United Nations DP/FPA/2012/2

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services

Distr.: General
22 December 2011

Original: English

First regular session 2012
1 to 3 February 2012, New York
Item 5 of the provisional agenda
UNFPA — Financial, budgetary and administrative matters

United Nations Population Fund

Institutional budget estimates for 2012-2013 and revision of financial regulations and rules

Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

I. Introduction

1. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions has considered the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) on the institutional budget estimates for 2012-2013 (DP/FPA/2012/1) and the report of the Executive Director on the proposed revisions to the UNFPA Financial Regulations and Rules (DP/FPA/2012/3). During its consideration of the two reports, the Advisory Committee met with the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director (External Relations, United Nations Affairs and Management) and other representatives, who provided additional information and clarification.

Format and presentation

2. The Advisory Committee recalls that in 2010 the Executive Boards of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF approved the proposals that were presented in a joint report of the three organizations entitled, “Road map to an integrated budget: cost classification and results-based budgeting”. The report was the culmination of a review of existing cost definitions and classification of activities and associated costs, as well as results-based budgeting models and methodologies of selected United Nations organizations and bilateral donors, in order to identify best practices. The three organizations agreed to work together for greater harmonization and improvement in the presentation of the biennial support budget for 2012-2013, and also work towards the presentation of a single, integrated budget for each organization beginning in 2014. The Advisory Committee notes that in accordance

11-65098 (E) 060112

with decision 2011/10 of the Executive Board of UNDP, UNFPA and UNOPS, the 2012-2013 institutional budget has been prepared following the results-based approach and is presented in the new cost classification format agreed upon by UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF. The budget therefore represents an important milestone on the road map to the implementation of the fully integrated budget in 2014.

Projected resources

3. According to the integrated resource plan summarized in the annex to the present report, the total projected resources (regular resources and other resources) for the biennium 2012-2013 amount to $2,185.6 million, which comprises an opening balance of $466.8 million and a total revenue of $1,718.8 million, reflecting an increase of $236 million, or 12.1 per cent, compared with the revised estimate of $1,949.6 million for 2010-2011. For 2012-2013, total regular resources are projected at $1,131.5 million, reflecting an increase of $92.5 million, or 8.9 per cent, compared with $1,039 million in 2010-2011. Other resources are projected at $1,054.2 million, reflecting an increase of $143.6 million, or 15.8 per cent, compared with $910.6 million in 2010-2011.

4. Income from regular resources, mostly contributions, is estimated at $1,038 million for 2012-2013, reflecting an increase of $51.4 million, or 5.2 per cent compared with $987.4 million for 2010-2011. Income from other resources is estimated at $680 million, reflecting an increase of $47.7 million, or 7.5 per cent compared with $632.3 million in 2010-2011. As regards the use of resources, the total resources proposed for 2012-2013 is $1,751.8 million, of which $1,459.6 million will be used for programmes and $292.2 million for the institutional budget. In paragraph 5 of his report, the Executive Director indicates that UNFPA is strengthening its strategic partnerships with middle-income countries and working with non-traditional donors, including the private sector and foundations, which presents opportunities for further revenue growth despite the prevailing economic uncertainty. **The Advisory Committee welcomes the initiative to strengthen partnerships, including with middle-income countries and looks forward to receiving further information on the results in the context of future budget submissions. In addition, the Committee notes the projected increase in contributions in the 2012-2013 budget.**

Strategic context

5. In paragraphs 11-14 of the report, the Executive Director indicates that the 2008-2013 UNFPA strategic plan provides the framework for the 2012-2013 budget and defines the following four key management outputs to address the challenges identified in the strategic plan:

(a) Enhanced programme effectiveness through strengthened results-based and evidence-based programming;

(b) Strengthened stewardship of resources through improved efficiency and risk management;

(c) Appropriately staffed UNFPA with high-performing professionals fulfilling its mission; and

(d) Secured broad-based and stable funding to meet the strategic plan resource requirements.

In the institutional budget, the results and resources framework, summarized in table 2 of the Executive Director's report, provides the link between strategic plan outputs and the resources allocated or initiatives identified to achieve the outputs. The framework follows the harmonized results-based budgeting methodology (see paragraph 2 above).

6. The Advisory Committee notes, from the results and resources framework, that accountability for the achievement of outputs is not tied to a single organizational unit but is shared across organizational units or functional clusters. Upon enquiry, the Committee was informed that while accountability for the outputs was a collective effort, there were other tools to enforce accountability, most notably Office Management Plans (OMPs) containing concrete deliverables at the office level and Performance Appraisal and Development (PAD) plans at the individual level. The managers of the organizational units were fully accountable for the resources they were entrusted with and, through reporting mechanisms, the actual expenditure for each functional cluster could be linked back to the strategic plan outputs. **The Advisory Committee trusts that UNFPA has sufficient tools in place to ensure that the managers of organizational units are held individually accountable for the achievement of organizational goals.**

7. **Overall, the Advisory Committee welcomes the progress made by UNFPA in improving its budget presentation, including the results-based budgeting framework and incorporation of the new cost classifications within the context of the harmonized approach with UNDP and UNICEF. The Advisory Committee also appreciates the use of charts and tables to facilitate the presentation of detailed financial information, but considers that greater efforts should continue to be made to ensure that such charts and tables are reader-friendly.**

II. Proposed institutional budget for 2012-2013

8. The Advisory Committee notes that according to the new cost classification, the budget for development effectiveness, United Nations development coordination, management and special purpose activities is now referred to as the institutional budget. The budget is based on the results-based budgeting approach and is presented in the new cost classification format indicated in paragraphs 2 and 5 above.

9. The proposed institutional budget for 2012-2013 amounts to $292.2 million, which represents a decrease of $2.9 million or 1 per cent, compared with the restated biennial support budget of $295.2 million for 2010-2011. As indicated in paragraphs 46-53 of the Executive Director's report and summarized in table 3, the volume decreases amount to $13.3 million, partially offset by volume increases amounting to $8.5 million. The decrease is also due to one-time non-recurrent management costs in the amount of $8.9 million and special purpose costs in the amount of $5.9 million, all of which are for activities undertaken in 2010-2011 and will not be undertaken in 2012-2013. The decreases are offset by increases of $9.9 million comprising adjustments for staff costs, exchange rates and inflation ($12.2 million); partially offset by efficiency savings related the relocation of its

headquarters premises ($2.4 million). Further increases are expected from non-recurring management costs for 2012-2013 in the amount of $6.8 million related to IPSAS implementation, information technology infrastructure enhancements and investments related to staff security in the field (see also paragraph 14 below).

10. The Advisory Committee notes from the integrated resource plan the decrease in the share of management activities in proportion to the total use of resources from 15.5 per cent in 2010-2011 to 13.4 per cent in 2012-2013. The Committee also notes the corresponding increase in the proportionate share of development activities from 84.1 per cent in 2010-2011 to 86.6 per cent in 2012-2013. **Recalling its earlier comments, (DP/FPA/2009/11, para. 7), the Advisory Committee welcomes the continued trend of an increasing share of the total resources being available for programme implementation.**

11. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that UNFPA had emphasized to its offices the need to reduce budgets and show efficiencies in their operations. It was indicated that a more restrictive process of approving requests for consultants had been introduced, with an increased requirement for the use of in-house resources. Furthermore, UNFPA continued to benefit from the shared costs for security in its co-located field offices. At its new headquarters offices UNFPA had set up standard double-sided printing as a default, and introduced technology to restrict the usage of network colour printers. UNFPA was also promoting paperless meetings, and striving to improve connectivity to enable wireless access to online documents. **The Advisory Committee welcomes the efforts made by UNFPA to achieve cost reductions by re-examining existing operational activities while maximizing the use of new technologies and encourages continued efforts in that regard. The Committee also encourages the use of common premises and common services, which should yield further efficiencies and savings.**

Proposed staffing changes

12. The Advisory Committee notes that, according to summary table 2 of the Executive Director’s report, resources amounting to an estimated $214.5 million in the 2012-2013 institutional budget have been allocated to posts. It is further indicated in paragraph 54 that a total of 994 posts are proposed for 2012-2013, reflecting a net increase of 15 posts compared with 979 in 2010-2011. The changes comprise net increase of one post at D-2 level; six posts at D-1 level; six international professional posts and two posts at other levels. The Committee further notes that the creation of 18 new posts in the field will be partially offset by the abolition of 10 posts; and 20 upgrades proposed will be partially offset by three downgrades. The upgrades will involve the reclassifications of eight country representative posts from P5 to D1 level in order to strengthen its field presence as indicated in paragraph 52 (c).

13. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that the proposed upgrade of country representative posts to the D1 level reflected the complexity of functions and the environment where they were located. It was also explained that UNFPA representatives are required to influence development policies by ensuring that population and other sensitive issues the organization deals with, such as reproductive health and gender, are central to development frameworks at national and community levels which requires a complex skill set comprising, inter alia,

policy analysis, advocacy and strategic policy. **The Advisory Committee notes the efforts being made by UNFPA to strengthen its field presence through the proposed post upgrades. The Committee is of the view, however, that future submissions should include more detailed information, such as job descriptions, to allow for a more informed analysis of the proposed staffing changes.**

III. Comments and observations on other issues

Implementation of IPSAS

14. During its consideration of the 2012-2013 budget, the Advisory Committee was informed that UNFPA was on track for the implementation of IPSAS in January 2012. As indicated in paragraph 78 of the Executive Director's report, the non-recurring management costs of $6.8 million budgeted for 2012-2013 include $1.2 million related to the IPSAS project management team until the end of 2012, to support the finalization and testing of systems and processes, including employee benefits, segment reporting, the rollout of the inventory module and post-adoption support. It was further indicated that the IPSAS team would be disbanded on 1 January 2013. **The Advisory Committee commends the progress made towards the implementation of IPSAS and related initiatives such as the revision of the UNFPA Financial Regulations and Rules and the enhancement of its information technology infrastructure. The Committee reiterates its opinion that the implementation should, to the extent possible, be harmonized with that of the other United Nations organizations and that the lessons learned should be documented and similarly shared.**

Travel costs

15. The Committee was further informed that a concerted management effort had been made to reduce travel costs. The measures included the increased use of videoconferencing and web-based communication as well as web-based seminars which have been used to share knowledge with field offices on subjects such as IPSAS, programming and technical matters, national execution (NEX) modality, procurement issues and cost classification issues. It was also indicated that UNFPA had decided to use non-refundable tickets for official travel, in addition to the minimum three-week advance purchase. For economy class travel, the option of procuring non-refundable airfare was deemed viable, particularly in cases of scheduled meetings attended by multiple UNFPA-funded participants such as the Executive Board meetings periodically held in Geneva. The Committee was informed that the cost of a non-refundable round-trip economy class ticket to Geneva was $750, compared to $4,044.40 for a refundable one. According to UNFPA, therefore, the measure was in the best interest of the Organization because savings far exceeded any potential penalties for cancellation. **The Advisory Committee appreciates the initiative taken by UNFPA to achieve savings from the rational utilization of travel resources. The Committee is of the view that the UNFPA experience in this regard should be shared with other United Nations funds and programmes.**

Lease for new headquarters premises

16. The Advisory Committee was informed that, for its headquarters in New York, UNFPA had secured a 15-year lease with an option to extend for another 10 years. The Committee was also informed that UNFPA had secured the services of a real estate expert, employed a dedicated real estate broker and consulted the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs to ensure that its best interests were fully protected in the agreement. In addition, UNFPA had secured a contribution of $2.16 million from the landlord towards infrastructure improvements as well as a six-month rent-free period valued at $2.2 million. It was indicated that the interest rates fixed at the signing of the lease entailed savings and advantages over the previous property, the News Building, and would be impossible to replicate in the prevailing real estate market. In that regard, the “lease-to-own option” had not been considered because it was not a generally accepted United Nations practice within New York City and the necessary funding had not been available.

The concept of knowledge hubs

17. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was provided with additional information with regard to the concept of knowledge hubs mentioned in the 2012-2013 institutional budget proposal in the context of the realignment of the regional coverage in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia region. The Committee was informed that given the region’s unique circumstances, a different model of cooperation was evolving along the lines of a new integrated technical approach. In particular, instead of increasing budget provisions for programme and technical staff in any given country office in the region, resources could be invested in selected and trusted UNFPA partnerships at the national and regional levels, including government or non-governmental partners. The partnerships would entail those institutions being in a position to interact directly with the UNFPA Regional Office in Istanbul with or without UNFPA country office presence. This model could lead to a transition towards a few centres of excellence to ensure attention for the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) agenda in the entire region. **The Advisory Committee welcomes the concept of knowledge hubs as a cost-saving approach to the implementation of the organization’s mandate and an innovative transition from the traditional country office model. The Committee encourages UNFPA to provide information on its experience in the implementation of this initiative in the context of its next budget submission.**

Cost recovery

18. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that the UNFPA cost-recovery rate was harmonized with UNDP and UNICEF, at 7 per cent for projects funded from donors and 5 per cent for projects funded from the programme country. It was explained that the rate is based on the methodology outlined in document DP/FPA/2005/5, endorsed by Executive Board decision 2005/12 and reconfirmed by subsequent decisions. It was further explained that the cost-recovery rate was set on a no-loss, no-gain basis, meaning that the indirect costs arising from the execution of projects funded from “other resources” had to be fully recovered. In order to establish the cost-recovery rate, therefore, it is crucial to determine the indirect costs related to the implementation of projects funded from “other resources”. The Committee was further informed that the current rates and methodology would again be reviewed jointly with UNDP and UNICEF in 2013, within the context of

the new integrated budget for 2014. **The Advisory Committee recalls the comments it had made in the context of its review of the UNICEF institutional budget for 2012-2013 (AC/1746 para. 26) and encourages the joint approach by UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF to determine future cost-recovery methodology and rates. The Committee also requests a further update on the review in the context of the next budget submission.**

Page limits

19. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that due to the newly imposed stricter word limit on the official documents, imposed by the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management (DGACM), UNFPA was not able to include information on the actions taken to implement the Advisory Committee's recommendations in the 2012-2013 institutional budget report. The Committee recalls its earlier comments regarding a proposal to modify the current arrangements for the provision of conference services to United Nations funds and programmes in the context of its consideration of the proposed United Nations programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 (see A/66/7, paras. I59-I61). The proposed arrangement would involve the concerned funds and programmes contracting directly with DGACM for translation services on a "pay-as-you-go" basis. **The Advisory Committee reiterates the view that Board of Auditors and Advisory Committee recommendations, and the actions taken to implement them, should always be included in the budget to facilitate their consideration by the Executive Board. The Committee is also of the view that if the proposal regarding translation services on a "pay-as-you-go" basis is implemented, it should provide UNFPA with discretion on its documents and thus provide opportunity for inclusion of the details required for better comprehension of its budget proposals.**

IV. Revision of UNFPA Financial Regulations and Rules

20. The Advisory Committee notes that UNFPA would be presenting the proposed revised Financial Regulations to its Executive Board at the first regular session on 1 February 2012 for approval. The proposed revisions are laid out in the report of the Executive Director (DP/FPA/2012/3) with the added text underlined and the deleted text marked by a strikethrough line. The report also provides the reasons for the changes.

21. The Advisory Committee recalls that the General Assembly, through its resolution 60/283 of July 2006, approved the adoption by the United Nations of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) to replace the United Nations System Accounting Standards (UNSAS). Subsequent to the adoption of the Assembly resolution and decision 2009/27 of the Executive Board of UNDP and UNFPA, the Executive Director issued a revised set of Financial Regulations and Rules that allowed UNFPA to change some of its accounting policies under UNSAS and move towards full IPSAS compliance in 2012. Having considered the proposal of the Executive Director and the related report of the Advisory Committee (DP/FPA/2009/13), the Board approved the proposed changes which took effect on 1 January 2010.

22. The Advisory Committee notes that in 2011, UNFPA participated in a joint exercise with UNDP and UNICEF to identify revisions to their Financial Regulations and Rules, subsequent to which new definitions and new Financial Regulations and Rules were identified to allow the organization to adopt, in 2012, the new cost classification categories approved by the Executive Board in decision 2010/32. In addition, UNFPA has revised the existing definitions and its Financial Regulations and Rules to bring them up to date with Executive Board decisions, current terminology, accounting policies and current business practices of UNFPA (see paragraphs 23-24 below). It was also indicated that, because of their long-standing familiarity with the organization, the current UNFPA external auditors had been able to operate without an updated set of Financial Regulations and Rules. With the expected change of external auditors in 2012, there was a pressing need for Financial Regulations and Rules which fully reflected UNFPA current policies and business practices.

23. The Advisory Committee was informed that 11 revisions were due to changes in accounting policies, 8 from business practices, 16 from Executive Board decisions and 45 from terminology updates. There were 18 more changes resulting from the revised cost classification categories, bringing the total number of changes to 98. In addition, there were 48 updates to existing definitions.

24. With respect to the changes in terminology, the Advisory Committee was further informed that the term “institutional budget” would replace the current term “support budget”. The terms “project”, “project document”, and “intercountry programme” would no longer be used in the context of programming activities as further indicated in paragraphs 28-29 below. They would be replaced by the terms “programme”, “workplan”, “relevant programme documentation” and “global and regional programme”. The phrase “executing agency” or “executing agencies” had been deleted since UNFPA only deals with “implementing partners” in the context of programming activities. The word “gross” had been deleted from the phrase “gross appropriation” in the context of budgetary contingency provision (Financial Regulation 9.8) because it was considered redundant. The terms “committing officer” and “verifying officer” would no longer be used in the context of the segregation of duties in approving business or financial transactions. UNFPA would now use the term “approving officer”.

25. During its consideration of the Executive Director’s report the Advisory Committee was also informed that the process of revising the Financial Regulations and Rules had involved extensive consultations and reviews specifically with the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs and the UNFPA Operations Committee. It was also indicated that the United Nations Board of Auditors and the Division for Oversight Services had reviewed the changes and provided their comments informally with the understanding that they reserved the right to revert further, if necessary. In that regard, the Advisory Committee was informed that their comments had been taken into account in the final version of the revisions. The Advisory Committee was also informed that the proposed revisions would be reviewed at a second informal session of the Executive Board before being presented at the regular session. **The Advisory Committee notes the approach taken by UNFPA to consult with the relevant entities throughout this process.**

26. The Advisory Committee notes that the IPSAS Board will continue to revise the existing standards and to issue new standards to meet emerging needs. It can

therefore be expected that compliance with IPSAS will entail periodic additions and amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules. **The Advisory Committee trusts that UNFPA will ensure that its Financial Regulations and Rules remain in compliance with IPSAS, and remain harmonized with those of other United Nations funds and programmes and, subsequently, the United Nations Secretariat.**

Other comments and observations

27. The Advisory Committee notes the proposed deletion of the term “executing agency” and its replacement with the term “implementing partner”, also referred to as “implementing agency”, in Financial Regulation 2.1. The Committee notes that the proposed definition places governments, United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations and educational institutions in the same category. The Advisory Committee trusts that this change will enable UNFPA to enhance its partnership with Member States and governments in programme implementation.

28. The Advisory Committee further notes the deletion of the terms “project” and “project document” from the UNFPA Financial Regulations and Rules, with the explanation that the current business practice is to engage in programming activities. The new definition for programme is “a plan for effectively delivering development results in line with the UNFPA mandate through a set of subordinate workplans”; while the deleted definition of project is “a separately identified undertaking… that forms part of a country or inter-country programme”. **In the Committee’s view, the definition of programme does not provide the same sharpness in meaning as the deleted definition of project. Similarly, “programme documentation” does not seem an appropriate replacement for “project document”.**

29. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that the move from project to programme and from project document to programme documentation was part of a UNDG-led exercise to foster simplification and harmonization of programming procedures that was rolled out in 2004 and progressively to all countries implementing programmes. It was indicated that the process clarified the documents required to implement a programme and that a project document was no longer required to disburse funds to an implementing partner. Rather, and upon approval by the Executive Board of the country programme document, the country office needed to sign a country programme action plan (CPAP) with the Government agency that retained overall ownership of the programme. It was further clarified that in order to disburse funds, individual workplans detailing the activities and the budgets with individual implementing partners had to be signed. The workplan was a shorter, more succinct document and a lot of the information that used to be contained in the project document had been added to the CPAP. As such, the project document was no longer required to disburse funds, but rather “relevant programme documentation”, specifically the CPAP and the workplan.

30. In Regulation 2.2, “contribution-in-kind” is defined as “resources of goods, services or property received at minimal cost to the organization”. Upon enquiry, the Advisory Committee was informed that the definition had been written to explain what is included as an in-kind contribution and to highlight that there may be some cost associated with that type of contribution. It was further indicated that the definition was not intended to explain the accounting treatment of an in-kind

contribution, particularly if there was a cost involved in obtaining that type of contribution. The term “minimal cost” had been included in the definition to highlight for the donor as well as the UNFPA staff that judgement should be used in accepting in-kind contributions if the cost was considered more than minimal. In that regard, if the cost of obtaining a contribution was considered high or exorbitant, the contribution may not be accepted.

V. Conclusion and recommendations

31. **The Advisory Committee recommends the Executive Board’s approval of the proposed appropriation of $292.2 million for the 2012-2013 institutional budget as well as the revisions of the UNFPA Financial Regulations and Rules, subject to its comments and recommendations set out in the paragraphs above. In addition, the Advisory Committee reiterates that the comments, views and recommendations contained in its earlier report (DP/FPA/2009/13) remain relevant and should be taken into account by the Board.**

Annex

UNFPA integrated resource plan

(In millions of United States dollars)

1. Resources available	2010-2011* Regular resources	Other Resources	Total resources	% of total	2012-2013 Regular resources	Other Resources	Total resources	% of total
Opening balance [a/]	51.7	278.4	330.0		92.7	374.2	466.8	
Income								
Contribution	961.8	629.3	1,591.2		1,013.5	680.0	1,693.5	
Other [b/]	25.5	2.9	28.4		25.3		25.3	
Total income [a/]	987.4	632.3	1,619.6		1,038.8	680.0	1,718.8	
Total available	1,039.0	910.6	1,949.6		1,131.5	1,054.2	2,185.6	
2. Use of resources								
A. Development activities								
A.1 Programmes - gross [c/]	689.4	536.5	1,225.9		820.4	686.5	1,506.8	
Cost recovery		(38.3)	(38.3)			(47.3)	(47.3)	
A.1 Programmes - net [c/]	689.4	498.2	1,187.6	80.1%	820.4	639.2	1,459.6	83.3%
A.2 Development effectiveness	51.2	7.7	58.9	4.0%	47.1	10.4	57.5	3.3%
Total Development	740.6	505.9	1,246.5	84.1%	867.5	649.6	1,517.1	86.6%
B. United Nations development coordination								0.0%
C. Management activities								
C.1 Recurring costs	191.0	30.6	221.6	14.9%	191.1	36.8	227.9	13.0%
C.2 Non-recurring costs [d/]	8.9		8.9	0.6%	6.8	-	6.8	0.4%
Total management	199.8	30.6	230.4	15.5%	197.9	36.8	234.7	13.4%
D. Special purpose								
D.1 Capital investments	5.9	-	5.9	0.4%				0.0%
Total use of resources (A+B+C+D)	946.4	536.5	1,482.8	100.0%	1,065.3	686.5	1,751.8	100.0%
3. Balance of resources (1-2) [e/]	92.7	374.2	466.8		66.1	367.7	433.8	24.8%
Summary institutional budget:								
A.2 Development effectiveness	51.2	7.7	58.9	4.0%	47.1	10.4	57.5	3.3%
C.1 Management recurring costs	191.0	30.6	221.6	14.9%	191.1	36.8	227.9	13.0%
C.2 Management non-recurring costs	8.9	-	8.9	0.6%	6.8	-	6.8	0.4%
D.1 Special purpose	5.9	-	5.9	0.4%	-	-	-	0.0%
Total [f/]	**256.9**	**38.3**	**295.2**	**19.9%**	**245.0**	**47.3**	**292.2**	**16.7%**

* In order to enable a comparison with the 2012-2013 budget proposal, 2010-2011 budget estimates were restated in accordance with the new cost classification approved by the Executive Board in decision 2010/32.

[a/] Opening balance for 2010-2011 biennium has been revised as per financial statements for the 2008-2009 biennium. In addition income estimates for 2010-2011 biennium have been revised, in line with summary table 1 on page 27 of the document DP/FPA/2001/1

[b/] Includes interest and miscellaneous income, as well as accounting linkage to offset tax reimbursements.

[c/] 'Programmes - gross' reflects total programme expenses as per financial statements; the cost recovery is credited to provide 'programmes - net' amounts and thus enabling a comparison with the estimates in the budget document, to avoid duplicate presentation of budget figures.

[d/] In order to enable a comparison with 2012-2013 budget proposal, the corresponding 2010-2011 budget estimates were restated on a gross basis, i.e., with full biennial requirement (please refer to estimates for the biennial support budget 2010-2011, DP/FPA/2009/10, paragraphs 26, 28 and 30).

[e/] Includes the addition to the operational reserve.

[f/] Includes indirect cost recovery from co-financing resources ($40.8 million) and income tax reimbursed to nationals of one Member State ($6.5 million).

Note: Figures in this table and in other tables in this document are rounded to the closest decimal; therefore, they may not add up.