Introduction

1. As stated in paragraph 1 of document IDB.23/12, a system of follow-up to recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) is currently under discussion by the UNIDO Secretariat and JIU, in compliance with decision IDB.22/Dec.7. An important objective of the exercise is to develop a scheme that could be implemented within available resources. The purpose of the present addendum is to report on progress made since the issuance of document IDB.23/12.

2. The joint efforts of the Secretariat and JIU to identify measures that minimize additional resource requirements in developing a follow-up system resulted in a mission of the Unit to UNIDO Headquarters on 30 October 2000 for a review of the pending issues. With the cooperation of the Joint Inspection Unit and the understanding reached on the interpretation of the requirements stipulated in annex I to document A/52/34, substantial progress was achieved, as described in the following paragraphs.

I. DISTRIBUTION OF JIU REPORTS

IDB.23/12, paras. 9 (a) and 9 (b)

3. JIU reports are available initially in English. Following data analysis received from JIU, the other UNIDO official language versions of the reports are available approximately six months following the receipt of the English version. Only JIU reports of relevance to UNIDO would be distributed by UNIDO to Member States, through Permanent Missions with an information note. Any difference of opinion concerning the relevance or applicability of a JIU report to UNIDO would be resolved by the Board.

II. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

4. Implications for the Board would be linked to the number of relevant JIU reports, and the number and type of recommendations contained therein, to be considered by sessions of the Board. In years during
which there are two regular sessions, it would be expected that only one would consider JIU recommendations. The average number of recommendations of particular applicability to UNIDO is 6-7 per report, i.e. approximately 20-22 recommendations could be expected per year. It has been noted that the past two years marked an increase in recommendations by 125 per cent.

5. It should be noted that some JIU recommendations are addressed to governing bodies, while others are directed to the executive heads of organizations. The Board could decide the extent to which it would consider the recommendations in the two categories.

6. Future documents prepared by the Secretariat on JIU activities for consideration by the Board would focus in a more analytical manner than in the past on specific recommendations in recent JIU reports. However, the approximate present length of those documents could be maintained by omitting the summary of JIU recommendations currently included in the documents. Therefore, a different type of document is foreseen that would be more time-intensive on the part of the Secretariat, but of a length that is not likely to entail additional translation or processing costs over the present approach.

IDB.23/12, para. 9 (e)

7. To enable the Board to systematically verify the implementation of approved recommendations, future documents to the Board would also feature a chapter covering the status of implementation of recommendations from earlier JIU reports. Resource implications emanating from this requirement would be limited to staff time (monitoring and report preparation) and somewhat longer documents (translation and minor printing costs).

IDB.23/12, paras. 9 (c) and (d)

8. Particular consideration was given to the implications of the proposed follow-up system for sessions of the Board. If the Board is to “take concrete action on each recommendation of a JIU report under consideration, rather than just taking note of the report as a whole” (A/52/34, annex I, para. 12), implications arise along the following lines:

- At the level of the plenary, additional time required would depend on the extent to which discussion takes place concerning the relevant documentation;
- Member States would have to take account of the need to draft decisions on each relevant recommendation. This would require time prior to sessions for drafting proposed texts and during sessions at the level of the informal consultations;
- The allocation of sufficient time for in-session discussion would have to be considered. As the length of a Board session is decided during consideration of the item for the provisional agenda and date of the forthcoming session, the actual time required would not yet be known;
- When the tentative schedule is discussed at the beginning of each session there would be a clear picture of the number and type of recommendations. This could be taken into account in allocating time for discussion in plenary and in the drafting of decisions.

III. SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS

9. In summary, the constructive efforts of the UNIDO Secretariat and JIU achieved substantial progress in developing a scheme of follow-up to JIU recommendations, with additional resource requirements limited to:

(a) Minor printing costs (estimated at $400 per report) arising from the distribution by UNIDO of JIU reports (which might be reduced when reports become available on the Internet);

(b) Increased staff time for monitoring follow-up and preparing documentation issued to the Board on JIU activities, with no additional translation or printing costs. The magnitude of resources required for implementation of the JIU recommendations is difficult to evaluate and depends on their nature and number;

(c) Additional interpretation costs if required for Board sessions would be estimated at $4,900 for an additional three hours. While additional interpretation is charged in three-hour blocks, there may be scope within the overall agenda to accommodate some time together with discussion of other items.

(d) Scheduling considerations for the work of the Board.

IV. ACTION REQUIRED OF THE BOARD

10. The Board may wish to take note of the progress achieved in developing a system of follow-up to JIU recommendations, as reported in document IDB.23/12/Add.1, and provide guidance for further action.