



General Assembly

Distr.: Limited
3 December 2021

Original: English

**United Nations Commission on
International Trade Law
Working Group III (Investor-State Dispute
Settlement Reform)
Forty-second session
New York, 14–18 February 2022**

Possible reform of investor-State dispute settlement (ISDS)

Advisory Centre

Note by the Secretariat

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
II. Advisory Centre	2
E. Possible legal structures.	2
F. Cost and financing	3
Annex	
I. Cost and financing (Budget model).	9



II. Advisory centre

E. Possible legal structures

1. Possible models for the establishment of the centre

1. The Working Group identified that, to ensure the legitimacy of the centre, its independence is a central value (A/CN.9/1004*, para. 37). The level of institutionalisation may have an impact on the manner in which the services are rendered, as well as on its independence or perceived independence and the funding scheme.

2. In that light, the Working Group may wish to consider the possible institutional setting of the centre, whether the centre would be (i) a legally independent intergovernmental body (with eventually regional branch offices to be accessible within different geographical areas); or (ii) attached to a structure that could be any existing international organization, a standing multilateral tribunal that would be set up as part of the ISDS reform, or one or more (if the centre were to be set-up in a decentralized fashion) existing arbitral institutions (A/CN.9/1004*, para. 37).

3. The Working Group may wish to note that the main advantage of a legally independent intergovernmental body would be that the centre could define the nature, scope, and prioritization of its activities. Such an independent centre could avoid real or perceived influence from, or conflicts of interest with, the activities of the organization hosting it.

4. If the centre were to be attached to an existing structure or a structure to be created as part of the reform (for instance, a standing body), synergies between such a permanent structure and the activities of the centre should be considered and developed. Such a host structure could assist the advisory centre with institutional resources and build on existing trust and relationships. However, the attachment of the centre to an existing institution might also be perceived as hampering confidence and trust in the centre.

2. Virtual centre/Location or locations

5. The Working Group may wish to consider draft provision 10 on the location of the centre.

Draft provision 10 – Location

1. Option 1: *[The Centre shall be based in [...].]* Option 2: *[The Centre's location shall be determined by the Governing Board in accordance with the relevant rules of procedure].*

2. *The Centre shall seek to ensure adequate global coverage, whether through virtual and, as feasible, physical presence regionally.*

Comments

6. The location, or locations, of an advisory centre could depend on a range of factors, including the form that such a mechanism would take, its mandate and roles, the identity and preferences of its beneficiaries, their legal needs, and centre's budget. It may be noted that most investment counsels and tribunals are concentrated in a limited number of world cities and it might be considered whether the advisory centre could be located close to these major hubs. Cost-effectiveness and regional representation might also need to be considered when determining this matter. In terms of regional representation, consideration could also be given to a seat located in a least developed or developing State so as to increase awareness of the existence of the centre and its services in the region where its potential beneficiaries are located so as to facilitate their access to the centre.

7. The question of location or locations is also connected to the sustainability of the centre. The Working Group may wish to consider the objective of an advisory centre to assist States which requires an easy access by the beneficiaries and the impact of this on its location.

8. It may be conceived that an advisory centre could have several offices located in different regions of the world, although this may raise costs and associated funding challenges. Given the implications on budget and sustainability of the centre, it could be decided to set up virtual centres in the form of dedicated desks at the centre or in regional development banks or relevant institutions and structures in various regions. It may also be considered whether to establish a single centre and to have units within the centre responsible for providing region-specific services. Yet another option would be to leave this question to be determined by the centre's governing board in light of prevailing circumstances so as to allow for decisions on possible regional branches to be made in a more informed fashion (see draft provision 10(1), option 2).

F. Cost and financing

9. The Working Group requested the Secretariat to conduct preparatory work with regard to the funding of an advisory centre, taking into account the following options: (i) the advisory centre being financed by its members through a fund established by participating developed States or voluntary contributions from other sources; and (ii) the possibility of the advisory centre charging a fee for its services or a fee to the users of ISDS (A/CN.9/1004*, para. 47). Further, it was highlighted that staffing needs should be carefully considered (A/CN.9/1004*, para. 37).

10. The Working Group may wish to consider as a possible model, as far as cost and financing is concerned, the Advisory Centre on WTO Law ("ACWL") financial structure. The ACWL is co-financed by its developed and developing country members. The ACWL's institutional structure is designed to ensure that the ACWL can provide its services to its developing country members and the least developed countries ("LDCs") independently of any financial considerations or other influence.¹ The Endowment Fund was created from the contributions of both the developed and developing country members. The contributions of developing countries vary with each country's share of world trade and income per capita. LDCs are not required to contribute to the Endowment Fund in order to be entitled to the ACWL's services. Each of the ACWL developed country members have contributed at least US\$1,000,000 to the Endowment Fund, to the annual budgets of the ACWL, or to both. Further, the ACWL charges fees for support in WTO dispute settlement proceedings. The fees are per hour: CHF 40 per hour for LDCs; CHF 162 per hour for Category C Members; CHF 243 per hour for Category B Members; and CHF 324 per hour for Category A Members. These fees are applied to a time budget adopted by the Management Board which indicates the maximum number of hours that the beneficiary of the services may expect the ACWL to charge for each procedural step in a WTO dispute settlement proceeding. In addition, the ACWL may accept contributions from governmental and non-governmental sources for specific purposes that are not related to dispute settlement cases, such as training and the traineeship programme.

11. The Working Group may wish to note that a study has been conducted by interested organizations in cooperation with the Secretariat to estimate the costs of establishing and operating an advisory centre, as well as to identify the possible sources of financing for the centre's operation (the "Study").² The Study is based on

¹ See *ACWL Organisational Structure*, <https://www.acwl.ch/organisational-structure/>.

² IAA/ILI: Note on the costs and financing of an Advisory Centre on International Investment Law (the "Study") https://uncitral.un.org/sites/uncitral.un.org/files/aciiil_note_on_costs_financing_24_august_2020_final_updated.pdf.

various assumptions given the early stage of the work on this topic.³ The main assumptions are that the beneficiaries of the services of the centre would be developing countries with priority given to the LDCs, and that cases would be at various stages and “mature” at different times.

1. Assessment of workload of the advisory centre and costs

12. The Study focuses on the staffing requirement for mediation and arbitration services and estimates the need based on research and a statistical analysis of ICSID awards, a range of blended hourly rates, and the average duration of the cases in the sample.⁴ The estimate does not take into account that some reform options, if adopted, might result in shorter proceedings and require fewer working hours per case.

13. It follows from the Study that a team of fifteen (15) lawyers and three (3) administrative staff could handle 4–6 mediation cases and 7–9 arbitration cases concurrently, while also providing some assistance during cooling-off periods. If it were decided to start with a smaller team and expand over time, a team of eight (8) lawyers and two (2) administrative staff could, on the basis of a conservative estimate, handle 2–3 mediation cases and 3–4 arbitration cases concurrently, while also providing some assistance during cooling-off periods. Both scenarios include the costs of a secondment programme which would allow government lawyers from member countries to join staff of the centre as paid secondees for a period to be determined (see [A/CN.9/1004*](#), para. 33). More staff might be required if further activities should be undertaken by the centre.

2. Budget as outlined in Annex 1

14. The Working Group may wish to consider the hypothetical budget of an advisory centre in Annex 1 to this Note. It is based on the standards applied in the United Nations.⁵

– Scenario A

15. The installation (and therefore non-recurring) costs of the centre would amount to US\$274,525, and the recurring costs (not including rent, travel and translation costs, experts, tribunal costs, etc.) would amount to US\$4,115,866 per annum, assuming that the centre has fifteen (15) lawyers as staff: one (1) executive director, three (3) senior associates, three (3) upper mid-level associates, two (2) mid-level associates, three (3) junior associates, and three (3) secondees. The total costs of establishing the centre and operating it for the first year would be US\$4,289,670.

– Scenario B

16. On the other hand, the installation (and therefore non-recurring) costs of the centre would amount to US\$252,914, and the recurring costs would amount to US\$3,040,824 per annum, assuming that the centre has a staff of eight (8) lawyers: one (1) executive director, two (2) senior associates, one (1) upper mid-level associate, one (1) mid-level associate, one (1) junior associate, and two (2) secondees. The total costs of establishing the centre and operating it for the first year would be US\$3,110,769.

3. Ways of financing these costs

17. The Study suggests that funding of USD 16 million would be required for the establishment and functioning of the advisory centre for five years under Scenario A.

³ Study, II. Assumptions, pp.4–7.

⁴ Study, paras. 24–45 and Annex 2 with further details, notably an overview of all ICSID cases between May 2019–May 2020, the number of hours spent on the cases, the calculation of average lawyers’ fees per case, the calculation of average number of hours per cases, and the calculation of average duration of a case.

⁵ More specifically, it refers to the UNODC Standard Salary Costs and the UNOV/UNODC Standard Cost Manual.

Alternatively, it suggests that funding of USD 10 million would be required under Scenario B.

18. The Working Group may wish to consider how these costs could be financed based on the above assessments. While acknowledging that there would be a need for the advisory centre to charge for its services to cover its costs sustainably, the Working Group had expressed that States may be required to pay for the services on a sliding scale, depending on the country's level of development and preference to be given to LDCs and developing States (A/CN.9/1004*, para. 47). If so, the classification of States would need to be further considered (for example, by using the World Bank's income-related classification of developing countries with high-income developing countries ("Category A"); upper-middle-income developing countries ("Category B"); and lower-middle-income developing countries ("Category C").⁶

19. As a one-time membership fee from the participating States might not be sufficient for the establishment and operation of an advisory centre, multiple sources of income might be required in order to meet these objectives. The Working Group may wish to consider whether the gap could be filled by: (i) voluntary contributions by States (as official development assistance); (ii) private donors and development assistance agencies or organizations; (iii) costs recovered from the claimant; and (iv) fees paid by ISDS users.

4. Financial Structure

20. The Working Group may wish to consider the following draft provision on the financial structure of an advisory centre which is to be adjusted depending on the manner in which the centre would be established.

Draft provision 11 – Financial structure of the Centre

1. *A trust fund shall be established to enable the sustainable operation of the Centre (the "Trust Fund").*
2. *The Trust Fund shall receive contributions from all the Members taking into account their level of economic development and as decided by the [Governing Board of the Centre]. [Least developed countries are exempted from paying a contribution.] It may also receive contributions or donations from public and private organizations and sponsors.*
3. *The Centre shall charge fees for the legal services in accordance with the schedule of fees set out in the Annex on Fees to this Agreement. The fee for State beneficiaries shall be set taking into account their level of economic development and decided by the [Governing Board of the Centre]. Least developed countries are not exempted from paying a fee for [Services], [for Services except those related to information-sharing, training, and capacity building] [for legal representation].*
4. *The annual budget of the Centre shall be from the resources of the Trust Fund, as well as from the fees the Centre charges for its services in accordance with the rates established by the [Governing Board].*
5. *The Centre's budget shall be examined annually by an external auditor.*

Comments

(a) One-Time Membership Fee

21. The Working Group may wish to consider how to ensure the smooth commencement of the activities of the centre, as income from services would only accrue at a later stage, that is, after the centre would commence to operate.⁷ Possible options include the payment of a one-time reasonable membership fee by developing

⁶ See also A/CN.9/212, para. 57 and related footnote 18.

⁷ Study, para. 16.

countries.⁸ Developed States might also participate in the centre and pay membership fees, particularly if the centre also functions as a forum for exchanging information, developing best practices, and facilitating training.

22. Taking the example of the ACWL, the Study suggests that Category A countries could be required to pay USD 486,000, Category B countries could be required to pay USD 162,000, and Category C countries could be required to pay USD 81,000 into a fund.⁹ As the Working Group had expressed its wish to account for the level of economic development of the States, the one-time membership fee could be determined by using the ‘means test’. By contrast, LDCs may not be required to contribute to the trust fund.¹⁰ The total funds gathered by these calculations could amount to USD 3,321,000 (from one (1) high-income, ten (10) upper-middle-income, and fifteen (15) lower-middle-income countries).¹¹ Lastly, the developed countries could pay a fixed amount and a financial contribution could be agreed as a part of the accession protocol.¹²

(b) Voluntary contributions

23. If preference is given to LDCs and Category C States, the largest part of the centre’s services would likely be dedicated towards these States. However, as a consequence, the funds generated by the advisory centre may be insufficient to cover the costs that it would likely incur.

24. In order to fill this gap, the Working Group may wish to consider that a part of the income of the advisory centre could originate from voluntary contributions by private donors and governmental agencies or organizations. The potential conflicts of interest highlighted in paragraph 39 of document [A/CN.9/1004*](#) may be noted.

25. As an illustration, the ACWL is financed through voluntary contributions from States, collected on a five-year cycle. As the establishment of the centre aims at enhancing legitimacy and fairness in ISDS, which is seen as public service and for the public good, it could be clarified that States and public institutions could commit to provide the required financing and that these contributions be considered as official development assistance (“ODA”).

(c) Fees to be charged to beneficiaries

26. The Working Group may further consider if and which cost of services provided by the advisory centre should be borne by the beneficiaries. The rate of these services might not be the same for all States and would need to take into account their level of economic development. Accordingly, the LDCs and non-LDC lower-middle income countries could be required to pay at a nominal rate, while the high- and middle-income developing countries could be required to pay at the market rate and discounted rate, respectively. If developed countries are permitted to avail themselves of the centre’s advisory services, they too could be required to pay market rates.

27. The Study indicates that charging for services (even at highly discounted rates) can help to achieve some degree of financial autonomy. The annual recurring cost in Scenario A could be USD 3,715,866, wherein the centre could function with fifteen (15) lawyers working for 22,500 billable hours on an average.

28. The Study suggests that for scenario A a break-even point can be achieved at an average hourly rate of USD 136.

29. Considering that hourly rates could vary depending on the category of beneficiaries, while also assuming that all categories would use the services, the break-even point is achieved under the Study by charging the following rates: Category A States could pay USD 400 per hour; Category B States could pay USD 90

⁸ Ibid., para. 64.

⁹ Ibid., paras. 66–67.

¹⁰ Ibid., para. 67.

¹¹ Ibid., paras. 69–70.

¹² Ibid., para. 68.

per hour; Category C States could pay USD 40 per hour; and LDCs could pay USD 20 per hour. This could generate income of USD 2,250,000, USD 506,250, USD 225,000, and USD 112,500 from the respective categories of States.

30. However, considering that the services may be available in priority to LDCs, the break-even point might not be reached based on the above-mentioned hourly rates. Therefore, while it is theoretically feasible to entirely finance the centre's costs by means of discounted fees for the services charged by the centre, this may not be sufficient. In order to ensure that the centre would deliver services at the lowest possible rate, in particular to the LDCs among its members, other options might need to be explored,¹³ such as: (i) increasing the hourly rates for all categories of States; or (ii) capping hourly rates for an average number of hours per case, combined with a lump-sum amount for series of services.

31. In addition, the Working Group had noted that ADR methods such as mediation are largely underutilised in the context of ISDS. In that context, it was stated that the role of the advisory centre in the resolution of disputes outside the adversarial methods should also be explored (A/CN.9/1044, para. 39). In order to meet this objective, the rates for amicable settlement services could be discounted (for example, a discount of 25 per cent or more could apply as compared to the fees charged in arbitration) to incentivise the use of mediation.

(d) Recovery of costs

32. Another source of funding might be found in costs to be recovered in situations where the beneficiaries of the centre would prevail in a dispute. The Working Group may wish to consider an option requiring the ISDS tribunals to recover the costs incurred by the centre for the corresponding working hours at the prevailing market rate.

(e) Users' Fee from ISDS users

33. The Working Group may wish to consider a user fee that could be levied on all monies that the parties spend for ISDS. If such funds and equivalent funds earned by the potential multilateral investment court are taxed, in total or in part, and dedicated to the advisory centre, it could provide stable financial support to it.

(f) Trust Fund

34. The Working Group may wish to consider how to guarantee a stability of income, so as to also ensure the centre's sustainability. A possible option for consideration in this respect is the establishment of a trust fund as a recipient of funds from diverse sources.

35. As a possible source of funding, it could be envisaged that provisions in investment treaties could foresee a fee would need to be paid by claimants to the trust fund of the advisory centre as a condition to rely on the treaty as a basis for the claim. This might contribute to the financing of the centre and deterring claimants from bringing frivolous claims.

5. Sustainability

36. The Working Group may wish to note that the funding sustainability of an advisory centre should be a major focus given the possible impact of the centre's activity in the long term on investment law. In particular, if the centre were to render assistance and defence services, beneficiaries need to be sure that the centre would be able to offer its services throughout the whole duration of a case it has taken up, which may take several years. The Working Group may wish to consider the various funding schemes in light of the need to ensure both the independence of the centre and its long-term sustainability.

¹³ Ibid., para. 96.

37. The Working Group may wish to note that, depending on the funding scheme, there could be tensions, perceived or actual, between, on the one hand, client governments of an advisory centre and, on the other, existing and potential donors, which may include non-governmental organizations and philanthropic entities. The extent of conflicts would depend on the scope of services and whether donors may have an interest in a fair framework that gives legitimacy to the system as such in the outcome of negotiations (between States and between investors and States) and/or in the outcome of particular cases (State-State or investor-State). This would also apply in a State-funded scheme, as donor States may have different perspectives regarding the objectives of the funding and the advisory centre. The objective of ensuring that beneficiaries retain the ability, while using the services of the advisory centre, to make their own decisions regarding objectives, formulation, use, and application of international investment law should be kept in mind when developing rules on the funding of the centre.

38. It may also be noted that donors may face political or policy difficulties in supporting the defence of some types of cases. If, for instance, the case relates to nationalization without compensation, or targeted nationalizations/expropriations, of an investment by a government, there may be concerns about the use of public funds to support the defence of such conduct. Certain claims may also be controversial. Rather than strengthening support for dispute resolution foreseen by international investment treaties, the involvement of a government-supported/taxpayer funded advisory centre may instead generate additional awareness of and critiques regarding the costs associated with ISDS.

39. In that light, the Working Group may wish to consider the means to address this conflict, including independent governance mechanisms; clear and transparent rules on allocation of decision-making authority; and appropriate, comprehensive, and effective rules regarding professional responsibility. An internal organization may allow, for instance, developed States to become members of the centre without being entitled to resource-intensive services, including assistance and defence in ISDS cases, yet still benefiting from other services, such as ADR services and sharing of best practices. One possibility would be to ensure diversity in the services rendered by the centre, including serving as a platform of exchange of best practises and of discussion for all States and other stakeholders. A system where membership would be opened to all States and services tailored to the needs of categories of beneficiaries might ensure its sustainability.

Annex 1

Cost and financing (Budget model)

BUDGET FOR ADVISORY CENTRE FOR DISPUTE SETTLEMENT ON
INVESTMENT MATTERS

Scenario A: 12 Lawyers

Budget class	Sq m	Unit	Total sq m	Cost per unit	Sub-Total	Total
INSTALLATION COSTS						\$274,525
(a) ICT equipment¹						\$52,095
Laptops w. docking stations and monitors		17		\$1,547	\$26,299	
Fixed telephone		17		\$308	\$5,236	
Personal Printer		12		\$300	\$3,600	
Mobile telephone		16		\$1,060	\$16,960	
Videoconferencing equipment				\$5,000	\$0	
(b) Furniture						\$99,930
. Individual Office ¹						\$39,230
Management Office furniture set (D1/D2 level)		1		\$6,117	\$6,117	
Standard Office furniture set (P5 level)		3		\$2,280	\$6,840	
Standard Office furniture set (G6-P4 level)		13		\$2,021	\$26,273	
. Conference Room						\$28,200
Conference Table		1		\$12,000	\$12,000	
Conference/visitor chairs		36		\$450	\$16,200	
. Other furniture						\$32,500
Bookcases, filing cabinets		10		\$2,500	\$25,000	
Coffee table, 4 armchairs		1		\$7,500	\$7,500	
(c) Materials and supplies						\$17,500
Library books		1		\$17,500	\$17,500	
(d) Services						\$105,000
Website development (multilingual)		1		\$80,000	\$80,000	
Database development "Collection best practices"		1		\$25,000	\$25,000	
RECURRING COSTS (per annum)						\$3,715,866
(a) Rent						
Rental costs depending on location						
(b) Buildings maintenance, utilities (including security)¹						\$129,366
Management office	27	1	27	\$10,080	\$10,080.45	
Standard Office ²	13.5	15	203	\$5,040	\$75,603.38	
Conference room	45	1	45	\$16,801	\$16,800.75	
Library	45	1	45	\$16,801	\$16,800.75	
Administrative booth/reception	27	1	27	\$10,080	\$10,080.45	
(c) Staff costs ³						\$2,380,500
Executive Director (D2 level)		1		\$231,400	\$231,400	
Lawyers, senior level (P5) ⁴		3		\$195,800	\$587,400	
Lawyers, upper medium level (P4)		3		\$166,600	\$499,800	
Lawyers, medium level (P3) ⁴		3		\$136,700	\$410,100	
Lawyers, junior level (P2)		2		\$112,700	\$225,400	
Secondment trainees (P2)		3		\$112,700	\$338,100	
Administrative staff (G4-G6)		1		\$88,300	\$88,300	
(d) Services and supplies						\$806,000
ICT hardware and software support, server hosting		12		\$3,500	\$42,000	
Software licenses/digital subscriptions (library, electronic communication)		1		\$80,000	\$80,000	
Telephone costs ⁵		12		\$9,500	\$114,000	
Translation costs ⁵		2,000		\$230	\$460,000	

Stationery and supplies		12		\$2,500	\$30,000	
Photocopying/printing equipment rental and maintenance		12		\$2,500	\$30,000	
Website hosting and maintenance		1		\$25,000	\$25,000	
Database development "Collection best practices"		1		\$25,000	\$25,000	
(d) Travel					\$400,000	
Travel costs		1		400,000	\$400,000	
Total costs ⁶						\$3,990,391
Contingency reserve (7.5%)						\$299,279
TOTAL REQUIREMENTS						\$4,289,670

¹ Based on 2019 UNOV/UNODC Standard Cost Manual

² Includes workspace for 2 Government officials on secondment/interns

³ Based on 2020 Revised UNODC Standard Salary Cost Manual

⁴ One staff foreseen to provide support in mediation proceedings

⁵ Provisions take into account that Advisory Centre is operating on a worldwide basis

⁶ Costs have been calculated on the basis of tax exemption

**BUDGET FOR ADVISORY CENTRE FOR DISPUTE SETTLEMENT ON
INVESTMENT MATTERS
Scenario B: 6 Lawyers**

Budget class	Sq m	Unit	Total sq m	Cost per unit	Sub-Total	Total
INSTALLATION COSTS						\$252,914
(a) ICT equipment¹					\$44,890	
Laptops w. docking stations and monitors		10		\$1,547	\$15,470	
Fixed telephone		10		\$308	\$3,080	
Personal Printer		6		\$300	\$1,800	
Mobile telephone		9		\$1,060	\$9,540	
Videoconferencing equipment		3		\$5,000	\$15,000	
(b) Furniture					\$85,524	
. Individual Office ¹					<u>\$24,824</u>	
Management Office furniture set (D1/D2 level)		1		\$6,117	\$6,117	
Standard Office furniture set (P5 level)		2		\$2,280	\$4,560	
Standard Office furniture set (G6-P4 level)		7		\$2,021	\$14,147	
. Conference Room					<u>\$28,200</u>	
Conference Table		1		\$12,000	\$12,000	
Conference/visitor chairs		36		\$450	\$16,200	
. Other furniture					<u>\$32,500</u>	
Bookcases, filing cabinets		10		\$2,500	\$25,000	
Coffee table, 4 armchairs		1		\$7,500	\$7,500	
(c) Materials and supplies					\$17,500	
Library books		1		\$17,500	\$17,500	
(d) Services					\$105,000	
Website development (multilingual)		1		\$80,000	\$80,000	
Database development "Collection best practices"		1		\$25,000	\$25,000	
RECURRING COSTS (per annum)						\$2,640,824
(a) Rent						
Rental costs depending on location						
(b) Buildings maintenance, utilities (including security)¹			266		\$99,124	
Management office	27	1	27	\$10,080	\$10,080.45	
Standard Office ²	13.5	9	122	\$5,040	\$45,362.03	
Conference room	45	1	45	\$16,801	\$16,800.75	
Library	45	1	45	\$16,801	\$16,800.75	
Administrative booth/reception	27	1	27	\$10,080	\$10,080.45	
(c) Staff costs ³					\$1,352,700	
Executive Director (D2 level)		1		\$231,400	\$231,400	

Lawyers, senior level (P5) ⁴		2		\$195,800	\$391,600	
Lawyers, upper medium level (P4)		1		\$166,600	\$166,600	
Lawyers, medium level (P3)		1		\$136,700	\$136,700	
Lawyers, junior level (P2) ⁴		1		\$112,700	\$112,700	
Secondment trainees (P2)		2		\$112,700	\$225,400	
Administrative staff (G4-G6)		1		\$88,300	\$88,300	
(d) Services and supplies					\$789,000	
ICT hardware and software support, server hosting		12		\$3,500	\$42,000	
Software licenses/digital subscriptions (library, electronic communication)		1		\$80,000	\$80,000	
Telephone costs ⁵		12		\$9,500	\$114,000	
Translation costs ⁵		2,000		\$230	\$460,000	
Stationery and supplies		12		\$2,500	\$30,000	
Photocopying/printing equipment rental and maintenance		12		\$2,500	\$30,000	
Website hosting and maintenance		1		\$25,000	\$25,000	
Database maintenance "Collection best practices"		1		\$8,000	\$8,000	
(d) Travel					\$400,000	
Travel costs		1		400,000	\$400,000	
Total costs ⁶						\$2,893,738
Contingency reserve (7.5%)						\$217,030
TOTAL REQUIREMENTS						\$3,110,769

¹ Based on 2019 UNOV/UNODC Standard Cost Manual

² Includes workspace for 2 Government officials on secondment/interns

³ Based on 2020 Revised UNODC Standard Salary Cost Manual

⁴ One staff foreseen to provide support in mediation proceedings

⁵ Provisions take into account that Advisory Centre is operating on a worldwide basis

⁶ Costs have been calculated on the basis of tax exemption