



Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Distr.: General
24 August 2011

Original: English

Fourth session

Marrakech, Morocco, 24-28 October 2011

Item 2 of the provisional agenda**

**Review of the implementation of the United Nations
Convention against Corruption: criminalization and law
enforcement and international cooperation**

Resource requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption***

Note by the Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 3/1, entitled “Review mechanism”, the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption underlined that the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption required a budget that ensured its efficient, continued and impartial functioning. In line with that resolution, the General Assembly, in its resolution 64/237, requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the Review Mechanism was adequately funded.

2. The Secretariat is hereby submitting budgetary information to the Conference of the States Parties on resources received for the biennium 2010-2011, both from the regular budget and from voluntary contributions; expenditures incurred and expected to be incurred, on the basis of the experience of the first year of operation of the Mechanism; and resource requirements for the biennium 2012-2013.

* Reissued for technical reasons on 3 October 2011.

** CAC/COSP/2011/1.

*** The present document was submitted late owing to the late receipt of information.



II. Requirements for regular budget and extrabudgetary resources for the biennium 2010-2011, based on initial estimates

A. Requirements for regular budget resources approved by the General Assembly

3. In paragraph 17 of its resolution 64/237, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue to provide the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) with the resources necessary to enable it to promote, in an effective manner, the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption and to discharge its functions as the secretariat of the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention. The Assembly also requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the new mechanism for the review of implementation of the Convention was adequately funded, in line with resolution 3/1 of the Conference.

4. The budgetary requirements of the secretariat and the Review Mechanism to be funded from the regular budget were established as follows in the report of the Second Committee on preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (A/64/422/Add.2), and the relevant report of the Fifth Committee (A/64/599):

(a) One D-1, one P-5, two P-4, one P-3, three P-2 and one General Service post; staff assessment and related general operating expenses (computer maintenance and communications costs);

(b) Interpretation in six languages and conference servicing for one meeting of the Implementation Review Group of 10 days' duration per year and translation of 100 pages of documentation in six languages per year.

5. The General Assembly approved those requirements in its resolution 64/237 and included them in the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

6. In particular, additional resources were made available under section 16, International drug control, crime and terrorism prevention and criminal justice; section 28F, Administration, Vienna; and section 36, Staff assessment, the latter being offset by the same amount under Income section 1, Income from staff assessment, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

7. Those additional posts created for the biennium 2010-2011 are fulfilling core secretariat functions for the substantive and technical servicing of the Implementation Review Group, and are in particular responsible for the organization of and support for country reviews (26 States parties under review in the first year), starting with the selection of the countries to be reviewed and the peer reviewers, the analysis of self-assessment reports and supplementary information received, the facilitation of active dialogue among the countries, and the preparation of executive summaries and thematic and regional implementation review reports.

8. With regard to the Implementation Review Group, provision had been made for 40 meetings, that is, 20 meetings of the Group per year, as well as for the

processing of the related reports and background documentation under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

Table 1

Requirements for regular budget resources for the biennium 2010-2011 approved by the General Assembly

	<i>Amount (United States dollars)</i>	<i>Budget section</i>
Posts and related general operating expenses		
Posts ^a (1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 1 GS (OL))	1 409 600	16
Staff assessment	229 300	16
Computer maintenance (\$1,300 per staff member per year)	23 400	16
Communications costs (\$1,500 per staff member per year)	27 000	28F
Subtotal	1 689 300	
Implementation Review Group		
Interpretation (10 days of meetings per year, 6 languages) and conference servicing	393 600	2
Translation of documentation: 100 pages per year, 6 languages	395 400	2
Subtotal	789 000	
Income from staff assessment	-229 300	
Total	2 249 000	

^a In this table, posts are costed as new posts, taking into account initial delays in recruitment.

B. Requirements for extrabudgetary resources for the biennium 2010-2011, based on initial estimates

9. Additional requirements to be funded from extrabudgetary resources for the Review Mechanism for the biennium 2010-2011 included costs of communications and translation from and into the working language or languages of the Mechanism designated for individual reviews, travel and daily subsistence allowance for representatives of least developed countries to attend the annual meetings of the Implementation Review Group, training and general operating expenses, as well as country visits and joint meetings in Vienna, and translation and interpretation into languages other than the six working languages of the Mechanism, if requested by the State party under review.

10. With regard to those requirements, the Secretary-General, as requested by the Conference, proposed to the Implementation Review Group for consideration and decision at its first meeting (Vienna, 28 June-2 July 2010), further means for funding the Review Mechanism in the note by the Secretary-General on resource requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for the bienniums 2010-2011 and 2012-2013 (CAC/COSP/IRG/2010/5).

11. The additional budgetary requirements to be funded from extrabudgetary resources for the biennium 2010-2011 were thus initially estimated, as shown in table 2, to amount to \$3,260,000, or \$1,630,000 per year.

Table 2

Requirements for extrabudgetary resources for the biennium 2010-2011, based on initial estimates

	<i>Amount, 2010-2011</i>	<i>Per year</i>
	<i>(United States dollars)</i>	
Travel of participants for country visits and joint meetings	678 000	339 000
Translation of self-assessment checklist and pertinent supporting material	1 787 400	893 700
Participation of least developed countries to the sessions of the Implementation Review Group	459 000	229 500
Training of governmental experts	267 800	133 900
General operating expenses for conference calls and videoconferences	67 800	33 900
Total (including 13 per cent programme support costs)	3 260 000	1 630 000

12. To date, a total of \$3,988,046 in voluntary contributions has been received for 2010-2011 from Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Qatar, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the United Nations Development Programme. In-kind contributions have also been provided by Portugal and the Russian Federation. The voluntary contributions received so far thus cover all the additional requirements of the Mechanism for the biennium 2010-2011, based on the initial estimates.

13. However, as highlighted below, based on expenditures in the first year of the functioning of the Mechanism, estimates have to be revised for the subsequent years.

III. Actual expenditures for the first year of functioning of the Mechanism

14. At the time of writing, not all country reviews of the first year had been finalized and thus the costs of the various budgetary items are based on estimates taking into account average costs from the completed reviews. The estimates were rounded to the nearest thousand.

Translation of documentation for the sessions of the Implementation Review Group (regular budget resources)

15. In the current biennium, 2010-2011, 248 pages of official documentation have been translated to date for the first session of the Implementation Review Group (28 June-2 July 2010), the reconvened first session (29 November-1 December 2010), the second session (30 May-3 June 2011) and for the upcoming reconvened second session (7-9 September 2011). Additional documents related to the Review

Mechanism will also be presented to the Conference of the States Parties in Marrakech in October 2011. The total number of pages of official documentation translated will therefore be higher than the estimated 200 pages per biennium. This increase in the number of pages has been partly offset by a decrease in standard translation costs.

16. In addition, since the first two sessions of the newly established Working Group on Prevention of Corruption (December 2010 and August 2011) focused on deciding on its priorities and establishing its programme of work, its requirements in terms of documentation were reduced for the biennium 2010-2011. In order to make full and efficient use of the approved regular budget, resources were redeployed to cover the increased requirements of the Implementation Review Group. Such redeployment will not be possible in the next biennium, during which the Working Group on Prevention of Corruption will start to implement fully its programme of work.

17. Finally, owing to delays in the country reviews and in the finalization of the country reports and related executive summaries, several of the official documents were presented to the Implementation Review Group as conference room papers, for which no translation was provided. However, on the basis of lessons learned in the first year of functioning of the Mechanism, country reviews will follow a tighter schedule in the second year and all official documents will therefore be presented to the Group in the six official languages of the United Nations.

Participation of least developed countries parties to the Convention in the meetings of the Implementation Review Group (extrabudgetary resources)

18. The costs of travel and daily subsistence allowance were covered for representatives of least developed countries parties to the Convention¹ to enable them to participate in the first session of the Implementation Review Group, held in Vienna from 28 June to 2 July 2010 (24 delegates), and in the reconvened first session, also in Vienna, from 29 November to 1 December 2010 (26 delegates), amounting to approximately \$193,000. No further expenditure is expected under this item.

Table 3

Costs of participation of least developed countries in the Implementation Review Group
(United States dollars)

<i>Foreseen for 2010-2011, per year</i>	<i>Actual expenditures as of July 2011 (first year)</i>
229 500	193 000

¹ Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives (not a least developed country since 2011), Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia.

Training of governmental experts (extrabudgetary resources)

19. In accordance with the terms of reference of the Review Mechanism and the guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat, UNODC organized training workshops to familiarize focal points of States parties under review and governmental experts of reviewing States parties with the substantive provisions of the Convention and the methodology of the review process. Seven workshops, held in Dakar, Panama, Rabat, Moscow, Vienna, Jakarta and Pretoria, were organized according to the regional and linguistic distribution of States. A last, ad hoc workshop was held during the week of the resumed session of the Implementation Review Group for States parties that had been unable to attend any of the other workshops, thus ensuring that all States parties under review and reviewing States parties had an opportunity for training. Despite the organization along regional and linguistic lines, interpretation costs had to be covered in four of the workshops.

20. The initial cost estimates for training of experts were based on 30 experts from developing countries participating each year. However, following requests from States parties, the costs of one expert per country under review and two experts per reviewing country were covered through voluntary contributions, bringing the total number of experts to 227, thus increasing the actual costs to approximately \$278,000. No further expenditure is expected under this item.

21. As a follow-up to the training workshops organized pursuant to the terms of reference, several States parties under review requested further assistance from the secretariat to complete the self-assessment, as foreseen by paragraph 15 of the guidelines. The possibility of national training on the self-assessment checklist for States parties under review might be considered by the Implementation Review Group in view of its mandate regarding technical assistance for the implementation of the Convention.

Table 4

Costs of training of governmental experts (United States dollars)

<i>Foreseen for 2010-2011, per year</i>	<i>Actual expenditures as of July 2011 (first year)</i>
133 900	278 000

Video- and telephone conference costs (extrabudgetary resources)

22. With regard to video- and telephone conferences, the actual costs were reduced by favouring telephone conferences over videoconferences, and also by organizing face-to-face initial conferences and joint meetings in parallel with the training workshops, the resumed session of the Implementation Review Group and the meetings of the Working Group on Asset Recovery and the Working Group on Prevention of Corruption, whenever focal points and governmental experts were present at such events. In addition, communications costs were included in the regular budget for the biennium 2010-2011 for each regular budget post (section 28F of the programme budget). Thus, no specific costs were incurred under this item.

Table 5
Costs of video- and telephone conferences
 (United States dollars)

<i>Foreseen for 2010-2011, per year</i>	<i>Actual expenditures as of July 2011 (first year)</i>
33 900	0

Translation of documentation (extrabudgetary resources)

23. In accordance with paragraph 51 of the terms of reference, “[t]he country review process may be conducted in any of the working languages of the Mechanism. The secretariat shall be responsible for providing the required translation and interpretation into any of the working languages of the Mechanism, as necessary for its efficient functioning.” Individual country reviews were expected to require some translation of documentation (including responses to the self-assessment checklist and pertinent supporting material) from one official language into another. It was initially estimated that an average of 4,000 pages per biennium (2,000 pages per year) would need to be translated from one language into another.

24. Of the 26 country reviews conducted in the first year of the review cycle, 10 were conducted in one language, 14 in two languages and 2 in three languages. While the translation of the complete response to the self-assessment checklist was ensured, States parties under review were requested to select the most relevant supporting documents to be submitted for translation as well.

25. In accordance with paragraph 52 of the terms of reference, the secretariat also provided, in the first year, translation from and into two languages that are not working languages of the Mechanism.

26. In several cases, the complete responses to the self-assessment checklist, as well as numerous supporting documents, had to be translated from one working language into two other working languages, thus exceeding the initial estimates (a total of 5,200 pages in the first year as of July 2011, rather than the originally foreseen 2,000 pages per year).

27. Translation requirements had to be accommodated throughout the review process. In addition to the translation of the responses to the self-assessment checklist, the supporting documents and the final country review report, translation and interpretation were provided during the desk review for comments submitted by reviewing States parties, as well as in the ensuing dialogue with the State party under review. Where requested, the draft country review report and executive summary were also translated into the working languages of the country review before being approved and finalized.

28. The increased number of pages and the various language combinations created bottlenecks in terms of both human and financial resources. The translation capacity of the Conference Management Service of the United Nations Office at Vienna would not have guaranteed delivery of the translated documents within one month after receipt of the checklist. In addition, voluntary contributions were insufficient to cover the additional translation requirements at the official United Nations standard translation rates.

29. In order to accelerate the translation process, and to reduce overall costs, it was therefore decided to outsource the translations of the responses to the self-assessment checklist and of relevant supporting documents through the UNODC field office network.

30. At the time of writing, the translation costs were approximately \$242,000. On the basis of the country reviews almost completed, it was estimated that about 1,000 pages would still need to be translated, in particular for the translation of additional documents shared during the country visits, as well as for the dialogue between the countries under review and the reviewing countries during the finalization of the country report and of the executive summary.

Table 6

Costs of translation of documentation

(United States dollars)

<i>Foreseen for 2010-2011, per year</i>	<i>Actual expenditures as of July 2011 (first year)</i>	<i>Total expenditures foreseen for first year</i>
893 700 ^a	242 000	302 000

^a Initial estimates based on the official United Nations translation rate.

Country visits and other means of active dialogue (extrabudgetary resources)

31. With respect to the country visits and joint meetings in Vienna, the initial cost estimates submitted to the Implementation Review Group were based on the assumption that country visits or joint meetings would be requested in approximately half of the reviews. The initial estimates were therefore based on 40 country visits per biennium (20 per year).

32. That assumption proved not to be accurate in the first year of the first cycle, with most countries requesting either a country visit or a joint meeting in Vienna. Indeed, at the time of reporting, 20 States parties under review had requested a country visit and 1 State party had requested a joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna, in accordance with paragraph 29 of the terms of reference and paragraph 24 of the guidelines. In five cases, the State party under review had not taken a decision as to the means of further dialogue.

33. The initial estimates were also based on a duration of three days for each country visit or joint meeting. Indeed, country visits lasted an average of three to four days. Debriefings with the reviewing experts and the secretariat, and with the focal point, where appropriate, were very useful for preparing the meetings and for gathering information after the meetings to compile and complete the draft country review report. In several cases, additional costs were incurred for such debriefings before and after the meetings, as well as for travel days.

34. In the initial estimate, five participants (including governmental experts from developing countries and secretariat staff) were expected to travel. For the country visits, when required and within available resources, the participation of up to two governmental experts per reviewing State party was funded. The costs were and still are being covered for experts from developing countries and least developed countries, as well as for some participants from countries from the Eastern European group on a case-by-case basis. While reviewing States parties were generally

represented by one or two governmental experts each during country visits, some countries financed the participation of additional experts through their own resources.

35. In addition, owing to the breadth of the chapters under review and the detailed analysis that quickly became the norm in the reviews, it was decided to have two staff from the secretariat travelling for each country visit, in order to provide appropriate and timely substantive support to the States parties, as well as to take care of administrative and logistical arrangements. For each country visit, up to six participants (including two governmental experts from each reviewing State party and two secretariat staff) therefore participated.

36. At the time of writing, the expenditures incurred for the country visits were approximately \$421,000 for the country visits that had already taken place and a joint meeting in Vienna. Seven country visits were still to be conducted.

Table 7

Costs of country visits and other means of active dialogue
(United States dollars)

<i>Foreseen for 2010-2011, per year</i>	<i>Actual expenditures as of July 2011 (first year)</i>	<i>Total expenditures foreseen for first year</i>
339 000	421 000	535 000

Additional staff costs (extrabudgetary resources)

37. Despite the fact that the recruitment process for the regular budget posts had been finalized, or that the posts had been filled with temporary staff in cases where the recruitment process proved to be lengthy, there was still a need for two consultancies to assist in the activities of the Review Mechanism.

38. One consultant assisted in the planning and scheduling of the activities of the Mechanism and in the organization of regional training events for governmental experts, and developed specific planning, implementation and monitoring systems to improve the functioning of the Mechanism on the basis of lessons learned during the first year. A second consultant was recruited to deliver expert information technology (IT) guidance for the upgrading, fine-tuning and maintenance of the self-assessment checklist; respond to ad hoc IT-related requests from users of the checklist and assist in mergers between the old and the new versions of the checklists; participate in training sessions on the Mechanism and deliver training modules on the self-assessment checklist; and analyse, using the new functionalities of the checklist, the responses and technical assistance needs stemming from the checklist (graphs and other features).

Table 8
Overall requirements for the first year of the Review Mechanism in the biennium 2010-2011

<i>Budgetary item</i>	<i>Original estimates for the first year (biennium 2010-2011)</i>	<i>Revised estimates for the first year (biennium 2010-2011)</i>
	<i>(United States dollars)</i>	
Posts and related general operating expenses^a		
Posts (1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 1 GS (OL))	704 800	712 200
Staff assessment	114 650	120 100
Computer maintenance (\$1,300 per staff member per year)	11 700	11 700
Communications costs (\$1,500 per staff member per year)	13 500	13 500
Subtotal	844 650	857 500
Implementation Review Group		
Interpretation (10 days of meetings per year, 6 languages) and conference servicing	196 800	232 800
Translation of documentation: 100 pages per year, 6 languages 248 pages in 2010 and 2011	197 700	472 900
Subtotal	394 500	705 700
Income from staff assessment	-114 650	-120 100
Total, regular budget	1 124 500	1 443 100
Travel of participants for country visits and joint meetings	339 000	535 000
Translation of documentation	893 700	302 000
Participation of least developed countries in the sessions of the Implementation Review Group	229 500	193 000
Training of governmental experts	133 900	278 000
General operating expenses for conference calls and videoconferences	33 900	–
Consultants	–	90 600
Total, extrabudgetary	1 630 000	1 398 600
Total requirements	2 754 500	2 841 700

^a The requirements for posts for the biennium 2010-2011 are divided for the purpose of this exercise, although owing to delays in recruitment, the costs for the first year were lower than the costs of any subsequent year.

IV. Requirements for the second and third years of the Review Mechanism (biennium 2012-2013) based on experience in the first year

A. Regular budget: proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013

39. Table 9 presents the requirements that have been included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. The amounts indicated include the delayed impact of the posts approved in December 2009 and are based on the standard costs approved for the preparation of the budget proposal for the biennium 2012-2013.

40. For the biennium 2012-2013, staff members will continue to facilitate the training of relevant experts from countries under review and reviewing countries; support 80 country reviews in total (analysis of self-assessment responses and supplementary information, participation in country visits, analysis of country reports and preparation of executive summaries of country reports); prepare 12 thematic reports and regional addenda; update annually the list of experts participating in the review process (up to 15 experts for each of the current total of 154 parties); and update the database of competent authorities, asset recovery focal points and central authorities.

41. With regard to the Implementation Review Group (1 meeting of 10 days' duration per year), the amount of \$465,600 required for the biennium in order for the Group to hold one session per year, as well as \$395,100 required for the biennium for the translation into all six official languages of 100 pages of documentation per year for the sessions, was included.

Table 9

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013

	<i>Estimates, 2012-2013 (United States dollars)</i>	<i>Regular budget section</i>
Posts and related general operating expenses		
Posts (1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 1 GS (OL)) (continuing posts)	2 536 000	16
Staff assessment	424 600	16
Computer maintenance	26 300	16
Communications costs	30 000	29F
Subtotal	3 016 900	
Implementation Review Group		
Interpretation (10 days of meetings per year, 6 languages) and conference servicing	465 600	2
Translation of documentation: 100 pages per year, 6 languages	395 100	2
Subtotal	860 700	
Income from staff assessment	-424 600	
Total regular budget proposed	3 453 000	

B. Regular budget: additional requirements not included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013

42. On the basis of experience and lessons learned during the first year of the Review Mechanism, the functions carried out by consultants will continue to be required in the biennium 2012-2013, when over 80 Member States will be under review, while follow-up activities related to the analysis of the needs identified through the Mechanism will need to be conducted simultaneously.

43. It is therefore recommended that two additional new posts be created to regularize the core functions carried out by the consultants who were recruited in 2010-2011 owing to the lack of availability of in-house expertise.

44. As the first year of the implementation review cycle was to be completed by mid-2011 and the second year will be completed by mid-2012, the secretariat will need to analyse the technical assistance needs identified through the Review Mechanism and devise, together with relevant partners and donors, strategies for a coordinated implementation of technical assistance activities, projects and programmes, as mandated in particular by resolution 3/4, on technical assistance, of the Conference of the States Parties.

45. An additional post of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer (P-3) would enable the secretariat to implement the mandate received from the Conference of the States Parties, in particular by its resolution 3/4, to analyse the technical assistance needs identified through the Review Mechanism; contribute to defining and monitoring the implementation of strategies (together with relevant partners and donors) for the coordinated implementation of technical assistance activities, projects and programmes; participate in joint programming activities; forge partnerships with assistance providers, as well as the public and private sectors; and further develop its database of anti-corruption experts in charge of delivering technical assistance.

46. One new General Service (Other level) post would support the staff involved in the analysis of technical assistance needs and follow-up activities, through a wide range of office support and administrative functions, such as assisting in the verification of receipt and accuracy of documents, approvals, signatures, etc.; generating a variety of standard statistical and financial reports, etc.; updating and maintaining large distribution lists; monitoring, preparing and distributing various materials and reports; handling arrangements for printing and translation as necessary; and researching, compiling and organizing information and reference materials from various sources for reports, workplans, studies, briefings, meetings, conferences, etc.

47. While the amount of \$395,100 required for the translation in all six official languages of 100 pages of documentation per year for the sessions of the Implementation Review Group was included in the proposed budget submission for the biennium 2012-2013, a total amount of \$2,212,500 (i.e. \$1,817,400 more than in the current submission) for the biennium would be required for the translation in all six official languages of 560 pages of documentation per year for the sessions (including the executive summaries of country review reports (40×10 pages) the thematic reports (2×16 pages), the regional reports (5×16 pages) and other background documents (3×16 pages)). This reflects an increase in the number of

pages to be translated, based on the experience and lessons learned in the first year of the Review Mechanism. This would represent an increase in the resource requirements of the Conference Management Service of the United Nations Office at Vienna.

Table 10

Regular budget: additional requirements not included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013

	<i>Estimates, 2012-2013 (United States dollars)</i>	<i>Regular budget section</i>
Posts and related general operating expenses		
Posts (1 P-3, 1 GS (OL)) ^a	265 900	16
Staff assessment	51 700	16
Computer maintenance	7 800	16
Communications costs	9 000	29F
Subtotal	334 400	
Implementation Review Group		
Translation of documentation: 460 pages per year, 6 languages (in addition to the 100 pages already included in the proposed programme budget for 2012-2013)	1 817 400	2
Subtotal	1 817 400	
Income from staff assessment	-51 700	
Total regular budget, newly requested	2 100 100	

^a The new posts are costed at 50 per cent for Professional and 65 per cent for General Service.

Table 11

Summary of regular budget requirements for the functioning of the Review Mechanism for the biennium 2012-2013 (second and third years)
(United States dollars)

Regular budget, already approved	3 453 000
Regular budget, newly requested	2 100 100
Total regular budget requested	5 553 100

C. Extrabudgetary resources: additional requirements for the second and third years of the Review Mechanism (biennium 2012-2013)

Participation of least developed countries parties to the Convention in the meetings of the Implementation Review Group

48. For the second session of the Implementation Review Group (30 May-3 June 2011), the costs of travel and daily subsistence allowance were covered for 31 representatives of least developed countries parties to the Convention,² bringing

² Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African

the costs to \$148,000 for one session. In the past months, two new least developed countries (Botswana and Vanuatu) have also become States parties to the Convention, and others may ratify in the coming years. The costs will therefore increase.

49. The estimates for one year of the Review Mechanism are calculated on the basis of two sessions per year (regular session and reconvened session) and of an average of 35 participants for each session, as has been the practice so far.

Table 12

Costs of participation of least developed countries in the Implementation Review Group
(United States dollars)

<i>Foreseen for 2010-2011, per year</i>	<i>Actual expenditures as of July 2011 (first year, two sessions)</i>	<i>Actual expenditures as of July 2011 (second year, one session to date)</i>	<i>Requirements per year for second and third years (2012-2013)</i>	<i>Requirements for second and third years (2012-2013)</i>
229 500	193 000	148 000	350 000	700 000

Training of governmental experts

50. At this stage, additional resources would be needed to cover the additional requests from States parties for the training of governmental experts if it is decided to cover also the costs of one expert per country under review and two experts per reviewing country, as this goes beyond the initial estimates covering only 30 governmental experts per workshop (see paras. 19-21 above).

51. Additional resources would also be needed to provide further assistance at the national level to States parties under review that request it in order to complete the self-assessment, as foreseen by paragraph 15 of the guidelines.

52. The estimates for one year of the review mechanism are calculated on the basis of 40 country reviews, which is 53 per cent more than the 26 reviews conducted in the first year.

Table 13

Costs of training of governmental experts
(United States dollars)

<i>Foreseen for 2010-2011, per year</i>	<i>Actual expenditures as of July 2011 (first year)</i>	<i>Requirements per year for second and third years (2012-2013)</i>	<i>Requirements for second and third years (2012-2013)</i>
133 900	278 000	425 000	850 000

Video- and telephone conference costs

53. No costs are foreseen under this item.

Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia.

Translation of documentation

54. The estimates for one year of the Review Mechanism are calculated on the basis of 40 country reviews, which is 53 per cent more than the 26 reviews conducted in the first year, and on the basis of the assumption that the practice of outsourcing the translation of responses to the self-assessment checklist and of relevant supporting documents through the UNODC field office network will be continued.

Table 14

Costs of translation of documentation (United States dollars)

<i>Foreseen for 2010-2011, per year</i>	<i>Total expenditures foreseen for first year</i>	<i>Requirements per year for second and third years (2012-2013)</i>	<i>Requirements for second and third years (2012-2013)</i>
893 700	302 000	465 000	930 000

Country visits and other means of active dialogue

55. As mentioned in paragraphs 31 to 36 above, additional resources would also be needed if most of the countries under review in the second and third years of the first cycle requested a country visit or a joint meeting in Vienna.

56. The estimates for one year of the Review Mechanism are calculated on the basis of 40 country reviews, which is 53 per cent more than the 26 reviews conducted in the first year, and on the basis of the assumption that for each country visit, the costs of two staff from the secretariat and of two experts from each reviewing State party that is a developing or a least developed country will be covered. Participants from countries from the Eastern European group will be covered on a case-by-case basis.

Table 15

Costs of country visits and other means of active dialogue (United States dollars)

<i>Foreseen for 2010-2011, per year</i>	<i>Total expenditures foreseen for first year</i>	<i>Requirements per year for second and third years (2012-2013)</i>	<i>Requirements for second and third years (2012-2013)</i>
339 000	535 000	820 000	1 640 000

57. To date, a total of \$4,916,846 in voluntary contributions has been received from Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Qatar, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States and UNDP for 2010, 2011 and 2012. In-kind contributions have also been provided by Portugal and the Russian Federation. The voluntary contributions received so far thus cover the costs of the first year, as well as most of the additional requirements of the Mechanism for the second and third years, based on the revised estimates, with a shortfall of \$600,000 in the third year.

58. Table 16 shows the projected costs to be covered from extrabudgetary resources for the first (2010-2011), second (2011-2012) and third (2012-2013) years of the Mechanism.

Table 16

Summary of extrabudgetary requirements for the functioning of the Review Mechanism for the biennium 2012-2013 (second and third years) as of July 2011
(United States dollars)

	<i>First year</i>	<i>Second year</i>	<i>Third year</i>
Fund balance at start of year		601 046	529 446
Extrabudgetary contributions received	1 999 646	1 988 400	928 800
Foreseen expenditures	1 398 600	2 060 000	2 060 000
Fund balance at year's end	601 046	529 446	-601 754

59. If UNODC secures the agreement of the different donors that the validity of pledges can be extended to a further year or years, the shortfall at the end of the third year will be \$601,754. The agreement of the donors will be sought individually in the course of 2011 and 2012. Should such agreement not be secured, additional funds will need to be raised to cover the estimated costs.

Table 17

Overall requirements for the functioning of the Review Mechanism for the biennium 2012-2013 (second and third years) and proposed source of funding

<i>Budgetary item</i>	<i>Estimates for second and third years (biennium 2012-2013) (United States dollars)</i>	<i>Source of funding</i>
Posts and related general operating expenses		
Posts (1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 1 GS (OL)), including staff assessment, computer maintenance and communications costs	3 016 900	Regular budget sections 16 and 29F; already included in the proposed programme budget for 2012-2013
New posts (1 P-3, 1 GS (OL)), including staff assessment, computer maintenance and communications costs ^a	334 400	Regular budget sections 16 and 29F
Implementation Review Group		
Interpretation (10 days of meetings per year, 6 languages) and conference servicing, as well as translation of documentation: 100 pages per year, 6 languages	801 100	Regular budget section 2; already included in the proposed programme budget for 2012-2013
Additional translation of documentation: 460 pages per year, 6 languages	1 817 400	Regular budget section 2
Income from staff assessment (current posts)	-424 600	Already included in the proposed programme budget for 2012-2013

<i>Budgetary item</i>	<i>Estimates for second and third years (biennium 2012-2013) (United States dollars)</i>	<i>Source of funding</i>
Income from staff assessment (new posts)	-51 700	
Total, regular budget	5 553 100	
Travel of participants for country visits and joint meetings	1 640 000	Extrabudgetary resources
Translation of documentation	930 000	Extrabudgetary resources
Participation of least developed countries in the sessions of the Implementation Review Group	700 000	Extrabudgetary resources
Training of governmental experts	850 000	Extrabudgetary resources
Total, extrabudgetary resources	4 120 000	
Total	9 673 100	

^a The new posts are costed at 50 per cent for Professional and 65 per cent for General Service.

D. Recommendations for funding of the overall requirements for the biennium 2012-2013

60. In view of the difficulties encountered in raising the additional resources required for the operationalization of the Review Mechanism in the biennium 2010-2011, the Implementation Review Group recommended in its resolution 1/1 that the budgetary requirements of the Mechanism and its secretariat be funded from the regular budget of the United Nations, in accordance with the terms of reference annexed to Conference of the States Parties resolution 3/1, for the biennium 2012-2013.

61. The Group also requested the Secretary-General to include in his proposals for the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 the budgetary requirements necessary for the full functioning of the Mechanism, including posts and related general operating expenses, costs of communications and translation from and into the working language or languages of the Mechanism designated for individual reviews, the functioning of the Group and the participation of least developed countries in its meetings, in accordance with the estimates included in document CAC/COSP/IRG/2010/5, but excluding the line items proposed on country visits and training, submitted to the Implementation Review Group at its first session.

62. The resource requirements anticipated to arise during 2012-2013 from the developments detailed in section C above will be presented once the recommendation of the Implementation Review Group is approved by the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption at its fourth session, in October 2011. If the Conference of the States Parties recommends that the requirements for the full functioning of the Mechanism and its secretariat be funded from the regular budget of the United Nations, a draft resolution will be presented to the General Assembly at its sixty-sixth session for it to decide on the appropriateness of resorting to the regular budget for that purpose.

63. If insufficient resources were made available from the regular budget, and if the additional requirements of the Review Mechanism and its secretariat for 2012-2013 were to be funded through voluntary contributions, there could be no guarantee that a sufficient level of voluntary contributions would be received to ensure that the requirements of the Mechanism were met. As the experience to date in trying to raise funds for the Mechanism has demonstrated, voluntary contributions are unpredictable, and without a minimum level of funding being provided, it might not be possible to ensure successful reviews. The Implementation Review Group may thus wish to encourage States parties to take urgent action in this regard.

64. Furthermore, during its first meeting, the Implementation Review Group stressed the urgent need for timely action with regard to advocating for additional resources for the biennium 2012-2013. It also suggested holding a number of informal consultations to consider the resource requirements for the functioning of the Review Mechanism for the biennium 2012-2013 and developing a plan of action.
