United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

Report by the Director-General on the execution of the programme (34 C/5) (01 January 2008 – 31 December 2009)

Internal Oversight

Part I – General Policy and Direction
I.B – Direction

Paragraph 00508

Chapter 5 – Internal Oversight

Regular budget: **Activities** (rounded to $ thousand)	
Planned: $ 1 134	**Actual: $ 1 456**

34 C/5 Expected Results	Achievement(s)	Challenges/ Lessons Learnt	Cost- Effectiveness	Sustainability
Quality and cost effectiveness of evaluation outputs improved for both regular and extrabudgetary programmes.	• Under the 2008–2013 Long-Term Strategy, evaluations are now selected based on their strategic importance. With this approach, IOS has ensured evaluation coverage of all strategically important areas, including decentralized bodies such as Field Offices, Category I institutes and some central service functions. • The 34 C/5 Evaluation Plan (Annex V) called for a number of strategic-level evaluations. The suite of Strategic Programme Objectives (SPO) evaluations is well underway. Four have been completed and submitted to the Board (SPO 1 / 2, 3, 14), three will be completed in early 2010 (SPO 4, 6, 11), three are underway (SPO 5, 7, 12 / 13), and three are to commence later in 2010 (SPO 8, 9, 10). • In addition to the 34C/5 planned evaluations, IOS completed evaluations of Capacity to Deliver, Recruitment Policy, and Delivering as One Pilot Locations, the Merit Based Promotion Programme, and visited field office locations covering Africa (Dakar), Asia and the Pacific (Dhaka, New Delhi, Bangkok), Arab States (Beirut, Cairo, Khartoum) Latin America and the Caribbean (Santiago, Lima, Havana). • In late 2009, the Independent External Evaluation of UNESCO was launched after the adoption of 35 C/Resolution 102 by the General Conference. IOS played an important support role and developed numerous briefing and background papers for the Board and senior management.	• The current long-term strategy does not cover UNESCO governance, which is mitigated by its inclusion in the Independent External Evaluation of UNESCO • A key challenge is ensuring fuller evaluation coverage of Category II Institutes and central services. • Individual programmes are not necessarily included in the sample covering SPOs and may thus not be evaluated.	The move to strategic, portfolio-based evaluations has improved the cost effectiveness of the evaluation function by allowing for wider evaluation coverage with the same resources. All IOS-led evaluations of UNESCO Field Offices have been shared with the external evaluation teams conducting SPO evaluations, thereby improving the overall coverage of those evaluations and also resulting in recommendations to improve cost-effectiveness. Although the Independent External Evaluation was not called for in the 34 C/5 Evaluation Plan, IOS was able to initiate the evaluation and play a lead role in its management at no added cost to the Organization.	IOS will continue to take a number of steps to ensure that evaluation outputs meet UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards for quality, and cost effectiveness, namely: • A monitoring tool to track follow up to evaluation recommendations; • Taking into account the relevant decisions of the Governing Bodies; • Sharing evaluation strategy and products with the Oversight Advisory Committee for comments' • Evaluation Reference Groups who review evaluation reports for quality.
Capacity increased to undertake evaluations and to self-assess internal controls within UNESCO.	• Three evaluation tools were released for the use of UNESCO staff to support the evaluation process and to improve the quality of evaluations. In addition, IOS organized five self-evaluation workshops, training a total of 80 participants. • IOS provided advisory and support services to Field Office staff requesting assistance in the management of donor-requested terminal evaluations. • IOS continued the promotion of control self-assessment activities at both HQ and field locations where IOS provides tools and facilitation to offices and units to enable them to examine their	• More effort is needed in developing a fuller set of training tools, including self learning tools, to strengthen capacities to undertake evaluations. • Opportunities for making better use of existing evaluation expertise within other evaluation units in the Field, in the spirit of Delivering as One UN, need to be explored.	The use of control self assessment tool is expected to lower costs associated with IOS field audits, and the pilot programme of self assessment with IOS validation is intended to be a low-cost option to full field audits by obtaining limited control assurances for field offices at substantially reduced IOS investment.	

34 C/5 Expected Results	Achievement(s)	Challenges/ Lessons Learnt	Cost- Effectiveness	Sustainability
	controls as a team and address areas requiring attention.			
Evaluation/audit results presented to governing bodies and utilized to improve as appropriate the management culture of the Organization.	• All IOS-managed evaluation reports are published on the external IOS website and the summaries of strategic evaluations are presented to the Executive Board. Key internal audit issues are shared with the governing bodies through information sessions and the IOS annual report. During the 34 C/5 biennium, IOS presented no less than 10 Executive Board documents on behalf of the Director-General (including summaries of external evaluation reports, IOS Annual Reports, reports on decentralized bodies and follow up to Joint Inspection Unit work), all intended to improve decision-making and accountability for results. • IOS systematically follows up all recommendations to ensure that results of IOS evaluations and audits are used by management to improve programme delivery and operational processes and controls. During the biennium, this was a high priority with significant efforts which led to a sharp fall in the number of open audit recommendations, from 2,200 at the beginning of 2008 to 450 by the end of 2009 reflecting major progress on many long outstanding issues. On evaluation recommendation follow up, management responses and action plans were obtained for 16 of 17 evaluations completed, and at the end of 2009, of a total of 187 recommendations 180 (96%) were accepted and 84 (47%) were closed. • Examples of how evaluations have contributed to strengthening programme management include: - **SPO 1/2**: An increased share of the 35 C/5 education budget is now being allocated to the sector's strategic priority areas. - **UNESCO's Capacity to Deliver**: An organization-wide risk management framework has been set up and is now being institutionalized in particular through the work of the Risk Management Committee established in late 2008. - **Evaluation on Recruitment Policy and Practice**: HRM has reduced the classification and recruitment timeframes through anticipated planning, forecasting and streamlining measures, updated the recruitment websites, implemented more focused advertising measures, and provided more professional support. - **Field Office**: One regional office is implementing a new strategy that addresses emerging economic trends in the region and their impact on the Office	• There is a need for more actionable recommendations coming from external evaluations. IOS addresses this challenge on an ongoing basis, in particular through closer interaction with evaluation reference groups to examine the practicality of some recommendations. • IOS is exploring ways of improving its visibility, especially access to its web site. In 2009, IOS made numerous improvements to its Intranet site to address this issue.	The use of the IOS web site to disseminate evaluation reports is seen to be a cost-effective solution at this time. Oversight Advisory Committee's deliberations communicating key audit issues are also made available on IOS intranet. The use of the TeamMate tool for audit recommendation follow up is user-friendly and a more efficient when compared to paper based, email or alternative follow up mechanism.	
Effective and efficient use of resources in programme delivery enhanced.	• During the biennium, IOS audit undertook 60 engagements which included 18 field audits, 11 headquarters audits, six IT audits and 25 advisory services and other focused oversight reviews.			

34 C/5 Expected Results	Achievement(s)	Challenges/ Lessons Learnt	Cost- Effectiveness	Sustainability
	• An organization wide Risk Management framework in line with the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Model has been set up and is now being institutionalized in particular through the work of the Risk Management Committee established in late 2008. The Risk Management Committee meets regularly to discuss major risk areas and to propose action plans for their mitigation. • Recent examples include: a) the development of a Succession Plan for key functions by HRM to mitigate the risk linked to the high retirement rate of senior position in the next 5-10 years; b) the stock take of existing Partnerships by ERC and identification of lessons learned which shall feed into the development of a strategy for engaging in and maintaining operational partnerships. This shall support UNESCO to better take account of strategic opportunities and decrease bureaucratic obstacles for engaging in operational partnerships.	• Most high-risk issues were associated with Field Offices and included location-specific deficiencies in procurement, management of extrabudgetary projects, and regional office roles and accountabilities. The principal Information Technology risks identified during 2009 were associated with network security and reiterated the importance of effective IT governance and project management. For Headquarters, the principal issues noted included opportunities to improve the management framework for extrabudgetary activity, work processes and organization of the procurement function, and objective setting for performance management of field offices.	The risk-based evaluation of the capacity to deliver 34 C/4 and evaluation of 8 pilot locations have been entirely undertaken internally which has lead to significant savings, in excess of USD 300,000. Re-orienting recommendation monitoring and follow-up to better reflect risks is expected to enhance cost effectiveness of follow-up processes.	
Recommendations from the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) quality assurance review of the audit function and the review of the evaluation strategy, as approved by the governing bodies, implemented.	• With regard to the review of the evaluation strategy, IOS further addressed the key priorities raised in the 2006 review, namely to improve the quality of evaluations (by focusing on SPO level evaluations), strengthen the follow-up to evaluation recommendations (through the development of additional guidelines), and improve evaluation capacities. A new Quality Assurance Review of the IOS evaluation function was conducted in December 2008. The review showed general compliance with UN Evaluation Group norms and standards and acknowledged the positive steps IOS had taken towards implementing a more strategic approach to evaluation planning. • The Oversight Advisory Committee was approved by the 35th General Conference as a standing committee in line with recognized best practices for oversight.	• With respect to improving evaluation capacities throughout the Organization more effort is needed in developing a fuller set of training tools, including self learning tools, to strengthen capacities to undertake evaluations. • Opportunities for making better use of existing evaluation expertise within the evaluation units of other agencies in the Field, in the spirit of One UN, need to be explored.	Joint audit / evaluation missions leverage competencies and resources for more comprehensive oversight results.	IOS audit has implemented all recommendations issued at Quality Assurance review of 2006.