

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

UNODC Evaluation Policy

Independent Evaluation Unit



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2015



Contents

I. Introduction.....	03
II. Definition of the Institutional Framework, roles and responsibilities	05
III. Conceptual framework for evaluation at UNODC	08
IV. Evaluation principles	10
V. Planning, managing and budgeting evaluations	12
VI. Follow-up mechanisms to evaluations.....	14
VII. Disclosure and dissemination procedures.....	14

Annexes

A. Resolutions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND 52/14) and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ 18/6)	16
---	----



I. Introduction

1. This document presents the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) evaluation policy, as the set of principles and rules that guide the Organisation's decisions and actions when planning, conducting, disseminating and using evaluations. The policy has been consulted with the Executive Director, Senior Management of UNODC and Member States and fully replaces the previous evaluation policy (2004).

2. The Unit responsible for carrying out the independent evaluation function of UNODC is the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). This Unit was originally established in 2003 under the Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs (DPA). During 2009, the Unit ceased to exist and was re-established as a stand-alone, independent unit on 27 January 2010, as per resolutions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) 52/14 (2 December 2009) and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ) 18/6 (3 December 2009)¹.

3. This document provides staff, as well as Member States and external evaluators with information on international principles for evaluation, the role and application of evaluation in UNODC, as well as related mandates and resolutions. It serves as a frame, which is complemented by the Evaluation Handbook².

4. This policy also situates independent evaluations at UNODC into a larger evaluation context at the United Nations.³ For example, UNODC is an active member of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), a network which, i.a. develops evaluation Norms and Standards (www.uneval.org).

5. This evaluation policy responds to formal requests from the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), the General Assembly and the Secretary General, summarized in the regulations "Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation"

¹ "16. Decides that the proposed consolidated budget for the biennium 2010-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime should contain adequate provisions for the establishment of a sustainable, effective and operationally independent evaluation unit."¹

² The Evaluation Handbook is available online and is updated annually in light of evolving changes, norms and standards in the field of evaluation: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>

³ In particular, building national evaluation capacity and utilising evaluation practices to foster transparent and evidence-based decision making within Member States' institutions has been one of several important topics at UNEG. Another salient topic continues being the application of Human Rights and Gender to the services and products an evaluation function like IEU offers. Furthermore, self-reflection and critical thinking is fostered through UNEG by carrying out peer-reviews of evaluations functions across the UN system. UNODC, through IEU, actively participates in these initiatives and shares respective experiences and knowledge with internal and external stakeholders.



(ST/SGB/20008). This rule “mandates the conduct of evaluation in the Secretariat decision making cycle”.

6. Furthermore, the above stated mandate is complemented by UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation in the UN system⁴; in particular UNEG Norm 3, which states that “each organization should develop an explicit policy statement on evaluation”, UNEG Standard 1.2: “UN organizations should develop an evaluation policy and regularly update it, taking into account the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN system ”; and UNEG Standard 1.3 “The evaluation policy should be approved by the Governing Bodies of the organization and/or the Head of the organization, and should be in line with the applicable UNEG Norms for Evaluation and with organizational corporate goals and strategies.”

7. UNODC governing bodies resolutions from CND⁵ and CCPCJ⁶, contain the request to establish a sustainable, effective and operationally independent evaluation function and invite Member States and the Organisation to contribute to implementing an evaluation culture. In resolution 20/1, the CCPCJ “requests the Secretariat to promote a culture of evaluation throughout the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime [...]”⁷⁸ .

8. This policy is informed by existing evaluation policies within the UN while meeting the specific needs of UNODC. It also intends to reflect the experience accumulated by UNODC’s evaluation function during the last eight years and adapting the function to new emerging organisational, accountability and learning needs.

9. This policy is divided into 7 sections and one annex with the key CND and CCPCJ resolution.

⁴ United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Norms for Evaluation in the UN System (2005) and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System (2005).

⁵ CND 52/14 2 December 2009

⁶ CCPCJ 18/6 3 December 2009

⁷ CCPCJ 20/1, para 7

⁸ Furthermore, CND (56/11, L.11/Rev. 1.1; para 5) and CCPCJ (22/2, L.3, para 5) requested the Independent Evaluation Unit in relation to the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC, to: “(a) Providing the working group with evaluation findings of the thematic and regional programmes of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime; (b) Consulting with the working group on a road map of current and future activities and results; (c) Promoting a culture of evaluation throughout the Office at all stages of programme planning, development and implementation; (d) Working with the Office in monitoring the implementation of recommendations made by relevant oversight bodies.”



II. Definition of the Institutional Framework, roles and responsibilities

A. Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU)

10. The unit responsible for carrying out the evaluation function of UNODC is IEU. To comply with the independence and impartiality inherent to the evaluation function in the United Nations, IEU has to operate on an independent and predictable budget and is to be adequately staffed by evaluation experts as defined by UNEG standards.

11. The Head of IEU is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNODC⁹ and reports directly and simultaneously to the Executive Director and to Member States, thus enabling it to conduct its work with impartiality and independence.

12. The Head of IEU is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the Unit meets high professional standards in the implementation of its work plan and the corporate evaluation plan. S/he is also responsible for managing the budget of the Unit and for the appointment of its staff. The Head of IEU is supported in the implementation of the Office work plan by a Deputy, Evaluation Officers, and Associates in addition to an adequate number of general service staff and consultants/analysts who report directly to her or him.

13. IEU's work is based on three pillars¹⁰:

- 1) Evaluation Reports;
- 2) Normative Work;
- 3) Evaluation Culture.

14. The biennial work plan is adopted by IEU following full consultation with Member States and UNODC management based on several criteria including, i.a., relevance, budget, accountability, risk priorities, innovation, replicability potential and evaluation history.¹¹ The plan outlines the type, timing and budget of respective evaluations. It provides an overall framework and allows scheduling and prioritisation of evaluations, while allowing flexibility and responsiveness to evolving needs with provision for changes when required.

⁹ Following CND Res. 52/14 and CCPCJ Res. 18/6: "The unit should circulate its reports simultaneously to the Executive Director and to Member States, with management responses being provided subsequently, and the reports should be submitted to the Commission for its consideration."

¹⁰ Please find more information in the Evaluation Handbook.

Detailed information on the criteria is available in the Evaluation Handbook.



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

15. A biennial Evaluation Report on the status of the evaluation function in UNODC will be produced by IEU and presented to the Executive Director and Member States. The report will be presented to the Open-ended Working Group on Governance and Finance (FinGov) and, if possible, to CND and CCPCJ.

16. IEU represents UNODC in the United Nations Evaluation Group and other evaluation networks and events as appropriate.

17. IEU is the focal point in UNODC for OIOS and Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) evaluation exercises and studies.

18. IEU coordinates and complements the efforts of Oversight Functions (e.g. OIOS, JIU) both at headquarters (HQ) and the field.

B. Executive Director

19. The Executive Director is formally consulted on the biannual work plan of IEU and receives the final evaluation reports for information. The Head of IEU briefs the Executive Director on a regular basis on evaluation results, progress made on building an evaluation culture, recommendations implementation rate, compliance with evaluation standards, as well as other evaluation related matters.

20. As per respective resolutions, “The Executive Director should ensure independent, timely and effective evaluations, in line with the standards and norms of the United Nations Evaluation Group and following the recommendations of the Office of Internal Oversight Services”¹² contributing to establishing and keeping an enabling environment where an independent evaluation culture can take root.

C. Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ)

21. Governing bodies of UNODC (CCPCJ and CND), are key stakeholders in accountability matters for the organisation. The resolutions from these governing bodies establish the legal and operational conditions for the independence of the evaluation function. IEU, to the extent possible, informs the Governing bodies about the biennial work plan and budget and they may also comment on and acknowledge the biennial Evaluation Meta-Analysis that may be used for strategic decision making.

¹² (CCPCJ, Res. 18/6, para 16.b, 2009)



D. Intergovernmental Working Group on Governance and Finance (FinGov)

22. As the major permanent representation of the governing bodies of UNODC (CCPCJ and CDN), FinGov may monitor that operational conditions for the independence of IEU are in place, contributing thereby to creating an enabling environment for a culture of evaluation for UNODC.

23. Member States at FinGov are briefed on the implementation of the IEU work plan and in-depth evaluation results and provide feedback on evaluation-related matters. Member States in this group are consulted on evaluation priorities and the biennial work plan of IEU.

E. Executive Committee

24. The Executive Committee is consulted regarding IEU's proposed Biennial Work Plan, which details the evaluation priorities for the two upcoming years. IEU briefs the Executive Committee on evaluation results and progress made on evaluation culture and engages with this Committee as requested.

F. Programme Review Committee (PRC)

25. IEU is a member of PRC and ensures that provision for evaluations are included both at substantive and financial level for all UNODC interventions. Therefore, "all country/regional and thematic programmes must be cleared by IEU [...]. In particular IEU will be asked to propose a concrete evaluation methodology for all programmes at the planning stage itself."¹³ Furthermore, consultations with IEU are mandatory for projects to be cleared by PRC, as well as projects approved using direct approval methodology.¹⁴ These provisions support to a certain extent the conditions for evaluability of projects and programmes¹⁵.

G. UNODC Senior Management

26. Evaluation is part of the programme and project cycle and is therefore an institutional responsibility to be taken up by all managers in UNODC. Senior Management ensures that adequate resources for evaluation are reserved under budget line 5700 and draws on evaluation findings to guide strategic decision-making on future programming. International standards followed in the United Nations

¹³ Interoffice Memorandum 24 May 2011, "Evaluation in the Planning process"

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Evaluability furthermore depends on UNODC's ability to institute sound monitoring and results-based management.



recommend allocating a range of 2% to 3% of the overall budget of a project or programme for evaluation purposes. IEU adheres to and applies these standards to ensure the validity, relevance and usefulness of the evaluation deliverables.

27. Project and Programmes selected for In-Depth evaluations will open a specific budget segment prior to start the evaluation where they will allocate the evaluation funds to be managed by IEU during the evaluation process. This constitutes a shift, which will be implemented through the launch of this evaluation policy. The implementation of this shift will be closely monitored and results will be shared within one year of implementation.

H. Member States

28. IEU presents evaluation findings, the recommendations' implementation rate, the compliance with evaluation standards in UNODC, and other evaluation-related topic to Member States on a regular basis. This reporting is done through FinGov as well as bi- and multilateral meetings with Member States.

29. Member States are invited to actively participate in evaluations, e.g. as Core Learning Partners, in order to increase the ownership and use of evaluation results.

III. Conceptual framework for evaluation at UNODC

A. Definition of evaluation

30. UNODC subscribes to UNEG's definition¹⁶ of evaluation: "An assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area, institutional performance, etc. It focuses on expected and achieved accomplishments, examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality, in order to understand achievements or the lack thereof".

31. Evaluation at UNODC aims at determining the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the interventions and contributions of the organization's institutional performance to fulfil its specific mandates. Furthermore, additional criteria related to measuring the dimensions of partnerships, gender and human rights are mandatorily added to the above criteria, reflecting the need to understand how UNODC has managed to mainstream gender and human rights into its investments and how partnerships with different stakeholder groups have been identified and managed.

¹⁶ Norms for evaluation in the UN System UNEG/FN/Norms(2005)



B. Purpose of evaluation

32. At UNODC IEU provides for evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful to serve three main purposes: accountability, organizational learning and knowledge generation. In addition, the evaluation function contributes to developing UNODC's capacities in terms of innovation and organizational change, providing building blocks to a learning Organisation.

1. Accountability

33. The evaluation function plays a critical role in supporting accountability by independently conducting evaluations which assess compliance with the established conventions, treaties, norms, policies and plans, and report fairly and accurately on results to the Executive Director, UNODC at large and Member States.

2. Organizational Learning

34. Evaluation includes measuring the extent to which intended and unintended results are or are not achieved and their impact on stakeholders. It also deals with answering difficult questions, such as whether the Organisation is doing the right things and whether it is doing things right. In this sense, it becomes an important source of evidence about institutional performance and a key contributor to organizational learning. Through the timely incorporation of recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes of the Organisation, evaluation aims at being of use throughout the project or programme cycle as well as at the level of policy formulation.

3. Knowledge Generation

35. Undertaking evaluations produces substantive knowledge on the specific topics under UNODC's mandates. This knowledge is delivered in form of evaluation reports which contain recommendations and lessons learned. IEU seeks to compile, synthesize and disseminate this knowledge to the benefit of UNODC's stakeholders as well as the United Nations Organisations at large and its Member States.

C. Types of evaluation in UNODC

36. As evaluation is part of the project and programme management, all projects and programmes in UNODC are to be evaluated according to UNODC evaluation policy, handbook and guidelines at least every 4 years or 6 months before the project or programme finalizes. In addition, policies or instruments may also be evaluated, as per the biannual evaluation plan.



37. The evaluation function in UNODC produces two different types of evaluations:

1. In-Depth Evaluations: Strategic evaluations of relevance to the organisation, such as country, regional, thematic, global programmes, cross-cutting issues, for example gender, human rights, etc., or corporate policies. A cluster evaluation is an evaluation of a set of related projects which aims at identifying commonalities and synergies across projects as well as determining the progress made towards a wider programming objective. A set of related projects identified by management and IEU as of key relevance for the Organisation may qualify as an In-Depth Evaluation. A joint evaluation, in which UNODC jointly carries out an evaluation with another implementing partner, also qualifies as an In-Depth evaluation.

2. Independent Project Evaluations: the unit of analysis is an individual project designed to achieve specific objectives within specified resources, in an adopted time span and following an established plan of action.

38. Participatory Self-Evaluation, included in the previous Evaluation Policy for small projects with a budget below USD 1,000,000, will not be continued in UNODC. After a thorough review of the methodology and feedback received from internal and external stakeholders, Participatory Self-Evaluations were discontinued as of 31 December 2014. All such UNODC projects or programme will need to plan and budget for independent project evaluations.

IV. Evaluation principles

39. UNODC is a member of UNEG and has adopted its Norms and Standards for Evaluation¹⁷. These norms reflect the singularity of the United Nations system, which is characterized by its focus on people and respect for their rights, the importance of international values and principles, universality and neutrality, its multiple stakeholders, its needs for global governance, its multi-disciplinarily and complex accountability system.

A. Evaluation is independent and impartial

40. The evaluation unit at UNODC "should be functionally and operationally independent and should be part of the Office of the Executive Director"¹⁸ Following UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System: "The evaluation function has to be

¹⁷ Norms for evaluation in the UN System UNEG/FN/Norms(2005) Standards for Evaluation in the UN System UNEG/FN/Standards(2005)

¹⁸ CND 52/14 2 December 2009; CCPCJ 18/6 3 December 2009



located independently from the other management functions so that it is free from undue influence and that unbiased and transparent reporting is ensured.”¹⁹ The objective is to have full authority to plan, conduct and present evaluation reports to appropriate decision-making levels directly. Management must not impose any type of restrictions and specifically on the scope, content and recommendations of evaluation reports.

B. Evaluation is transparent and participatory

41. The evaluation process at UNODC is transparent and involves relevant stakeholders at key stages of the UNODC Evaluation process, starting with the drafting of the Terms of Reference. Information on the evaluation approach, design and methodology must be shared throughout the process. This is essential for the credibility and utility of the evaluation and facilitates consensus building and ownership of the findings and recommendations. The transparency in the evaluation process improves credibility and the quality of the evaluations.

C. Evaluation is utilization focused

42. Evaluation products must be timely and tailored to meet the needs of its intended users. The analysis of findings by evaluators has to consider the realities of the programme or country context, and recommendations have to be practical and realistic to be implemented.

43. Evaluations require a commitment to respond and act upon by the respective authorities and managers, addressing the recommendations derived from evaluation. A systematic follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations is facilitated through respective electronic tools provided by IEU. Responsibility to implement recommendations rests with management, as delineated in the “Follow-up Action Plan” for each evaluation.

44. IEU monitors the implementation rate of recommendations and requests responsible managers to update the status of the recommendations. IEU reports the recommendation implementation rate to the Executive Director and Member States on an annual basis.

D. Evaluation conforms to internationally accepted standards

45. The standards on evaluation of UNEG and Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) guide the activity of the evaluation function in UNODC. Each evaluation

¹⁹ N6 - Norms for evaluation in the UN System UNEG/FN/Norms(2005)

should employ design, planning and implementation processes that are inherently quality oriented, covering appropriate methodologies for data-collection and analysis.

E. Human Rights and Gender

46. UNODC incorporates specific principles and safeguards to ensure that all evaluations undertaken or commissioned by UNODC include a focus on protection of human rights and gender issues following UNEG guidance UNEG/G(2011)2 Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation²⁰

F. Ethics

47. Evaluators should have personal and professional integrity and abide by the UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation and the UNEG code of conduct for evaluation in the United Nations system, to ensure that the rights of individuals involved in an evaluation are respected. Evaluators must act with cultural sensitivity and pay particular attention to protocols, codes and recommendations that may be relevant to their interactions with women, minority groups, etc.

V. Planning, managing and budgeting evaluations

A. Planning for evaluations

48. As evaluation is part of the project and programme cycle and all projects and programmes in UNODC are to be evaluated, the planning for evaluation in line with UNODC evaluation policy and handbook is the responsibility of Project and Programme Managers.

49. The Project or Programme Manager is responsible for reserving sufficient funding for the mandatory evaluations under budget line 5700 and planning for the evaluation exercise on time. In accordance with international standards, the budget reserved for any type of evaluation should be 2-3% of the overall budget of the project or programme.

B. Budget and Management Arrangements

50. All UNODC projects and programmes are evaluated and therefore the subsequent managerial and budgeting arrangements need to be included at the design stage of the

²⁰ Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation Towards UNEG Guidance UNEG/G(2011)2



intervention before a final approval can be granted. Therefore, IEU must be consulted on a mandatory basis prior to any project or programme approval or revision.²¹

51. In-depth evaluations are financed by the programme and supported by IEU through staff time and expertise. IEU commissions, manages and implements this type of evaluation in consultation with respective managers, ensuring the overall quality, validity, relevance and usefulness of the evaluation deliverables. IEU adheres to and applies the international standards to arrange for an allocation of 2-3% of the overall budget of the project or programme for evaluation purposes. Project or Programmes selected for In-depth evaluations will need to reserve these funds under budget line 5700 and open a specific budget segment at the onset of the evaluation, allowing for these funds to be managed by IEU during the evaluation process. Only after such budget segment is set up, IEU starts the planning phase of the evaluation by initiating the drafting of the Terms of Reference (TOR).

52. For all Independent Project Evaluations, managers must include an evaluation plan in their project document and arrange for an allocation of 2-3% of the overall budget of a project to cover all related evaluation costs under budget line 5700²². Following detailed guidelines in the Evaluation Handbook, managers and independent evaluators will work according to clearly assigned roles in the evaluation process.

53. Member States representatives – including donors – may observe an evaluation process, following an agreement as per the Evaluation Handbook and IEU.

54. The IEU website²³ includes a step by step evaluation platform to manage evaluation processes with guidelines, templates and evaluation reports, financed and maintained by IEU to provide services to UNODC staff who is engaged in the evaluation process both at HQ and the field.

55. External quality rating of in-depth evaluations may be carried out through an independent, external service provider, following best practices within the UN system, thereby disclosing to the public the overall quality of the evaluation report following a distinct set of criteria.

56. In order to promote transparency and ensure the maximum objectivity of evaluations, UNODC relies on external, independent evaluators selected on the basis of

²¹ Special Memo 11/2011 Chair of PRC: “submitting offices must undertake consultations with IEU for all projects and programmes (and revision to the same) to be approved [...] consultations with IEU should be undertaken well before the project document/project revision is submitted in ProFi. [...] IEU will provide advice and assistance regarding details of the planned evaluation to be included in the document, e.g. type of evaluation, timing, scope, purpose, etc”

²² UNODC Evaluation Handbook

²³ <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>



their competence, independence and integrity. In the case of Independent Project Evaluations, evaluators are selected by means of a transparent process by the Project Manager, following Human Resources Management Service rules as well as IEU norms and standards²⁴. In the case of In-depth Evaluations, evaluators are identified and selected by IEU in consultation with managers.²⁵

57. Independent evaluators must have an understanding and experience of evaluation concepts, techniques and ethics, and be able to work as part of an international team. Whenever possible, local evaluators should also be included since they are familiar with the local context and speak the local language. The involvement of local evaluators also contributes towards building local evaluation capacity. Furthermore, the composition of the evaluation team should be gender balanced.²⁶

VI. Follow-up mechanisms to evaluations

58. IEU facilitates the systematic follow-up of management on the status of implementation of evaluation recommendations, in which management details, responsibilities and timelines to implement the respective recommendations are included. In-Depth Evaluations are accompanied by a Management Response, which delineates management's reaction to the findings and recommendations contained in the report. The Management Response, as well as the Follow-up Action Plan, are attached to and published with the final evaluation report.

59. IEU is responsible for establishing dissemination and feedback mechanisms for communicating evaluation results within UNODC, as well as to Member States. Making information easily accessible to UNODC's main stakeholders allows evaluation recommendations, best practices and lessons learned to inform the planning of future interventions and policies.

VII. Disclosure and dissemination procedures

60. IEU disseminates all Independent Project and In-Depth Evaluations through its website²⁷.

61. The further dissemination of evaluation reports rests with the respective managers or stakeholders.

²⁴ Further information on the selection of evaluators is provided in the Evaluation Handbook.

²⁵ More details regarding the qualification of independent evaluators can be found in the Evaluation Handbook: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>

²⁶ More details regarding the qualification of independent evaluators can be found in the Evaluation Handbook: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>

²⁷ <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/publications.html>



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

62. Both, IEU and management are responsible for disseminating independent evaluation findings and encouraging the development of a learning community. Country and Regional Offices are encouraged to translate the executive summary into local languages and use other means in order to inform stakeholders of findings and to enhance learning.



VIII. Annexes

A. Resolutions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND 52/14) and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ 18/6)

Resolution 52/14

Budget for the biennium 2010-2011 for the Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs,

Exercising the administrative and financial functions entrusted to it by the General Assembly in its resolution 46/185 C, section XVI, paragraph 2, of 20 December 1991,

Having considered the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime on the proposed budget for the biennium 2010-2011 for the Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme¹ and the related recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,²

Recalling that there are no priorities within major programmes as decided by the General Assembly,

1. *Welcomes the measures taken to develop a thematic and regional programme approach to the programme of work of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, and requests the Executive Director of the Office to present to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs at its fifty-third session, in 2010, the changes that would need to be made to the strategic framework and a report on the implications of such an approach for the Office and for the allocation of resources to the subprogrammes of the programme of work, taking into account the views expressed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in the relevant parts of its report;³*

2. *Notes that the proposed budget for the biennium 2010-2011 for the Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme⁴ is based, inter alia, on the strategy for the period 2008-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, as approved by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 2007/12 of 25 July 2007;*

3. *Also notes that the proposed budget is harmonized with sections 16 and 28F of the proposed programme budget of the United Nations for the biennium 2010-2011;⁵*

4. *Further notes that the proposed budget focuses on general-purpose funds and that it also includes special-purpose funds and programme support cost income earned on special-purpose contributions, as well as regular budget resources;*

5. *Further notes that the general-purpose resources of the Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme and the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund are presented as a single budget, with*

¹ See E/CN.7/2009/13-E/CN.15/2009/23.

² E/CN.7/2009/14-E/CN.15/2009/24.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ See E/CN.7/2009/13-E/CN.15/2009/23.

⁵ A/64/6 (Sect. 16) and (Sect. 28F).



accounts to be kept separate, and that general-purpose expenditure will be apportioned between the two funds in accordance with the income that each generates;

6. *Further notes* that the proposed budget clearly distinguishes between general-purpose funds and programme support cost funds and that it harmonizes the use and management of these fund categories across the two funds of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime;

7. *Further notes* that the programme support cost resources of the Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme and the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund are presented as a single budget, with accounts to be kept separate, and that programme support cost expenditure will be apportioned between the two funds in accordance with the income that each generates;

8. *Notes with concern* the sharp decline in general-purpose income in the biennium 2008-2009 and the corresponding measures taken to reduce general-purpose expenditure;

9. *Considers* that strengthening the dialogue between the Executive Director and the Member States on the development, implementation and funding of the thematic and regional programmes may help, in particular, to address this sharp decline;

10. *Approves* the projected use of general-purpose funds in the biennium 2010-2011, and invites Member States to provide contributions totalling at least 17,241,800 United States dollars;

11. *Expresses concern* about the financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime;

12. *Invites* Member States to provide additional general-purpose contributions to the Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme and the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund totalling 9,570,800 dollars to enable the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to restore and strengthen the functions and activities discontinued in the biennium 2008-2009 as a result of the precipitous decline in general-purpose income to the Office;

13. *Endorses* the programme support cost fund and special-purpose fund estimates as indicated below;

Resource projections for the Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme

Category	Resources (thousands of United States dollars)		Posts	
	2008-2009	2010-2011	2008-2009	2010-2011
General-purpose funds				
Post	19 775.6	15 103.7	73	52
Non-post	3 257.7	2 138.1	-	-
Special-purpose funds	268 793.9	234 207.4	-	-
Programme support cost funds				
Post	14 611.9	15 531.3	123	118
Non-post	4 931.3	5 156.6	-	-
External executing agencies	1 053.4	1 053.4	-	-
Total	312 423.9	273 190.5	196	170



14. *Notes* that the above estimated resource projections are subject to the availability of funding;

15. *Reaffirms* the role of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 48/218 B of 29 July 1994 and other relevant resolutions of the Assembly and to the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations, for oversight, monitoring and control by the Assembly of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations, takes note of the findings and recommendations in the report of the Office on inspection of programme-level monitoring and evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, dated 5 October 2009, and requests the Secretariat to act upon and implement those recommendations and to report to Member States on follow-up in that regard;

16. *Decides* that the proposed consolidated budget for the biennium 2010-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime should contain adequate provisions for the establishment of a sustainable, effective and operationally independent evaluation unit, including the following aspects:

(a) The necessary resources should be made available to fund the position of the head of the unit through reallocation of resources from the regular budget of the United Nations available to the Office;

(b) The Executive Director should ensure independent, timely and effective evaluations, in line with the standards and norms of the United Nations Evaluation Group and following the recommendations of the Office of Internal Oversight Services;

(c) The unit should be functionally and operationally independent and should be part of the Office of the Executive Director;

(d) The Executive Director should delegate authority to make all personnel and operational decisions concerning staff and consultants to the head of the unit in line with the relevant General Assembly resolutions and in conformity with the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations;

(e) The unit should circulate its reports simultaneously to the Executive Director and to Member States, with management responses being provided subsequently, and the reports should be submitted to the Commission for its consideration;

(f) The unit should establish an appropriate cycle for its reports, including the annual evaluation report, with a view to ensuring that its reports are available to all Member States well in advance of the session of the Commission held in the first part of each year;

(g) The reports of the unit should be made public and accessible;

17. *Requests* the Executive Director to ensure the sustainability of the Strategic Planning Unit, consistent with the importance of the functions performed by the Unit;

18. *Requests* the head of the independent evaluation unit to brief the Member States periodically, preferably through the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, as appropriate, on the findings and the implementation of recommendations contained in evaluation reports;

19. *Invites* Member States to take an active role in the development and application of the evaluation policy;



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

20. *Takes note* of the draft workplan of the independent evaluation unit for the biennium 2010-2011 as a transitional step towards the re-establishment of the unit, decides that the workplan should be implemented without delay, and requests the unit to report to Member States on follow-up in that regard;

21. *Requests* the Executive Director to report to the Commission, at its fifty-third session, on the implementation of paragraphs 16, 17 and 18 of the present resolution, including on the sustainable and predictable financing of the position of head of the Strategic Planning Unit in the future, and to provide advance information in that regard to the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.