

19 May 2015

English only

---

**Implementation Review Group of the  
United Nations Convention against Corruption****Sixth session**

Vienna, 1-5 June 2015

Item 5 of the provisional agenda

**Financial and budgetary matters****Projected costs for the functioning of the second cycle of the  
Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United  
Nations Convention against Corruption****Note by the secretariat****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 would require 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. In its resolution 4/1, entitled “Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption”, the Conference decided that the Implementation Review Group should assist the Conference in the fulfilment of its responsibility to consider the budget biennially by engaging with the secretariat during the intersessional period with regard to expenditures and projected costs related to the Review Mechanism. It also requested the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), in furtherance of the budget consideration function, and consistent with the financial rules and regulations of the United Nations, to support the Group by: (a) providing the Group with financial information on expenditures and projected costs related to the Review Mechanism, in a format and at intervals to be agreed by the secretariat and the Group; and (b) engaging in a dialogue, as appropriate, with the Group prior to finalizing its submissions relating to the finances of the Review Mechanism for each biennial regular budget.



3. At the resumed fifth session of the Implementation Review Group, held in Vienna from 13 to 15 October 2014, several States parties encouraged the secretariat to present to the Group at its sixth session estimates of the resource requirements for the second review cycle.

4. The secretariat is hereby submitting preliminary information to the Implementation Review Group on the projected costs for the functioning of the second cycle of the Review Mechanism during its first two years of operation.

5. In order to facilitate the discussion of the Implementation Review Group, the note is presented in three parts, which are covering the projected costs in terms of:

- (a) Posts and related general operating expenses (Part I);
- (b) Implementation Review Group (Part II);
- (c) Operating expenses (Part III).

A summary table presenting the overall projected costs is presented in part IV.

## **I. Projected costs for the first two years of the second cycle of the Review Mechanism: Posts and related general operating expenses**

6. In the additional requirements approved by the Fifth Committee after review of the statement on the programme budget implications of resolution 64/237 (see A/C.5/64/12 and A/64/599), the resource requirements for posts and related general operating expenses for the functioning of the Review Mechanism were estimated on the basis of the following parameters:

- (a) The Review Mechanism would follow a four-year cycle;
- (b) Forty States parties would be reviewed each year;
- (c) Translation of the responses to the self-assessment checklist and of supporting documentation would be required for 15 of the 80 countries under review during the biennium;
- (d) One session of the Implementation Review Group would be held each year, with a duration of 10 days;
- (e) Forty country visits would be organized and carried out per biennium.

7. Based on these parameters and the activities which were envisaged to implement the Review Mechanism, the staffing requirements for a biennium were estimated as follows:

- (a) Eighty reviews at 12 staff workweeks each, totalling 960 staff workweeks;
- (b) Preparation of 80 reports at two weeks each, totalling 160 staff workweeks;
- (c) Preparation of aggregate analytical reports, totalling 30 staff workweeks;

(d) Preparation and servicing of the sessions of the Implementation Review Group, totalling 20 staff workweeks;

(e) Forty country visits at two weeks each (including preparation time), totalling 80 staff workweeks;

(f) Maintenance of an expert database and other miscellaneous activities, totalling 30 staff workweeks.

8. On that basis, in 2009 the total number of staff workweeks per biennium was estimated at 1,280. Based on an average annual figure of 44 effective workweeks per staff member, the total requirement for supporting the Review Mechanism was calculated to be 14 staff members at various levels, including Professional and General Service staff.

9. In 2009, it was estimated that approximately 30 per cent of the work could be accomplished by then-existing staff of the Corruption and Economic Crime Section (that is: 1 P-5, 1 P-4, 1 P-3, 1 P-2 and 1 General Service (Other level)).

10. On that basis, the General Assembly (see A/C.5/64/12 and A/64/599) approved the establishment of 9 additional posts for the servicing of the Review Mechanism: 1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 1 General Service (Other level).

11. Subsequent to resolution 3/1, additional mandates and tasks related to the functioning of the Review Mechanism were established by the Conference of the States Parties and the Implementation Review Group. At the first session of the Group, held in June 2010, the guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat, which had been adopted as a draft by the Conference at its third session, were finalized by the Group (see CAC/COSP/IRG/2010/7). Those guidelines established specific additional tasks to be carried out by the secretariat regarding the country review process, such as the organization of the initial steps of the review, and regarding the substantive support of the country review, such as the incorporation of comments in the draft report and the organization of dialogues for agreement on the report. Further tasks were mandated as a result of resolutions adopted by the Conference at its fourth session on the work of the Review Mechanism. Most importantly, in resolution 4/1, the Conference requested UNODC to support the Group in considering the budget of the Review Mechanism and to ensure consistency in reporting for all States parties. In resolution 4/6, the Conference requested the secretariat to convene and conduct briefings on the outcomes of the review process for non-governmental organizations on the margins of the sessions of the Group, as well as to prepare summaries of those briefings. In decision 5/1, it decided that the Implementation Review Group, with the support of the secretariat, would collect and discuss relevant information in order to facilitate the assessment of the performance of the Review Mechanism. Finally, at its resumed fifth session, the Group requested the secretariat to collect inputs from States and update the comprehensive self-assessment checklist (see CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/11/Add.1).

12. During the 2016-2017 biennium, at least 90 Member States will be under review, while follow-up activities related to the analysis of the technical assistance needs identified for more than 80 countries reviewed during the first cycle of the Review Mechanism will need to be conducted simultaneously. This will involve the development of strategies for a coordinated implementation of technical assistance

activities, projects and programmes, as mandated in particular by resolution 3/4 of the Conference of the States Parties, on technical assistance to implement the Convention against Corruption.

13. The operation of the Review Mechanism from 2010 to date has provided the secretariat with concrete data on its requirements. The data show that the actual workload is greater than originally estimated. The reasons are the following:

- (a) The parameters have changed, resulting in an increased workload;
- (b) Some activities are more time-consuming than estimated in 2009;
- (c) Some activities were not anticipated in 2009 because the guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat had not been finalized.

14. The parameters have changed as follows:

- (a) The Review Mechanism follows two five-year cycles;
- (b) At least 45 States parties are to be reviewed per year, owing to the actual and anticipated increase in ratifications and accessions;
- (c) Translation of the responses to the self-assessment checklist and of supporting documentation into one or two other languages is required for the majority of reviews (more than two thirds on average each year). In addition, the length of the responses to the self-assessment checklist is longer than originally estimated;
- (d) The Implementation Review Group holds two sessions each year, one regular session and one resumed session, with a total duration of 10 days;
- (e) The majority of States (more than 95 per cent) have requested direct dialogue in the form of country visits or joint meetings in Vienna.

15. Activities that are more time-consuming than was estimated in 2009 or that were not anticipated in 2009 relate to the preparation and conduct of the country reviews, including the writing of the country reports and executive summaries in different languages, as well as the increased preparation and servicing requirements of the Implementation Review Group.

16. In comparison with 2009 and on the basis of the changed parameters and the experience of performing the related tasks, table 2 below shows the activities as envisaged in 2009 with respect to the country review process, the activities that were not anticipated and the work of the Implementation Review Group. It also provides a comparison between the 2009 estimate and the actual staff requirements in workweeks per year.

Table 1  
**Comparison between the 2009 workload estimate and the actual workload in support of the Review Mechanism**

<i>Description of tasks</i>	<i>Workload in staff workweeks per year</i>	
	<i>2009 estimate</i>	<i>Actual workload</i>
<b>(a) Country reviews</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>720</b>
<p>In 2009, the secretariat of the Review Mechanism was tasked with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring that all States under review each submit a complete self-assessment checklist, and following up and requesting additional information if the list is incomplete</li> <li>• Distributing the checklist responses and supporting documentation to the peer-reviewing countries and requesting feedback</li> <li>• Supporting the review by facilitating an active dialogue between the State party under review and the two reviewing States, which could include requests that the State party provide clarifications or additional information or address supplementary questions related to the review. The constructive dialogue may also entail the organization of conference calls, videoconferences, e-mail exchanges or joint meetings at the United Nations Office in Vienna</li> <li>• Determining the schedule and requirements of each country review in consultation with the reviewing States parties and the State party under review and addressing all issues relevant to the review</li> <li>• Developing a set of guidelines for the reviewing States parties and a blueprint country report and assisting the reviewing States parties in preparing a country review.</li> </ul>		
<b><i>Additional requirements</i></b>		
<p>While these tasks were being performed, the actual number of States parties grew by 29, from the initial 144 States to 173 States. In anticipation of further ratifications and accessions within the next 18 months, it is reasonable to assume that 180 States will be parties to the Convention in the 2016-2017 biennium.</p> <p>Approximately one quarter of States reviewed each year required and received assistance for the completion of responses to the checklist. In 2009, the actual length of responses and attachments was underestimated. Also, the work time needed to facilitate the initial steps of the review process and to ensure that all States under review submitted a complete self-assessment checklist, as well as the follow-up to responses and requests for additional information if the lists were incomplete, was underestimated.</p> <p>It was not foreseen in 2009 that the Review Mechanism would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer the responses contained in the self-assessment checklist into the blueprint for country reports to facilitate the desk review</li> <li>• Support the desk review, including through consistency checks and language revisions when the self-assessment had been translated</li> <li>• Prepare a draft blueprint of the country review report in advance of direct dialogue in the different languages of the review.</li> </ul>		
<b>(b) Preparation of review reports</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>90</b>
<p>In 2009, the Review Mechanism was tasked with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting a desk review that entailed an analysis of the responses to the self-assessment checklist, focusing on measures taken to implement the Convention</li> <li>• Assisting the reviewing States parties in preparing a country review report with an executive summary to identify successes, good practices and challenges and make observations for the implementation of the Convention. Where appropriate, the</li> </ul>		

<i>Description of tasks</i>	<i>Workload in staff workweeks per year</i>	
	<i>2009 estimate</i>	<i>Actual workload</i>
<p>report would include the identification of technical assistance needs for the purposes of improving implementation of the Convention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitting the executive summaries for each country report.</li> </ul>		
<b><i>Additional requirements</i></b>		
<p>The workload increased owing to the increases in accessions and ratifications. It was not foreseen in 2009 that the Review Mechanism would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare the country review reports in the language(s) in which the country review was conducted, ensure consistency among the language versions, lead a process of consultations among the reviewing experts and the focal point of the State under review, incorporate their observations in all of the language versions and facilitate the reaching of agreement on the country review reports by the parties involved</li> <li>• Prepare the executive summaries in the languages in which the country review was conducted, ensure consistency among the language versions, lead a process of consultations among the reviewing experts and the focal point of the State under review, incorporate their observations in all the language versions and facilitate the reaching of agreement on the country review reports by the parties involved</li> <li>• Undertake a consistency check of all the country reviews to ensure that the observations of the executive summaries are consistent.</li> </ul>		
<b>(c) Preparation of aggregate analytical reports</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<p>In 2009, the Review Mechanism was tasked with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compiling the most common and relevant information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs contained in the country reports and including them thematically in a thematic implementation report and regional supplementary addenda for submission to the Implementation Review Group.</li> </ul>		
<b><i>Additional requirements</i></b>		
<p>The workload increased owing to the increase in accessions and ratifications. However, the Review Mechanism absorbed this additional requirement (and will continue to do so) by putting in place a system of updates to the thematic reports and regional addenda.</p>		
<b>(d) Preparation and servicing of the session of the Implementation Review Group</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>
<p>In 2009, the Review Mechanism was tasked with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizing the drawing of lots for the reviewing countries</li> <li>• Prior to such drawing of lots, ensuring geographical balance, the availability of countries with similar legal systems and the ability of countries to be subjected to the review in a given year</li> <li>• Servicing the Implementation Review Group, which is an open-ended intergovernmental group of States parties. It operates under the authority of and reports to the Conference of the States Parties and holds annual sessions (regular and resumed) in Vienna. The Implementation Review Group is mandated to conduct an overview of the review process to identify challenges and good practices, as well as consider technical assistance requirements, to ensure effective implementation of the Convention. Thematic implementation reports serve as the basis for the analytical work of the Implementation Review Group, which submits recommendations and conclusions to the Conference of the States Parties.</li> </ul>		

<i>Description of tasks</i>	<i>Workload in staff workweeks per year</i>	
	<i>2009 estimate</i>	<i>Actual workload</i>
<b><i>Additional requirements</i></b>		
The reporting obligation of the Review Mechanism to the Implementation Review Group in furtherance of its mandate and requirements for the Conference of the States Parties, as well as the servicing of the sessions, was greater than estimated in 2009. In 2009, it was not foreseen that the Review Mechanism would organize two sessions of the Implementation Review Group (one regular and one resumed) instead of one, in line with the guidance provided by the Implementation Review Group and the Conference of the States Parties, inter alia, through the organization of panel discussions and oral updates on the thematic reports.		
<b>(e) Country visits</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>86</b>
<b><i>Additional requirements</i></b>		
As indicated previously, on average more than 95 per cent of the States under review each year requested direct dialogue. The initial estimates did not account for sufficient preparation time, including logistics, preparation of documentation and servicing of the direct dialogue.		
<b>(f) Maintenance of an expert database and other miscellaneous activities</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
In 2009, the Review Mechanism was tasked with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining a list of up to 15 experts from each of the 80 peer review countries, to be drawn up annually, kept up to date and distributed prior to the drawing of lots</li> <li>• Specifically in the area of technical assistance, as part of the Review Mechanism follow-up process, reviewing whether identified technical assistance needs have been met and reporting on the outcome of the analysis of information to the Implementation Review Group.</li> </ul>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>938</b>

17. In comparison with the 640 staff workweeks per annum estimated in 2009, the actual required staff workweeks are 938 per annum. Based on an average of 44 effective workweeks per staff member per annum, the actual total requirement for supporting the Review Mechanism is 21 staff members (both Professional and General Service staff).

18. The Review Mechanism is currently supported by 14 regular budget posts: 12 Professional Staff (1 D-1, 2 P-5, 3 P-4, 2 P-3 and 4 P-2) and 2 General Service staff (Other level).

19. In addition to these 14 regular budget posts, the Review Mechanism is currently supported by 2 extrabudgetary posts (1 P-3 and 1 General Service (Other level)).

20. An analysis of the capacity of the Corruption and Economic Crime Branch concluded that, through efficiency arrangements and rigorous attention to planning, 30 per cent of the additional workload, which would be equivalent to two posts, would be absorbed.

21. Therefore, the secretariat would require 5 new posts, namely 4 Professional staff (1 P-4 and 3 P-3) and 1 General Service staff (Other level) as of 1 January 2016 to carry out the following functions:

(a) One additional 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 experts on countering corruption who are in charge of delivering technical assistance;

(b) Two additional Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officers (P-3) and one new Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer (P-4) would enable the secretariat to implement the mandate received from the Conference of the States Parties, in particular by its resolution 3/1 and the General Assembly resolution 64/237, to effectively meet the full requirements of States parties in conducting country reviews, as described in detail previously, in a timely manner and to ensure the highest levels of quality of the review process;

(c) One additional General Service (Other level) post would support the staff involved in the conduct of country reviews, as well as the analysis of technical assistance needs and follow-up activities.

## **II. Projected costs for the first two years of the second cycle of the Review Mechanism: Implementation Review Group**

22. The projected costs for the interpretation and translation of official documentation of the Implementation Review Group have increased for the translation of documentation for the sessions of the Implementation Review Group, based on the experience of the first review cycle. It is anticipated that for the second cycle of the Review Mechanism, translation will be provided for a total of 300 pages of documentation per year for the sessions of the Implementation Review Group by making full and efficient use of the approved regular budget of the Conference Management Service and under UNODC's share of existing translation resources.

## **III. Projected costs for the first two years of the second cycle of the Review Mechanism: Operating the Review Mechanism**

23. For operating the Review Mechanism, the projected costs would be required for: (i) participants for country visits and joint meetings; (ii) translation of working documentation; (iii) participation of least developed countries in the sessions of the Implementation Review Group; (iv) training of governmental experts; (v) travel of UNODC experts to provide targeted assistance in a country under review; (vi) computer maintenance and communication costs. The projected costs are based on the following parameters:

(a) 45 States parties are reviewed per year;



(b) It is assumed that the translation of the responses to the self-assessment checklist and supporting documentation into one or two other languages is required for the majority of reviews (more than two thirds on average each year);

(c) It is assumed that the majority of States parties (more than 95 per cent) will request direct dialogue in the form of country visits or joint meetings in Vienna;

(d) It is assumed that two experts per reviewing country will participate in a direct dialogue owing to the diversity of subjects covered under chapter V of the Convention against Corruption and, in particular, under chapter II;

(e) Two staff from the secretariat will participate in a direct dialogue;

(f) Generally, the costs for travel and daily subsistence allowance in relation to a direct dialogue are covered for experts from developing and least developed countries, as well as on a case-by-case basis for other requesting countries;

(g) The Implementation Review Group holds a regular session and a resumed session each year;

(h) The costs for travel and daily subsistence allowance related to a session of the Implementation Review Group are covered through the Review Mechanism for one representative from each least developed country that is a State party to UNCAC.

24. Based on the above parameters, the projected operating costs are estimated to be \$5,132,300 for the first two years, as detailed in table 2 below.

#### IV. Summary of the projected costs for the first two years of the second cycle of the Review Mechanism

Table 2

##### Overall projected costs for the first two years of the second cycle of the Review Mechanism

(United States dollars)

	<i>Projected costs for the first and second years</i>
<b>I. Posts and related general operating expenses</b>	
Posts (1 D-1, 1 P-5, 3 P-4, 4 P-3, 3 P-2 and 2 General Service (Other level))	\$3,987,000
Computer maintenance	\$34,600
Communication costs	\$46,600
<b>Subtotal I</b>	<b>\$4,068,200</b>
<b>II. Implementation Review Group</b>	
Interpretation (20 meetings per year, 6 languages) and conference servicing	\$542,400
Translation of documentation (300 pages per year, 6 languages)	\$1,252,800
<b>Subtotal II</b>	<b>\$1,795,200</b>

	<i>Projected costs for the first and second years</i>
<b>III. Operating the Review Mechanism</b>	
Travel of participants for country visits and joint meetings	\$2,026,000 <sup>a</sup>
Translation of working documentation	\$1,466,900 <sup>b</sup>
Participation of least developed countries in the sessions of the Implementation Review Group	\$561,700 <sup>c</sup>
Training of governmental experts	\$936,200 <sup>d</sup>
Travel of UNODC experts to provide targeted assistance in countries under review	\$117,100 <sup>e</sup>
Computer maintenance and communication costs	\$24,400 <sup>f</sup>
<b>Subtotal III</b>	<b>\$5,132,300</b>
<b>Grand total I+II+III</b>	<b>\$10,995,700</b>

25. It is not clear, at this stage, what source of funding would provide the additional projected costs. Should the Conference of the States Parties recommend, and the General Assembly likewise recommend, that the additional costs for the second review cycle be funded from the regular budget of the United Nations, a statement of programme budget implication will be presented to the General Assembly for it to decide on the appropriateness of resorting to the regular budget for that purpose, at the time when it considers the draft resolution on the subject.

<sup>a</sup> The estimate for the costs for country visits and joint dialogue is based on the average expenditures for the 111 country visits and 8 joint meetings that were carried out under the first cycle as of 28 February 2015. As of that date, there was only one country under review that had had neither a country visit nor a joint meeting.

<sup>b</sup> The estimate for the costs of the translation of working documents is based on the expenditures for the translation of working documents that were incurred during the first cycle for all countries under review as of 28 February 2015.

<sup>c</sup> The estimate for the costs of the participation of least developed countries in the sessions of the Implementation Review Group is based on the assumption that the number of such States parties to the Convention against Corruption will increase from 41 to 43 within the next 12 months. It is also based on the assumption that 80 per cent of least developed countries that are States parties will participate in the sessions of the Implementation Review Group.

<sup>d</sup> The estimate for the costs for conducting training for governmental experts is based on the expenditures for conducting training for governmental experts that were incurred during the first cycle until 28 February 2015. It is assumed that training needs will decrease during the second two-year period of the second cycle.

<sup>e</sup> In relation to country reviews conducted under the first cycle, the UNODC regional advisors on countering corruption based in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean in particular provided targeted assistance in some countries under review. The resulting expenditures were usually charged to existing projects other than the one that is used to administer the extrabudgetary contributions provided by donors to specifically finance the extrabudgetary requirements of the Review Mechanism.

<sup>f</sup> The estimate is based on the expenditures that were incurred during the first cycle of the review mechanism and the need to renew some of the information technology equipment.