

19 May 2011

English only

Implementation Review Group**Second session**

Vienna, 30 May-3 June 2011

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

**Resources and expenditures for the functioning of the
Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the
United Nations Convention against Corruption****Note prepared by the Secretariat****Introduction**

1. In its resolution 3/1, entitled “Review Mechanism”, the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption underlined that the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption requires a budget that ensures its efficient, continued and impartial functioning. In line with this resolution, the General Assembly, in its resolution 64/237 of 31 March 2010, requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention was adequately funded, in line with resolution 3/1.
2. As requested by the Implementation Review Group, the Secretariat is hereby submitting budgetary information to the Implementation Review Group, in particular an outline of actual expenditures incurred at the time of writing this paper for the first year of the functioning of the Review Mechanism (taking into consideration that most of the country reviews of the first year are not finalised yet) and indications on estimated costs for the biennium 2012-2013.
3. Detailed expenditures for the complete first year of the Review Mechanism as well as more accurate estimates for the biennium 2012-2013 will be provided at the reconvened session of the Implementation Review Group in September 2011 and at the fifth session of the Conference of the States parties in October 2011.



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

4. In paragraph 17 of resolution 64/237 of 31 March 2010, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue to provide the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime with the resources necessary to enable it to promote, in an effective manner, the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption and to discharge its functions as the secretariat of the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention. The Assembly also requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the new mechanism for the review of implementation of the Convention was adequately funded, in line with resolution 3/1 of the Conference.

5. The budgetary requirements of the Secretariat and the Review Mechanism to be funded from the regular budget were established as follows in the report of the Second Committee on preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (document A/64/422/Add.2) and the relevant report of its Fifth Committee (document A/64/599):

(a) 1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 1 General Service posts; staff assessment and related general operating expenses (Computer maintenance and Communication costs) — USD 1,689,300 gross (USD 1,460,000 net);

(b) Interpretation in six languages and conference servicing for one meeting of the Implementation Review Group of ten days duration per year and translation of 100 pages of documentation in six languages per year — USD 789,000.

6. The General Assembly approved those requirements on 24 December 2009 (resolution 64/237) and included them in the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

7. In particular, additional resources were made available under section 16, International drug control, crime and terrorism prevention and criminal justice, section 28F, Administration, Vienna, and section 36, Staff assessment, the latter being offset by the same amount under Income section 1, Income from staff assessment, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

8. With regard to the Implementation Review Group, provision had been made for 40 meetings of the Implementation Review Group, that is, 20 meetings per year, as well as for the processing of the related reports and background documentation under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

II. Additional extrabudgetary requirements for the biennium 2010-2011

9. Additional requirements for the Review Mechanism for the biennium 2010-2011 included costs of communication and translation from and into

working language or languages of the Mechanism designated for individual reviews, travel and daily subsistence allowance for representatives of least developed countries to attend the annual meetings of the Implementation Review Group, training and general operating expenses, as well as country visits and joint meetings in Vienna, and translation and interpretation into languages other than the six working languages of the Mechanism, if requested by the State party under review.

10. With regard to these requirements, the Secretary-General, as requested by the Conference, proposed to the Implementation Review Group for consideration and decision at its first meeting (Vienna 28 June to 2 July 2010), further means for funding the Review Mechanism in its “Note of the Secretary-General on resource requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for the bienniums 2010-2011 and 2012-2013” (CAC/COSP/IRG/2010/5).

11. The additional budgetary requirements to be funded from extrabudgetary resources for the biennium 2010-2011 were estimated as follows, for a total of USD 3,260,000:

(a) Travel of 5 participants per country visit for 40 countries and payment of daily subsistence allowances — USD 678,000;

(b) Translation of the self-assessment checklist and pertinent supporting material in 2 languages, based on 4,000 pages — USD 1,787,400;

(c) Travel to the sessions of the Implementation Review Group of representatives of least developed countries (31) parties to the Convention and payment of 14 days daily subsistence allowances, based on one session per year — USD 459,000;

(d) Training of governmental experts taking part in the review process in 2010 and 2011 — USD 267,800;

(e) General operating expenses for conference calls and videoconferences — USD 67,800.

III. Voluntary contributions received to cover the additional requirements for the biennium 2010-2011

12. Since the beginning of 2010, the Secretariat has made considerable efforts to raise funds for the additional requirements of the Review Mechanism through voluntary contributions, by repeatedly sending out funding proposals as well as by organizing a donor briefing in Vienna, in addition to presenting the funding shortfall at various other forums.

13. In its Resolution 1/1, adopted on 2 July 2010, the Implementation Review Group welcomed the voluntary contributions which had been received until that time, which covered partially these requirements of the Mechanism for the biennium 2010-2011. It also requested UNODC in accordance with the Terms of Reference of the Mechanism to continue to seek voluntary contributions to cover those costs of the Mechanism not covered by the regular budget of the United Nations.

14. To date, voluntary contributions have been received from Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Qatar, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In-kind contributions have also been provided by Portugal and the Russian Federation.

15. The voluntary contributions received so far thus cover most of the additional operational requirements of the Mechanism for the biennium 2010-2011 as listed under part II of this document, with a current shortfall of USD 700,000.

IV. Expenditures for the first year of the functioning of the Mechanism

16. At the time of writing, the final stages of the country review process, i.e. drafting of country review reports and executive summaries as well as agreement to these are ongoing in most cases. It is therefore too early to give an indication of the exact final costs, which will be provided at the reconvened session of the Implementation Review Group in September 2011 and at the fifth session of the Conference of the States parties in October 2011. An overview of issues and delays relating to the first year of the work of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, some of which have a financial impact and are mentioned hereunder, is presented in the "Note by the Secretariat on Country reviews: Lessons learned from year 1 of the current review cycle" (CAC/COSP/IRG/2011/2). The figures included in this part of the document are estimates only.

17. The information hereunder highlights the main trends with regard to the different budgetary requirements financed through voluntary contributions. The secretariat will provide an oral update on the expenditures to the Implementation Review Group.

Participation of least developed countries Parties to the Convention in the meetings of the Implementation Review Group

18. The costs of travel and daily subsistence allowance were covered for 26 representatives of least developed countries Parties to the Convention to enable them to participate in the first session of the Implementation Review Group, which took place in Vienna from 28 June to 2 July 2010 as well as in the reconvened first session which also took place in Vienna from 29 November to 1 December 2010, for a total of approximately USD 200,000. The delegates came from Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mozambique, the Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia.

19. Similar arrangements are in place for the second session of the Implementation Review Group, with additional support provided to three additional least developed countries Parties to the Convention, namely Bangladesh, Nepal and Timor-Leste.

Training of governmental experts

20. In accordance with the terms of reference of the Review Mechanism and the guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat, UNODC organized training workshops to familiarize focal points of States parties under review and governmental experts of reviewing States parties with the substantive provisions of the Convention and the methodology of the review process. These workshops were based on a regional and linguistic distribution of States. Seven workshops were held, in Dakar, Panama, Rabat, Moscow, Vienna, Jakarta and Pretoria. A last ad hoc workshop was organized during the week of the resumed session of the Implementation Review Group for States parties that were unable to attend any of the other workshops, thus ensuring that all States parties under review and reviewing States parties had an opportunity for training.

21. The initial cost estimates for training of experts were based on 30 experts from developing countries participating each year. However, following requests from States parties, the costs of one expert per country under review and two experts per reviewing country were covered through voluntary contributions, bringing the total number to 227, thus increasing the actual costs to approximately USD 260,000.

22. Although a regional and linguistic distribution of States was favoured for the different training workshops, interpretation costs had to be covered in four of the trainings.

23. As a follow-up to the training workshops organized pursuant to the terms of reference, several States parties under review requested further assistance from the secretariat to complete the self-assessment, as foreseen by paragraph 15 of the guidelines. The availability of national training opportunities on the self-assessment checklist for States parties under review might be considered by the Implementation Review Group in view of its mandate regarding technical assistance for the implementation of the Convention.

24. The Secretariat is currently seeking ways to continue to provide the mandated training more efficiently. For the second year of the Review Mechanism, the actual costs may be reduced by organizing training workshops in parallel with the sessions of the Implementation Review Group. One factor under consideration is that organising workshops in Vienna will reduce travel of the Secretariat while enabling more Secretariat staff to be available during the workshops.

Video and telephone conference costs

25. With regard to video and telephone conference costs, the actual costs will most likely be reduced by favouring telephone conferences over videoconferences, but also by organizing face-to-face initial conferences and joint meetings in parallel with the training workshops, the resumed session of the Implementation Review Group as well as the meetings of the working groups on asset recovery and on prevention, whenever focal points and governmental experts are present at such events.

Translation of documentation

26. In accordance with paragraph 51 of the terms of reference, “[t]he country review process may be conducted in any of the working languages of the

Mechanism. The secretariat shall be responsible for providing the required translation and interpretation into any of the working languages of the Mechanism, as necessary for its efficient functioning.” Individual country reviews were expected to require some translation of documentation (including responses to the self-assessment checklist and pertinent supporting material) from one official language into another and vice versa. It was initially estimated that an average 4,000 pages per biennium (2,000 pages per year) from one language into another would need to be translated.

27. From the 26 country reviews conducted in the first year of the review cycle, ten were conducted in one language, fourteen in two languages, and two in three languages. While the translation of the complete response to the self-assessment checklist was ensured, States parties under review were requested to select most relevant supporting documents to be submitted for translation as well.

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

29. In several cases, the complete responses to the UNCAC self-assessment checklist as well as numerous supporting documents had to be translated from one working language into one or two other working languages, exceeding by far the initial estimates (at the date of writing, already 5,000 pages for year 1 only).

30. Translation requirements had to be accommodated throughout the review process. In addition to the translation of the response to the self-assessment checklist of the supporting documents and of the final country review report, translation and interpretation were provided during the desk review for comments submitted by reviewing States parties as well as in the ensuing dialogue with the State party under review. Where requested, the draft country review report and executive summary were also translated into the working languages of the country review before being approved and finalized.

31. The increased number of pages and the various language combinations created bottlenecks both in terms of human and financial resources. The translation capacity of the Conference Management Service of the United Nations Office in Vienna would not have guaranteed a timely delivery of the translated documents within one month after receipt of the checklist. In addition, voluntary contributions were insufficient to cover the additional translation requirements at the official United Nations standard translation rates.

32. In order to accelerate the translation, and to reduce the overall costs, it was therefore decided to outsource the translations of the responses to the self-assessment checklist and of relevant supporting documents through the UNODC field office network. At the time of writing, the translation costs were approximately USD 250,000.

Country visits and other means of active dialogue

33. In terms of the country visits and joints meetings in Vienna, the initial cost estimates submitted to the Implementation Review Group were based on the assumption that country visits or joint meetings would be requested in

approximately half of the reviews. The initial estimates were therefore based on 40 country visits per biennium (20 per year).

34. This assumption proved not to be accurate in the first year of the first cycle, with most countries requesting either a country visit or joint meeting in Vienna. Indeed, at the time of reporting, twenty States parties under review had requested a country visit and one State party had requested a joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna, in accordance with paragraphs 29 of the terms of reference and 24 of the guidelines. In five cases, the State party under review had not taken a decision as to the means of further dialogue.

35. The initial estimates were also based on a duration of three days for each country visit or joint meeting. Indeed, country visits lasted on average of three to four days. Debriefings with the reviewing experts and the Secretariat and with the focal point where appropriate, were very useful to prepare the meetings and to gather information after the meetings with a view to compiling and completing the draft country review report. In several cases, additional costs were incurred for such coordination time prior and after the meetings as well as for travel days.

36. In the initial estimate, five participants (including governmental experts from developing countries and Secretariat staff) were expected to travel. During the organization of the country visits, when required and within available resources, the participation of up to two governmental experts per reviewing State party was funded. The costs were/are covered for experts from developing countries and Least Developed Countries, as well as for some participants from countries from the Eastern European group on a case-by-case basis. In addition, due to the breadth of the chapters under review and the detailed analysis that became quickly the norm in the reviews, it was decided to have two staff from the Secretariat travelling for each country visit, in order to provide appropriate and timely substantive support to the States parties, as well as to take care of administrative and logistic arrangements. For each country visit, up to six participants (including two governmental experts from each reviewing State party and two Secretariat staff) therefore participated.

37. At the time of writing, the expenditures incurred for the country visits were approximately USD 300,000 for the thirteen country visits that had taken place and one joint meeting in Vienna. While reviewing States parties were generally represented by one or two governmental experts each during country visits, some countries financed the participation of additional experts through their own resources.

V. Resource requirements for the biennium 2012-2013

38. The following outputs of the mechanism are foreseen for the biennium 2012-2013:

- (a) Analysis of self-assessment responses and supplementary information (80 per biennium);
- (b) Analysis of country reports and preparation of executive summaries of country reports (80 per biennium);
- (c) Preparation of thematic reports and regional addenda (12 per biennium);

- (d) List of experts participating in the review process, updated annually (up to 15 experts each of a current total of 151 parties);
- (e) Technical assistance needs matrix, updated annually;
- (f) Pool of experts for the provision of technical assistance;
- (g) Database of competent authorities, asset recovery focal points and central authorities;
- (h) Country visits (40 per biennium);
- (i) Training of experts (10 workshops per biennium).

39. The overall budgetary requirements for the implementation of the request contained in paragraph 17 of General Assembly resolution 64/237 for the biennium 2012-2013 were presented in the “Note prepared by the Secretariat on Resources and expenditures for the functioning of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption” (CAC/COSP/IRG/2010/CRP.11).

40. Based on experience gained, challenges identified and lessons learned in the first year of the functioning of the Review Mechanism, which the Secretariat will continue to compile and analyse in the coming months, the Secretariat will need to revise these estimates and/or provide new estimates to the Conference of the States Parties for its consideration and approval.

41. In the Note by the Secretariat on the financial implications of the proposed Review Mechanism of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (CAC/COSP/2009/11) presented to the Conference of the States parties at its fourth session in Doha, in November 2009, the estimated staffing requirements have been established based on assumptions detailed in the mentioned document. On this basis, it had been estimated that the mechanism would require 10 new posts as follows: 1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4, 1 P-3, 3 P-2 and 2 General Service (Other level).

42. These additional posts created for the biennium 2010-2011 are fulfilling core secretariat functions for the substantive and technical servicing of the Conference and its three established working groups (planning, coordination, management and backstopping of technical assistance delivery; legal analysis; coordination with United Nations system entities and external partner entities; input for policy development; substantive servicing of intergovernmental bodies; etc.), and in particular support to the first 26 States parties under review in the first year.

43. Based on the experience and lessons learned gathered during the first year of functioning of the Review Mechanism, such functions will need to be further strengthened in the biennium 2012-2013, where 80 Member States will be under review over that period, while follow-up activities related to the analysis of the needs identified through the Review Mechanism will need to take place simultaneously. It is envisaged that three additional new posts would therefore be needed.

44. As the first year of the Implementation Review cycle will be completed by mid-2011 and the second year by mid-2012, the Secretariat will need to analyse the technical assistance needs as identified through the Review Mechanism and devise strategies (together with relevant partners and donors) for a coordinated

implementation of technical assistance activities/projects/programmes — as mandated in particular by resolution 3/4 on technical assistance of the Conference of the States Parties to UNCAC.

45. An additional post of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer (P3) would (together with the P4 position already existing) enable the Secretariat to implement the mandate received from the Conference of the States Parties, in particular in its resolution 3/4, to analyse the technical assistance needs as identified through the Review Mechanism; contribute to defining and monitoring the implementation of strategies (together with relevant partners and donors) for a coordinated implementation of technical assistance activities/projects/programmes; participate in joint programming activities; forge partnerships with assistance providers as well as the public and private sectors and further develop its database of anti-corruption experts in charge of delivering technical assistance.

46. One new GS (OL) post would support the staff involved in the analysis of technical assistance needs and follow-up activities, through a wide range of office support and administrative functions such as, assisting in the verification of receipt and accuracy of documents, approvals, signatures, etc.; generating a variety of standard statistical and financial reports, etc.; updating and maintaining large distribution lists; monitoring, preparing and distributing various materials and reports; handling arrangement for printing and translation as necessary; researching, compiling and organizing information and reference materials from various sources for reports, workplans, studies, briefings, meetings/conferences, etc.

47. Assistance provided by the Secretariat to Member States for the ratification and/or implementation of UNCAC, including through the Review Mechanism, is supported by several tools and databases (many of them IT-based) which include:

(a) The UNCAC self-assessment checklist, a user-friendly computer-based application to assess compliance with the Convention (developed acting upon the mandates received from the Conference of the States Parties to UNCAC in its resolutions 1/2, 2/1 and 3/1). States Parties use the checklist during the Implementation Review Process, but also as a tool for gap analysis outside the Implementation Review;

(b) The database of governmental experts appointed by each State Party to UNCAC for the purpose of the implementation review process;

(c) The anti-corruption technical assistance expert database, a directory of anti-corruption expertise which can be drawn on by UNODC, other multilateral and bilateral technical assistance providers and countries seeking specific anti-corruption expertise (resolution 1/5 of the COSP as well as decision CAC/COSP/WG.3/2008/3 of the Working Group on Technical Assistance);

(d) The Legal Library and the Knowledge Management Consortium, which consolidate corruption-related information and knowledge, including anti-corruption laws related to the requirements of UNCAC, strategies, regulations, administrative practices and court cases, on a country-by-country basis. Such information will be provided to the reviewing experts to assist their work under the Review Mechanism (supported by the Conference of the States Parties in its resolutions 2/1 and 3/4 and by the Working Group on Asset Recovery, which repeatedly refers to both tools as a

valuable repository of data and analytical information in its conclusions and recommendations);

(e) The Mutual Legal Assistance Request Writer Tool, a software application which has been designed to provide guidance to practitioners through each step of the drafting process of an MLA request;

(f) The anti-corruption e-learning tool, an interactive web-based programme designed to feature the relevance of UNCAC to the corporate community.

48. In order to allow the Secretariat to further develop and maintain the different tools (including IT tools) supporting its work and the Review Mechanism in particular, it is also proposed to create a third post, at the GS (OL) level. This post would assist in developing and maintaining the mentioned tools; in answering requests from Member States using the different tools; in testing and evaluating new tools and technologies and making recommendations on the adaptation of such tools to the immediate supervisor; and in training users on developed systems and in preparing user documentation.

49. With regard to the Implementation Review Group (1 meeting of 10 days duration per year), the amount of \$395,400 required for the biennium in order to hold one session per year of the Implementation Review Group, as well as the amount of \$ 2,214,240 for the biennium required for the translation into all six official languages of 560 pages of documentation per year for the sessions (including the executive summaries of country review reports (40*10 pages) the thematic reports (2*16 pages), the regional reports (5*16 pages) and other background documents (3*16 pages)) would be needed. This reflects an increase in the number of pages to be translated (from an estimated 100 pages for a cost of USD 395, 400 for the biennium 2010-2011) based on the experience and lessons learned in the first year of the Review Mechanism. This would represent an increase in the resource requirements of the Conference Management Service of the United Nations at Vienna.

50. Additionally, and with reference to paragraph 47.d above (on the mandates for TRACK), an amount of USD 380,000 would be required to cover the costs of the hosting and maintenance of UNODC Knowledge Management Consortium and Legal Library, based on the estimates provided by the Information Technology Service of the United Nations Office at Vienna.

51. At this stage, as mentioned in paragraphs 20 to 24 (training of governmental experts), additional resources would be needed to cover the additional requests from States parties, if it is decided to further cover the costs of one expert per country under review and two experts per reviewing country, as this goes beyond the initial estimates to cover the costs of only 30 governmental experts per workshop. Additional resources would also be needed to provide further assistance at the national level to States parties under review which request it in order to complete the self-assessment, as foreseen by paragraph 15 of the guidelines.

52. As mentioned in paragraphs 33 to 37 (country visits and joint meetings), additional resources would also be needed if most of the countries under review in the second and third years of the first cycle request a country visit or a joint meeting in Vienna.

VI. Recommendations for funding of the overall requirements for the biennium 2012-2013

53. In view of the difficulties encountered in raising the additional resources required for the operationalization of the Mechanism in the Biennium 2010-2011, the Implementation Review Group recommended in its resolution 1/1 that the budgetary requirements of the Mechanism and its secretariat be funded from the regular budget of the United Nations in accordance with the terms of reference annexed to resolution 3/1 for the biennium 2012-2013.

54. It also requested the Secretary-General to include in his proposals for the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 the budgetary requirements necessary for the full functioning of the Mechanism, including posts and related general operating expenses, costs of communication and translation from and into working language or languages of the Mechanism designated for individual reviews, functioning of the Group, and the participation of least developed countries in its meetings in accordance with the estimates included in document CAC/COSP/IRG/2010/5, but excluding the line items proposed on country visits and training, submitted to the Implementation Review Group at its first session.

55. The resource requirements anticipated to arise during 2012-2013 from the developments detailed in part V of this document will be put forward once the recommendation of the Implementation Review Group is approved by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption at its fourth session in November 2011. If the Conference of the States Parties recommends that the requirements for the full functioning of the mechanism and its secretariat be funded from the regular budget of the United Nations, a draft resolution will be presented to the General Assembly at its sixty-sixth session for it to decide on the appropriateness of resorting to the regular budget for this purpose.

56. If insufficient resources were made available from the regular budget, and if the additional requirements of the Review Mechanism and its secretariat for 2012-2013 were to be funded through voluntary contributions, there can be no guarantee that a sufficient level of voluntary contributions would be received to ensure that the requirements of the mechanism were met. As the experience to date in trying to raise funds for the mechanism has demonstrated, voluntary contributions are unpredictable, and without a minimum level of funding being provided, it might not be possible to ensure successful reviews. The Implementation Review Group may thus wish to encourage States parties to take urgent action in this regard.

57. Furthermore, during its first meeting, the Implementation Review Group stressed the urgent need for timely action with regard to advocating for additional resources for the biennium 2012-2013; it also suggested holding a number of informal consultations to consider the resource requirements for the functioning of the Review Mechanism for the biennium 2012-2013 and developing a plan of action. The Implementation Review Group may also wish to encourage States parties to take urgent action in this regard as well.

58. Additionally, as a result of the country reviews, detailed information on technical assistance requirements and priorities of developing countries will be made available through the technical assistance matrix. This information has the

potential to ensure more streamlined, coherent and consistent technical assistance programming, which would support countries in filling the gaps identified by the reviews and action plans developed as a follow-up to the reviews. Funds will need to be provided for technical assistance activities to meet the needs identified by countries in respect of the implementation of the Convention.

59. The Implementation Review Group may wish to make recommendations on the way forward in terms of ensuring that the growing demands of reviewed States parties are met and that a broad set of technical assistance responses/activities is available to those States parties which request it.

60. So far, only one country has indicated that it is contemplating to earmark a significant amount of funds for the implementation of technical assistance activities over a period of three years. Such multi-year contributions will enable a continuous and flexible support to those States parties which request assistance and contribute to ensure that relevant needs are met.

61. The Implementation Review Group may wish to consider recommending to the Conference of the States Parties ways and means to ensure the provision of technical assistance to meet requirements identified through the Review Mechanism.

62. In considering this issue, the Implementation Review Group may wish to take into account the desirability and means of ensuring a strategic alignment of donors' activities. Further the Implementation Review Group may wish to consider ways of ensuring the predictability of funding (in line with, inter alia, the Mutual Accountability principle of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness agenda) while allowing for the necessary implementation flexibility.