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 rate of acceptance

10. At the time the present review was initiated in February 2015, UNFPA 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. UNFPA's acceptance rate was well above the average of all organizations and its implementation rate (of accepted recommendations) was slightly lower than the average rate, as shown in the table.

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

	UNFPA	All organizations
Number of recommendations	322	7692**
Number of accepted recommendations	276	5000**
Number of implemented recommendations	221	4020**
Rate of acceptance	85.7%	65%
Rate of implementation	80.1%	80.4%

*As of February 2015.

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

11. At the time this management letter was being finalized in April 2016, the rate of acceptance has increased to 86 per cent and the rate of implementation to 85.2 per cent. UNFPA continues to rank among the highest performers. **The Inspector commends UNFPA management for these results and encourages to maintaining them.**

B. Lower rate of implementation of recommendations addressed to the executive head

12. Likewise in the most of the participating organizations, UNFPA's rate of acceptance of recommendations addressed for action to the executive head during the period 2006-2012 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 slightly 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.

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

	UNFPA executive head	UNFPA legislative body
Rate of acceptance	92.3%	69.0%
Rate of implementation	79.3%	81.7%

*As of August 2015.

13. At the time this management letter was being finalized in April 2016, despite the increase in the rate of implementation of recommendations addressed to the executive head to 83.9 per cent, it remains lower than the rate of implementation of recommendations addressed to UNFPA legislative body, which also significantly increased to 90 per cent. The rate of acceptance of recommendations

for both addressees remained the same. In its comments on the draft management letter UNFPA indicated: “The difference in implementation rate may be due (a) to the limited number of recommendations addressed to Governing Bodies in comparison to that addressed to Executive Heads (which may skew percentages); (b) changes related to policies and processes requiring modifications of the enterprise resource planning managed by UNDP; (c) recommendations related to inter-agency harmonization and decisions, for instance at the Chief Executives Board – High Level Committee on Management level; (d) recommendations addressed to the Executive Head which depend on a political process; (e) the limited implementation choice offered by the WBTS when a recommendation is accepted in principle, but the situation underlying the recommendation has not occurred, or its implementation is beyond available funding; (f) given the convergence between the JIU and the Office of Audit and Investigation Services on a number of topics (and funding), the review of JIU recommendations benefits from that of OAIS recommendations. On a general note, a more definite analysis of implementation rates would depend on the WBTS offering more advanced ‘drill-down’ features – as manually reviewing a 150-page document (covering all recommendations of JIU reports issued between 2006 and 2012) is impractical.”

C. Fluctuations in the trend of acceptance and implementation

14. It can be further noted that both the rates of acceptance and implementation of recommendations fluctuated over the period 2006 to 2012, to decrease by 2012, as shown in the table below. The Inspector requested that UNFPA management undertakes an analysis of the reasons of this trend and report to the JIU. In its comments on the draft management letter, UNFPA indicated that it thoroughly reviewed the portfolio of outstanding recommendations, and that as of April 2016, the rates of implementation for the years 2010 to 2012 have significantly increased, although they have not reached the level of 2006-2007; UNFPA noted that several policies are under development and implementation and that the rate of implementation for 2009 remains low due to one report where action is related to a political process.

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

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Number of recommendations	26	40	51	45	57	65	38
Rate of acceptance	88.5%	88.0%	92.2%	82.2%	89.5%	87.7%	71.1%
Rate of implementation	95.7%	100%	85.1%	64.9%	84.3%	73.7%	59.3%

*As of February 2015.

D. Long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more

15. A review of 162 recommendations in 24 JIU reports and notes addressed for action to UNFPA during the period 2006-2009 showed that, as of February 2016, there were 20 recommendations outstanding for five years or more, for which action should have already been taken by UNFPA to either accept and implement or to reject them (see annex I).

16. The majority of these recommendations (95 per cent) were in progress of implementation. In its comments, UNFPA indicated that in 2015 the organization conducted an in-depth review of all outstanding recommendations, leading to keeping 20 recommendations outstanding (as reported in annex II) and provided detailed explanations to JIU as to their status; the Organization took the position that some recommendations might be accepted but not implemented for reasons beyond its control, such as action necessary at the inter-agency level or lack of opportunity to implement them; since the present system offers only a binary choice (implemented or not), such recommendations may remain in progress of implementation. **The JIU encourages UNFPA to pursue its efforts in**

implementing long-outstanding recommendations and will provide advice on the specific situations brought to its attention.

III. CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS BY THE UNFPA LEGISLATIVE BODY

17. The JIU reviewed handling of 23 reports issued by the Unit during the period 2010-2012 containing at least one recommendation addressed to UNFPA Executive Board.

18. The review found that UNFPA procedures for handling JIU reports were generally in compliance with the relevant provisions of the JIU statute (articles 11.4 and 12), to which UNFPA has adhered to and, *mutatis mutandis*, resolution 2002/8 of the Executive Board, except for the submission of CEB comments and timely consideration of JIU reports, as described below.

A. Dissemination of reports

19. 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.

20. The annual report of the Executive Director to the Executive Board on JIU recommendations lists all JIU reports of relevance to the organization issued since the previous report and provides a link to the Unit's website where these reports can be found. The Inspector invited UNFPA management to provide hyperlinks to the JIU reports to facilitate access to them. UNFPA indicated that this has already been done in the annual report to be presented to the Executive Board in June 2016 (DP/FPA/2016/2 - Part II).

21. The response of UNFPA to the JIU questionnaire indicates that JIU reports are disseminated internally to the organizational units which are involved in implementing the recommendations or may have an interest on them.

B. Submission of CEB and executive head's comments

22. 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.

23. The annual report to the 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 also includes, in annexes, a statistical summary of reports and notes that are subject to the reporting period; information on the implementation status of recommendations issued during the two preceding years; an overview of the recommendations relevant to UNFPA and directed to the governing body of UNFPA and relevant management comments; and an outline of the topics of relevance for UNFPA in the JIU work programme for the year.

24. No reference is made to the consolidated CEB comments prepared. The Inspector suggested that hyperlinks be provided to facilitate access to the CEB comments as well. UNFPA commented that the consolidated CEB comments on a given JIU report are only available after the UNFPA annual report to the Executive Board is prepared.

C. Consideration of JIU reports

25. There is a standing agenda item of the annual session of the Executive Board during its session in June of each year dedicated to the consideration of JIU reports. All JIU reports sent for action to UNFPA during the period 2010-2012 were considered by the Executive Board. Nine reports were considered after one year since their issuance, one of them after two years (see annex II). UNFPA has indicated that for a JIU report to be considered at the annual session of the Executive Board in June, it has to be issued before the report on JIU recommendations is written (usually by mid-February) and

undergo internal approval before being sent for editing and translation prior to the Executive Board meeting. This is the case of eight of the nine JIU reports considered more than one year after their issuance, whereas the JIU report considered two years later was due to an oversight.

26. The Inspector noted that the information input in the WBTS on the consideration of reports was incomplete or needed to be corrected (date and document reference of executive head's comments and action by legislative body (see annex II). The Inspector requested that action be taken to correct/input the required data in the WBTS and UNFPA took action accordingly.

D. Decisions taken by the legislative body on JIU recommendations

27. The Inspector also noted that the annual report to the Executive Board on JIU recommendations contains a draft decision for action by the Executive Board "to take note of the present report, especially those aspects of the JIU reports that have particular relevance to the work of UNFPA".⁵ Subsequently, the Executive Board takes note of the report.⁶ 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 Inspectors, this is a valid alternative solution since it triggers subsequent action by the UNFPA secretariat.

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

28. 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.

29. We would appreciate receiving a response to this management letter by 30 June 2016.

⁵ DP/FPA/2011/3 (Part II), DP/FPA/2012/6 (Part II), DP/FPA/2013/3 (Part II), DP/FPA/2014/5 (Part II), DP/FPA/2015/5 (part II), DP/FPA/2016/2 (Part II).

⁶ For example, DP/2014/2 of 4/6/2013, Decision No. 2013/26, Item 10, page 32, Decisions adopted by the Executive Board in 2013, Overview of decisions adopted by the Executive Board at its annual session 2013.

Annex I

**Long-outstanding recommendations for five years or more (2006-2009),
as of February 2016**

Report/note/ML	Recommendation No.	Status
JIU/NOTE/2006/1	9	Implementation: In progress
JIU/NOTE/2008/2	7	Implementation: In progress
	8	Implementation: In progress
	9	Implementation: In progress
JIU/REP/2008/4	8	Implementation: In progress
JIU/REP/2008/6	6	Implementation: In progress
	7	Implementation: In progress
JIU/REP/2009/5	1	Implementation: In progress
	2	Implementation: Not started
	3	Implementation: In progress
	6	Implementation: In progress
	10	Implementation: In progress
	11	Implementation: In progress
	12	Implementation: In progress
	13	Implementation: In progress
	14	Implementation: In progress
15	Implementation: In progress	
JIU/REP/2009/6	3	Implementation: In progress
	5	Implementation: In progress
	16	Implementation: In progress
Total outstanding recommendations		20

Annex II

Consideration of JIU reports and recommendations by the Executive Board of UNFPA (2010-2012)

Report	System-wide, several or single organization (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date CEB comments issued and reference number (c)	Time b/ report sent for action and CEB comments issued (in months) (d) = (c) –(b)	Date executive head's comments issued and reference number* (e)	Time b/ report sent for action and executive head's comments issued (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and reference number (g)	Time b/ 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 (on time for consideration, comments by CEB and by secretariat and action taken by LBs) (k)
JIU/REP/2012/12	SWR	15/02/2013	23/05/2013 A/67/873/Add.1	3 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	2 months	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	3.5 months	DP/2014/2, 04/06/2013 Decision No. 2013/19 (paragraph 1) The Executive Board took note of the report of UNFPA on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2012	
JIU/REP/2012/11	SWR	07/03/2013	20/05/2013 A/67/867/Add.1	2 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	1 month	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	3 months	Same as above	
JIU/REP/2012/9	SWR	28/02/2013	19/09/2013 A/68/373/Add.1	6 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	1 month	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	3 months	Same as above	
JIU/REP/2012/8	SWR	28/06/2013	04/09/2013 A/68/344/Add.1	2 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	Not possible date report sent for action because they considered it in the annual report	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	1 month	Same as above	
JIU/REP/2012/5	SWR	28/02/2013	19/09/2013 A/68/67/Add.1	7 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	1 month	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	3 months	Same as above	

Report	System-wide, several or single organization (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date CEB comments issued and reference number (c)	Time b/ report sent for action and CEB comments issued (in months) (d) = (c) –(b)	Date executive head's comments issued and reference number* (e)	Time b/ report sent for action and executive head's comments issued (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and reference number (g)	Time b/ 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 (on time for consideration, comments by CEB and by secretariat and action taken by LBs) (k)
JIU/REP/2012/4	SWR	22/10/2012	21/06/2013 A/67/888/Add.1	8 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	5.5 months	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	7.5 months	Same as above	
JIU/REP/2012/2	SWR	11/05/2012	28/09/2012 A/67/337/Add.1	4.5 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	11 months	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	13 months	Same as above	Consideration > 1 year (see paragraph 25)
JIU/REP/2011/10	SEV	15/03/2012	11/10/2012 A/67/136/Add.1	7 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	13 months	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	14.5 months	Same as above	Consideration > 1 year (see paragraph 25)
JIU/REP/2011/9	SWR	09/03/2012	29/06/2012 A/67/119/Add.1	3.5 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	13 months	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	15 months	Same as above	Consideration > 1 year (see paragraph 25)
JIU/REP/2011/7	SWR	29/03/2012	29/08/2012 A/67/140/Add.1	5 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	12 months	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	14 months	Same as above	Consideration >1 year (see paragraph 25)
JIU/REP/2011/6	SWR	21/02/2012	02/07/2012 A/67/83/Add.1	4 months	30.03.2012 DP/FPA/2012 /6 (Part II)	1 month	25.06.2012 DP/FPA/2012 /6 (Part II)	4 months	DP/2013/2, 15/11/2012 Decision No. 2012/14 (paragraph 1) The Executive Board took note of the report of UNFPA on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2011	
JIU/REP/2011/5	SWR	21/02/2012	28/02/2012 A/66/710/Add.1	7 days	30.03.2012 DP/FPA/2012 /6 (Part II)	1 month	26.06.2012 DP/FPA/2012 /6 (Part II)	4 months	Same as above	

Report	System-wide, several or single organization (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date CEB comments issued and reference number (c)	Time b/ report sent for action and CEB comments issued (in months) (d) = (c) –(b)	Date executive head's comments issued and reference number* (e)	Time b/ report sent for action and executive head's comments issued (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and reference number (g)	Time b/ 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 (on time for consideration, comments by CEB and by secretariat and action taken by LBs) (k)
JIU/REP/2011/4	SWR	29/03/2012	15/06/2012 A/67/78/Add.1	2.5 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	12 months	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	14 months	DP/2014/2, 04/06/2013 Decision No. 2013/19 (paragraph 1) The Executive Board took note of the report of UNFPA on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2012	Consideration > 1 year (see paragraph 25)
JIU/REP/2011/3	SWR	08/07/2011	29/02/2012 A/66/717/Add.1	7.5 months	30.03.2012 DP/FPA/2012 /6 (Part II)	9months	26.06.2012 DP/FPA/2012 /6 (Part II)	11.5 months	DP/2013/2, 15/11/2012 Decision No. 2012/14 (para.1) The Executive Board took note of the report of UNFPA on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2011	
JIU/REP/2011/1	SWR	10/06/2011	23/03/2012 A/66/327/Add.1	9 months	30.03.2012 DP/FPA/2012 /6 (Part II)	9 months	26.06.2012 DP/FPA/2012 /6 (Part II)	12.5 months	Same as above	Consideration > 1 year (see paragraph 25)
JIU/REP/2010/8	SWR	29/03/2011	23/09/2011 A/66/355/Add.1	6 months	05.04.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	24 months	06.06.2013 DP/FPA/2013 /3 (Part II)	26 months	DP/2014/2, :04/06/2013 Decision No. 2013/19 (paragraph 1) The Executive Board took note of the report of UNFPA on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2012	Consideration > 2 years (see paragraph 25)

Report	System-wide, several or single organization (a)	Date report sent for action (b)	Date CEB comments issued and reference number (c)	Time b/ report sent for action and CEB comments issued (in months) (d) = (c) –(b)	Date executive head's comments issued and reference number* (e)	Time b/ report sent for action and executive head's comments issued (in months) (f)= (e) –(b)	Date report taken up by legislative body and reference number (g)	Time b/ 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 (on time for consideration, comments by CEB and by secretariat and action taken by LBs) (k)
JIU/REP/2010/7	SWR	16/12/2010	23/09/2011 A/66/348/Add.1	9 months	08.04.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	4 months	06.06.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	5.5 months	DP/2012/2, 04/11/2011 Decision No. 2011/25 (paragraph 1) The Executive Board took note of the report of UNFPA on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in 2010	
JIU/REP/2010/6	SWR	22/11/2010	17/08/201 A/66/308/Add.1	9 months	08.04.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	4.5 months	06.06.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	6.5 months	Same as above	
JIU/REP/2010/5	SWR	04/01/2011	23/09/2011 A/66/73/Add.1	8.5 months	08.04.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	3 months	06.06.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	5 months	Same as above	
JIU/REP/2010/4	SWR	22/11/2010	17/08/2011 A/65/788/Add.1	10 months	08.04.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	4.5 months	06.06.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	6.5 months	Same as above	
JIU/REP/2010/3	SWR	18/06/2010	09/09/2010 A/65/345/Add.1	2.5 months	08.04.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	9.5 months	06.06.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	11.5 months	Same as above	
JIU/REP/2010/2	SWR	19/05/2010	01/09/2010 A/65/338/Add.1	3 months	08.04.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	10.5 months	06.06.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	12.5 months	Same as above	Consideration > 1 year (see paragraph 25)
JIU/REP/2010/1	SWR	19/03/2010	07/09/2010 A/65/346/Add.1	5.5 months	08.04.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	12.5 months	06.06.2011 DP/FPA/2011 /3 (Part II)	14.5 months	Same as above	Consideration >1 year (see paragraph 25)

Total reports: 23