Improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Report by the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group

Summary

The document contains the report of the intergovernmental working group established pursuant to decisions 51/1 and 17/2, adopted respectively by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at their annual sessions in 2008, to discuss and prepare recommendations to be presented to the Commissions on how to ensure political ownership by the Member States and on how to improve the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). The report has been prepared by the co-chairpersons of the intergovernmental working group, Ambassador Ashipala-Musavyi (Namibia) and Ambassador Hans Lundborg (Sweden) and adopted by the working group at its final session.
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I. Mandate

1. At their annual sessions in 2008, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND), in its decision 51/1, and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ), in its decision 17/2, decided to establish an open-ended intergovernmental working group to discuss and prepare recommendations to be presented to the Commissions on how to ensure political ownership by the Member States and on how to improve the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). In adopting the parallel decisions, Member States understood that a single working group would be established to consider these issues, and that its report would be presented to the two Commissions for consideration at their forthcoming sessions in March and April 2009, respectively.

II. Deliberations

A. Introduction

2. Member States welcomed the open-ended working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC as an opportunity to discuss a number of issues which are crucial to the political ownership of UNODC by Member States and the performance and future effectiveness of the organization. The decision to establish the working group was a reflection of the shared concern by Member States of the need to improve the financial situation and the governance of UNODC along with enhanced political ownership of the Office by Member States. Member States recognized that the issues of governance and the financial situation of UNODC were closely and invariably linked. It is the role of Member States to give clear policy directives to UNODC, including on the use of resources, through CND and CCPCJ. If the current governance deficit identified by Member States could be addressed in a satisfactory way, and if UNODC would be able to improve its reporting on how regular budget and voluntary contribution funds are being used for its programmes and operations, Member States would generally be in a better position to take informed decisions and to exercise their governing responsibilities.

3. Member States recognized that the issues of governance and the financial situation of UNODC were closely and invariably linked. It is the role of Member States to give clear policy directives to UNODC, including on the use of resources, through CND and CCPCJ. If the current governance deficit identified by Member States could be addressed in a satisfactory way, and if UNODC would be able to improve its reporting on how regular budget and voluntary contribution funds are being used for its programmes and operations, Member States would generally be in a better position to take informed decisions and to exercise their governing responsibilities.

4. Member States acknowledged that the CND and CCPCJ must reinforce their roles as the governing bodies of UNODC in dealing with its financial situation.

---

1 The recommendations of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime are contained in the report of the Secretariat (E/CN.7/2009/10-E/CN.15/2009/10).
Member States agreed that the budgetary authority entrusted to the two Commissions by the General Assembly has strengthened the function of the Commissions as the principal policymaking organ of the United Nations in the field of drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice.

5. Member States recognized the new demands and pressures on the UNODC in response to illicit drugs and the evolving globalization of crime, and in relation to the implementation of new international instruments such as UNTOC and UNCAC, for which the UNODC acts as the Secretariat.

6. Member States also called for stronger incentives to be created for all Member States to be more open, flexible and forthcoming in solving the problems related to the funding structure of UNODC. Clear and concise reporting by UNODC on achieved results and outcomes, efficiency, transparency, accountability and timely responses to oversight reports together with a transparent programme planning process constitute necessary conditions for creating the confidence in UNODC which both recipient states and donor states require in order to be able to assume political ownership and provide effective and predictable funding.

7. In drafting recommendations to the Commissions on how to improve both the governance structure and the financial situation of UNODC, Member States expressed that the working group should be guided by the following principles:

   (a) In the first instance, Member States should seek to work within existing structures to improve governance and financial arrangements. The objective should be to reinforce the role of the two Commissions as the governing bodies of UNODC in drugs control and crime prevention and criminal justice matters respectively, including in dealing with financial aspects;

   (b) Any proposed complementary governance structure should be universal, transparent, participatory and Member States driven;

   (c) Political ownership, governance and the financial situation of UNODC are closely and invariably linked;

   (d) Changes to the operations of the current system should enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of UNODC as a whole;

   (e) There should be greater focus on enhancing the transparency and accountability of UNODC’s programmes, funding and operations. Any processes and measures which increase the transparency and accountability of UNODC operations, to all Member States, would be likely to have positive effects for the predictability and sustainability of funding;

   (f) Any proposed new procedures or structures should seek to enhance the monitoring and evaluation of UNODC’s activities, both internally and externally;

   (g) Any proposed increases to the regular budget share of the United Nations to the UNODC would need to be carefully considered and thoroughly justified;

   (h) There should be increased emphasis given to UNODC cooperating and coordinating, with other international and regional partners;

   (i) Any proposed new procedures or structures should be carefully crafted so as to avoid unnecessarily increasing the administrative and bureaucratic burden on UNODC;
(j) Any proposed new procedures or structures should be carefully crafted so as to avoid unnecessarily increasing the administrative and bureaucratic burden on the Vienna-based permanent missions.

B. Identifying the challenges

1. Improving governance and political ownership

8. Member States acknowledged that UNODC is playing a very important role in contributing to the attainment of justice for all, and by assisting Member States in addressing the threats posed by drugs, crime and terrorism. UNODC has developed well in recent years and its expanded mandate and growing voluntary contributions are a testimony to the success of this important Office.

9. Many Members expressed the view that UNODC was falling short of its mandate due to several factors, including the lack of strategic guidance from Member States, lack of predictable and sufficient financial resources, and in some instances lack of funding for mandates provided through resolutions of the Commissions. Member States therefore found it appropriate to consider how UNODC’s evolving responsibilities, expanded mandate and increases in its project portfolio have affected its overall performance, noting that the rapid growth of UNODC activities and mandates was causing challenges for the management of UNODC.

10. Member States emphasized that the present governance structure of UNODC has proven less and less able to provide the vital line of communication and dialogue between Member States and the Secretariat. Initiatives and programmes initiated by the Office without requisite consultations with and endorsement by Member States have in some instances been suffering from lack of political ownership of Member States.

11. Member States expressed concern that the Commissions have difficulties combining their work on substance with their role as governing bodies of UNODC. Many Member States felt that the effectiveness of the governing functions has been impeded by the fact that the Commissions only meet once a year, which makes timely reactions and follow-up difficult. Priority tends to be given to negotiations on policy-related resolutions rather than to governance issues. Many Member States with smaller Permanent Missions and limited number of delegates from capitals, have difficulties following the Committee of the Whole and other informal working groups being held in parallel to the Plenary. Many Member States also felt the need to be better prepared and properly informed before taking decisions on strategic policies and financial matters. As a consequence, Member States identified that UNODC has a governance deficit at present.

12. Member States acknowledged the important normative and governing role of the Commissions and agreed that any recommendations aiming to enhance the governance structure of UNODC should be consistent with maintaining the role of the Commissions as the decision-making bodies of UNODC. CND has the mandate to function as the governing body of UNODC and to approve, on the basis of the proposals of the Executive Director, the budget of the Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme. Similarly, the CCPCJ acts as the governing
body of the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund that provides resources for promoting technical assistance in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice. Both Commissions are attended by experts and provide important norm-setting functions and also provide standards related to counter-narcotics and drug control. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs also contains treaty-based normative functions that are critical to maintaining the integrity of the drug-scheduling system.

13. In this context, it was also noted that the Conference of State Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) and the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), for which the UNODC acts as the Secretariat, enhance the role of the Member States in areas related to crime prevention and criminal justice.

14. Member States noted that most UN organizations have established complementary bodies dealing with budget and overarching/strategic policy issues, usually assisting or being subsidiary to the formal governing bodies. Due to the specific organizational and funding history of UNODC, such a body has not been established as of yet. In this context, Member States expressed appreciation towards the effort that the Secretariat has made to compare the governance structures of other UN agencies, and agreed that the Working Group could benefit from studying and drawing experiences from already existing models within the UN system.

15. Member States stressed that correspondence should be channelled through the permanent missions in Vienna in a timely manner. Some Member States noted that all projects must be prepared only after thorough consultation with the recipient country through official channels and that these consultations should be documented for future reference.

16. Member States concluded that the governance of UNODC must be improved in order to ensure adequate political ownership and funding of its present and future activities, in order to achieve sustainable results, and to safeguard the implementation of agreed mandates such as the UNODC Medium-Term Strategy for the Period 2008-2011. Member States also identified a need to establish regular consultations and dialogue between the Secretariat and Member States.

2. Adoption of a thematic approach

17. Member States welcomed and encouraged UNODC in its efforts to adopt a thematic approach for the formulation of operational programmes and provision of voluntary contributions, within the framework of priorities established in the UNODC Medium Term Strategy. Member States expressed that creating thematic funding proposals not only would help to increase communication between UNODC branches, but would also provide an overall vision for the activities being undertaken in a specific region or on a specific subject matter. Thematic or pooled funding would also provide UNODC with greater flexibility as funds for these purposes are not as highly earmarked. Larger thematic programmes would also enhance the capacity of UNODC to manage and control activities and procedures.

18. A shift towards larger thematic and regional programs, rather than individual projects, would create incentives for donors to provide UNODC with more flexible funding. Member States however also noted that this would require UNODC to build donor confidence in its ability to deliver. Elaboration of such programmes in close consultation with recipient partners, as well as donors, should lead to more
effective outcomes, greater regional buy-in and improved cost-sharing arrangements. Some Member States asserted that in order for thematic programming to be successful and effective, hard earmarking to activities or projects within a thematic programme should not be acceptable. Member States further reiterated the importance of determining technical assistance programs in accordance with national and regional priorities.

19. Member States stated that reporting by UNODC should primarily focus on outcomes and results achieved in these thematic programmes.

3. Evaluation

20. Member States stressed the importance of reviving and supporting the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) and ensuring its financial as well as administrative independence. Many Member States stated that the staff of the IEU as well as its activities should be funded by regular budget resources so that extension of contracts would not rely upon the good will of the senior management of the UNODC. Evaluation of projects could be funded by the projects themselves.

21. Many Member States underlined that the IEU should report to Member States without delay, with the management response coming later on. The evaluation reports should be automatically made available to the Commissions for consideration during their main sessions. The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) and the Office of the Internal Oversight Service (OIOS) should also closely monitor the performance of the UNODC, and relevant JIU reports and the summary of relevant OIOS reports should also be submitted to the Commissions.

4. The need for increased dialogue among Member States and with UNODC

22. Member States stressed the importance of a more direct and structured dialogue between recipient states and donor states, facilitated by UNODC, in order to share views on the needs and priorities of recipient countries. Such a dialogue and exchange of information would also contribute to enhanced coordination among donors, thereby reducing inefficiencies and avoiding duplication of work. Member States also identified the need of dialogue between Member States and the Secretariat in order to improve the understanding of and confidence in UNODC. An enhanced dialogue can contribute to increased transparency for UNODC operations and can contribute to and avoiding duplication of efforts.

5. Improving the financial situation


24. A number of Member States were of the view that UNODC was falling short of its mandate due to several factors, including the lack of strategic guidance from
Member States, lack of predictable and sufficient financial resources, inadequate level of general purpose funding, and in some instances lack of funding for mandates provided through resolutions of the Commissions. Member States also found it appropriate to consider how UNODC’s evolving responsibilities, expanded mandate and increases its project portfolio have affected its overall performance.

25. Member States noted that while overall special purpose funding has increased substantially during the past decade, and especially over the past two bienniums (2004-2005 and 2006-2007), there has been a decrease in general purpose funding and little if any real growth in the UNODC regular budget over the past four years. This has led to a situation where the predictability and stability of funding of UNODC, in particular of general purpose funding, has been affected, leading to challenges for UNODC to manage its substantive work, not least by placing considerable strain on the Office’s programme and programme support services in its implementation of its mandates. The rapid growth in special purpose funding and the substantive financial, human resources and other management risks that accompany it must be mitigated by enhanced financial, human and other management capacity along with the efforts in reallocation of financial and human resources. The current funding situation is also affecting the flexibility and ability of UNODC management to make strategic decisions. Some Member States recognized the importance of appropriately charging project costs to voluntarily funded projects to enable UNODC to recover the costs of implementing these programs to the greatest extent possible. Programme support costs are essentially un-earmarked funds to support the proper functioning of UNODC field operations.

26. Member States acknowledged that important steps have been taken by UNODC to meet the challenges associated with the budget and funding structure of UNODC.

27. Member States also noted that the IEU, the OIOS, the JIU, ACABQ and the External Auditors have presented specific recommendations in this regard.

28. Member States especially welcomed the establishment of the first integrated UNODC Medium Term Strategy for the period 2008-2011 as an important medium term planning tool, and the fact that this strategy is being harmonized with the strategic framework of the United Nations for the period 2010-2011. Member States expressed appreciation towards the efforts by the Secretariat to integrate and consolidate the presentation of the UN International Drug Control Programme and the UN Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme in the consolidated budget for the biennium 2008-2009, although two distinct draft budgets are still being prepared. Member States also expressed support towards the efforts made to align the consolidated budget for the biennium 2008-2009 with the Medium Term Strategy in a result-based approach, and looked forward to the first result-based Budget Performance Report to be presented in March 2009.

29. Member States expressed an interest in a sound and transparent financial basis for the Office so as to achieve more predictable and sustainable funding of UNODC. In order for Member States to consider improving the ratio between earmarked and un-earmarked funds and increasing general purpose funds, Member States underlined the importance of UNODC providing clear and transparent information on the use of funds and results attained.
6. United Nations regular budget funding to UNODC

30. Member States considered whether the UNODC share of the UN regular budget was adequate, and discussed what measures could be taken, including by revisiting the United Nations regular budget share to the UNODC. Member States expressed that any proposed increases to the regular budget share to UNODC would need to be carefully considered and thoroughly justified. Member States also underlined that any proposal to increase the share of the regular budget to UNODC should be seen as a common, forward-looking, gradual and long-term process. One option for Member States could be to request, through a resolution, the Secretary-General to report on how to strengthen the United Nations programme against drugs and crime.

31. Some Member States supported the inclusion of phrases, such as “subject to extra-budgetary resources” in any resolution passed by the Commissions, the inclusion of which does not contradict the UN’s financial rules and regulations. Other Member States highlighted the necessity of stopping the use of such phrases in resolutions which impeded the biennium budget proposals of the Secretary-General to reflect the resources levels commensurate with UNODC’s mandates and which also hindered the full, efficient and effective implementation of its mandates.

32. Member States stated that any proposed increases to the regular budget share to UNODC would have to be based on a better common understanding of which functions are funded by the regular budget, and which by general purpose resources, and which by special purpose funding, to determine if the level of regular budget and general purpose contributions is adequate. A review should take into consideration the expanded mandate and workload of the UNODC as an integrated UN Office dealing with drug and crime issues, as well as its new role as the Secretariat of the Conferences of States Parties of UNCAC and UNTOC. In this context, Member States also acknowledged that budget discipline need to be adhered to, and that a thorough examination of the structure and efficiency of UNODC needs to be conducted.

33. Member States generally agreed that vital functions within UNODC should be funded by regular budget and general purpose funds, but acknowledged that some essential functions were currently dependent on special purpose funds.

7. Voluntary Contributions – general-purpose funds, special-purpose funds and programme support costs

34. Member States expressed support for UNODC’s efforts to increase the amount of voluntary funding, particularly to the general purpose funds, and discussed concrete steps to encourage Member States to be more forthcoming in providing general purpose contributions.

35. Member States considered the following possible elements of an action plan to improve the funding situation of UNODC: Applying a thematic approach, improved reporting on outcomes, a system of positive incentives for Member States to provide flexible funding, broadening of the donors base, voluntary commitments by donors to commit a share of their contributions to general purpose funding, as well as voluntary commitments by donors to biannual indicative pledges aligned with UNODC biannual budget cycle.
36. In general, more transparent and outcome-oriented reporting would enhance Member States’ confidence in and political ownership of UNODC activities and convince donors to maintain or increase their flexible contributions. While welcoming the efforts by the Secretariat to provide more detailed information on the use of general purpose contributions in the consolidated budget proposal for the biennium 2008-2009, Member States underlined that UNODC should regularly provide Member States with concise information on performance and impact, with sufficient detail to allow Member States to understand the ways in which general purpose funds are spent. Member States also stated that it would be beneficial if reporting on the use of general purpose funds would be more clearly connected to outcomes and result areas in the Medium Term Strategy. A single consolidated, transparent report on the use of general purpose contributions would contribute to countering existing donor resistance towards such contributions.

37. Member States discussed the possibility of introducing a system of incentives in order to stimulate Member States to be more forthcoming with flexible contributions. Member States discussed whether UNODC should strictly apply the 13 per cent programme support costs (PSC) rule for earmarked special purpose contributions to smaller projects, while PSC for special purpose contributions to programmes and individual projects with substantially streamlined support and reporting requirements should be negotiable. Overall, an incentive structure should be created which should favour funding of thematic programmes over funding to individual projects.

38. Member States discussed the possibility of introducing a system of agreements by donors to commit a share of their contribution to general purpose funding. A number of Member States were in favour of further exploring this proposal, on the basis of voluntary commitments.

39. Member States were prepared to discuss proposals to increase the predictability and stability of funding of UNODC by donor commitments to biannual indicative pledges on general purpose and special purpose contributions, aligned with UNODC biannual budget cycle, on the basis of voluntary commitments, to implement its mandates according to the UNODC Medium Term Strategy.

40. Member States discussed various options on how to broaden the donor base by targeting developed and middle-income countries in order to assist the organization in meeting its mandates.

III. Adoption of the report

41. At its 5th and final session on 9 March 2009, the intergovernmental working group meeting adopted the report of the intergovernmental working group on “Improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime” (E/CN.7/2009/10-E/CN.15/2009/10), including its recommendations. The representative of the United States disassociated himself from the consensus.
IV. Organization and sessions of the intergovernmental working group

A. Opening and sessions of the intergovernmental working group

42. The intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC was prepared by the Chairperson of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, H.E. Ambassador Ashipala-Musavyi (Namibia) and H.E. Ambassador Hans Lundborg (Sweden), in consultation with the Bureau and Extended Bureau of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Acting Chairperson of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, and the Bureau and Extended Bureau of that Commission. The task of the intergovernmental working group was to implement CND and CCPCJ decisions 51/1 and 17/2.

43. The intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC held a total of sessions in the period October 2008 to March 2009. The first session was held on 7 October 2008; the second on 10-11 November 2008; the third on 27 and 28 November 2008; the fourth on 30 January 2009 and the fifth and final session was held on 9 March 2009.

B. Participation

44. The following States were represented: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lichtenstein, Luxemburg, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovak, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Zimbabwe. The European Commission was also represented.

C. Election of officers

45. At its first session, on 7 October 2008, the open-ended intergovernmental working group, elected by acclamation H.E. Ambassador Ashipala-Musavyi (Namibia) and Ambassador Hans Lundborg (Sweden) as its co-chairpersons.

D. Documentation

46. The documents before the intergovernmental working group are listed in the annex to the present document.
V. Closure of the intergovernmental working group

47. Closing statements were made by the representative of the Group of 77 and China and by the co-Chairs of the working group, H.E. Ambassador Ashipala-Musavyi (Namibia) and Ambassador Hans Lundborg (Sweden). The co-Chairs thanked the delegations for the commitment shown and for the efforts undertaken during the negotiations of the report and recommendations of the working group and for their successful adoption. They also thanked the Secretariat for the cooperation and support given to the open-ended intergovernmental working group throughout the period of negotiations of its report and recommendations to be presented consideration and adoption by the fifty-second session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and by the eighteenth session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.
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