



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
8 May 2001

Original: English

Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice

Tenth session

Vienna, 8-17 May 2001

Agenda item 5

**Follow-up to the Tenth United Nations Congress on the
Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders**

Comments submitted by Finland on the draft plans of action for the implementation during the period 2001-2005 of the Vienna Declaration on Crime and Justice: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty-first Century (E/CN.15/2001/5)

Summary

The draft plans of action for the implementation of the Vienna Declaration on Crime and Justice have been discussed at a number of informal inter-sessional meetings of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, beginning in September 2000. While Finland is grateful to the Secretariat for providing opportunities for comments to be made on earlier drafts, Finland regrets that, with some minor exceptions, the Secretariat has not taken into consideration the repeated and clear criticism made by Member States regarding the way in which the draft has been formulated. As a result, the Commission is now faced with the lengthy task of making the draft acceptable.

The purpose of the present document is to explain how the following main problems raised by the draft can be overcome:

(a) *Lack of balance.* The Vienna Declaration was the result of a carefully worked out balance between priority themes in the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme. That balance has been seriously disrupted in the draft contained in the report by the Secretary-General (E/CN.15/2001/5), which focuses almost solely on (transnational) organized crime and related issues;

(b) *Lack of clarity regarding the relationship between the draft and existing mandates.* Existing programme mandates that are directly relevant to implementation

of key elements of the Vienna Declaration are, almost without exception, missing from the draft. On the other hand, the draft includes several new mandates for the Centre for International Crime Prevention in respect of transnational organized crime. There is no attempt to identify which elements of the draft are new and which are based on existing mandates. Furthermore, the draft contains language that imposes new commitments on Member States. All of this makes it difficult for member States to see the “added value” of the draft;

(c) *Lack of clarity regarding the relationship between the draft and the general programme of work.* In the last paragraph of the Vienna Declaration, the Commission is invited to design specific measures for the implementation and follow-up of the commitments undertaken in the Vienna Declaration. In the draft contained in document E/CN.15/2001/5, the attempt to lay out a rather extensive programme of activities also in respect of issues not covered in the Vienna Declaration raises several troubling questions. In particular, is the draft intended to consolidate and replace all existing mandates that constitute the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme? If so, this would seem to go much further than the intent of the Vienna Declaration;

(d) *Lack of clarity regarding the status and time frame of the draft.* As noted in the Vienna Declaration, the Commission is only invited to design specific measures. The draft contained in document E/CN.15/2001/5, however, has embellished this invitation by adding a reference to the period 2001-2005. This implies that the action plan is, in effect, a medium-term programme for the United Nations—a programme that is adduced from a document approved by the Tenth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. This, in turn, is seriously at odds with the institutional role of, respectively, the quinquennial congresses and the Commission;

(e) *Lack of information on budgetary implications.* The draft, as noted, assigns new mandates to the Centre for International Crime Prevention. Some of the mandates would seem to have extensive budgetary implications. It is not clear from the draft how extensive those implications are;

(f) *Lack of clarity on the role of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme network.* Given the strong contribution of the institutes to implementation of the Programme, it is surprising that the draft gives only limited attention to the potential role of the institutes in implementing the Vienna Declaration. This is all the more surprising given the chronic shortage of resources facing the Centre for International Crime Prevention. The institutes can and do supplement the work of the Centre in key areas of the Programme, in respect of combating transnational organized crime, as well as other issues.

Detailed analysis of the draft plans of action and proposals for correcting them

Problem 1. Lack of balance

1. The Vienna Declaration on Crime and Justice: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty-first Century (General Assembly resolution 55/59, annex) covers a wide range of issues. Considerable time was spent at the Tenth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in crafting the proper balance between the different elements. It is therefore surprising to find that this balance has been seriously disrupted in the draft plans of action for the implementation during the period 2001-2005 of the Vienna Declaration on Crime and Justice: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty-first Century (E/CN.15/2001/5). In the draft, 14 pages (paras. 8-66) deal with (transnational) organized crime, including trafficking in persons, the smuggling of firearms, trafficking in firearms, corruption and money-laundering. Only eight pages are devoted to other activities. Moreover, when one examines precisely what the Centre for International Crime Prevention intends to do on the basis of the draft, one finds that the work of the Centre related to transnational organized crime is quite detailed and extensive (paras. 13, 18, 23, 27, 33, 41, 46, 51, 59, 60 and 65). In respect of the “other activities”, the Centre’s work list proposed in the draft is much shorter and tends to be focused—once again—on (transnational) organized crime. Even when speaking of witnesses and victims, for example, the envisaged work of the Centre relates, *inter alia*, to the preparation and administration of an international fund for support to victims of transnational crime (para. 84 (a)) and to paying “particular attention to the prevention of trafficking in persons ... and to the support of victims and witnesses ... in such cases” (para. 84 (b)). (The reference to an international fund for victims of transnational crime is a particularly egregious example of selective interpretation of the Vienna Declaration; paragraph 27 of the Vienna Declaration refers more broadly to “the establishment of funds for victims”.)

2. The point has repeatedly been made by Member States in discussions within the framework of the United Nations, most recently by all Member States speaking on the subject at the ninth session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, that while transnational organized crime is the immediate short-term priority of the Programme, in particular in view of the adoption by the General Assembly (resolution 55/25) of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its protocols, there must be a balance between work on this issue and work on other issues, both in the short term and in the long term. The Economic and Social Council has stated that the issue of criminal law for the protection of the environment (Council resolution 1996/10, para. 3), the elimination of violence against women (Council resolution 1996/12, para. 17: the Commission “should continue to consider the elimination of violence against women within its priority themes”) and juvenile justice (Council resolution 1998/21, sect. II, para. 7; and Council resolution 1999/28, para. 13), are priority areas; the draft makes almost no reference at all even to these high-priority issues.

3. Where possible work of the Centre for International Crime Prevention on other issues is mentioned, this tends to be rather vague (“exchange of information” and “promotion of best practices”). When dealing with the broad issue of treatment of

offenders, moreover, the pattern used elsewhere in the draft of having a separate section on the Centre's commitments is not followed. Instead, there is just a general reference (in para. 90) stating that "other international actions will include the following ...". According to this section, the only commitment of the Centre would be to "encourage international and regional financial institutions to incorporate in their technical cooperation programme measures to reduce prison overcrowding". Any other work is apparently to be left to a nebulous "international community".

4. In this connection, Finland does not wish to re-embark on a discussion on the balance. Finland does want to note that a call for "balance" does not mean, for example, devoting an equal number of pages in the draft action plans to the different priority themes, or requiring that the Centre for International Crime Prevention devote an equal number of man-hours to projects in the different areas. Effective international action in crime prevention and criminal justice must respond to a variety of problems, including the need, in particular in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, for technical assistance in developing crime prevention measures, dealing with child and young offenders and persons at risk, developing mediation and restorative justice, responding to the problem of violence against women, strengthening the position of the victim of crime, developing community-based sanctions and improving correctional programmes. Member States have repeatedly called for action by the Centre in all of these areas.

5. It is here that reference could and should be made to existing mandates that specifically call upon the Centre for International Crime Prevention to act. A simple and logical way to remedy the balance would be to restructure the draft plan so that it reflects at least the main subjects dealt with in the Vienna Declaration (paragraph numbers refer to paragraphs in the Vienna Declaration):

(a) United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (paras. 5-7);

(b) Organized crime (paras. 8 and 10);

(c) Women's issues (paras. 11 and 12);

(d) Trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants (para. 14);

(e) Trafficking in firearms (para. 15);

(f) Corruption (para. 16);

(g) Money-laundering (para. 17);

(h) Computer-related crime (para. 18);

(i) Acts of violence and terrorism (para. 19);

(j) Racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, and violence stemming from intolerance on the basis of ethnicity (paras. 20 and 21);

(k) Standards and norms, including the issues of prison reform, the independence of the judiciary, the independence of the prosecution and the International Code of Conduct for Public Officials (para. 22);

(l) Model treaties for international cooperation in criminal matters (para. 23);

- (m) Juvenile justice (para. 24);
- (n) Comprehensive crime prevention strategies (para. 25);
- (o) Pre-trial and detention prison populations (para. 26);
- (p) Victims of crime (para. 27);
- (q) Restorative justice (para. 28).

6. **Finland proposes that the draft be restructured by following the logic of the Vienna Declaration and having separate sections on each of the issues mentioned above. If necessary, closely related issues could be consolidated into one section. Furthermore, the draft should be based, as a point of departure, on existing mandates in all of the areas covered by the Vienna Declaration.**

7. **Noting the almost total lack of attention paid in the draft to existing mandates of the Centre for International Crime Prevention in respect of such areas as crime prevention, witnesses and victims of crime, treatment of offenders, and women's issues, Finland has compiled a list of the existing mandates, which should form the core of such a restructured draft (see annex).**

Problem 2. Lack of clarity regarding the relationship between the draft and existing mandates

8. As presently drafted, the draft plans of action impose commitments on Member States, commitments that to some extent are totally new. While Finland understands the possible need for considering such new mandates, it is highly regrettable that no attempt is made to distinguish between existing mandates and new mandates, or between existing mandates and mandates in which perhaps a few key words have been changed for the purposes of the draft.

9. An example of a commitment that does not rest entirely on an existing decision by the Commission, the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly is paragraph 10 (d) of the draft: "States will ... significantly increase their overall level of extrabudgetary contributions and strengthen and broaden the Centre's donor base ... in support of the Convention and the protocols thereto, as well as other projects and programmes." This wording differs significantly from article 30, paragraph 2, of the Convention, according to which States parties to the Convention (note: not all States) "shall make concrete efforts to the extent possible ... to enhance financial and material assistance ..." and "shall endeavour to make adequate and regular voluntary contributions to an account specifically designated for that purpose in a United Nations funding mechanism." (According to paragraph 44 (k) of the draft, States will provide increased resources to support the development and implementation of national and regional anti-trafficking strategies.)

10. A second example is that, according to paragraphs 10 and 39 of the draft, States that have signed the Convention and its protocols* should ratify the

* The protocols to the Convention referred to here are the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, and the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (General Assembly resolution 55/25, annexes II and III).

instruments before the end of 2002, and carry out a variety of measures designed to further their implementation. Although the activities themselves are laudable, it should be noted that the Vienna Declaration does not contain any such language. Moreover, given that the Convention and the protocols themselves contain provisions on the implementation of those instruments, it is questionable to what extent further measures need to be identified in the draft plans of action.

11. A third example is the four mandates of the Centre for International Crime Prevention related to the possible future international instrument on corruption (para. 27 of the draft). Although, in the light of General Assembly resolution 55/61 of 4 December 2000, the first mandate (the provision of substantive expertise and full secretariat services to the ad hoc committee for the negotiation of an international legal instrument against corruption) would seem to be timely, the other three are considerably premature in anticipating the entry into force of such an international instrument. It is highly likely that their time will come, but those activities should not be linked so directly to the implementation of the Vienna Declaration.

12. Finland proposes that this problem be corrected by using existing mandates as the point of departure. The Commission can of course build upon those mandates, but this should be a deliberate exercise, in full awareness of what has already been decided by United Nations bodies.

Problem 3. Lack of clarity regarding the relationship between the draft and the general programme of work

13. In paragraph 3 of its resolution 55/60 of 4 December 2000, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with Member States, draft plans of action to include specific measures for the implementation of and follow-up to the commitments undertaken in the Vienna Declaration for consideration and action by the Commission at its tenth session.

14. The draft goes beyond this request in several respects. The draft omits many existing programme mandates that are quite clearly connected with topics covered by the Vienna Declaration. Moreover, in paragraph 4 of the draft, it is stated that the draft sets out the commitments and planned activities of Member States and the United Nations system in the area of crime prevention and criminal justice for the period 2001-2005. The use here of the definite article "the" shows that the draft is based on the assumption that it consolidates all existing mandates. By inference, this means that the adoption of the draft would negate any mandates not included therein.

15. The wording of paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 55/60, however, implies that approval of the plans of action most emphatically cannot invalidate existing mandates regarding issues not covered in the Vienna Declaration. For this reason, it is misleading to attempt to draft the plans of action in a way that implies comprehensiveness.

16. Finland proposes that this problem be corrected by: (a) emphasizing that the draft focuses on the implementation of the Vienna Declaration; and (b) removing any implication that the implementation plan would be a consolidation of all activities to be undertaken in the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme.

Problem 4. Lack of clarity regarding the status and time frame of the draft

17. Although the Vienna Declaration gives no indication of the time frame (other than identifying, for three actions, 2002 and 2005 as target years (see paras. 14, 15 and 27 of the Vienna Declaration)), the draft clearly states in its title, in the summary and in paragraph 1 that it covers the period 2001-2005. This, in turn, implies that the quinquennial congresses have in some way assumed the authority to determine the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme. However, as stipulated in the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/152 of 18 December 1991, the congresses have only a consultative role. It is the Commission that provides policy guidance to the United Nations in this field and develops, monitors and reviews the implementation of the Programme on the basis of a system of medium-term planning in accordance with the principles presented in that annex.

18. This difference in the respective roles of the quinquennial congresses and the Commission is a fundamental one that must be respected. It is the Commission which is charged with taking a position on the broad range of crime prevention and criminal justice issues that come to the attention of the United Nations as an intergovernmental body. The annual sessions of the Commission provide the necessary continuity for this. Equally, the annual sessions allow the Commission to assess developments in crime and in the response of the international community and to draw the necessary conclusions. This cannot be done by a two-week congress debating selected themes at five-year intervals.

19. Finland proposes that this problem be corrected by deleting any and all references to the period 2001-2005 unless, in respect of a specific mandate, such a reference can be drawn directly from the Vienna Declaration or the Commission makes a specific decision on this.

Problem 5. Lack of information on budgetary implications

20. In paragraph 5 of the draft, it is stated that commitments for United Nations entities that go beyond the core functions financed through regular budgets are contingent on the availability of adequate resources through voluntary contributions. It is true that many of the activities of the Centre for International Crime Prevention envisaged in the draft are to a large degree based on existing mandates. Regrettably, there is no attempt to indicate which functions can be carried out on the basis of available resources and which cannot. Moreover, the draft includes several activities which do not appear to rest on any existing mandate whatsoever and would clearly require additional budgetary resources.

21. Several examples can be cited of this. Perhaps the one with the greatest programmatic and resource implications is in paragraph 18 (h), according to which the Centre for International Crime Prevention would prepare and service a world conference or congress to review implementation of the Convention and adopt recommendations for further action. (Such a world conference or congress is clearly something other than the "Conference of the Parties to the Convention" referred to in article 32 of the Convention.) A new mandate for the organization of a global forum on trafficking in persons is contained in paragraph 44 (j) of the draft.

22. Finland proposes that this problem be corrected by obtaining, from United Nations Headquarters, a statement of the financial implications of any new mandates, for consideration by the Commission before deciding on the Secretariat draft.

Problem 6. Lack of clarity on the role of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme network

23. The role of the institutes of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme network was determined already by the General Assembly in its resolution 46/152 (annex, paras. 35-38, in particular para. 37: "The commission may request the institutes, subject to the availability of resources, to implement select elements of the programme. The commission may also suggest areas for inter-institute activities.") The Economic and Social Council, in section IV of its resolution 1992/22 of 30 July 1992, recommended that the Secretary-General coordinate and integrate the activities of the institutes. Most recently, the Council adopted resolution 1999/23 of 28 July 1999, entitled "Work of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme"; in paragraph 11 of that resolution, the Council requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the expertise and resources of the institutes of the Programme network were utilized effectively in the implementation of the Programme.

24. Over the years, the many institutes of the Programme network have provided a considerable contribution to the implementation of the Programme. The activities have dealt with all of the priority themes, including but by no means limited to transnational organized crime. Those activities have taken the form of, for example, extensive training courses, numerous studies, the collection, analysis and dissemination of information on crime trends and on best practices in criminal justice, and technical assistance projects. The capacity of the institutes to work with issues designated by Member States as priorities should be recognized, in particular in respect of areas to which the Centre for International Crime Prevention, due to its limited resources, has been unable to devote its attention.

25. In this light, it is regrettable that the few footnoted references in the draft plans of action to the activities of the institutes once again focus primarily on transnational crime. According to those footnotes, the Centre for International Crime Prevention would carry out the mandates dealing with the collection and analysis of data on transnational organized crime, trafficking in persons and trafficking in firearms in cooperation with the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute and as appropriate, other members of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme network and other international organizations, including law enforcement agencies (e.g. the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) and Europol) and data providers in the different countries. (For some reason, there is no reference in the text of, or any footnote to, paragraph 33, to possible work by the institutes in respect of corruption. This is odd, in particular given the extensive involvement of several of the institutes—especially but not only the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute—in training and research on anti-corruption mechanisms.)

26. It is true that a somewhat similar footnote deals with crime prevention and action on witnesses and victims of crime, but as noted above, these two issues have been written into the draft plans of action in a way that emphasizes the aspects

involving transnational organized crime. As a point of comparison, there is no reference whatsoever to the institutes in respect of the treatment of offenders—perhaps the area in which the institutes have done the most work to supplement the efforts of the Centre for International Crime Prevention.

27. Finland proposes that this problem be corrected by adding references to the potential role of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme network.

Annex

Existing mandates of the Centre for International Crime Prevention to be included in the draft plans of action, with the focus on areas insufficiently covered in the draft plans of action

Women's issues (paras. 11 and 12 of the Vienna Declaration on Crime and Justice: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty-first Century)

1. The Centre for International Crime Prevention (and other crime prevention bodies and mechanisms), is invited to avail itself of the information and materials on violence against women, including violence in the family, violence in the community and violence by the State, that are being gathered by Governments and United Nations treaty bodies, other special rapporteurs, specialized agencies, bodies and organs, and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, including women's equality-seeking organizations (Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/12, para. 7).
2. The Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice is called upon, "through the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Division and the institutes comprising the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme network", to cooperate and to coordinate with all relevant organs, bodies and other entities of the United Nations system their activities on issues relating to violence against women and to the removal of gender bias in the administration of criminal justice (Council resolution 1996/12, para. 8).
3. The institutes comprising the Programme network are called upon to consolidate and disseminate information on successful intervention models and preventive programmes at the national level (Council resolution 1996/12, para. 9).
4. The United Nations entities and the institutes comprising the Programme network are urged to continue and to improve training concerning the human rights of women and issues of gender bias and violence against women for all United Nations personnel and officials, especially those in human rights and humanitarian relief, peacekeeping and peacemaking activities, and to promote their understanding of the human rights of women so that they can recognize and deal with violations of the human rights of women and can fully take into account the gender aspect of their work (Council resolution 1996/12, para. 10).
5. The Commission, through the Centre for International Crime Prevention and the institutes of the Programme network, is called upon to cooperate with all relevant organs, bodies and other entities of the United Nations system and to coordinate their activities on issues relating to violence against women and to the removal of the gender bias in the administration of criminal justice (General Assembly resolution 52/86, para. 4).
6. The institutes comprising the Programme network are called upon to continue training in the field of violence against women and to consolidate and disseminate

information on successful intervention models and preventive programmes at the national level (General Assembly resolution 52/86, para. 5).

7. The Commission, through the Centre for International Crime Prevention, is requested to assist Member States, at their request, in utilizing the Model Strategies and Practical Measures on the Elimination of Violence against Women in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (General Assembly resolution 52/86, para. 11).

8. This issue was also dealt with by the Economic and Social Council in the omnibus resolution emerging from the Ninth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (Council resolution 1995/27, sect. IV.C). In paragraph 31 of that resolution, the Council invited the institutes of the Programme network to promote and undertake certain practical activities to eliminate violence against women.

Standards and norms, including the issues of prison reform, the independence of the judiciary, the independence of the prosecution, and the International Code of Conduct for Public Officials (para. 22 of the Vienna Declaration)

9. The Secretary-General is requested:

(a) To promote the use and application of United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice, inter alia, by providing advisory services and technical cooperation to Member States on request, including assistance to Member States in criminal justice and law reform, organization of training for law enforcement and criminal justice personnel and support to the administration and management of penal and penitentiary systems, thus contributing to the upgrading of their efficiency and capabilities (Economic and Social Council resolutions 1996/16, para. 9; Council resolution 1995/13, para. 10; Council resolution 1994/18, para. 14; and Council resolution 1993/34, sect. III, para. 7);

(b) To coordinate activities related to the use and application of standards and norms between the Centre for International Crime Prevention and other relevant United Nations entities (Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/16, para. 10; Council resolution 1995/13, para. 10; Council resolution 1994/18, para. 14; and Council resolution 1993/34, sect. III, para. 7).

Model treaties for international cooperation (para. 23 of the Vienna Declaration)

10. The Secretary-General is requested:

(a) To elaborate, in consultation with Member States, model legislation on mutual assistance in criminal matters (General Assembly resolution 53/112, para. 4);

(b) To regularly update and disseminate information on practices related to international cooperation in criminal matters and to prepare a directory of central authorities responsible for mutual legal assistance (General Assembly resolution 53/112, para. 9);

(c) In cooperation with interested Member States, relevant intergovernmental organizations and the institutes comprising the Programme network, to develop appropriate training materials for use in providing technical assistance to requesting Member States (General Assembly resolutions 53/112, para. 10, and 52/88, sect. II, para. 12);

(d) To continue to provide advisory and technical cooperation services to Member States requesting assistance in the development, negotiation and implementation of international instruments on extradition, as well as the drafting and application of appropriate national legislation, as necessary; and to promote regular communication and exchanges of information between central authorities of Member States dealing with requests for extradition (General Assembly resolution 52/88, sect. II, para. 12).

Juvenile justice (para. 24 of the Vienna Declaration; cf. para. 90 of the draft plans of action)

11. The Secretary-General is requested:

(a) To promote, support and implement, as appropriate, technical cooperation and assistance projects, subject to the availability of sufficient resources (Economic and Social Council resolution 1999/28, para. 15; Council resolution 1998/21, sect. II, para. 8; Council resolution 1997/30, para. 3; Council resolution 1996/13, para. 8; and Council resolution 1995/27, sect. IV, paras. 20 and 23);

(b) To ensure effective cooperation among the relevant United Nations entities and the other organizations mentioned in the Guidelines for Action on Children in the Criminal Justice System (Economic and Social Council resolutions 1999/28, para. 11, and 1996/13, para. 8);

(c) To undertake, subject to the availability of regular budget or extrabudgetary funds, needs assessment missions with a view to reforming or improving juvenile justice systems of requesting States (Economic and Social Council resolution 1997/30, para. 7).

Comprehensive crime prevention strategies (para. 25 of the Vienna Declaration; cf. para. 77 of the draft plans of action)

12. The Secretary-General is requested:

(a) To continue studying the effects of criminality in urban areas, the factors contributing to it and measures for its effective prevention (Economic and Social Council resolution 1995/27, sect. IV, para. 4);

(b) To organize seminars and training programmes to search for ways and means to prevent crime in urban and other areas (Economic and Social Council resolution 1995/27, sect. IV, para. 4);

(c) To conduct a study on possible cultural and institutional differences in effective crime prevention and to make the study available to the Commission (Economic and Social Council resolution 1999/25, para. 4).

13. The Centre for International Crime Prevention is urged to promote projects that contribute to the exchange of information and experience in crime prevention for the purpose of encouraging new forms of collaboration between countries at the levels of government, the community and non-governmental organizations (Economic and Social Council resolution 1999/25, para. 9).

Pre-trial and detention prison populations (para. 26 of the Vienna Declaration; cf. para. 90 of the draft plans of action)

14. The Secretary-General is requested to assist, upon request and within existing resources or, where possible, funded by extrabudgetary resources if available, countries in the improvement of their prison conditions by providing advisory services, needs assessment, capacity-building and training (Economic and Social Council resolution 1997/36, para. 1).

Victims of crime (para. 27 of the Vienna Declaration; cf. para. 84 of the draft plans of action)

15. The Secretary-General is requested to undertake activities to assist Member States in developing mediation and restorative justice policies and to facilitate the exchange at the regional and international levels of experience on the issues of mediation and restorative justice, including dissemination of best practices (Economic and Social Council resolution 1999/26, para. 9).

16. The Secretary-General is urged to translate into the other official languages of the United Nations the guide for policy makers on the implementation of the Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power and the handbook on justice for victims on the use and application of the Declaration and to disseminate them widely (Economic and Social Council resolution 1998/21, sect. III, para. 3).

17. The Secretary-General is invited to incorporate victim assistance modules in technical assistance projects and assist Member States, on request, in applying the guide and the handbook mentioned in paragraph 16 above (Economic and Social Council resolution 1998/21, sect. III, para. 6).

18. The Secretary-General is requested:

(a) To prepare for the establishment of an international fund for providing support to victims of crime (Vienna Declaration, para. 27; Economic and Social Council resolution 1998/21, sect. III, para. 5);

(b) To assist the Commission in consideration of the desirability of formulating United Nations standards in the field of mediation and restorative justice (Economic and Social Council resolution 1999/26, para. 8).

19. The Secretary-General is invited:

(a) To make use of the international database established by the Government of the Netherlands in order to provide guidelines for drafting appropriate laws on

victims and, at the request of Member States, to assist in the elaboration of new legislation (Economic and Social Council resolution 1998/21, sect. III, para. 7);

(b) To promote, where necessary, demonstration or pilot projects for the establishment and the further development of victim services, and other operational activities, and to develop measures, where necessary, for special victim groups (Economic and Social Council resolution 1998/21, sect. III, para. 8).

20. The Secretary-General is requested to consult with the institutes of the Programme network, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and other entities on the desirability of establishing mechanisms to facilitate the coordination of technical cooperation initiatives to prevent victimization and assist victims of crime and abuse of power (Economic and Social Council resolution 1997/31, para. 14).
