



Assembly of States Parties

Distr.: General
29 October 2012

Original: English

Eleventh session

The Hague, 14-22 November 2012

**Report of the Committee on Budget and Finance
on the work of its nineteenth session**

Content

	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1-18	4
A. Opening of the session and adoption of the agenda	13-17	5
B. Participation of observers	18	6
II. Consideration of issues on the agenda of the Committee at its nineteenth session	19-177	7
A. Financial matters	19-53	7
1. Scale of assessment and replenishment of the Contingency Fund	19-21	7
2. Contingency Fund	22-30	7
3. Working Capital	31-32	9
4. Budgetary process	33-37	9
5. Analytic accountability	38-39	10
6. International Public Sector Accounting Standards	40-41	10
7. Management of exchange rate risks of the Trust Fund for Victims	42-45	10
8. Status of contributions	46	11
9. States in arrears	47	11
10. Surpluses	48	11
11. Amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules	49-53	11
B. Administrative matters	54-69	12
1. Conditions of service in the field	54	12
2. Retiree health insurance subsidy scheme Conditions of service in the field	55-56	12
3. Junior Professional Officer programme	57	13
4. Staff performance appraisal	58-69	13
C. Governance	70-73	14
Organizational structure of the Court	70-73	14
D. Audit matters	74-85	15
Audit reports	74-85	15
(a) Financial statements of the Court for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011	74-76	15
(b) Financial statements of the Trust Fund for Victims for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011	74-76	15
(c) Report of the Office of Internal Audit	77-83	16
(d) Report of the Audit Committee	84-85	16
E. Legal aid	86-99	16
F. Budgetary matters	100-136	18
1. Financial performance data of the 2012 approved budget as at 30 June 2012	100-103	18
2. Consideration of the 2013 proposed programme budget	104-111	18
3. Recommendations of general application on the 2013 proposed programme budget	112-116	19
(a) Assumptions and activities for 2013	112-115	19
(b) Presentation and macro analysis	116	20

	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
4. United Nations Common system	117-136	20
(a) Travel.....	117	20
(b) Training	119	20
(c) Consultants	120	20
(d) Hospitality	121	21
(e) General Temporary Assistance and staff levels	122-128	21
(f) Tailoring resources to match the level of judicial activity.....	129-136	21
G. Major programmes	137-158	22
1. Major Programme I: Judiciary	137-140	22
2. Major Programme III: Registry.....	141-148	23
(a) Sub-programme 3120: Office of Internal Audit	141	23
(b) Sub-programme 3260: Information and Communication Technologies Section	142-143	23
(c) Sub-programme 3340: Court Interpretation and Translation Section	144	23
(d) Programme 3400: Public Information and Documentation Section	145-147	23
(e) Sub-programme 3770: Registry Permanent Premises Office	148	24
3. Major Programme IV: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties	149-153	24
4. Major Programme VI: Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims	154	25
5. Major Programme VII-1: Project Director’s Office (permanent premises)	155	25
6. Major Programme VII-2: Permanent premises project – Interest	156-157	25
7. Major Programme VII-5: Independent Oversight Mechanism	158	26
H. Premises of the Court	159-174	26
1. Permanent premises	159-171	26
(a) Status of the project	159-161	26
(b) Transition to the new premises	162-164	27
(c) Total cost of ownership	165-166	27
(d) Financial burden sharing with future States Parties.....	167	27
(e) Extending the deadline for one-time payments.....	168-169	28
(f) Non-integrated user equipment (“2gv elements”)	170	28
(g) Reclassification of the position of the Deputy Project Director from P-4 to P-5 level.....	171	28
2. Interim premises.....	172-174	28
I. Other matters.....	175	29
Future meetings.....	175	29
Annex I: List of documents		30
Annex II: Status of contributions as at 30 September 2012.....		31
Annex III: Impact of measures to bring the level of the International Criminal Court’s budget for 2013 in line with the level of the approved budget for 2012.....		34
Annex IV: Strategic dynamic evolution of judicial activities in the Court 2013		46
Annex V: Options recommended by the Committee on Budget and Finance		47
Annex VI: Budgetary implications of the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee on Budget and Finance.....		48

I. Introduction

1. The Committee on Budget and Finance (“the Committee”) conducted its examination of the 2013 proposed programme budget on the basis of the general principle of budgetary integrity.
2. The Committee noted some improvements in the 2013 proposed programme budget document, such as better justifications and more refined assumptions. The Committee also noted a number of steps that had been taken by the Court to control costs, resulting in savings calculated in amount of €2.89 million.¹
3. The Committee recalled that, for the 2012 budget year, the Assembly of States Parties (“the Assembly”) at its tenth session had approved appropriations totalling €111 million with €108.8 million for the budget and €2.2million to replenish the Contingency Fund.
4. The Committee noted that, up until August 2012, it had received seven notifications from the International Criminal Court (“the Court”) for accessing the Contingency Fund, in amounts totalling €3.69 million.
5. The Committee also recalled resolution ICC-ASP/10/Res.4 in which the Assembly had requested the Court “to prepare, if it proposes any increase of the budget for 2013, a paper which details the Court’s options where reductions would be made in order to bring the level of the proposed budget for 2013 in line with the level of the approved budget for 2012, as well as how those reductions would impact on the Court’s activities.”²
6. The Committee had before it a paper entitled “Impact of measures to bring the level of the International Criminal Court’s budget for 2013 in line with the level of the approved budget for 2012,” dated 12 September 2012.³ See annex III in this report.
7. The Committee noted that the 2013 proposed programme budget contained an increase of €9.6 million (8.8 per cent) over the 2012 approved budget, and that rent and associated costs for the interim premises constituted €6.02 million (5.5 per cent)⁴ of the increase over the 2012 approved budget. The Committee noted that the issue of the rent for the interim premises cannot be estimated with full accuracy at this time. The Committee noted that, with the expiration of the rent-free period, additional resources would be required for a limited period of time until the Court’s moving to the permanent premises. The Committee was of the view that this justified the exemption of the said amount of about €6 million related to the interim premises when comparing the level of the 2013 proposed programme budget against the level of the 2012 approved budget.
8. After reviewing the 2013 proposed programme budget and the justifications provided, the Committee concluded that total additional savings could be achieved in the amount of €3.28 million including the interest on the loan for the permanent premises, and that, if approved, the adjusted 2013 proposed programme budget amount would thus be €115.12 million including the rent and the maintenance for the interim premises, or the adjusted 2013 proposed programme budget would thus be €109.22 million excluding the rent and its maintenance for the interim premises.
9. The Committee noted that a number of important policy issues were under study in The Hague Working Group of the Bureau that would potentially have a significant importance for the finances of the Court. These included: legal aid; governance; victims; and reparations. Decisions that might be taken on those matters had the potential to provide for additional efficiencies in future years.
10. The Committee also noted some events that, if they do occur, could have significant cost implications, including: possible trial preparation in the case of *The Prosecutor v. Laurent Gbagbo*, if charges are confirmed (€1.27 million); possible opening of an African

¹ CBF19/03P08.

² *Official Records of the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*, tenth session, New York, 1-21 December 2011 (ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/10/Res.4, section H.

³ CBF19/03P04/Rev.1.

⁴ ICC-ASP/11/10, para. 29, tables 5 and 6, Corr.1 and Corr.2.

Union Liaison Office (€436,700); or provision for the addition of inspection and evaluation functions to the current mandate of the Independent Oversight Mechanism (€212,300).

11. The Committee also noted the multi-year cost drivers (2014-16)⁵ identified in table 7 of the 2013 proposed programme budget and drew the attention of the Assembly to several significant cost drivers, including capital investment replacements (estimated at €1.3, €1.6 and €0.65 million for 2014-16 respectively); premises related costs of €11.4, €23.5 and €14.5 million; and an estimated staff cost increases of roughly €3.4, €2.2 and €2.2 million per year over the same period.⁶

12. The Committee added an overall summary of its recommendations in annex V. The summary identifies three options, with varying cost and operational impacts, for the Assembly's consideration as it reviews the 2013 proposed programme budget. It was the Committee's hope that these additions to the report would provide useful input for the Assembly's consideration of these issues.

A. Opening of the session and adoption of the agenda

13. The nineteenth session of the Committee was convened in accordance with the decision of the Assembly taken at the 9th plenary meeting, on 21 December 2011, of its tenth session, from 12 to 21 December 2011, and the further decision of the Committee on its dates, taken on 27 April 2012. The session, comprising 18 meetings, was held from 24 September to 3 October 2012. The President of the Court, Judge Sang-Hyun Song, delivered welcoming remarks at the opening of the session.

14. 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.

15. The following members attended the nineteenth 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 Izquierdo (Ecuador)
9. Gerd Saupe (Germany)
10. Ugo Sessi (Italy)
11. Elena Sopková (Slovakia)
12. Masatoshi Sugiura (Japan)

16. At its 1st meeting, the Committee adopted the following agenda (CBF/19/1):

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Participation of observers
4. Organization of work
5. States in arrears

⁵ ICC-ASP/11/10, paras. 31-41, Corr.1 and Corr.2.

⁶ Ibid., para. 30, table 7.

6. Financial matters:
 - (a) Scale of assessment and replenishment of the Contingency Fund;
 - (b) Financial performance data of the 2012 budget;
 - (c) Budget process;
 - (d) Analytic accountability;
 - (e) Consideration of the proposed programme budget for 2013;
 - (f) International Public Sector Accounting Standards; and
 - (g) Management of exchange rate risks of the Trust Fund for Victims.
7. Administrative matters:
 - (a) Conditions of service in the field;
 - (b) Retiree health insurance subsidy scheme; and
 - (c) Junior Professional Officer programme.
8. Audit matters:
 - (a) Audit reports
 - (i) Financial statements of the International Criminal Court for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011;
 - (ii) Financial statements for the Trust Fund for Victims for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011; and
 - (iii) Report of the Office of Internal Audit.
 - (b) Report of the Audit Committee.
9. Legal aid
10. Premises of the Court
11. Other matters

17. The following organs of the Court were invited to participate in the meetings of the Committee to introduce the reports: the Presidency, the Office of the Prosecutor and the Registry. Furthermore, the budget facilitator, Ambassador Håkan Emgård (Sweden) and the focal point on legal aid, Ambassador Leon Marc (Slovenia) of The Hague Working Group of the Bureau of the Assembly, the Trust Fund for Victims and the Oversight Committee on Permanent Premises (“Oversight Committee”) made presentations to the Committee.

B. Participation of observers

18. 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 nineteenth session

A. Financial matters

1. Scale of assessment and replenishment of the Contingency Fund

19. The Committee considered the report of the Court on the methodology utilized for establishing the scale of assessment for the contributions to be paid by States Parties for financing the regular budget, the related Working Capital Fund, and the replenishment of the Contingency Fund.⁷ It took note of the relevant provision of the Rome Statute (article 117), and the related articles of the Financial Regulations and Rules. In essence, the Court's scale was based on the scale adopted by the United Nations for its regular budget, and adjusted through an ad hoc formula in order to take into account the differences in membership between the United Nations and the Court, including the fixing of a maximum assessment rate for the largest contributor.

20. As for the Contingency Fund, whose replenishment was based on the above mentioned principle, the Committee recalled the recommendation made at its eighteenth session "that the scale of assessment chosen for replenishment of the Contingency Fund in future years be not that of the budget year when the replenishment is approved by the Assembly, but that of the corresponding budget year when the replenishment is apportioned among States Parties."⁸ While taking note of the Court's intention to approach the External Auditor in order to obtain an opinion on the issue of possible adjustments after the closing of the accounts of the corresponding budget year, as well as to the conformity of the proposed change with the principles established in the Financial Regulations and Rules, the Committee found no reasons for now to modify the above recommendation, taking into account the forward looking nature of the replenishment of the Contingency Fund and in the absence of new elements of information by the Court on this issue.

21. Finally, the Committee was informed that the current session of the United Nations General Assembly was expected to adopt the new scale of assessment for the triennium 2013-2015 but, judging from past experience, was unlikely to do so before the last week of December 2012, that is, well after the end of the eleventh session of the Assembly. In view of the above, **the Committee recommended that, for 2013, the contributions to be paid by States Parties should be provisionally assessed in accordance with an agreed scale of assessment, based on the scale adopted by the United Nations for its regular budget applied for 2012, and adjusted with the principles on which the scale is based. The Committee further recommended that final assessments be based on the scale adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its 67th session for its regular budget, applied for 2013, and adjusted in accordance with the principles on which that scale is based. Furthermore, any maximum assessment rate for the largest contributors applicable for the United Nations regular budget should apply to the Court's scale of assessment.**

2. Contingency Fund

22. The opening balance of the Contingency Fund on 1 January 2012 adjusted for replenishment of the Fund was €7.12 million.

23. Up until August 2012, the Court reported that it had made seven notifications to the Committee, detailed in table 1 below, that it would need to access the Contingency Fund in order to cover costs relating to various developments in the situations in Kenya, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Libya and Central African Republic. The total notional cost of these unforeseen activities was €369 million.

⁷ ICC-ASP/11/44.

⁸ ICC-ASP/11/5, para. 17.

Table 1: Requests to access the Contingency Fund – 2012

<i>Number</i>	<i>Description of the request</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Amount</i>
1	Unavoidable costs in the situation of Côte d'Ivoire	2011/34/IA	04/01/2012	€391,800
2	Letter to CBF Chair to cover the costs of extension of judges' mandates	2012/09/IA	14/03/2012	€372,800
3	Letter to the CBF Chair to cover the costs related to the decision on the Confirmation of Charges in Kenya	2012/12/IA	12/04/2012	€1,567,800
4	Letter to the CBF Chair to cover expenses for the creation of a small field presence of the Registry in Côte d'Ivoire	2012/16/IA	14/05/2012	€361,200
5	Situation in Kenya: expenses for a limited number of legal support staff required to assist in the preparation of the two cases for trial during the remainder of the year	2012/20/IA	01/06/2012	€275,400
6	DRC: case of Messrs. Katanga and Ngudjolo Chui	2012/39/IA	14/08/2012	€115,200
7	Additional expenses not foreseen during the preparation of the budget 2012: situations in DRC, Libya, CAR and Côte d'Ivoire.	2012/40/IA	27/08/2012	€605,300
Total amount of notifications				€3,689,500

24. The Committee also recalled that it had requested that the Court indicate in its notifications the resources that would be of a temporary or one-time nature and those that would likely be required over a longer period of time. This was particularly important for General Temporary Assistance (GTA) resources. **The Committee recommended that the Court improve how it identified and reported on the use of additional GTA resources in each major programme in order to provide a clearer understanding and tracking of these resources.**

25. With respect to replenishment of the Contingency Fund, the Court estimated that its actual access to the Contingency Fund would be approximately €2.1 million in 2012. Such expenditure would bring the Contingency Fund below the €7 million replenishment threshold. However, it was unclear at the time of this session if the projected rate of expenditure would materialize. **The Committee recommended that the Court review its proposed activities notified under the Contingency Fund to determine whether all resources were still required. The Committee also requested the Court to provide⁹ 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 2012.**

26. On the basis of this requested report from the Court, the Assembly would be in a position to determine with reasonable accuracy the forecasted expenditure of the Contingency Fund and hence the amount required to replenish the Contingency Fund to the required minimum of €7 million.

27. Despite the fact that the Court's budget was based on assumptions foreseeable by its organs at the time of its preparation, the Court's judicial work continued to involve many unforeseen events, for example the opening of a new situation or new developments in existing cases.

28. The Committee recognized this element of unforeseeability in the Court's activities, but it was nonetheless concerned at the number of notifications by the Court for accessing the Contingency Fund, and at the fact that this might lead to weakening of financial discipline on the Court's part, and result in an imbalance between utilization of the approved budget and recourse to the Contingency Fund.

29. The Committee reiterated that the Contingency Fund was an important tool for the Court but that it should not be used in a way that would undermine budgetary integrity. In order to strengthen financial discipline and enhance transparency in the use of the Contingency Fund, **the Committee recommended that the Court should, within 60 calendar days following the notification to access the Contingency Fund, send, through its Chair, a written report to the Committee providing an update on the use of the resources requested in the notification.**

⁹ Through the Committee pursuant to regulations 6.7 and 6.8 of the Financial Regulations and Rules.

30. Finally, the Committee decided that it might, in the future, return to this issue in order to consider possible amendments to the rules governing access to the Contingency Fund.

3. Working Capital Fund

31. The Committee noted the recommendation of the External Auditor that the Court should review its Working Capital Fund requirements and consider whether the current level of its Working Capital Fund remains sufficient. As stipulated in Regulation 6.2 of the Financial Regulations and Rules: “There shall be established a Working Capital Fund to ensure capital for the Court to meet short-term liquidity problems pending receipt of assessed contributions.” The Working Capital Fund’s current level of €7.41 million was established in 2008 when the Court’s annual expenditure was €84.85 million.¹⁰ With a level of budget of €111 million in 2012, the Working Capital Fund now represented less than one month of expenditure. For instance in July 2012, the Court had not received sufficient contributions to meet the following month’s disbursements.

32. The Committee was informed that the Court has never had to resort to the Working Capital Fund to date. **Therefore, for 2013, the Committee recommended that the Assembly maintain the Working Capital Fund at its current level. However, it invited the Court to assess risks and, correspondingly, the current level of the Working Capital Fund, in light of increasing financing needs in future, associated with, for example, regular in-year payments for maintenance of the new premises, as well as the repayment of the host State loan. The Committee invited the Court to report back to the Committee at its twentieth session.**

4. Budgetary process

33. The Committee considered the report submitted to it by the Court, entitled “Report of the Court on its budgetary process and zero-based budgeting.”¹¹

34. Overall, the Committee took a favourable view of much of the content of the report. However, the Committee emphasized that the purpose of zero-based budgeting (ZBB) was not to replace the Court’s existing budgetary procedures, but rather to help to improve them, in particular in reducing inefficiency costs.

35. The Committee recalled that ZBB did not permit previous years’ performances or budgets to be used as a basis for preparation of the following year’s budget. Rather, under the ZBB method, the value of each activity is systematically re-examined.

36. The Committee requested the Court to continue with its study of the implementation of the ZBB process in certain carefully chosen sections of the Court. **As a practical follow-up, the Committee invited the Court to consider a possible ZBB exercise for its public information, documentation and outreach activities.** Public outreach, of course, was essential to raising awareness and promoting understanding of the Court’s mandate and work, primarily among the affected communities. However, the Committee recalled the suggestions it made at its seventeenth session in September 2011 that “[o]utreach is fragmented across the Court with different organs and programmes pursuing different forms of outreach. While some fragmentation may be necessary, at some point the Court will require guidance as to the level and type of outreach that is appropriate within the regular budget for this stage of the Court’s development. For example the Committee proposed to evaluate, how could outreach to affected communities be consolidated in a general victims unit, if the Court rely on other media sources to publicize information on trials and focus more on other activities.”¹²

¹⁰ *Official Records... Eighth session... 2009* (ICC-ASP/8/20), vol. II, part B.2, para. 11.

¹¹ ICC-ASP/11/45.

¹² *Official Records... Tenth session... 2011* (ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. II, part B.2, para. 11.

37. As a first step, **the Committee invited the Court to provide, for its twentieth session, a factual overview, together with a costing, of its current outreach and public information activities, broken down by type of activities, targets groups, contributing programmes and organs. The Committee also invited the Court to consider additional areas where it could undertake a ZBB exercise.**

5. Analytic accountability

38. The Committee noted that the Court was still at the preliminary stage of implementation of analytic accountability within its various departments. The Court is planning, by the end of 2012, to have “limited” recourse to the services of an outside consultant, at a cost of €50,000, in order to create an initial tool.

39. **The Committee requested the Court to make greater efforts to investigate the possibilities for implementing analytic accountability at the lowest possible cost to the Court, and to report back to it at its twentieth session.**

6. International Public Sector Accounting Standards

40. The Committee took note of the report on International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) that addressed the issues raised by the Committee in its eighteenth session concerning the implication of application of IPSAS on the Court’s budgeting regime and accounting policies. The Committee was informed about the progress of implementing the IPSAS project and agreed with the Court that at this stage, it was too early to commit to accruals based budgeting, which, as confirmed by the External Auditor, was not part of the necessary transformation to IPSAS, but rather remains a policy choice. However, the Committee also noted that there were transactions in the current budget, which were accruals based, such as employee benefits. The Committee asked for clarification of the impact of these transactions on the budget (e.g. the size of provisions that are made each year for these accrued liabilities). **The Committee requested the Court, in order to enhance transparency, to present such provisions in an annex to the 2013 proposed programme budget and subsequent ones.**

41. **The Committee also requested to be informed at its twentieth session of the actual implementation of IPSAS against the schedule of the project, along with the utilization of budget resources.**

7. Management of exchange rate risks of the Trust Fund for Victims

42. The Committee had before it the Court’s paper on the management of exchange rate risks of the Trust Fund for Victims (TFV).¹³ Accordingly, the TFV had currently open currency positions in one of its regions of operation. This was because the TFV’s financing commitments to the local intermediaries were denominated in local currency whereas the TFV’s financial assets were mostly denominated in Euros. Consequently, if the Euro devalued against the local currency, as had happened in the recent past, the TFV had to use a higher amount in Euros than anticipated.

43. The representatives of the Court and the Secretariat of the TFV explained that the denomination of commitments in local currency was due to local currency regulations and a lack of affordable hedging facilities. It also took account of the limited capacity of small local intermediaries to manage multiple currency accounts, and it followed the practice of donor organizations such as United States Agency for International Development (USAID), United Nations agencies and the Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department of the European Commission.

44. While the Committee acknowledged the difficulties encountered by the Court and the Secretariat of the TFV, it noted that they lacked the capacity for a professional exchange risk management. More so than large donors, the TFV appeared to be vulnerable to unexpected exchange rate movements. The current practice left the TFV exposed to significant exchange rate swings. The Committee noted the recommendation of the

¹³ CBF/19/18.

External Auditor that the Secretariat of the TFV develop, as soon as possible, a risk register to document the operational, financial and reputational risks, which the TFV faced.¹⁴

45. **The Committee recommended that the Court and the Secretariat of the TFV undertake a thorough review of the available options for mitigating the currency risks. It encouraged the Secretariat of the TFV to develop, in cooperation with the Court, a policy defining acceptable levels of currency risks in its operations, as well as procedures to keep these risks within the allowed limits. It invited the Court and the Secretariat of the TFV to report back to the Committee at its twentieth session.**

8. Status of contributions

46. The Committee reviewed the status of contributions as at 30 September 2012 (annex II). The Committee noted that a total of €97,628,388 had been received for the 2012 financial period, amounting to 89.7 per cent of the assessed 2012 contributions, and that €11,924,496 was outstanding from current and previous financial periods. The Committee noted with appreciation that this rate was much better than at the same point in 2011 (67.9 per cent), but expressed at the same time concern over the level of the arrears and the fact that only 58 States had fully paid up for all their outstanding contributions at this point in the fiscal year. **The Committee encouraged all States Parties to pay their assessed contributions in full and on time, in order to ensure that the Court had sufficient funds throughout the year, in accordance with regulation 5.6 of the Financial Regulations and Rules.**

9. States in arrears

47. According to article 112, paragraph 8, of the Rome Statute, “a State Party which is in arrears of the payment of its financial contributions towards the cost 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 contribution due from it for the preceding two full years.” The Committee was informed that as at 2 October 2012, seven States Parties remained in arrears and were ineligible to vote. The Committee noted that on 26 July 2012, the Secretariat had informed States Parties in arrears about their outstanding contributions and had advised them of the minimum payment required to avoid the application of article 112, paragraph 8, of the Rome Statute. The same States Parties were also informed of the procedure for requesting an exemption from the loss of voting rights. **In view of the fact that, as of 3 October 2012, the Court had not yet received any response from those States Parties, the Committee requested the Secretariat to again notify States Parties in arrears about their outstanding contributions.**

10. Cash surplus

48. In accordance with regulation 4.6 of the Financial Regulations and Rules, the estimated cash surplus to be returned to States Parties on 1 January 2013 would amount to €1.86 million. It would comprise the provisional cash surplus for 2011 and assessed contributions in respect of prior periods that were received from States Parties in 2011. The total audited cash surplus for 2010 was €1.69 million as included in the financial statements of the Court as at 31 December 2011 and had been already communicated to States Parties.

11. Amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules

49. The Committee was presented with proposed amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules, accompanied with explanations of each amendment.¹⁵ The Committee encouraged the Court to create a glossary of terms relating to budgetary and accounting concepts, which could reduce the risk of misunderstandings about the concepts used in the Financial Regulations and Rules.

¹⁴ ICC-ASP/11/13, paras. 4 and 20.

¹⁵ CBF/19/7.

50. The Committee took note of the Court's approach of keeping changes to a minimum level, addressing the essential required changes, in order to allow implementation of IPSAS as of 1 January 2014.

51. **In order to avoid increased risks in the process of transformation to IPSAS, the Committee recommended that the Assembly approve the proposed amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules.**

52. **The Committee requested the Court to keep the Financial Regulations and Rules under further review before starting to implement IPSAS, and to submit to the Assembly, through the Committee at its twenty-first session, any further amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules, which might be identified as necessary during consultations with the incoming External Auditor.**

53. **The Committee noted that the amendments had been proposed in order to allow the implementation of IPSAS, and therefore recommended that the revised Financial Regulations and Rules should come into effect on 1 January of the year when IPSAS will be implemented, currently foreseen as 2014.**

B. Administrative matters

1. Conditions of service in the field

54. The Committee considered the report on the conditions of service of internationally recruited staff serving at field duty stations.¹⁶ The Committee recalled that any proposals with budget implications should be explicitly approved by the Assembly, after consideration by the Committee. **The Committee recommended that the proposed four-year transitional arrangements for harmonization of the conditions of service in the field and the new harmonized approach to Rest and Recuperation (R&R) framework in which the Court proposed to pay for travel and accommodation/subsistence allowance in addition to the current entitlements of five days and travel time-off for R&R purposes not be approved. Instead, the Committee recommended that the Court harmonize the conditions of service and R&R for all staff serving in non-family duty stations with those currently applied to United Nations peacekeeping operations as of 1 January 2013.** Should these recommendations be accepted by the Assembly, staff would not receive a unified Special Operations Living Allowance (SOLA) and accommodation/subsistence allowance for R&R, but would be paid for travel cost for R&R. The financial implications of the decision for the 2013 proposed programme budget would be a reduction of €300,000.

2. Retiree health insurance subsidy scheme

55. The Committee considered the proposal of the Court for a retiree health insurance subsidy scheme.¹⁷ The Committee noted the financial implications up to 2050 and the risk of premium inflation, and noted that, under a high-risk scenario of annual premium increases of nine per cent and access to the scheme by all eligible retired staff, the estimated annual cost of the scheme would be between €9,600 and €12,000 for 2013. This amount would continue to be limited during the first years (approximately €29,000 for 2014 and €115,000 for 2015), rising, under a high-risk scenario, up to approximately €2.4 million in 2050.¹⁸

56. Taking into account the facts that the Court is the only permanent organization without any retirement health insurance subsidy scheme among comparable international organizations, that the proposed scheme of 50/50 subsidy is the lowest among them and much lower than the Court's original proposal of a two-thirds subsidy, and that all eligible retired staff would not access the scheme because of the burden of the premium on them after retirement and the eligibility of access to their national or residential health services, **the Committee recommended the approval of the proposed scheme for the staff of the**

¹⁶ CBF/19/12.

¹⁷ CBF/19/13.

¹⁸ These amounts are subject to change in case of future rise of retirement age.

Court who are administered under the Staff Regulations and Rules. In this regard, the Committee was of the view that the financial implications of the scheme during the first decade were not significant and could be absorbed within the approved budget level for normal operation of the Court.

3. Junior Professional Officer programme

57. The Court informed the Committee that it continued to prepare its analysis and thus requested the Committee to postpone its consideration of a Junior Professional Officer (JPO) programme to its twentieth session. Although the Committee received a report on the programme,¹⁹ the Committee noted that the report was not complete and that the Court would need to take several steps in order to establish the JPO programme. **In this regard, the Committee invited the Court to undertake the necessary preparation of the programme in order to present a concrete and comprehensive proposal for final consideration by the Committee during its twentieth session.**

4. Common system and staff performance appraisal

58. The Committee considered the question of the United Nations common system (UNCS) of salaries, allowances and other conditions of service.

59. In this regard, the Committee noted the Assembly's decision²⁰ that the Court would join the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund (UNJSPF). Article 3(b) of the Regulations, Rules and Pension Adjustment System of the Fund provides that the Fund shall be open to the specialized agencies referred to in article 57, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and to any other international, intergovernmental organization, which participates in the common system of salaries, allowances and other conditions of service of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Article 3(c) of the Regulations provides that admission to membership in the Fund shall be by decision of the General Assembly, upon the affirmative recommendation of the Board, after acceptance by the organization concerned of these Regulations and agreement reached with the Board as to the conditions which shall govern its admission.

60. At its second session, the Assembly adopted the Court's Staff Regulations,²¹ in which a number of elements aligned on those of the UNCS.

61. The Court subsequently submitted its Staff Regulations to the UNJSPB for consideration, and the General Assembly, based on the affirmative recommendation of the Board, decided to admit the Court to membership in the Fund.

62. Thus, the Committee considered that, on the basis of the documents produced to it, the Court is bound by the Fund's Statutes. In consequence, the Court is obliged to apply the main elements of the UNCS such as classification of posts, salary scales, dependency benefit/allowances, annual leave, home leave, health protection, sick leave, maternity leave, reasonable compensation in the event of illness, accident or death attributable to the performance of official duties on behalf of the Court, payments of termination indemnity and repatriation grants to its staff.

63. The Committee also noted that there are discretionary elements on the conditions of services such as travel and removal expenses, special leave and retiree health insurance subsidy scheme. The Staff Rules of the Court stipulates that a staff member authorized to travel shall receive a daily subsistence allowance (DSA), in conformity with the UNCS. The Committee noted that the Court is not obliged to follow the UNCS but had decided to apply DSA based on the UNCS to its staff instead of establishing its own structure. The Staff Rules also include provisions on special leave without referring to the UNCS. The Court has not introduced a retiree health insurance subsidy scheme to date, while all other comparable international organizations have it.

¹⁹ CBF/19/16.

²⁰ ICC-ASP/1/Decision No. 3.

²¹ ICC-ASP/2/Res. 2.

64. The Committee noted that salary increments are not stipulated in the Staff Regulations but in the Staff Rules. Thus, the Committee considered that salary increments are not directly linked to the membership of the UNJSPF. However, the Committee noted that the employment contract between the staff member and the Court is concluded by an offer of appointment, which specifies that the appointment shall be governed by the provisions of the Staff Regulations and Rules and any subsequent amendments thereto. As a result, the Committee considered that, under its current contracts with staff, the Court has a contractual obligation to grant a salary increment to the staff member who performs his or her duty satisfactorily.

65. The Committee recalled resolution ICC-ASP/10/Res.4,²² where the Assembly calls upon the Court to review the appraisal system, including through a consideration of different options by which satisfactory performance is assessed, and the discretionary elements of terms and conditions of service within the UNCS, and to report back to the Committee at its eighteenth session.

66. The Committee at its eighteenth session recommended that the Court develop proposals to introduce a culture of personal accountability, including rewards for good performance and sanctions for poor performance, and report to the Committee for consideration at its twenty-second session.

67. The Committee received a progress report on staff performance appraisal at this session. The progress report explained that there was no direct link between the results of an individual's performance appraisal and a step increase, but rather, a step increase was a function of time spent with the Court, i.e. work experience. However, no step increase is granted in the 0.5 per cent of the cases when staff receive an appraisal assessment of unsatisfactory performance.

68. The Court's report did not address the issue of whether changing the structure of assessments (e.g. satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and outstanding) and corresponding share of staff receiving above mentioned feedback (e.g. 60, 20, and 20 per cent) would inherently risk staff motivation and ultimately performance. As explained to the Assembly last year by the representative of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), such a personnel policy change introducing ceilings on ratings of performance appraisal with a view to freezing the financial impacts may violate the current Staff Regulations and Rules and result in potential International Labour Organization Administrative Tribunal (ILOAT) cases. Whether and to what extent the ILOAT would consider the current budget constraints during a time of economic crisis as sufficient to justify such a policy change being applied to existing staff is not certain. Furthermore, even if the performance appraisal policy is to be changed, it may not result in immediate monetary gains to the budget, as it may only apply to new staff.

69. The Committee was pleased to receive a progress report and looked forward to receiving the final report for its consideration.

C. Governance

Organizational structure of the Court

70. The Committee was informed that the Court was about to launch a review of its organizational structure, to respond to earlier recommendations of the Committee that the Court undertake a thorough evaluation of its organizational structure in order to streamline functions, processes and corresponding structures; reduce spans of control where necessary; identify responsibilities that could be delegated; and rationalize lines of reporting. The Court explained this would be a three-phase process: an intra-organ review to identify the most effective structure in each organ, i.e. the Judiciary, the Office of the Prosecutor and the Registry (phase 1); an inter-organ review to assess the impact of any potential change vis-à-vis other organs of the Court and to address possible duplications (phase 2); and a review of staffing requirements (phase 3).

²² *Official Records... Tenth session... 2011*(ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/10/Res.4.

71. The Court had considered the recommendation of the Committee, at its eighteenth session in April 2012, to use internal resources to conduct the review. However, the Court had found that it needed high-level expertise for the undertaking. The proposal that had won the procurement bid had been from Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC). This required an investment of approximately €90,000. The Court was also identifying high level experts to provide strategic guidance on a pro-bono basis.

72. The Committee agreed with the Court on the importance and potential impact of the project. The review should help find ways of improving the Court's financial performance, remove unnecessary complexity and duplications, and ensure that the entire organizational system is aligned and set up to deliver on the Court's objectives. The Committee recalled that, under the Rome Statute, the Assembly shall provide management oversight to the Presidency, the Prosecutor and the Registrar regarding the administration of the Court (article 112, paragraph 2(b)). **The Committee emphasized that the review by the external consultant should equally apply to the three major organs. The Committee invited the Court to keep the Assembly and the Committee informed on the progress, and to report to the Committee at its twentieth session.**

73. The Committee recognized that the movement into the permanent premises would provide a unique opportunity for the Court to have a clearer picture of its operations than the first decade in the interim premises, and thus recalled its previous recommendations to make a comprehensive review on the organizational structure of the Court such as the skeleton of the Court and the ZBB.

D. Audit matters

Audit reports

- (a) **Financial statements of the Court for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011**
- (b) **Financial statements of the Trust Fund for Victims for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011**

74. The Committee welcomed the presentation by the External Auditor and expressed its appreciation for the quality work provided by him throughout the previous years.

75. Introducing his reports on the financial statements of the Court²³ and of the Trust Fund for Victims,²⁴ 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.

76. Concerning the Trust Fund for Victims, the Committee noted that the External Auditor had reiterated its recommendation to develop a separate risk register and had urged the TFV to implement a solution as soon as practicable. It also endorsed the recommendations relating to the implementation of IPSAS and the need to obtain sufficient assurance on the adequacy and effectiveness of the TFV's framework of governance, risk management and control. **The Committee welcomed the intention of the TFV to address these issues soon and looked forward to a progress report at its twentieth session.**

- (c) **Report of the Office of Internal Audit**

77. Pursuant to rule 110.1 of the Financial Regulations and Rules, the Office of Internal Audit submitted its annual activity report to the Committee,²⁵ outlining the activities of the Office of Internal Audit in the second half of 2011 and the first half of 2012, as well as its report on the status of audit recommendations.²⁶

78. The Committee considered the two reports and discussed the specific findings and recommendations with the Director of the Office of Internal Audit.

²³ ICC-ASP/10/12.

²⁴ ICC-ASP/10/13.

²⁵ CBF/17/6.

²⁶ CBF/17/7.

79. The Committee took a favourable view of the main points. **However, the Committee requested the Office of Internal Audit, as a priority, to ensure that each audit report begins with a statement summarizing, for each department audited, the recommendations contained in previous reports and their state of implementation.**

80. The Committee was informed that, in connection with the audit strategy for the Permanent Premises Project, the Director of the Office of Internal Audit had met with the Oversight Committee of the project in order to discuss the question of the project audit. One solution envisaged was to hire an outside specialist.

81. The Committee stressed that an outside specialist should satisfy certain conditions:

(a) No conflict of interest, actual or potential, whether financial, or as a supplier, client, or close relation, or in connection with a service relationship (having been employed by the entity to be audited);

(b) Proven technical competence; and

(c) Bound by client confidentiality, even after ceasing to be external auditor to the entity in question.

82. In the present case, the Committee considered that there was a risk of a conflict of interest, in that the outside specialist was already employed by the British Auditors who have just come to the end of their appointment as the Court's External Auditor. The risk is not immediately apparent, but the possibility remains.

83. Finally, the Committee expressed concern at the fact that the Office of Internal Audit dealt with logistical matters on behalf of the Audit Committee, taking time from its audit duties. **The Committee recommended that these tasks be assumed instead by the Registry.**

(d) Report of the Audit Committee

84. The Committee received and took note of the report, entitled "Annual Report of the Audit Committee."²⁷

85. The Committee noted that, at the current time, the mandates of the external members of the Audit Committee were due to terminate as follows: three members on 31 January 2013, while one member had his term extended to 31 July 2013. **The Committee recommended that steps be taken to ensure, for the future, transparency, objectivity and equitable geographical representation in the selection of the external members.**

E. Legal aid

86. As regards the legal aid scheme, the Court submitted a 2013 proposed budget of €7.97 million, based on the Court's new remuneration scales. This represents an increase of 12 per cent over one year and 21.5 per cent over the period 2011-2012, reflecting a request for an additional amount of €0.9 million in respect of legal aid.

87. Examination of the documents produced by the Court showed that the cost of legal aid, calculated under the new rules proposed by the Registry, took account of the total number of victim applications likely to be received by the Court in the various cases. According to the Registry's projections,²⁸ 14,400 applications for participation are to be expected in 2013. To these must be added some 6,000 applications for reparation.

88. The Committee took note of the Supplementary Report of the Registry on four aspects of the legal aid system,²⁹ as well as the annex on the financial implications of the proposed review of the system.³⁰ As has been the case in the past, legal aid is one of the major cost drivers. A pragmatic approach to the question is required, one which takes

²⁷ CBF/19/21.

²⁸ ICC-ASP/11/10, paras. 428 to 432, Corr.1 and Corr.2.

²⁹ ICC-ASP/11/43.

³⁰ ICC-ASP/11/43/Add.1.

account of the right of both defendants and victims to equally access to the Court, and to participate in the proceedings.

89. At its tenth session,³¹ the Assembly continued to follow this dual approach. Thus it noted the significant increase in legal costs, as well as the essential role played by the system in enabling all accused persons and victims to participate in the proceedings.

90. During its work, the Committee noted that the total cost of legal aid to the defence for the period from 2006 to June 2012 amounted to €1.51 million. Over this same period, the cost of legal aid to victims totalled €15.85 million. It has thus cost the Court €27.36 million to implement its legal aid scheme. The Committee noted the increase in costs³² since 2008.

91. As well as the budgetary implications of legal aid to the defence and to victims' representatives, the Committee also examined the question of judicial decisions with significant financial implications.³³ This is a more difficult cost to control, as it is the normal consequence of a judicial decision. As a source of rights, it represents an unavoidable expense or "dépense de guichet." Thus an additional €942,000 had been spent in 2011 and, currently, €923,000 has been committed for the budgetary year 2012 on account of judicial decisions. The Committee would emphasize the difficulty of producing a cost forecast through to 31 December 2012.

92. On the basis of the documents currently before it, the Committee considered that the main changes to the scheme presented by the Registry should be regarded as the key elements in a review of the system with a view to optimal attainment of the objectives of the legal aid scheme.

93. First, the Committee considered that the proposal to limit the duplication of a counsel's mandates to two cases simultaneously would enable a fair balance to be struck between the different interests at stake. This involves in particular a reduction in counsel's fees for the second mandate and would achieve a saving of over €240,000 by the end of the two mandates. Additionally, there is a proportionate reduction in the fees of the other members of the team dealing simultaneously with the two cases.

94. Secondly, the Registry proposed a change in the rules governing expenses, imposing a monthly cap of €3,000, including DSA. Immediate implementation of this measure in the cases currently before the Court is likely to save €204,000 over a full year. Not only will the changes in no way affect the ability of teams to represent their clients before the Court, but the current arrangement for a DSA is contributing to the cost of the legal aid scheme. The Committee noted, moreover, that teams were failing to adequately substantiate the actual expenses incurred by members.

95. **Thirdly, the Committee considered that the Registry's proposal to suspend payment of the monthly lump-sum amount to teams when procedural activities were substantially reduced would help to squeeze excessive costs out of the scheme. Here again, the Committee considered that this measure should be implemented immediately.**

96. Fourthly, the Committee considered the position of the Office of Public Counsel for Victims and its role in terms of representation. **In light of potential current obstacles to the implementation of changes in the system, the Committee requested the Registry to provide it at its twentieth session with a supplementary report on the progress achieved.**

97. For these various reasons, **the Committee recommended that the Assembly implement these proposals, which the Registry believed would save €1.1 million with effect from the budgetary year 2013. The Committee therefore recommended that the amount for legal aid in the 2013 proposed budget be reduced by €1.1 million.**

98. Finally, **the Committee considered that a reorganization of the legal aid scheme as proposed by the Registry in line with the Assembly's resolution at its tenth session**³⁴

³¹ *Official Records ... Tenth session ... 2011*(ICC-ASP/10/20), Vol. I, p 17, para. 19.

³² See annex IV.

³³ CBF/19/5.

³⁴ *Official Records... Tenth session... 2011*(ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/10/Res.4.

also necessarily required further review of the position and role of the Office of Public Counsel for the Defence.

99. Following an enquiry into the workload indicators of the Office, the Committee noted that the Office's main task seemed to be carrying out research and drafting legal opinions for defence teams, and producing various documents. This undoubtedly saves time for defence teams. **The Court might also consider introducing alternative schemes designed to respect the rights of all persons concerned as soon as a new situation is opened, in particular by providing for a Court duty roster prior to the constitution of a defence team. As regards documentary research and drafting for defence counsel, the Committee considered that this is work for which each team is already paid.**

F. Budgetary matters

1. Financial performance data of the 2012 approved budget as at 30 June 2012

100. At its seventeenth session, the Committee, having analyzed all of the documents and supporting items provided by the Court, had recommended that the Assembly approve a 2012 proposed programme budget of €112,128,300, which had included a reduction of some €5.6 million in the amount originally requested by the Court. The Committee had considered that this amount corresponded to the amount actually required by the Court to enable it to fulfil the tasks entrusted to it.

101. At its tenth session, the Assembly had adopted its resolution 4,³⁵ whereby it approved appropriations totalling €111 million for the budgetary year 2012, of which €108.8 million was for the ordinary budget and €2.2million to replenish the Contingency Fund.

102. The Committee had before it the report of the Court on the budget performance as at 30 June 2012.³⁶ It noted that the implementation rate for 2012 as at 30 June was 52.3 per cent, representing an expenditure of €56.93 million and was thus slightly lower than that in 2011. The projected implementation rate to 31 December 2012 was 100.3 per cent based on a projected expenditure of €109.15 million, which means that the Court needs to identify further savings of some €350,000 in order to maintain the expenses within the 2012 approved budget.³⁷

103. Up until August 2012, the Committee has received a total of seven notifications for access to the Contingency Fund, representing a total of €3.69 million in order to cover the costs relating to the developments in the situation of Kenya, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Libya and Central African Republic. Given a forecast budget implementation rate of around 100 per cent for the regular budget, and a forecast implementation rate of 68.2 per cent for the Contingency Fund notifications, the Court estimated that its actual access to the Contingency Fund would be more than €2 million in 2012. Such expenditure would bring the Contingency Fund below the €7 million replenishment threshold.

2. Consideration of the 2013 proposed programme budget

104. At its nineteenth session, the Committee was presented by the Court with a proposed budget for the financial year 2013 in a total amount of €118.4 million, broken down as follows:

- (a) €115.42 million for the Court's regular budget; and
- (b) €2.98 million for the Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties;

105. In its 2013 proposed programme budget as submitted to the Committee, the Court broke down its requirements as follows:

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ ICC-ASP/11/16.

³⁷ The implementation rate as at 30 June 2011 was 53.8 per cent representing an expenditure of €55.73 million (ICC-ASP/10/11).

- (a) €11.08 million for the Judiciary;
- (b) €28.67 million for the Office of the Prosecutor;
- (c) €66.47 million for the Registry;
- (d) €6.02 million for the interim premises;
- (e) €1.66 million for the Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims;
- (f) €1.23 million for the Office of the Director of the Permanent Premises Project; and
- (g) €0.29 million for the Independent Oversight Mechanism.

106. The Committee noted that this proposal, including costs for interim premises, represented an increase of €9.6 million (including the two corrigenda) or 8.8 per cent in relation to the appropriations approved by the Assembly for 2012.

107. The Committee noted that the Assembly had also requested the Court to prepare a working document detailing the options where reductions would be made in order to bring the level of the 2013 proposed programme budget in line with the level of the approved budget for 2012, as well as how those reductions would impact on the Court's activities.³⁸

108. The Committee had before it paper prepared by the Court setting out the impact of measures to bring its budget for 2013 in line with the level of the 2012 approved budget.³⁹ This paper is attached to this report as annex III.

109. The Committee noted that the €6.02 million requested for the interim premises was a new cost; as such costs were borne by the host State up until December 2012. The Committee further noted that the Court's additional expenditure requirements for the upcoming budget, over and above interim premises, related to UNCS costs in an amount of €3.88 million; legal aid in an amount of €0.9 million; and trial preparation for the two Kenya cases, amounting to €2.04 million.

110. The total sum of these various items, including interim premises and deducting the budget reductions in the areas of GTA, consultants and other non-staff costs of €2.89 million, resulted in a budget proposal by the Court €9.6 million higher than the level of the 2012 budget approved including the two corrigenda.

111. In examining the budget, the Committee noted that the issue of the rent for the interim premises could not be estimated with full accuracy at this time, and also noted that any additional resources required for the interim premises would be for a limited period of time, until the Court's move to the permanent premises. **The Committee thus took the view that this justified the exemption of the said amount of about €6 million related to the interim premises, as well as the interest on loan for the permanent premises of €204,568 when comparing the level of the 2013 proposed programme budget against the level of the 2012 approved budget.**

3. Recommendations of general application on the 2013 proposed programme budget

(a) Assumptions and activities for 2013

112. The Committee also had before it the document "Report of the Court on Judicial decisions with significant financial implications"⁴⁰ and noted the impact that judicial decisions could have on the budget of the Court.

113. The Court's judicial activity is expected to increase in 2013. The Presidency considers that two cases may go to appeal against conviction and/or sentence, while at least four cases will be at trial or trial preparation stage, in addition to the mass of pre-trial work. The Prosecutor informed the Committee that he expected to be conducting seven investigations in seven situations. Nine further investigations remain open. In addition, the Prosecutor will be active in three trials and two appeals.

³⁸ *Official Records... Tenth session... 2011* (ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/10/Res.4, section H, para. 2.

³⁹ CBF19/03P04/Rev.1.

⁴⁰ CBF/19/5.

114. However, the Committee noted that the 2013 proposed programme budget made no provision for the confirmation of charges in the *Gbagbo* case. While it is not possible at this stage to predict the outcome of the proceedings, a decision to confirm the charges will involve very substantial additional costs.⁴¹ Similarly, the 2013 proposed programme budget has made no request in respect of the African Union Liaison Office;⁴² nor does it include any provision for the addition of inspection and evaluation functions to the current mandate of the Independent Oversight Mechanism.⁴³

115. Finally, the Committee was informed that, in the *Lubanga* case, judgment had been rendered, and decisions adopted on reparation. It noted, however, that the Registry remained obliged to continue to fund the Judiciary, despite the fact that the translation of the judgment was still awaited. This delay involves additional costs that were not foreseen in 2012, and which need to be financed.

(b) Presentation and macro analysis

116. The Court informed the Committee that it had proposed a budget of €118.4 million for 2013, representing an increase of €9.6 million, or 8.8 per cent over the 2012 approved budget level. The Court identified the major causes of the increase as rent and maintenance of the interim premises of the Court, forward commitments and UNCS costs, and the operation of the legal aid system. In addition, the Court requested increased resources for the reparations anticipated by the Court and to carry out the investigative mandate of the Independent Oversight Mechanism.

4. United Nations Common system

117. As regards the 2013 proposed programme budget, the Court considered that the financial impact of the UNCS will amount to €3.88 million. Despite its major impact on costs, **the Committee recommended that the Assembly integrate this expense into the 2013 budget, so as to stabilize the situation and prevent a subsequent multiplier, which would make the preparation of future budgets still more problematic.**

(a) Travel

118. **The Committee noted the impact of travel on the budget of the Court, and recommended that the Court examine ways of finding savings on travel costs.**

(b) Training

119. The 2013 proposed programme budget allocated an amount of €693,000 for training, compared to €675,000 and €748,000 for 2011 and 2012 respectively. In many cases, the Court did not justify the need for training, nor specify the areas which require skills enhancement. **The Committee recommended that justifications be provided for future budget requests.**

(c) Consultants

120. As regards consultants, the Committee noted again inconsistencies in the submissions on this point. In the budget documents provided to the Committee, this item appeared both individually and under the head of “contractual services”. In accordance with the Committee’s recommendation, costs in respect of this item have indeed fallen, as can be seen from the table in annex VI of the 2013 proposed programme budget. However, the Committee noted a lack of consistency in the various budget submissions, as certain sub-programmes have reintroduced consultancy costs as “contractual services.” A case in point is Sub-programme 3770 (Registry Permanent Premises Office), where under contractual services, paragraph 505 refers to a recurrent expense for consultancy services relating to the transition to the new premises. It is further stated that consultancy services are preferred

⁴¹ The Registry’s initial estimates of the cost to Judiciary and Registry at some €1.27 million.

⁴² Predicted cost €436,700.

⁴³ Predicted cost €212,300.

because of the different fields of expertise and “workload flexibility.” For the 2013 proposed budget, a request of €182,000 have been made. **In the absence of any substantive justification, the Committee recommended an overall ceiling of €100,000 be allocated for Sub-programme 3770 with a reduction of €82,000. The Committee further invited the Court to establish a standard definition for the content of proposals included under the head of “contractual services.”**

(d) Hospitality

121. The Committee acknowledged that the provision of appropriate hospitality was an important requirement in support of the Court’s work. However, **the Committee concluded that proposals to increase the amounts allocated to hospitality had not been sufficiently justified and that the amounts available should remain at the 2012 level. The total deduction would amount to €30,000.**

(e) General Temporary Assistance and staff levels

122. The Committee conducted an in-depth analysis of all GTA requirements for 2013. Taking into account all judicial activities, probable timelines presented and the length of time for which the functions of each post would be needed, specific recommendations were made on four of the major programmes, taking a work-months approach needed to perform certain activities.

123. In regard to Major Programme I, the Committee noted that there were two posts at level P-3 and P-2 that were not included in the budget. **Therefore, the Committee recommended that the associated resources should not be approved. This deduction represents nine working months at a P-3 level and nine working months at a P-2/P-1 level.**

124. Furthermore, taking into account that additional judicial procedures are not expected to start before April 2013, at the time expected for recruitment for some posts, and the expected workload, **the Committee recommended a deduction of six working months at a P-3 level and five working months at a P-2/P-1 level. Therefore, the total deduction would amount to 15 working months at the P-3 level and fourteen working months at the P-2/P-1 level.**

125. **The Committee invited the Court to meet the workload requirements of the Judiciary through the redeployment of approved resources among divisions, to the extent possible, before accessing the Contingency Fund.**

126. In respect of Major Programme II, on the basis of paragraph 124 above regarding GTA for Major Programme I, and the considerations regarding the beginning of new judicial activities, **the Committee recommended a total deduction of one working month at a P-5 level, three working months at a P-4 level, six working months at a P-3 level, 22 working months at a P-2/P-1 level, and six working months at a GS-OL level.**

127. As regards Major Programme III, taking into account the nature of the functions of the posts and the length of time that those functions will be needed; Court days assumptions, as well as the “One Court” principle, **the Committee recommended a reduction of nine working months at a P-2/P-1 level.**

128. In Major Programme IV, taking into consideration that most of the GTA posts requested by Major Program IV are directly related to servicing the twelfth of the Assembly, and there is no link with judicial activities, **the Committee was of the view that the length of some posts were longer than needed and thus recommended a reduction of two working months at the GS-OL level.**

(f) Tailoring resources to match the level of judicial activity

129. The Committee carried out an in-depth analysis of the Court’s financial projections in respect of judicial activity in 2013. Once again, the Committee adjusted the figures in light of anticipated developments in judicial activity over the coming year. As a result, table 3 in the 2013 proposed programme budget needs to be amended as regards the items

relating to operational support, that is to say, all of the Court's resources devoted to support for the various cases, which increase from €25.12 million to €27.07 million. On the other hand the resources for the two Kenya cases are reduced from €7.72 million to €5.82 million.

130. The in-depth study of the figures provided by the Court shows that since 2011 there has been a significant slow-down in activity in five cases, namely the Uganda case and the four Darfur cases.

131. As regards the Uganda case, approved appropriations fell from €2.27 million in 2011 to €1.5 million in 2012, and are forecast to fall further to €0.97 million in 2013.

132. As to the four Darfur cases, here again the Committee noted a significant decrease in funding between 2011 and 2013, with the budget for the four cases decreasing from €4.73 million in 2011 to a forecast €1.78 million in 2013.

133. Hence, in these two groups of cases, the Committee noted a reduction in requested funding of 60 per cent for Uganda and 62 per cent for the four Darfur cases.

134. The Committee nonetheless noted a significant increase in funding requests for operational support from 2012 to 2013, the €27.07 million requested for the coming year representing an overall increase of more than 35 per cent.

135. While the Court's operations will undeniably require effective support in 2013, it seems reasonable to the Committee to make allowance for the Court's reduced activity in the Uganda and Darfur cases. These five cases account for 6.83 per cent of the funding for cases in the coming year. It appeared from the Committee's discussions with the organs of the Court that, in principle, no particular judicial developments are expected in these cases in the course of 2013.

136. While an overall 6.83 per cent cut in operational support costs for all programmes is not considered appropriate, **the Committee recommended a reduction in certain operational support items for 2013, as indicated in annex IV to this report. These include travel, contractual services, and general operating costs for Major Programme III. These four items represent a total amount of €4.7 million for 2013. An across-the-board funding cut of five per cent is proposed, namely €235,000. The Committee excludes from this reduction Major Programmes I and II, for which it has already recommended further reductions according to paragraph 139.**

G. Major programmes

1. Major Programme I: Judiciary

137. The Committee identified some inaccuracies in the 2013 proposed budget of Major Programme I in the allocation of judges' salaries and entitlements for 2013. The Committee was provided with a corrigendum that lowered the proposed budget by €354,800.⁴⁴

138. The Committee noted that after the correction made in the judges' salaries and allowances for 2013 proposed budget, a sum of €160,000 had been provided for three judges, made up of UNCS costs of €65,000, travel cost of €20,000 and a provision for repatriation grant of €75,000. The Committee stressed that in the 2012 approved budget a sum of €304,600 was accrued as a provision for costs relating to end of term and for newly elected judges. However, during 2012 only one judge was called to serve on a full-time basis. It appeared that there was no expectation to call the other judge. Despite repeated requests, the Committee did not receive satisfactory explanations regarding expenditure utilized from the accrued provision for departing and for newly elected judges in 2012, as well as provision requested for the same purpose in 2013. **Therefore, the Committee recommended that the Assembly remove the provision for repatriation grant of €75,000 provided for in the 2013 proposed programme budget.**

⁴⁴ ICC-ASP/11/10/Corr.1.

139. As for the 2013 proposed travel budget and having been informed that there would be no in situ visits by judges in 2013, **the Committee recommended to reduce the situation-related travel budget of Major Programme I in the amount of €39,300.**

140. The Committee noted the increase in the 2013 proposed consultancy budget because of the need of expertise of the new legal and enforcement section of the Presidency. However, the Committee was of the opinion that consultancy services should be reduced as much as possible and the use of internal resources encouraged instead. **Therefore, the Committee recommended that the budget for consultancy be approved at the 2012 approved budget level.**

2. Major Programme III: Registry

(a) Sub-programme 3120: Office of Internal Audit

141. The Committee considered the new P-3 post in the Office of Internal Audit to cover information and communication technologies and information security issues and **concluded that, as it was not of a recurring nature, for the time being it should not be an established post, but it could be funded as a GTA post for eight months. The Committee requested the Court to return to it at its twentieth session with information on how these resources were used during 2013.**

(b) Sub-programme 3260: Information and Communication Technologies Section

Contractual services

142. The Committee concluded that, in view of the justifications provided, further savings could be found in contractual services, and recommended that the level of funds be approved at a lower level. **Therefore, the Committee recommended that funds not be approved for the project Implementation of a SAP based Budget Planning, Control and Reporting system of €40,000, and that funds for other projects with a total amount of €400,000 be reduced by eight per cent.**

Equipment including furniture

143. In view of the explanations given for justifying requested funds for ICT, the Committee was of the view that not all of the projects were an absolute necessity at this point in time, **the Committee therefore recommended that the level of funds be approved at a lower level and recommended that funds for the MyCourtbook initiative €170,000 not be approved.**

(c) Sub-programme 3340: Court Interpretation and Translation Section

144. The Committee was pleased to see that the Court proposed to abolish one P-1 post in the Court Interpretation and Translation Section for a Lingala paraprofessional interpreter. Furthermore, it was brought to the attention of the Committee that there was a continued need for in-house expertise in the Arabic language, and that one P-2 Associate Translator was budgeted as a GTA in this section since 2007. **The Committee therefore recommended conversion of this GTA to an established post. This recommendation will not undermine the principle of the freeze imposed on the Court structure review, as the position remains within the same section, for the same purpose and at the same budget level.**

(d) Programme 3400: Public Information and Documentation Section

145. During the consideration of the Programme, the Committee recalled the comment made during its seventeenth session⁴⁵; "...highlighted the importance of ensuring synergies within the Court in relation to coordination and cooperation with other actors in the

⁴⁵ *Official Records...Tenth session...2011*(ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. II, part B., para. 117.

international arena, in order to enhance its outreach efforts,” and was of the view that such synergies should also be created in regard to public information.

146. The Committee expressed concern that a “One Court” approach was not being applied to public information activities and that in the case of the OTP existed within its structure a “Public Information Unit” comprised of two professional posts and one GS-OL post.

147. In this regard the Committee was informed that due to the independence of the OTP and the nature of the work, it was considered necessary that the OTP maintain at least a post for Public Information that could act as a “spokesperson” for the prosecution. **Thus, the Committee recommended that the OTP maintain a “spokesperson” and another post; the first working in coordination with PIDS and the latter would remain in the OTP under PIDS guidance. The third post at P-2 level would be transferred to PIDS in order to strengthen the section and help achieve the objectives outlined in the Public Information Strategy 2011-2013.**⁴⁶

(e) **Sub-programme 3770: Registry Permanent Premises Office**

148. During the Permanent Premises Director’s presentation of the work in process concerning the project, the Committee made numerous inquiries concerning the transition to the new premises, and was informed that the office responsible for preparing and managing the transition would be the Registry Permanent Premises Office. **Thus the Committee suggested that an outline of the strategy for the preparation and management of the transition to the new premises be presented at its twentieth session in April 2013.**

3. **Major Programme IV: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties**

149. The Committee examined the budget proposal for Major Programme IV (the Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties). It noted inter alia that the Secretariat had been facing an ever-growing workload, in particular as a result of the significant increase in the services provided by it to the Assembly, its subsidiary organs, and Working Groups, as summarized in the table below:

Table 2: Number of official meetings and documents serviced by the Secretariat

	2009	2010	2011 (until September)	2012
Bureau	18	21	19	15
The Hague Working Group	27	46	88	53
New York Working Group	9	17	28	7
Oversight Committee	20	32	23	16
Total	86	116	158	91
Number of documents	604	839	909	742

150. The 2013 proposed programme budget for Major Programme IV foresaw an overall increase of 7.4 per cent, primarily to reflect increased travel costs for members of the Committee, the translation of large numbers of pre-session and in-session papers and the cost of travel on mission by the office of the President of the Assembly. The Committee noted that implementation of a partnership with The Hague Working Group involved increased travel, as well as a more frequent presence. The 2013 proposed programme budget amounts to €2.98 million with an increase of €206,000.

151. Furthermore, the increase in the number of meetings of The Hague Working Group, the preparation and distribution of particularly large numbers of specialized documents, within a restricted time-frame and in several languages, on top of the Secretariat’s normal, day-to-day work, all combine to put the Secretariat’s staff under additional pressure.

⁴⁶ ICC-ASP/9/29.

152. The Committee identified various methods whereby the financial costs of the Secretariat's activities might be substantially reduced. **The Committee accordingly recommended the following measures to the Assembly:**

(a) **Limit requests for reports, restricting their length to 16 pages, including annexes. According to the Secretariat's estimates, for each report not requested, there is a saving of €2,320 per translation, €6,960 if the document is not produced in three languages.**

(b) **As far as possible, distribute reports in electronic form. This would save some €62,000.**

(c) **Two years out of three, hold the annual session of the Assembly at the seat of the United Nations. Organizing the sessions of the Assembly in The Hague inevitably involves extra costs, as can already be seen in the 2013 proposed programme budget. These include in particular rental of premises, hire of extra staff at the World Forum Convention Centre, security, and all the ancillary tasks. According to the Secretariat, this would enable the Assembly to save at least €250,000. The Committee had already pointed out the financial advantages of this proposal in its report on the work of its seventeenth session.⁴⁷**

(d) **The Committee noted the increasing workload of the Secretariat, including a significantly growing number of meetings that are required to be serviced and an increasing volume of documentation. The Committee recommended that the Assembly consider whether any of the activities of its Working Groups could be streamlined in order to reduce the requirement to provide personnel and documentation to as many meetings.**

153. **More generally, the Committee recommended that the Secretariat present its proposed budget with a breakdown by sub-programme, in order to reflect as faithfully as possible structural costs, costs of the Presidency, and costs relating to services and work on behalf of the Assembly's Bureau and the Working Groups of the Bureau, the Oversight Committee, and the Committee on Budget and Finance.**

4. Major Programme VI: Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims

154. The Committee noted that the Trust Fund for Victims had recognized a need to address its growingly complex revenue and disbursement streams. The Committee was also informed that activities under the reparations mandate which might occur in 2013 were currently unforeseeable in scope and form. The Committee recalled its recommendation at its seventeenth session that the TFV undertake a review of the possibility of using some percentage of voluntary contributions to cover costs for the delivery of programmes and projects in the field.⁴⁸ **The Committee recommended that the TFV consider this issue further, in view of the increasing complexity of its activities and its income streams, in order to advise on the possibility of using some percentage of voluntary contributions to cover these costs. Furthermore, the Committee discussed the freezing of the non-staff costs, for which the Trust Fund had proposed an increase of 14.4 per cent. A freezing in the proposed budget for hospitality, travel and contractual services was recommended, which represents a total of €79,200.**

5. Major Programme VII-1: Project Director's Office (permanent premises)

155. The Committee noted that the total 2013 proposed budget for Major Programme VII-1 was €1.02 million based on the tables in the 2013 proposed programme budget document, while the sum of its sub-programmes was only €999,200. **In this regard, the Committee recommended that the difference between these two figures, amounting to €24,400, be deducted from the 2013 proposed programme budget.**

⁴⁷ *Official Records ... Tenth session ... 2011*(ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. II, part B.2, para. 121.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 25.

6. Major Programme VII-2: Permanent premises project - Interest

156. The Committee noted that the total estimated accrued interest on the host State's loan for the project in 2013 was €204,568, while the table in paragraph 2 of the annex I of the 2013 proposed programme budget showed €207,400. **The Committee requested the Court to issue a corrigendum to rectify all related figures in this regard.**

157. The Committee noted that €204,568 had been included in the 2013 proposed programme budget, representing the estimated amount of interest that should be paid by States Parties that did not opt for one-time payments for their contribution to the Permanent Premises Project. Only States Parties that did not opt for a one-time payment would have to pay this interest, which for now was but an estimated amount, in 2013. **For the sake of transparency, the Committee recommended that there be a separate assessment for these interest payments, and this amount of €204,568 should be reduced from Major Programme VII-2.**

7. Major Programme VII-5: Independent Oversight Mechanism

158. The Committee noted that pursuant to article 112, paragraph 4, of the Rome Statute the scope of the activities of the Independent Oversight Mechanism's (IOM) included investigation, evaluation and inspection. However, the Assembly had decided that, initially, the IOM would perform only its investigative functions,⁴⁹ and that a comprehensive proposal for full operationalisation be considered at its eleventh session.⁵⁰ In view of the envisaged workload of the IOM in 2013, **the Committee recommended that the total Professional and above staff be maintained at the effective *status quo* of one P-4 for the 2013 proposed programme budget and that the funding for P-2 not be approved at this time.**

H. Premises of the Court

1. Permanent premises

(a) Status of the project

159. The Chairman of the Oversight Committee, Mr. Roberto Bellelli, and the Project Director, Mr. Neil Bradley, provided an update of their activities, focusing on the progress of the Permanent Premises Project, its funding, cost and timeliness, as well as its ongoing challenges. The project was currently below the approved budget and within its timelines. These results had been achieved through effective governance and management of the project.

160. The award stage of the project, involving four tenderers, had been closed with a unanimous recommendation of the assessment panel on the Most Economically Advantageous Tender in August 2012. Following the recommendation of the Project Director, the Oversight Committee had decided to award the general contract for the construction to the consortium of Visser & Smit / Boele Van Eesteren for the guaranteed maximum price of €147 million against the €153 million level available for this purpose in the overall €190 million budget. Consequently, in addition to having absorbed the cost of the integrated user equipment ("3gv-costs") in accordance with resolution ICC-ASP/10/Res.6, the project was currently €6.1 million under the maximum authorized €190 million figure. The Registrar had signed the contract with the general contractor on 1 October 2012. The estimated completion date for the project continued to be September 2015, with readiness for the Court to move into the new premises in December 2015.

161. While pleased with the positive outcome of the tender process, the Committee agreed with the Oversight Committee on the need to manage the challenges of the project throughout the construction phase. A cautious approach to the financial aspects of the project should be maintained until its final completion.

⁴⁹ *Official Records... Ninth session... 2010* (ICC-ASP/9/20), vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/9/Res.5.

⁵⁰ *Official Records... Tenth session ... 2011* (ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/10/Res.5.

(b) Transition to the new premises

162. The Committee agreed with the Oversight Committee on the critical need to ensure the timely completion of the project and the smooth transition of the Court to the new premises. The Project Director explained that the transition process was a complex and challenging project in itself, which required careful planning in good time. A transparent management structure and the clear assignment of responsibilities within the Court were essential. The Project Director expressed concern about the current lack of clarity in this respect. **The Committee recommended that the Court expeditiously develop a detailed, monitorable scheme for managing the transition, based on a clear accountability structure. The Committee requested the Court to provide a progress report at its twentieth session.**

163. The Committee was informed that the Director of the Permanent Premises Office has concluded service agreements with various Court departments. Those agreements specify the amounts to be paid for the services provided, which have been set against the Office's budget appropriation. The total cost of support services provided by the Court to the Permanent Premises Office amounts to €386,000.

164. The Committee accepted that it was preferable to take advantage of existing experience and skills within the Court, but was concerned to ensure that the use of approved resources remained transparent and subject to proper oversight. **The Committee recommended that, at its twentieth session, the Project Director submit a more detailed and transparent analysis, containing information on the number of hours worked by temporary staff from other Court departments working for the Project Director's Office, including particulars of their remuneration.**

(c) Total cost of ownership

165. The Oversight Committee recalled that, at the Committee's eighteenth session in April 2012, it had sought the Committee's advice on how to approach the funding costs component of the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO). These costs for using and owning the building were estimated to impact the budget as from 2016 in a range between €13.3 million and €14.8 million. They included three components: (i) financial costs; (ii) operating costs; and (iii) funding costs for capital investment replacements throughout the lifetime of the permanent premises, which accounted for a significant part of the TCO. **The Committee invited the Oversight Committee and the Project Director to complete their qualitative analysis with quantitative assumptions and scenarios, including risk assessments and illustrations of the costs.**⁵¹

166. Following-up on the Committee's recommendations, the Project Director was finalizing the structure of a working group to study the options and to consider establishing a fund to deal with the lifetime approach. The Committee shared the concern of the Oversight Committee that it would be extremely difficult to cope with the estimated additional requirements of up to €14.8 million peryear in the lifetime approach. **Therefore, the Committee recommended that the Working Group not focus only on one single option, such as the lifetime approach, but rather, it should undertake a review of the range of possible approaches including, but not limited to, a combination of the lifetime and annual approaches to mitigate the immediate financial impact.**

(d) Financial burden sharing with future States Parties

167. **The Committee also suggested that the Working Group should clarify technical options for future States Parties adhering after the completion of the permanent premises project to contribute to the financing of the project costs, taking into account the practice of other international organizations in sharing the burden of project financing among a growing membership.**

⁵¹ ICC-ASP/11/5, para. 67.

(e) Extending the deadline for one-time payments

168. States Parties can contribute to the financing of the permanent premises project in either of two ways: through one-time payments up-front or, alternatively, by being assessed annually for the payment of interest and for the repayment of the host State loan over a 30 year period. As regards one-time payments, the Oversight Committee recalled that the deadline for States Parties to opt for one-time payments is 15 October 2012. Several States Parties had recently expressed an interest in also availing themselves of the one-time payment option. Consequently, the Oversight Committee had prepared a draft resolution again extending the deadline for opting into the system to 31 December 2014, and for making possible advance payments to be received in full by 15 June 2015. The Committee recalled that one-time payments would be subject to an adjustment once the final cost of the project and the amount of the host State loan were known. This is to ensure that all States Parties pay the correct amount. **In order to provide transparency and predictability, the Committee invited the Oversight Committee and the Project Director to provide illustrative scenarios showing how the adjustment mechanism would work in practice at its twentieth session.**

169. The Committee was of the view that an extension of the deadline for one-time payment was a good measure for increasing financial certainty to the project. **However, in order to ensure fair burden sharing, the Committee suggested that the Oversight Committee look into options available in order to differentiate between those States Parties that opted for one-time payments before the original deadline and have made their payments, and those that would be interested in opting for one-time payments at the present time. In addition, the issue of interest accrued so far should be taken into account when accepting new one-time payers.**

(f) Non-integrated user equipment (“2gv elements”)

170. The cost of the non-integrated user equipment (“2gv elements”) is currently estimated at €17.5 million spread out over 2012 to 2016. The Committee noted the sharp spike projected in 2015 of up to €13.5 million. **The Committee recommended that the Court review again the options for possibly mitigating this increase, including the suitability and extended use of existing equipment.**

(g) Reclassification of the position of the Deputy Project Director and Financial Controller from P-4 to P-5 level

171. The Committee noted the request of the Project Director’s Office to reclassify the post of Deputy Project Director and Financial Controller from a P-4 to a P-5 level.⁵² The Committee recalled that at its sixth session, the Assembly had created the post of Deputy Project Director and Financial Controller at the P-4 level, stating that “a Deputy Project Director with solid financial experience in evaluating construction and design tenders will be essential.”⁵³ **The Committee therefore was not of the opinion that the increased financial duties of the Deputy Project Director and Financial Controller went beyond the original specifications for the post and recommended that the conversion not be approved. The budget line for this item should thus be reduced by €24,400.**

2. Interim premises

172. The Committee made a provisional examination of the estimated costs in the 2013 proposed programme budget.

173. The Court included an amount of €6.02 million for estimated rent and associated costs under Major Programme V (Interim Premises) in the 2013 proposed programme budget. The Committee was informed that the rent of premises were fixed in the rental contract with an adjustment mechanism based on the inflation rate of the host State and that

⁵² ICC-ASP/11/10, Corr.1 and Corr.2, annex VII.

⁵³ *Official Records...Sixth session...2007* (ICC-ASP/6/20), vol. I, ICC-ASP/6/Res.1, annex V, paragraph I (b).

other costs including the rent of warehouse and car park were estimated based on assumptions.

174. The Committee noted that the Court was revisiting the estimated associated costs and that the Court had already identified savings opportunities amounting to €120,000. **Therefore, the Committee recommended to reduce the amount of €120,000 from the 2013 proposed programme budget, and also it encouraged the Court to continue reviewing its assumptions on an ongoing basis with a view to identifying further possible reductions of those costs.**

I. Other matters

Future meetings

175. The Committee decided, tentatively, to hold its twentieth and twenty-first sessions in The Hague, from 22 to 26 April 2013, and from 9 September to 18 September 2013, respectively.

Annex I

List of documents

CBF/19/1	Provisional agenda
CBF/19/1/Add.1	Annotated list of items included in the provisional agenda
CBF/19/2	Report of the Court on the implementation of International Public Sector Accounting Standards
CBF/19/3	Annual Report of the Office of Internal Audit
CBF/19/4	Annual Report of the Office of Internal Audit. Implementation of audit recommendations: status as at 30 June 2012
CBF/19/5	Report of the Court on Judicial decisions with significant financial implications
CBF/19/6	Supplementary Report of the Registry on four aspects of the Court's legal aid system
CBF/19/6/Add.1	Financial implications of the review of the legal aid system of the Court
CBF/19/7	Report of the Court on proposed amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules
CBF/19/8	Report of the Court on the activities of the Judiciary
CBF/19/9	Report of the Court on the activities of the Office of the Prosecutor
CBF/19/10	Report of the Court on the activities of the Registry
CBF/19/11	Report of the Court on the methodology for its scale of assessment
CBF/19/12	Report of the Court on the conditions of service of internationally recruited staff serving at field duty stations
CBF/19/13	Proposal by the Court for a retiree health insurance subsidy scheme
CBF/19/14	Report of the Court on analytic accountability
CBF/19/15	Report of the Court on its budgeting process and zero-based budgeting
CBF/19/16	Report of the Court on Junior Professional Officers (JPO)
CBF/19/17	Report on the organizational structure of the Court
CBF/19/18	Management of Exchange Rate Risks - Trust Fund for Victims
CBF/19/19	Interim report on the activities of the Oversight Committee
CBF/19/20	Performance Appraisal System in the Court
CBF/19/21	Annual report of the Audit Committee
ICC-ASP/11/3	Progress report of the Court on the implementation of International Public Sector Accounting Standards
ICC-ASP/11/4	Report of the Court on proposed amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules
ICC-ASP/11/5	Report of the Committee on Budget and Finance on the work of its eighteenth session
ICC-ASP/11/7	Report of the Court on human resources management
ICC-ASP/11/8	Report on activities and programme performance of the International Criminal Court for the year 2011
ICC-ASP/11/10	Proposed Programme Budget for 2013 of the International Criminal Court
ICC-ASP/11/10/Corr.1	Proposed Programme Budget for 2013 of the International Criminal Court – Corrigendum 1
ICC-ASP/11/10/Corr.2	Proposed Programme Budget for 2013 of the International Criminal Court – Corrigendum 2
ICC-ASP/11/11	Report of the Court on its budgeting process
ICC-ASP/11/12	Financial statements for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011
ICC-ASP/11/13	Trust Fund for Victims - Financial statements for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011
ICC-ASP/11/14	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 2012
ICC-ASP/11/16	Report on budget performance of the International Criminal Court as at 30 June 2012

Annex II

Status of contributions as at 30 September 2012 (in euros)

	<i>Prior Years' Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>Prior Years' Receipts</i>	<i>Prior Years' Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>2012 Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>2012 Contributions Received</i>	<i>2012 Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Total Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Replenishment Contingency Fund 2011</i>	<i>Grand Total</i>
1 Afghanistan	25,146	25,146	-	6,452	-	6,452	6,452	46	6,498
2 Albania	78,460	78,460	-	16,124	16,118	6	6	-	6
3 Andorra	79,424	79,424	-	11,283	11,252	31	31	-	31
4 Antigua and Barbuda	28,382	22,936	5,446	3,220	-	3,220	8,666	76	8,742
5 Argentina	6,834,472	6,834,472	-	462,639	462,639	-	-	-	-
6 Australia	21,271,213	21,271,213	-	3,115,945	3,115,945	-	-	-	-
7 Austria	10,591,419	10,591,419	-	1,371,794	1,371,794	-	-	-	-
8 Bangladesh	24,349	-	24,349	16,124	-	16,124	40,473	380	40,853
9 Barbados	108,249	108,249	-	12,893	12,893	-	-	-	-
10 Belgium	13,191,168	13,191,168	-	1,732,868	1,732,868	-	-	-	-
11 Belize	12,152	12,152	-	1,610	-	1,610	1,610	11	1,621
12 Benin	23,001	23,001	-	4,831	-	4,831	4,831	34	4,865
13 Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	89,457	89,457	-	11,283	11,283	-	-	-	-
14 Bosnia & Herzegovina	84,045	84,045	-	22,565	22,565	-	-	-	-
15 Botswana	171,794	171,794	-	29,017	-	29,017	29,017	194	29,211
16 Brazil	16,433,395	16,433,395	-	2,596,893	2,596,893	-	-	-	-
17 Bulgaria	281,834	281,834	-	61,254	61,254	-	-	-	-
18 Burkina Faso	25,045	20,641	4,404	4,831	-	4,831	9,235	114	9,349
19 Burundi	10,528	10,528	-	1,610	1,610	-	-	-	-
20 Cambodia	23,001	18,505	4,496	4,831	-	4,831	9,327	114	9,441
21 Canada	35,957,386	35,957,386	-	5,169,599	5,169,599	-	-	-	-
22 Cape Verde	-	-	-	1,610	-	1,610	1,610	-	1,610
23 Central African Republic	12,152	11,722	430	1,610	-	1,610	2,040	38	2,078
24 Chad	10,530	1,646	8,884	3,220	-	3,220	12,104	76	12,180
25 Chile	802,688	802,688	-	380,430	380,430	-	-	-	-
26 Colombia	1,640,848	1,640,848	-	232,125	232,125	-	-	-	-
27 Comoros	7,722	582	7,140	1,610	-	1,610	8,750	38	8,788
28 Congo	17,046	17,046	-	4,831	-	4,831	4,831	34	4,865
29 Cook Islands	4,842	3,313	1,529	1,610	-	1,610	3,139	38	3,177
30 Costa Rica	379,421	379,421	-	54,803	54,803	-	-	-	-
31 Croatia	692,318	692,318	-	156,356	-	156,356	156,356	1,088	157,444
32 Cyprus	516,705	516,705	-	74,147	74,147	-	-	-	-
33 Czech Republic	1,174,000	1,174,000	-	562,583	562,583	-	-	-	-
34 Democratic Republic of the Congo	37,073	37,073	-	4,831	475	4,356	4,356	-	4,356
35 Denmark	8,892,049	8,892,049	-	1,186,410	1,186,410	-	-	-	-
36 Djibouti	11,956	5,223	6,733	1,610	-	1,610	8,343	38	8,381
37 Dominica	12,152	9,345	2,807	1,610	-	1,610	4,417	38	4,455
38 Dominican Republic	310,393	181,192	129,201	67,706	-	67,706	196,907	1,597	198,504
39 Ecuador	307,937	307,937	-	64,475	-	64,475	64,475	448	64,923
40 Estonia	248,227	248,227	-	64,475	64,475	-	-	-	-

	<i>Prior Years' Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>Prior Years' Receipts</i>	<i>Prior Years' Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>2012 Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>2012 Contributions Received</i>	<i>2012 Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Total Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Replenishment Contingency Fund 2011</i>	<i>Grand Total</i>
41 Fiji	44,227	43,052	1,175	6,452	-	6,452	7,627	152	7,779
42 Finland	6,707,707	6,707,707	-	912,375	912,375	-	-	-	-
43 France	75,022,145	75,022,145	-	9,870,108	9,870,108	-	-	-	-
44 Gabon	123,453	50,944	72,509	22,565	-	22,565	95,074	532	95,606
45 Gambia	12,152	12,152	-	1,610	-	1,610	1,610	13	1,623
46 Georgia	44,021	44,021	-	9,672	9,672	-	-	-	-
47 Germany	103,597,452	103,597,452	-	12,924,798	12,924,798	-	-	-	-
48 Ghana	55,376	55,376	-	9,672	-	9,672	9,672	66	9,738
49 Greece	7,230,587	7,230,587	-	1,113,873	-	1,113,873	1,113,873	7,321	1,121,194
50 Grenada	641	-	641	1,610	-	1,610	2,251	16	2,267
51 Guatemala	-	-	-	22,565	-	22,565	22,565	-	22,565
52 Guinea	23,917	20,935	2,982	3,220	-	3,220	6,202	76	6,278
53 Guyana	10,528	10,528	-	1,610	1,610	-	-	-	-
54 Honduras	69,828	40,516	29,312	12,893	-	12,893	42,205	304	42,509
55 Hungary	2,551,662	2,551,662	-	469,080	469,080	-	-	-	-
56 Iceland	450,270	450,270	-	67,706	67,706	-	-	-	-
57 Ireland	5,089,997	5,089,997	-	802,759	802,759	-	-	-	-
58 Italy	60,676,389	60,676,389	-	8,058,250	8,058,250	-	-	-	-
59 Japan	84,487,697	84,487,697	-	20,198,024	20,198,024	-	-	-	-
60 Jordan	145,420	145,420	-	22,565	22,565	-	-	-	-
61 Kenya	102,343	102,343	-	19,345	-	19,345	19,345	128	19,473
62 Latvia	263,067	263,067	-	61,254	61,254	-	-	-	-
63 Lesotho	12,152	12,152	-	1,610	-	1,610	1,610	35	1,645
64 Liberia	10,528	6,504	4,024	1,610	-	1,610	5,634	38	5,672
65 Liechtenstein	95,568	95,568	-	14,503	14,503	-	-	-	-
66 Lithuania	436,827	436,827	-	104,774	64,973	39,801	39,801	-	39,801
67 Luxembourg	1,012,518	1,012,518	-	145,074	145,074	-	-	-	-
68 Madagascar	13,657	11,099	2,558	4,831	-	4,831	7,389	114	7,503
69 Malawi	12,533	12,533	-	1,610	-	1,610	1,610	11	1,621
70 Maldives	128	-	128	1,610	-	1,610	1,738	3	1,741
71 Mali	23,001	20,463	2,538	4,831	-	4,831	7,369	114	7,483
72 Malta	190,146	190,146	-	27,407	27,407	-	-	-	-
73 Marshall Islands	12,152	8,422	3,730	1,610	-	1,610	5,340	38	5,378
74 Mauritius	133,666	133,666	-	17,734	17,734	-	-	-	-
75 Mexico	20,139,394	20,139,394	-	3,797,805	-	3,797,805	3,797,805	29,204	3,827,009
76 Moldova (Republic of)	3,075	3,075	-	3,220	3,211	9	9	-	9
77 Mongolia	15,227	15,227	-	3,220	3,220	-	-	-	-
78 Montenegro	17,615	17,615	-	6,452	-	6,452	6,452	66	6,518
79 Namibia	79,678	79,678	-	12,893	12,893	-	-	-	-

	<i>Prior Years' Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>Prior Years' Receipts</i>	<i>Prior Years' Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>2012 Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>2012 Contributions Received</i>	<i>2012 Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Total Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Replenishment Contingency Fund 2011</i>	<i>Grand Total</i>
80 Nauru	12,152	12,152	-	1,610	1,169	441	441	-	441
81 Netherlands	21,876,126	21,876,126	-	2,990,216	2,990,216	-	-	-	-
82 New Zealand	3,011,296	3,011,296	-	440,063	440,063	-	-	-	-
83 Niger	15,227	7,943	7,284	3,220	-	3,220	10,504	76	10,580
84 Nigeria	661,527	543,653	117,874	125,729	-	125,729	243,603	2,965	246,568
85 Norway	9,272,838	9,272,838	-	1,404,031	1,404,031	-	-	-	-
86 Panama	256,997	256,997	-	35,469	35,469	-	-	-	-
87 Paraguay	102,262	91,881	10,381	11,283	-	11,283	21,664	266	21,930
88 Peru	1,066,702	906,459	160,243	145,074	-	145,074	305,317	3,422	308,739
89 Philippines	23,064	23,064	-	145,074	145,032	42	42	-	42
90 Poland	6,845,205	6,845,205	-	1,334,715	1,334,715	-	-	-	-
91 Portugal	6,082,461	6,082,461	-	823,714	823,714	-	-	-	-
92 Republic of Korea	24,571,322	24,571,322	-	3,643,059	3,643,059	-	-	-	-
93 Romania	1,131,697	1,131,697	-	285,317	285,317	-	-	-	-
94 Saint Kitts and Nevis	7,722	7,722	-	1,610	1,610	-	-	-	-
95 Saint Lucia	1,794	-	1,794	1,610	-	1,610	3,404	38	3,442
96 Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	11,956	11,956	-	1,610	-	1,610	1,610	25	1,635
97 Samoa	12,034	12,034	-	1,610	1,610	-	-	-	-
98 San Marino	35,837	35,837	-	4,831	4,831	-	-	-	-
99 Senegal	59,456	59,456	-	9,672	-	9,672	9,672	66	9,738
100 Serbia	295,620	295,620	-	59,644	59,644	-	-	-	-
101 Seychelles	3,588	3,588	-	3,220	-	3,220	3,220	66	3,286
102 Sierra Leone	12,152	9,344	2,808	1,610	-	1,610	4,418	38	4,456
103 Slovakia	947,243	947,243	-	228,904	228,904	-	-	-	-
104 Slovenia	1,121,678	1,121,678	-	166,029	-	166,029	166,029	1,079	167,108
105 South Africa	3,897,662	3,897,662	-	620,606	620,606	-	-	-	-
106 Spain	34,606,024	34,606,024	-	5,121,238	-	5,121,238	5,121,238	38,501	5,159,739
107 Suriname	10,994	10,994	-	4,831	4,831	-	-	-	-
108 Sweden	12,668,681	12,668,681	-	1,715,145	1,715,145	-	-	-	-
119 Switzerland	14,469,763	14,469,763	-	1,821,530	1,821,530	-	-	-	-
110 Tajikistan	15,227	15,227	-	3,220	3,220	-	-	-	-
111 Tanzania (United Republic of)	77,508	65,583	11,925	12,893	-	12,893	24,818	304	25,122
112 The former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia	71,606	51,668	19,938	11,283	-	11,283	31,221	266	31,487
113 Timor-Leste	12,034	12,034	-	1,610	50	1,560	1,560	-	1,560
114 Trinidad and Tobago	353,187	353,187	-	70,927	70,927	-	-	-	-

<i>States Parties</i>	<i>Prior Years' Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>Prior Years' Receipts</i>	<i>Prior Years' Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>2012 Assessed Contributions</i>	<i>2012 Contributions Received</i>	<i>2012 Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Total Outstanding Contributions</i>	<i>Replenishment Contingency Fund 2011</i>	<i>Grand Total</i>	<i>States Parties</i>
115 Tunisia	15,376	-	15,376	48,362	-	48,362	63,738	380	64,118	
116 Uganda	59,157	59,157	-	9,672	5,236	4,436	4,436	-	4,436	
117 United Kingdom	77,814,612	77,814,612	-	10,645,471	10,645,471	-	-	-	-	
118 Uruguay	446,660	446,660	-	43,520	-	43,520	43,520	279	43,799	
119 Vanuatu	-	-	-	1,480	-	1,480	1,480	-	1,480	
120 Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	2,667,903	2,667,903	-	506,159	506,159	-	-	-	-	
121 Zambia	25,682	25,682	-	6,452	6,452	-	-	-	-	
Total	713,988,755	713,326,116	662,639	108,799,841	97,628,388	11,171,453	11,834,092	90,404	11,924,496	

Note: concerns outstanding assessed programme budget contributions and replenishment of the Contingency Fund; does not include outstanding Working Capital Fund.

Annex III

Impact of measures to bring the level of the International Criminal Court's budget for 2013 in line with the level of the approved budget for 2012*

A. Introduction

1. At its last session, the Assembly requested the Court “to prepare, if it proposes any increase of the budget for 2013, a paper which details the Court’s options where reductions would be made in order to bring the level of the approved budget for 2013 in line with the level of the approved budget for 2012¹ as well as how those reductions would impact on the Court’s activities”.²

2. As in previous years, during 2012 the Court has made its best efforts to cut down expenses, find efficiencies and concentrate its efforts and resources on the most efficient and economical means of implementing its mandate. As a result of these efforts and notwithstanding its increased workload, the necessary net increase in the 2013 proposed programme budget of Major Programmes I, II and III is €3.5 million (3.5 per cent) when compared against the approved corresponding appropriations for the 2012 budget. Accordingly, the organs of the Court have been able to integrate additional requirements through efficiencies, reprioritizations and reductions, thereby minimizing the increase. In addition, States Parties will have to pay the rent – a cost that had heretofore been covered by the host State – for the Court’s interim premises for the first time in 2013, which amounts to an added €6.02 million in the Court’s budget.

3. The new requirements for the rent, in addition to increases in the Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties (€206,200), the Independent Oversight Mechanism (€104,300) and the Trust Fund for Victims (€208,700), as well as a reduction in the Permanent Premises Project’s Director’s Office (-€109,000), bring the total increase of the Court’s 2013 proposed programme budget to €9.9 million (9.1 per cent).

4. In light of these additional expenses and pursuant to the above-mentioned resolution, the Court hereby submits a paper identifying measures which, if adopted by the Assembly, could bring the level of the Court’s budget for 2013 in line with the level of the approved budget for 2012. Importantly, it must be stressed that this paper and the measures identified herein are not a proposal from the Court for further reductions as the Court has already submitted the most economical and efficient budget proposal. The Court believes that the activities affected by the identified reduction measures and their corresponding resources are of high importance and part of the mandatory activities within the Court’s legal framework. In compliance with the above-mentioned resolution by the Assembly, the Court will identify the impact and consequences that further reductions to its 2013 proposed programme budget are likely to have on the Court’s implementation of its mandate.

* As submitted by the Court.

¹ *Official Records... Tenth session... 2011*(ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/10/Res.4, paragraph A.1. In this resolution the Assembly approved “appropriations totaling €111,000,000 with €108,800,000 for the budget of the Court and €2,200,000 to replenish the Contingency Fund” (*emphasis added*).

² *Official Records... Tenth session... 2011*(ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. I, part III, ICC-ASP/10/Res.4, paragraph H.2 (*in quote footnote and emphasis added*).

Table 1: Resource growth by Major Programme in 2013. Proposed Programme Budget as compared to the 2012 approved budget (in thousands of euro)

	<i>Amount €</i>	<i>%</i>
MP I: Judiciary	1,150.7	11.2
MP II: Office of the Prosecutor	939.4	3.4
MP III: Registry	1,431.7	2.2
MP IV: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties	206.2	7.4
MP V: Rent & Maintenance (Interim Premises)	6,021.4	
MP VI: Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims	208.7	14.4
MP VII-1: Project Director's Office (Permanent Premises)	-109.0	-8.2
MP VII-5: Independent Oversight Mechanism	104.3	56.2
Total	9,953.4	9.1

B. Background on budgetary issues

5. The Court's budget is driven by its activities as set forth in its founding document, the Rome Statute. The Preamble stipulates that the States Parties to the Rome Statute are "[d]etermined to put an end to impunity for the perpetrators of [the most serious crimes of concern to the international community as a whole] and thus to contribute to the prevention of such crimes".³ Further, the Rome Statute's regulatory framework regarding jurisdiction⁴ and admissibility⁵ as well as the Prosecutor's investigative mandate⁶ is based on the premise that the Court determines the level of its activities based on the following principles:

- (a) Has a crime of sufficient gravity been committed?
- (b) Does the court have jurisdiction over the crime? and
- (c) Is the case admissible?⁷ The Court's budgetary requirements follow these underlying assumptions.

6. In 2012, the Assembly approved €108.8 million for the 2012 programme budget. While these appropriations represented an approximately 5 per cent increase in the Court's budget compared to the 2011 approved budget, the Court's increased budgetary needs for 2012 had been triggered by a number of significant judicial developments, most prominently the referral of the Libya situation by the Security Council, the two Kenya cases and the situation in Côte d'Ivoire which are now before the Court. In addition to the reductions in the Court's 2012 proposed programme budget and the supplementary budget⁸ recommended by the Committee on Budget and Finance, the Assembly imposed further cuts to the Court's proposal, bringing it to the above-mentioned total of €108,800,000.

7. The deficit in the 2012 approved budget has mainly affected the areas of personnel expenses for established posts and GTA, legal aid and non-staff costs such as travel, contractual services, equipment and supplies and materials. These budgetary measures, in addition to the unexpected and unprecedented vacancy rate imposed for GTAs, have had an adverse impact on the Court and have threatened to compromise its ability to meet its contractual obligations vis-à-vis its employees.

³ Rome Statute, Preamble, paras. 4 and 5.

⁴ See article 13 of the Rome Statute.

⁵ See article 17 of the Rome Statute.

⁶ See articles 14, 15 of the Rome Statute.

⁷ O. Triffterer, *Commentary on the Rome Statute of the International Criminal court*, 2nd Edition 2008, article 1, para. 22.

⁸ *Official Records... Tenth session... 2011*(ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. I, annex II A., previously issued as ICC-ASP/10/10/Add.2.

8. The Court continues to pay its staff full wages in accordance with their entitlements and has absorbed the financial burden imposed through the freeze on salary scales and staff costs. In 2012, with a continuously high implementation rate and a substantial amount of staff costs to absorb, the Court was forced to terminate the contracts of a number of employees on GTA contracts due to the unavailability of funds. For the same reason, budgeted posts which have become vacant due to staff leaving the Court have not been filled. In addition, non-staff costs have also been affected.

9. Another measure adopted by the Assembly that exacerbates the gap between the budget and the Court's financial reality is the unprecedented vacancy rate which, since 2012, has also been applied to GTA. These contracts reflect the staff needed to perform certain activities on a short term need basis. The application of a vacancy rate on GTA is inappropriate as these resources are hired on a need-per-month basis within a calendar year. Any reductions through the application of a vacancy rate do inevitably result in a shortfall in capacity.

10. A reprioritization of operations has taken place across the Court during 2012 in addition to the adoption of preventive financial and operational measures in order to cope with the deficit. Some of the financial measures include the delay and postponement of recruitments and the cancellation of contract renewals. Further, operational measures have been taken to economize resources with the result that special projects will be delayed. This encompasses, *inter alia*, consultancies to support the risk management project; the development of the Human Resources manual; brokerage expertise to establish the insurance committee and internal audits on IT-related issues; the refurbishment of courtrooms; investments on SAP projects such as the automation of annual leave and the new payroll system; and certain training, including language courses. In addition, one of the two courtrooms was closed mainly due to the lack of resources for the replacement of equipments and the corresponding maintenance costs.

11. Staff shortages and the reduced courtroom capacity are likely to cause delays to the judicial proceedings, resulting in delays and additional costs for other parts of the Court involved in the proceedings, not least the legal aid budget.

12. Support sections continue to do their utmost to maintain the level of services currently provided; however, the Court has experienced some operational delays and risks are increasing in certain activities. The operational measures also increase the risk of serious complications in areas such as support to courtroom activities, protection of witnesses and victims, support to Counsel, field operations, victims' participation, and others.

C. Elaboration of the 2013 proposed programme budget

13. As the Court has previously stated,⁹ its budgetary policy is one of strict reliance on established facts; it does not budget for any activity unless its occurrence in the following year is clearly foreseeable and quantifiable. This commitment to an accurate and lean budgeting approach in the Court's regular programme budget has been endorsed by the Committee.¹⁰ This budgeting philosophy is subject to ongoing discussions in the Assembly's Study Group on Governance in its cluster on the Court's budgeting process.¹¹

14. Consistent with its budget policy and current budget process, the Court has included in its proposed budget for 2013 only the necessary requirements deriving from the 2013 budget assumptions, including provision for the hearings in both trials in the Kenya situation. The Court's budgeting strategy continues to be mandate-driven and the Court has requested, in the 2013 proposed programme budget, the adequate financial resources to ensure that its operations are carried out effectively and efficiently.¹²

⁹ *Official Records ...Sixth session ... 2007* (ICC-ASP/6/20), vol. II, part A.I, para. 55. Also see CBF/18/8, para. 7.

¹⁰ ICC-ASP/7/16, para. 6. and ICC/18/8, para. 7.

¹¹ Delegates of States Parties have welcomed the Court's initiative to provide budget assumptions for scenarios of additional Court activities which are, while foreseeable, not adequately quantifiable at the time of setting the Court's budget assumptions.

¹² CBF/18/18, para. 9.

15. Mindful of the financial constraints that States Parties are experiencing due to the current economic environment, the Court has prioritised its financial requirements and has continued to focus on the efficient delivery of prosecutorial and judicial activities and the corresponding support operations. In this regard, the 2013 proposed programme budget excludes resources for some special projects, operational requirements, staff development and staff welfare. While it was concluded that the postponement of these operations will only have a minor directly detrimental impact on the Court's prosecutorial and judicial operations in the short term, their exclusion from the proposed budget will create inefficiencies across the Court in the foreseeable future.

D. Staff costs in the 2013 budget

16. Due to the nature of the Court's operations, its main investments are linked to its human resources. For this purpose, the Court applies the United Nations' common system of salaries, allowances and other conditions of service – a necessary precondition for participation in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund.¹³ In applying this system, the Court is under an obligation to implement the common standards, methods and arrangements being applied to salaries, allowances and benefits for international civil service staff. ICSC¹⁴ ensures appropriate mandatory levels of salaries and allowances of all common system staff which are approved by the United Nations General Assembly and result in corresponding adjustments in staff costs.¹⁵

17. While the Court is legally bound to apply the UNCS, for the past two years, the Assembly has followed the Committee's recommendation that the Court absorb the increases of staff salaries and enhanced conditions in the field within each major programme.¹⁶ If the Court were to freeze staff salaries and periodic increments, it would thus infringe individual rights and entitlements. Litigations before the ILOAT with a risk for potential liabilities would be a predictable consequence.

E. Impact of budget reductions

1. Overview

18. In complying with the Assembly's request, the Court identified a list of measures which, if adopted by the Assembly, could bring about substantial reductions to the budget. In addition, and to further inform the Assembly's consideration of this paper, the Court has identified the impact and consequences that additional reductions to its 2013 proposed programme budget are likely to have on the Court's implementation of its mandate. In carrying out this exercise, the Court has focused on: a) major programme-specific measures which generate savings within specific major programmes; and b) cross-cutting measures which have an impact on all organs of the Court.

19. While the first set of measures is aimed at finding resources which can be reduced from the different major programmes in an isolated manner without unduly affecting the activities of the other parts of the Court, this approach will necessarily result in limited reductions. The way in which the budget of the Court is built reflects the synergies and inter-related operations among the different organs of the Court triggered by judicial and prosecutorial activities.

20. Table 2 illustrates the 2013 proposed programme budget by major programme and the 2012 approved programme budget, as well as the reductions that would be required in each major programme should the Assembly wish to bring the 2013 proposed budget in line with the 2012 approved programme budget. It transpires that while some major programmes may be able to achieve zero nominal growth through in-programme

¹³ Regulation 6.1 of the Staff Regulations.

¹⁴ The Salaries and Allowances Division of the ICSC monitors the levels of net remuneration, recommends adjustments to net and gross base/floor salary scale and levels of staff, and carries out periodic studies to determine the best-paid national civil service used as a comparator of the common system.

¹⁵ The common system is designed to avoid serious discrepancies in terms and conditions of employment, to avoid competition in recruitment of personnel and to facilitate the interchange of personnel. It applies to over 52,000 staff members serving at over 600 duty stations.

¹⁶ *Official Records... Tenth session... 2011*(ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. II., part B.2., para. 76.

reductions, other major programmes with more substantial growth rates cannot do so. Therefore, and in particular if the Court is to absorb the rent for the interim premises, Court-wide cross-cutting measures are necessary to make the required savings.

21. The proposed programme budget for the Court does not include any potential savings resulting from possible changes in the legal aid system which, if adopted by the Assembly, would reduce the Registry's proposed budget by approximately €1.1 million, as indicated in the Supplementary Report of the Registry on four aspects of the Court's legal aid system, and corresponding annex.¹⁷ Therefore, the resource growth shown in table 2 could be reduced from €9.95 million to €8.88 million.

Table 2: 2013 Proposed Programme Budget resource growth (in thousands of euro)

<i>Major Programme</i>	<i>Proposed 2013 budget €</i>	<i>Approved 2012 budget €</i>	<i>Resource growth €</i>
I	11,434.7	10,284	1,150.7
II	28,663.1	27,723.7	939.4
III	66,473.4	65,041.7	1,431.7
IV	2983.5	2,777.3	206.2
V	6,021.4	n/a	6,021.4
VI	1,659.3	1,450.6	208.70
VII-1 and VII-2	1,228.2	1,337.2	-109.0
VII-5	289.8	185.5	104.3
Total	118,753.4	108,800	9,953.3

2. Major Programme-specific measures for budget reductions

(a) Major Programme I

22. The main cost drivers of the 2013 proposed programme budget for Major Programme I are two-fold. Firstly, the Presidency will need to call three judges elected on 11 March 2012 to full-time service in the first quarter of 2013 in order to staff the two trial chambers in the Kenya situation at the cost of €791,000. Secondly, additional staffing resources will become necessary for the Kenya cases as well as in the Appeals Division, which will be facing two final appeals in addition to its habitual workload of interlocutory and other appellate proceedings.¹⁸

23. In order to bring the 2013 proposed budget of Major Programme I in line with the 2012 approved programme budget, a reduction of €1.5 million is required. This figure largely reflects the cost of three judges necessary for constituting a second trial chamber in the situation in Kenya – costs which are inelastic and not subject to possible reductions or absorptions due to statutory requirements of a minimal number of judges per chamber.¹⁹ With an overall budget of €11.4 million, a reduction of Major Programme I's budget to the level of the approved budget allotment in 2012 would necessitate cuts exceeding 10 per cent of its overall budget allotment. Since Major Programme I's budget consists of almost exclusively staff costs and judges' costs, such a reduction would cut deep into its staffing resources, effectively amounting to a 25 per cent staff reduction, and take away the entire GTA budget. This would result in the elimination of staff capacities which carry out essential Chambers support functions as regards, for instance, victim participation, disclosure of evidence and witness protection issues (e.g. redaction of evidence). Ongoing judicial proceedings would be severely impacted and envisaged proceedings would have to be postponed substantially, generating further costs down the line and possibly infringing upon the right of the accused to an expeditious trial. Therefore, Major Programme I

¹⁷ ICC-ASP/11/43 and Add.1.

¹⁸ In addition, the yearly increase of staff costs due to new salary scales etc. as outlined above sharply impacts Major Programme I due to its high concentration of staff costs.

¹⁹ For example, article 39 of the Rome Statute stipulates the minimum number of judges per Chamber, from which the Judiciary cannot divert for any reasons, let alone cost-saving considerations.

identified measures which, while having an impact on the implementation of its mandate, will not lead to a complete collapse of its ongoing activities. The measures identified by the Court are also illustrated in table 3.

Table 3: Major Programme I's budget reduction measures

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Reduction (20 per cent) of GTA provision for: - Pre-Trial Division; - Trial Division (GTA resources for the <i>Kenya</i> case); and Appeals Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likely to generate disruptions in the judicial proceedings and eventually cause delays as the staff resources required by the chambers and divisions are calculated rather conservatively. - In light of probable future pre-trial activity, in particular in the Côte d'Ivoire and Libya situations, the decrease of resources which are meant to cover short-term peak activity and resource requirements may deprive the Pre-Trial Division of its flexibility to react as expeditiously as possible to any requests and motions by the Prosecutor or other parties and participants to the proceedings. - Likely to generate disruptions in the proceedings and eventually cause delays in judicial proceedings as the staff resources required by the chambers and divisions are calculated rather conservatively. - Delays in the Kenya trial preparation and subsequent trial hearings, currently scheduled to commence on 10 and 11 April 2013 respectively, would not only generate further costs for legal aid for the defence, victim participation and representation, but would also threaten to violate the accuseds' procedural rights under the Rome Statute and finally undermine the credibility and standing of the Court externally. - Likely to adversely affect the quality and expeditiousness of judicial processes. 	€ 172,000
Reduction (20 per cent) of consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A decrease of resources which are meant to cover short-term peak activity and resource requirements may deprive the Judiciary of its flexibility to react as expeditiously as possible to any judicial development, in particular in regards of victim participation and evidence processing issues, as well as other short-term expertise on specific items. - Likely to affect the requirement of the Legal and Enforcement Unit of the Presidency to receive expert advice on specific items related to the Court's arrangements for the enforcement of sentences. 	€5,000
Reduction (20 per cent) in training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decreased training capacity eventually results in loss of expertise, lack of development of professional skills and loss of motivation. Further, it could, in case of the newly established Legal and Enforcement Unit of the Presidency, lead to inefficiencies due to a lack of adequate preparations for the specific tasks ahead. 	€4,800
Reduction (20 per cent) in travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The President's travel in relation to his external functions has proven to be instrumental in galvanizing support for the Court and in motivating states to ratify the Rome Statute. A decreased travel allotment for the Presidency will require the President to carry out his external relations functions more selectively, to the detriment of the economically weaker regions where the Presidency cannot raise travel funds. - Judges' travel to conferences, workshops and any other essential events on Court-related topics has had a tangible positive effect on the public vision and understanding of the Court. A reduction of the travel budget reduces the judges' independence in choosing which international/regional event to support through their attendance. 	€36,000
Total		€217,800

(b) Major Programme II

24. In order to bring the 2013 proposed programme budget of Major Programme II in line with the 2012 approved programme budget, a reduction of €939,400 would be required. The measures identified by Major Programme II are illustrated in table 3.

25. It is worth emphasizing that the amount of €28.6 million requested by Major Programme II in the 2013 proposed budget, already includes significant savings that have been achieved through the adoption of ongoing efficiency measures. Without those measures, the baseline for 2013 would stand at €321 million.

26. The implementation of the 2013 salary scales provision leads to increases that were not unforeseeable given the two year freeze on this budget line and Major Programme II has made all efforts to offset as much of this as possible through efficiencies on other

budget lines and retaining other non-staff budget lines at the reduced levels approved by the Assembly for 2012.

27. In table 4 below, further measures are quantified and the impact thereof is described.

Table 4: Major Programme II's budget reduction measures

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Suspend all training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although in-house training at zero cost is used to the extent possible, budgets have been reduced year-on-year to keep overall budget requests to a minimum. - Level of budget retained at 2012 level approved by the Assembly which reflects 0.21 per cent of the staffing budget compared to 0.5 per cent as per organisational norms. - Suspension of training is inconsistent with strategic objectives of the Court and at odds with the appraisal guidelines and erodes managerial responsibilities for staff development to maintain effective and efficient workforce. - This represents a short-term saving as reinstatement would be required in subsequent budget requests, thus increase above the 2012 baseline is deferred only for one year. 	€ 55,900
Cancel all OTP-specific IT developments in support of investigation and trials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budgets already diminished over last years, thus developments are behind schedule, with risks of reduced efficiency and integrity for evidence processing and case management. - Postponement of developments is not consistent with the Court's strategic goal in the context of establishing an e-Court. - Added complication that aging systems that cannot be supported by maintenance contracts. - Evidence and case management integrity is of prime importance for Office of the Prosecutor (OTP) cases, thus any postponement would require reinstatement in 2014, therefore increase above the 2012 baseline are deferred only for one year. 	€137,950
Postpone one investigation (including all staff and operational costs except witness management)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seriously infringes prosecutorial independence and compromises the essence of the Rome Statute and compliance with statutory obligations. - Increased budget in subsequent years will be required or, if sustained, the reduced activity will negatively impact public and stakeholder perception of the Court as effective in delivering its mandate. 	€600,000
Total		€793,850

28. The only option under the direct control of Major Programme II where significant costs can be reduced is the reduction of investigations, which strikes at the core of the Rome Statute and protracts impunity. In this context, the suspension of trials, particularly where the accused is/are not in detention or trial proceedings have commenced, cannot be excluded. As Major Programme II is only engaged in investigations and litigation, either scenario can lead to significant budget reductions; however, in the case of the latter, the decision is not in the hands of the Office of the Prosecutor. Similarly, it cannot be expected that a chamber of impartial, professional judges will take any decision possibly violating the accused's rights to a fair and expeditious trial merely to realize short-term gains for the Court's budget.

(c) Major Programme III

29. In order to bring the 2013 proposed programme budget of Major Programme III in line with the 2012 approved programme budget, a reduction of €1.43 million is required. It should be noted that before the inclusion of the costs arising from the Trial Chamber V's decision of 9 July 2012 setting the date for the two trials in the Kenya situation for 10 and 11 April 2013 respectively, the proposed budget of Major Programme III presented a slight difference of €184,300 in relation to the approved 2012 budget, an increase of less than 0.3 per cent. A further €1.24 million is now required for the Registry to provide all the necessary courtroom support and in general support the activities and the implementation of the mandates of the different parties and participants in the proceedings in the two Kenya trials once they commence in April 2013.

30. The Registry underwent a thorough review of its required resources and in particular reassessed the level of established posts and GTA posts bearing in mind the strict requirements for 2013. Similarly, requests for consultants have been thoroughly scrutinized

and accepted only on an exceptional basis when there is a strong justification for the use of such resources. As a result, Major Programme III has managed to absorb over €3 million of approximately €4.4 million comprising of the additional resources required for legal aid costs in 2013, as well as the additional costs linked to the Court-wide implementation of the UNCS and the increased costs for supporting the trial hearings in the two Kenya cases.

31. Because of the thorough scrutiny that had already been performed in the proposed budget for Major Programme III in order to bring it as close as possible to the same level of the 2012 budget, the Registry's operation have been stripped to the bare essentials, leaving no room for additional cuts without seriously impacting the adequate functioning of the judicial proceedings and the operations conducted by the parties and participants in the proceedings.

32. The measures identified by the Court for Major Programme III are detailed in table 5.

Table 5: Major Programme III's budget reduction measures

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Cancelling all security liaison and support for missions of elected officials	- As only remote support and liaison from the Court's headquarters would be possible, this could potentially compromise the life of individuals and the credibility and image of the Court.	€20,000
Suspend training: United Nations Close Protection basic course	- Would entail non-compliance with UN standards (as obligated to all members of the UNSMS). - Lack of training could potentially compromise human life.	€20,000
Suspend Crisis Management Training for Joint Crisis Management Team	- Not providing such training would maintain the status quo in relation to crisis management readiness. Recently the Court has faced a number of crisis situations which required appropriate management.	€20,000
Suspend Safe and Secure Approaches in Field Environments (SSAFE) training course	- Staff members would not be properly trained and equipped to deal with adverse situations. - Potential to compromise human life, cause serious injury, entail legal liability and lead to loss of reputation.	€78,000
Postponement of pilot project for the new eCourt solutions (My Courtbook)	- Delay in the implementation of more efficient solutions for judicial proceedings through eCourt support.	€170,000
Postpone upgrade of the Transcript Management System	- The integration of the Transcripts Management System with other eCourt applications will be delayed and no support will be available for transcripts for mobile computing.	€55,000
Postpone purchasing of license for the implementation of SAP custom reporting	- The Court has invested in SAP Business Object as the corporate reporting solution. Without these additional licenses the Court will not be able to leverage the creation of custom business reports (Crystal Reports) for all areas of the Court.	€20,000
Reduce support costs linked to the postponement of an investigation by the OTP	- These costs are estimate based on the average support provided by the Registry to the OTP in the conduct of investigations and are directly linked to the measure identified by Major Programme II concerning the postponement of an investigation. - As stated before, this measure would seriously infringe prosecutorial independence and compromise the essence of the Rome Statute as well as compliance with statutory obligations.	€103,000
Stop translation of requests for judicial cooperation into languages other than French and English.	- Article 87.2 of the Rome Statute allows States to receive requests for cooperation translated into the language of their choice. In order to reduce the costs associated with this measure, the Assembly would need to resolve that States will only receive requests for cooperation from the Court in either English or French. - Beyond the direct costs, the Court cannot judge the impact of such a measure although it would reduce the workload that the Court Interpretation and translation Section has in excess of regular workload and would reduce the backlog in programming and processing translations.	€54,000

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Suspend all human resources related training	- Language training in English and French for headquarters staff and field staff would be removed from the Court learning plan. This will negatively impact the Court's ability to implement its strategic objective – to be able to work in both English and French. At the operational level, staff will not develop their capacity to work in both English and French and this will reduce performance improvement opportunities and increase reliance on language services. Staff motivation and satisfaction (as indicated in staff surveys) will be negatively impacted as the Court will continue to be seen as an organization that does not develop its staff.	€160,000
Reduction (by 75 per cent) of training for the Division of Court Services	- Training of court reporters: will reduce speed and accuracy of real-time transcripts, therefore more time required for editing, therefore more difficult to provide edited version of transcript within required time, i.e. 2 hours after end of court session, thereby affecting Chambers' and parties' capacity to prepare the next day's session (ex. examination of witnesses based on previous day's examination, etc.); this could also multiply complaints and decrease usefulness of real-time transcripts for parties and participants, thus affecting the smooth running of the proceedings. - Training for forensic processing of evidence: this new mandate of the Court Management Section has meant that one staff has been dedicated to acquire all necessary knowledge, and it is of paramount importance that the updates be provided, so as to provide the service, when required, in conditions which would sustain parties'/chambers' challenges and possibly examination in court. It would affect the proceedings if evidence was procured in violation of existing rules and practices; it could ultimately result in a piece of evidence being rejected solely because of wrong processing. - Training for the Office of the Director of the Division of Court Services: As the training funds within the OD DCS are, <i>inter alia</i> , specifically earmarked for training on the freezing of assets, cancellation of these funds will lead to loss of expertise. As a consequence, it is likely that certain assets might not become available for use in payment for defence teams, damages and/or reparations.	€60,000
Cancel the purchase of a vehicle for transportation of witnesses.	- Vehicles are almost 10 years old with high mileage and maintenance costs, with the attendant risk of breakdown, generating additional costs in case of trial delay or the hiring of an additional vehicle.	€49,500
Total		€809,500

(d) Major Programme IV

33. In order to bring the 2013 proposed programme budget of €2.9 million in line with the 2012 approved programme budget, a reduction of at least €206,200 is required. The measures identified by the Court are illustrated in table 6.

Table 6: Major Programme IV's budget reduction measures

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Assembly session held in New York. Reduction of cost in the following categories: rental of conference rooms, security, badges, photocopying equipment, WiFi and other conference services from the commercial provider of the conference centre.	- Moving the Assembly session to New York would increase the travel and accommodation costs of participants from all other programmes.	€250,000
Total		€250,000

(e) Major Programme VI

34. In order to bring the 2013 proposed programme budget of €1,65 million in line with the 2012 approved programme budget, a reduction of €208,700 would be required.²⁰

²⁰ In the Court's 2013 proposed programme budget, the TFV displays a 14.4 per cent increase compared to the approved 2012 STFV budget. This is a 9.5 per cent decrease, when compared to the proposed STFV budget for 2012.

35. More than half of this amount – €128,900 – represents growth in staffing budget lines: professional staff, general support staff, temporary staff and consultants. Of this amount, €87,300 represents the increase in GTA costs. This is largely the consequence of shifting a GTA position from the field (Kenya) to The Hague in order to accommodate the increased administrative workload and to ensure further assistance from within the Secretariat of the TFV to the financial support provided by the Registry.²¹ During the latest Board meeting in March 2012, such a measure was discussed as a means of reducing the risk of staff overload at the Secretariat of the TFV, particularly in the area of financial-administrative matters. The total resource growth in non-staff budget lines is €78,900. Going back to 2012 levels, while detrimental to the TRV’s operational capacity, is feasible.

36. It should be noted that the Board’s decision²² on the 2013 budget of the Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims and related considerations provides that:

“Regarding the Secretariat’s budget for 2013, the Board endorsed the Secretariat outline for a budget proposal, pending review by the Board of the final draft. The Board also advised the Secretariat that the proposed TFV Secretariat budget for 2013 should clearly reflect the work load of the Secretariat and that an alternative budget proposal at the level of the 2012 budget should indicate the effects on the Trust Fund’s anticipated operations under both of its mandates.”

37. The corresponding measures identified by the Secretariat of the TFV are illustrated in table 7.

Table 7: Major Programme VI’s budget reduction measures

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Reductions in travel, consultancy and other non-staff costs	- The risk is a crippling of the TFVs operational flexibility and effectiveness, especially in regard of the implementation of reparations awards, but also in terms of fundraising capability.	€ 208,700
Total		€208,700

(f) Major Programme VII-5

38. The 2013 proposed programme budget amounts to €289800 and includes an increase of approximately €104,300, which reflects the cost of the approved P-2 post for the IOM. The measure identified by the IOM is illustrated in table 8 below.

Table 8: Major Programme VII-5’s budget reduction measures

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Reduction of P-2 post	- The implications for such a zero-growth alternative would be that the IOM could not enter into operation as envisioned under ASP/9/Res.5, as the workforce of the office (identified in ICC-ASP/9/Res.5 as one P-4 and one P-2) would be halved. Such a drastic reduction of office staffing would not permit this new office to fulfill its investigative mandate.	€ 104.3
Total		€104.3

²¹ At its last session, instead of approving the requested additional professional staff member for financial matters and upon a recommendation by the Committee, the Assembly approved the dedication of senior staff time from the Registry to support the Secretariat in financial matters. This was eventually agreed between the Registrar and the Secretariat to amount to 1.5 days a week of staff time of a very senior (P-5 level) staff member. This support has been helpful at the “high end” of the Secretariat’s financial expertise needs (development of private donations guidelines, preparation of PayPal mechanism, development of delegation of authority from Registrar to the Executive Director). Nonetheless, an urgent need continues to exist for financial expertise in the daily administration of the Fund’s resources. This need has been repeatedly recognized by the External Auditors and will only increase with the proper management of new revenue from private donors, including via PayPal. Since, in the current budget climate, asking for an additional professional level staff was never likely to be successful, the Fund has instead opted to transform the Kenya GTA staff position into a HQ-based staff position, at inevitably higher cost.

²² Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Trust Fund for Victims, March 2012.

3. Cross-cutting measures for further budget reductions and to absorb the rent for the interim premises

39. As a result of the major programme-specific measures described above, the Court has been able to identify measures which, if adopted by the Assembly, would amount to approximately €2.4 million of further reductions to the 2013 budget, leaving a €1.5 million gap towards the 2012 approved programme budget. Further, taking into account the additional €6.02 million required for the rent for the interim premises of the Court which will have to be paid by the States Parties as of 2013, a total of € 7.6 million would remain to be absorbed should the Assembly decide that the Court's budget for 2013 remains at the same level as the approved budget for 2012 (see table 9 below).

Table 9: Difference between cost of measures and resource growth (thousands of euros)

<i>Major Programme</i>	<i>Resource Growth €</i>	<i>Measures in €</i>	<i>Difference €</i>
MP I: Judiciary	1,150.7	217.8	932.9
MP II: Office of the Prosecutor	939.4	793.8	145.6
MP III: Registry	1,431.7	809.5	622.2
MP IV: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties	206.2	250.5	-43.8
MP VI: Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims	208.7	208.7	-
MP VII-1: Project Director's Office (Permanent Premises)	-109	-	-109
MP VII-5: Independent Oversight Mechanism	104.3	104.3	-
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>3,932.0</i>	<i>2,384.6</i>	<i>1547.9</i>
MP V: Rent a& Maintenance (Interim Premises)	6,021.4	-	6,021.4
Total	9,953.4	2,384.6	7,569.3

40. As previously stated, if the Court were to absorb these additional costs in its 2013 programme budget, its prosecutorial and judicial operations would be severely impacted, resulting in the suspension of most activities in a number of situations and cases before the Court. This would not only directly affect the judicial and prosecutorial independence of the Court, but in many instances would constitute a direct breach of the Rome Statute and the legal texts governing the mandate of the Court. Should the Assembly, in any case, wish to pursue this avenue in order to achieve further reductions in the Court's budget at the cost of forcing the Court to breach its obligations under the Rome Statute, the Court has estimated that the impact of an absorption of €7.6 million would be equal to suspending activities in relation to the situations in Uganda, Darfur (Sudan) and Libya as well as postponing trial hearings in the Kenya cases beyond 2013.

41. Such an approach will, as a consequence, a) reduce the requirements for support staff in the Judiciary; b) affect the level and capacity of the joint teams of the OTP; c) reduce travel costs and field operations and support; d) reduce the requirements of support in relation to security, witness and victims protection, victims' participation, translation and interpretation; e) reduce financial requirements for outreach activities; and f) reduce support activities and operations for the defence and victims participating in the proceedings.

42. Crucially, these measures would not only be inadvisable as they affect the independent and adequate implementation of the Court's mandate, but they would also result in further budgetary inefficiencies, as, for example, the Court will continue to have a legal obligation to pay legal aid for indigent detainees and the delays in the ongoing proceedings could result in extensions of judges' mandates. In addition, there would be residual obligations which could not be switched off at the start of the year and would need to be scaled down in an appropriate manner.

43. Furthermore, as regards the postponement of trial hearings and any other conscious measures leading to delays of pre-trial and trial proceedings, the Court is, by virtue of both its own statutory framework and applicable human rights treaties and instruments, under a legal obligation to afford any person indicted and tried before the Court with the minimum procedural rights and guarantees. Amongst these fundamental fair trial guarantees is the right to an expeditious trial. Were any ongoing proceedings at the Court to be substantially delayed in order to accommodate budgetary requirements, the Court would in fact be in violation of fundamental individual rights of persons before the Court.

44. In essence, the only legally viable option would be for the Prosecutor to suspend investigative activities where suspected persons' fair trial rights are not yet at stake. While in doing so savings may be achieved throughout the Court which would cover at least part of the rent of the interim premises, such a course of action would constitute a serious threat to prosecutorial independence and have a detrimental effect not only on the OTP but on the Court as a whole.

Annex IV

Strategic dynamic evolution of judicial activities in the Court 2013

Table 1: Strategic dynamic evolution of judicial activities in the Court 2013 for MP-I

	<i>Operational support 2013</i>	<i>Operational support 2012</i>
Professional staff	509.2	452.0
General Service staff	200.2	181.8
General temporary assistance	1,172.6	262.8
Travel	39.3	
Grand Total	1,921.30	896.55

Table 2: Strategic dynamic evolution of judicial activities in the Court 2013 for MP-II

	<i>Operational support 2013</i>	<i>Operational support 2012</i>
Professional staff	3,244.0	3,138.3
General Service staff	2,196.4	1,285.2
General temporary assistance	1,599.4	235.2
Travel	354.4	230.8
Contractual services	180.0	178.0
General operating expenses	10.0	10.0
Supplies and materials		3.8
Furniture and equipment	30.0	20.0
Grand Total	7,614.20	5,101.32

Table 3: Strategic dynamic evolution of judicial activities in the Court 2013 for MP-III

	<i>Operational support 2013</i>	<i>Operational support 2012</i>
Professional staff	5,666.0	3,720.0
General Service staff	4,463.1	3,579.7
General temporary assistance	967.7	655.0
Temporary assistance for meetings	112.8	
Overtime	16.5	16.5
Consultants	16.0	101.5
Travel	251.2	251.2
Contractual services	633.4	400.8
Counsel	2,578.0	2,578.0
General operating expenses	1,239.4	2,265.7
Supplies and materials	82.6	46.9
Furniture and equipment	36.7	
Grand Total	17,157.80	13,615.29

Table 4: Strategic dynamic evolution of judicial activities in the Court 2013 for MP-VI

	<i>Operational support 2013</i>	<i>Operational support 2012</i>
Professional staff	252.4	237.2
General Service staff	63.2	60.6
Consultants	60.0	19.0
Contractual services	4.4	10.1
Grand Total	380.00	326.90

Annex V

Options recommended by the Committee on Budget and Finance

Comparison of the 2013 proposed programme budget and the recommendations of the Committee on Budget and Finance (thousands of euros)

1. The Committee reviewed the paper and identified several elements that could be proposed and could provide additional cost savings. At the same time, the Committee also accepted, in many instances, the Court's analysis of the negative impact of other cuts identified in the paper.

2. Having reviewed the paper and the proposed budget, the Committee identified three options that the Assembly might wish to consider as it reviews the 2013 proposed programme budget:

Option 1: The recommendations of the Committee, including its proposed reductions, are adopted. Cost savings in the amount of €3.28 million would be expected to be realized, for a total budget in the amount of €115.12 million.

Option 2: The recommendations of the Committee, including its proposed reductions, are adopted, and the Assembly decides to meet in New York in 2013, rather than in The Hague. Cost savings in the amount of €3.53 million would be expected to be realized, for a total budget in the amount of €114.87 million.

Option 3: The recommendations of the Committee, including its proposed reductions, are adopted; the Assembly of States Parties decides to meet in New York in 2013, rather than The Hague; and the increase in common staffing costs is absorbed by the Court. Cost savings in the amount of €7.41 million would be expected to be realized, for a total budget in the amount of €110.99 million.

Annex VI

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 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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>	4,764.4		4,764.4	4,689.4		4,689.4	-75.0		-75.0
Professional staff	20,434.4	22,042.3	42,476.7	20,216.3	21,855.0	42,071.3	-218.1	-187.3	-405.4
General Service staff	11,741.6	9,328.7	21,070.3	11,741.6	9,328.7	21,070.3			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>32,176.0</i>	<i>31,371.0</i>	<i>63,547.0</i>	<i>31,957.9</i>	<i>31,183.7</i>	<i>63,141.6</i>	<i>-218.1</i>	<i>-187.3</i>	<i>-405.4</i>
General temporary assistance	2,729.5	9,119.1	11,848.6	2,789.2	8,397.1	11,186.3	59.7	-722.0	-662.3
Temporary assistance for meetings	660.0	153.2	813.2	660.0	153.2	813.2			
Overtime	252.5	138.8	391.3	252.5	138.8	391.3			
Consultants	176.0	177.1	353.1	141.0	177.1	318.1	-35.0		-35.0
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>3,818.0</i>	<i>9,588.2</i>	<i>13,406.2</i>	<i>3,842.7</i>	<i>8,866.2</i>	<i>12,708.9</i>	<i>24.7</i>	<i>-722.0</i>	<i>-697.3</i>
Travel	946.4	3,598.9	4,545.3	898.2	3,495.9	4,394.1	-48.2	-103.0	-151.2
Hospitality	61.0		61.0	31.0		31.0	-30.0		-30.0
Contractual services	2,677.7	2,011.1	4,688.8	2,518.7	1,904.4	4,423.1	-159.0	-106.7	-265.7
Training	459.4	232.9	692.3	459.4	232.9	692.3			
Counsel for Defence		3,117.4	3,117.4		2,608.4	2,608.4		-509.0	-509.0
Counsel for Victims		4,010.1	4,010.1		3,448.2	3,448.2		-561.9	-561.9
General operating expenses	12,637.0	4,670.4	17,307.4	12,312.5	4,595.5	16,908.0	-324.5	-74.9	-399.4
Supplies and materials	765.4	283.5	1,048.9	765.4	270.2	1,035.6		-13.3	-13.3
Furniture and equipment	1,133.0	76.7	1,209.7	963.0	76.7	1,039.7	-170.0		-170.0
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>18,679.9</i>	<i>18,001.0</i>	<i>36,680.9</i>	<i>17,948.2</i>	<i>16,632.2</i>	<i>34,580.4</i>	<i>-731.7</i>	<i>-1,368.8</i>	<i>-2,100.5</i>
Total	59,438.3	58,960.2	118,398.5	58,438.2	56,682.1	115,120.3	-1,000.1	-2,278.1	-3,278.2

Table 2: Major Programme I: Judiciary

Major Programme I Judiciary	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	4,764.4		4,764.4	4,689.4		4,689.4	-75.0		-75.0
Professional staff	3,086.8	509.2	3,596.0	3,086.8	509.2	3,596.0			
General Service staff	901.5	200.2	1,101.7	901.5	200.2	1,101.7			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>3,988.3</i>	<i>709.4</i>	<i>4,697.7</i>	<i>3,988.3</i>	<i>709.4</i>	<i>4,697.7</i>			
General temporary assistance	114.7	1,172.6	1,287.3	114.7	920.5	1,035.2		-252.1	-252.1
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	25.0		25.0	14.4		14.4	-10.6		-10.6
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>139.7</i>	<i>1,172.6</i>	<i>1,312.3</i>	<i>129.1</i>	<i>920.5</i>	<i>1,049.6</i>	<i>-10.6</i>	<i>-252.1</i>	<i>-262.7</i>
Travel	151.9	39.3	191.2	120.7	31.2	151.9	-31.2	-8.1	-39.3
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	63.3		63.3	63.3		63.3			
Supplies and materials	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>266.2</i>	<i>39.3</i>	<i>305.5</i>	<i>230.0</i>	<i>31.2</i>	<i>261.2</i>	<i>-36.2</i>	<i>-8.1</i>	<i>-44.3</i>
Total	9,158.6	1,921.3	11,079.9	9,036.8	1,661.1	10,697.9	-121.8	-260.2	-382.0

Table 3: Programme 1100: The Presidency

1100 The Presidency	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	793.1		793.1	793.1		793.1			
General Service staff	283.9		283.9	283.9		283.9			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,077.0</i>		<i>1,077.0</i>	<i>1,077.0</i>		<i>1,077.0</i>			
General temporary assistance	114.7		114.7	114.7		114.7			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	15.0		15.0	4.4		4.4	-10.6		-10.6
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>129.7</i>		<i>129.7</i>	<i>119.1</i>		<i>119.1</i>	<i>-10.6</i>		<i>-10.6</i>
Travel	140.8	39.3	180.1	111.9	31.2	143.1	-28.9	-8.1	-37.0
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>161.8</i>	<i>39.3</i>	<i>201.1</i>	<i>127.9</i>	<i>31.2</i>	<i>159.1</i>	<i>-33.9</i>	<i>-8.1</i>	<i>-42.0</i>
Total	1,396.5	39.3	1,435.8	1,352.0	31.2	1,383.2	-44.5	-8.1	-52.6

Table 4: Programme 1200: Chambers

1200 Chambers	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	4,736.4		4,736.4	4,661.4		4,661.4	-75.0		-75.0
Professional staff	2,139.3	509.2	2,648.5	2,139.3	509.2	2,648.5			
General Service staff	533.9	200.2	734.1	533.9	200.2	734.1			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	2,673.2	709.4	3,382.6	2,673.2	709.4	3,382.6			
General temporary assistance		1,172.6	1,172.6		920.5	920.5		-252.1	-252.1
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	10.0	1,172.6	1,182.6	10.0	920.5	930.5		-252.1	-252.1
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>	19.0		19.0	19.0		19.0			
Total	7,438.6	1,882.0	9,320.6	7,363.6	1,629.9	8,993.5	-75.0	-252.1	-327.1

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

1310 New York Liaison Office	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	154.4		154.4	154.4		154.4			
General Service staff	83.7		83.7	83.7		83.7			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	238.1		238.1	238.1		238.1			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	11.1		11.1	8.8		8.8	-2.3		-2.3
Hospitality	1.0		1.0	1.0		1.0			
Contractual services	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Training									
General operating expenses	63.3		63.3	63.3		63.3			
Supplies and materials	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	85.4		85.4	83.1		83.1	-2.3		-2.3
Total	323.5		323.5	321.2		321.2	-2.3		-2.3

Table 6: Major Programme II: Office of the Prosecutor

Major Programme II Office of The Prosecutor	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	3,750.6	12,677.8	16,428.4	3,664.9	12,677.8	16,342.7	-85.7		-85.7
General Service staff	1,179.3	2,852.2	4,031.5	1,179.3	2,852.2	4,031.5			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>4,929.9</i>	<i>15,530.0</i>	<i>20,459.9</i>	<i>4,844.2</i>	<i>15,530.0</i>	<i>20,374.2</i>	<i>-85.7</i>		<i>-85.7</i>
General temporary assistance	38.8	5,422.9	5,461.7	38.8	5,111.2	5,150.0		-311.7	-311.7
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		81.0	81.0		81.0	81.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>5,503.9</i>	<i>5,542.7</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>5,192.2</i>	<i>5,231.0</i>		<i>-311.7</i>	<i>-311.7</i>
Travel	187.0	1,697.1	1,884.1	187.0	1,697.1	1,884.1			
Hospitality	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Contractual services	25.0	327.5	352.5	25.0	327.5	352.5			
Training	23.9	32.0	55.9	23.9	32.0	55.9			
General operating expenses		285.0	285.0		285.0	285.0			
Supplies and materials	38.0	10.0	48.0	38.0	10.0	48.0			
Furniture and equipment		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>278.9</i>	<i>2,381.6</i>	<i>2,660.5</i>	<i>278.9</i>	<i>2,381.6</i>	<i>2,660.5</i>			
Total	5,247.6	23,415.5	28,663.1	5,161.9	23,103.8	28,265.7	-85.7	-311.7	-397.4

Table 7: Programme 2100: The Prosecutor

2100 The Prosecutor	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	2,173.8	448.3	2,622.1	2,088.1	448.3	2,536.4	-85.7		-85.7
General Service staff	727.1	646.0	1,373.1	727.1	646.0	1,373.1			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>2,900.9</i>	<i>1,094.3</i>	<i>3,995.2</i>	<i>2,815.2</i>	<i>1,094.3</i>	<i>3,909.5</i>	<i>-85.7</i>		<i>-85.7</i>
General temporary assistance	38.8	2,090.1	2,128.9	38.8	2,090.1	2,128.9			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		81.0	81.0		81.0	81.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>2,171.1</i>	<i>2,209.9</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>2,171.1</i>	<i>2,209.9</i>			
Travel	63.5	349.3	412.8	63.5	349.3	412.8			
Hospitality	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Contractual services	25.0	217.5	242.5	25.0	217.5	242.5			
Training	23.9	32.0	55.9	23.9	32.0	55.9			
Counsel for Defence		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0			
Supplies and materials	38.0	10.0	48.0	38.0	10.0	48.0			
Furniture and equipment		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>155.4</i>	<i>648.8</i>	<i>804.2</i>	<i>155.4</i>	<i>648.8</i>	<i>804.2</i>			
Total	3,095.1	3,914.2	7,009.3	3,009.4	3,914.2	6,923.6	-85.7		-85.7

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

2110 Immediate Office of the Prosecutor	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	1,043.3		1,043.3	957.6		957.6	-85.7		-85.7
General Service staff	339.5		339.5	339.5		339.5			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,382.8</i>		<i>1,382.8</i>	<i>1,297.1</i>		<i>1,297.1</i>	<i>-85.7</i>		<i>-85.7</i>
General temporary assistance	38.8		38.8	38.8		38.8			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		81.0	81.0		81.0	81.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>81.0</i>	<i>119.8</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>81.0</i>	<i>119.8</i>			
Travel	41.1	94.9	136.0	41.1	94.9	136.0			
Hospitality	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0			
Contractual services		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0			
Training	23.9	32.0	55.9	23.9	32.0	55.9			
Counsel for Defence									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>70.0</i>	<i>156.9</i>	<i>226.9</i>	<i>70.0</i>	<i>156.9</i>	<i>226.9</i>			
Total	1,491.6	237.9	1,729.5	1,405.9	237.9	1,643.8	-85.7		-85.7

Table 9: Sub-programme 2120: Services Section

2120 Services Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	1,130.5	448.3	1,578.8	1,130.5	448.3	1,578.8			
General Service staff	387.6	646.0	1,033.6	387.6	646.0	1,033.6			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,518.1</i>	<i>1,094.3</i>	<i>2,612.4</i>	<i>1,518.1</i>	<i>1,094.3</i>	<i>2,612.4</i>			
General temporary assistance		2,090.1	2,090.1		2,090.1	2,090.1			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>2,090.1</i>	<i>2,090.1</i>		<i>2,090.1</i>	<i>2,090.1</i>			
Travel	22.4	254.4	276.8	22.4	254.4	276.8			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	25.0	187.5	212.5	25.0	187.5	212.5			
Training									
Counsel for Defence		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0			
Supplies and materials	38.0	10.0	48.0	38.0	10.0	48.0			
Furniture and equipment		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>85.4</i>	<i>491.9</i>	<i>577.3</i>	<i>85.4</i>	<i>491.9</i>	<i>577.3</i>			
Total	1,603.5	3,676.3	5,279.8	1,603.5	3,676.3	5,279.8			

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

2200 Jurisdiction, Complementarity and Cooperation Division	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	771.5	936.3	1,707.8	771.5	936.3	1,707.8			
General Service staff	129.2		129.2	129.2		129.2			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>900.7</i>	<i>936.3</i>	<i>1,837.0</i>	<i>900.7</i>	<i>936.3</i>	<i>1,837.0</i>			
General temporary assistance		420.2	420.2		420.2	420.2			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>420.2</i>	<i>420.2</i>		<i>420.2</i>	<i>420.2</i>			
Travel	108.6	282.9	391.5	108.6	282.9	391.5			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
Counsel for Defence									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>108.6</i>	<i>282.9</i>	<i>391.5</i>	<i>108.6</i>	<i>282.9</i>	<i>391.5</i>			
Total	1,009.3	1,639.4	2,648.7	1,009.3	1,639.4	2,648.7			

Table 11: Programme 2300: Investigation Division

2300 Investigation Division	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	300.4	7,661.5	7,961.9	300.4	7,661.5	7,961.9			
General Service staff	129.2	1,818.6	1,947.8	129.2	1,818.6	1,947.8			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>429.6</i>	<i>9,480.1</i>	<i>9,909.7</i>	<i>429.6</i>	<i>9,480.1</i>	<i>9,909.7</i>			
General temporary assistance		706.1	706.1		706.1	706.1			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>706.1</i>	<i>706.1</i>		<i>706.1</i>	<i>706.1</i>			
Travel		894.8	894.8		894.8	894.8			
Hospitality									
Contractual services		110.0	110.0		110.0	110.0			
Training									
Counsel for Defence		275.0	275.0		275.0	275.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>		<i>1,279.8</i>	<i>1,279.8</i>		<i>1,279.8</i>	<i>1,279.8</i>			
Total	429.6	11,466.0	11,895.6	429.6	11,466.0	11,895.6			

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

2320 Planning and Operations Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	300.4	3,111.3	3,411.7	300.4	3,111.3	3,411.7			
General Service staff	129.2	1,495.6	1,624.8	129.2	1,495.6	1,624.8			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>429.6</i>	<i>4,606.9</i>	<i>5,036.5</i>	<i>429.6</i>	<i>4,606.9</i>	<i>5,036.5</i>			
General temporary assistance		659.5	659.5		659.5	659.5			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>659.5</i>	<i>659.5</i>		<i>659.5</i>	<i>659.5</i>			
Travel		242.7	242.7		242.7	242.7			
Hospitality									
Contractual services		110.0	110.0		110.0	110.0			
Training									
Counsel for Defence									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>		<i>352.7</i>	<i>352.7</i>		<i>352.7</i>	<i>352.7</i>			
Total	429.6	5,619.1	6,048.7	429.6	5,619.1	6,048.7			

Table 13: Sub-programme 2330: Investigation Teams

2330 Investigation Teams	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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		4,550.2	4,550.2		4,550.2	4,550.2			
General Service staff		323.0	323.0		323.0	323.0			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>		<i>4,873.2</i>	<i>4,873.2</i>		<i>4,873.2</i>	<i>4,873.2</i>			
General temporary assistance		46.6	46.6		46.6	46.6			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>46.6</i>	<i>46.6</i>		<i>46.6</i>	<i>46.6</i>			
Travel		652.1	652.1		652.1	652.1			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
Counsel for Defence		275.0	275.0		275.0	275.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>		<i>927.1</i>	<i>927.1</i>		<i>927.1</i>	<i>927.1</i>			
Total		5,846.9	5,846.9		5,846.9	5,846.9			

Table 14: Programme 2400: Prosecution Division

2400 Prosecution Division	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	504.9	3,631.7	4,136.6	504.9	3,631.7	4,136.6			
General Service staff	193.8	387.6	581.4	193.8	387.6	581.4			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>698.7</i>	<i>4,019.3</i>	<i>4,718.0</i>	<i>698.7</i>	<i>4,019.3</i>	<i>4,718.0</i>			
General temporary assistance		2,206.5	2,206.5		1,894.8	1,894.8		-311.7	-311.7
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>2,206.5</i>	<i>2,206.5</i>		<i>1,894.8</i>	<i>1,894.8</i>		<i>-311.7</i>	<i>-311.7</i>
Travel	14.9	170.1	185.0	14.9	170.1	185.0			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
Counsel for Defence									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>14.9</i>	<i>170.1</i>	<i>185.0</i>	<i>14.9</i>	<i>170.1</i>	<i>185.0</i>			
Total	713.6	6,395.9	7,109.5	713.6	6,084.2	6,797.8		-311.7	-311.7

Table 15: Major Programme III: The Registry

Major Programme III The Registry	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	12,319.8	8,409.4	20,729.2	12,271.3	8,222.1	20,493.4	-48.5	-187.3	-235.8
General Service staff	9,249.3	6,213.1	15,462.4	9,249.3	6,213.1	15,462.4			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>21,569.1</i>	<i>14,622.5</i>	<i>36,191.6</i>	<i>21,520.6</i>	<i>14,435.2</i>	<i>35,955.8</i>	<i>-48.5</i>	<i>-187.3</i>	<i>-235.8</i>
General temporary assistance	1,838.2	2,455.3	4,293.5	1,909.7	2,297.1	4,206.8	71.5	-158.2	-86.7
Temporary assistance for meetings	200.0	153.2	353.2	200.0	153.2	353.2			
Overtime	214.5	138.8	353.3	214.5	138.8	353.3			
Consultants	86.6	36.1	122.7	86.6	36.1	122.7			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>2,339.3</i>	<i>2,783.4</i>	<i>5,122.7</i>	<i>2,410.8</i>	<i>2,625.2</i>	<i>5,036.0</i>	<i>71.5</i>	<i>-158.2</i>	<i>-86.7</i>
Travel	184.5	1,709.0	1,893.5	184.5	1,636.9	1,821.4		-72.1	-72.1
Hospitality	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
Contractual services	1,143.4	1,633.6	2,777.0	1,021.4	1,526.9	2,548.3	-122.0	-106.7	-228.7
Training	387.4	178.0	565.4	387.4	178.0	565.4			
Counsel for Defence		3,117.4	3,117.4		2,608.4	2,608.4		-509.0	-509.0
Counsel for Victims		4,010.1	4,010.1		3,448.2	3,448.2		-561.9	-561.9
General operating expenses	6,315.8	4,368.4	10,684.2	6,315.8	4,293.5	10,609.3		-74.9	-74.9
Supplies and materials	693.2	273.5	966.7	693.2	260.2	953.4		-13.3	-13.3
Furniture and equipment	1,104.0	36.7	1,140.7	934.0	36.7	970.7	-170.0		-170.0
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>9,832.3</i>	<i>15,326.7</i>	<i>25,159.0</i>	<i>9,540.3</i>	<i>13,988.8</i>	<i>23,529.1</i>	<i>-292.0</i>	<i>-1,337.9</i>	<i>-1,629.9</i>
Total	33,740.7	32,732.6	66,473.3	33,471.7	31,049.2	64,520.9	-269.0	-1,683.4	-1,952.4

Table 16: Programme 3100: Office of the Registrar

3100 Office of the Registrar	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	2,566.5	1,603.4	4,169.9	2,566.5	1,442.2	4,008.7		-161.2	-161.2
General Service staff	2,624.6	2,013.9	4,638.5	2,624.6	2,013.9	4,638.5			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>5,191.1</i>	<i>3,617.3</i>	<i>8,808.4</i>	<i>5,191.1</i>	<i>3,456.1</i>	<i>8,647.2</i>		<i>-161.2</i>	<i>-161.2</i>
General temporary assistance	1,082.4	208.5	1,290.9	1,082.4	208.5	1,290.9			
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>258.8</i>	<i>1,465.6</i>	<i>1,206.8</i>	<i>258.8</i>	<i>1,465.6</i>			
Travel	30.1	445.9	476.0	30.1	434.0	464.1		-11.9	-11.9
Hospitality	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
Contractual services	112.0	263.3	375.3	112.0	261.6	373.6		-1.7	-1.7
Training	97.6	107.7	205.3	97.6	107.7	205.3			
Counsel for Defence		3,117.4	3,117.4		2,608.4	2,608.4		-509.0	-509.0
Counsel for Victims		4,010.1	4,010.1		3,448.2	3,448.2		-561.9	-561.9
General operating expenses	165.0	616.6	781.6	165.0	573.7	738.7		-42.9	-42.9
Supplies and materials	63.3	159.3	222.6	63.3	146.0	209.3		-13.3	-13.3
Furniture and equipment	1.0	1.7	2.7	1.0	1.7	2.7			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>473.0</i>	<i>8,722.0</i>	<i>9,195.0</i>	<i>473.0</i>	<i>7,581.3</i>	<i>8,054.3</i>		<i>-1,140.7</i>	<i>-1,140.7</i>
Total	6,870.9	12,598.1	19,469.0	6,870.9	11,296.2	18,167.1		-1,301.9	-1,301.9

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

3110 Immediate Office of the Registrar	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	953.5		953.5	953.5		953.5			
General Service staff	205.8		205.8	205.8		205.8			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,159.3</i>		<i>1,159.3</i>	<i>1,159.3</i>		<i>1,159.3</i>			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	16.8	18.0	34.8	16.8	18.0	34.8			
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>20.8</i>	<i>18.0</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>20.8</i>	<i>18.0</i>	<i>38.8</i>			
Total	1,180.1	18.0	1,198.1	1,180.1	18.0	1,198.1			

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

3130 Legal Advisory Services Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	585.7		585.7	585.7		585.7			
General Service staff	126.5		126.5	126.5		126.5			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>712.2</i>		<i>712.2</i>	<i>712.2</i>		<i>712.2</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>			
Total	729.7		729.7	729.7		729.7			

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

3140 Security and Safety Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	585.7	536.1	1,121.8	585.7	458.6	1,044.3		-77.5	-77.5
General Service staff	2,165.8	1,337.7	3,503.5	2,165.8	1,337.7	3,503.5			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>2,751.5</i>	<i>1,873.8</i>	<i>4,625.3</i>	<i>2,751.5</i>	<i>1,796.3</i>	<i>4,547.8</i>		-77.5	-77.5
General temporary assistance	1,082.4		1,082.4	1,082.4		1,082.4			
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>50.3</i>	<i>1,257.1</i>	<i>1,206.8</i>	<i>50.3</i>	<i>1,257.1</i>			
Travel	13.3	348.4	361.7	13.3	336.5	349.8		-11.9	-11.9
Hospitality									
Contractual services	94.5	218.9	313.4	94.5	217.2	311.7		-1.7	-1.7
Training	97.6	100.3	197.9	97.6	100.3	197.9			
General operating expenses	165.0	137.0	302.0	165.0	120.6	285.6		-16.4	-16.4
Supplies and materials	63.3	16.2	79.5	63.3	16.2	79.5			
Furniture and equipment	1.0	1.7	2.7	1.0	1.7	2.7			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>434.7</i>	<i>822.5</i>	<i>1,257.2</i>	<i>434.7</i>	<i>792.5</i>	<i>1,227.2</i>		-30.0	-30.0
Total	4,393.0	2,746.6	7,139.6	4,393.0	2,639.1	7,032.1		-107.5	-107.5

Table 20: Sub-programme 3180: Field Operations Section

3180 Field Operations Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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		858.7	858.7		775.0	775.0		-83.7	-83.7
General Service staff		613.0	613.0		613.0	613.0			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>		1,471.7	1,471.7		1,388.0	1,388.0		-83.7	-83.7
General temporary assistance		208.5	208.5		208.5	208.5			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		208.5	208.5		208.5	208.5			
Travel		72.9	72.9		72.9	72.9			
Hospitality									
Contractual services		44.4	44.4		44.4	44.4			
Training		7.4	7.4		7.4	7.4			
General operating expenses		478.6	478.6		452.1	452.1		-26.5	-26.5
Supplies and materials		143.1	143.1		129.8	129.8		-13.3	-13.3
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>		746.4	746.4		706.6	706.6		-39.8	-39.8
Total		2,426.6	2,426.6		2,303.1	2,303.1		-123.5	-123.5

Table 21: Sub-programme 3190: Counsel Support Section

3190 Counsel Support Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	441.6	208.6	650.2	441.6	208.6	650.2			
General Service staff	126.5	63.2	189.7	126.5	63.2	189.7			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	568.1	271.8	839.9	568.1	271.8	839.9			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel		6.6	6.6		6.6	6.6			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training									
Counsel for Defence		3,117.4	3,117.4		2,608.4	2,608.4		-509.0	-509.0
Counsel for Victims		4,010.1	4,010.1		3,448.2	3,448.2		-561.9	-561.9
General operating expenses		1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>		7,135.1	7,135.1		6,064.2	6,064.2		-1,070.9	-1,070.9
Total	568.1	7,406.9	7,975.0	568.1	6,336.0	6,904.1		-1,070.9	-1,070.9

Table 22: Programme 3200: Common Administrative Services Division

3200 Common Administrative Services Division	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	3,609.3	559.3	4,168.6	3,609.3	559.3	4,168.6			
General Service staff	5,217.8	1,567.7	6,785.5	5,217.8	1,567.7	6,785.5			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>8,827.1</i>	<i>2,127.0</i>	<i>10,954.1</i>	<i>8,827.1</i>	<i>2,127.0</i>	<i>10,954.1</i>			
General temporary assistance	755.8	95.4	851.2	750.8	95.4	846.2	-5.0		-5.0
Temporary assistance for meetings	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0			
Overtime	90.1	30.4	120.5	90.1	30.4	120.5			
Consultants	14.6		14.6	14.6		14.6			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>880.5</i>	<i>125.8</i>	<i>1,006.3</i>	<i>875.5</i>	<i>125.8</i>	<i>1,001.3</i>	<i>-5.0</i>		<i>-5.0</i>
Travel	72.5	62.7	135.2	72.5	60.1	132.6		-2.6	-2.6
Hospitality									
Contractual services	527.0	230.0	757.0	487.0	193.0	680.0	-40.0	-37.0	-77.0
Training	247.2		247.2	247.2		247.2			
General operating expenses	4,693.9	1,720.1	6,414.0	4,693.9	1,710.1	6,404.0		-10.0	-10.0
Supplies and materials	475.7		475.7	475.7		475.7			
Furniture and equipment	1,103.0	35.0	1,138.0	933.0	35.0	968.0	-170.0		-170.0
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>7,119.3</i>	<i>2,047.8</i>	<i>9,167.1</i>	<i>6,909.3</i>	<i>1,998.2</i>	<i>8,907.5</i>	<i>-210.0</i>	<i>-49.6</i>	<i>-259.6</i>
Total	16,826.9	4,300.6	21,127.5	16,611.9	4,251.0	20,862.9	-215.0	-49.6	-264.6

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

3210 Office of the Director CASD	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	375.6		375.6	375.6		375.6			
General Service staff	63.2		63.2	63.2		63.2			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>438.8</i>		<i>438.8</i>	<i>438.8</i>		<i>438.8</i>			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel									
Hospitality	11.9	3.2	15.1	11.9	3.2	15.1			
Contractual services									
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>11.9</i>	<i>3.2</i>	<i>15.1</i>	<i>11.9</i>	<i>3.2</i>	<i>15.1</i>			
Total	450.7	3.2	453.9	450.7	3.2	453.9			

Table 24: Sub-programme 3220: Human Resources Section

3220 Human Resources Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	792.3		792.3	792.3		792.3			
General Service staff	790.9	189.7	980.6	790.9	189.7	980.6			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,583.2</i>	<i>189.7</i>	<i>1,772.9</i>	<i>1,583.2</i>	<i>189.7</i>	<i>1,772.9</i>			
General temporary assistance	246.0		246.0	246.0		246.0			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	14.6		14.6	14.6		14.6			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>260.6</i>		<i>260.6</i>	<i>260.6</i>		<i>260.6</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>			
Total	2,071.7	200.7	2,272.4	2,071.7	200.7	2,272.4			

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

3240 Budget and Finance Section	Proposed Budget 2013				Proposed Budget 2013				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	751.4			751.4	751.4			751.4				
General Service staff	758.7	332.2		1,090.9	758.7	332.2		1,090.9				
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,510.1</i>	<i>332.2</i>		<i>1,842.3</i>	<i>1,510.1</i>	<i>332.2</i>		<i>1,842.3</i>				
General temporary assistance	70.3		369.2	439.5	65.3		369.2	434.5	-5.0			-5.0
Temporary assistance for meetings												
Overtime	5.1			5.1	5.1			5.1				
Consultants												
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>75.4</i>		<i>369.2</i>	<i>444.6</i>	<i>70.4</i>		<i>369.2</i>	<i>439.6</i>	<i>-5.0</i>			<i>-5.0</i>
Travel			15.0	15.0			15.0	15.0				
Hospitality												
Contractual services	88.5		186.0	274.5	88.5		186.0	274.5				
Training			30.0	30.0			30.0	30.0				
General operating expenses	65.0			65.0	65.0			65.0				
Supplies and materials												
Furniture and equipment												
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>153.5</i>		<i>231.0</i>	<i>384.5</i>	<i>153.5</i>		<i>231.0</i>	<i>384.5</i>				
Total	1,739.0	332.2	600.2	2,671.4	1,734.0	332.2	600.2	2,666.4	-5.0			-5.0

Table 26: Sub-programme 3250: General Services Section

3250 General Services Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	564.3		564.3	564.3		564.3			
General Service staff	2,324.4		2,324.4	2,324.4		2,324.4			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	2,888.7		2,888.7	2,888.7		2,888.7			
General temporary assistance	70.3		70.3	70.3		70.3			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime	55.0	25.4	80.4	55.0	25.4	80.4			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	125.3	25.4	150.7	125.3	25.4	150.7			
Travel	14.8		14.8	14.8		14.8			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	25.8		25.8	25.8		25.8			
Training	16.3		16.3	16.3		16.3			
General operating expenses	2,457.6	22.5	2,480.1	2,457.6	22.5	2,480.1			
Supplies and materials	245.5		245.5	245.5		245.5			
Furniture and equipment	68.0		68.0	68.0		68.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	2,828.0	22.5	2,850.5	2,828.0	22.5	2,850.5			
Total	5,842.0	47.9	5,889.9	5,842.0	47.9	5,889.9			

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

3260 Information and Communication Technologies Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	1,125.7	559.3	1,685.0	1,125.7	559.3	1,685.0			
General Service staff	1,280.6	1,045.8	2,326.4	1,280.6	1,045.8	2,326.4			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	2,406.3	1,605.1	4,011.4	2,406.3	1,605.1	4,011.4			
General temporary assistance		95.4	95.4		95.4	95.4			
Temporary assistance for meetings	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0			
Overtime	30.0	5.0	35.0	30.0	5.0	35.0			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	50.0	100.4	150.4	50.0	100.4	150.4			
Travel	24.8	48.5	73.3	24.8	45.9	70.7		-2.6	-2.6
Hospitality									
Contractual services	210.0	230.0	440.0	170.0	193.0	363.0	-40.0	-37.0	-77.0
Training	40.9		40.9	40.9		40.9			
General operating expenses	2,171.3	1,697.6	3,868.9	2,171.3	1,687.6	3,858.9		-10.0	-10.0
Supplies and materials	185.0		185.0	185.0		185.0			
Furniture and equipment	1,035.0	35.0	1,070.0	865.0	35.0	900.0	-170.0		-170.0
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	3,667.0	2,011.1	5,678.1	3,457.0	1,961.5	5,418.5	-210.0	-49.6	-259.6
Total	6,123.3	3,716.6	9,839.9	5,913.3	3,667.0	9,580.3	-210.0	-49.6	-259.6

Table 28: Programme 3300: Division of Court Services

3300 Division of Court Services	Proposed Budget 2013 Before CBF recommendations			Proposed Budget 2013 After CBF recommendations			Difference Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
	Professional staff	4,066.4	4,787.9	8,854.3	4,037.4	4,795.9	8,833.3	-29.0	8.0
General Service staff	632.2	2,401.8	3,034.0	632.2	2,401.8	3,034.0			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>4,698.6</i>	<i>7,189.7</i>	<i>11,888.3</i>	<i>4,669.6</i>	<i>7,197.7</i>	<i>11,867.3</i>	<i>-29.0</i>	<i>8.0</i>	<i>-21.0</i>
General temporary assistance		1,999.4	1,999.4		1,843.8	1,843.8		-155.6	-155.6
Temporary assistance for meetings	180.0	153.2	333.2	180.0	153.2	333.2			
Overtime		58.1	58.1		58.1	58.1			
Consultants		36.1	36.1		36.1	36.1			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>180.0</i>	<i>2,246.8</i>	<i>2,426.8</i>	<i>180.0</i>	<i>2,091.2</i>	<i>2,271.2</i>		<i>-155.6</i>	<i>-155.6</i>
Travel	55.4	987.7	1,043.1	55.4	940.1	995.5		-47.6	-47.6
Hospitality									
Contractual services	67.2	289.4	356.6	67.2	279.4	346.6		-10.0	-10.0
Training	13.8	68.1	81.9	13.8	68.1	81.9			
General operating expenses	1,386.9	2,009.2	3,396.1	1,386.9	1,987.2	3,374.1		-22.0	-22.0
Supplies and materials	29.2	114.2	143.4	29.2	114.2	143.4			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>1,552.5</i>	<i>3,468.6</i>	<i>5,021.1</i>	<i>1,552.5</i>	<i>3,389.0</i>	<i>4,941.5</i>		<i>-79.6</i>	<i>-79.6</i>
Total	6,431.1	12,905.1	19,336.2	6,402.1	12,677.9	19,080.0	-29.0	-227.2	-256.2

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

3310 Office of the Director DCS	Proposed Budget 2013 Before CBF recommendations			Proposed Budget 2013 After CBF recommendations			Difference Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
	Professional staff	169.1	290.4	459.5	169.1	290.4	459.5		
General Service staff	63.2		63.2	63.2		63.2			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>232.3</i>	<i>290.4</i>	<i>522.7</i>	<i>232.3</i>	<i>290.4</i>	<i>522.7</i>			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	19.7	22.4	42.1	19.7	22.4	42.1			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training	12.3		12.3	12.3		12.3			
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>32.0</i>	<i>22.4</i>	<i>54.4</i>	<i>32.0</i>	<i>22.4</i>	<i>54.4</i>			
Total	264.3	312.8	577.1	264.3	312.8	577.1			

Table 30: Sub-programme 3320: Court Management Section

3320 Court Management Section	Proposed Budget 2013 Before CBF recommendations			Proposed Budget 2013 After CBF recommendations			Difference Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
	Professional staff	420.1	774.2	1,194.3	420.1	774.2	1,194.3		
General Service staff	126.5	711.6	838.1	126.5	711.6	838.1			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>546.6</i>	<i>1,485.8</i>	<i>2,032.4</i>	<i>546.6</i>	<i>1,485.8</i>	<i>2,032.4</i>			
General temporary assistance		256.7	256.7		246.5	246.5		-10.2	-10.2
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime		15.0	15.0		15.0	15.0			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>271.7</i>	<i>271.7</i>		<i>261.5</i>	<i>261.5</i>		<i>-10.2</i>	<i>-10.2</i>
Travel		40.1	40.1		40.1	40.1			
Hospitality									
Contractual services		56.3	56.3		56.3	56.3			
Training		19.0	19.0		19.0	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>18.9</i>	<i>203.4</i>	<i>222.3</i>	<i>18.9</i>	<i>203.4</i>	<i>222.3</i>			
Total	565.5	1,960.9	2,526.4	565.5	1,950.7	2,516.2		-10.2	-10.2

Table 31: Sub-programme 3300: Detention Section

3300 Detention Section	Proposed Budget 2013 Before CBF recommendations			Proposed Budget 2013 After CBF recommendations			Difference Before CBF vs After CBF		
	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total	Basic	Situation- related	Total
	Professional staff	208.6	83.9	292.5	208.6	83.9	292.5		
General Service staff	63.2	63.2	126.4	63.2	63.2	126.4			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>271.8</i>	<i>147.1</i>	<i>418.9</i>	<i>271.8</i>	<i>147.1</i>	<i>418.9</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	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
Hospitality									
Contractual services		2.1	2.1		2.1	2.1			
Training	1.5	17.0	18.5	1.5	17.0	18.5			
General operating expenses	1,381.0	118.4	1,499.4	1,381.0	118.4	1,499.4			
Supplies and materials	7.5		7.5	7.5		7.5			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>1,394.0</i>	<i>137.5</i>	<i>1,531.5</i>	<i>1,394.0</i>	<i>137.5</i>	<i>1,531.5</i>			
Total	1,665.8	290.6	1,956.4	1,665.8	290.6	1,956.4			

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

3340 Court Interpretation and Translation Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	1,829.0	2,366.2	4,195.2	1,829.0	2,450.1	4,279.1		83.9	83.9
General Service staff	252.9	269.0	521.9	252.9	269.0	521.9			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>2,081.9</i>	<i>2,635.2</i>	<i>4,717.1</i>	<i>2,081.9</i>	<i>2,719.1</i>	<i>4,801.0</i>		<i>83.9</i>	<i>83.9</i>
General temporary assistance		867.2	867.2		743.3	743.3		-123.9	-123.9
Temporary assistance for meetings	180.0	153.2	333.2	180.0	153.2	333.2			
Overtime									
Consultants		20.1	20.1		20.1	20.1			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>180.0</i>	<i>1,040.5</i>	<i>1,220.5</i>	<i>180.0</i>	<i>916.6</i>	<i>1,096.6</i>		<i>-123.9</i>	<i>-123.9</i>
Travel	5.2	159.2	164.4	5.2	139.2	144.4		-20.0	-20.0
Hospitality									
Contractual services	40.2	115.5	155.7	40.2	115.5	155.7			
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>54.1</i>	<i>286.9</i>	<i>341.0</i>	<i>54.1</i>	<i>266.9</i>	<i>321.0</i>		<i>-20.0</i>	<i>-20.0</i>
Total	2,316.0	3,962.6	6,278.6	2,316.0	3,902.6	6,218.6		-60.0	-60.0

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

3350 Victims and Witnesses Unit	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	689.0	1,090.8	1,779.8	660.0	1,014.9	1,674.9	-29.0	-75.9	-104.9
General Service staff	63.2	1,176.6	1,239.8	63.2	1,176.6	1,239.8			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>752.2</i>	<i>2,267.4</i>	<i>3,019.6</i>	<i>723.2</i>	<i>2,191.5</i>	<i>2,914.7</i>	<i>-29.0</i>	<i>-75.9</i>	<i>-104.9</i>
General temporary assistance		423.3	423.3		413.9	413.9		-9.4	-9.4
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime		43.1	43.1		43.1	43.1			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>466.4</i>	<i>466.4</i>		<i>457.0</i>	<i>457.0</i>		<i>-9.4</i>	<i>-9.4</i>
Travel	26.5	581.0	607.5	26.5	581.0	607.5			
Hospitality									
Contractual services									
Training		25.1	25.1		25.1	25.1			
General operating expenses		1,890.8	1,890.8		1,868.8	1,868.8		-22.0	-22.0
Supplies and materials		5.7	5.7		5.7	5.7			
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>26.5</i>	<i>2,502.6</i>	<i>2,529.1</i>	<i>26.5</i>	<i>2,480.6</i>	<i>2,507.1</i>		<i>-22.0</i>	<i>-22.0</i>
Total	778.7	5,236.4	6,015.1	749.7	5,129.1	5,878.8	-29.0	-107.3	-136.3

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

3360 Victims Participation and Reparations Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	750.6	182.4	933.0	750.6	182.4	933.0			
General Service staff	63.2	181.4	244.6	63.2	181.4	244.6			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>813.8</i>	<i>363.8</i>	<i>1,177.6</i>	<i>813.8</i>	<i>363.8</i>	<i>1,177.6</i>			
General temporary assistance		452.2	452.2		440.1	440.1		-12.1	-12.1
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>462.2</i>	<i>462.2</i>		<i>450.1</i>	<i>450.1</i>		<i>-12.1</i>	<i>-12.1</i>
Travel		185.0	185.0		157.4	157.4		-27.6	-27.6
Hospitality									
Contractual services	27.0	115.5	142.5	27.0	105.5	132.5		-10.0	-10.0
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>27.0</i>	<i>315.8</i>	<i>342.8</i>	<i>27.0</i>	<i>278.2</i>	<i>305.2</i>		<i>-37.6</i>	<i>-37.6</i>
Total	840.8	1,141.8	1,982.6	840.8	1,092.1	1,932.9		-49.7	-49.7

Table 35: Programme 3400: Public Information and Documentation Section

3400 Public Information and Documentation Section	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	962.1	458.7	1,420.8	1,045.9	424.6	1,470.5	83.8	-34.1	49.7
General Service staff	585.1	229.7	814.8	585.1	229.7	814.8			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,547.2</i>	<i>688.4</i>	<i>2,235.6</i>	<i>1,631.0</i>	<i>654.3</i>	<i>2,285.3</i>	<i>83.8</i>	<i>-34.1</i>	<i>49.7</i>
General temporary assistance		152.0	152.0		149.4	149.4		-2.6	-2.6
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>		<i>152.0</i>	<i>152.0</i>		<i>149.4</i>	<i>149.4</i>		<i>-2.6</i>	<i>-2.6</i>
Travel	12.2	107.2	119.4	12.2	97.2	109.4		-10.0	-10.0
Hospitality									
Contractual services	255.2	800.9	1,056.1	255.2	742.9	998.1		-58.0	-58.0
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>466.4</i>	<i>921.6</i>	<i>1,388.0</i>	<i>466.4</i>	<i>853.6</i>	<i>1,320.0</i>		<i>-68.0</i>	<i>-68.0</i>
Total	2,013.6	1,762.0	3,775.6	2,097.4	1,657.3	3,754.7	83.8	-104.7	-20.9

Table 36: Programme 3700: Registry Independent Offices

3700 Registry Independent Offices	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	1,115.5	1,000.1	2,115.6	1,012.2	1,000.1	2,012.3	-103.3		-103.3
General Service staff	189.6		189.6	189.6		189.6			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>1,305.1</i>	<i>1,000.1</i>	<i>2,305.2</i>	<i>1,201.8</i>	<i>1,000.1</i>	<i>2,201.9</i>	<i>-103.3</i>		<i>-103.3</i>
General temporary assistance				76.5		76.5	76.5		76.5
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	72.0		72.0	72.0		72.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>72.0</i>		<i>72.0</i>	<i>148.5</i>		<i>148.5</i>	<i>76.5</i>		<i>76.5</i>
Travel	14.3	105.5	119.8	14.3	105.5	119.8			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	182.0	50.0	232.0	100.0	50.0	150.0	-82.0		-82.0
Training	21.8	2.2	24.0	21.8	2.2	24.0			
General operating expenses	3.0	9.0	12.0	3.0	9.0	12.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>221.1</i>	<i>166.7</i>	<i>387.8</i>	<i>139.1</i>	<i>166.7</i>	<i>305.8</i>	<i>-82.0</i>		<i>-82.0</i>
Total	1,598.2	1,166.8	2,765.0	1,489.4	1,166.8	2,656.2	-108.8		-108.8

Table 37: Programme 3740: Office of Public Counsel for the Defence

3740 Office of Public Counsel for the Defence	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	149.1	292.5	441.6	149.1	292.5	441.6			
General Service staff	63.2		63.2	63.2		63.2			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>212.3</i>	<i>292.5</i>	<i>504.8</i>	<i>212.3</i>	<i>292.5</i>	<i>504.8</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>			
Total	217.3	332.2	549.5	217.3	332.2	549.5			

Table 38: Programme 3750: Office of Public Counsel for Victims

3750 Office of Public Counsel for Victims	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	233.0	707.6	940.6	233.0	707.6	940.6			
General Service staff	63.2		63.2	63.2		63.2			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	296.2	707.6	1,003.8	296.2	707.6	1,003.8			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</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>	4.6	116.5	121.1	4.6	116.5	121.1			
Total	300.8	824.1	1,124.9	300.8	824.1	1,124.9			

Table 39: Programme 3760: Office of Internal Audit

3760 Office of Internal Audit	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	500.4		500.4	397.1		397.1	-103.3		-103.3
General Service staff	63.2		63.2	63.2		63.2			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	563.6		563.6	460.3		460.3	-103.3		-103.3
General temporary assistance				76.5		76.5	76.5		76.5
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	72.0		72.0	72.0		72.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	72.0		72.0	148.5		148.5	76.5		76.5
Travel	1.4	10.5	11.9	1.4	10.5	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>	20.7	10.5	31.2	20.7	10.5	31.2			
Total	656.3	10.5	666.8	629.5	10.5	640.0	-26.8		-26.8

Table 40: Programme 3770: Registry Permanent Premises Office

3770 Registry Permanent Premises Office	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	233.0		233.0	233.0		233.0			
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	233.0		233.0	233.0		233.0			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	5.8		5.8	5.8		5.8			
Hospitality									
Contractual services	182.0		182.0	100.0		100.0	-82.0		-82.0
Training									
General operating expenses	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0			
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	190.8		190.8	108.8		108.8	-82.0		-82.0
Total	423.8		423.8	341.8		341.8	-82.0		-82.0

Table 41: Major Programme IV: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties

Major Programme IV Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	605.7		605.7	605.7		605.7			
General Service staff	285.1		285.1	285.1		285.1			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	890.8		890.8	890.8		890.8			
General temporary assistance	528.9		528.9	517.1		517.1	-11.8		-11.8
Temporary assistance for meetings	460.0		460.0	460.0		460.0			
Overtime	38.0		38.0	38.0		38.0			
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	1,026.9		1,026.9	1,015.1		1,015.1	-11.8		-11.8
Travel	293.8		293.8	293.8		293.8			
Hospitality	25.0		25.0	5.0		5.0	-20.0		-20.0
Contractual services	693.0		693.0	693.0		693.0			
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>	1,065.8		1,065.8	1,045.8		1,045.8	-20.0		-20.0
Total	2,983.5		2,983.5	2,951.7		2,951.7	-31.8		-31.8

Table 42: Major Programme V: Rent and Maintenance (Interim Premises)

Major Programme V Rent and Maintenance (Interim Premises)	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	6,021.4		6,021.4	5,901.5		5,901.5	-119.9		-119.9
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	6,021.4		6,021.4	5,901.5		5,901.5	-119.9		-119.9
Total	6,021.4		6,021.4	5,901.5		5,901.5	-119.9		-119.9

Table 43: Major Programme VI: Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims

Major Programme VI Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	169.1	445.9	615.0	169.1	445.9	615.0			
General Service staff	63.2	63.2	126.4	63.2	63.2	126.4			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	232.3	509.1	741.4	232.3	509.1	741.4			
General temporary assistance	208.9	68.3	277.2	208.9	68.3	277.2			
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	40.0	60.0	100.0	40.0	60.0	100.0			
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	248.9	128.3	377.2	248.9	128.3	377.2			
Travel	114.8	153.5	268.3	97.8	130.7	228.5	-17.0	-22.8	-39.8
Hospitality	5.0		5.0	2.5		2.5	-2.5		-2.5
Contractual services	155.0	50.0	205.0	118.0	50.0	168.0	-37.0		-37.0
Training	4.5	22.9	27.4	4.5	22.9	27.4			
General operating expenses	5.0	17.0	22.0	5.0	17.0	22.0			
Supplies and materials	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0			
Furniture and equipment		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	287.3	253.4	540.7	230.8	230.6	461.4	-56.5	-22.8	-79.3
Total	768.5	890.8	1,659.3	712.0	868.0	1,580.0	-56.5	-22.8	-79.3

Table 44: Major Programme VII.1: Project Director's Office

Major Programme VII.1 Project Director's Office	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	293.8		293.8	293.8		293.8			
General Service staff	63.2		63.2	63.2		63.2			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>357.0</i>		<i>357.0</i>	<i>357.0</i>		<i>357.0</i>			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	24.4		24.4				-24.4		-24.4
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>24.4</i>		<i>24.4</i>				<i>-24.4</i>		<i>-24.4</i>
Travel	9.7		9.7	9.7		9.7			
Hospitality	5.0		5.0	2.5		2.5	-2.5		-2.5
Contractual services	616.3		616.3	616.3		616.3			
Training	3.2		3.2	3.2		3.2			
General operating expenses	2.5		2.5	2.5		2.5			
Supplies and materials	1.5		1.5	1.5		1.5			
Furniture and equipment	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>642.2</i>		<i>642.2</i>	<i>639.7</i>		<i>639.7</i>	<i>-2.5</i>		<i>-2.5</i>
Total	1,023.6		1,023.6	996.7		996.7	-26.9		-26.9

Table 45: Programme 7110: Project Director's Office for Permanent Premises

7110 Project Director's Office for Permanent Premises	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	293.8		293.8	293.8		293.8			
General Service staff	63.2		63.2	63.2		63.2			
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>357.0</i>		<i>357.0</i>	<i>357.0</i>		<i>357.0</i>			
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants	24.4		24.4				-24.4		-24.4
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>24.4</i>		<i>24.4</i>				<i>-24.4</i>		<i>-24.4</i>
Travel	9.7		9.7	9.7		9.7			
Hospitality	5.0		5.0	2.5		2.5	-2.5		-2.5
Contractual services	80.0		80.0	80.0		80.0			
Training	3.2		3.2	3.2		3.2			
General operating expenses	2.5		2.5	2.5		2.5			
Supplies and materials	1.5		1.5	1.5		1.5			
Furniture and equipment	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0			
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>105.9</i>		<i>105.9</i>	<i>103.4</i>		<i>103.4</i>	<i>-2.5</i>		<i>-2.5</i>
Total	487.3		487.3	460.4		460.4	-26.9		-26.9

Table 46: 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 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	386.3		386.3	386.3		386.3			
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	386.3		386.3	386.3		386.3			
Total	386.3		386.3	386.3		386.3			

Table 47: Programme 7130: 2gv Element (Non Integrated User Equipment)

7130 2gv Element (Non Integrated User Equipment)	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	150.0		150.0	150.0		150.0			
Training									
General operating expenses									
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	150.0		150.0	150.0		150.0			
Total	150.0		150.0	150.0		150.0			

Table 48: Programme 7200: Accrued Interest, Host State

7200 Accrued Interest, Host State	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	204.6		204.6						-204.6
Supplies and materials									
Furniture and equipment									
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	204.6		204.6						-204.6
Total	204.6		204.6						-204.6

Table 49: Major Programme VII.5: Independent Oversight Mechanism

Major Programme VII.5 Independent Oversight Mechanism	Proposed Budget 2013			Proposed Budget 2013			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	208.6		208.6	124.7		124.7			-83.9
General Service staff									
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	208.6		208.6	124.7		124.7			-83.9
General temporary assistance									
Temporary assistance for meetings									
Overtime									
Consultants									
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>									
Travel	4.7		4.7	4.7		4.7			
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>	81.2		81.2	81.2		81.2			
Total	289.8		289.8	205.9		205.9			-83.9