

05 July 2011

English only

---

## **Implementation Review Group**

Resumed second session  
Vienna, 7-9 September 2011

# **Resource requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption<sup>1</sup>**

Note prepared 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 requires a budget that ensures its efficient, continued and impartial functioning. In line with this resolution, the General Assembly, in its resolution 64/237 of 24 December 2009, requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention was adequately funded, in line with resolution 3/1.

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 as well as from voluntary contributions; expenditures incurred and expected to incur based on the experience of the first year of operation of the mechanism; and resource requirements for the biennium 2012-2013.

---

<sup>1</sup> This document is an advanced draft which is being made available to the Implementation Review Group.

Please recycle 



**I) Requirements for Regular Budget and extra-budgetary resources for the biennium 2010-2011, based on initial estimates**

**a. Requirements for Regular Budget resources for the biennium 2010-2011, approved by the General Assembly**

3. In paragraph 17 of resolution 64/237 of 24 December 2009, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue to provide the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime 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 (document A/64/422/Add.2) and the relevant report of its Fifth Committee (document A/64/599):

- a. 1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 1 General Service posts; staff assessment and related general operating expenses (Computer maintenance and Communication costs);
- b. Interpretation in six languages and conference servicing for one meeting of the Implementation Review Group of ten days duration per year and Translation of 100 pages of documentation in six languages per year.

5. The General Assembly approved those requirements on 24 December 2009 (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. These 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 to 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 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 of the Implementation Review Group, that is, 20 meetings 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**

	Amount 2010-2011 In USD	Budget Section
<b>Posts and related general operating expenses</b>		
Posts (1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 1 GS (OL)) <i>(in this table posts are NOT costed as continuing posts, taking into account an initial delay in the recruitment)</i>	1,409,600	Section 16
Staff assessment	229,300	Section 16
Computer maintenance (\$1,300 per staff-member per year)	23,400	Section 16
Communication costs (\$1,500 per staff-member per year)	27,000	Section 28F
<b>Sub-total POSTS</b>	<b>1,689,300</b>	
<b>Implementation review group</b>		
Interpretation - 10 day meeting per year - 6 languages - & conference servicing	393,600	Section 2
Translation of documentation - 100 pages at \$290*450/330 per page in 6 languages per year	395,400	Section 2
<b>Sub-total IRG</b>	<b>789,000</b>	
Income from staff assessment	-229,300	
<b>Total Regular Budget approved</b>	<b>2,249,000</b>	

**b. Requirements for extra-budgetary resources for the biennium 2010-2011, based on initial estimates**

9. Additional requirements to be funded from extra-budgetary resources for the Review Mechanism for the biennium 2010-2011 included costs of communication and translation from and into 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 these 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 to 2 July 2010), further means for funding the Review Mechanism in its "Note of 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 extra-budgetary resources for the biennium 2010-2011 were thus initially estimated as follows, for a total of USD 3,260,000 (or USD 1,630,000 per year):

**Table 2: Requirements for extra-budgetary resources for the biennium 2010-2011, based on initial estimates (in USD)**

	Amount 2010-2011	Amount per year
Travel of participants for country visits and joint meetings	678,000	339,000
Translation of the self-assessment checklist and pertinent supporting material	1,787,400	893,700
Participation of LDCs 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% Project Support Costs)	3,260,000	1,630,000

12. To date, a total of USD 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, the United States of America, and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 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 hereunder, based on expenditures in first year of the functioning of the Mechanism, estimates have to be revised for the following years.

## II) 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 closest thousand.

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

15. In the current biennium 2010-2011, over 250 pages of official documentation have been translated to date for the first session of the Implementation Review Group (28 June to 2 July 2010), the reconvened first session (29 November to 1 December 2010) and the second session (30 May to

3 June 2011). Additional documents are being processed for the upcoming reconvened second session (6 to 8 September 2011) and documents related to the Implementation Review Mechanism will also be presented to the Conference of the States Parties to be held in Marrakesh in October 2011. The total number of pages of official documentation translated will therefore be higher than the estimates (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 (in 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 will start fully implementing its programme of work.

17. Finally, due to delays in the country reviews and in the finalisation 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, based on 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 Implementation Review Group in 6 languages.

Participation of least developed countries Parties to the Convention in the meetings of the Implementation Review Group (extra-budgetary resources)

18. The costs of travel and daily subsistence allowance were covered for 26 representatives of least developed countries Parties to the Convention to enable them to participate in the first session of the Implementation Review Group, which took place in Vienna from 28 June to 2 July 2010 ( 24 delegates), in the reconvened first session which also took place in Vienna from 29 November to 1 December 2010 (26 delegates), for a total of approximately USD 193,000<sup>2</sup>. No further expenditure is expected under this item.

**Table 3: Costs of participation of LDCs to the Implementation Review Group in USD**

Foreseen for 2010-2011 by year	Actual Expenditures as of July 2011 - YEAR 1
229,500	193,000

Training of governmental experts (extra-budgetary resources)

<sup>2</sup> Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Lao PDR Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives (not an LDC anymore since 2011), Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Togo, Uganda, Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia.

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. These workshops were based on a regional and linguistic distribution of States. Seven workshops were held, in Dakar, Panama, Rabat, Moscow, Vienna, Jakarta and Pretoria. A last ad hoc workshop was organized during the week of the resumed session of the Implementation Review Group for States parties that were 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. Although a regional and linguistic distribution of States was favoured for the different training workshops, interpretation costs had to be covered in four of the trainings.

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 to 227, thus increasing the actual costs to approximately USD 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 availability of national training opportunities 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 trainings of governmental experts in USD**

Foreseen for 2010-2011 by year	Actual Expenditures as of July 2011 - YEAR 1
133,900	278,000

Video and telephone conference costs (extra-budgetary resources)

22. With regard to video and telephone conference costs, the actual costs reduced by favouring telephone conferences over video conferences, but 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 as well as the meetings of the working groups on asset recovery and on prevention, whenever focal points and governmental experts are present at such events. In addition, communication costs were included in the regular budget for the biennium 2010-2011 for each regular budget post (section 28F of the Regular Budget). Therefore no specific cost was incurred under this item.

**Table 5: Costs of video and telephone conference in USD**

Foreseen for 2010-2011 By year	Actual Expenditures as of July 2011 - YEAR 1
33,900	0

Translation of documentation (extra budgetary 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 and vice versa. It was initially estimated that an average 4,000 pages per biennium (2,000 pages per year) from one language into another would need to be translated.

24. From the 26 country reviews conducted in the first year of the review cycle, ten were conducted in one language, fourteen in two languages, and two 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 most relevant supporting documents to be submitted for translation as well.

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

26. In several cases, the complete responses to the UNCAC self-assessment checklist as well as numerous supporting documents had to be translated from one working language into or two other working languages, exceeding the initial estimates (for a total of 5200 pages in year 1 as of July 2011 as compared to the originally foreseen 2000 pages per year).

27. Translation requirements had to be accommodated throughout the review process. In addition to the translation of the response to the self-assessment checklist, of the supporting documents and of 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 both in terms of human and financial resources. The translation capacity of the Conference Management Service of the United Nations Office in Vienna would not have guaranteed a timely 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, and to reduce the 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 USD 242,000. Based on the country reviews almost completed, it was estimated that about 1000 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 finalisation of the country report and of the executive summary.

**Table 6: Costs of translation of documentation in USD**

Foreseen for 2010-2011 By year	Actual Expenditures as of July 2011 - YEAR 1	Total expenditures foreseen for Year 1
893,700 <sup>3</sup>	242,000	302,000

Country visits and other means of active dialogue (extra-budgetary resources)

31. In terms of the country visits and joints 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. This assumption proved not to be accurate in the first year of the first cycle, with most countries requesting either a country visit or joint meeting in Vienna. Indeed, at the time of reporting, twenty States parties under review had requested a country visit and one State party had requested a joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna, in accordance with paragraphs 29 of the terms of reference and 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 on average of three to four days. Debriefings with the reviewing experts and the Secretariat and with the focal point where appropriate, were very useful to prepare the meetings and to gather information after the meetings with a view to compiling and completing the draft country review report. In several cases, additional costs were incurred for such coordination time prior 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. During the organisation of the country visits, when required and within

<sup>3</sup> Initial estimates based on UN official translation rate



available resources, the participation of up to two governmental experts per reviewing State party was funded. The costs were/are 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, due to the breadth of the chapters under review and the detailed analysis that became quickly 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 logistic 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 USD 421,000 for the country visits that had taken place and a joint meeting in Vienna. 7 country visits were still to be organised

**Table 7: Costs of country visits and other means of active dialogue in USD**

Foreseen for 2010-2011 By year	Actual Expenditures as of July 2011 - YEAR 1	Total expenditures foreseen for Year 1
339,000	421,000	535,000

Additional staff costs (extra budgetary resources)

37. Despite the recruitment process for the regular budget posts having been either finalized or filled with temporary staff in cases where the recruitment proved to be lengthy, there was still a need for two consultancies to be issued to assist with the organization of the mechanism.

38. One consultant assisted in the planning and scheduling of the activities of the review mechanism; in the organization of regional trainings for governmental experts and developed specific planning, implementation and monitoring systems, in order to improve the functioning of the Implementation Review Mechanism based on the lessons learned during the first year. A second consultant was recruited to deliver IT expert guidance for the upgrading, fine-tuning and maintenance of the UNCAC self-assessment checklist; answer IT-related ad-hoc requests of users of the checklist and assistance in mergers between the old and the new versions of the checklists; participate in training sessions on the Implementation Review Mechanism and deliver 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 Mechanism in the Biennium 2010-2011 in USD**

<b>Budgetary item</b>	<b>Original estimates for the first year (biennium 2010-2011)</b>	<b>Revised estimates for the first year (biennium 2010-2011)</b>
<b>Posts and related general operating expenses<sup>4</sup></b>		
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
Communication costs (\$1,500 per staff-member per year)	13,500	13,500
<b>Sub-total POSTS</b>	<b>844,650</b>	<b>857,500</b>
<b>Implementation review group</b>		
Interpretation - 10 day meeting per year - 6 languages - & conference servicing	196,800	232,800
Translation of documentation - 100 pages at \$290*450/330 per page in 5 languages per year (initial rate) - 192 pages in 2010 at \$234x450/330 per page in 5 languages (actual rate for 2010)	197,700	305,800
<b>Sub-total - Implementation review group</b>	<b>394,500</b>	<b>538,600</b>
Income from staff assessment	-114,650	-120,100
<b>Total Regular Budget</b>	<b>1,124,500</b>	<b>1,276,000</b>
Travel of participants for country visits and joint meetings	339,000	535,000
Translation of documentation	893,700	302,000
Participation of LDCs to 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
<b>Total Extra-budgetary resources required</b>	<b>1,630,000</b>	<b>1,398,600</b>
<b>TOTAL REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>2,754,500</b>	<b>2,674,600</b>

<sup>4</sup> Please note that the requirements for Posts for the biennium 2010-2011 are divided for the purpose of this exercise, although due to the delays in recruitment, the costs of the first year were lower than the costs of any further year.

### III) Requirements for the second and third years of the Mechanism (biennium 2012-2013) based on experience in first year of the functioning of the Mechanism

#### a. Regular budget - Proposed programme budget for Biennium 2012-2013

39. The table below presents the requirements which have been included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. The amounts indicated include the delayed impact for 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, the staff members will continue to facilitate training relevant experts from countries under review and reviewing countries; supporting 80 country reviews in total (analysis of self-assessment responses and supplementary information, participation in the country visits, analysis of country reports and preparation of executive summaries of country reports); preparing 12 thematic reports and regional addenda; updating annually the list of experts participating in the review process, updated annually (up to 15 experts each of a current total of 154 parties); and updating 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 \$393,600 required for the biennium in order to hold one session per year of the Implementation Review Group, as well as the amount of \$ 395,400 for the biennium required 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 Biennium 2012-2013**

	Estimates 2012-2013 In USD	RB Section
<b>Posts and related general operating expenses</b>		
Posts (1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 1 GS (OL)) ( <i>continuing posts</i> )	2,536,000	RB section 16
Staff assessment	424,600	RB section 16
Computer maintenance (\$1,500 per staff-member per year)	28,000	RB section 16
Communication costs (\$1,500 per staff-member per year)	30,000	RB Section 29F
<b>Sub-total POSTS</b>	<b>3,011,000</b>	
<b>Implementation review group</b>		
Interpretation - 10 day meeting per year - 6 languages - & conference servicing	465,600	RB Section 2
Translation of documentation - 100 pages at \$246*450/330 per page in 5 languages per year	335,500	RB Section 2
<b>Sub-total IRG</b>	<b>801,100</b>	
Income from staff assessment	-424,600	
<b>Total Regular Budget proposed</b>	<b>3,387,500</b>	

**b. Regular budget - Additional requirements not included in the Proposed programme budget for Biennium 2012-2013**

42. Based on the experience and lessons learned gathered during the first year of functioning of the Review Mechanism, the functions carried out by these consultants will continue to be required in the biennium 2012-2013, where over 80 Member States will be under review over that period, while follow-up activities related to the analysis of the needs identified through the Review Mechanism will need to take place simultaneously.

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

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

45. An additional post of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer (P3) would enable the Secretariat to implement the mandate received from the Conference of the States Parties, in particular in its Resolution 3/4, to analyze the technical assistance needs as identified through the Review Mechanism; contribute to defining and monitoring the implementation of strategies (together with relevant partners and donors) for a coordinated implementation of technical assistance activities/projects/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 GS (OL) 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 arrangement for printing and translation as necessary; researching, compiling and organizing information and reference materials from various sources for reports, work plans, studies, briefings, meetings/conferences, etc.

47. While the amount of \$ 335,500 for the biennium required for the translation into all six official languages of 100 pages of documentation per year for the sessions of the Implementation Review Group were included in the proposed budget submission for biennium 2012-2013, a total amount of \$ 1,677,300 (i.e. USD 1,341,800 more than the current submission) for the biennium would be required for the translation into 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 at Vienna.

**Table 10 - Regular budget - Additional requirements not included in the Proposed programme budget for Biennium 2012-2013**

	Estimates 2012-2013 In USD	RB Section
<b>Posts and related general operating expenses</b>		
Posts (1P-3 1 GS (OL)) <sup>5</sup>	265,900	RB section 16
Staff assessment	51,700	RB section 16
Computer maintenance (\$1,500 per staff-member per year)	7,800	RB section 16
Communication costs (\$1,500 per staff-member per year)	9,000	RB Section 29F
<b>Sub-total POSTS</b>	<b>334,400</b>	
<b>Implementation review group</b>		
Translation of documentation - 460 pages at \$246*450/330 per page in 5 languages per year (in addition to the 100 pages already included in the proposed programme budget for 2012-2013)	1,341,800	RB Section 2
<b>Sub-total IRG</b>	<b>1,341,800</b>	
Income from staff assessment	-51,700	
<b>Total Regular Budget newly requested</b>	<b>1,624,500</b>	

**Table 11: Summary of regular budget requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for biennium 2012-2013 (years 2 and 3) in USD**

Regular budget already approved	<b>3,375,400</b>
Regular budget newly requested	<b>1,624,500</b>
<b>Total Regular budget requested</b>	<b>5,012,000</b>

**c. Extra-budgetary resource - Additional requirements for the second and third years of the Mechanism (biennium 2012-2013)**

**1. 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<sup>6</sup>, bringing the costs to USD 148,000 for one session. In the past months, 2 new

<sup>5</sup> The new posts are costed at 50% for professional and 65% for General Service posts.

<sup>6</sup> Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Lao PDR Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Timor Leste, Togo, Uganda, Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia.

least developed countries (Vanuatu and Botswana) have also become states parties to the Convention and more might 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 2 sessions per year (regular session and reconvened session) and of an average of 35 participants for each session, as it has been the practice so far.

**Table 12: Costs of participation of LDCs to the Implementation Review Group in USD**

Foreseen for 2010-2011 BY YEAR	Actual Expenditures as of July 2011 - Year 1 (2 sessions)	Actual Expenditures as of July 2011 - Year 2 (1 session to date)	Requirements PER YEAR for Years 2 and 3 (2012-2013)	Requirements for Years 2 and 3 (2012-2013)
229,500	193,000	148,000	350,000	700,000

2. Training of governmental experts

50. At this stage, as mentioned in paragraphs 16 to 18 (training of governmental experts), additional resources would be needed to cover the additional requests from States parties, if it is decided to further cover the costs of one expert per country under review and two experts per reviewing country, as this goes beyond the initial estimates to cover the costs of only 30 governmental experts per workshop.

51. Additional resources would also be needed to provide further assistance at the national level to States parties under review which 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 (against 26 for year 1) - i.e. an increase by 53%.

**Table 13: Costs of training of governmental experts in USD**

Foreseen for 2010-2011 BY YEAR	Actual Expenditures as of July 2011 - YEAR 1	Requirements PER YEAR for Years 2 and 3 (2012-2013)	Requirements for Years 2 and 3 (2012-2013)
133,900	278,000	425,000	850,000

3. Video and telephone conference costs

53. No cost is foreseen under this item.

4. Translation of documentation

54. The estimates for one year of the review mechanism are calculated on the basis of 40 country reviews (against 26 for year 1) - (i.e. an increase by 53%) and based on the assumption that the practice of outsourcing the translations of the responses to the self-assessment checklist and of relevant supporting documents through the UNODC field office network will be continued. Such

costs could be included in the additional requirements in terms of regular budget (not included in the proposed programme budget for Biennium 2012-2013) but this would represent a dramatic increase in terms of financial resources, based on the official United Nations standard translation rates. Additionally, as mentioned already, the translation capacity of the Conference Management Service of the United Nations Office in Vienna would not guarantee a timely delivery of the translated documents within one month after receipt of the checklist and of relevant supporting documents.

**Table 14: Costs of translation of documentation**

Foreseen for 2010-2011 BY YEAR	Total expenditures foreseen for Year 1	Requirements PER YEAR for Years 2 and 3 (2012-2013)	Requirements for Years 2 and 3 (2012-2013)
893,700	302,000	465,000	930,000

5. Country visits and other means of active dialogue

55. As mentioned in paragraphs 28 to 33 (country visits and joint meetings), additional resources would also be needed if most of the countries under review in the second and third years of the first cycle request 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 (against 26 for year 1) - (i.e. an increase by 53%) and based on the assumption that for each country visit, the costs of 2 staff from Secretariat and of 2 experts from each reviewing state party which is a developing country 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 in USD**

Foreseen for 2010-2011 BY YEAR	Total expenditures foreseen for Year 1	Requirements PER YEAR for Years 2 and 3 (2012-2013)	Requirements for Years 2 and 3 (2012-2013)
339,000	535,000	820,000	1,640,000

57. To date, a total of US\$ 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 of America, and the United Nations Development Programme (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 year 1 as well as most of the additional requirements of the Mechanism for years 2 and 3 based on the revised estimates, with a shortfall of USD 600,000 in year 3.

58. Table 16 below shows the projected costs to be covered from extra-budgetary resources for years 1 (2010-2011), 2 (2011-2012) and 3 (2012-2013) of the mechanism.

**Table 16: Summary of extra-budgetary requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for biennium 2012-2013 (years 2 and 3) in USD as of July 2011**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Fund balance at year start	\$0	\$601,046	\$529,446
Extra-budgetary 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 end	\$601,046	\$529,446	-\$601,754

59. If UNODC secures the agreements of the different donors that the validity of the different pledges can be extended to further year(s), the shortfall at the end of year 3 would be USD 601,754. The agreements of the donors will be sought individually in the course of 2011 and 2012. Should such agreements not be secured, additional funds will need to be raised to cover the estimated costs.



**Table 17: Overall Requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for biennium 2012-2013 (years 2 and 3) in USD and proposed source of funding**

Budgetary item	Estimates for years 2 and 3 (biennium 2012-2013)	Source of funding
<b>Posts and related general operating expenses</b>		
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 communication costs	3,011,000	RB section 16 and 29 F already included in the proposed programme budget for 2012-2013
New Posts (1P-3 1 GS (OL)) including staff assessment, computer maintenance and communication cost <sup>7</sup>	334,400	RB section 16 and 29 F
<b>Implementation review group</b>		
Interpretation - 10 day meeting per year - 6 languages - & conference servicing as well as Translation of documentation - 100 pages at \$246*450/330 per page in 5 languages per year	801,100	RB section 2 already included in the proposed programme budget for 2012-2013
Additional translation of documentation - 460 pages at \$246*450/330 per page in 5 languages per year	1,341,800	RB section 2
Income from staff assessment (current posts)	-424,600	already included in the proposed programme budget for 2012-2013
Income from staff assessment (new posts)	-51,700	
<b>Total Regular Budget</b>	<b>5,012,000</b>	
Travel of participants for country visits and joint meetings	1,640,000	Extra-budgetary resources
Translation of documentation	930,000	Extra-budgetary resources
Participation of LDCs to the sessions of the Implementation Review Group	700,000	Extra-budgetary resources
Training of governmental experts	850,000	Extra-budgetary resources
<b>Total Extra-budgetary resources</b>	<b>4,120,000</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,132,000</b>	

#### **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 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 resolution 3/1 for the biennium 2012-2013.

<sup>7</sup> The new posts are costed at 50% for professional and 65% for General Service posts.

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 communication and translation from and into working language or languages of the Mechanism designated for individual reviews, 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 part C of this document will be put forward once the recommendation of the Implementation Review Group is approved by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption at its Fourth session in November 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 66th session for it to decide on the appropriateness of resorting to the regular budget for this 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 can 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. The Implementation Review Group may also wish to encourage States parties to take urgent action in this regard as well.