



**Assembly of States Parties**

Distr.: General  
4 November 2013

Original: English

---

**Twelfth session**

The Hague, 20-28 November 2013

**Report of the Committee on Budget and Finance  
on the work of its twenty-first session**

*Content*

	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction .....	1-12	4
A. Opening of the session, adoption of the agenda and organization of work .....	7-11	4
B. Participation of observers .....	12	6
II. Consideration of issues on the agenda of the Committee at its twenty-first session .....	13-170	6
A. Financial and budgetary matters.....	13-95	6
1. Status of contributions .....	13-14	6
2. States in arrears.....	15-16	6
3. Working Capital Fund (WCF) .....	17-21	6
4. Contingency Fund .....	22-27	7
5. International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) .....	28-34	8
6. Analytic Accountability project.....	35-36	8
7. Replacement of capital investment .....	37-38	9
8. Multi-year funding project (transition programme).....	39-42	9
9. Financial performance data as at 30 June 2013 (second quarter).....	43-54	10
10. Consideration of the 2014 proposed programme budget .....	55-95	11
(a) General recommendations for the 2014 proposed programme budget.....	55	11
(b) Assumptions and activities for 2014.....	56-58	11
(c) Presentation and macro analysis .....	59-61	11
(d) Major programmes.....	62-95	11
i. Major Programme I: Judiciary.....	62-66	11
ii. Major Programme II: Office of the Prosecutor.....	67-78	12
iii. Major Programme III: Registry .....	79-85	14
iv. Major Programme IV: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties.....	86-91	15
v. Major Programme VII-5: Independent Oversight Mechanism (IOM)....	92-95	16
B. Administrative matters .....	96-109	16
1. Organizational structure of the Court.....	96-100	16
2. Procurement .....	101	17
3. Administrative Instructions for investment of liquid funds .....	102-103	17
4. Junior Professional Officer programme (JPO).....	104-105	17
5. Retirement age .....	106-109	18
C. Audit matters .....	110-132	18
1. Audit reports .....	110-132	18
(a) Financial statements of the Court for the period 1 January to 31 December 2012 ..	110-123	18
<i>Accrued liabilities</i> .....	112-123	19
(b) Financial statements of the Trust Fund for Victims for the period 1 January to 31 December 2012.....	124-125	20
(c) Report of the Office of Internal Audit (OIA) and the Audit Committee .....	126-132	20
D. Legal aid.....	133-138	21

	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
E.	Premises of the Court .....	139-162 21
1.	Overview.....	139-141 21
2.	Status of the project .....	142 22
3.	A unified project .....	143 22
4.	Transition costs .....	144-148 22
	Background.....	144 22
	Funding of transition costs.....	145 22
	<i>Proposal of the Oversight Committee</i> .....	145 22
	Observations of the Committee.....	146 23
	<i>Budget relief</i> .....	147 23
	<i>Financial envelope</i> .....	148 23
5.	Review of “2gy” costs .....	149-151 23
6.	Enhanced conference capacity .....	152-154 24
	Report of the Oversight Committee.....	152 24
	Observations of the Committee.....	153 24
	One-time payments.....	154 24
7.	Working Group on the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) .....	155 24
8.	Interim premises lease contract.....	156-162 24
	Background.....	156 24
	The Court’s report.....	157 25
	<i>Termination dates</i> .....	158 25
	<i>Financial risks</i> .....	159 25
	<i>Strategy</i> .....	160 25
	Observations of the Committee.....	161-162 25
F.	Trust Fund for Victims.....	163-165 26
1.	Risk management policy.....	163-165 26
G.	Other matters .....	166-170 26
1.	Intermediaries .....	166-168 26
2.	Documentation submitted to the Committee on Budget and Finance .....	169 26
3.	Future meetings of the Committee.....	170 26
Annex I:	List of documents .....	27
Annex II:	Status of contributions as at 13 September 2013.....	28
Annex III:	List of potential developments which could impact on the 2014 proposed programme budget .....	32
Annex IV:	Requests to access the Contingency Fund – 2013.....	33
Annex V:	Budgetary implications of the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee on Budget and Finance.....	34

## I. Introduction

1. The Committee on Budget and Finance (“the Committee”) conducted its examination of the 2014 proposed programme budget on the basis of the general principle of budgetary integrity.
2. The Committee recalled that, for the 2013 budget year, the Assembly of States Parties (“the Assembly”) at its eleventh session had approved appropriations totalling €15.62 million, of which €15.12 million for the regular budget and €0.50 million to replenish the Contingency Fund.<sup>1</sup>
3. The Committee noted that, up until August 2013, it had received seven notifications from the International Criminal Court (“the Court”) to access the Contingency Fund, for amounts totalling €7.21 million.
4. The Committee noted that the 2014 proposed programme budget represented an increase of €10.95 million (9.5 per cent) over the 2013 approved budget.
5. After reviewing the 2014 proposed programme budget and the justifications provided, the Committee concluded that total additional savings could be achieved in the amount of €4.52 million. If approved, the adjusted 2014 proposed programme budget would then amount to €21.55 million.
6. The budgetary implications, calculated by the Court, of implementing the Committee’s recommendations are set out in annex V.

### A. Opening of the session, adoption of the agenda and organization of work

7. The twenty-first session of the Committee was convened in accordance with the decision of the Assembly taken at the 8<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting, on 21 November 2012, of its eleventh session, from 14 to 22 November 2012, and the further decision of the Committee on its dates, taken on 26 April 2013. The session, comprising 20 meetings, was held from 9 to 19 September 2013. The President of the Court, Judge Sang-Hyun Song, delivered welcoming remarks at the opening of the session.
8. In accordance with rule 13 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, the Committee appointed Mr. Hugh Adsett (Canada) as Rapporteur. The Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties (“the Secretariat”) provided the substantive servicing for the Committee, and the Executive Secretary to the Committee on Budget and Finance, Mr. Fakhri Dajani, acted as the Secretary of the Committee.
9. The following members attended the twenty-first session of the Committee:
  - 1) Hugh Adsett (Canada)
  - 2) David Banyanka (Burundi)
  - 3) Carolina María Fernández Opazo (Mexico)
  - 4) Gilles Finkelstein (France)
  - 5) Fawzi A. Gharaibeh (Jordan)
  - 6) Samuel P.O. Itam (Sierra Leone)
  - 7) Juhani Lemmik (Estonia)
  - 8) Mónica Sánchez (Ecuador)
  - 9) Gerd Saupe (Germany)
  - 10) Ugo Sessi (Italy)
  - 11) Elena Sopková (Slovakia)
  - 12) Masatoshi Sugiura (Japan)

---

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Eleventh session, The Hague, 14-22 November 2012 (ICC-ASP/11/20)*, vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/11/Res.1, section E.

10. At its 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Committee adopted the following agenda (CBF/21/1):
- 1) Opening of the session, adoption of the agenda and organization of work
  - 2) Participation of officials and observers
  - 3) Financial and budgetary matters:
    - (a) States in arrears
    - (b) Working Capital Fund
    - (c) Contingency Fund
    - (d) International Public Sector Accounting Standards
    - (e) Replacement of capital investment
    - (f) Multi-year funding project (transition programme)
    - (g) Financial performance data as of 30 June 2013
    - (h) Consideration of the 2014 proposed programme budget
  - 4) Administrative matters:
    - (a) Organizational structure
    - (b) Procurement
    - (c) Administrative Instruction for investment of liquid funds
    - (d) Junior Professional Officer programme
    - (e) Retirement age
  - 5) Audit matters:
    - (a) Audit reports:
      - (i) Financial statements of the International Criminal Court for the period 1 January to 31 December 2012
      - (ii) Financial statements of the Trust Fund for Victims for the period 1 January to 31 December 2012
      - (iii) Report of the Office of Internal Audit
    - (b) Audit Committee.
  - 6) Legal aid
  - 7) Premises of the Court:
    - (a) Transition programme
    - (b) Total Cost of Ownership
    - (c) Review of 2gv costs
    - (d) Interim premises lease contract
  - 8) Trust Fund for Victims:
    - (a) Risk management policy
  - 9) Other matters:
    - (a) Intermediaries
    - (b) Organization of the Secretariat
    - (c) Future meetings of the Committee

11. The following major programmes of the Court were invited to participate in the meetings of the Committee to introduce the reports: the Presidency, the Office of the Prosecutor (OTP), the Registry and the Trust Fund for Victims. Furthermore, the budget facilitator, Ambassador Werner Druml (Austria) and the legal aid facilitator, Ambassador

Gyula Sümeghy (Hungary) of The Hague Working Group of the Bureau of the Assembly and the Chairman of the Oversight Committee on Permanent Premises (“Oversight Committee”) Mr. Roberto Bellelli, made presentations to the Committee. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the presentations.

## **B. Participation of observers**

12. The Committee decided to accept the request of the Coalition for the International Criminal Court to make a presentation to the Committee. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the presentation.

## **II. Consideration of issues on the agenda of the Committee at its twenty-first session**

### **A. Financial and budgetary matters**

#### **1. Status of contributions**

13. The Committee reviewed the status of contributions as at 13 September 2013 (annex-II) and noted that €102,882,641 had been paid for the regular budget, and €449,537 had been paid for the replenishment of the Contingency Fund pursuant to resolution ICC-ASP/11/Res.1, section F. At the same date, outstanding contributions from previous years stood at €336,025, outstanding contributions for 2013 at €9,157,083, and outstanding contributions for the replenishment of the Contingency Fund at €50,463, making a total of €9,543,571 in outstanding contributions.

14. In addition, the Committee noted with appreciation that, as at 13 September 2013, 91.82 per cent of contributions due in 2013 had been paid, recalling that at the same date in 2012, only 78.1 per cent had been paid and just 68 States had fully paid all their contributions. **The Committee urged all States Parties to make best efforts to ensure that the Court had sufficient funds throughout the year, in accordance with regulation 5.6 of the Financial Regulations and Rules (FRR).**

#### **2. States in arrears**

15. According to article 112, paragraph 8 of the Rome Statute, “a State Party which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions toward the costs of the Court shall have no vote in the Assembly and in the Bureau if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years.”

16. The Committee recognised that, as at 13 September 2013, nine States Parties were in arrears in an amount equal to or exceeding two full years of contributions and were therefore ineligible to vote. The Committee noted that the Secretariat had informed the States Parties in arrears on 27 June 2013 of the minimum payment required to avoid application of article 112, paragraph 8 of the Rome Statute, and of the procedure for requesting an exemption from the loss of voting rights. **The Committee requested the Secretariat to notify again States Parties in arrears. The Committee recommended that all States Parties in arrears settle their accounts with the Court as soon as possible.**

#### **3. Working Capital Fund (WCF)**

17. The WCF was established in accordance with Regulation 6.2 of the FRR of the Court to ensure sufficient capital for the Court to meet short-term liquidity problems pending receipt of assessed contributions. Since 2008, the amount of the WCF has been fixed at €7.4 million.

18. In its report to the Committee, the Court again drew attention to the fact that this amount would be insufficient to cover its day-to-day operations<sup>2</sup> if there should be a repeat of the 2011 situation and a significant delay in the receipt of contributions.<sup>3</sup>

19. The Committee examined monthly cash balances over the period from 2011 to 2013. It noted that the Court recognized that cash balance variations were mainly driven by incoming contributions, as the majority of the Court's expenses were linear (reflecting monthly payroll costs) and thus do not have an unpredictable effect on cash flow.

20. The Committee noted that, according to the information currently before it, the Court had never had to draw on the WCF. The Committee considered that the Court had the necessary resources to cover its liquidity needs. The Committee recalled its earlier recommendation that the Court, when entering into a contractual relationship, look into the possibility of postponing any financial obligations until later in the financial year, in order to lower the liquidity risks during the first months of the year.<sup>4</sup>

**21. The Committee recommended that the Assembly maintain the WCF at its current level.**

#### **4. Contingency Fund**

22. As at 1 January 2013, the opening balance of the Contingency Fund stood at €7.5 million. Pursuant to the Assembly resolution ICC-ASP/11/Res.1, the fund was replenished with €500,000.

23. Up until the end of August 2013, the Court submitted seven notifications to access the Contingency Fund to cover expenditure in various situations, as shown in annex IV, for a revised total amount of €7.21 million.

24. An overview of requests made in 2013 showed that out of the €7.21 million requested, only €2.03 million or 28.1 per cent had been spent as at 17 September 2013.<sup>5</sup>

25. The spending rate for request III pertaining to the opening of the situation in Mali was even lower, at only 14.6 per cent (€3.24 million) of the appropriations requested, as at 17 September 2013, though this might be explained by changes to the schedule initially decided upon by the Court.<sup>6</sup>

**26. The Committee recommended that the Court submit a table to it at each session of the Committee, showing a breakdown of the requested funds into categories of expenditure.<sup>7</sup> It reiterated its request that the Court, as a matter of course, should send a report to the Committee within 60 calendar days following notification.<sup>8</sup>**

**27. The Committee stressed once again that use of the Contingency Fund must only be considered when the event giving rise to the request could not have been foreseen or could not be accurately estimated when the budget was drawn up. Such events would include the opening of a new situation or unforeseeable developments in a current case. The Committee urged the Court to maintain very strict budgetary discipline when requests. Furthermore, the Committee encouraged the Court to make every effort to absorb all unforeseen expenditure in the regular budget.**

<sup>2</sup> According to the Court, its operational expenses amount to approximately €9 million per month. See CBF/21/6, para. 6.

<sup>3</sup> According to the Court, delay in receiving contributions relating to its 2010 budget, particularly one of the larger contributions, meant that by year end in 2010 the Court had received only 78 per cent of its contributions, resulting in larger invoices being put on hold until such time as delayed contributions were received. See CBF/21/6, para. 5.

<sup>4</sup> ICC-ASP/12/5/Rev.1, para. 26.

<sup>5</sup> €91,800 for MP I; €643,400 for MP II; and €94,300 for MP III.

<sup>6</sup> Due to the elections in Mali.

<sup>7</sup> Cost of judges, staff expenditure, temporary assistance (for meetings or other requirements), travel, counsel for defence or victims, other running costs, supplies, materials.

<sup>8</sup> *Official Records ... Eleventh session ... 2012* (ICC-ASP/11/20), vol. II, part B.2, para. 29.

## 5. International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS)

28. At its seventh session, the Assembly decided that the Court would work towards implementation of IPSAS in the period from 2011 to 2016.<sup>9</sup>

29. The total amount approved for this multi-year project was €1,917,550. The overall project funding was distributed for the duration of the project on a yearly basis, based on the activities planned in the respective years.

30. The Committee was informed that the expected cumulative expenditure for 2011 to 2013 would be €1,398,600, and that the Court would be in a position to “go live” with all aspects of IPSAS in January 2014. The Committee welcomed the conclusion that the project would thus be completed on time and within budget.

31. At its twentieth session, the Committee was informed of the Court’s proposal to reallocate the resources approved for 2013 between two consecutive years and between items of expenditure, due to adjustments in the timing of training activities. The timing of training activities had been adjusted so that training would take place closer to the actual implementation date of IPSAS, as well as in the post-implementation period, as this having been recognized as best practice by other IPSAS implementers in the United Nations system. This amendment to the project meant that only about 50 per cent of the €600,200 approved would be utilized, resulting in an estimated overall surplus of €290,000 at the end of 2013.

32. In the 2014 proposed programme budget, the Court had requested a total of €345,300 for activities relating to IPSAS implementation. **The Committee noted that the estimated surplus of €290,000 in 2013 would be needed for the planned implementation of IPSAS in 2014 and should therefore remain available to fund these activities in 2014. As a result, the total amount of €345,300 requested for IPSAS implementation in the 2014 proposed budget would, in fact, be offset by the surplus of €290,000, meaning that only about €55,300 would have to be assessed for States Parties’ contributions in 2014.**

33. At its eleventh session, the Assembly approved the amendments to the FRR that were required for the implementation of IPSAS and requested the Court to submit through the Committee any further amendments to the FRR which might be necessary.<sup>10</sup>

34. The Committee was informed that no further amendments to the FRR had been so far identified for the implementation of IPSAS. However, the Court agreed with the External Auditors that a special purpose audit of the financial statements for 2013, restated to complying with IPSAS, would be performed under a separate mandate, which would also include consideration of amendments to the FRR. **The Committee recommended that, if any further amendments to the FRR were identified, the Court report thereon to the Committee at its twenty-third session. The Committee also requested that it be informed at its twenty-second session of the actual implementation of IPSAS against the project schedule, and of budget utilisation.**

## 6. Analytic Accountability project

35. The Committee took note of the update on the status of the Analytic Accountability project. It was informed that the Project remained within the initial timeline, which would allow analytical financial data on 2012 expenditures to be presented by the end of 2013, and to use it to analyze the provisional 2013 financial data in early 2014.

36. The Committee reiterated its view that analytical data should be available to trace the costs for each situation, case or trial phase on a periodic basis (e.g. six months); they would thus become an important input into forecasting for each year’s proposed programme budget of the Court. **The Committee requested the Court to present the results of the Analytic Accountability project and the way forward at its twenty-second session.**

<sup>9</sup> *Official Records ... Seventh session ... 2008* (ICC-ASP/7/20), vol. I, part I, para.34.

<sup>10</sup> *Official Records ... Eleventh session ... 2012* (ICC-ASP/11/20), vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/11/Res.1, annex.



## 7. Replacement of capital investment

37. The Committee considered the “Second report of the Court on the assessment and review of asset replacement and write-off policies.”<sup>11</sup> In its report, the Court noted that, according to external consultants, the asset management policies and procedures in place at the Court were in line with accepted practice in both the private and public sectors. The Court indicated that it was performing an extensive review of its documentation and communication on asset management, in response to various recommendations of the external consultant, Price Waterhouse Cooper (PwC), and in preparation for implementation of IPSAS. The Court also indicated that it was considering a cost-benefit analysis exercise in regard to some measures proposed by PwC, as some of the proposed measures would require additional resources, which would need to be balanced against potential future gains.

**38. The Committee took note of the report and requested the Court to submit a report to it at its twenty-second session on the consequences of its review and on the impact of the new IPSAS accounting rules.**

## 8. Multi-year funding project (transition programme)

39. The Court presented an updated report on the funding of multi-year projects.<sup>12</sup> The Committee took note of the report and reiterated its position that there was a need for clearly defined rules to govern multi-year projects.

40. The Committee acknowledged that both the Permanent Premises project and the transition programme appeared to have the characteristics of typical multi-year projects. Since they had a common objective to provide the Court with custom-made purpose-fit premises, their closer linkage seemed to be justified. Therefore, the Committee welcomed the proposal to place both construction and transition projects under the managerial authority of the Project Director’s office and fund both components under an overall financial envelope.

**41. The Committee noted that the new premises project was not the first multi-year project, as the IPSAS project had also been presented as such. Based on this experience, the Committee was of the view that several important elements should be put in place to govern such projects in line with the applicable FRR. It requested the Court to address the following elements in a report to be submitted at its twenty-second session:**

- a) clearly defined objectives and budgets for the whole duration of the project;
- b) accountability arrangements for both attainment of the objectives and resources expenditure; and
- c) budgeting arrangements which would:
  - i) allow unspent funds to be carried over from one year to another instead of having the year-end balance returned to States Parties; and
  - ii) allow the “borrowing” of funds against the overall project budget upfront if some activities needed to be carried out earlier than originally envisaged, and savings could be achieved in other parts of the Court’s regular budget.

**42. The Committee recommended that the accounts for multi-year funding projects be reported separately from the others, so that revenue sources and annual expenditures could be recorded transparently and the necessary adjustments made upon project completion (i.e. surrendering the surplus and assessing any deficit amounts to State Parties) based on the scales of assessment for the year to which the respective revenues and expenditures belonged.**

<sup>11</sup> CBF/21/9.

<sup>12</sup> ICC-ASP/12/22.

## 9. Financial performance data as at 30 June 2013 (second quarter)

43. The Committee had before it the Report on budget performance of the International Criminal Court as at 30 June 2013.<sup>13</sup> The Committee noted that the implementation rate was 54.0 per cent, or €62.19 million, against the 2013 approved budget of €15.12 million. That represented an increase of 3.4 per cent compared to the previous year's implementation rate of 50.6 per cent as at 30 June 2012. The Court forecasted an implementation rate of 98.4 per cent or €13.29 million at year-end for the 2013 approved budget.

44. With regard to forecast expenditure for 2013 year-end per item of expenditure, the Court estimated implementation rates of 98.6 and 98.8 per cent for staff costs and non-staff costs respectively. The Committee noted that the implementation rate for established posts was 47.0 per cent as at 30 June 2013. With a spot vacancy rate of 9.1 per cent as at 30 June 2013, 692 of 766 approved posts had been filled.

45. As to the budget implementation status as at 30 June 2013 and forecast expenditure for 2013 year-end per major programme, the implementation rate for the Judiciary as at 30 June 2013 was 47.0 per cent and the forecast for the 2013 year-end was 90.0 per cent.

46. The OTP implementation rate stood at 49.1 per cent and forecasted 100.0 per cent implementation at 2013 year-end.

47. The Registry had implemented 54.4 per cent of its 2013 approved budget and was expecting to achieve full implementation of its approved budget of €64.52 million at 2013 year-end.

48. The Secretariat had implemented 49.3 per cent and forecasted that at 2013 year-end it would have implemented 95.8 per cent of its 2013 approved budget.

49. The Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims (TFV) had implemented 45.9 per cent and expected at 2013 year-end to implement 99.2 per cent of its 2013 approved budget.

50. The Project Director's Office (permanent premises) forecasted 80.4 per cent budget implementation at 2013 year-end, although it had implemented only 30.7 per cent as at 30 June 2013.

51. The forecast implementation of the Independent Oversight Mechanism (IOM) for the 2013 year-end was only 65.8 per cent because the IOM was not expected to be fully operational until the respective decision had been taken by the Assembly, and therefore most of the allocation for non-staff costs would not be used.

52. The Committee noted that the Contingency Fund notifications had been revised twice and reduced to €7.21 million, a decrease of €1.25 million from the original amount of €8.46 million.

53. As at 30 June 2013, the Court had implemented 12.7 per cent or €0.92 million against total revised notifications of €7.21 million. The Court indicated that the forecast implementation rate at 2013 year end was 86.6 per cent or €6.24 million.

**54. The Committee recommended that the Court, to the fullest extent possible, include its expenses in its regular budget, and limit its requests to draw upon the Contingency Fund to only what is strictly necessary. The Committee also requested the Court to provide<sup>14</sup> an updated forecast to the Assembly that would include actual expenditure of both the regular budget and the Contingency Fund notifications up to the end of October 2013.**

<sup>13</sup> ICC-ASP/12/24.

<sup>14</sup> Through the Committee pursuant to regulations 6.7 and 6.8 of the Financial Regulations and Rules.

## 10. Consideration of the 2014 proposed programme budget

### (a) General recommendations for the 2014 proposed programme budget

55. The Court had proposed a budget of €126.07 million for 2014, representing an increase of €10.95 million or 9.5 per cent over the 2013 approved budget level. The Court identified the main causes of the increase as an increase in the number of situations, the volume of prosecutorial and judicial activities and corresponding services required, implementation of the new OTP strategy, forward commitments and United Nations common system costs.

### (b) Assumptions and activities for 2014

56. The Committee also had before it the “Report of the Court on Judicial decisions with significant financial implications in 2012”<sup>15</sup> and noted the impact that judicial decisions could have on the budget of the Court.

57. The Court’s judicial (includes prosecutorial) and investigative activity was expected to increase in 2014. The OTP envisaged that it would conduct investigations in eight situations in 2014 (compared to seven provided for in the 2013 regular budget), namely five full investigations (seven in 2013) and 13 hibernated and trial support related investigations (compared to nine residual investigations in 2013). Preliminary examinations were envisaged in eight situations (also eight in 2013).

58. The Presidency considered that five cases would potentially be on trial followed in two cases by enforcement of sentences and reparations in case of a conviction. Further, there would be three final appeals including appeals regarding reparations. At least two cases would be at the pre-trial stage. The Court budgeted for consecutive trials, but there might be a need to resort to a simultaneous hearing schedule with further consequences for the budget, not currently provided for.

### (c) Presentation and macro analysis

59. The Committee noted the overall improvement in explanations provided in support of the proposed budget. However, it also noted that there was still room for improvement in regard to overall presentation and macro-analysis of the budget.

60. The Committee was informed that the budget submission was based on assumptions made at the end of June 2013, which were likely to be amended before the end of the current budget year if not before, in most cases triggering the Contingency Fund notifications.

61. **The Committee requested the Court to provide a list of potential developments with budgetary impacts, for the information of the Assembly and the Committee. The Court presented the list (annex III), dividing the potential developments into three categories based on their relative probability and their impact on the activities of the Court. The Committee welcomed the information and felt that such information should in future be annexed to the budget submission, and updated before the autumn session of the Committee and the session of the Assembly.**

### (d) Major programmes

#### i. Major Programme I: Judiciary

62. The Committee noted that despite extensive judicial activities in 2014 the overall MP I 2014 proposed budget was €483,000 lower than the 2013 approved budget.

63. The Committee observed that there were two reasons for the significant decrease in the resources required for judges’ salaries: First, only 16 judges would be in full-time

<sup>15</sup> CBF21/09P01.

service.<sup>16</sup> Second, the decrease was related to the pension scheme for judges, involving three factors: 1) introduction of a new, cheaper pension scheme for newly elected judges; 2) pension contributions for judges serving longer than nine years cease after the judge has completed nine years of service; and 3) the insurer has started to repay the Court for judges who have stayed at the Court for longer than nine years, as it was not required to pay their pensions at the time previously envisaged. This has resulted in a €53,800 decrease in judges' cost in the 2014 proposed programme budget compared with the 2013 approved budget. The Committee was informed, however, that it was not yet possible to predict when the last two elected judges would need to be called in for full-time service, which would result in a need for additional resources.

64. The Committee noted that the 2014 proposed budget for salary and entitlements for judges included accruals for annual leave, repatriation and relocation of judges in the amount of €32,600. As salaries and entitlements were subject to different regulations, which were approved by the Assembly at its third session,<sup>17</sup> **the Committee recommended that the resources requested for this purpose be approved, and requested the Court to provide to the Committee, at its twenty-second session, comprehensive information on the methodology for calculating accruals for annual leave, repatriation and relocation.**

65. **The Committee considered the request for GTA resources for MP I and, after consideration of the workload indicators and assumptions of judicial developments, recommended the resources requested to fund one P-2 for six months and one P-3 for six months not be approved.** In this regard, the Committee recalled its recommendation at its nineteenth session<sup>18</sup> that the Court meet the workload requirements of the Judiciary through the redeployment of approved resources among divisions, to the extent possible, before accessing the Contingency Fund.

66. **The Committee recommended that hospitality in 2014 be approved at the level of the 2013 approved budget.**

ii. Major Programme II: Office of the Prosecutor

67. The 2014 proposed programme budget submitted by the OTP amounted to €35.74 million, which represented an increase of 26.5 per cent over the 2013 approved budget.

68. The OTP explained to the Committee that it was now dealing with 18 cases in eight different situations. For 2014, the OTP planned to place greater focus on a limited number of cases, with investigations being reduced from seven to five. The aim was to mobilize sufficient resources for investigations and legal proceedings, including article 70 investigations (offences against the administration of justice), while also assigning the necessary minimum resources to maintain other cases. Eight preliminary examinations were also envisaged. In relation to activities in the areas of jurisdiction, complementarity and cooperation, the Prosecutor indicated that further resources were needed to address these eight preliminary examinations. She pointed out, moreover, that preliminary examinations played a key role in decision-making, and could have a preventive impact in relation to subsequent proceedings before the Court.

69. In support of her requests, the Prosecutor stated that from now on quality and efficiency would be the key concepts in a new strategic plan for the period from 2013 to 2017. There would be a gradual increase in resources based on a modification of the rotational model, on greater resources for investigations, on Chambers' expectations, on improved information management and on the need to maintain a certain level of investigation in non-active cases. The OTP envisaged a phased-in annual increase in resources spread over four years: 26.5 per cent in 2014, 15.4 per cent in 2015, 9.4 per cent in 2016 and 6.3 per cent in 2017, totalling about €20 million more in 2017 than in 2013. The OTP would continue to seek efficiency gains through cooperation with the Registry. It

<sup>16</sup> Pursuant to Article 36(10) and 39(3) of the Statute, the term of office of a judge may be extended in order to complete the trial.

<sup>17</sup> *Official Records ... Third session ... 2004* (ICC-ASP/3/25), part III, ICC-ASP/3/Res.3, annex.

<sup>18</sup> *Official Records ... Eleventh session ... 2012*(ICC-ASP/11/20), vol. II, part B.2, para. 125.

would likewise seek to improve the quality of its work in the various phases of the proceedings.

70. The Committee noted the report on the OTP produced by a consulting firm, which contained three series of proposals: strengthening the OTP's organizational structure and chart, improving the performance of the Joint Teams and Executive Committee and, lastly, increasing staff resources.

71. The Committee took note of the launch of a new prosecutorial strategy by the OTP. **The Committee noted that the strategy was in its formative stage, and recommended that the OTP take steps to spell out the details of its strategy more fully, including, for example, describing the way in which the increase in the number of investigators would enhance the quality of investigations, and requested the Court to report to the Committee at its twenty-second session. This would assist in developing well justified projections for the expected cost and results of the proposed multi-year "ramp up" of the strategy, and would enable the Committee to better review the potential impact of the strategy on the resources of the Court.**

72. The Committee noted that successful implementation of the strategy would need to be accompanied by a well-developed "change management" plan, as the transition from the previous approach was expected to require significant additional resources over several years. The Committee was doubtful whether the OTP had the capacity to absorb large numbers of additional personnel at short notice.

73. Detailed examination of the 2014 proposed programme budget for MP II revealed a significant demand for staff resources in all areas of activity, and particularly in the Investigation Division.<sup>19</sup> **Although it was understood that, in general terms, the demand was driven by the desire to meet the objectives of the strategy presented by the Prosecutor, and by new cases in Mali, the Committee was of the view that the strategic plan presented to it did not support an increase of this magnitude in investigation capabilities. Similarly, the Committee had seen no evidence to show that the establishment of new investigation standards would justify such an increase in staffing levels. The Committee therefore recommended that not all of the requested additional positions for 2014 be approved, but that they should be restricted to half of the additional number proposed, namely 16 positions.**

74. As the link between the OTP strategy and resource requirements required further clarification, the Committee concluded that it would be necessary to conduct a macroeconomic analysis of the OTP budget request for 2014. In order to establish a baseline for its analysis, the Committee carried out a detailed examination and concluded that the average cost per case was €1.31 million.

75. The Committee noted that the OTP proposed to take on the same number of cases (18) in 2014 as in 2013. The Committee also noted that two of the cases would be new cases. The Committee noted that the actual distribution of available resources amongst various cases would be at the discretion of the Prosecutor, bearing in mind her duties under the Rome Statute, including her responsibility for the efficient management of her office. At the same time, given the absence of a document setting out a strategic plan for future years, and pending the establishment of new investigation standards, it was necessary for the Committee to establish a benchmark against which the request for additional resources in 2014 could be measured.

76. **The Committee therefore decided to apply the average cost per case of €1.31 million to the 16 ongoing cases, in order to determine an appropriate baseline amount for 2014. The Committee concluded that the requested increase of nearly 20 per cent<sup>20</sup> in the average cost for these cases between the 2013 approved budget and 2014 proposed programme budget had not been fully justified, and therefore recommended the proposed budget be reduced by €2.2 million.**

<sup>19</sup> In 2013, 42.0 FTE were approved for a total of 504.0 months. Requests for access to the Contingency Fund in respect of two situations added an additional 41.8 FTE for 501.6 months. In the 2014 proposed programme budget, the OTP considered that, in seven situations, it would also need a further 32.0 FTE for 384.0 months.

<sup>20</sup> Represents the increase in average cost per case; i.e., €1.31 million in 2013, and €1.55 million in 2014.

**Table 1: Calculation of the recommended reduced budget**

<i>Description</i>	<i>Amount in millions</i>	<i>Note</i>
2014 proposed programme budget	€35.74	(€27.9 million* for 18 cases + €7.84 million for other items)
*Costs of 18 cases	€27.9	
Costs of the new two cases	(€4.8)	
Costs of the current 16 cases	€23.1	
Average cost per case is €1.31 million x 16	(€20.9)	
<b>Excess amount requested for 2014</b>	<b>€2.2</b>	

77. At the same time, the Committee acknowledged that 2014 would provide the OTP with the first opportunity to apply its new strategy from the beginning of a case. The Committee recommended the approval of the OTP's request for €4.8 million<sup>21</sup> for the new cases, noting that the actual allocation of resources to particular cases would be at the discretion of the Prosecutor, in the exercise of her responsibilities under the Rome Statute.

78. The Committee recommended that hospitality in 2014 be approved at the same level as the 2013 budget.

iii. Major Programme III: Registry

79. The 2014 proposed programme budget submitted by the Registrar amounted to €8.11 million, which represented an increase of 5.6 per cent over the 2013 approved budget. The Registrar explained to the Committee that an expected substantial increase in the Court's judicial and prosecutorial activities for 2014, in comparison to 2013, and the OTP's intention to enhance the quality and efficiency of its investigative and prosecutorial activities would inevitably bring about a substantial increase in demand on the Registry, as the service provider to the other organs of the Court, in addition to forward commitments, such as common system costs.

80. The Committee welcomed the efforts made by the Registrar to identify a reduction of approximately €3.5 million as a result of efficiency gains and careful allocation, redeployment and reprioritization of resources. The Committee noted that the Registry, as a result of these savings, had proposed an increase of €3.6 million against the anticipated €7 million increase.

81. Having recommended a reduction of €2.2 million in the budget of the OTP, the Committee reviewed the requirements for the Registry as the service provider to the OTP. **The Committee noted that, historically, the ratio of budget requested by the OTP to meet the needs for a new situation or case to the budget requested by the Registry was about 2:1. The Committee therefore recommended a reduction of €1.1 million in the 2014 proposed budget of the Registry.**

82. The Committee also noted and welcomed the intention of the Registrar to optimize the organizational structure of the Registry with a view to enhancing its efficiency and improving the services provided, which would lead to further savings. The Registrar requested the flexibility to begin his ambitious plan in 2014 under the oversight of the Committee and the Assembly, without waiting for the 2015 budget cycle.

83. **The Committee recommended that the Registrar be granted the authority to reorganize and streamline the Registry on a provisional basis, within the limits of the approved budget and the maximum number of established posts and approved**

<sup>21</sup> ICC-ASP/12/10, table 18.

positions. The Committee also recommended that the Registrar be invited to set a tentative target of 3 per cent savings in his plan, and requested the Registrar to report on the measures taken and proposals to be considered, together with the realized and anticipated improvements and savings, to the Committee at its twenty-second and twenty-third sessions. The Committee further invited the Registrar to consider additional savings and efficiencies that could be achieved through synergies with other major programmes.

84. With regard to Sub-programme 3260 (Information and Communication Technologies Section), the Committee recommended cutting the proposed increase of €41,100 as there was no justification for it. It called upon the Court, under future proposed programme budgets to present its ICT projects together with a short narrative on their objectives, justifications and time-line.

85. With regard to Sub-programmes 3740 (Office of Public Counsel for the Defence) and 3750 (Office of Public Counsel for Victims), the Committee noted that the staff requirements did not correspond to the workload indicators provided by the Court. The Committee called upon the Court to include, in their 2015 proposed budget, a clearer explanation of the actual workload of the offices and the staffing levels necessary to ensure their proper functioning.

iv. Major Programme IV: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties

86. The Committee considered the 2014 proposed programme budget from MP IV and welcomed the new format and template, which made the various components of the request easier to understand. The Committee noted the reduction of 3.9 per cent in the total amount requested in comparison to the 2013 approved budget, as a result of lower costs for organizing the thirteenth session of the Assembly in New York. While the proposal alluded to a possible increase in staff resources, no specific figures had been given.

87. The Committee further noted the steady growth in the Secretariat's workload, as a result of the great variety of tasks assigned to it.

88. The Committee considered that the Secretariat should take advantage of the forthcoming progressive reorganization of the Court, and in particular of the Registry, in order to seek ways of sharing certain resources (in particular in the area of IT), thus avoiding an artificial increase in staff numbers in this area.

89. The Committee noted that, from 2014, the Advisory Committee on Nominations (ACN) of Judges wished to have its budget borne by the Assembly. The Secretariat estimated the cost of travel to The Hague of seven members of the ACN at €22,834, the two other members being already present in The Hague. **The decision on whether to meet the ACN's operating costs is one for the Assembly alone. The Committee recommended that, if the Assembly decided in favour of the principle, it should approve the request for €22,834.**

90. The Committee would like to see the Secretariat enjoying stable staffing, so as to ensure good mutual relations over a period of steadily increasing workload. **The Committee authorized its Chairman to hold consultations with the Director of the Secretariat, in order to find a suitable organizational model. Thought should also be given to the level of resources required. A detailed report would be submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee.**

91. **The Committee recommended that hospitality in 2014 be approved at the same level as 2013.**

v. Major Programme VII-5: Independent Oversight Mechanism (IOM)

92. Pursuant to article 112(4) of the Rome Statute, the IOM had responsibility for inspection, evaluation and investigation. The Committee recalled that the Assembly had decided that the IOM's current mandate would initially be limited to investigation. The Committee observed that operationalization of the evaluation and inspection functions would inevitably require organizational changes to the structure of the IOM.

93. The Committee considered that the evaluation function required further clarification; since it would undoubtedly have an impact on the work of the Court's other sections.<sup>22</sup> Further thought should also be given to the issue of overlap with existing evaluation related activities,<sup>23</sup> as well as the timetable for this reform, given that, at the same time, the Court, and in particular the Registry, was about to undergo reorganization.

94. At this stage, the Committee could only rely on working hypotheses. If, at its twelfth session, the Assembly was to decide to make the IOM fully operational, then, in order to ensure that it was provided with properly qualified staff, its Head would need to be given a sufficiently high grade (P-5), with a team composed of a P-4, P-2 and GSOL. By the same token, the budget of MP VII-5 would need to be increased by €255,000 in order to enable the IOM to accomplish the tasks assigned to it.

95. If, on the other hand, the Assembly decided that further discussions were necessary in order to determine the scope of the IOM's mission, then its staff should remain unchanged from the 2013 approved budget.

## **B. Administrative matters**

### **1. Organizational structure of the Court**

96. Initially, at its eighteenth session, the Committee had recommended that the Court undertake a thorough review of its organizational structure, with a view to rationalizing reporting lines, identifying responsibilities that could be delegated and streamlining functions, processes and structures.<sup>24</sup> The Committee subsequently stated at its nineteenth session<sup>25</sup> that it was necessary to find ways of improving the Court's financial performance, remove unnecessary complexity and duplications, and ensure that the entire organizational system was aligned and set up to deliver on the Court's objectives.

97. At the current session, the Committee considered two reports prepared by an external consultant,<sup>26</sup> one dealing with the outcome of the review of the OTP, and the other providing a consolidated version of the various reviews of the organs of the Court.

98. The Committee noted that the external consultant's reviews sought to improve the day-to-day operations of the organs of the Court. In particular, the internal workings of each organ had been addressed with a view to enabling them to achieve greater freedom of action and carry out structural change. However, the Committee noted that no conclusions had been drawn from the reviews' findings for improving financial performance. A simple consolidated version of three reviews did not provide a directly usable, cross-cutting vision, and the Court had to therefore now consider preparing an overall synthesis. Finally, it was regrettable that some aspects of the review, particularly as regards field offices, had purely document-based.

99. The Committee observed that the Registrar had included in the 2014 proposed programme budget for MP III a report on his initial efforts to limit requests for funds. The Committee encouraged the Registrar to continue his efforts, and to draw the necessary conclusions from the reorganization, within the framework of the Rome Statute and the regulations of the Court. The Committee welcomed the fact that initial studies carried out by the Registry showed that, as a result of productivity and efficiency gains, MP III could be maintained at a stable level, notwithstanding the impact of the Court's judicial activities (MP I and MP II). The Committee anticipated that costs savings would result from this process.

**100. The Committee recommended that, at its twenty-second session, the Court submit to it a synthesis report clearly setting out the position of the organs of the Court on the recommendations contained in the consultant's reports. It further recommended that the Court provide it with particulars of the impact of the new strategies of the Court's organs on human resources, finance and the Court's internal**

<sup>22</sup> In particular the Office of Internal Audit.

<sup>23</sup> The Office of Internal Audit, the External Auditor, and the Committee on Budget and Finance all contribute, in various ways, to the evaluation function.

<sup>24</sup> *Official Records... Eleventh session... 2012*(ICC-ASP/11/20), vol. II, part B.1, para. 29.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, part B.2, paras. 70 and 72.

<sup>26</sup> CBF/21/18 and CBF/21/24.



procedures. Finally, the Committee encouraged the Registrar to continue with his efforts to reorganize the Registry, with a view to achieving operational rationalization and greater long-term financial transparency, and requested to be kept informed.

## 2. Procurement

101. The Committee welcomed the efforts undertaken by the Court towards cooperation in joint procurement activities with other international organizations and local government agencies, and recommended that the Procurement Unit continue to carry out these activities in accordance with rule 110.18 of the FRR, and report thereon to it at its twenty-second session. The Committee took note of the efforts made to involve private sector partners, and encouraged the Procurement Unit to continue keeping this commercial option under review.

## 3. Administrative Instructions for investment of liquid funds

102. The Committee had before it the Report of the Court on its Administrative Instruction regarding liquid funds,<sup>27</sup> explaining the changes made by the Court in 2012 to the Administrative Instruction on the Investment of Surplus Funds. The Court explained that the 2012 changes were made in response to the continuing global financial crisis, which affected many banks in Europe, and the downgrading of many European banks from AA to single A. It was the view of the Court's Investment Review Committee that the previous Administrative Instruction did not provide sufficient flexibility to allow immediate action to be taken if one or more banks unexpectedly became riskier than previously predicted. The Court also stated that, although no banks in The Netherlands had a long-term investment rating above single A, the Court's funds were concentrated in short-term investments, and there had been no change in the investment rating for short-term investments.

103. The Committee took note of the report, including the Court's indication that it would inform the Committee if any substantial changes were made to the Administrative Instruction.

## 4. Junior Professional Officer programme (JPO)

104. The Committee considered the report of the Court on the establishment of a JPO programme.<sup>28</sup> The issue had been on the Committee's agenda since 2009, and the Committee had repeatedly expressed two major potential concerns with the programme: first, that the programme might result in an unfair advantage for young professionals from donor countries, who might be fast-tracked in recruitment exercises, thereby affecting geographical representation within the institution; and second, that all costs associated with the programme might not be fully recovered from the sponsor countries, with additional financial implications for the Court.

105. The revised report presented by the Court addressed these concerns. According to the Court, it had the capacity to accommodate at least 20 JPOs. **With some minor modifications of the draft guidelines and the sample memorandum of understanding between the Court and the donor country, the Committee recommended that the JPO programme be introduced to the Court on a trial basis, taking full account of the concerns raised by the Committee, in particular the possible impact on geographical representation, and subject to a comprehensive review in 2017.**

## 5. Retirement age

106. The Committee considered the report of the Court on implementation of the increased age of separation for staff members.<sup>29</sup> In its report on the work of its twentieth session,<sup>30</sup> the Committee had expressed the view that the Court should follow the decision

<sup>27</sup> CBF/21/5.

<sup>28</sup> ICC-ASP/12/52.

<sup>29</sup> CBF/21/22.

<sup>30</sup> ICC-ASP/12/5/Rev.1.

of the United Nations General Assembly. The Committee noted that the United Nations General Assembly had decided to increase the mandatory age of separation for all staff joining the organization on or after 1 January 2014.

**107. The Committee recommended that the Court raise the mandatory age of separation to the age of 65 for new staff members joining the Court on or after 1 January 2014.**

108. The Committee noted that the International Civil Service Commission had recommended that the General Assembly raise the mandatory age of separation for current United Nations staff members to the age of 65, with effect from 1 January 2016, and noted that the General Assembly would consider the proposal at its sixty-eighth session (the session beginning on 23 September 2013). **Therefore, the Committee was of the view that it should consider the mandatory age of separation for current staff members after receipt of a proposal from the Court and relevant information from other international organizations on their approach, including possible General Assembly decisions. The Committee therefore requested the Court to submit a report thereon to its twenty-second session for its consideration.**

109. **In the meantime, pending a decision by the Assembly at its thirteenth session on the forthcoming recommendations of the Committee, the Committee recommended that the Court grant extensions up to the end of 2014 to any staff who reached the age of 62 in 2014 and would like to continue service with the Court, unless the staff member was subject to separation due to reasons other than age, in compliance with the Staff Regulations and Rules of the Court.**

## **C. Audit matters**

### **1. Audit reports**

#### **(a) Financial statements of the Court for the period 1 January to 31 December 2012**

110. The Committee noted the need for the Court to improve its monitoring of outstanding unliquidated obligations (ULO) in order to reduce the level of cancellations of prior period obligations. It appeared that the amount of cancelled ULOs was in the range of €1.5 million, only appearing in the records 12 months after the end of the financial year to which they related, as provided for in regulation 4.4 of the FRR.

**111. The Committee therefore recommended that the Court prepare an annex to the regular year-end report on financial performance, indicating the total number of ULOs and the total amount due as at 31 December of the financial year, and the updated figures for the same period as at 31 December of the prior year, together with an update on the situation regarding the desired decrease in the number of cancelled ULOs.**

#### *Accrued liabilities:*

112. The Committee noted that, in respect of employee benefits, the Court had accumulated a provision of €10.91 million as at 31 December 2012 to cover accrued annual leave, repatriation grants and other separation benefits.

113. The Court informed the Committee that a firm of auditors Deloitte Pension Advisory BV had carried out an actuarial study of the Court's liabilities. The Court's total liability in respect of employee benefits was evaluated by the auditors at €10.71 million (including expenditure relating to judges) as at 31 December 2012, namely €5.13 million for accrued annual leave, and €5.58 million for repatriation grants and other separation benefits. The auditors had also informed the Court that its potential health insurance liability amounted to €0.93 million.

114. The Court stated that this liability represented its present obligations, which were expected to result in an outflow of resources in the future, and said that it was a recommended practice in other organisations to have funds available to meet liabilities as they fell due.

115. In its 2014 proposed programme budget, all staff benefits were budgeted under staff costs, which were broken down into salary costs and all other staff benefits. The Court explained that the latter included elements budgeted on an accrual basis, as disclosed in annex V (d) to the 2014 proposed programme budget. Staff costs were estimated on the basis of the United Nations salary scales, while other staff benefits were budgeted by estimating a ratio of common staff costs to salary costs and adding this to the salary costs. For 2014, the ratio used by the Court was 44.35 per cent.

116. Accruals were thus estimated at €0.8 million for staff in the 2014 proposed programme budget.

117. The Committee considered that, in view of the fact that IPSAS standards were to be implemented with effect from the forthcoming budgetary year, the Court's provisioning policy now needed to be clearly defined.

118. The Committee observed that, while this accounting practice might represent sound management of the Court's liabilities, a provisioning policy should enable the financial calculations concerned to be better understood.

119. Furthermore, rules for the evaluation of liabilities needed to be defined by reference to clear and transparent criteria, including the following:

- A strategy to be submitted to the Assembly by the Court to cover its liabilities on a long-term basis;
- The precise nature of the benefits covered thereby; and
- Particulars of calculation methods, as well as a clear breakdown among the various component elements, in particular, as regards repatriation grants and other separation benefits.

120. According to the Court's initial calculations, including health insurance, the currently available amount of €10.91 million covered only 66 per cent of its total liabilities (€16.63 million). However, the Committee was also informed that the maximum liability paid to staff in any one year so far was €1.7 million.

121. According to the report submitted by the Court in August 2012,<sup>31</sup> the financial impact of subsidizing health insurance contributions would be relatively modest in the initial years. The cost was estimated at €27,000 for 2015 and €102,000 for 2020. The actuarial study used as basis by the Court was a long-term one, and had not been made available to the Committee. However the Committee found that, in light of the information currently available, it was not necessary to make a provision for after-retirement health insurance in the amount of €5.93 million in 2014.

**122. The Committee recommended that, at its twenty-second session, the Court provide it with a detailed report on its practice in regard to provisioning for its liability in respect of staff benefits, as well as a policy statement covering all aspects of such provisioning.**

**123. It further recommended that the provision of €0.8 million in the 2014 proposed programme budget not be approved, pending submission of an overall policy document to the Assembly through the Committee at its twenty-second session.**

**(b) Financial statements of the Trust Fund for Victims for the period 1 January to 31 December 2012**

124. Introducing his reports on the financial statements of the Court<sup>32</sup> and of the TFV,<sup>33</sup> the External Auditor informed the Committee that the statements were free of material misstatement and presented fairly the financial position of the Court and of the TFV and that he was able to offer an unqualified audit opinion.

<sup>31</sup> CBF/19/13, para. 8.

<sup>32</sup> ICC-ASP/12/12.

<sup>33</sup> ICC-ASP/12/13.

125. The Committee welcomed the presentation by the External Auditor and expressed its appreciation for the quality of work provided by him.

(c) **Report of the Office of Internal Audit (OIA) and the Audit Committee**

126. The Committee received and analysed seven reports containing information on the activities of the OIA and the Audit Committee and on the action taken to implement their recommendations.

127. The Committee noted that the mandates of certain external members of the Audit Committee had been extended, but that the Audit Committee had not met since June 2012. As a result, the audit plan of the OIA for 2013 had not been approved.

**128. The Committee recommended that the Court conduct an in-depth review of the Audit Committee, including terms of reference, composition and appointments, taking into consideration, in particular, regional distribution balance, as well as reporting lines and remuneration, and to report to it thereon at its twenty-second session.**

129. Since the action plan of the OIA for 2013 had not been approved, the Committee was unable to review its implementation. It was informed orally of the OIA's action plan for the second semester of 2013.

**130. The Committee considered that the best way of monitoring implementation of the work plan for the OIA would be to align the plan on the calendar year. That is to say, at the Committee's April session in Year N (the April session being devoted principally to administrative matters) the Committee would be presented with the results of all of the Office's activities during Year N-1, together with its preliminary audit plan for Year N+1. In other words, for twenty-second session of the Committee, in April 2014, the OIA would submit to the Committee an account of all of its work done in 2013, and of the programme of work that it envisaged for 2015. At the twenty-third session of the Committee in September 2014, the Office would present its report for purposes of its budget request for the following year.**

131. The Committee expressed its appreciation of all the information it had received in various documents from the OIA, and hoped that the change in the way the OIA interacted with the Committee would enable the OIA to prepare a transparent document containing all information relevant to its activities.

**132. The Committee noted the information regarding implementation of the OIA's recommendations and observed that one year after the audit, the implementation rate had been a somewhat modest 51 per cent. The Committee recommended that managers in the various sections each be made responsible for implementation of the audit recommendations concerning them, and that information on the implementation of recommendations be included in the OIA's annual report.**

**D. Legal aid**

133. The Committee took note of the Registry's reports on monitoring and assessing the implementation performance of legal aid up until the end of August 2013. The Committee noted that the new arrangements implemented on 1 April 2012 and the application of resolution ICC-ASP/11/Res.1 had already generated overall savings of over €40,000, although it was aware that the reform in question was entering into effect only gradually. The Committee was also pleased that the Registry was continuing to monitor the new legal aid system.

134. The Committee was of the view that it was now necessary to wait until the first judicial cycles draw to a close to learn all the necessary lessons from the reform and to adopt a holistic approach to the issue.

135. Finally, the Committee also considered that two sets of events might well have a direct impact on the amount of appropriations available for legal aid.

136. First, there was a financial link between the total appropriations allocated to legal aid and the judicial decisions of the Court.<sup>34</sup> Thus, in 2012, seven decisions were rendered which had a direct impact on the budget of the Registry. Obviously the decisions in question fell within the power of the judges alone. The Committee stressed once again that it believed it was almost impossible, to assess the financial repercussions in the 2014 proposed programme budget.

137. **Nevertheless, the Committee recommended that the Registry conduct a study, based on key decisions already rendered, to identify common themes in the various judgments. The Registry could then identify ways to improve existing procedures, and this would make it easier to quantify financial requirements. The Committee requested that a report be submitted to the Committee at its twenty-second session.**

138. **Second, cases currently at the appeals stage should soon draw to a close and the Court might then be required to consider the payment of reparations, if and where applicable. This innovative procedure had no equivalent in this field and therefore a preliminary financial approach was impossible. In light of the legal texts, the Committee called on the Court to initiate joint reflection on the rules to be observed, and to report to the Committee at its twenty-second session.**

## **E. Premises of the Court**

### **1. Overview**

139. The Chairman of the Oversight Committee briefed the Committee on the status of the construction and transition projects. He presented a funding mechanism proposed by the Oversight Committee to finance the transition of the Court to the new premises. The Committee had before it the Oversight Committee's progress report.<sup>35</sup> The Oversight Committee sought the Committee's advice. The Project Director provided additional explanations. Mr. Peter Timmermanns from the Dutch consultancy Brink Groep gave an update on the progress of the Working Group on the Total Cost of Ownership.

140. The Committee acknowledged the progress achieved in several areas. It discussed the continuing challenges and outstanding issues. The discussion focused on the review of the transition costs and the proposed mechanism for funding them.

141. The Committee noted that an amount of €95,500 had been requested for services rendered by the relevant sections of the Court to the permanent premises project upon the establishment of service agreements with the sections concerned. A fixed fee for the services rendered had been agreed for the next three years. In to render transparent the utilization of these resources, the Committee requested that it be provided with information on the implementation and allocation of these resources in the budget performance report for 2013 and during the first trimester of 2014, at the Committee's twenty-second session.

### **2. Status of the project**

142. Following the start of construction in March 2013, the permanent premises project is still within the approved budget of €190 million and the agreed timelines. In fact, savings of €6.3 million have been achieved. Risks are covered and being monitored. The project remains on target for delivery of the premises to the Court in September 2015, with full availability for use by December 2015.

### **3. A unified project**

143. Recognizing the pressing need for coordination to ensure greater efficiency, the Oversight Committee and the Court reviewed the governance of the project. They agreed to unite the construction and transition projects into a single permanent premises project, managed by the Project Director who will report to the Oversight Committee and to the Registrar. In conformity with the relevant Assembly resolutions, the Oversight Committee

<sup>34</sup> CBF/21/09P01.

<sup>35</sup> CBF/21/20.

revised the governance accordingly. Following the merger of the projects, an overall financial envelope of a maximum of €195.7 million was adopted for the permanent premises project, comprising both construction and transition activities. The Committee welcomed the new governance arrangement as it would help to ensure that the strategies for construction and transition were fully aligned with each other.

#### 4. Transition costs

##### Background

144. The construction costs were set by the Assembly at no more than €190 million at 2014 price levels. This did not include the costs of the transition of the Court to the new premises. The Court's revised estimate in April 2013 put total transition costs at €18.5 million, including the cost of non-integrated user equipment (so-called "2gv" costs). Based on a cost review by the Project Director, the Oversight Committee, in agreement with the Registrar, revised the cost estimate down to €1.3 million (excluding the Court staff costs, which in April had been put at €3.2 million within the €18.5 million estimate, and which will now remain in the regular budget at the reduced overall level of €1.5 million spread out over 2014, 2015 and 2016). This amount of €1.3 million for the transition will now have to be financed under the overall budget provision of €195.7 million for the permanent premises.

##### Funding of transition costs

###### *Proposal of the Oversight Committee*

145. The Oversight Committee proposed a funding mechanism aimed at ensuring that further assessed contributions from States Parties, if any, are delayed until 2017. Accordingly, the amount of €1.3 million would be financed by making sequential use of the following instruments:

- (a) €0.6 million from savings on the construction cost.
  - The Project Director confirmed that these savings could be safely released.
- (b) This would leave an outstanding amount of €0.7 million, which the Oversight Committee proposed could be financed from:
  - 1) Surpluses from the 2012 to 2014 budgets, which, under the FRR would be surrendered between 2014 and 2016 following auditing of the respective accounts.
    - The Court noted that the use of surplus funds for the transition project was a technically viable option. The Assembly would need to approve it through a resolution or an amendment to the FRR. The Court also confirmed that surplus funds for 2012, likely to amount to €2.5 million, would be available in 2014. Past experience suggested that further surpluses could be expected in 2015 and 2016, although such projections were still uncertain.
  - 2) Temporary advances from Court cash reserves (2014 - 2015) until such surpluses were available.
    - The Court noted that cash reserves had been established to cover for current and future liabilities. It confirmed that it would be prepared to consider prudent recourse to its reserves provided this was a measure of last resort, of a temporary nature, for a limited amount and with an agreed schedule for restitution.
  - 3) Temporary advances from the WCF, if necessary.
    - The Court strongly advised against recourse to the WCF. The WCF must be kept intact as a vital financial cushion to meet short-term liquidity problems pending receipt of assessed contributions while implementing its regular budget.
  - 4) Any shortfall remaining upon project completion will be met out of 2017 assessed contribution.

### Observations of the Committee

146. In the Committee's view, the funding scheme of the Oversight Committee is a viable option for the Assembly to consider.

#### *Budget relief*

147. Based on the current estimate of transition expenditure, the Oversight Committee's funding scheme would reduce the burden on the Court's regular budget by €3.33 million for 2014 and by €13.52 million for 2015, giving a combined total of €16.85 million.

#### *Financial envelope*

148. As proposed by the Oversight Committee, the overall financial envelope for construction and transition should not exceed €195.7 million; there should be a cost review mechanism consisting of (i) a periodic target review every six months until project completion, and (ii) a review aimed at reducing the cost to no more than €193.7 million by early June 2014. **The Committee recommended that the Project Director identify and report separately on the spending on construction and transition activities. The Committee called upon the Court to examine, when appropriate, the scope for the prudent use of cash reserves, should this become necessary as a temporary measure of last resort. However, it agreed with the Court that using the WCF for the transition costs should not be considered, as this Fund constituted an essential element of the financial security of the Court. Any remaining financing needs for 2015, as well as the appropriate mix of financing instruments in 2015, could be reviewed towards the end of 2014, and a report thereon submitted to the Committee at its twenty-third session.**

## **5. Review of "2gv" costs**

149. The Committee noted that, as the Oversight Committee had recalled, a verification of the transition requirements list had yet to be submitted. It concurred with the Oversight Committee that a meaningful review of the list should be conducted against the following background: (i) complete inventories of the Court's assets, including their value and status; (ii) short and medium-term procurement plans, including opportunities for joint procurement; and (iii) an extension of the useful life of assets. The Committee also recalled the request from the Assembly at its eleventh session, to explore "new options for reducing the 2gv elements, including the suitability and extended use of existing equipment".<sup>36</sup>

150. In a similar vein, the External Auditor had also recommended that the Court prepare a financial report in respect of all 2gv items, which would improve project management by providing States Parties with an overview of these costs.<sup>37</sup>

151. The Committee appreciated the recent downward revision made by the Project Director and his ongoing efforts to achieve further economies. At the same time, it agreed with the Oversight Committee that, under the new governance structure, the Project Director had now been given the managerial authority for implementing the recommendations above.

## **6. Enhanced conference capacity**

### Report of the Oversight Committee

152. The Oversight Committee informed the Committee that it had approved a change in the design of the new premises, so as to create the capacity for large-scale conference events, including possible meetings of the Assembly. It had also approved the use of up to €0.7 million to be financed from savings on the construction costs. The choice of venue would, as before, be at the discretion of the Assembly.

<sup>36</sup> ICC-ASP/12/5/Rev.1, paras. 98 and 99.

<sup>37</sup> ICC-ASP/12/12, recommendation 1.

### Observations of the Committee

153. From the technical and financial perspective which fell within its remit, the Committee noted that the Oversight Committee and the Project Director had established a sound business case. Holding an Assembly meeting at the new premises rather than at the convention centre in The Hague would yield substantial savings. These would amortize the initial investment after less than three such meetings. The design change would facilitate the flexible, cost-efficient use of the premises throughout their lifetime.

### One-time payments

154. The Oversight Committee informed the Committee that, by the beginning of September 2013, 43 States Parties had opted for advance payments in the amount of €42.3 million. Several other States Parties had also expressed an interest in potentially paying their contributions up-front before the deadline in June 2015.

## **7. Working Group on the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)**

155. The Oversight Committee informed the Committee that the Working Group, set up in March 2013 and headed by the Project Director, was considering the different approaches for funding the TCO, which comprised all the future costs of using and owning the new premises. The costs, estimated at between €1.5 million and €2.8 million, were expected to impact on the annual budget from 2016 onwards. The Working Group aimed to present an update on progress by the twelfth session of the Assembly in November 2013, and the final results by the thirteenth session of the Assembly in 2014.

## **8. Interim premises lease contract**

### Background

156. At its twentieth session in April 2013, the Committee had noted that, as the Oversight Committee had observed, the Court's lease contracts for its current interim premises appeared to run into the year 2016. However, it was anticipated that the Court would have moved into its new permanent premises by the end of December 2015. Hence, the Court risked being obliged to pay rent even after it had vacated the interim premises, although some flexibility in case of unexpected delays would be convenient. The Committee had called on the Oversight Committee and the Court to come up with a strategy on how to proceed. Also, it had requested the Court to submit an analysis of all its current lease agreements, showing the termination arrangements and the ensuing financial risks, and to report at its twenty-first session.

### The Court's report

157. The Committee had before it the Report of the Court on its current lease agreements for the interim premises.<sup>38</sup> The report provided particulars of its current lease agreements for the interim premises, an overview of the termination arrangements and possible financial risks, as well as proposals for its future strategy.

### *Termination dates*

158. The earliest termination date for the Haagseveste premises is 30 June 2016, with 15 months' notice of termination required by 31 March 2015. The lease of the Arc building at Saturnusstraat expired initially in 2012. Following decisions of the Assembly, the Court entered into negotiations with the Dutch Housing and Construction Ministry (RGD) about the renewal of the lease. At the time when the Committee met, this lease had not been signed, since discussions between RGD and the Court on the legal terms of the contract had

---

<sup>38</sup> ICC-ASP/12/54.



only just been concluded. Under these terms, the renewed contract would expire on 31 March 2016, subject to 13 months' notice of termination. The Court did, however, state, that the lease was ready for signature. The Court did not explain how it intended to proceed.

#### *Financial risks*

159. The continuation of the leases up to their terminations dates in 2016 would entail costs of up to €1.9 million.<sup>39</sup>

#### *Strategy*

160. The Court suggested that re-negotiating the terms of the leases with the building owners would be difficult through normal commercial channels. It proposed that States Parties might liaise directly with the host State. The Court also intended to liaise with RGD and the host State with a view to having the latter take over the leases prior to their official termination dates, so that refurbishment works might commence earlier than planned. For details, see chapters III and V of the report.

#### Observations of the Committee

161. The proposed contacts at State Party level are based on political considerations beyond the Committee's ambit.

162. From the financial perspective, however, the Committee agreed with the observation made by the Oversight Committee in April 2013 that the matter was urgent, as the outcome of the negotiations might depend on their early initiation. Also, the length of the notice periods of up to 15 months should be taken into account. It was not clear from the report to what extent the matter had moved forward to date. In fact, it appeared that the negotiations concerning the lease renewal for Saturnusstraat with the termination date at the end of March 2016 had been concluded while the possible conflict with the earlier target date for the Court's relocation to the new premises had come to the fore. **The Committee invited the Court and the Oversight Committee to come back at its twenty-second session with a progress report identifying, where appropriate, issues of a financial or technical nature on which they might be seeking the Committee's advice.**

## **F. Trust Fund for Victims**

### **1. Risk management policy**

163. The Committee had before it the Report of the Court and the Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims on the Management of Exchange Rate Risks.<sup>40</sup> The Committee recalled its earlier concerns that the TFV would be exposed to unpredictable losses, resulting from exchange rate swings. The Committee noted that the TFV's risk prioritization workshop had identified the likelihood of currency risk in the "high-risk" range, while impact and vulnerability were identified in the medium-risk range.

164. The Committee took note of the policy and mitigation measures identified by the TFV in order to address this issue, including establishing a "risk appetite" for each currency in which the TFV operates, and encouraged the TFV to implement these measures effectively as part of its risk management strategy. **The Committee requested the TFV to provide a progress report on the management of currency exchange rate risks to the Committee at its twenty-second session.**

165. The Committee was informed that Trial Chamber I, in its decision in the Lubanga case had assigned significant roles and responsibilities to the TFV in the development and implementation of appropriate reparations awards. It was noted that, pending the outcome of the appeals proceedings in the case, the potential costs to the TFV Secretariat could not yet be quantified or addressed.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., para. 15.

<sup>40</sup> CBF/21/21.

## **G. Other matters**

### **1. Intermediaries**

166. The Committee received the Second report of the Court on the financial implications of the draft Guidelines governing the relations between the Court and intermediaries.<sup>41</sup> At its previous session in April 2013, the Committee had taken note of the policy proposed by the Court in relation to the use of intermediaries.

167. The Committee pointed out that, on the Court's own admission, the data supplied by it were only partial, and that, at the present time, the relevant costs could not readily be identified. Three Registry sections were stated to be involved.<sup>42</sup> For its part, the OTP estimated its costs in this regard, for 2012, at €5,490, but expected this amount to rise in 2013.

168. The Committee welcomed these draft Guidelines and considered that they should now be discussed by the Assembly. Their adoption would undoubtedly enhance the security of the Court's proceedings if intermediaries were utilized with prudence and in a way that was clearly understandable by the parties.

### **2. Documentation submitted to the Committee on Budget and Finance**

169. The Committee noted that the Court continued to submit some documents after the deadline. The Committee reiterated the importance of the timely submission of all documents requested for each session if it was to do its work in an effective manner. **The Committee recommended that the Court provide all the documents and papers requested from the Court at least 45 days prior to a session of the Committee.**

### **3. Future meetings of the Committee**

170. The Committee decided, tentatively, to hold its twenty-second and twenty-third sessions in The Hague, from 28 April to 2 May 2014, and from 7 to 17 October 2014, respectively.

---

<sup>41</sup> ICC-ASP/12/53.

<sup>42</sup> Victims Participation and Reparations section, Victims and Witnesses Unit, Security and Safety Section.

## Annex I

### List of documents

<i>CBF document symbol</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>CBF document symbol was converted to</i>
CBF/21/1	Provisional agenda	
CBF/21/1/Add.1	Annotated list of items included in the provisional agenda	
CBF/21/2	Registry's second quarterly report on monitoring and assessing the implementation performance of legal aid	ICC-ASP/12/50
CBF/21/3	Refined report of the Court on Junior Professional Officer programme	ICC-ASP/12/52
CBF/21/4	Report of the Court on Procurement	
CBF/21/5	Report of the Court on its Administrative Instruction regarding liquid funds	
CBF/21/6	Report of the Court on its Working Capital Fund	
CBF/21/7	Report of the Court on the amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules necessitated by IPSAS implementation	ICC/ASP/12/18
CBF/21/8	Second Report of the Court on the financial implications of the draft Guidelines governing the relations between the Court and Intermediaries	ICC-ASP/12/53
CBF/21/9	Second report of the Court on the assessment and review of asset replacement and write-off policies	
CBF/21/10	Report on the composition and rules governing the Audit Committee	
CBF/21/11	Annual Report of the Office of Internal Audit - 2nd half of 2012	
CBF/21/12	Annual report of the Office of Internal Audit - 1st semester 2013	
CBF/21/13	Annual report of the Office of Internal Audit - Implementation of audit recommendations: situation as of 30/06/13	
CBF/21/14	Report on the procedure for closing the recommendations of the Office of Internal Audit - June 2013	
CBF/21/15	Office of Internal Audit - 2014-2015 IT Audit Strategy Plan & 2013 IT Audit Plan	
CBF/21/16	Report of the Office of Internal Audit on its activities for 2014	
CBF/21/17	Report of the Court on the funding of multi-year projects	ICC-ASP/12/22
CBF/21/18	Report on the organizational structure of the Court	
CBF/21/19	Third Quarterly Report of the Registry on monitoring and assessing the implementation performance of legal aid from the time the amendments came into force to the end of August 2013	ICC-ASP/12/51
CBF/21/20	Second interim report on the activities of the Oversight Committee	
CBF/21/21	Report of the Court and the Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims on the Management of Exchange Rate Risks	
CBF/21/22	Report of the Court on implementation of the increased age of separation for staff members joining on or after 1 January 2014 and for existing staff members	
CBF/21/23	Report of the Court on its current lease agreements for the interim premises	ICC-ASP/12/54
CBF/21/24	Comprehensive report on the organizational structure of the Court	
ICC-ASP/12/10	Proposed Programme Budget for 2014 of the International Criminal Court	
ICC-ASP/12/11	Report of the Court on the impact of measures	
ICC-ASP/12/12	Financial statements for the period 1 January to 31 December 2012	
ICC-ASP/12/13	Trust Fund for Victims: Financial statements for the period 1 January to 31 December 2012	
ICC-ASP/12/14	Report to the Assembly of States Parties on the projects and the activities of the Board of Directors of the Trust Fund for Victims for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2013	
ICC-ASP/12/24	Report on Budget Performance of the ICC as at 30 June 2013	

**Annex II****Status of contributions as at 13 September 2013** (in euros)

	<i>States Parties</i>	<i>Prior Years' Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>Prior Years' Receipts and Credits</i>	<i>Prior Years' Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>2013 Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>2013 Receipts and Credits</i>	<i>2013 Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Outstanding contributions Contingency Fund</i>	<i>Total Outstanding contributions</i>
1	Afghanistan	31,598	31,598	-	8,851	8,851	-	-	-
2	Albania	94,584	94,584	-	17,814	17,814	-	-	-
3	Andorra	90,707	90,707	-	14,229	14,229	-	-	-
4	Antigua and Barbuda	31,602	26,205	5,397	3,585	-	3,585	92	9,074
5	Argentina	7,297,111	7,297,111	-	769,264	769,264	-	-	-
6	Australia	24,387,158	24,387,158	-	3,693,161	3,693,161	-	-	-
7	Austria	11,963,213	11,963,213	-	1,420,998	1,420,998	-	-	-
8	Bangladesh	40,473	40,473	-	11,204	11,204	-	-	-
9	Barbados	121,142	121,142	-	14,229	13,354	875	64	939
10	Belgium	14,924,036	14,924,036	-	1,777,060	1,777,060	-	-	-
11	Belize	13,762	13,762	-	1,793	1,679	114	8	122
12	Benin	27,832	23,035	4,797	5,378	-	5,378	24	10,199
13	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	100,740	100,740	-	16,022	-	16,022	72	16,094
14	Bosnia and Herzegovina	106,610	106,610	-	30,251	30,251	-	-	-
15	Botswana	200,811	200,811	-	30,251	30,073	178	135	313
16	Brazil	19,030,288	19,030,288	-	5,224,519	-	5,224,519	23,316	5,247,835
17	Bulgaria	343,088	343,088	-	83,694	83,694	-	-	-
18	Burkina Faso	29,876	25,045	4,831	5,378	-	5,378	56	10,265
19	Burundi	12,138	12,138	-	1,793	1,684	109	8	117
20	Cambodia	27,832	27,832	-	7,171	7,171	-	-	-
21	Canada	41,126,985	41,126,985	-	5,313,478	5,313,478	-	-	-
22	Cape Verde	1,610	1,603	7	1,793	-	1,793	8	1,808
23	Central African Republic	13,762	11,744	2,018	1,793	-	1,793	46	3,857
24	Chad	13,750	13,750	-	3,585	46	3,539	16	3,555
25	Chile	1,183,118	1,183,118	-	594,706	297,249	297,457	2,654	300,111
26	Colombia	1,872,973	1,872,973	-	461,155	461,155	-	-	-
27	Comoros	9,332	605	8,727	1,793	-	1,793	46	10,566
28	Congo	21,877	17,046	4,831	8,851	-	8,851	73	13,755
29	Cook Islands	6,452	6,452	-	1,793	1,664	129	8	137
30	Costa Rica	434,224	434,224	-	67,672	59,910	7,762	302	8,064

	<i>States Parties</i>	<i>Prior Years' Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>Prior Years' Receipts and Credits</i>	<i>Prior Years' Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>2013 Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>2013 Receipts and Credits</i>	<i>2013 Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Outstanding contributions Contingency Fund</i>	<i>Total Outstanding contributions</i>
31	Côte d'Ivoire	-	-	-	12,436	12,436	-	-	-
32	Croatia	848,674	848,674	-	224,415	224,415	-	-	-
33	Cyprus	590,852	590,852	-	83,694	83,694	-	-	-
34	Czech Republic	1,736,583	1,736,583	-	687,363	687,363	-	-	-
35	Democratic Republic of the Congo	41,904	41,904	-	5,378	65	5,313	24	5,337
36	Denmark	10,078,459	10,078,459	-	1,201,961	1,201,961	-	-	-
37	Djibouti	13,566	5,245	8,321	1,793	-	1,793	46	10,160
38	Dominica	13,762	9,368	4,394	1,793	-	1,793	46	6,233
39	Dominican Republic	378,099	250,093	128,006	80,108	-	80,108	1,955	210,069
40	Ecuador	372,412	372,412	-	78,316	426	77,890	350	78,240
41	Estonia	312,702	312,702	-	71,257	71,257	-	-	-
42	Fiji	50,679	50,679	-	5,378	2,641	2,737	24	2,761
43	Finland	7,620,082	7,620,082	-	924,215	924,215	-	-	-
44	France	84,892,253	84,892,253	-	9,959,312	9,959,312	-	-	-
45	Gabon	146,018	73,928	72,090	35,629	-	35,629	691	108,410
46	Gambia	13,762	13,762	-	1,793	1,793	-	-	-
47	Georgia	53,693	53,693	-	12,436	12,436	-	-	-
48	Germany	116,522,250	116,522,250	-	12,715,822	12,715,822	-	-	-
49	Ghana	65,048	55,376	9,672	24,985	-	24,985	178	34,835
50	Greece	8,344,460	8,344,460	-	1,136,082	21,647	1,114,435	5,070	1,119,505
51	Grenada	2,251	-	2,251	1,793	-	1,793	24	4,068
52	Guatemala	22,565	-	-	48,065	45,691	2,374	215	2,589
53	Guinea	27,137	21,100	6,037	1,793	-	1,793	84	7,914
54	Guyana	12,138	12,138	-	1,793	1,793	-	-	-
55	Honduras	82,721	82,721	-	14,229	9,488	4,741	64	4,805
56	Hungary	3,020,742	3,020,742	-	473,703	473,703	-	-	-
57	Iceland	517,976	517,976	-	48,065	48,065	-	-	-
58	Ireland	5,892,756	5,892,756	-	744,279	744,279	-	-	-
59	Italy	68,734,639	68,734,639	-	7,920,415	7,920,415	-	-	-
60	Japan	104,685,721	104,685,721	-	19,290,082	19,290,082	-	-	-
61	Jordan	167,985	167,985	-	39,214	-	39,214	175	39,389
62	Kenya	121,688	121,688	-	23,192	23,192	-	-	-
63	Latvia	324,321	324,321	-	83,694	62,100	21,594	374	21,968
64	Lesotho	13,762	13,762	-	1,793	1,685	108	8	116
65	Liberia	12,138	6,527	5,611	1,793	-	1,793	46	7,450

	<i>States Parties</i>	<i>Prior Years' Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>Prior Years' Receipts and Credits</i>	<i>Prior Years' Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>2013 Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>2013 Receipts and Credits</i>	<i>2013 Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Outstanding contributions Contingency Fund</i>	<i>Total Outstanding contributions</i>
66	Liechtenstein	110,071	110,071	-	16,022	16,022	-	-	-
67	Lithuania	541,601	541,601	-	129,966	129,966	-	-	-
68	Luxembourg	1,157,592	1,157,592	-	144,195	144,195	-	-	-
69	Madagascar	18,488	13,574	4,914	5,378	-	5,378	138	10,430
70	Malawi	14,143	12,533	1,610	3,585	-	3,585	26	5,221
71	Maldives	1,738	1,738	-	1,793	1,793	-	-	-
72	Mali	27,832	27,832	-	7,171	4,820	2,351	32	2,383
73	Malta	217,553	217,553	-	28,458	28,458	-	-	-
74	Marshall Islands	13,762	8,445	5,317	1,793	-	1,793	46	7,156
75	Mauritius	151,400	151,400	-	23,192	18,045	5,147	104	5,251
76	Mexico	23,937,199	23,937,199	-	3,279,959	3,279,959	-	-	-
77	Mongolia	18,447	18,447	-	5,378	5,378	-	-	-
78	Montenegro	24,067	24,067	-	8,851	8,851	-	-	-
79	Namibia	92,571	92,571	-	17,814	17,814	-	-	-
80	Nauru	13,762	13,762	-	1,793	1,708	85	8	93
81	Netherlands	24,866,342	24,866,342	-	2,945,185	2,945,185	-	-	-
82	New Zealand	3,451,359	3,451,359	-	450,511	450,511	-	-	-
83	Niger	18,447	7,943	10,504	3,585	-	3,585	92	14,181
84	Nigeria	787,256	787,256	-	160,217	117,399	42,818	715	43,533
85	Norway	10,676,869	10,676,869	-	1,515,336	1,515,336	-	-	-
86	Panama	292,466	292,466	-	46,272	46,272	-	-	-
87	Paraguay	113,545	113,545	-	17,814	17,713	101	80	181
88	Peru	1,211,776	1,211,776	-	208,394	163,311	45,083	930	46,013
89	Philippines	168,138	168,138	-	274,273	274,273	-	-	-
90	Poland	8,179,920	8,179,920	-	1,640,036	1,640,036	-	-	-
91	Portugal	6,906,175	6,906,175	-	843,994	16,104	827,890	3,767	831,657
92	Republic of Korea	28,214,381	28,214,381	-	3,550,647	3,550,647	-	-	-
93	Republic of Moldova	6,295	6,295	-	5,378	5,378	-	-	-
94	Romania	1,417,014	1,417,014	-	402,446	288,373	114,073	1,796	115,869
95	Saint Kitts and Nevis	9,332	9,332	-	1,793	1,793	-	-	-
96	Saint Lucia	3,404	-	3,404	1,793	-	1,793	46	5,243
97	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	13,566	11,956	1,610	1,793	-	1,793	11	3,414
98	Samoa	13,644	13,644	-	1,793	1,793	-	-	-
99	San Marino	40,668	40,668	-	5,378	5,378	-	-	-
100	Senegal	69,128	59,524	9,604	10,644	-	10,644	48	20,296

<i>States Parties</i>	<i>Prior Years' Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>Prior Years' Receipts and Credits</i>	<i>Prior Years' Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>2013 Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>2013 Receipts and Credits</i>	<i>2013 Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Outstanding contributions Contingency Fund</i>	<i>Total Outstanding contributions</i>
101 Serbia	355,264	355,264	-	71,257	71,257	-	-	-
102 Seychelles	6,808	6,808	-	1,793	1,793	-	-	-
103 Sierra Leone	13,762	9,367	4,395	1,793	-	1,793	46	6,234
104 Slovakia	1,176,147	1,176,147	-	304,524	304,524	-	-	-
105 Slovenia	1,287,707	1,287,707	-	178,031	178,031	-	-	-
106 South Africa	4,518,268	4,518,268	-	662,378	662,378	-	-	-
107 Spain	39,727,262	39,727,262	-	5,293,983	5,293,983	-	-	-
108 Suriname	15,825	15,825	-	7,171	4,816	2,355	32	2,387
109 Sweden	14,383,826	14,383,826	-	1,709,500	1,709,500	-	-	-
110 Switzerland	16,291,293	16,291,293	-	1,864,339	1,864,339	-	-	-
111 Tajikistan	18,447	18,447	-	5,378	3,213	2,165	24	2,189
112 The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	82,889	82,889	-	14,229	11,549	2,680	64	2,744
113 Timor-Leste	13,644	13,603	41	3,585	-	3,585	16	3,642
114 Trinidad and Tobago	424,114	424,114	-	78,316	78,316	-	-	-
115 Tunisia	63,738	63,738	-	64,087	49,602	14,485	286	14,771
116 Uganda	68,829	68,829	-	10,644	51	10,593	48	10,641
117 United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	88,460,083	88,460,083	-	9,222,092	9,222,092	-	-	-
118 United Republic of Tanzania	90,401	65,966	24,435	11,204	-	11,204	354	35,993
119 Uruguay	490,180	488,459	1,721	92,545	-	92,545	413	94,679
120 Vanuatu	1,480	-	1,480	1,793	-	1,793	8	3,281
121 Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	3,174,062	3,174,062	-	1,116,475	176,721	939,754	4,983	944,737
122 Zambia	32,134	32,134	-	10,644	-	10,644	48	10,692
<i>Rounding diff.</i>				<i>-124</i>				
	<b>822,788,596</b>	<b>822,430,006</b>	<b>336,025</b>	<b>112,039,600</b>	<b>102,882,641</b>	<b>9,157,083</b>	<b>50,463</b>	<b>9,543,571</b>

Note: The table includes outstanding assessed programme budget contributions and outstanding contributions to replenishments of the Contingency Fund; it does not include outstanding advances to the Working Capital Fund.

## Annex III

### List of potential developments which could impact on the 2014 proposed programme budget

#### I. Procedural developments provided for by the Rome Statute but not yet certain

- a) *Gbagbo* trial preparation following the confirmation of charges: July – December 2014 (possible financial implications: €640,000)
- b) *Ntaganda* trial preparation following the confirmation of charges: July – December 2014 (possible financial implications: €640,000)

#### II. Procedural developments leading to delays in on-going proceedings

- a) Delays in proceedings due to unexpected evidentiary obstacles (example: (temporary) unavailability of witnesses)
- b) Delays in proceedings due to health issues of the accused (example: Pre-Trial Proceedings in 2012 in the *Gbagbo* case)
- c) Katanga: possibility that Defence requests further witnesses to be called for final determination of the mode of liability, leading to an extension of proceedings into early 2014
- d) Issues subject to interlocutory appeals before the Appeals Chamber: any interlocutory appeals (requiring suspensive effect) in cases on trial, slowing down progress in proceedings on the merits

#### III. Procedural developments currently unforeseeable

- a) United Nations Security Council referral of a situation to the Court;
- b) State Party referral
- c) Prosecutor opening a *proprio motu* investigation in a new situation (after having sought and obtained permission to do so by the Pre-Trial Chamber)
- d) Arrest or surrender to the Court of persons sought with an arrest warrant (example: Bosco Ntaganda earlier this year)
- e) Surrender to the Court of persons sought with an arrest warrant and already detained in other countries (examples: Simone Gbagbo; Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi; Abdullah Al-Senussi)
- f) (Temporary) unavailability of a judge or other key party to the proceedings due to serious illness



## Annex IV

## Requests to access the Contingency Fund – 2013

<i>No</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description of the request</i>	<i>Initial amount</i>	<i>First review</i>	<i>Second review</i>
1	17/12/2012	Extension of judges for Democratic Republic of the Congo and the related requirements for additional legal aid for the defence team in the case of The Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo Chui.	€311,087	€244,800	€244,800
2	17/12/2012	Continuation of Pre-trial proceedings in the case of The Prosecutor v. Laurent Gbagbo in the first seven months of 2013.	€509,100	€66,900	€66,900
3	09/04/2013	To meet unavoidable cost for the Mali situation.	€4,279,200	€3,791,200	€3,241,200
4	15/04/2013	Unavoidable costs in the case of The Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga in the situation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, namely the need to further extend the mandates of two judges of the Trial Chamber II beyond their extended mandates.	€14,500	€14,500	€14,500
5	18/04/2013	Unavoidable unexpected costs relating to the transfer of suspects to the seat of the Court.	€24,554	€24,554	€24,554
6	12/06/2013	Unavoidable costs in the case of The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo.	€30,500	€30,500	€30,500
7	18/06/2013	Unavoidable costs in the case of The Prosecutor v. Bosco Ntaganda in the situation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.	€2,588,600	€2,588,600	€2,588,600
<b>Total amount of notifications</b>			<b>€8,457,541</b>	<b>€7,761,054</b>	<b>€7,211,054</b>

## Annex V

## Budgetary implications of the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee on Budget and Finance

### Comparison of proposed budget and the recommendations of the Committee on Budget and Finance (thousands of euros)

**Table 1: Total of all Major Programmes**

Total ICC	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
<i>Judges</i>	3,835.6		3,835.6	3,835.6		3,835.6			
Professional staff	20,945.8	21,946.5	42,892.3	20,739.8	21,732.8	42,472.6	-206.0	-213.7	-419.7
General Service staff	11,885.6	9,547.4	21,433.0	11,768.1	9,470.3	21,238.4	-117.5	-77.1	-194.6
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>32,831.4</i>	<i>31,493.9</i>	<i>64,325.3</i>	<i>32,507.9</i>	<i>31,203.1</i>	<i>63,711.0</i>	<i>-323.5</i>	<i>-290.8</i>	<i>-614.3</i>
General temporary assistance	3,125.3	16,896.7	20,022.0	2,823.4	14,200.7	17,024.1	-301.9	-2,696.0	-2,997.9
Temporary assistance for meetings	474.7	68.8	543.5	474.7	68.8	543.5			
Overtime	260.4	141.6	402.0	260.4	98.1	358.5		-43.5	-43.5
Consultants	34.6	244.0	278.6	33.4	240.3	273.7	-1.2	-3.7	-4.9
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>3,895.0</i>	<i>17,351.1</i>	<i>21,246.1</i>	<i>3,591.9</i>	<i>14,607.9</i>	<i>18,199.8</i>	<i>-303.1</i>	<i>-2,743.2</i>	<i>-3,046.3</i>
Travel	1,135.7	4,338.5	5,474.2	1,127.7	4,056.9	5,184.6	-8.0	-281.6	-289.6
Hospitality	40.0		40.0	31.0		31.0	-9.0		-9.0
Contractual services	2,349.3	2,145.1	4,494.4	2,305.1	2,100.0	4,405.1	-44.2	-45.1	-89.3
Training	473.9	255.0	728.9	473.9	229.9	703.8		-25.1	-25.1
Counsel for Defence		2,866.4	2,866.4		2,866.4	2,866.4			
Counsel for Victims		3,000.7	3,000.7		3,000.7	3,000.7			
General operating expenses	12,200.6	5,745.3	17,945.9	12,188.6	5,395.2	17,583.8	-12.0	-350.1	-362.1
Supplies and materials	721.4	294.0	1,015.4	721.4	294.0	1,015.4			
Furniture and equipment	625.9	472.9	1,098.8	584.8	428.2	1,013.0	-41.1	-44.7	-85.8
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>17,546.8</i>	<i>19,117.9</i>	<i>36,664.7</i>	<i>17,432.5</i>	<i>18,371.3</i>	<i>35,803.8</i>	<i>-114.3</i>	<i>-746.6</i>	<i>-860.9</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>58,108.8</b>	<b>67,962.9</b>	<b>126,071.7</b>	<b>57,367.9</b>	<b>64,182.3</b>	<b>121,550.2</b>	<b>-740.9</b>	<b>-3,780.6</b>	<b>-4,521.5</b>

**Table 2: Major Programme I: Judiciary**

Major Programme I Judiciary	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Judges	3,835.6		3,835.6	3,835.6		3,835.6			
Professional staff	3,119.1	516.0	3,635.1	3,088.3	511.0	3,599.3	-30.8	-5.0	-35.8
General Service staff	898.5	204.2	1,102.7	889.8	202.1	1,091.9	-8.7	-2.1	-10.8
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>4,017.6</i>	<i>720.2</i>	<i>4,737.8</i>	<i>3,978.1</i>	<i>713.1</i>	<i>4,691.2</i>	<i>-39.5</i>	<i>-7.1</i>	<i>-46.6</i>
General temporary assistance	115.4	1,225.2	1,340.6	114.2	1,108.9	1,223.1	-1.2	-116.3	-117.5
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>130.4</i>	<i>1,225.2</i>	<i>1,355.6</i>	<i>129.2</i>	<i>1,108.9</i>	<i>1,238.1</i>	<i>-1.2</i>	<i>-116.3</i>	<i>-117.5</i>
Travel	167.5		167.5	167.5		167.5			
Hospitality	17.0		17.0	12.0		12.0	-5.0		-5.0
Contractual services	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Training	24.0		24.0	24.0		24.0			
General operating expenses	67.4		67.4	67.4		67.4			
Supplies and materials	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>285.9</i>		<i>285.9</i>	<i>280.9</i>		<i>280.9</i>	<i>-5.0</i>		<i>-5.0</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,269.5</b>	<b>1,945.4</b>	<b>10,214.9</b>	<b>8,223.8</b>	<b>1,822.0</b>	<b>10,045.8</b>	<b>-45.7</b>	<b>-123.4</b>	<b>-169.1</b>

**Table 3: Programme 1100: The Presidency**

1100 The Presidency	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Judges	28.0		28.0	28.0		28.0			
Professional staff	798.8		798.8	790.9		790.9	-7.9		-7.9
General Service staff	289.5		289.5	286.7		286.7	-2.8		-2.8
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,088.3</i>		<i>1,088.3</i>	<i>1,077.6</i>		<i>1,077.6</i>	<i>-10.7</i>		<i>-10.7</i>
General temporary assistance	115.4		115.4	114.2		114.2	-1.2		-1.2
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>120.4</i>		<i>120.4</i>	<i>119.2</i>		<i>119.2</i>	<i>-1.2</i>		<i>-1.2</i>
Travel	159.9		159.9	159.9		159.9			
Hospitality	15.0		15.0	10.0		10.0	-5.0		-5.0
Contractual services									
Training	6.0		6.0	6.0		6.0			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>180.9</i>		<i>180.9</i>	<i>175.9</i>		<i>175.9</i>	<i>-5.0</i>		<i>-5.0</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,417.6</b>		<b>1,417.6</b>	<b>1,400.7</b>		<b>1,400.7</b>	<b>-16.9</b>		<b>-16.9</b>

**Table 4: Programme 1200: Chambers**

1200 Chambers	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Judges	3,807.6		3,807.6	3,807.6		3,807.6			
Professional staff	2,150.4	516.0	2,666.4	2,129.2	511.0	2,640.2	-21.2	-5.0	-26.2
General Service staff	544.4	204.2	748.6	539.1	202.1	741.2	-5.3	-2.1	-7.4
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>2,694.8</i>	<i>720.2</i>	<i>3,415.0</i>	<i>2,668.3</i>	<i>713.1</i>	<i>3,381.4</i>	<i>-26.5</i>	<i>-7.1</i>	<i>-33.6</i>
General temporary assistance		1,225.2	1,225.2		1,108.9	1,108.9		-116.3	-116.3
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>10.0</i>	<i>1,225.2</i>	<i>1,235.2</i>	<i>10.0</i>	<i>1,108.9</i>	<i>1,118.9</i>		<i>-116.3</i>	<i>-116.3</i>
Travel									
Hospitality	1.0		1.0	1.0		1.0			
Contractual services									
Training	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>19.0</i>		<i>19.0</i>	<i>19.0</i>		<i>19.0</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,531.4</b>	<b>1,945.4</b>	<b>8,476.8</b>	<b>6,504.9</b>	<b>1,822.0</b>	<b>8,326.9</b>	<b>-26.5</b>	<b>-123.4</b>	<b>-149.9</b>

**Table 5: Sub-programme 1310: New York Liaison Office**

1310 New York Liaison Office	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Judges									
Professional staff	169.9		169.9	168.2		168.2	-1.7		-1.7
General Service staff	64.6		64.6	64.0		64.0	-0.6		-0.6
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>234.5</i>		<i>234.5</i>	<i>232.2</i>		<i>232.2</i>	<i>-2.3</i>		<i>-2.3</i>
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	7.6		7.6	7.6		7.6			
Hospitality	1.0		1.0	1.0		1.0			
Contractual services	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Training									
General operating expenses	67.4		67.4	67.4		67.4			
Supplies and materials	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>86.0</i>		<i>86.0</i>	<i>86.0</i>		<i>86.0</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>320.5</b>		<b>320.5</b>	<b>318.2</b>		<b>318.2</b>	<b>-2.3</b>		<b>-2.3</b>

**Table 6: Major Programme II: Office of the Prosecutor**

Major Programme II Office of The Prosecutor	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	4,159.8	12,533.0	16,692.8	4,118.9	12,409.7	16,528.6	-40.9	-123.3	-164.2
General Service staff	1,071.2	2,955.2	4,026.4	1,060.7	2,927.5	3,988.2	-10.5	-27.7	-38.2
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>5,231.0</i>	<i>15,488.2</i>	<i>20,719.2</i>	<i>5,179.6</i>	<i>15,337.2</i>	<i>20,516.8</i>	<i>-51.4</i>	<i>-151.0</i>	<i>-202.4</i>
General temporary assistance	93.5	11,702.3	11,795.8	92.5	9,627.5	9,720.0	-1.0	-2,074.8	-2,075.8
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		86.9	86.9		86.9	86.9			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>93.5</i>	<i>11,789.2</i>	<i>11,882.7</i>	<i>92.5</i>	<i>9,714.4</i>	<i>9,806.9</i>	<i>-1.0</i>	<i>-2,074.8</i>	<i>-2,075.8</i>
Travel	278.9	1,960.2	2,239.1	248.1	1,747.7	1,995.8	-30.8	-212.5	-243.3
Hospitality	8.0		8.0	5.0		5.0	-3.0		-3.0
Contractual services	25.0	347.5	372.5	25.0	347.5	372.5			
Training	35.0	65.0	100.0	35.0	65.0	100.0			
General operating expenses		315.0	315.0		315.0	315.0			
Supplies and materials	38.0	20.0	58.0	38.0	20.0	58.0			
Furniture and equipment		50.0	50.0		50.0	50.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>384.9</i>	<i>2,757.7</i>	<i>3,142.6</i>	<i>351.1</i>	<i>2,545.2</i>	<i>2,896.3</i>	<i>-33.8</i>	<i>-212.5</i>	<i>-246.3</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,709.4</b>	<b>30,035.1</b>	<b>35,744.5</b>	<b>5,623.2</b>	<b>27,596.8</b>	<b>33,220.0</b>	<b>-86.2</b>	<b>-2,438.3</b>	<b>-2,524.5</b>

**Table 7: Programme 2100: The Prosecutor**

2100 The Prosecutor	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	2,239.4	450.1	2,689.5	2,217.4	445.7	2,663.1	-22.0	-4.4	-26.4
General Service staff	675.8	724.9	1,400.7	669.2	717.8	1,387.0	-6.6	-7.1	-13.7
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>2,915.2</i>	<i>1,175.0</i>	<i>4,090.2</i>	<i>2,886.6</i>	<i>1,163.5</i>	<i>4,050.1</i>	<i>-28.6</i>	<i>-11.5</i>	<i>-40.1</i>
General temporary assistance	93.5	2,405.3	2,498.8	92.5	2,381.3	2,473.8	-1.0	-24.0	-25.0
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		86.9	86.9		86.9	86.9			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>93.5</i>	<i>2,492.2</i>	<i>2,585.7</i>	<i>92.5</i>	<i>2,468.2</i>	<i>2,560.7</i>	<i>-1.0</i>	<i>-24.0</i>	<i>-25.0</i>
Travel	119.6	358.2	477.8	103.3	323.2	426.5	-16.3	-35.0	-51.3
Hospitality	8.0		8.0	5.0		5.0	-3.0		-3.0
Contractual services	25.0	237.5	262.5	25.0	237.5	262.5			
Training	35.0	65.0	100.0	35.0	65.0	100.0			
General operating expenses		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0			
Supplies and materials	38.0	20.0	58.0	38.0	20.0	58.0			
Furniture and equipment		50.0	50.0		50.0	50.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>225.6</i>	<i>760.7</i>	<i>986.3</i>	<i>206.3</i>	<i>725.7</i>	<i>932.0</i>	<i>-19.3</i>	<i>-35.0</i>	<i>-54.3</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,234.3</b>	<b>4,427.9</b>	<b>7,662.2</b>	<b>3,185.4</b>	<b>4,357.4</b>	<b>7,542.8</b>	<b>-48.9</b>	<b>-70.5</b>	<b>-119.4</b>

**Table 8: Sub-programme 2110: Immediate Office of the Prosecutor**

2110 Immediate Office of the Prosecutor	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	1,094.2		1,094.2	1,083.5		1,083.5	-10.7		-10.7
General Service staff	346.3		346.3	342.9		342.9	-3.4		-3.4
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,440.5</i>		<i>1,440.5</i>	<i>1,426.4</i>		<i>1,426.4</i>	<i>-14.1</i>		<i>-14.1</i>
General temporary assistance	93.5	82.9	176.4	92.5	82.1	174.6	-1.0	-0.8	-1.8
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		86.9	86.9		86.9	86.9			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>93.5</i>	<i>169.8</i>	<i>263.3</i>	<i>92.5</i>	<i>169.0</i>	<i>261.5</i>	<i>-1.0</i>	<i>-0.8</i>	<i>-1.8</i>
Travel	81.2	84.6	165.8	67.9	70.8	138.7	-13.3	-13.8	-27.1
Hospitality	8.0		8.0	5.0		5.0	-3.0		-3.0
Contractual services		50.0	50.0		50.0	50.0			
Training	35.0	65.0	100.0	35.0	65.0	100.0			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>124.2</i>	<i>199.6</i>	<i>323.8</i>	<i>107.9</i>	<i>185.8</i>	<i>293.7</i>	<i>-16.3</i>	<i>-13.8</i>	<i>-30.1</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,658.2</b>	<b>369.4</b>	<b>2,027.6</b>	<b>1,626.8</b>	<b>354.8</b>	<b>1,981.6</b>	<b>-31.4</b>	<b>-14.6</b>	<b>-46.0</b>

**Table 9: Sub-programme 2120: Services Section**

2120 Services Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	1,145.2	450.1	1,595.3	1,133.9	445.7	1,579.6	-11.3	-4.4	-15.7
General Service staff	329.5	724.9	1,054.4	326.3	717.8	1,044.1	-3.2	-7.1	-10.3
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,474.7</i>	<i>1,175.0</i>	<i>2,649.7</i>	<i>1,460.2</i>	<i>1,163.5</i>	<i>2,623.7</i>	<i>-14.5</i>	<i>-11.5</i>	<i>-26.0</i>
General temporary assistance		2,322.4	2,322.4		2,299.2	2,299.2		-23.2	-23.2
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>2,322.4</i>	<i>2,322.4</i>		<i>2,299.2</i>	<i>2,299.2</i>		<i>-23.2</i>	<i>-23.2</i>
Travel	38.4	273.6	312.0	35.4	252.4	287.8	-3.0	-21.2	-24.2
Hospitality									
Contractual services	25.0	187.5	212.5	25.0	187.5	212.5			
Training									
General operating expenses		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0			
Supplies and materials	38.0	20.0	58.0	38.0	20.0	58.0			
Furniture and equipment		50.0	50.0		50.0	50.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>101.4</i>	<i>561.1</i>	<i>662.5</i>	<i>98.4</i>	<i>539.9</i>	<i>638.3</i>	<i>-3.0</i>	<i>-21.2</i>	<i>-24.2</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,576.1</b>	<b>4,058.5</b>	<b>5,634.6</b>	<b>1,558.6</b>	<b>4,002.6</b>	<b>5,561.2</b>	<b>-17.5</b>	<b>-55.9</b>	<b>-73.4</b>

**Table 10: Programme 2200: Jurisdiction, Complementarity and Cooperation Division (JCCD)**

2200 Jurisdiction, Complementarity and Cooperation Division	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	781.0	947.9	1,728.9	773.3	938.6	1,711.9	-7.7	-9.3	-17.0
General Service staff	131.8		131.8	130.5		130.5	-1.3		-1.3
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>912.8</i>	<i>947.9</i>	<i>1,860.7</i>	<i>903.8</i>	<i>938.6</i>	<i>1,842.4</i>	<i>-9.0</i>	<i>-9.3</i>	<i>-18.3</i>
General temporary assistance		1,086.0	1,086.0		960.8	960.8		-125.2	-125.2
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>1,086.0</i>	<i>1,086.0</i>		<i>960.8</i>	<i>960.8</i>		<i>-125.2</i>	<i>-125.2</i>
Travel	144.3	313.3	457.6	131.5	285.4	416.9	-12.8	-27.9	-40.7
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>144.3</i>	<i>313.3</i>	<i>457.6</i>	<i>131.5</i>	<i>285.4</i>	<i>416.9</i>	<i>-12.8</i>	<i>-27.9</i>	<i>-40.7</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,057.1</b>	<b>2,347.2</b>	<b>3,404.3</b>	<b>1,035.3</b>	<b>2,184.8</b>	<b>3,220.1</b>	<b>-21.8</b>	<b>-162.4</b>	<b>-184.2</b>

**Table 11: Programme 2300: Investigation Division**

2300 Investigation Division	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	305.7	7,616.7	7,922.4	302.7	7,541.8	7,844.5	-3.0	-74.9	-77.9
General Service staff	131.8	1,769.0	1,900.8	130.5	1,752.8	1,883.3	-1.3	-16.2	-17.5
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>437.5</i>	<i>9,385.7</i>	<i>9,823.2</i>	<i>433.2</i>	<i>9,294.6</i>	<i>9,727.8</i>	<i>-4.3</i>	<i>-91.1</i>	<i>-95.4</i>
General temporary assistance		4,592.3	4,592.3		3,261.4	3,261.4		-1,330.9	-1,330.9
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>4,592.3</i>	<i>4,592.3</i>		<i>3,261.4</i>	<i>3,261.4</i>		<i>-1,330.9</i>	<i>-1,330.9</i>
Travel		1,075.4	1,075.4		949.9	949.9		-125.5	-125.5
Hospitality									
Contractual services		110.0	110.0		110.0	110.0			
Training									
General operating expenses		285.0	285.0		285.0	285.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>		<i>1,470.4</i>	<i>1,470.4</i>		<i>1,344.9</i>	<i>1,344.9</i>		<i>-125.5</i>	<i>-125.5</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>437.5</b>	<b>15,448.4</b>	<b>15,885.9</b>	<b>433.2</b>	<b>13,900.9</b>	<b>14,334.1</b>	<b>-4.3</b>	<b>-1,547.5</b>	<b>-1,551.8</b>

**Table 12: Sub-programme 2320: Planning and Operations Section**

2320 Planning and Operations Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	305.7	3,160.7	3,466.4	302.7	3,129.9	3,432.6	-3.0	-30.8	-33.8
General Service staff	131.8	1,439.5	1,571.3	130.5	1,426.5	1,557.0	-1.3	-13.0	-14.3
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>437.5</i>	<i>4,600.2</i>	<i>5,037.7</i>	<i>433.2</i>	<i>4,556.4</i>	<i>4,989.6</i>	<i>-4.3</i>	<i>-43.8</i>	<i>-48.1</i>
General temporary assistance		2,020.6	2,020.6		1,986.8	1,986.8		-33.8	-33.8
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>2,020.6</i>	<i>2,020.6</i>		<i>1,986.8</i>	<i>1,986.8</i>		<i>-33.8</i>	<i>-33.8</i>
Travel		290.8	290.8		263.1	263.1		-27.7	-27.7
Hospitality									
Contractual services		110.0	110.0		110.0	110.0			
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>		<i>400.8</i>	<i>400.8</i>		<i>373.1</i>	<i>373.1</i>		<i>-27.7</i>	<i>-27.7</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>437.5</b>	<b>7,021.6</b>	<b>7,459.1</b>	<b>433.2</b>	<b>6,916.3</b>	<b>7,349.5</b>	<b>-4.3</b>	<b>-105.3</b>	<b>-109.6</b>

**Table 13: Sub-programme 2330: Investigation Teams**

2330 Investigation Teams	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff		4,456.0	4,456.0		4,411.9	4,411.9		-44.1	-44.1
General Service staff		329.5	329.5		326.3	326.3		-3.2	-3.2
<i>Subtotal staff</i>		<i>4,785.5</i>	<i>4,785.5</i>		<i>4,738.2</i>	<i>4,738.2</i>		<i>-47.3</i>	<i>-47.3</i>
General temporary assistance		2,571.7	2,571.7		1,274.6	1,274.6		-1,297.1	-1,297.1
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>2,571.7</i>	<i>2,571.7</i>		<i>1,274.6</i>	<i>1,274.6</i>		<i>-1,297.1</i>	<i>-1,297.1</i>
Travel		784.6	784.6		686.8	686.8		-97.8	-97.8
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
General operating expenses		285.0	285.0		285.0	285.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>		<i>1,069.6</i>	<i>1,069.6</i>		<i>971.8</i>	<i>971.8</i>		<i>-97.8</i>	<i>-97.8</i>
<b>Total</b>		<b>8,426.8</b>	<b>8,426.8</b>		<b>6,984.6</b>	<b>6,984.6</b>		<b>-1,442.2</b>	<b>-1,442.2</b>



**Table 14: Programme 2400: Prosecution Division**

2400 Prosecution Division	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	833.7	3,518.3	4,352.0	825.5	3,483.6	4,309.1	-8.2	-34.7	-42.9
General Service staff	131.8	461.3	593.1	130.5	456.9	587.4	-1.3	-4.4	-5.7
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>965.5</i>	<i>3,979.6</i>	<i>4,945.1</i>	<i>956.0</i>	<i>3,940.5</i>	<i>4,896.5</i>	<i>-9.5</i>	<i>-39.1</i>	<i>-48.6</i>
General temporary assistance		3,618.7	3,618.7		3,024.0	3,024.0		-594.7	-594.7
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>3,618.7</i>	<i>3,618.7</i>		<i>3,024.0</i>	<i>3,024.0</i>		<i>-594.7</i>	<i>-594.7</i>
Travel	15.0	213.3	228.3	13.3	189.2	202.5	-1.7	-24.1	-25.8
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>15.0</i>	<i>213.3</i>	<i>228.3</i>	<i>13.3</i>	<i>189.2</i>	<i>202.5</i>	<i>-1.7</i>	<i>-24.1</i>	<i>-25.8</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>980.5</b>	<b>7,811.6</b>	<b>8,792.1</b>	<b>969.3</b>	<b>7,153.7</b>	<b>8,123.0</b>	<b>-11.2</b>	<b>-657.9</b>	<b>-669.1</b>

**Table 15: Major Programme III: The Registry**

Major Programme III The Registry	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	12,199.2	8,460.0	20,659.2	12,079.3	8,378.8	20,458.1	-119.9	-81.2	-201.1
General Service staff	9,496.2	6,323.5	15,819.7	9,402.2	6,276.9	15,679.1	-94.0	-46.6	-140.6
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>21,695.4</i>	<i>14,783.5</i>	<i>36,478.9</i>	<i>21,481.5</i>	<i>14,655.7</i>	<i>36,137.2</i>	<i>-213.9</i>	<i>-127.8</i>	<i>-341.7</i>
General temporary assistance	2,158.3	3,900.1	6,058.4	1,866.1	3,395.2	5,261.3	-292.2	-504.9	-797.1
Temporary assistance for meetings	254.7	68.8	323.5	254.7	68.8	323.5			
Overtime	222.4	141.6	364.0	222.4	98.1	320.5		-43.5	-43.5
Consultants	19.6	47.1	66.7	18.4	43.4	61.8	-1.2	-3.7	-4.9
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>2,655.0</i>	<i>4,157.6</i>	<i>6,812.6</i>	<i>2,361.6</i>	<i>3,605.5</i>	<i>5,967.1</i>	<i>-293.4</i>	<i>-552.1</i>	<i>-845.5</i>
Travel	196.0	2,252.3	2,448.3	196.0	2,183.2	2,379.2		-69.1	-69.1
Hospitality	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
Contractual services	835.3	1,717.6	2,552.9	791.1	1,672.5	2,463.6	-44.2	-45.1	-89.3
Training	389.3	174.4	563.7	389.3	149.3	538.6		-25.1	-25.1
Counsel for Defence		2,866.4	2,866.4		2,866.4	2,866.4			
Counsel for Victims		3,000.7	3,000.7		3,000.7	3,000.7			
General operating expenses	6,028.8	5,420.3	11,449.1	6,016.8	5,070.2	11,087.0	-12.0	-350.1	-362.1
Supplies and materials	649.2	274.0	923.2	649.2	274.0	923.2			
Furniture and equipment	593.9	417.9	1,011.8	552.8	373.2	926.0	-41.1	-44.7	-85.8
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>8,696.5</i>	<i>16,123.6</i>	<i>24,820.1</i>	<i>8,599.2</i>	<i>15,589.5</i>	<i>24,188.7</i>	<i>-97.3</i>	<i>-534.1</i>	<i>-631.4</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>33,046.9</b>	<b>35,064.7</b>	<b>68,111.6</b>	<b>32,442.3</b>	<b>33,850.7</b>	<b>66,293.0</b>	<b>-604.6</b>	<b>-1,214.0</b>	<b>-1,818.6</b>

**Table 16: Programme 3100: Office of the Registrar**

3100 Office of the Registrar	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	2,588.7	1,623.4	4,212.1	2,563.3	1,608.1	4,171.4	-25.4	-15.3	-40.7
General Service staff	2,676.0	2,091.0	4,767.0	2,649.9	2,079.1	4,729.0	-26.1	-11.9	-38.0
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>5,264.7</i>	<i>3,714.4</i>	<i>8,979.1</i>	<i>5,213.2</i>	<i>3,687.2</i>	<i>8,900.4</i>	<i>-51.5</i>	<i>-27.2</i>	<i>-78.7</i>
General temporary assistance	1,082.4	607.5	1,689.9	1,082.4	587.1	1,669.5		-20.4	-20.4
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime	124.4	50.3	174.7	124.4	50.3	174.7			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>1,206.8</i>	<i>657.8</i>	<i>1,864.6</i>	<i>1,206.8</i>	<i>637.4</i>	<i>1,844.2</i>		-20.4	-20.4
Travel	37.5	637.5	675.0	37.5	629.8	667.3		-7.7	-7.7
Hospitality	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
Contractual services	112.0	463.9	575.9	107.0	418.8	525.8	-5.0	-45.1	-50.1
Training	97.2	108.1	205.3	97.2	108.1	205.3			
Counsel for Defence		2,866.4	2,866.4		2,866.4	2,866.4			
Counsel for Victims		3,000.7	3,000.7		3,000.7	3,000.7			
General operating expenses	165.0	563.5	728.5	165.0	563.5	728.5			
Supplies and materials	63.3	159.8	223.1	63.3	159.8	223.1			
Furniture and equipment	0.9	1.8	2.7	0.9	1.8	2.7			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>479.9</i>	<i>7,801.7</i>	<i>8,281.6</i>	<i>474.9</i>	<i>7,748.9</i>	<i>8,223.8</i>	<i>-5.0</i>	<i>-52.8</i>	<i>-57.8</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,951.4</b>	<b>12,173.9</b>	<b>19,125.3</b>	<b>6,894.9</b>	<b>12,073.5</b>	<b>18,968.4</b>	<b>-56.5</b>	<b>-100.4</b>	<b>-156.9</b>

**Table 17: Sub-programme 3110: Immediate Office of the Registrar**

3110 Immediate Office of the Registrar	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	958.1		958.1	948.7		948.7	-9.4		-9.4
General Service staff	207.8		207.8	207.8		207.8			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,165.9</i>		<i>1,165.9</i>	<i>1,156.5</i>		<i>1,156.5</i>	<i>-9.4</i>		<i>-9.4</i>
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	21.4	32.5	53.9	21.4	32.5	53.9			
Hospitality	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
Contractual services									
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>25.4</i>	<i>32.5</i>	<i>57.9</i>	<i>25.4</i>	<i>32.5</i>	<i>57.9</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,191.3</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>1,223.8</b>	<b>1,181.9</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>1,214.4</b>	<b>-9.4</b>		<b>-9.4</b>

**Table 18: Sub-programme 3130: Legal Advisory Services Section**

3130 Legal Advisory Services Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	592.7		592.7	586.9		586.9	-5.8		-5.8
General Service staff	128.9		128.9	127.7		127.7	-1.2		-1.2
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>721.6</i>		<i>721.6</i>	<i>714.6</i>		<i>714.6</i>	<i>-7.0</i>		<i>-7.0</i>
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel									
Hospitality									
Contractual services	17.5		17.5	17.5		17.5			
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>17.5</i>		<i>17.5</i>	<i>17.5</i>		<i>17.5</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>739.1</b>		<b>739.1</b>	<b>732.1</b>		<b>732.1</b>	<b>-7.0</b>		<b>-7.0</b>

**Table 19: Sub-programme 3140: Security and Safety Section**

3140 Security and Safety Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	592.7	557.2	1,149.9	586.9	552.0	1,138.9	-5.8	-5.2	-11.0
General Service staff	2,208.4	1,423.2	3,631.6	2,186.7	1,413.9	3,600.6	-21.7	-9.3	-31.0
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>2,801.1</i>	<i>1,980.4</i>	<i>4,781.5</i>	<i>2,773.6</i>	<i>1,965.9</i>	<i>4,739.5</i>	<i>-27.5</i>	<i>-14.5</i>	<i>-42.0</i>
General temporary assistance	1,082.4	208.0	1,290.4	1,082.4	206.1	1,288.5		-1.9	-1.9
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime	124.4	50.3	174.7	124.4	50.3	174.7			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>1,206.8</i>	<i>258.3</i>	<i>1,465.1</i>	<i>1,206.8</i>	<i>256.4</i>	<i>1,463.2</i>		<i>-1.9</i>	<i>-1.9</i>
Travel	9.5	390.5	400.0	9.5	390.5	400.0			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	94.5	217.2	311.7	89.5	217.2	306.7	-5.0		-5.0
Training	97.2	100.7	197.9	97.2	100.7	197.9			
General operating expenses	165.0	120.6	285.6	165.0	120.6	285.6			
Supplies and materials	63.3	16.2	79.5	63.3	16.2	79.5			
Furniture and equipment	0.9	1.8	2.7	0.9	1.8	2.7			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>430.4</i>	<i>847.0</i>	<i>1,277.4</i>	<i>425.4</i>	<i>847.0</i>	<i>1,272.4</i>	<i>-5.0</i>		<i>-5.0</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,438.3</b>	<b>3,085.7</b>	<b>7,524.0</b>	<b>4,405.8</b>	<b>3,069.3</b>	<b>7,475.1</b>	<b>-32.5</b>	<b>-16.4</b>	<b>-48.9</b>

**Table 20: Sub-programme 3180: Field Operations Section**

3180 Field Operations Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff		854.3	854.3		846.3	846.3		-8.0	-8.0
General Service staff		603.3	603.3		601.4	601.4		-1.9	-1.9
<i>Subtotal staff</i>		<i>1,457.6</i>	<i>1,457.6</i>		<i>1,447.7</i>	<i>1,447.7</i>		<i>-9.9</i>	<i>-9.9</i>
General temporary assistance		306.0	306.0		303.9	303.9		-2.1	-2.1
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>306.0</i>	<i>306.0</i>		<i>303.9</i>	<i>303.9</i>		<i>-2.1</i>	<i>-2.1</i>
Travel		137.0	137.0		137.0	137.0			
Hospitality									
Contractual services		246.7	246.7		201.6	201.6		-45.1	-45.1
Training		7.4	7.4		7.4	7.4			
General operating expenses		441.9	441.9		441.9	441.9			
Supplies and materials		143.6	143.6		143.6	143.6			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>		<i>976.6</i>	<i>976.6</i>		<i>931.5</i>	<i>931.5</i>		<i>-45.1</i>	<i>-45.1</i>
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,740.2</b>	<b>2,740.2</b>		<b>2,683.1</b>	<b>2,683.1</b>		<b>-57.1</b>	<b>-57.1</b>

**Table 21: Sub-programme 3190: Counsel Support Section**

3190 Counsel Support Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	445.2	211.9	657.1	440.8	209.8	650.6	-4.4	-2.1	-6.5
General Service staff	128.9	64.5	193.4	127.7	63.8	191.5	-1.2	-0.7	-1.9
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>574.1</i>	<i>276.4</i>	<i>850.5</i>	<i>568.5</i>	<i>273.6</i>	<i>842.1</i>	<i>-5.6</i>	<i>-2.8</i>	<i>-8.4</i>
General temporary assistance		93.5	93.5		77.1	77.1		-16.4	-16.4
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>93.5</i>	<i>93.5</i>		<i>77.1</i>	<i>77.1</i>		<i>-16.4</i>	<i>-16.4</i>
Travel	6.6	77.5	84.1	6.6	69.8	76.4		-7.7	-7.7
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
Counsel for Defence		2,866.4	2,866.4		2,866.4	2,866.4			
Counsel for Victims		3,000.7	3,000.7		3,000.7	3,000.7			
General operating expenses		1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>6.6</i>	<i>5,945.6</i>	<i>5,952.2</i>	<i>6.6</i>	<i>5,937.9</i>	<i>5,944.5</i>		<i>-7.7</i>	<i>-7.7</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>580.7</b>	<b>6,315.5</b>	<b>6,896.2</b>	<b>575.1</b>	<b>6,288.6</b>	<b>6,863.7</b>	<b>-5.6</b>	<b>-26.9</b>	<b>-32.5</b>

**Table 22: Programme 3200: Common Administrative Services Division**

3200 Common Administrative Services Division	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	3,637.5	567.0	4,204.5	3,601.7	561.4	4,163.1	-35.8	-5.6	-41.4
General Service staff	5,385.2	1,534.3	6,919.5	5,332.0	1,519.4	6,851.4	-53.2	-14.9	-68.1
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>9,022.7</i>	<i>2,101.3</i>	<i>11,124.0</i>	<i>8,933.7</i>	<i>2,080.8</i>	<i>11,014.5</i>	<i>-89.0</i>	<i>-20.5</i>	<i>-109.5</i>
General temporary assistance	812.3	330.0	1,142.3	522.7	294.7	817.4	-289.6	-35.3	-324.9
Temporary assistance for meetings	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0			
Overtime	98.0	32.8	130.8	98.0	32.8	130.8			
Consultants	14.6		14.6	14.6		14.6			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>944.9</i>	<i>362.8</i>	<i>1,307.7</i>	<i>655.3</i>	<i>327.5</i>	<i>982.8</i>	<i>-289.6</i>	<i>-35.3</i>	<i>-324.9</i>
Travel	74.9	65.0	139.9	74.9	65.0	139.9			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	396.8	187.0	583.8	357.6	187.0	544.6	-39.2		-39.2
Training	247.2		247.2	247.2		247.2			
General operating expenses	4,410.9	1,698.7	6,109.6	4,398.9	1,680.7	6,079.6	-12.0	-18.0	-30.0
Supplies and materials	431.7		431.7	431.7		431.7			
Furniture and equipment	593.0	416.1	1,009.1	551.9	371.4	923.3	-41.1	-44.7	-85.8
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>6,154.5</i>	<i>2,366.8</i>	<i>8,521.3</i>	<i>6,062.2</i>	<i>2,304.1</i>	<i>8,366.3</i>	<i>-92.3</i>	<i>-62.7</i>	<i>-155.0</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,122.1</b>	<b>4,830.9</b>	<b>20,953.0</b>	<b>15,651.2</b>	<b>4,712.4</b>	<b>20,363.6</b>	<b>-470.9</b>	<b>-118.5</b>	<b>-589.4</b>

**Table 23: Sub-programme 3210: Office of the Director CASD**

3210 Office of the Director CASD	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	379.0		379.0	375.2		375.2	-3.8		-3.8
General Service staff	64.5		64.5	63.8		63.8	-0.7		-0.7
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>443.5</i>		<i>443.5</i>	<i>439.0</i>		<i>439.0</i>	<i>-4.5</i>		<i>-4.5</i>
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	19.7		19.7	19.7		19.7			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>19.7</i>		<i>19.7</i>	<i>19.7</i>		<i>19.7</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>463.2</b>		<b>463.2</b>	<b>458.7</b>		<b>458.7</b>	<b>-4.5</b>		<b>-4.5</b>

**Table 24: Sub-programme 3220: Human Resources Section**

3220 Human Resources Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	800.4		800.4	792.5		792.5	-7.9		-7.9
General Service staff	806.5	193.4	999.9	798.5	191.5	990.0	-8.0	-1.9	-9.9
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,606.9</i>	<i>193.4</i>	<i>1,800.3</i>	<i>1,591.0</i>	<i>191.5</i>	<i>1,782.5</i>	<i>-15.9</i>	<i>-1.9</i>	<i>-17.8</i>
General temporary assistance	322.2		322.2	319.1		319.1	-3.1		-3.1
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	14.6		14.6	14.6		14.6			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>336.8</i>		<i>336.8</i>	<i>333.7</i>		<i>333.7</i>	<i>-3.1</i>		<i>-3.1</i>
Travel	6.0	11.0	17.0	6.0	11.0	17.0			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	16.7		16.7	16.7		16.7			
Training	160.0		160.0	160.0		160.0			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials	45.2		45.2	45.2		45.2			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>227.9</i>	<i>11.0</i>	<i>238.9</i>	<i>227.9</i>	<i>11.0</i>	<i>238.9</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,171.6</b>	<b>204.4</b>	<b>2,376.0</b>	<b>2,152.6</b>	<b>202.5</b>	<b>2,355.1</b>	<b>-19.0</b>	<b>-1.9</b>	<b>-20.9</b>

**Table 25: Sub-programme 3240: Budget and Finance Section**

3240 Budget and Finance Section	Proposed Budget 2014				Proposed Budget 2014				Difference			
	Before CBF recommendations				After CBF recommendations				Before CBF vs After CBF			
	Basic	Situation-related	IPSAS	Total	Basic	Situation-related	IPSAS	Total	Basic	Situation-related	IPSAS	Total
Professional staff	756.7			756.7	749.3			749.3	-7.4			-7.4
General Service staff	773.7	338.8		1,112.5	766.0	335.4		1,101.4	-7.7	-3.4		-11.1
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,530.4</i>	<i>338.8</i>		<i>1,869.2</i>	<i>1,515.3</i>	<i>335.4</i>		<i>1,850.7</i>	<i>-15.1</i>	<i>-3.4</i>		<i>-18.5</i>
General temporary assistance	170.0		248.5	418.5	132.7			132.7	-37.3		-248.5	-285.8
Temporary assistance for meetings												
Overtime	8.0			8.0	8.0			8.0				
Consultants												
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>178.0</i>		<i>248.5</i>	<i>426.5</i>	<i>140.7</i>			<i>140.7</i>	<i>-37.3</i>		<i>-248.5</i>	<i>-285.8</i>
Travel	10.2		10.0	20.2	10.2		10.0	20.2				
Hospitality												
Contractual services	86.1		56.8	142.9	88.4		15.3	103.7	2.3		-41.5	-39.2
Training			30.0	30.0			30.0	30.0				
General operating expenses	43.2			43.2	43.2			43.2				
Supplies and materials												
Furniture and equipment												
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>139.5</i>		<i>96.8</i>	<i>236.3</i>	<i>141.8</i>		<i>55.3</i>	<i>197.1</i>	<i>2.3</i>		<i>-41.5</i>	<i>-39.2</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,847.9</b>	<b>338.8</b>	<b>345.3</b>	<b>2,532.0</b>	<b>1,797.8</b>	<b>335.4</b>	<b>55.3</b>	<b>2,188.5</b>	<b>-50.1</b>	<b>-3.4</b>	<b>-290.0</b>	<b>-343.5</b>

**Table 26: Sub-programme 3250: General Services Section**

3250 General Services Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	568.8		568.8	563.2		563.2	-5.6		-5.6
General Service staff	2,370.2		2,370.2	2,346.9		2,346.9	-23.3		-23.3
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>2,939.0</i>		<i>2,939.0</i>	<i>2,910.1</i>		<i>2,910.1</i>	<i>-28.9</i>		<i>-28.9</i>
General temporary assistance	71.6		71.6	70.9		70.9	-0.7		-0.7
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime	55.0	32.8	87.8	55.0	32.8	87.8			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>126.6</i>	<i>32.8</i>	<i>159.4</i>	<i>125.9</i>	<i>32.8</i>	<i>158.7</i>	<i>-0.7</i>		<i>-0.7</i>
Travel	3.1	11.7	14.8	3.1	11.7	14.8			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	42.0		42.0	42.0		42.0			
Training	16.3		16.3	16.3		16.3			
General operating expenses	2,281.9	44.1	2,326.0	2,281.9	44.1	2,326.0			
Supplies and materials	201.5		201.5	201.5		201.5			
Furniture and equipment	68.0		68.0	68.0		68.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>2,612.8</i>	<i>55.8</i>	<i>2,668.6</i>	<i>2,612.8</i>	<i>55.8</i>	<i>2,668.6</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,678.4</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>5,767.0</b>	<b>5,648.8</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>5,737.4</b>	<b>-29.6</b>		<b>-29.6</b>

**Table 27: Sub-programme 3260: Information and Communication Technologies Section**

3260 Information and Communication Technologies Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	1,132.6	567.0	1,699.6	1,121.5	561.4	1,682.9	-11.1	-5.6	-16.7
General Service staff	1,370.3	1,002.1	2,372.4	1,356.8	992.5	2,349.3	-13.5	-9.6	-23.1
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>2,502.9</i>	<i>1,569.1</i>	<i>4,072.0</i>	<i>2,478.3</i>	<i>1,553.9</i>	<i>4,032.2</i>	<i>-24.6</i>	<i>-15.2</i>	<i>-39.8</i>
General temporary assistance		330.0	330.0		294.7	294.7		-35.3	-35.3
Temporary assistance for meetings	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0			
Overtime	35.0		35.0	35.0		35.0			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>55.0</i>	<i>330.0</i>	<i>385.0</i>	<i>55.0</i>	<i>294.7</i>	<i>349.7</i>		<i>-35.3</i>	<i>-35.3</i>
Travel	25.9	42.3	68.2	25.9	42.3	68.2			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	195.2	187.0	382.2	195.2	187.0	382.2			
Training	40.9		40.9	40.9		40.9			
General operating expenses	2,085.8	1,654.6	3,740.4	2,073.8	1,636.6	3,710.4	-12.0	-18.0	-30.0
Supplies and materials	185.0		185.0	185.0		185.0			
Furniture and equipment	525.0	416.1	941.1	483.9	371.4	855.3	-41.1	-44.7	-85.8
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>3,057.8</i>	<i>2,300.0</i>	<i>5,357.8</i>	<i>3,004.7</i>	<i>2,237.3</i>	<i>5,242.0</i>	<i>-53.1</i>	<i>-62.7</i>	<i>-115.8</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,615.7</b>	<b>4,199.1</b>	<b>9,814.8</b>	<b>5,538.0</b>	<b>4,085.9</b>	<b>9,623.9</b>	<b>-77.7</b>	<b>-113.2</b>	<b>-190.9</b>

**Table 28: Programme 3300: Division of Court Services**

3300 Division of Court Services	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	4,130.4	4,889.9	9,020.3	4,089.9	4,842.6	8,932.5	-40.5	-47.3	-87.8
General Service staff	644.8	2,458.7	3,103.5	638.2	2,438.9	3,077.1	-6.6	-19.8	-26.4
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>4,775.2</i>	<i>7,348.6</i>	<i>12,123.8</i>	<i>4,728.1</i>	<i>7,281.5</i>	<i>12,009.6</i>	<i>-47.1</i>	<i>-67.1</i>	<i>-114.2</i>
General temporary assistance		2,775.6	2,775.6		2,328.3	2,328.3		-447.3	-447.3
Temporary assistance for meetings	234.7	68.8	303.5	234.7	68.8	303.5			
Overtime		58.5	58.5		15.0	15.0		-43.5	-43.5
Consultants	5.0	47.1	52.1	3.8	43.4	47.2	-1.2	-3.7	-4.9
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>239.7</i>	<i>2,950.0</i>	<i>3,189.7</i>	<i>238.5</i>	<i>2,455.5</i>	<i>2,694.0</i>	<i>-1.2</i>	<i>-494.5</i>	<i>-495.7</i>
Travel	55.6	1,357.4	1,413.0	55.6	1,296.0	1,351.6		-61.4	-61.4
Hospitality									
Contractual services	55.0	290.1	345.1	55.0	290.1	345.1			
Training	16.1	64.1	80.2	16.1	39.0	55.1		-25.1	-25.1
General operating expenses	1,385.9	3,135.6	4,521.5	1,385.9	2,803.5	4,189.4		-332.1	-332.1
Supplies and materials	29.2	114.2	143.4	29.2	114.2	143.4			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>1,541.8</i>	<i>4,961.4</i>	<i>6,503.2</i>	<i>1,541.8</i>	<i>4,542.8</i>	<i>6,084.6</i>		<i>-418.6</i>	<i>-418.6</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,556.7</b>	<b>15,260.0</b>	<b>21,816.7</b>	<b>6,508.4</b>	<b>14,279.8</b>	<b>20,788.2</b>	<b>-48.3</b>	<b>-980.2</b>	<b>-1,028.5</b>

**Table 29: Sub-programme 3310: Office of the Director DCS**

3310 Office of the Director DCS	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	171.3	291.8	463.1	169.6	288.9	458.5	-1.7	-2.9	-4.6
General Service staff	64.5		64.5	63.8		63.8	-0.7		-0.7
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>235.8</i>	<i>291.8</i>	<i>527.6</i>	<i>233.4</i>	<i>288.9</i>	<i>522.3</i>	<i>-2.4</i>	<i>-2.9</i>	<i>-5.3</i>
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	5.0	15.0	20.0	3.8	11.3	15.1	-1.2	-3.7	-4.9
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>15.0</i>	<i>20.0</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>11.3</i>	<i>15.1</i>	<i>-1.2</i>	<i>-3.7</i>	<i>-4.9</i>
Travel	19.7	22.4	42.1	19.7	22.4	42.1			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training	12.1		12.1	12.1		12.1			
General operating expenses		61.0	61.0		46.0	46.0		-15.0	-15.0
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>31.8</i>	<i>83.4</i>	<i>115.2</i>	<i>31.8</i>	<i>68.4</i>	<i>100.2</i>		<i>-15.0</i>	<i>-15.0</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>272.6</b>	<b>390.2</b>	<b>662.8</b>	<b>269.0</b>	<b>368.6</b>	<b>637.6</b>	<b>-3.6</b>	<b>-21.6</b>	<b>-25.2</b>



**Table 30: Sub-programme 3320: Court Management Section**

3320 Court Management Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	421.3	776.7	1,198.0	417.2	769.1	1,186.3	-4.1	-7.6	-11.7
General Service staff	128.9	725.6	854.5	127.7	718.4	846.1	-1.2	-7.2	-8.4
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>550.2</i>	<i>1,502.3</i>	<i>2,052.5</i>	<i>544.9</i>	<i>1,487.5</i>	<i>2,032.4</i>	<i>-5.3</i>	<i>-14.8</i>	<i>-20.1</i>
General temporary assistance		352.1	352.1		325.3	325.3		-26.8	-26.8
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime		15.0	15.0		15.0	15.0			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>367.1</i>	<i>367.1</i>		<i>340.3</i>	<i>340.3</i>		<i>-26.8</i>	<i>-26.8</i>
Travel									
Hospitality									
Contractual services		56.3	56.3		56.3	56.3			
Training	4.0	15.0	19.0	4.0	15.0	19.0			
General operating expenses	5.9		5.9	5.9		5.9			
Supplies and materials	13.0	88.0	101.0	13.0	88.0	101.0			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>22.9</i>	<i>159.3</i>	<i>182.2</i>	<i>22.9</i>	<i>159.3</i>	<i>182.2</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>573.1</b>	<b>2,028.7</b>	<b>2,601.8</b>	<b>567.8</b>	<b>1,987.1</b>	<b>2,554.9</b>	<b>-5.3</b>	<b>-41.6</b>	<b>-46.9</b>

**Table 31: Sub-programme 3330: Detention Section**

3330 Detention Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	211.9	84.1	296.0	209.8	83.3	293.1	-2.1	-0.8	-2.9
General Service staff	64.5	64.5	129.0	63.8	63.8	127.6	-0.7	-0.7	-1.4
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>276.4</i>	<i>148.6</i>	<i>425.0</i>	<i>273.6</i>	<i>147.1</i>	<i>420.7</i>	<i>-2.8</i>	<i>-1.5</i>	<i>-4.3</i>
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		6.0	6.0		6.0	6.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>6.0</i>	<i>6.0</i>		<i>6.0</i>	<i>6.0</i>			
Travel	3.7		3.7	3.7		3.7			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training		17.0	17.0		17.0	17.0			
General operating expenses	1,380.0	119.4	1,499.4	1,380.0	119.4	1,499.4			
Supplies and materials	7.5		7.5	7.5		7.5			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>1,391.2</i>	<i>136.4</i>	<i>1,527.6</i>	<i>1,391.2</i>	<i>136.4</i>	<i>1,527.6</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,667.6</b>	<b>291.0</b>	<b>1,958.6</b>	<b>1,664.8</b>	<b>289.5</b>	<b>1,954.3</b>	<b>-2.8</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>-4.3</b>

**Table 32: Sub-programme 3340: Court Interpretation and Translation Section**

3340 Court Interpretation and Translation Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	1,854.5	2,473.6	4,328.1	1,836.2	2,449.3	4,285.5	-18.3	-24.3	-42.6
General Service staff	257.9	274.3	532.2	255.3	271.6	526.9	-2.6	-2.7	-5.3
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>2,112.4</i>	<i>2,747.9</i>	<i>4,860.3</i>	<i>2,091.5</i>	<i>2,720.9</i>	<i>4,812.4</i>	<i>-20.9</i>	<i>-27.0</i>	<i>-47.9</i>
General temporary assistance		1,078.5	1,078.5		932.1	932.1		-146.4	-146.4
Temporary assistance for meetings	234.7	68.8	303.5	234.7	68.8	303.5			
Overtime									
Consultants		16.1	16.1		16.1	16.1			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>234.7</i>	<i>1,163.4</i>	<i>1,398.1</i>	<i>234.7</i>	<i>1,017.0</i>	<i>1,251.7</i>		<i>-146.4</i>	<i>-146.4</i>
Travel	5.2	139.2	144.4	5.2	139.2	144.4			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	53.0	108.3	161.3	53.0	108.3	161.3			
Training		2.7	2.7		2.7	2.7			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials	8.7	9.5	18.2	8.7	9.5	18.2			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>66.9</i>	<i>259.7</i>	<i>326.6</i>	<i>66.9</i>	<i>259.7</i>	<i>326.6</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,414.0</b>	<b>4,171.0</b>	<b>6,585.0</b>	<b>2,393.1</b>	<b>3,997.6</b>	<b>6,390.7</b>	<b>-20.9</b>	<b>-173.4</b>	<b>-194.3</b>

**Table 33: Sub-programme 3350: Victims and Witnesses Unit**

3350 Victims and Witnesses Unit	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	715.4	1,076.6	1,792.0	708.6	1,066.5	1,775.1	-6.8	-10.1	-16.9
General Service staff	64.5	1,208.8	1,273.3	63.8	1,201.0	1,264.8	-0.7	-7.8	-8.5
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>779.9</i>	<i>2,285.4</i>	<i>3,065.3</i>	<i>772.4</i>	<i>2,267.5</i>	<i>3,039.9</i>	<i>-7.5</i>	<i>-17.9</i>	<i>-25.4</i>
General temporary assistance		783.6	783.6		514.5	514.5		-269.1	-269.1
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime		43.5	43.5					-43.5	-43.5
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>827.1</i>	<i>827.1</i>		<i>514.5</i>	<i>514.5</i>		<i>-312.6</i>	<i>-312.6</i>
Travel	27.0	1,038.4	1,065.4	27.0	977.0	1,004.0		-61.4	-61.4
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training		25.1	25.1					-25.1	-25.1
General operating expenses		2,955.2	2,955.2		2,638.1	2,638.1		-317.1	-317.1
Supplies and materials		5.7	5.7		5.7	5.7			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>27.0</i>	<i>4,024.4</i>	<i>4,051.4</i>	<i>27.0</i>	<i>3,620.8</i>	<i>3,647.8</i>		<i>-403.6</i>	<i>-403.6</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>806.9</b>	<b>7,136.9</b>	<b>7,943.8</b>	<b>799.4</b>	<b>6,402.8</b>	<b>7,202.2</b>	<b>-7.5</b>	<b>-734.1</b>	<b>-741.6</b>

**Table 34: Sub-programme 3360: Victims Participation and Reparations Section**

3360 Victims Participation and Reparations Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	756.0	187.1	943.1	748.5	185.5	934.0	-7.5	-1.6	-9.1
General Service staff	64.5	185.5	250.0	63.8	184.1	247.9	-0.7	-1.4	-2.1
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>820.5</i>	<i>372.6</i>	<i>1,193.1</i>	<i>812.3</i>	<i>369.6</i>	<i>1,181.9</i>	<i>-8.2</i>	<i>-3.0</i>	<i>-11.2</i>
General temporary assistance		561.4	561.4		556.4	556.4		-5.0	-5.0
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>571.4</i>	<i>571.4</i>		<i>566.4</i>	<i>566.4</i>		<i>-5.0</i>	<i>-5.0</i>
Travel		157.4	157.4		157.4	157.4			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	2.0	125.5	127.5	2.0	125.5	127.5			
Training		4.3	4.3		4.3	4.3			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials		11.0	11.0		11.0	11.0			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>298.2</i>	<i>300.2</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>298.2</i>	<i>300.2</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>822.5</b>	<b>1,242.2</b>	<b>2,064.7</b>	<b>814.3</b>	<b>1,234.2</b>	<b>2,048.5</b>	<b>-8.2</b>	<b>-8.0</b>	<b>-16.2</b>

**Table 35: Programme 3400: Public Information and Documentation Section**

3400 Public Information and Documentation Section	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	1,057.0	368.2	1,425.2	1,046.6	365.1	1,411.7	-10.4	-3.1	-13.5
General Service staff	596.7	239.5	836.2	590.7	239.5	830.2	-6.0		-6.0
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,653.7</i>	<i>607.7</i>	<i>2,261.4</i>	<i>1,637.3</i>	<i>604.6</i>	<i>2,241.9</i>	<i>-16.4</i>	<i>-3.1</i>	<i>-19.5</i>
General temporary assistance	148.2	71.6	219.8	146.8	70.9	217.7	-1.4	-0.7	-2.1
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>148.2</i>	<i>71.6</i>	<i>219.8</i>	<i>146.8</i>	<i>70.9</i>	<i>217.7</i>	<i>-1.4</i>	<i>-0.7</i>	<i>-2.1</i>
Travel	19.8	86.6	106.4	19.8	86.6	106.4			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	271.5	726.6	998.1	271.5	726.6	998.1			
Training	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0			
General operating expenses	67.0	13.5	80.5	67.0	13.5	80.5			
Supplies and materials	125.0		125.0	125.0		125.0			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>490.3</i>	<i>826.7</i>	<i>1,317.0</i>	<i>490.3</i>	<i>826.7</i>	<i>1,317.0</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,292.2</b>	<b>1,506.0</b>	<b>3,798.2</b>	<b>2,274.4</b>	<b>1,502.2</b>	<b>3,776.6</b>	<b>-17.8</b>	<b>-3.8</b>	<b>-21.6</b>

**Table 36: Programme 3700: Registry Independent Offices**

3700 Registry Independent Offices	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	785.6	1,011.5	1,797.1	777.8	1,001.6	1,779.4	-7.8	-9.9	-17.7
General Service staff	193.5		193.5	191.4		191.4	-2.1		-2.1
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>979.1</i>	<i>1,011.5</i>	<i>1,990.6</i>	<i>969.2</i>	<i>1,001.6</i>	<i>1,970.8</i>	<i>-9.9</i>	<i>-9.9</i>	<i>-19.8</i>
General temporary assistance	115.4	115.4	230.8	114.2	114.2	228.4	-1.2	-1.2	-2.4
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>115.4</i>	<i>115.4</i>	<i>230.8</i>	<i>114.2</i>	<i>114.2</i>	<i>228.4</i>	<i>-1.2</i>	<i>-1.2</i>	<i>-2.4</i>
Travel	8.2	105.8	114.0	8.2	105.8	114.0			
Hospitality									
Contractual services		50.0	50.0		50.0	50.0			
Training	21.8	2.2	24.0	21.8	2.2	24.0			
General operating expenses		9.0	9.0		9.0	9.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>30.0</i>	<i>167.0</i>	<i>197.0</i>	<i>30.0</i>	<i>167.0</i>	<i>197.0</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,124.5</b>	<b>1,293.9</b>	<b>2,418.4</b>	<b>1,113.4</b>	<b>1,282.8</b>	<b>2,396.2</b>	<b>-11.1</b>	<b>-11.1</b>	<b>-22.2</b>

**Table 37: Sub-programme 3740: Office of Public Counsel for the Defence**

3740 Office of Public Counsel for the Defence	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total	Basic	Situation-related	Total
Professional staff	149.3	296.0	445.3	147.8	293.1	440.9	-1.5	-2.9	-4.4
General Service staff	64.5		64.5	63.8		63.8	-0.7		-0.7
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>213.8</i>	<i>296.0</i>	<i>509.8</i>	<i>211.6</i>	<i>293.1</i>	<i>504.7</i>	<i>-2.2</i>	<i>-2.9</i>	<i>-5.1</i>
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	2.5	14.5	17.0	2.5	14.5	17.0			
Hospitality									
Contractual services		20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0			
Training	2.5	2.2	4.7	2.5	2.2	4.7			
General operating expenses		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>39.7</i>	<i>44.7</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>39.7</i>	<i>44.7</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>218.8</b>	<b>335.7</b>	<b>554.5</b>	<b>216.6</b>	<b>332.8</b>	<b>549.4</b>	<b>-2.2</b>	<b>-2.9</b>	<b>-5.1</b>

**Table 38: Sub-programme 3750: Office of Public Counsel for Victims**

3750 Office of Public Counsel for Victims	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	233.4	715.5	948.9	231.1	708.5	939.6	-2.3	-7.0	-9.3
General Service staff	64.5		64.5	63.8		63.8	-0.7		-0.7
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>297.9</i>	<i>715.5</i>	<i>1,013.4</i>	<i>294.9</i>	<i>708.5</i>	<i>1,003.4</i>	<i>-3.0</i>	<i>-7.0</i>	<i>-10.0</i>
General temporary assistance		115.4	115.4		114.2	114.2		-1.2	-1.2
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>115.4</i>	<i>115.4</i>		<i>114.2</i>	<i>114.2</i>		<i>-1.2</i>	<i>-1.2</i>
Travel	4.6	80.5	85.1	4.6	80.5	85.1			
Hospitality									
Contractual services		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0			
Training									
General operating expenses		6.0	6.0		6.0	6.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>116.5</i>	<i>121.1</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>116.5</i>	<i>121.1</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>302.5</b>	<b>947.4</b>	<b>1,249.9</b>	<b>299.5</b>	<b>939.2</b>	<b>1,238.7</b>	<b>-3.0</b>	<b>-8.2</b>	<b>-11.2</b>

**Table 39: Sub-programme 3760: Office of Internal Audit**

3760 Office of Internal Audit	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	402.9		402.9	398.9		398.9	-4.0		-4.0
General Service staff	64.5		64.5	63.8		63.8	-0.7		-0.7
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>467.4</i>		<i>467.4</i>	<i>462.7</i>		<i>462.7</i>	<i>-4.7</i>		<i>-4.7</i>
General temporary assistance	115.4		115.4	114.2		114.2	-1.2		-1.2
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>115.4</i>		<i>115.4</i>	<i>114.2</i>		<i>114.2</i>	<i>-1.2</i>		<i>-1.2</i>
Travel	1.1	10.8	11.9	1.1	10.8	11.9			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training	19.3		19.3	19.3		19.3			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>20.4</i>	<i>10.8</i>	<i>31.2</i>	<i>20.4</i>	<i>10.8</i>	<i>31.2</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>603.2</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>614.0</b>	<b>597.3</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>608.1</b>	<b>-5.9</b>		<b>-5.9</b>

**Table 40: Major Programme IV: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties**

Major Programme IV Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	636.2		636.2	630.0		630.0	-6.2		-6.2
General Service staff	290.7		290.7	287.8		287.8	-2.9		-2.9
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>926.9</i>		<i>926.9</i>	<i>917.8</i>		<i>917.8</i>	<i>-9.1</i>		<i>-9.1</i>
General temporary assistance	544.5		544.5	539.1		539.1	-5.4		-5.4
Temporary assistance for meetings	220.0		220.0	220.0		220.0			
Overtime	38.0		38.0	38.0		38.0			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>802.5</i>		<i>802.5</i>	<i>797.1</i>		<i>797.1</i>	<i>-5.4</i>		<i>-5.4</i>
Travel	363.9		363.9	386.7		386.7	22.8		22.8
Hospitality	6.0		6.0	5.0		5.0	-1.0		-1.0
Contractual services	683.0		683.0	683.0		683.0			
Training	9.9		9.9	9.9		9.9			
General operating expenses	24.4		24.4	24.4		24.4			
Supplies and materials	14.7		14.7	14.7		14.7			
Furniture and equipment	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>1,106.9</i>		<i>1,106.9</i>	<i>1,128.7</i>		<i>1,128.7</i>	<i>21.8</i>		<i>21.8</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,836.3</b>		<b>2,836.3</b>	<b>2,843.6</b>		<b>2,843.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>		<b>7.3</b>

**Table 41: Sub-programme 4100: Conference**

4100 Conference	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff									
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>									
General temporary assistance	274.5		274.5	271.9		271.9	-2.6		-2.6
Temporary assistance for meetings	160.0		160.0	160.0		160.0			
Overtime	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>454.5</i>		<i>454.5</i>	<i>451.9</i>		<i>451.9</i>	<i>-2.6</i>		<i>-2.6</i>
Travel									
Hospitality									
Contractual services	591.0		591.0	591.0		591.0			
Training									
General operating expenses	24.4		24.4	24.4		24.4			
Supplies and materials	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>625.4</i>		<i>625.4</i>	<i>625.4</i>		<i>625.4</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,079.9</b>		<b>1,079.9</b>	<b>1,077.3</b>		<b>1,077.3</b>	<b>-2.6</b>		<b>-2.6</b>

**Table 42: Sub-programme 4200: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties**

4200 Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	486.9		486.9	480.7		480.7	-6.2		-6.2
General Service staff	290.7		290.7	287.8		287.8	-2.9		-2.9
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>777.6</i>		<i>777.6</i>	<i>768.5</i>		<i>768.5</i>	<i>-9.1</i>		<i>-9.1</i>
General temporary assistance	165.1		165.1	162.3		162.3	-2.8		-2.8
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>183.1</i>		<i>183.1</i>	<i>180.3</i>		<i>180.3</i>	<i>-2.8</i>		<i>-2.8</i>
Travel	67.2		67.2	90.0		90.0	22.8		22.8
Hospitality	6.0		6.0	5.0		5.0	-1.0		-1.0
Contractual services									
Training	9.9		9.9	9.9		9.9			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials	4.7		4.7	4.7		4.7			
Furniture and equipment	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>92.8</i>		<i>92.8</i>	<i>114.6</i>		<i>114.6</i>	<i>21.8</i>		<i>21.8</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,053.5</b>		<b>1,053.5</b>	<b>1,063.4</b>		<b>1,063.4</b>	<b>9.9</b>		<b>9.9</b>

**Table 43: Sub-programme 4400: Office of the President of the Assembly**

4400 Office of the President of the Assembly of States Parties	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff									
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>									
General temporary assistance	104.9		104.9	104.9		104.9			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>104.9</i>		<i>104.9</i>	<i>104.9</i>		<i>104.9</i>			
Travel	34.1		34.1	34.1		34.1			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	12.0		12.0	12.0		12.0			
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>46.1</i>		<i>46.1</i>	<i>46.1</i>		<i>46.1</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>151.0</b>		<b>151.0</b>	<b>151.0</b>		<b>151.0</b>			

**Table 44: Sub-programme 4500: Committee on Budget and Finance**

4500 Committee on Budget and Finance	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	149.3		149.3	149.3		149.3			
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>149.3</i>		<i>149.3</i>	<i>149.3</i>		<i>149.3</i>			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings	60.0		60.0	60.0		60.0			
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>60.0</i>		<i>60.0</i>	<i>60.0</i>		<i>60.0</i>			
Travel	262.6		262.6	262.6		262.6			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	80.0		80.0	80.0		80.0			
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>342.6</i>		<i>342.6</i>	<i>342.6</i>		<i>342.6</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>551.9</b>		<b>551.9</b>	<b>551.9</b>		<b>551.9</b>			

**Table 45: Major Programme V: Rent and Maintenance (Interim Premises)**

Major Programme V Rent and Maintenance (Interim Premises)	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff									
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>									
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel									
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
General operating expenses	5,900.7		5,900.7	5,900.7		5,900.7			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>5,900.7</i>		<i>5,900.7</i>	<i>5,900.7</i>		<i>5,900.7</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,900.7</b>		<b>5,900.7</b>	<b>5,900.7</b>		<b>5,900.7</b>			



**Table 46: Major Programme VI: Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims**

Major Programme VI Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	171.3	437.5	608.8	169.6	433.3	602.9	-1.7	-4.2	-5.9
General Service staff	64.5	64.5	129.0	63.8	63.8	127.6	-0.7	-0.7	-1.4
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>235.8</i>	<i>502.0</i>	<i>737.8</i>	<i>233.4</i>	<i>497.1</i>	<i>730.5</i>	<i>-2.4</i>	<i>-4.9</i>	<i>-7.3</i>
General temporary assistance	213.6	69.1	282.7	211.5	69.1	280.6	-2.1		-2.1
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		110.0	110.0		110.0	110.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>213.6</i>	<i>179.1</i>	<i>392.7</i>	<i>211.5</i>	<i>179.1</i>	<i>390.6</i>	<i>-2.1</i>		<i>-2.1</i>
Travel	106.6	126.0	232.6	106.6	126.0	232.6			
Hospitality	2.5		2.5	2.5		2.5			
Contractual services	100.0	80.0	180.0	100.0	80.0	180.0			
Training	6.0	15.6	21.6	6.0	15.6	21.6			
General operating expenses	5.0	10.0	15.0	5.0	10.0	15.0			
Supplies and materials	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0			
Furniture and equipment	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>228.1</i>	<i>236.6</i>	<i>464.7</i>	<i>228.1</i>	<i>236.6</i>	<i>464.7</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>677.5</b>	<b>917.7</b>	<b>1,595.2</b>	<b>673.0</b>	<b>912.8</b>	<b>1,585.8</b>	<b>-4.5</b>	<b>-4.9</b>	<b>-9.4</b>

**Table 47: Major Programme VII.1: Project Director's Office**

Major Programme VII.1 Project Director's Office	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	532.4		532.4	527.2		527.2	-5.2		-5.2
General Service staff	64.5		64.5	63.8		63.8	-0.7		-0.7
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>596.9</i>		<i>596.9</i>	<i>591.0</i>		<i>591.0</i>	<i>-5.9</i>		<i>-5.9</i>
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0			
Hospitality	2.5		2.5	2.5		2.5			
Contractual services	661.0		661.0	661.0		661.0			
Training	3.2		3.2	3.2		3.2			
General operating expenses	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
Supplies and materials	1.5		1.5	1.5		1.5			
Furniture and equipment	2.0		2.0	2.0		2.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>692.2</i>		<i>692.2</i>	<i>692.2</i>		<i>692.2</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,289.1</b>		<b>1,289.1</b>	<b>1,283.2</b>		<b>1,283.2</b>	<b>-5.9</b>		<b>-5.9</b>

**Table 48: Programme 7110: Project Director's Office for Permanent Premises**

7110 Project Director's Office for Permanent Premises	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	532.4		532.4	527.2		527.2	-5.2		-5.2
General Service staff	64.5		64.5	63.8		63.8	-0.7		-0.7
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	596.9		596.9	591.0		591.0	-5.9		-5.9
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0			
Hospitality	2.5		2.5	2.5		2.5			
Contractual services	65.5		65.5	65.5		65.5			
Training	3.2		3.2	3.2		3.2			
General operating expenses	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
Supplies and materials	1.5		1.5	1.5		1.5			
Furniture and equipment	2.0		2.0	2.0		2.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	96.7		96.7	96.7		96.7			
<b>Total</b>	<b>693.6</b>		<b>693.6</b>	<b>687.7</b>		<b>687.7</b>	<b>-5.9</b>		<b>-5.9</b>

**Table 49: Programme 7120: ICC Staff Resource and Management Support for the Permanent Premises**

7120 ICC Staff Resource and Management Support for the Permanent Premises	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff									
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>									
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel									
Hospitality									
Contractual services	595.5		595.5	595.5		595.5			
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	595.5		595.5	595.5		595.5			
<b>Total</b>	<b>595.5</b>		<b>595.5</b>	<b>595.5</b>		<b>595.5</b>			

**Table 50: Programme 7130: 2gv Element (Non Integrated User Equipment)**

7130 2gv Element (Non Integrated User Equipment)	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff									
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>									
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel									
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>									
<b>Total</b>									

**Table 51: Programme 7200: Accrued Interest, Host State**

7200 Accrued Interest, Host State	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff									
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>									
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel									
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
General operating expenses	170.3		170.3	170.3		170.3			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	170.3		170.3	170.3		170.3			
<b>Total</b>	<b>170.3</b>		<b>170.3</b>	<b>170.3</b>		<b>170.3</b>			

**Table 52: Major Programme VII.5: Independent Oversight Mechanism**

Major Programme VII.5 Independent Oversight Mechanism	Proposed Budget 2014			Proposed Budget 2014			Difference		
	Before CBF recommendations			After CBF recommendations			Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
Professional staff	127.8		127.8	126.5		126.5	-1.3		-1.3
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>127.8</i>		<i>127.8</i>	<i>126.5</i>		<i>126.5</i>	<i>-1.3</i>		<i>-1.3</i>
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	4.8		4.8	4.8		4.8			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	40.0		40.0	40.0		40.0			
Training	6.5		6.5	6.5		6.5			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0			
Furniture and equipment	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>81.3</i>		<i>81.3</i>	<i>81.3</i>		<i>81.3</i>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>209.1</b>		<b>209.1</b>	<b>207.8</b>		<b>207.8</b>	<b>-1.3</b>		<b>-1.3</b>