



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
13 April 2011

Original: English

Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice

Twentieth session

Vienna, 11-15 April 2011

Draft report

Rapporteur: Erasmo **Lara Cabrera** (Mexico)

Addendum

Strategic management, budgetary and administrative questions

1. At its 1st, 2nd and 5th meetings, on 11 and 13 April 2011, the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice considered agenda item 3, which read as follows:

“Strategic management, budgetary and administrative questions:

“(a) Work of the working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime;

“(b) Directives on policy and budgetary issues for the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme.”

2. For its consideration of agenda item 3, the Commission had before it the following:

(a) Report of the Executive Director on the activities of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (E/CN.7/2011/3-E/CN.15/2011/3);

(b) Report of the Executive Director on support for the development and implementation of the regional programmes of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (E/CN.7/2011/6-E/CN.15/2011/6);

(c) Note by the Secretariat on the work of the standing open-ended working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (E/CN.7/2011/9-E/CN.15/2011/9);



(d) Report of the Executive Director on the implementation of the consolidated budget for the biennium 2010-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (E/CN.7/2011/11-E/CN.15/2011/11).

3. An introductory statement was made by the Executive Director. A representative of the Secretariat also made a statement. Statements were made by the representatives of the United States, Argentina, Canada, Japan, Chile, Iran (Islamic Republic of), China, the United Kingdom, Mexico, Brazil and Germany. Statements were also made by the observers for Indonesia, Lebanon (on behalf of the Group of 77 and China), Sweden, Guatemala, Norway, Israel, France and Spain. The observer for Palestine made a statement. A closing statement was made by the Chair.

A. Deliberations

4. The move by the Office from a project-based to an integrated programme-based approach was regarded as a positive development that could contribute to improving its funding situation. The regional programmatic approach was seen as a tool to ensure ownership by the countries concerned through thorough consultations during the development and implementation of those programmes.

5. The need for UNODC to secure stable, predictable and adequate resources through a widening of the donor base, an increase of the regular budget, an increased share of general-purpose funds and additional extrabudgetary and “soft” earmarked voluntary contributions was stressed. The establishment of partnerships with the private sector was also advocated. Some of those options were considered less likely, given budgetary constraints at the United Nations and in Member States. It was stated that the budgetary challenges facing UNODC were also due to the increase of mandates given to the Office by Member States without the corresponding financial resources.

6. The standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC was acknowledged as a valuable instrument for facilitating dialogue among Member States and between Member States and the Secretariat, particularly as regards the development and implementation of the thematic and regional programmes of UNODC, among other issues. It was noted that the working group needed to progress from the deliberative stage to the stage of being in a position to transmit recommendations for action by the Commission and that, in that regard, results had been less than satisfactory.

7. The need to involve Member States and the Independent Evaluation Unit in the development of a medium-term strategy for the Office for the period 2012-2015, to be presented to the Commission at its reconvened session in 2011, was highlighted.

8. With reference to the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the review of management and administration in the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime,¹ it was stated that the recommendations contained in that report should be followed up and acted upon, including by the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC, for

¹ JIU/2010/10.

consideration by the Commission at its reconvened session in 2011. The issues of gender balance and geographic diversity in the recruitment of staff were also discussed.

9. In response to remarks by the Executive Director, the view was expressed that UNODC should be both a normative and an analytical agency, and that it should be an agency for the provision of technical assistance to Member States, particularly as regards the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the United Nations Convention against Corruption, as well as standards and norms and their further development. The development of normative and analytical knowledge served as the basis for the provision of technical assistance. Some noted that the technical cooperation work of the Office could justify its evolution towards becoming a specialized agency, as well as the rationalization of its funding system; others found that idea premature. The proposal for informal meetings among like-minded delegations or other means for exchanging ideas and proposals in informal settings was generally welcomed.

10. The role of the Commission as the governing body of UNODC for budgetary, administrative and management matters was also discussed, as was the question of whether that was the appropriate role for a functional commission. The fact that its functions were and should be primarily normative was noted. The similar role played by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and by the crime congresses was also discussed. All of those bodies acted as governing bodies, providing UNODC with growing mandates without the necessary resources to implement them, and their instructions could sometimes be conflicting.

11. The merging of the two Commissions was not considered viable in view of their different constituencies. It was suggested that the proposal of holding joint reconvened sessions for the consideration of budgetary, administrative and management questions, as suggested in the report of the Joint Inspection Unit, could be given consideration for a trial period.

12. Regarding options for improving the methods of work of the Commission, the importance of submitting draft resolutions and decisions no later than one month before each session was emphasized, and ideas in that regard were put forward. It was stated that meeting such a deadline would facilitate preparations by Member States and the work of the Commission. The idea of holding a one-day session of the Commission for the submission of draft resolutions, followed by a two-week break so that Member States would have time to consult with their capitals and consider the substantive aspects of the texts, was generally welcomed and seen as meriting further discussion.

13. It was generally noted that the amount of time between the session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice should be longer than had been the case in 2011. It was also suggested that consideration should be given to the possibility of each Commission holding a session every other year, with the two Commissions alternating years.

14. It was suggested that the Commission should not change its working methods without first considering the impact such changes might have on its work. It was

noted that proposed changes for compiling the reports on the sessions of the Commission, in particular reducing or removing summaries of substantive deliberations, needed further exploration. It was also suggested that procedural elements of the report, including financial information, could be presented differently.

15. It was also suggested that documents before the Commission could be streamlined by including more cross-references to other documents, a matter that would also require further consideration.

B. Action taken by the Commission

16. At its fifth meeting, on 13 April 2011, the Commission approved for adoption by the Economic and Social Council a draft decision (E/CN.15/2011/L.2) presented by Sweden and the United States that had been submitted on the recommendation of the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, pursuant to Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice resolution 18/3 and Economic and Social Council decision 2009/251. (For the text, see [...].) Prior to the adoption of the draft decision, a representative of the Secretariat read out a statement on the financial implications of its adoption. Also prior to the adoption of the draft decision, the representative of the United States made a statement indicating that both of the sponsors of draft decision E/CN.15/2011/L.2 and of draft resolution E/CN.15/2011/L.3 (see para. 17 below) would have preferred that the two documents had been first sent for consideration to the Committee of the Whole and that, while there was no objection to the procedure followed, it should not be seen as setting a precedent.

17. At the same meeting, the Commission adopted a draft resolution (E/CN.15/2011/L.3) submitted by Sweden and the United States. (For the text, see [...].) Prior to the adoption of the draft resolution, a representative of the Secretariat read out a statement on the financial implications of its adoption. (For the text, see E/CN.7/2011/CRP.5.) Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the United Kingdom made a statement noting that her Government interpreted the concept of “sufficient share of the regular budget” in operative paragraph 12 of the resolution as being consistent with the need for further streamlining and rationalization within the Secretariat and other United Nations entities.

18. At the same meeting, the Commission adopted a draft resolution entitled “Implementation of the budget for the biennium 2010-2011 for the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund” (E/CN.7/2011/11-E/CN.15/2011/11, annex IV). (For the text, see [...].)