



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
24 April 2009

Original: English

Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice

Eighteenth session

Vienna, 16-24 April 2009

Agenda item 7

**Policy directives for the crime programme of the
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the role
of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal
Justice as its governing body, including administrative,
strategic management and budgetary questions and
follow-up on resolutions**

Open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Note by the Secretariat

1. The open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime was established pursuant to Commission on Narcotic Drugs decision 51/1 and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice decision 17/2.
2. The report of the working group is attached to the present note, which has been prepared pursuant to Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice decision 18/2.



Report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Summary

The open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime was established pursuant to Commission on Narcotic Drugs decision 51/1 and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice decision 17/2, adopted in 2008, to discuss and prepare recommendations to be presented to the commissions on how to ensure political ownership by Member States and on how to improve the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. The present report was prepared by the co-chairpersons of the working group, Selma Ashipala-Musavyi (Namibia) and Hans Lundborg (Sweden), and adopted by the working group at its fifth session, on 9 March 2009.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Mandate	3
II. Deliberations	3
A. Introduction	3
B. Identifying the challenges	5
1. Improving governance and political ownership	5
2. Adoption of a thematic approach	6
3. Evaluation	7
4. The need for increased dialogue among Member States and with UNODC	7
5. Improving the financial situation	7
6. UNODC funding from the regular budget of the United Nations	9
7. Voluntary contributions: general-purpose funds, special-purpose funds and programme support costs	9
III. Adoption of the report	10
IV. Organization of the working group	11
A. Opening of the fifth session and information on previous sessions of the working group	11
B. Participation	11
C. Election of officers	11
D. Documentation	12
V. Closure of the fifth session of the working group	12
Annex	
List of documents before the open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime	13

I. Mandate

1. At their annual sessions in 2008, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, in its decision 51/1, and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, in its decision 17/2, decided to establish an open-ended intergovernmental working group to discuss and prepare recommendations to be presented to the commissions on how to ensure political ownership by Member States and on how to improve the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).¹ In adopting the parallel decisions, Member States understood that a single working group would be established to consider those issues and that its report would be presented to the two commissions for consideration at their forthcoming sessions, in March and April 2009, respectively.

II. Deliberations

A. Introduction

2. Member States welcomed the open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC for providing an opportunity to discuss a number of issues crucial to the political ownership of UNODC by Member States and the performance and future effectiveness of the Office. The decision to establish the working group was a reflection of the shared concern by Member States of the need to improve the financial situation and the governance of UNODC along with the need to enhance political ownership of the Office by Member States.

3. Member States recognized that the issues of governance and the financial situation of UNODC were closely and invariably linked. It was the role of Member States to give clear policy directives to UNODC, including on the use of resources, through the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. If the current governance deficit identified by Member States could be addressed in a satisfactory way, and if UNODC were able to improve its reporting on how regular budget and voluntary contribution funds were being used for its programmes and operations, Member States would generally be in a better position to take informed decisions and to exercise their governing responsibilities.

4. Member States acknowledged that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice must reinforce their roles as the governing bodies of UNODC in dealing with its financial situation. Member States agreed that the budgetary authority entrusted to the two commissions by the General Assembly had strengthened the function of the commissions as the principal policymaking organ of the United Nations in the fields of drug control and of crime prevention and criminal justice.

¹ The recommendations of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and the financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime are contained in the report of the Secretariat (E/CN.7/2009/10-E/CN.15/2009/10).

5. Member States recognized the new demands and pressures on UNODC to respond to illicit drugs and the evolving globalization of crime, as well as to implement international instruments such as the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the United Nations Convention against Corruption, for which the UNODC acted as the secretariat.

6. Member States also called for stronger incentives to be created for all Member States to be more open, flexible and forthcoming in solving the problems related to the funding structure of UNODC. Clear and concise reporting by UNODC on achieved results and outcomes, efficiency, transparency, accountability and timely responses to oversight reports together with a transparent programme-planning process constituted necessary conditions for creating the confidence in UNODC that both recipient States and donor States required in order to be able to assume political ownership and provide effective and predictable funding.

7. In drafting recommendations to the commissions on how to improve both the governance structure and the financial situation of UNODC, Member States expressed that the working group should be guided by the following principles:

(a) In the first instance, Member States should seek to work within existing structures to improve governance and financial arrangements. The objective should be to reinforce the role of the two commissions as the governing bodies of UNODC in drug control and in crime prevention and criminal justice matters respectively, including by dealing with financial aspects;

(b) Any proposed complementary governance structure should be universal, transparent, participatory and driven by Member States;

(c) Political ownership, governance and the financial situation of UNODC are closely and invariably linked;

(d) Changes to the operations of the current system should enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of UNODC as a whole;

(e) There should be greater focus on enhancing the transparency and accountability of UNODC programmes, funding and operations. Any processes and measures that increase the transparency and accountability of UNODC operations to all Member States are likely to have positive effects on the predictability and sustainability of funding;

(f) Any new procedures or structures proposed should seek to enhance the monitoring and evaluation of UNODC activities, both internally and externally;

(g) Any proposed increases in the share of the regular budget of the United Nations allocated to UNODC would need to be carefully considered and thoroughly justified;

(h) Increased emphasis should be placed on UNODC to cooperate and coordinate with other international and regional partners;

(i) Any new procedures or structures proposed should be carefully crafted so as to avoid unnecessarily increasing the administrative and bureaucratic burden on UNODC;

(j) Any new procedures or structures proposed should be carefully crafted so as to avoid unnecessarily increasing the administrative and bureaucratic burden on the Vienna-based permanent missions.

B. Identifying the challenges

1. Improving governance and political ownership

8. Member States acknowledged that UNODC was playing a very important role in contributing to the attainment of justice for all and in assisting Member States in addressing the threats posed by drugs, crime and terrorism. UNODC had developed well in previous years and its expanded mandate and growing voluntary contributions were testimony to the success of this important Office.

9. Many Member States expressed the view that UNODC was falling short of its mandate due to several factors, including the lack of strategic guidance from Member States, the lack of predictable and sufficient financial resources and, in some instances, the lack of funding for carrying out the mandates provided through resolutions of the two commissions. Member States, therefore, found it appropriate to consider how the evolving responsibilities, the expanded mandate and the increases in the project portfolio of UNODC had affected its overall performance, noting that the rapid growth of UNODC activities and mandates was causing challenges for the management of UNODC.

10. Member States emphasized that the present governance structure of UNODC had proved less and less able to provide the vital line of communication and dialogue between Member States and the Secretariat. Initiatives and programmes carried out by the Office without the requisite consultations with and endorsement by Member States had, in some instances, suffered from a lack of political ownership by Member States.

11. Member States expressed concern that the commissions had difficulties combining their work on substance with their role as governing bodies of UNODC. Many Member States felt that the effectiveness of the governing functions had been impeded by the fact that the commissions only met once a year, which made timely reactions and follow-up difficult. Priority tended to be given to negotiations on policy-related resolutions rather than to governance issues. Many Member States with small permanent missions and a limited number of delegates from capitals had difficulties following meetings of the Committee of the Whole and other informal working groups held in parallel to the plenary. Many Member States also felt the need to be better prepared and properly informed before taking decisions on strategic policies and financial matters. As a consequence, Member States identified that UNODC had a governance deficit.

12. Member States acknowledged the important normative and governing role of the commissions and agreed that any recommendations aimed at enhancing the governance structure of UNODC should be consistent with maintaining the role of the commissions as the policymaking bodies of UNODC. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs had the mandate to function as the governing body of UNODC and to approve, on the basis of the proposals of the Executive Director, the budget of the Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme. Similarly, the

Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice acted as the governing body of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund, which provided resources for promoting technical assistance in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice. Both commissions were attended by experts, carried out important norm-setting functions and provided standards related to drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs also carried out treaty-based normative functions that were critical to maintaining the integrity of the drug-scheduling system.

13. In that context, it was also noted that 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, for which UNODC acted as the secretariat, enhanced the role of the Member States in areas related to crime prevention and criminal justice.

14. Member States noted that most United Nations agencies had established complementary bodies dealing with budget and overarching/strategic policy issues, and that those bodies usually assisted or were subsidiary to the formal governing bodies. Due to the specific organizational and funding history of UNODC, such a body had not yet been established. In that context, Member States expressed appreciation for the effort made by the Secretariat to compare the governance structures of other United Nations agencies (for example, the non-paper prepared by the Secretariat on the governance structures of UNODC and selected United Nations entities) and agreed that the working group could benefit from studying and drawing experiences from already existing models within the United Nations system.

15. Member States stressed that correspondence should be channelled through the permanent missions in Vienna in a timely manner. Some Member States noted that all projects must be prepared only after thorough consultation with the recipient State, through official channels, and that those consultations should be documented for future reference.

16. Member States concluded that the governance of UNODC must be improved in order to ensure adequate political ownership and funding of its present and future activities, to achieve sustainable results and to safeguard the implementation of agreed mandates such as the strategy for the period 2008-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Member States also identified a need to establish regular consultations and dialogue between the secretariat and Member States.

2. Adoption of a thematic approach

17. Member States welcomed and encouraged UNODC in its efforts to adopt a thematic approach for the formulation of operational programmes and the provision of voluntary contributions, within the framework of priorities established in its strategy for the period 2008-2011. Member States expressed the view that creating thematic funding proposals not only would help to increase communication between UNODC branches, but would also provide an overall vision for the activities being undertaken in a specific region or on a specific subject matter. Thematic or pooled funding would also provide UNODC with greater flexibility, as funds for those purposes were not as highly earmarked. Larger thematic programmes would also enhance the capacity of UNODC to manage and control activities and procedures.

18. A shift towards larger thematic and regional programmes, rather than individual projects, would create incentives for donors to provide UNODC with more flexible funding. However, Member States noted that this would require UNODC to increase donors' confidence in its ability to deliver. Elaboration of such programmes in close consultation with recipient partners, as well as donors, should lead to more effective outcomes, greater regional buy-in and improved cost-sharing arrangements. Some Member States asserted that in order for thematic programming to be successful and effective, "hard" earmarking for activities or projects within a thematic programme should not be acceptable. Member States further reiterated the importance of determining technical assistance programmes in accordance with national and regional priorities.

19. Member States stated that reporting by UNODC should primarily focus on outcomes and results achieved in those thematic programmes.

3. Evaluation

20. Member States stressed the importance of reviving and supporting the Independent Evaluation Unit and of ensuring its financial and administrative independence. Many Member States stated that the staff of the Unit, as well as its activities, should be funded by regular budget resources so that the extension of contracts would not be dependent on the goodwill of UNODC senior management. The evaluation of projects could be funded by the projects themselves.

21. Many Member States underlined that the Independent Evaluation Unit should report to Member States without delay, and that the response from management could come later. The evaluation reports should be automatically made available to the commissions for consideration during their main sessions. The Joint Inspection Unit and the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) of the Secretariat should also closely monitor the performance of UNODC, and relevant Joint Inspection Unit reports and summary of relevant OIOS reports should also be submitted to the commissions.

4. The need for increased dialogue among Member States and with UNODC

22. Member States stressed the importance of a more direct and structured dialogue between recipient States and donor States, facilitated by UNODC, in order to share views on the needs and priorities of recipient States. Such a dialogue and exchange of information would also contribute to enhanced coordination among donors, thereby reducing inefficiencies and avoiding duplication of work. Member States also identified the need for dialogue between Member States and the secretariat in order to improve understanding of and confidence in UNODC. Enhanced dialogue could contribute to increased transparency in UNODC operations and to the avoidance of duplication of efforts.

5. Improving the financial situation

23. Member States took note of the extensive documentation provided by the Secretariat, in particular the recommendations contained in the report of the Executive Director on financial issues and difficulties faced by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in implementing its mandates and an initial assessment of the ways and means of improving the financial situation (E/CN.7/2008/11-

E/CN.15/2008/15), the OIOS report on inspection of programme management and administrative practices in the Office for Drugs and Crime (ODC), dated 19 March 2007, and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime financial report and audited financial statements for the biennium ended 31 December 2007 and report of the Board of Auditors General (A/63/5/Add.9).

24. Member States noted that while overall special-purpose funding had increased substantially during the previous decade, and especially over the previous two bienniums (2004-2005 and 2006-2007), there had been a decrease in general-purpose funding and little if any real growth in the UNODC regular budget over the previous four years. That had led to a situation in which the predictability and stability of funding for UNODC, in particular of general-purpose funding, had been affected, leading to challenges for UNODC in the management of its substantive work, not least by placing considerable strain on the Office's programme and programme support services in the implementation of its mandates. The rapid growth in special-purpose funding and the substantial risks in terms of financial, human resource and other management aspects accompanying such growth must be mitigated by enhanced financial, human and other management capacity along with efforts in the reallocation of financial and human resources. The current funding situation was also affecting the flexibility and ability of UNODC management to make strategic decisions. Some Member States recognized the importance of appropriately charging project costs to voluntarily funded projects in order to enable UNODC to recover, to the greatest extent possible, the costs of implementing those programmes. Programme support costs were essentially un-earmarked funds to support the proper functioning of UNODC field operations.

25. Member States acknowledged that important steps had been taken by UNODC to meet the challenges associated with its budget and funding structure.

26. Member States also noted that the Independent Evaluation Unit, OIOS, the Joint Inspection Unit, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and external auditors had presented specific recommendations in that regard.

27. Member States especially welcomed the establishment of the strategy for the period 2008-2011 for UNODC as an important medium-term planning tool, and the fact that the strategy was being harmonized with the strategic framework of the United Nations for the period 2010-2011. Member States expressed appreciation for the efforts made by the Secretariat to integrate and consolidate the presentation of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme and the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme in the consolidated budget for the biennium 2008-2009, although two distinct draft budgets were still being prepared. Member States also expressed support for the efforts made to align the consolidated budget for the biennium 2008-2009 with the strategy for the period 2008-2011 for UNODC in a result-based approach, and they looked forward to the first result-based budget performance report to be presented in March 2009.

28. Member States expressed an interest in having a sound and transparent financial basis for UNODC so that more predictable and sustainable funding for the Office could be achieved. In order for Member States to consider improving the ratio between earmarked and un-earmarked funds, and increasing general-purpose

funds, Member States underlined the importance of UNODC providing clear and transparent information on the use of funds and results attained from such use.

6. UNODC funding from the regular budget of the United Nations

29. Member States considered whether the share of the regular budget of the United Nations allocated to UNODC was adequate and discussed which measures could be taken, including by revisiting that allocation. Member States expressed that any proposed increases in the allocation would need to be carefully considered and thoroughly justified. Member States also underlined that any proposal to increase the allocation should be seen as a shared, forward-looking, gradual and long-term process. One option for Member States could be to request, through a resolution, that the Secretary-General report on how to strengthen the United Nations drug and crime programmes.

30. Some Member States supported the inclusion of phrases such as “subject to extrabudgetary resources” in resolutions passed by the commissions, the inclusion of which did not contradict the Financial Rules and Regulations of the United Nations. Other Member States stressed the need to stop using such phrases in resolutions, as such phrases impeded the biennium budget proposals of the Secretary-General from reflecting the resource levels commensurate with the mandates of UNODC and hindered the full, efficient and effective implementation of the mandates.

31. Member States stated that any proposed increases in the share of the regular budget allocation to UNODC would have to be based on a better common understanding of which functions were funded by the regular budget, which by general-purpose contributions and which by special-purpose contributions, to determine whether the level of regular budget resources and general-purpose contributions was adequate. A review should take into consideration the expanded mandate and workload of UNODC as an integrated United Nations office dealing with drug and crime issues, as well as its new role as the secretariat of both the Conference of the Parties to the Organized Crime Convention and the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention against Corruption. In that context, Member States also acknowledged that budget discipline needed to be adhered to and that a thorough examination of the structure and efficiency of UNODC needed to be conducted.

32. Member States generally agreed that vital functions within UNODC should be funded by regular budget and general-purpose funds, but acknowledged that some essential functions were currently dependent on special-purpose funds.

7. Voluntary contributions: general-purpose funds, special-purpose funds and programme support costs

33. Member States expressed support for the efforts made by UNODC to increase the amount of voluntary funding, particularly general-purpose funds, and discussed concrete steps to encourage Member States to be more forthcoming in providing general-purpose contributions.

34. Member States considered the following possible elements of an action plan to improve the funding situation of UNODC: (a) the application of a thematic approach; (b) improved reporting on outcomes; (c) a system of incentives for

Member States to provide flexible funding; (d) a broadening of the donor base; (e) voluntary commitments by donors to allocate a share of their contributions to general-purpose funding; and (f) voluntary commitments by donors to make biennial indicative pledges in line with the biennial budget cycle of UNODC.

35. In general, more transparent and outcome-oriented reporting would enhance Member States' confidence in and political ownership of UNODC activities and convince donors to maintain or increase their flexible contributions. While welcoming the efforts of the Secretariat to provide more detailed information on the use of general-purpose contributions in the consolidated budget proposal for the biennium 2008-2009, Member States underlined that UNODC should regularly provide Member States with concise information on performance and impact, with sufficient detail to allow Member States to understand the ways in which general-purpose funds were being spent. Member States also stated that it would be beneficial if reporting on the use of general-purpose funds were more clearly connected to outcomes and result areas in the strategy for the period 2008-2011 of UNODC. A single consolidated, transparent report on the use of general-purpose contributions would help counteract existing donor resistance towards making such contributions.

36. Member States discussed the possibility of introducing a system of incentives in order to stimulate Member States to be more forthcoming in making flexible contributions. Member States discussed whether UNODC should enforce strict application of the 13 per cent programme support cost rule for earmarked, special-purpose contributions to smaller projects but make application negotiable for special-purpose contributions to programmes and individual projects with substantially streamlined support and reporting requirements. Overall, an incentive structure should be created that would favour the funding of thematic programmes over individual projects.

37. Member States discussed the possibility of introducing a system of agreements by donors to commit a share of their contribution to general-purpose funding. A number of Member States were in favour of further exploring this proposal, on the basis of voluntary commitments.

38. Member States were prepared to discuss proposals to increase the predictability and stability of funding for UNODC by donor commitments to biennial indicative pledges on general-purpose and special-purpose contributions, aligned with the UNODC biennial budget cycle, on the basis of voluntary commitments, to implement its mandates according to its strategy for the period 2008-2011.

39. Member States discussed various ways to broaden the donor base by targeting developed and middle-income countries with a view to assisting UNODC in meeting its mandates.

III. Adoption of the report

40. At its fifth and final session, held on 9 March 2009, the open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime adopted its report,

including the recommendations (E/CN.7/2009/10-E/CN.15/2009/10). The representative of the United States of America disassociated himself from the consensus.

IV. Organization of the working group

A. Opening of the fifth session and information on previous sessions of the working group

41. The report of the working group was prepared by the Chairperson of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Selma Ashipala-Musavyi (Namibia), and Hans Lundborg (Sweden), in consultation with the Bureau and extended Bureau of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Acting Chairperson, the Bureau and the extended Bureau of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. The task of the working group was to implement Commission on Narcotic Drugs decision 51/1 and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice decision 17/2.

42. The working group held a total of five sessions between October 2008 and March 2009. The first session was held on 7 October 2008; the second on 10 and 11 November 2008; the third on 27 and 28 November 2008; the fourth on 30 January 2009; and the fifth and final session was held on 9 March 2009.

B. Participation

43. The following States were represented: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe. The European Commission was also represented.

C. Election of officers

44. At its first session, on 7 October 2008, the working group elected by acclamation Selma Ashipala-Musavyi (Namibia) and Hans Lundborg (Sweden) as its co-chairpersons.

D. Documentation

45. The documents before the working group are listed in the annex to the present document.

V. Closure of the fifth session of the working group

46. Closing statements were made by the representative of Argentina (speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China) and the co-chairpersons of the working group. The co-chairpersons thanked the participants for the commitment shown and for the efforts undertaken during the deliberations of the working group. They also thanked the secretariat for the cooperation and support given to the working group as it negotiated its report and the recommendations to be presented to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs at its fifty-second session and by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its eighteenth session.

Annex

List of documents before the open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

A. Background documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on the proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2010-2011 (A/63/600)

Report of the Secretary-General on the first performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/63/573)

Report of the Secretary-General on trends in contributions to operational activities for development of the United Nations system and measures to promote an adequate, predictable and expanding base of United Nations development assistance (A/63/201)

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime financial report and audited financial statements for the biennium ended 31 December 2007 and report of the Board of Auditors General (A/63/5/Add.9)

Report of the Executive Director on financial issues and difficulties faced by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in implementing its mandates and an initial assessment of the ways and means of improving the financial situation (E/CN.7/2008/11-E/CN.15/2008/15)

Report of the Executive Director on programmes and initiatives to be implemented by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in the bienniums 2008-2009 and 2010-2011 (E/CN.7/2008/12-E/CN.15/2008/16)

Note by the Secretariat on resolutions and decisions relating to the drug programme of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime adopted in the period 2003-2007 in which action by the Office was requested (E/CN.7/2008/13)

Note by the Secretariat on resolutions and decisions relating to crime prevention and criminal justice adopted in the period 2003-2007 in which action by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime was requested (E/CN.15/2008/18)

Report of the Executive Director on deviations from the standard programme support charge of 13 per cent during the period 2005-2007 (E/CN.7/2008/14-E/CN.15/2008/19)

Report of the Executive Director on the consolidated budget for the biennium 2008-2009 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (E/CN.7/2007/17-E/CN.15/2007/18)

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/62/6 (Sect. 16))

Report of the Secretary-General on strengthening the role of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (E/CN.15/2006/16 and Corr.1)

Note by the Secretary-General on strengthening the United Nations machinery for drug control (E/CN.7/1999/5)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the inspection of programme management and administrative practices in the Office for Drugs and Crime (MEDC-2006-003)

B. Documentation prepared by the Secretariat at the request of Member States to facilitate the discussions of the working group

Non-paper by the Financial Resources Management Service of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime containing detailed information on posts and functions as at 1 December 2008 (10 December 2008)

Note by the Secretariat on the UNODC Regional Programmes (4 December 2008)

Briefing note on the position of general-purpose funds as at 31 October 2008 (19 November 2008)

Non-paper by the Financial Resources Management Service containing information on the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, including an organizational chart and detailed staffing requirements for the biennium 2008-2009, with functional titles (Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme and the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund; posts funded from general-purpose funds and programme support cost funds) (18 November 2008)

Non-paper by the Financial Resources Management Service on programme evaluation and the Independent Evaluation Unit (11 November 2008)

Non-paper by the Financial Resources Management Service containing information on regular budget resources allocated to the United Nations Office at Vienna and UNODC, and detailed information on the staffing of UNODC (31 October 2008)

Non-paper by the Financial Resources Management Service on strengthening the management and backstopping of field operations at UNODC (31 October 2008)

Non-paper by the Financial Resources Management Service on core activities and functions of UNODC (7 October 2008)

Non-paper by the Secretariat on the governance structures of UNODC and selected United Nations entities (7 October 2008)

Presentation by the Financial Resources Management Service on the budget cycle of the United Nations and UNODC (1 October 2008)

Presentation by the Financial Resources Management Service to the working group on governance and funding (11 September 2008)