



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
24 May 2017

Original: English

Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice

Twenty-sixth session

Vienna, 22-26 May 2017

Draft report

Rapporteur: Roland Seeger (Germany)

Addendum

Strategic management, budgetary and administrative questions

1. At its 5th meeting, on 24 May 2017, 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 standing open-ended intergovernmental 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;

“(c) Working methods of the Commission;

“(d) Staff composition of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and other related matters.”

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

(a) Report of the Executive Director on the activities of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime ([E/CN.7/2017/2-E/CN.15/2017/2](#));

(b) Note by the Secretariat on the work of the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime ([E/CN.7/2017/3-E/CN.15/2017/3](#) and Add.1).

3. The Director of the Division for Management made an introductory statement. The observer for Spain, in his capacity as co-chair of the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, also made an introductory statement.



4. Statements were made by the observers for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States) and the Sudan (on behalf of States members of the League of Arab States).
5. Under agenda item 3, statements were made by the representatives of Thailand, Japan, Colombia, Canada, China, Brazil, the United States of America and India.
6. A statement was also made by the observer for Algeria.

Deliberations

7. Several speakers expressed appreciation for the work of the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in enhancing the transparency and accountability of the Office and strengthening cooperation between Member States and UNODC on programmatic, financial and other relevant issues. The role of the working group in advocating the importance of UNODC regional, country and global programmes was emphasized by some other speakers, while several speakers also commented on the role of the working group in continuing consultations with UNODC on financial management and governance matters. Appreciation was expressed for the Secretariat's efforts to provide useful and timely updates on its activities. Speakers expressed support for the extension of the mandate of the working group for four years and appreciation to the co-chairs of the working group for their work.
8. Many speakers underlined the importance and relevance of UNODC technical cooperation activities and called for a further expansion of regional, country and global programmes in, inter alia, the Middle East and North Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean and South-East Asia. It was suggested that the Office could increase the effectiveness of its programmes through a stronger link to research. The need to expand programmes in the areas of cybercrime, research, drug control, alternative development and border control cooperation was also mentioned.
9. Several speakers expressed concern regarding the financial situation of UNODC, in particular the decrease in general-purpose funding, and called upon donors to increase their unearmarked contributions. Speakers noted the heavy reliance of UNODC on extrabudgetary resources, the risk of UNODC becoming too donor-driven and the need to diversify the UNODC donor base.
10. Support was expressed for improving and streamlining the UNODC full cost recovery funding model. UNODC was asked to provide full disclosure of the calculation basis of the full cost recovery rates. Some speakers called for a continued evaluation and assessment of the impact of the funding model of full cost recovery on administrative practices, office viability, programme delivery and the sustainability of the UNODC field office network. It was suggested by one speaker that the full cost recovery principles be applied to both field offices and headquarters. It was noted that, if well applied, the use of full cost recovery could ensure quality programmes and a sound financial future. UNODC was cautioned by some speakers regarding the risk of losing its competitiveness due to the high full cost recovery charges in some regions.
11. Some speakers stressed the need to distribute programme support cost income between headquarters and field offices on the basis of clear criteria and in an equitable manner. They called for enhanced transparency and review of the policy of allocation of programme support cost income, including to field offices and substantive functions in Vienna, and proposed further consultations on this matter at the next meetings of the working group.
12. Reference was made to the introduction of Umoja, the continuing difficulties posed by its implementation, and its impact on the delivery of UNODC programmes, particularly in the field. UNODC was encouraged to continue its work on improving Umoja functionalities, particularly in tracking donor funding and

project status. UNODC was also requested to continue to report on the status of implementation of Umoja and its impact on programme delivery, and to report on the training of staff.

13. Several speakers expressed support for a culture of results-based management, monitoring and evaluation and stressed the need for high-quality programme and project reporting based on the monitoring of data, which would, in turn, allow for accountability and evaluation. UNODC was encouraged to incorporate evaluation reporting into Umoja in order to ensure that the results of evaluation could be fed into programme planning.

14. It was noted that while there had been some improvement in the gender balance of UNODC staff, much remained to be done regarding equitable geographic representation and that both issues should be treated as equally essential pillars of the human resources strategy. Special efforts should be made to recruit candidates from developing countries and from unrepresented and underrepresented countries. Many speakers expressed concern that some regions were not adequately represented among UNODC staff. It was noted that developing countries had qualified professionals with technical skills and practical experience and that it was feasible for UNODC to recruit such candidates within available resources and using its network of field offices. At the same time, reference was made to article 101 of the Charter of the United Nations that the paramount consideration in selecting candidates should be to secure the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. One speaker expressed the view that Member States could contribute to improving the situation by publicizing vacancy announcements to national authorities and the general public through official channels and social media. It was noted that continued efforts were required to improve the gender balance, in particular at the senior level, while giving full support to internal female candidates by providing training opportunities and a family-friendly environment at UNODC headquarters and in field offices. UNODC was requested to continue to provide disaggregated data on the staff composition of UNODC.

15. Regarding the working methods of the Commission, several speakers noted that the agenda of the Commission should include an item entitled “General debate” and made proposals for the establishment of a list of speakers. Reference was made to the need for the Commission to take timely decisions on its agenda items, including the themes of its thematic discussions, and the need to capitalize on the presence of experts from State capitals at the Commission’s sessions during the consideration of key substantive issues. Some speakers suggested that UNODC prepare annual reports to follow up on the implementation of resolutions adopted by the Commission at previous sessions. Reference was also made to the need to enhance the functioning of the workshop organized by the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network by better integrating its proceedings in the work of the Commission, in particular during its thematic discussions. Moreover, reference was made to the need for the full utilization of interpretation resources during the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole.
