

**Assembly of States Parties**Distr.: General
1 November 2012

Original: English

Eleventh session

The Hague, 14-22 November 2012

Report on the organizational structure of the Court***I. Introduction**

1. At its eighteenth session held in April 2012, the Committee on Budget and Finance (hereinafter “the Committee”) considered the report of the International Criminal Court (“the Court”) on its organizational structure. The report was presented by the Court in response to the Committee’s recommendation at its seventeenth session that it undertake a thorough evaluation/review of its organizational structure with a view to streamlining functions, processes and corresponding structures, reducing spans of control where necessary, identifying responsibilities that could be delegated and rationalizing lines of reporting¹. In the report, a three-phase process was described in order to meet the requirements of this extensive project: an intra-organ review to evaluate and identify the most effective organizational structure of each organ (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 resulting from these changes (phase 2); and a review of staffing requirements (phase 3). The Court pointed out the high level of expertise required for such an undertaking and concluded that a partnership between external and internal resources was considered the most effective approach in that context. For this purpose, the Court subsequently launched a procurement process.

2. In its report on the work of its eighteenth session², the Committee, having considered the Court’s report, recalled its original recommendation that the Court undertake a thorough evaluation/review of its organizational structure and present a report on the complete structure of the Court, and not at the position level, with a view to identifying clear managerial and reporting lines, as well as any needs, current or future, to modify the Court’s structure and post requirements. The Committee further recommended that the Court “use internal resources to provide a response to the questions above for its nineteenth session”³.

II. Progress update

3. In view of the Committee’s recommendation as above and in the context of the 2012 budget reductions, discussions took place on the possibility of avoiding or limiting the use of external resources for the project without compromising the outcome. As a result, it was decided that a procurement process should be initiated, while further initiatives continued to explore the possibility of drawing on the services of subject-matter experts (possibly pro

* Previously issued as CBF/19/17.

¹ *Official Records of the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Tenth Session, New York, 12-21 December 2011* (ICC-ASP/10/20), vol. II, part B2, para. 43.

² ICC-ASP/11/5.

³ *Ibid.*, para. 29.

bono) within the structure of the existing project. Due to these necessary considerations, the project has been slightly delayed.

4. The proposal that won the procurement bid was from Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC). The Court considered that this proposal, which requires an investment of approximately €90,000, offers the best value, in both technical and commercial terms, of the 13 responses received to the Court's expression of interest. Although the Court is currently facing a difficult financial situation, it is giving priority to this project in light of its importance and potential impact. In the meantime, the Court is also in the process of identifying high level experts to provide strategic guidance to the project on a pro-bono basis. The Court is now considering the possibility of finding a role for these experts in the proposed PWC methodology so as to maximize the knowledge base utilized while trying to keep the cost of the project at an absolute minimum.

5. The Court is confident that this approach will be the most efficient considering the Committee's recommendation and the limited resources available internally to reach the goal of this complex project. Further to the present written report, the Court will be available to report orally to the Committee at its nineteenth session on the progress achieved so far with this mixed-structure project of internal resources, external consultants and *pro bono* experts.
