



# Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

Distr.: General  
25 August 2008

Original: English

## Fourth session

Vienna, 8-17 October 2008

Item 2 (a), (b), (c) and (h) of the provisional agenda\*

**Review of the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto: information-gathering and possible mechanisms to review implementation; expert consultation on criminalization; expert consultation on international cooperation, with particular emphasis on extradition, mutual legal assistance and international cooperation for the purpose of confiscation, and the establishment and strengthening of central authorities; expert consultation on money-laundering**

## Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime: consolidated information received from States for the first reporting cycle

### Report of the Secretariat

## Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction .....	1-3	3
II. Analysis of national legislation and measures reported in relation to the relevant provisions of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime .....	4-105	4
A. Criminalization requirements .....	4-53	4
B. International cooperation requirements .....	54-96	15
C. Difficulties reported and technical assistance needs .....	97-105	28
III. Conclusions and recommendations .....	106-108	31

\* CTOC/COP/2008/1.



Annexes

I.	Relevant legislation and website addresses received from States . . . . .	33
II.	Status of responses to the questionnaire on the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime: first reporting cycle. . . . .	37

## I. Introduction

1. By its resolution 55/25 of 15 November 2000, the General Assembly adopted the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime<sup>1</sup> and two supplementary protocols: the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children,<sup>2</sup> and the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air.<sup>3</sup> The Convention entered into force on 29 September 2003.

2. At its first session, the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime adopted decision 1/2, in which it decided that the programme of work for its second session would include the following:

(a) Consideration of the basic adaptation of national legislation in accordance with the Convention;

(b) Starting with examination of criminalization legislation and difficulties encountered in implementation in accordance with article 34, paragraph 2, of the Convention;

(c) Enhancing international cooperation and developing technical assistance to overcome difficulties identified in the implementation of the Convention.

3. The present report provides an update of data presented in the analytical report on the implementation of the Convention that was submitted to the Conference at its second session. It contains an overview and an analysis of all the replies to the relevant questionnaire and checklist received by the Secretariat (for additional information, see CTOC/COP/2008/2).<sup>4</sup> It also contains information that highlights the progress made towards meeting the requirements set out in the Convention and some of the difficulties that States are facing in implementing the provisions. Many States provided copies of their relevant legislation (see annex I). A list of those States whose responses had been received at the time of drafting and that are reflected in the present report is included in annex II. It should be noted that in cases in which no update was received, the responses submitted previously were assumed to still be valid.

---

<sup>1</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2225, No. 39574.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 2237, No. 39574.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 2241, No. 39574.

<sup>4</sup> After the checklist was sent to the States parties and signatories, 21 additional replies and 21 updates were received.

## **II. Analysis of national legislation and measures reported in relation to the relevant provisions of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime**

### **A. Criminalization requirements**

#### **1. Criminalization of participation in an organized criminal group (art. 5)**

4. Under article 5, States parties are required to criminalize participation in an organized criminal group. They may do so by establishing as a crime either the agreement between two or more persons to commit a crime serious (para. 1 (a)(i)) or the conduct of a person who takes part in the criminal activities of an organized criminal group or in activities that support the group in its criminal objectives (para. 1 (a)(ii)), or both of the above.

5. Almost all reporting States confirmed that participation in an organized criminal group was criminalized in their domestic legislation, the exceptions being Ecuador, Iceland and Thailand; Ireland and Myanmar reported that new legislation in line with the Convention was under consideration.<sup>5</sup> Ecuador indicated that its domestic legislation referred to the concept of “illicit association” defined as “an association constituted with the aim of harming property or persons”. The constitution of such an association was by itself an offence, irrespective of the number of persons involved or the type of benefit sought.<sup>6</sup>

6. On the question of whether they criminalized the agreement to commit a serious offence (art. 5, para. 1 (a)(i)) or the conduct of taking an active part in criminal activities (art. 5, para. 1 (a)(ii)), most States reported that both offences were established as crimes under their law. This seems to indicate that the offence of agreeing to commit a serious crime, inspired from the common law conspiracy model, has in fact been widely incorporated into national legislation across the board of legal traditions. Seven States (Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Morocco, Netherlands and New Zealand) indicated that they had established the second type of offence (taking an active part in criminal activities of an organized criminal group), to the exclusion of the agreement offence. Six States (Bosnia and Herzegovina, El Salvador, France, Mauritius, Norway and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) reported that only the agreement to commit a serious crime for a material benefit was established as a crime, to the exclusion of the second offence.

---

<sup>5</sup> Malawi, which did not respond to the questionnaire, indicated in a declaration made upon becoming party to the Convention that offences pursuant to article 5 had not yet been established and that it was in the process of reviewing its domestic legislation with the aim of incorporating obligations assumed on ratification of the Convention (see CTOC/COP/2005/7, para. 28).

<sup>6</sup> In notifications formulated when becoming a party to the Convention, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), which did not respond to the questionnaire, referred to the establishment of an offence of forming an organized criminal group in the Venezuelan criminal code (see CTOC/COP/2005/7, para. 51).

7. Of those States which criminalized the agreement to commit a serious crime, approximately one half<sup>7</sup> reported that the definition of that offence included, as allowed by article 5, the additional element of an act committed by one of the participants in furtherance of the agreement or the involvement in an organized criminal group, while 33 States indicated that no additional element was required.

8. On the question of whether their legislation established as a crime the offence of organizing, directing, aiding, abetting, facilitating or counselling the commission of a serious crime involving an organized criminal group, most States confirmed that they complied with this requirement of the Convention, which is a crucial means of ensuring the prosecution of leaders of an organized criminal group. Angola, El Salvador, Iceland and Myanmar indicated that they had not established such an offence. Ecuador noted that the provision of weapons and of premises to the criminal group were targeted under its legislation as specific offences. Madagascar clarified that the offence already existed and was dealt with in a draft bill on organized crime and money-laundering that was expected to be adopted by the Parliament in October 2008.

## **2. Criminalization of the laundering of proceeds of crime (art. 6)**

9. All reporting States, with the exception of Angola, Azerbaijan, Jamaica, Morocco and Togo, indicated that they had criminalized the laundering of proceeds of crime in accordance with article 6 of the Convention. Azerbaijan reported that a draft law on money-laundering was being developed. Togo reported that a law was being drafted within its national programme for the modernization of justice. Jamaica and Morocco reported that their penal codes were in the process of being revised and would include money-laundering among other new offences. Angola indicated that there was no such offence in its legislation.

10. Article 6 requires that money-laundering offences be applicable to the widest range of predicate offences, including offences provided for under articles 5 (participation in an organized criminal group), 8 (corruption) and 23 (obstruction of justice), offences provided for under the Protocols to which States are parties or are considering becoming parties, as well as all serious crimes.

11. Almost all reporting States indicated that all the offences covered by the Convention were under their law predicate offences to money-laundering. China explained that obstruction of justice still had to be included as a predicate offence. Costa Rica reported that predicate offences were all offences subject to a defined penalty threshold and that obstruction of justice did not meet the threshold requirement, thus not qualifying as a predicate offence to money-laundering. Ecuador indicated that money-laundering offences applied only to trafficking in drugs and that an upgrading of the legislation to combat money-laundering was currently under way. The legislation envisaged would take an "all-offences" approach to predicate offences for money-laundering. Burundi, Iceland, the

---

<sup>7</sup> In addition to those reporting States, a number of States that did not respond to the questionnaire reported such information in notifications formulated upon becoming parties: Panama and Saudi Arabia indicated that their legislation required an act in furtherance of the agreement and Lesotho stated that its legislation required both additional elements (see CTOC/COP/2005/7, paras. 36, 42 and 26).

Philippines, Thailand, Tunisia and Ukraine also reported that not all offences covered by the Convention were predicate offences in their national legislation.

12. Concerning offences covered by the Migrants Protocol and the Trafficking in Persons Protocol, a number of States not yet parties to the Protocols (Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Iceland, Malaysia and Thailand) indicated that these were not predicate offences to money-laundering. Some others (Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Jamaica, Kuwait, Mauritius, New Zealand, Niger, Philippines, South Africa, Tajikistan, Tunisia and Ukraine), although parties to the Protocols, indicated that the offences under the Protocols were not predicate offences to money-laundering, either because such offences had not yet been criminalized in their domestic law (Costa Rica, Mauritius and South Africa) or for other unspecified reasons, such as possibly the fact that the list of predicate offences included in the money-laundering legislation had not yet been updated to include new offences established pursuant to the Protocols or that those offences did not meet a penalty threshold requirement. In this respect it should be noted that a generic definition of predicate offences as including all crimes would have the advantage of ensuring that as soon as an offence was established under national legislation in compliance with the Convention and its Protocols, it would also be covered as a predicate offence to money-laundering. A large predicate basis removes difficulties in proving that particular proceeds are attributable to specific criminal activities when the person in question is involved in a broad range of criminal activities.

13. Article 6 further requires that predicate offences include offences committed both within and outside the jurisdiction of the State party in question. Among the reporting States, most States confirmed that money-laundering offences were applicable to predicate offences committed abroad, under the requirement of dual criminality, that is, that the predicate offence should constitute a criminal offence in both the country in which it was committed and in the country exercising its jurisdiction over the money-laundering offence. Besides, States also indicated the existence of various other conditions and exceptions. For example, a Chinese citizen who has been sentenced to a maximum punishment of three years for committing a predicate offence outside Chinese territory may be exempt from prosecution. In the Comoros, it is indispensable that at least one of the perpetrators is a national. Tunisia reported that nationals and foreigners who had committed predicate offences outside Tunisia could be prosecuted if a Tunisian had been injured.

14. The vast majority of States reported compliance with the requirement to criminalize the acquisition, possession and use of property, knowing that such property is the proceeds of crime, which under article 6 is subject to the basic concepts of each State party's legal system. Angola reported that the offence of acquisition, possession and use of proceeds of crime was not provided for in its legislation. Jamaica reported that these offences were being considered in a draft bill. Portugal reported that the offence of acquisition, possession and use of proceeds of crime had been incorporated in domestic law in 1993 but had been deleted from it in 2004. Mexico indicated that acquisition of proceeds was established as a crime, with the mental element of knowledge as provided for under article 6 and an additional element of purpose (purpose of concealing the origin, localization and destination of property). Possession and use of proceeds of crime, however, had not yet been criminalized. Further, Mexico indicated that

criminalization of possession and use, with the same mental elements as acquisition, was being addressed in a project of law. The United States of America indicated that its domestic law provided for criminal liability for acquisition, possession or use of proceeds of crime if the conduct constituted a financial transaction.

15. Regarding criminalization of ancillary offences to money-laundering – such as participation in, association with and conspiracy to commit, attempts to commit and aiding, abetting, facilitating and counselling the commission of a money-laundering offence – which is also under article 6 subject to the basic concepts of each State party's legal system, all reporting States, with the exception of Angola, Azerbaijan, Ecuador, Finland, Germany, Mexico and the Philippines, confirmed that these activities were established as criminal offences under their domestic law. Angola reported that this crime was not provided for by its legislation. Ecuador indicated that participation in, association with and conspiracy to commit, attempts to commit and aiding, abetting, facilitating and counselling the commission of a money-laundering offence had only been criminalized in relation to drug offences. In relation to conspiracy, Germany indicated that the agreement to commit a crime was only punishable if the crime agreed upon was a serious offence for which a violator was liable to at least one year's imprisonment. Mexico noted that incitement, attempt and complicity were covered under its general criminal law provisions. Participation in, association with, aiding, abetting, facilitating and counselling of money-laundering offences were specifically criminalized in the money-laundering legislation when carried out with fraudulent intent by employees of financial institutions. Penalties provided for were the same as for money-laundering.

16. Article 6, paragraph 2 (e), allows States parties, when required by the fundamental principles of their domestic law, to provide that an offender may not be prosecuted and punished for both the predicate offence and the laundering of proceeds from that offence. Nine States (Angola, Austria, Congo, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Italy, Norway and Sweden) reported that they had availed themselves of that possibility. Austria, the Congo, Costa Rica, Gabon, Germany, Norway and Sweden indicated, however, that they would not refuse extradition, mutual legal assistance or cooperation for the purposes of confiscation solely on the grounds that the relevant request was based on a money-laundering offence and not on the predicate offence committed by the same person. Ecuador indicated that it would refuse extradition in such a situation.

### **3. Criminalization of corruption (art. 8)**

17. All reporting States, with the exception of Azerbaijan, El Salvador and Kazakhstan, indicated that their domestic legislation criminalized the active and passive bribery of a public official, as well as participation as an accomplice in bribery offences, as required by article 8. Angola and Ukraine reported that their domestic legislation did not criminalize passive bribery of a public official. Kazakhstan specified that a law regarding the criminalization of corruption was currently in the process of being adopted and that a legal measure related to passive bribery was being discussed.

18. El Salvador and Peru noted that their legislation had introduced a distinction – not made by article 8 – between bribery aiming at the commission of an act that was due as opposed to bribery aiming at the commission of an act in violation of the

public official's duties (e.g. facilitation of trafficking in human beings) indicating that the penalty provided for was increased in the second case. Involvement of members of the judiciary in bribery offences also constituted an aggravating circumstance attracting more severe penalties.

19. As regards criminalization of participation as an accomplice in bribery offences, several States indicated that this was achieved through provisions in their criminal code of general application establishing liability for aiding, abetting or participating as an accomplice in offences.

20. Although not specifically addressed by the questionnaire, one point may be worth mentioning as it has been identified as a recurrent weakness in legislation implementing other anti-corruption provisions:<sup>8</sup> article 8 requires States parties to cover under their active bribery offences not only the actual giving of an undue advantage to a public official, but also the promise or offering of such advantage, therefore covering situations where the bribe has not actually been transferred to the public official.

21. It should also be noted that the United Nations Convention against Corruption<sup>9</sup> includes in its article 15 provisions identical to those of article 8 of the Organized Crime Convention on active and passive bribery of public officials, but also extends the range of mandatory corruption offences to active bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations, as well as to the embezzlement, misappropriation and other diversion of property by a public official. States reviewing their legislation for compliance with article 8 should therefore consider taking into account the more comprehensive provisions of the Convention against Corruption.

#### **4. Criminalization of obstruction of justice (art. 23)**

22. Article 23 requires States parties to establish as a criminal offence the use both of corrupt means, such as bribery, and of coercive means, such as threats of violence, to induce false testimony or to interfere with the giving of testimony or the production of evidence, as well as the use of coercive means to interfere with the exercise of official duties by a justice or law enforcement official.

23. Most responding States reported that obstruction of justice was at least to some extent established as a criminal offence under their domestic legislation. Ecuador and the United Republic of Tanzania indicated that their provisions covered the requirements of the Convention only in part as the use of force to induce false testimony or otherwise interfere with justice was not provided for. In Portugal, the use of threats, physical violence and intimidation to obtain false testimony was criminalized but not the use of bribery for the same purpose. Costa Rica indicated that only some of those offences were criminalized in its legislation: false testimony and inducement of false testimony or interference with the giving of testimony. The same situation applied to Senegal, which referred to the offence of false testimony and to the offence of discrediting judicial decisions.

---

<sup>8</sup> Such as provisions of the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

<sup>9</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2349, No. 42146.

24. While under article 23 the offence is constituted whether or not false testimony was actually given or whether or not there was an actual interference with the course of justice, legislation in Peru and South Africa seems to require effective concealment of evidence or obstruction of justice as an element of the offence.

25. El Salvador, Iceland and Jamaica reported that their domestic legislation did not comply with the requirements of article 23 without providing further details.

26. States parties are required to apply the offence of obstruction of justice to all proceedings related to offences covered by the Convention, including offences established pursuant to the supplementary Protocols. Most responding States indicated that under their law article 23 was applicable in the context of proceedings relating to the commission of any offence, as the purpose of obstructing justice in relation to a specific offence was not a required element of the offence of obstruction of justice.

#### **5. Jurisdiction (art. 15)**

27. States parties are required, pursuant to article 15, to establish their jurisdiction over offences established in accordance with articles 5, 6, 8 and 23 of the Convention when the offence is committed in their territory or aboard vessels flying their flag or aircraft registered under their laws.

28. All reporting States except Jamaica and the United States confirmed their capacity to assert such jurisdiction in compliance with the Convention. The only exceptions mentioned concerned diplomatic and other immunities granted under generally accepted rules of international law as well as special arrangements applying to foreign troops stationed in a State's territory.

29. While the establishment of territorial jurisdiction is not expected to be problematic, States should ensure that such territorial jurisdiction encompasses both subjective and objective principles of territoriality, thus covering situations where the act was commenced in the territory (and completed elsewhere) as well as situations where it was completed in the territory. This is particularly relevant in relation to transnational offences where the constituent elements of the crime are frequently committed in more than one jurisdiction.

30. In addition to mandatory territorial jurisdiction, the Convention provides States parties with the option of establishing extraterritorial jurisdiction on a number of grounds.

31. The first ground relates to offences committed extraterritorially against a national of the State party. Most States indicated that they were in a position to assert their jurisdiction on such grounds. Nineteen States (Argentina, Benin, Canada, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lithuania, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, Sweden and the United States) indicated that they were not.

32. The second ground relates to offences committed abroad by nationals or stateless persons having their habitual residence in the State party's territory. Of all the reporting States, only Argentina, Canada, the Philippines and the United States reported that they had not established jurisdiction on the basis of nationality. A number of States emphasized that dual criminality was required to establish such jurisdiction. France indicated that establishment of jurisdiction on this ground

would not apply to stateless residents. In Peru, jurisdiction could be established when the suspected offender entered Peruvian territory after committing the crime abroad. Malaysia indicated that extraterritorial jurisdiction did not apply to all offences under the Convention, but only to corruption and money-laundering offences.

33. The third optional ground for the establishment of extraterritorial jurisdiction is based on the so-called “effects” principle and concerns offences committed outside a State party’s territory with a view to the commission of an offence within that territory. Offences to which such jurisdiction may apply are offences of participation in an organized criminal group (established pursuant to art. 5, para. 1) committed abroad with a view to committing a serious crime on the party’s territory and money-laundering ancillary offences (established pursuant to art. 6, para. 1 (b)(ii)) with a view to committing a money-laundering offence in the territory.

34. A vast majority of States reported that they had established jurisdiction covering offences of participation in an organized criminal group in the described circumstances. Angola, Brazil, Canada, Côte d’Ivoire, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Thailand reported that they had not. Concerning ancillary money-laundering offences, many States reported that they had established jurisdiction covering such offences in the described circumstances, while Angola, Canada, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, Thailand and Togo reported they had not. France, Myanmar and the Netherlands indicated that assertion of jurisdiction would depend on the offender’s nationality. In Peru it was required that the offence intended to be committed on Peruvian territory represent a threat to public security and peace.

35. While, as seen above, establishment of jurisdiction over offences committed abroad by nationals is in principle optional, there is a situation described in article 15, paragraph 3, where such establishment becomes mandatory, namely, when a national has committed an offence abroad and a State party does not extradite him or her solely on the ground that he or she is one of its nationals. Establishment of jurisdiction by the State of nationality is required in such a case to give effect to paragraph 10 of article 16 (extradition), which obliges a State party when it refuses extradition on the ground of nationality to submit the case without undue delay to its competent authorities for the purpose of prosecution (the principle of *aut dedere aut judicare*).

36. Almost all States confirmed that they could establish jurisdiction in such a case, some of them noting that they had in any event no bar on the extradition of nationals. The States that had reported in answer to the question on optional establishment of jurisdiction over nationals that they had not established jurisdiction over offences committed abroad by nationals (Canada, Philippines and South Africa) confirmed that position, stating, however, that nationality was in their legal system no obstacle to extradition. Conversely, it appears that all States that do not extradite nationals are able to assert jurisdiction pursuant to article 15, paragraph 3, in accordance with the requirement of *aut dedere aut judicare* (see paras. 64-66 below).

37. If extradition is refused on grounds other than nationality, there is no obligation to establish jurisdiction. Such a case constitutes an optional ground for the establishment of extraterritorial jurisdiction. Most responding States reported that jurisdiction could be asserted when an offender was not extradited, in cases such as lack of guarantee of due process, fear of discrimination or penalty contrary to the public order of the requested State. Some States reported that jurisdiction could be established only to cover serious crimes: crimes liable to more than five years' imprisonment (France); genocide, war crimes and treason (South Africa); terrorism (Mexico, under a draft law); and crimes against State security (Morocco).

38. On the question of whether article 15 would also apply to offences covered by the two supplementary Protocols in force at the time of distribution of the questionnaire, most responding States reported that rules of jurisdiction were of a general nature, thus applying to all offences established under domestic legislation, including those established pursuant to the Protocols. Angola, Barbados, the Czech Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania (not yet parties to the Protocols or to the Convention), Costa Rica and Jamaica reported that article 15 was not yet applicable to offences under the Protocols. Referring to its reply to the question on predicate offences to money-laundering (see para. 12 above) Mauritius reiterated that some of the offences established under the Protocols had not yet been criminalized under its domestic law.

#### **6. Liability of legal persons (art. 10)**

39. Article 10 requires that States parties adopt such measures as may be necessary to establish the liability of legal persons for participation in serious crimes involving an organized criminal group and for the offences established in accordance with articles 5 (participation in an organized criminal group), 6 (money-laundering), 8 (corruption) and 23 (obstruction of justice), as well as for the offences established pursuant to the supplementary Protocols. The obligation to provide for the liability of legal entities is mandatory, to the extent that this is consistent with each State's legal principles. There is no obligation however to establish criminal liability. Civil or administrative forms of liability are sufficient to meet the requirement. States parties have an obligation to provide for effective, proportionate and dissuasive sanctions.

40. Of the responding States, nine parties (Belarus, Ecuador, Finland, Latvia, Mexico, Myanmar, Namibia, Senegal and Ukraine) and one signatory (Czech Republic) reported that liability of legal persons was not established under their domestic law. However, Senegal specified that liability of legal persons could be inferred from specific texts and Mexico reported that while liability of legal persons was established under its domestic law, the relevant provisions were not being implemented due to a lack of procedures to give effect to it. The Czech Republic, Latvia and Namibia indicated that adequate legislation had not yet been adopted on the matter. Myanmar reported that legislation addressing liability of legal persons for corruption offences was contemplated. Ireland stated that additional legislation was necessary and that work was being carried out in relation to this measure in order to complete the ratification process. It should be noted that Belarus had addressed the issue of liability of legal persons in a reservation formulated when becoming a party to the Convention, to the effect that it would implement article 10

to the extent that this did not contravene national legislation. Serbia<sup>10</sup> indicated that a draft law including both administrative and criminal forms of liability had been prepared.

41. Fifteen States parties (Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Germany, Kazakhstan, Peru, Russian Federation, Slovakia and Uzbekistan) and three signatories (Angola, Congo and Greece) indicated that they had not established criminal liability of legal persons. However, either civil (Central African Republic, Costa Rica and Uzbekistan) or administrative (Bulgaria and Germany) or both civil and administrative (Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Benin, Brazil, Cambodia, Congo, Ecuador, Greece, Kazakhstan, Peru, Russian Federation and Slovakia) forms of liability had been established. Slovakia reported that criminal liability of legal persons would be included in the new penal code. It should also be noted that, upon becoming a party to the Convention, Ecuador had entered a reservation to the effect that criminal liability of legal persons was not embodied in Ecuadorian legislation and that the reservation would be withdrawn when legislation progressed in that area. Uzbekistan had also declared that its legislation did not provide for criminal or administrative liability in respect of legal persons.

42. Most States reported having established criminal liability of legal persons, either as the only form of liability (12 States) or together with civil or administrative forms of liability (or both).

43. As regards sanctions, fines were most frequently reported either as criminal sanctions (e.g. Afghanistan, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Guinea, Jamaica, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mauritius, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland) or as civil or administrative sanctions (Bulgaria, Central African Republic, Congo, Germany and Greece). A number of States reported that, in the framework of their civil liability, legal persons could be sentenced to the payment of damages and compensation for losses (China (mainland), Comoros, Costa Rica, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Mali, Mauritius, Philippines and South Africa). Other sanctions reported included confiscation of assets and of instruments used in the commission of the offence (Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Estonia, France, Morocco and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), dissolution of the legal person (Angola, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cape Verde, Croatia, Djibouti, France, Lithuania, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Peru, Portugal, Slovenia and Spain), prohibition to carry out certain activities on a temporary or definitive basis (Angola, Belgium, France, Lithuania, Mauritius, Peru, Spain and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), withdrawal of licences (Angola, Greece and Tunisia), closure of premises used in the commission of the offence (Belgium, Brazil, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, France, Morocco, Netherlands and Peru), prohibition to conclude contracts with the State and barring from public procurement (France and South Africa), barring from using cheques (France), placement under judicial scrutiny for a period of five years (France) and publication of the sanction imposed in the media (Canada, France and Portugal). Seven States (Bahrain, Burundi, China, Cyprus, Mali, Mauritius and Philippines) indicated among the sanctions available the deprivation of liberty for

---

<sup>10</sup> From 3 June 2006, the membership of Serbia and Montenegro in the United Nations was continued by Serbia.

officers of the legal person, which could be understood in the context of paragraph 3 of article 10, which indicates that liability of legal persons shall be without prejudice to the criminal liability of natural persons who have committed the offences.

44. Regarding the scope of application of article 10, responses seem to indicate that some respondents contemplated application of the liability of legal persons mainly or exclusively in the context of bribery and money-laundering offences (implied in replies from China (Macao Special Administrative Region) El Salvador, Estonia, Finland and Turkey). Responding to a question on application of article 10 in the context of offences established under the Protocols, most responding States indicated that legal persons could be liable to any offence established under national legislation.

## **7. Confiscation and seizure (art. 12)**

45. Almost all responding States reported that their domestic legislation enabled, as required by article 12, the confiscation of proceeds of crime derived from offences covered by the Convention (para. 1 (a)), property, equipment or other instrumentalities used in or destined for use in such offences (para. 1 (b)), proceeds of crime transformed or converted into other property (para. 3), proceeds of crime intermingled with legitimately obtained property (para. 4) and income or other benefits derived from any of the above-mentioned proceeds or property (para. 5).

46. Ecuador indicated that confiscation was only available in relation to proceeds derived from drug trafficking offences and acknowledged the need for upgrading of its legislation to cover the broad range of crimes provided for under the Convention. Jamaica reported that only property, equipment or other instrumentalities used in or destined for use in offences and income and other benefits could be confiscated and indicated that there was a draft bill on the confiscation of other proceeds of crime. Angola reported that confiscation of proceeds of crimes under its domestic legislation was only provided for in the case where the proceeds of crime would be used as evidence in a trial. It should be mentioned at this point that, on the question of whether confiscation was also available for proceeds derived from offences established under the Protocols, responding States generally reported that rules on confiscation were general rules applicable with respect to the proceeds of any criminal offence.<sup>11</sup> It should be noted in this respect that an “all-crimes” approach facilitates the provision of international cooperation as regards search, seizure and confiscation as well as the establishment of evidence.

47. Barbados and New Zealand reported that their legislation did not enable the confiscation of property, equipment or other instrumentalities used in or destined for use in offences.

<sup>11</sup> Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Madagascar, Malaysia (only in the case of drug offences), Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland (in the case of a criminal group), Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and Uzbekistan.

48. Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador and Mexico indicated that proceeds of crime intermingled with legitimately obtained property could not be confiscated. Mexico explained in this connection that its confiscation system did not allow for value-based confiscation. A reform of the code of penal procedure was in process, however, and would remedy the situation. Value-based confiscation allows the confiscation of property that represents the assessed value of gains derived from the offence. It is provided for under paragraph 1 (a) as an alternative to the confiscation of proceeds of crime (“or property the value of which corresponds to that of such proceeds”). This may prove useful in various circumstances as for instance when the tainted proceeds to be confiscated cannot be located, have been removed from the jurisdiction or have been rendered worthless. A form of value-based confiscation must in any event be made available to deal with proceeds intermingled with property acquired from legitimate sources.

49. Angola, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Lithuania and the Russian Federation stated that income or other benefits could not be confiscated in the same manner as the proceeds or property from which they derived. It should be noted in this regard that proceeds and property liable to confiscation will frequently be deployed so as to produce income and other benefits (e.g. illicit profits placed on deposit or invested in shares on which dividends are paid). While it may be argued that these benefits derive from lawful transactions, paragraph 5 of article 12 aims at ensuring that offenders do not keep the benefit of their use of illicit proceeds.

50. On the question of whether their domestic legislation enabled, for the purpose of eventual confiscation, the identification, tracing, freezing or seizure of items liable to confiscation, all responding States reported that their legislation was in compliance with this requirement, except for Angola, Ecuador and Mexico, which reiterated, *mutatis mutandis*, the position indicated on the question of confiscation (see paras. 45 and 47 above). Angola indicated that the identification, tracing, freezing or seizure of items was only possible in relation to confiscation pronounced as an accessory sanction. Jamaica reported that its domestic legislation permitted the identification, tracing, freezing or seizure of items liable to confiscation, but only in cases involving drug-related offences. The Czech Republic provided a detailed description of the involvement of police and judicial authorities in the detection, tracing and freezing of proceeds of crime. Croatia explained that special attention was being paid to financial investigations and freezing assets.

51. All responding States except Angola and Jamaica confirmed that their domestic legislation permitted access by their competent authorities to bank, financial or commercial records for the investigation and prosecution of offences covered by the Convention, as well as for securing confiscation. Jamaica indicated that access to bank, financial or commercial records was not yet allowed by its domestic legislation; however, a draft bill was being considered. The power for courts and other competent authorities to secure production or to order the seizure of bank, financial or commercial records must, under article 12, be available not only in the context of domestic confiscation but also in the context of confiscation pursuant to a request under article 13, on international confiscation. Such power implies that appropriate exceptions are made to the principle of bank secrecy. It should be noted that, responding to a question on bank secrecy in the context of article 18 (mutual legal assistance), a few States indicated that bank secrecy could be a ground for declining the granting of mutual legal assistance (see paras. 80

and 81 below). That position is likely also to have an impact on compliance with obligations under article 12 as far as they extend to international confiscation.

52. Paragraph 7 of article 12 draws the attention of States parties to the reversal of the burden of proof in respect of the lawful origin of proceeds, an approach that eases the difficulty for law enforcement authorities to prove that assets are derived from crime by establishing a presumption to that effect and leaving it to the offender to rebut the presumption. Paragraph 7 imposes no obligation on parties and emphasizes that any application of this measure must be consistent with the principles of each State party's domestic law and with the nature of its judicial and other proceedings. Of the responding States, 45<sup>11</sup> reported that their legislation permitted such shifting of the burden of proof, and 47<sup>12</sup> reported that this was not permitted under their domestic law. Serbia<sup>10</sup> indicated that a draft law had been submitted to Parliament to allow shifting the burden of proof.

53. It should be mentioned finally that a few States referred in their replies to the punitive nature of confiscation. France indicated that confiscation was available as a complementary penalty for certain offences established under the Convention and the Protocols, such as the offence of trafficking in persons. Latvia noted that under its domestic law confiscation was a penalty irrespective of the licit or illicit origin of property. On the contrary, Uzbekistan, in a declaration formulated when becoming a party to the Convention, had stated that confiscation of property as a form of punishment had been removed from its criminal code.

## **B. International cooperation requirements**

### **1. Extradition (art. 16)**

54. Article 16 recognizes the existence of distinct traditions in the field of extradition law and practice. States parties may make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty relationship between the requesting and requested States or may make provision in their domestic law to permit extradition even in the absence of an applicable treaty. Paragraph 4 of article 16 provides that parties that do make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty have an option to consider the Convention as the legal basis for extradition with other parties to the Convention.

55. Of the responding States, 88 indicated that they required a treaty basis to grant extradition. Fourteen of them (Angola, Congo, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Malaysia,<sup>13</sup> Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Poland, Portugal, Ukraine and United States) indicated that they would not consider the Convention the legal basis for

<sup>12</sup> Angola, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China (Macao Special Administrative Region (SAR)), Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Iceland, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Latvia (which indicated that such a measure was however provided for under a new draft criminal procedure law), Lithuania, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Ukraine and United States of America.

<sup>13</sup> Malaysia stated in a notification made upon becoming party to the Convention that it would render extradition on the legal basis provided by its Extradition Act of 1992 (see CTOC/COP/2005/7, para. 125).

extradition, while all the others reported that they would consider the Convention as meeting their requirement for a treaty basis when responding to extradition requests from other States parties.<sup>14</sup>

56. Twenty-nine States<sup>15</sup> indicated that they did not make the provision of extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty.<sup>16</sup> They either reported that they did not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty relationship or did not clearly state whether they required a treaty basis, indicating nonetheless that they would take the Convention as a legal basis to grant extradition. Thus, approximately a third of States declared that they would consider the Convention a basis to grant extradition. It should be noted that those States which require a treaty basis and do not take the Convention as the legal basis for extradition have an obligation under paragraph 5 of article 16 to seek to conclude treaties on extradition with other parties in order to strengthen international cooperation in criminal matters as a stated purpose of the Convention.

57. Among the parties to the Convention that responded to the questionnaire, Honduras and Myanmar reported extensive restrictions on the provision of extradition: Honduras indicated that extradition was not provided for under its legal system, while Myanmar<sup>17</sup> reported that extradition was not granted on the basis of extradition treaties nor on the basis of a domestic extradition law, but was afforded on the basis of reciprocity on a case-by-case basis.

58. Paragraph 3 of article 16 establishes an obligation for States parties to consider the offences to which article 16 applies extraditable offences under any treaty already existing between them and to include them in every treaty to be concluded in the future. An obligation to the same effect – to ensure that offences under article 16 are treated as extraditable offences between parties – also applies under paragraph 6 to parties whose legislation permits extradition without a treaty.

59. A number of reporting States indicated in that regard that extradition treaties concluded by them or domestic extradition law (or both, in cases where both define extraditable offences) did not adopt the approach of specifically listing offences that

---

<sup>14</sup> In addition to the States responding to the questionnaire, a number of States have stated their position on this issue in notifications made upon becoming parties to the Convention: Armenia, Belize, Malawi, Panama, Paraguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) stated that they would take the Convention as a basis for extradition, while Botswana, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lesotho indicated they would not (see CTOC/COP/2005/7, paras. 96-150).

<sup>15</sup> Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Estonia, Kuwait, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, New Zealand, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Turkey. (From 3 June 2006, the membership of Serbia and Montenegro in the United Nations was continued by Serbia. The response to the questionnaire on the implementation of the Convention for the first reporting cycle was submitted to the Secretariat before that development and reflected the position of the former Serbia and Montenegro.)

<sup>16</sup> In addition to the States responding to the questionnaire, a number of States have formulated the same position – not requiring a treaty basis to grant extradition – in notifications made upon becoming parties (see the notifications from Chile, Costa Rica and Slovakia in CTOC/COP/2005/7, paras. 110, 112 and 140).

<sup>17</sup> Upon becoming a party to the Convention, Myanmar had made a reservation to the effect that it did not consider itself bound by article 16.

were considered extraditable but defined them in terms of severity of punishment. This is the approach recommended in article 2 of the Model Treaty on Extradition adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 45/116 of 14 December 1990. Given the nature of the offences covered by the Convention and taking into account various provisions, for instance under articles 10 and 11, designed to ensure that they attract appropriately severe sanctions, it can be assumed that the offences required to be considered extraditable offences under article 16 will be covered under the “threshold-of-penalty” approach.

60. On a related matter, paragraph 7 of article 16 provides that extradition shall be subject to the conditions provided for by the domestic law of the requested State party or by applicable extradition treaties, including, inter alia, conditions related to the minimum penalty requirement. Many responding States<sup>18</sup> indicated that extradition could be granted for offences punishable by imprisonment or other deprivation of liberty of not less than 12 months or a more severe penalty. Other thresholds of punishment were also reported by Tunisia (two months), South Africa (6 months) and Algeria, Canada, the Central African Republic, Greece and Romania (two years). A period of at least four months to be served was further identified as the relevant threshold where extradition was requested for the enforcement of a sentence (Estonia, Iceland, Latvia, Sweden and United Kingdom). Other options in the latter case were reported by Algeria (two months), Egypt and Namibia (six months) and Greece and Romania (one year). A number of States made reference to provisions of their domestic legislation enabling accessory extradition and surrender of a person sought for lesser offences (Egypt, Jamaica, Latvia and Sweden).

61. Article 16, when defining in paragraph 1 its scope of application with respect to offences covered under the Convention, makes provision for the principle of dual criminality, that is, the requirement that the offence for which extradition is sought be punishable under the domestic law of both the requesting and the requested parties.<sup>19</sup> All responding States except Afghanistan, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras and Peru confirmed that they required dual criminality for the granting of an extradition request. A number of member States of the European Union referred to exceptions to the dual criminality requirement in the area of application of the European arrest warrant. Romania indicated that new domestic legislation had introduced some amount of flexibility, as it provided that dual criminality would not

---

<sup>18</sup> Including, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, China, Croatia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Indonesia, Latvia, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and United Kingdom.

<sup>19</sup> It should be noted that article 43 (international cooperation) of the United Nations Convention against Corruption provides that, whenever dual criminality is considered a requirement, it should be deemed fulfilled irrespective of whether the offence is placed within the same category or denominated with the same terminology, as long as the conduct underlying the offence is a criminal offence under the laws of both the requested and requesting States. Article 44 (extradition) of the same Convention provides that a State party whose law so permits may grant the extradition of a person for any of the offences covered by the Convention that are not punishable under its own domestic law. The flexibility introduced in the Convention against Corruption can be taken to reflect modern international practice with regard to the dual criminality requirement.

be required to grant extradition if so stipulated under an international treaty to which Romania was a party.

62. Besides refusal on the ground of absence of dual criminality, article 16 provides that grounds upon which the requested State party may refuse extradition are defined by the domestic law of that party or by applicable extradition treaties. Responses received provided an overview of such grounds for refusal, which may be either mandatory or optional, under the relevant legislation or treaties. They included reference to political offences;<sup>20</sup> crimes against security, public order or other essential interest;<sup>21</sup> conflict with general principles of the law of the requested State;<sup>22</sup> a discrimination clause;<sup>23</sup> military offences;<sup>24</sup> *ne bis in idem*/double jeopardy;<sup>25</sup> amnesty, statute of limitation or other immunity from prosecution;<sup>26</sup> jurisdiction of the requested State;<sup>27</sup> extraterritoriality;<sup>28</sup> pending prosecution or proceedings (at least until completion of such proceedings) in the requested State;<sup>29</sup> serving a sentence at least until after expiration of the sentence;<sup>30</sup> humanitarian considerations;<sup>31</sup> anticipated torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment in the requesting State;<sup>32</sup> death penalty, especially in case of lack of assurances of non-execution;<sup>33</sup> political asylum for the person sought;<sup>34</sup> lack of fair trial assurances in the requesting State;<sup>35</sup> envisaged judgement by a special court in the requesting State;<sup>36</sup> and jurisdiction immunity in accordance with applicable international agreements.<sup>37</sup> Some countries mentioned that grounds for refusing extradition were specified in applicable bilateral or multilateral extradition

<sup>20</sup> Algeria, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Central African Republic, China (mainland), Congo, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Namibia, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey and United Republic of Tanzania.

<sup>21</sup> Estonia, Mauritius and Turkey.

<sup>22</sup> Costa Rica, Ecuador, Estonia and Germany.

<sup>23</sup> Australia, Burundi, China (mainland), Ecuador, Estonia, Indonesia, Latvia, Mauritius, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Sweden and Turkey. See also article 16, paragraph 14, of the Convention.

<sup>24</sup> Bulgaria, China (mainland), Congo, Finland, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Mauritius, Mexico, Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and United Republic of Tanzania.

<sup>25</sup> China (mainland), El Salvador, Estonia, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Sweden and Ukraine.

<sup>26</sup> Australia, Austria, Brazil, China (mainland), Mexico, El Salvador, Estonia, Latvia, Namibia, Russian Federation, Sweden, Turkey and Ukraine.

<sup>27</sup> Austria, Brazil, China (mainland), Indonesia, Latvia, Mexico, Russian Federation and Turkey.

<sup>28</sup> Covering cases where the exercise of the jurisdiction of the requesting State was viewed as being overly broad (Brazil).

<sup>29</sup> Estonia, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Nigeria, Russian Federation and Sweden. It should be noted that this ground could lead to postponement of extradition instead of denial until the completion of the relevant proceedings in the requested State.

<sup>30</sup> Indonesia, Nigeria and United Republic of Tanzania.

<sup>31</sup> Especially in view of the age, health or condition of the person sought (Austria, China, Iceland, Sweden, Romania and Ukraine).

<sup>32</sup> Australia, China (mainland), Latvia, South Africa and Switzerland.

<sup>33</sup> Angola, Australia, Costa Rica, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Namibia, South Africa and Switzerland.

<sup>34</sup> Romania and Ukraine.

<sup>35</sup> China (mainland), Costa Rica, Finland, Latvia, Sweden and United Republic of Tanzania.

<sup>36</sup> Bulgaria.

<sup>37</sup> Romania.

treaties (Belarus, Czech Republic, Ukraine and United States) or regional instruments, such as the European Convention on Extradition<sup>38</sup> (Netherlands and Turkey) or European Union framework decision 2002/584/JHA of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant (Estonia and Malta).

63. Paragraph 15 of article 16 addresses the issue of the fiscal offence as a ground for refusal by providing that States parties may not refuse a request for extradition on the sole ground that the offence is also considered to involve fiscal matters. Seventy-one responding States reported that their domestic legal framework permitted extradition for offences involving fiscal matters, while 14 States<sup>39</sup> indicated that extradition was not permitted in such cases.

64. The issue of the refusal of extradition on the ground of nationality is addressed in paragraph 10 of article 16, which reflects the principle of *aut dedere aut judicare*, as well as in paragraphs 11 and 12, on, respectively, conditional surrender of nationals and enforcement of sentences imposed on nationals by a requesting State.

65. Fifty<sup>40</sup> responding States reported that their domestic legal framework did not permit the extradition of nationals, some of them emphasizing that the prohibition of extradition of nationals was enshrined in their constitution. Thirty-six States<sup>41</sup> indicated that they were able to extradite their nationals. Some other States provided that the extradition of nationals was restricted to certain circumstances: a number of European States<sup>42</sup> indicated that their nationals could only be extradited to other European Union member States under the European arrest warrant mechanism. Latvia and Romania referred to the requirement for adequate human rights safeguards from the requesting State as well as to the existence of a treaty relationship under which the extradition of nationals was required. Namibia reported that its Ministry of Justice had to authorize extradition of a national.

66. Paragraph 10 of article 16 requires a State party that has denied extradition of a person on the ground of nationality to submit the case to its competent authorities for the purpose of prosecution. All of the responding States except Honduras that do not extradite their nationals or that set restrictive conditions to the extradition of nationals reported that they were able to establish their jurisdiction on offences

<sup>38</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 359, No. 5146.

<sup>39</sup> Twelve parties (Cambodia, Central African Republic, Comoros, Honduras, Latvia, Madagascar, Morocco, Myanmar, New Zealand, Paraguay, Philippines and Switzerland), one signatory (Indonesia) and one non-signatory (Chad).

<sup>40</sup> Algeria, Angola, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China (mainland), Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mali, Moldova, Morocco, Myanmar, Niger, Poland, the Russian Federation, Sao Tome and Principe, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

<sup>41</sup> Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Canada, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Guatemala, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania and United States.

<sup>42</sup> The Czech Republic, France, Iceland and Sweden (whose nationals may also be extradited to the Nordic countries). Romania also mentioned extradition to member States of the European Union among the circumstances in which extradition of nationals was allowed.

committed by their nationals abroad, pursuant to paragraph 3 of article 15 (see also comments in para. 36 above) and paragraph 10 of article 16, in accordance with the principle of *aut dedere aut judicare*.

67. Under paragraph 10, the obligation for a State that has denied extradition of a person on the ground of nationality to submit the case to its competent authorities is triggered by a request to that effect from the party seeking extradition. A number of States provided information on the procedure they would use to effect such a request: Switzerland, for instance, indicated that it proceeded through a delegation of penal prosecution to the State that had refused extradition. France and Morocco would, under their respective law on penal procedure, formulate an official denunciation. Belgium indicated that its domestic law did not provide for any specific procedure but that there was no obstacle to the formulation of such a request, which indeed was provided for under various treaties to which Belgium was a party. Many reporting States also confirmed that they would afford assistance to a State that had refused extradition in order to ensure that effective prosecutorial action could be carried out. Such assistance would follow the procedural regime of mutual legal assistance applying in particular to the provision of evidence or would take the form of a transfer of criminal proceedings. It should be noted in this respect that article 21 encourages States parties to consider transferring to one another proceedings for the prosecution of an offence in cases where such transfer is considered to be in the interests of the proper administration of justice.

68. Paragraph 11 of article 16 provides States that cannot extradite their nationals with another alternative: they may temporarily surrender their national to the State requesting extradition for the sole purpose of conducting the trial. The person would thereafter be returned to his or her State of nationality to serve the sentence imposed as a result of the trial or proceedings for which extradition was sought. Thirty-eight responding States reported that conditional surrender was available in their country, a number of them indicating that the mechanism was provided for under various bilateral treaties to which they were parties. Some European States indicated that the provisional surrender of nationals was only possible in the framework of the European arrest warrant. Another 38 States indicated that conditional surrender was not available in their country.

69. Paragraph 12 further addresses the situation where a State party has denied the extradition of one of its nationals. When extradition is sought for the purpose of enforcing a sentence, a State party that denies extradition is required, to the extent permitted by its domestic law and upon application of the requesting State party, to consider enforcing the sentence imposed by the requesting party. Of the responding States, 31 indicated that provisions of their code of criminal procedure or bilateral or international treaties to which they were parties enabled them to recognize and enforce foreign criminal judgements. Twenty-three States indicated that they were not able to enforce on their nationals sentences imposed abroad.

70. Paragraph 8 of article 16 provides the obligation for parties, subject to their domestic law, to endeavour to expedite extradition procedures. On the question of whether they were able in certain cases to expedite extradition, most States indicated that a summary or simplified procedure was available when the individual concerned did not intend to contest the extradition. Some provided information on guarantees of the rights of the defendant provided for under their law: the individual had to be fully informed of his/her rights and aware of the consequences and to

express consent in writing. Some European States reported that a simplified procedure was available between the member States of the European Union. Twenty-three States<sup>43</sup> indicated that no simplified extradition procedure was available in their country.

71. As regards simplification of evidentiary requirements also required under paragraph 8, subject to (each State party's) domestic law, 28 States indicated that their domestic legislative framework did not provide for specific evidentiary requirements, while 47 reported that the granting of an extradition request was subject to evidentiary requirements. A number of them (Canada, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Namibia and Peru) referred specifically to the need for prima facie evidence to support the request. The requirement to provide the courts of the requested State with adequate evidence of the guilt of the accused before extradition can take place has proved burdensome, in particular to countries with a civil law tradition seeking assistance from common law countries. The Convention therefore encourages States parties to simplify such requirements.

72. On the question of whether they were able to apply article 16 of the Convention in the case of offences covered by the two Protocols in force at the time of dissemination of the questionnaire, a number of States not yet parties to the Convention and/or to the Protocols (Afghanistan, Angola, Barbados, Burundi, Czech Republic and Indonesia) but also some States parties to the Convention as well as to the Protocols (Ecuador, Jamaica, Mauritius, Namibia, Niger, Philippines and South Africa) indicated that offences established under the Protocols were not yet criminalized in their domestic law and therefore that the dual criminality required for extradition to be granted would not be met. The same comments were made, *mutatis mutandis*, with respect to the granting of mutual legal assistance requests.

## 2. Mutual legal assistance (art. 18)

73. Article 18 requires States parties to afford one another the widest measure of mutual legal assistance in investigations, prosecutions and judicial proceedings in relation to offences covered by the Convention.

74. Most of the responding States reported having in place domestic legislation on mutual legal assistance.<sup>44</sup> All of the responding States except Iceland indicated that they were parties to bilateral or in some cases multilateral treaties and arrangements on mutual legal assistance. Many also reported that reciprocity or comity was a basis on which mutual legal assistance could be granted.

75. Paragraph 7 of article 18 provides that a set of detailed provisions included in paragraphs 9-29 apply in the absence of another treaty relationship between the parties concerned. Those provisions may also apply between parties bound by a treaty of mutual legal assistance in lieu thereof, if they so decide and in particular if such application facilitates cooperation. These provisions deal with matters such as grounds for refusal of assistance, modalities for the transfer of detainees to provide

<sup>43</sup> Angola, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cambodia, Central African Republic, China, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Kazakhstan, Myanmar, Nigeria, the Russian Federation, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania and Uzbekistan.

<sup>44</sup> Ten States reported that they did not have such legislation: Angola, Brazil, Cambodia, Egypt, Indonesia, Kuwait, Mexico, Peru, Turkey and Ukraine.

evidence, channels of communication of requests, form and contents of requests and limitations on the use of information provided.

76. Most of the responding States confirmed that they would be able to apply the provisions of article 18 of the Convention, including paragraphs 9-29, in order to provide mutual legal assistance to parties to the Convention with which they were not bound by a mutual legal assistance treaty. Eleven States<sup>45</sup> indicated that they would not be able to do so, however. Those parties which are not in a position to afford mutual legal assistance to other parties with which they have not concluded a mutual legal assistance treaty will need to ensure that the gap is remedied, as the Convention is mandatory on this point. If their legal system does not permit direct application of the Convention's provisions, they may need to adopt enabling legislation to ensure that, in the absence of a mutual legal assistance treaty, paragraphs 9-29 apply to requests made under the Convention.

77. Article 18, paragraph 3, lists the purposes for which mutual legal assistance may be requested. It constitutes a basic minimum list and does not exclude other types of assistance that are not contrary to the domestic law of the requested State. Most of the responding States reported being able to provide all types of assistance listed in paragraph 3. Angola indicated that it could not provide any of these types of assistance. Namibia, however, indicated that it was not in a position to provide information, evidentiary items and expert evaluations (para. 3 (e)) nor to provide originals or certified copies of relevant documents and records, including Government, bank, financial, corporate and business records (para. 3 (f)). In an answer to a further question, Namibia indicated that bank secrecy was not an obstacle to the provision of mutual legal assistance. Kazakhstan reported that it could provide all types of assistance except for the identification or tracing of the proceeds of crime, property, instrumentalities or other things for evidentiary purposes (para. 3 (g)). Azerbaijan indicated that it would not be able to facilitate the voluntary appearance of persons in a requesting State party (para. 3 (h)). This type of assistance may indeed involve complex situations where a person serving a sentence in the requested State is required as a witness in the requesting State. Parties should nevertheless ensure that provision is made under their domestic law and practice to enable them to afford all the types of assistance enumerated in paragraph 3.

78. An additional and less traditional type of assistance is dealt with under paragraph 18 of article 18. States parties are required, subject to the fundamental principles of their domestic law, to permit the hearing of individuals present in their territory and whose testimony or expert evaluation is required in the requesting State to take place by videoconference. While a majority of the responding States reported that they could permit hearings by videoconference to take place, in accordance with paragraph 18, several States<sup>46</sup> indicated that they were not in a position to do so.

79. Responding States further provided an overview of the kind of information that their legal framework (domestic legislation and/or applicable bilateral or

---

<sup>45</sup> Nine parties (Azerbaijan, Ecuador, Honduras, Madagascar, Namibia, Nigeria, Spain, Togo and United Republic of Tanzania) and two signatories (Angola and Congo).

<sup>46</sup> For example: Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Brazil, China (including Macao SAR), Cyprus, Greece, Mali, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines and Ukraine.

multilateral treaties) required for inclusion in mutual legal assistance requests. Most States reported that, in accordance with paragraph 15 of article 18, the minimum information requirements included the identification of the authority requesting assistance, the type and nature of the assistance requested, the description and legal classification of the relevant facts, as well as the purpose of the assistance sought in conjunction with the subject and nature of the proceedings in the requesting State to which the request related. References to confidentiality assurances, where necessary, and time limits for the provision of assistance were also reported. Moreover, many States pointed out that the specification of any additional information to be included in a mutual legal assistance request was subject to the type of assistance sought.

80. Paragraph 8 of article 18 deals with the refusal of mutual legal assistance on the ground of bank secrecy. This is of particular relevance to the provision of bank and financial records and to the identification and tracing of proceeds of crime for evidentiary purposes under article 18, paragraphs 3 (f) and 3 (g), respectively. It is also crucial for the provision of assistance pursuant to article 13, paragraph 3, on international cooperation for purposes of confiscation, to which the provisions of article 18 are applicable *mutatis mutandis*.

81. Of the responding States, most reported that bank secrecy could not be raised to oppose a request by judicial or other competent authorities and was not by itself an obstacle to the provision of assistance. Germany specifically indicated that bank secrecy did not exist in German criminal law. The Congo clarified that bank secrecy could not be raised to oppose a request by judicial or other competent authorities as it was contrary to the regulation on money-laundering of Central African Economic and Monetary Community and to the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption. Algeria, Belarus, Cambodia, Chad, El Salvador, Italy, Jamaica and Togo, however, indicated that bank secrecy was a ground for refusal of assistance under their domestic legal framework. As paragraph 8 includes an unqualified prohibition on denial of mutual legal assistance on the ground of bank secrecy, States parties whose domestic legislation currently permits such ground for refusal should enact amending legislation to remedy this. Parties that do not provide for the direct application of treaties should adopt appropriate domestic legislation to that effect.

82. Paragraph 9 of article 18 provides that the absence of dual criminality may be a ground for refusing the provision of mutual legal assistance. It emphasizes, however, that States parties may, at their own discretion, provide mutual legal assistance in the absence of dual criminality. This paragraph provides for flexibility in the application of the dual criminality requirement and thus differs from the formulation of article 16 on extradition. This is justified by the fact that in most cases provision of mutual legal assistance does not involve the direct deprivation of a person's liberty, while extradition does. While most responding States had reported that they required the presence of dual criminality in order to grant an extradition request (see para. 61 above), 44 States<sup>47</sup> reported that dual criminality

---

<sup>47</sup> Algeria, Argentina, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Italy, Jamaica, Latvia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, Sao Tome and Principe, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and United States.

was not a requirement in granting mutual legal assistance. In addition, eight States (Ecuador, Finland, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom) indicated that dual criminality was only required when coercive measures, such as seizures and confiscations, were involved.<sup>48</sup> The other responding States reported that dual criminality was required under their domestic legal framework for the application of article 18.

83. Besides absence of dual criminality, there are a number of grounds enumerated in paragraph 21 on which assistance may be refused. Responding States, reporting on grounds for refusal, either mandatory or optional, provided for in their domestic legal framework, referred inter alia to prejudice of sovereignty, security, *ordre public* or other essential interests;<sup>49</sup> contradiction of the basic principles of the law of the requested State;<sup>50</sup> political offences;<sup>51</sup> military offences;<sup>52</sup> discrimination clause;<sup>53</sup> *ne bis in idem*/double jeopardy;<sup>54</sup> death penalty (Belgium, Netherlands and Portugal); incompatibility of foreign procedure with international standards (Switzerland); violation of human rights obligations (United Kingdom); humanitarian considerations (Romania); ad hoc or extraordinary court or tribunal (Ecuador and Portugal); lack of reciprocity (Burundi and Tunisia); failure to request assistance on the basis of the applicable treaty (Czech Republic, Greece, Malaysia, Philippines and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); insufficiency of information (Latvia); relevant criminal proceedings in the requested State (Romania, South Africa and Uzbekistan), especially in cases of seizure and transfer of assets or property necessary for conducting such proceedings (Czech Republic); and violation of confidentiality (Austria).

84. A number of the above grounds for refusal are not referred to in paragraph 21 of article 18. They appear to have been carried over from extradition treaties, legislation and practice. In view of the fact that some of the conditions and limits set to extradition may not be applicable in the context of mutual legal assistance, States parties may wish to consider reviewing existing grounds for refusal in order to achieve the appropriate balance between the protection of national interests and fundamental principles and ensuring that the widest measure of assistance can be granted. In particular they may wish to direct their attention to the possibility of reducing the number of mandatory grounds for refusal.

<sup>48</sup> This position is similar to that reflected in the United Nations Convention against Corruption, article 46 (mutual legal assistance), paragraph 9 (b) of which states:

“States Parties may decline to render assistance (...) on the ground of absence of dual criminality. However, a requested State Party shall, where consistent with the basic concepts of its legal system, render assistance that does not involve coercive action.”

<sup>49</sup> Algeria, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, China (including Macao SAR), Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Indonesia, Latvia, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, New Zealand, Philippines, Poland, Russian Federation and Sweden.

<sup>50</sup> Belarus, China (including Macao SAR), Malaysia, Mauritius, Poland and Russian Federation.

<sup>51</sup> Australia, Chad, Central African Republic, China (including Macao SAR), Congo, Croatia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Latvia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and Ukraine.

<sup>52</sup> China (including Macao SAR), Congo, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mauritius, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden and Switzerland.

<sup>53</sup> Australia, China (including Macao SAR), Croatia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mauritius, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal and Ukraine.

<sup>54</sup> Ecuador, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Sweden and Ukraine.

85. Article 24 of the Convention, on the protection of witnesses, requires States parties to consider entering into agreements or arrangements with other States for the relocation of witnesses in criminal proceedings who give testimony concerning offences covered by the Convention. Most of the responding States reported not having concluded such agreements with other parties. Several States<sup>55</sup> reported being parties mostly within a regional framework to agreements on witness protection, including witness relocation. Some of them indicated that ad hoc bilateral arrangements needed to be concluded in each specific case.

### 3. International cooperation for purposes of confiscation (art. 13) and disposal of confiscated proceeds of crime or property (art. 14)

86. Article 13 requires States parties to give effect to requests for confiscation received from another party, to the greatest extent possible within their domestic legal system. All responding States indicated that they were able to confiscate proceeds of crime at the request of another party, with the exception of Angola, the Czech Republic, Ecuador and Jamaica, which reported that such cooperation was not provided for under its legal system. Ecuador reported that confiscation was only possible at the domestic level with regards to proceeds derived from drug trafficking. The Czech Republic, which had indicated that income and other benefits derived from proceeds of crime could not be confiscated at the domestic level (see para. 49 above), indicated that the same limitation applied in the context of foreign requests for confiscation.

87. Paragraph 1 of article 13 provides parties with an alternative to the method used to give effect to foreign confiscation requests. Parties may enforce such requests indirectly, that is, submit the request to their competent authorities for the purpose of obtaining a domestic order of confiscation, which, if granted, will be enforced (art. 13, para. 1 (a)); or they may directly enforce the foreign request, that is, submit the order of confiscation issued by a court of the requesting State to the competent domestic authorities for enforcement (art. 13, para. 1 (b)).

88. It should be noted that direct enforcement of a foreign request is a much less cumbersome and quicker process than indirect enforcement, as it dispenses with the need to litigate on the merits of the case in a second jurisdiction and overcomes obstacles associated with differences in evidentiary requirements between the requesting and requested States. With the indirect method, there is a danger that, after an order of confiscation has been obtained in the requesting State and before the requested State goes through the process of obtaining a domestic order, considerable delay will occur, thus allowing the proceeds to be placed out of the reach of confiscation.

89. On the question of whether they used the indirect or the direct enforcement method, 40 States reported using both methods of enforcement; another 33<sup>56</sup>

<sup>55</sup> In particular, Bahrain, Cambodia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Philippines, Slovakia, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania and Uzbekistan.

<sup>56</sup> Afghanistan, Argentina, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Netherlands, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and United Kingdom.

reported using the indirect enforcement method only; and 6 (Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Namibia, Tajikistan and Tunisia) reported use of the direct enforcement method only. Thus, a total of 73 States indicated using indirect enforcement (either exclusively or as an alternative to the direct method) and 46 reported using direct enforcement (either exclusively or as an alternative to the indirect method). It may be assumed that States that report using both methods use direct enforcement selectively, only for requests originating from certain States or fulfilling certain conditions. France indicated, without further explanation, that it did not use direct nor indirect enforcement methods, although it indicated its ability to confiscate proceeds of crime at the request of another State party.

90. Paragraph 2 of article 13 requires States parties to take measures to identify, trace and freeze or seize proceeds that may ultimately become liable to confiscation, at the request of another party. All responding States, subject to the exceptions below, confirmed that their competent authorities were able to take such measures in response to a foreign request. Ecuador reported that such cooperation measures were not available under its legal system. Jamaica indicated that relevant legislation had not yet been adopted. Namibia indicated that there was no provision under its relevant legislation for the identification and tracing of proceeds of crime but that the power to seize such proceeds was provided for. Angola reported that according to its domestic legislation confiscation was only possible if the confiscated proceeds could be used in the legal proceedings, as evidence, for example. The Czech Republic underlined that no such measure could be applied to income and other benefits derived from the proceeds of crime.

91. On the question of whether foreign requests made pursuant to paragraph 2 were being enforced directly or indirectly in the requested State, responses from States indicated that their approach to this option was the same as that adopted for the enforcement of confiscation requests (see para. 89 above).

92. With regard to the information required for inclusion in a request for assistance for the purposes of confiscation, most responding States confirmed that the information was similar to that needed in other mutual legal assistance requests.<sup>57</sup> Additional information needed in view of the specific nature of this form of international cooperation included a description of the criminal acts concerned; details of the property to be confiscated and its location; and the judicial decision or order for confiscation issued in the requesting State,<sup>58</sup> where such a decision or order was directly submitted to the competent authorities of the requested State for enforcement (see art. 13, paras. 1 (b) and 3 (b)). It was also reported that, in the case of a request submitted to the competent authorities for the purpose of obtaining a domestic order of confiscation, the information required would be similar to that needed for an internal procedure of confiscation. Responses further implied or highlighted the need for transmission of information on the facts of and the legal basis for the case concerned and on the type of action required in the case of submission of a request to identify, trace and freeze or seize proceeds of crime or property for the purpose of eventual confiscation.

---

<sup>57</sup> The provisions of article 18 on mutual legal assistance are applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to article 13 on international cooperation for purposes of confiscation (art. 13, para. 3).

<sup>58</sup> Conditions and requirements pertaining to the authentication and certification of such a decision or order (original or certified copy) as well as to its enforceability and finality were also reported by some States.

93. As regards grounds for refusal of cooperation for the purposes of confiscation, paragraph 7 of article 13 provides that cooperation may be refused if the offence to which the request relates is not an offence covered by the Convention. Article 13, paragraph 3, states that the provisions of article 18 (mutual legal assistance) are applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to article 13. Therefore, the grounds for refusal of a mutual legal assistance request provided for under paragraph 21 of article 18 are also relevant to the requests under article 13. Responding States reporting on grounds for refusal mostly referred to the same grounds as for other mutual legal assistance requests (see para. 82 above). Additional grounds for refusal included general notions of sovereignty and *ordre public* (Algeria and Gabon), but also the absence of reciprocity in the granting of assistance for confiscation (France and Tunisia), infringement of the rights of innocent third parties (Indonesia), absence of reliable proof (Congo), as well as cases where the confiscation order was still subject to review or appeal in the requesting State, where the defendant had not received notice of the proceedings or where the court that issued the order did not have jurisdiction over the matter (Namibia).

94. Article 14, on disposal of confiscated proceeds of crime or property, provides that when acting on the request for confiscation made by another party under article 13, States parties shall, to the extent permitted by their domestic law and if so requested, give priority consideration to returning the confiscated proceeds or property to the requesting State, so that it can give compensation to the victims of crime or return such proceeds or property to their legitimate owners. This provision reinforces the provisions of article 25, which requires States parties to establish appropriate procedures for compensation of, and restitution to, victims of offences covered by the Convention.

95. Providing information on whether such return of confiscated proceeds or property was possible under their domestic legal system, 53 States<sup>59</sup> indicated that their national legislation permitted it. Some of them<sup>60</sup> mostly referred to bilateral agreements but also to multilateral treaties,<sup>61</sup> reported that they were parties to agreements or arrangements with other States dealing with the disposal of proceeds or property confiscated upon request from another State.

---

<sup>59</sup> Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Kuwait, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States and Uzbekistan. (From 3 June 2006, the membership of Serbia and Montenegro in the United Nations was continued by Serbia. The response to the questionnaire on the implementation of the Convention for the first reporting cycle was submitted to the Secretariat before that development and reflected the position of the former Serbia and Montenegro.)

<sup>60</sup> Including Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Cyprus, Egypt, Honduras, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, Peru, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom and United States.

<sup>61</sup> Such as the 1990 Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime of the Council of Europe (art. 15 on disposal of confiscated property).

96. Sixteen States<sup>62</sup> reported having concluded agreements or arrangements dealing with the sharing of confiscated proceeds of crime in accordance with paragraph 3 (b) of article 14, which requires States parties to give special consideration to concluding agreements on sharing with other parties, on a regular or case-by-case basis, confiscated proceeds of crime or funds derived from such proceeds.<sup>63</sup>

## **C. Difficulties reported and technical assistance needs**

### **1. Difficulties reported**

97. A number of responding States reported on steps taken to adapt domestic legislation to the requirements of the Convention on the issues dealt with in the questionnaire. Some of them<sup>64</sup> indicated in general terms that the requirements of the Convention and areas where legal reform was needed were being reviewed or would be reviewed in the event of ratification. Angola reported that it was reforming its penal legislation.

98. In the area of establishing criminal offences as required by the Convention, Algeria, Ecuador, Jamaica and Morocco referred to legislative provisions on corruption that were currently being drafted or under review. Belgium indicated that the definition of criminal organization was in the process of being amended. Benin reported that several reforms had been undertaken and that a new penal code (including matters of both substantive law and procedure) was about to be adopted. Sao Tome and Principe reported that a new penal code had been approved by the National Assembly. Burundi indicated that political struggles and slow legislation procedures impeded the completion of the ratification process. In addition, legislation was currently being established or brought in conformity with the Convention in Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Comoros, the Congo, Gabon, Guinea and Togo. The Czech Republic referred more generally to strengthening relevant criminalization provisions. An amendment to the penal code, introducing the element of criminal liability of legal persons, was being considered in Latvia.

99. Afghanistan, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Indonesia, Jamaica and Morocco referred to steps taken or contemplated to upgrade their provisions on criminalization of money-laundering. The Czech Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania indicated that draft legislation on seizure and confiscation of proceeds of crime was being prepared or had been submitted to parliament. Latvia reported on amendments to the Criminal Procedure Law, which, if approved by parliament, would introduce a shift in the burden of proof in the context of confiscation.

100. Croatia referred to the possible need to review its legislation on mutual legal assistance and international confiscation to adapt it to the requirements of the Convention. Brazil reported that it was in the process of developing its international

---

<sup>62</sup> Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Cape Verde, Egypt, France, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Mali, Mauritius, Netherlands and Switzerland.

<sup>63</sup> See in this respect the recently adopted model bilateral agreement regarding the sharing of confiscated proceeds of crime or property (Economic and Social Council resolution 2005/14).

<sup>64</sup> Angola, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Iceland, Jamaica, Mauritius, Myanmar, Nigeria, United Kingdom and United Republic of Tanzania.

judicial cooperation regime and Indonesia reported that a draft law on mutual legal assistance in criminal matters was being considered by parliament. Costa Rica indicated that it might need to undertake a study on mutual legal assistance and international confiscation. Slovenia indicated that its legislation on mutual legal assistance and international confiscation was being reviewed. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia referred to draft legislation on witness protection that was under parliamentary review.

101. A number of States (Belarus, Brazil, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Latvia, Mauritius, Mexico, Myanmar and Slovakia) indicated that they were encountering obstacles in the process of adapting their national legislation to the requirements of the Convention. These were related, for example, to the adoption of controversial legal provisions, such as that on liability of legal persons (Latvia on criminal liability and Mexico on liability in general), to the constraints faced by developing countries in terms of scarce resources and inadequate staffing of the office in charge of preparing new legislation (Congo, Mauritius, Myanmar and Niger) and to a lack of support in parliament (Slovakia). In this regard, Myanmar expressed the view that the implementation of the Convention should be gradual and sustainable and take into account the situation of developing countries.

## **2. Need for technical assistance**

102. A number of responding States indicated that they needed assistance to implement the Convention. China (mainland) referred to the need to gain knowledge on other States' legislation and practice in areas such as extradition, mutual legal assistance, measures to combat money-laundering, confiscation and asset-sharing. Comoros and Ecuador indicated that they needed assistance to carry out the required legal reform. Cameroon and Costa Rica indicated that they needed assistance in reviewing legislation in force; in the case of Costa Rica, on mutual legal assistance and international confiscation in particular. Mauritius stated that it would find model laws for the incorporation of the requirements of the Convention and its Protocols useful. Madagascar referred to the need of casework best practice guidelines, regional exchange of expertise and experience on the matter of confiscation and disposal of the confiscated proceeds of crime or property.

103. In the area of training and capacity-building, Ecuador, El Salvador and Indonesia indicated that technical assistance was needed for training officials involved in the implementation of the Convention. Benin, Burundi, the Congo, Gabon, Madagascar, the Niger and Togo requested assistance for training officials, as well as material and financial assistance. Romania identified the training of magistrates specialized in combating organized crime and provision of equipment to carry out hearings by videoconference as areas where it would require technical assistance. Madagascar referred to the need for assistance to publicize and disseminate the new laws. Only material assistance regarding the publication of documents was needed by the Central African Republic. Cambodia, Egypt, Namibia and the Philippines referred in general terms to assistance in implementing the Convention.

104. A number of responding States indicated that they provided technical assistance to other countries for the implementation of the Convention on a bilateral basis<sup>65</sup> or through international organizations.<sup>66</sup>

105. When considering needs for technical assistance as reported by States responding to the questionnaire, the Conference may wish to also refer to the working paper prepared by the Secretariat on technical assistance activities (CTOC/COP/2006/9).

---

<sup>65</sup> Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, Canada (provision of fund and expertise, as well as assistance in negotiation and implementation of agreements on international cooperation), Chad, Ecuador, Egypt (provision of training, exchange of expertise and field visits), Finland (consulting and organization of seminars), Germany (provision of training and equipment (except weapons) for border police, as well as provision of means and equipment for intelligence purposes), Greece (organization of training seminars and workshops, as well as legislative assistance), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (willingness to provide assistance upon request on the basis of a bilateral agreement), Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal (legislative assistance on combating organized crime, terrorism and corruption), Russian Federation (through workshops and conferences and joint harmonization of legislation), South Africa (assistance in legislation and implementation), Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic (crime control and training), Tunisia (provision of training, border control and exchange of experience), United Republic of Tanzania (mutual evaluation missions in countries of the region) and United States (in the following areas: alien smuggling, trafficking in persons, border control, corruption, counter-narcotics, law enforcement and police science, money-laundering and financial crime and promotion of rule of law).

<sup>66</sup> Australia (through the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and the Asia/Pacific Group on Money Laundering) Brazil, Cambodia (through the United Nations), Canada (through the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Chad, the Commonwealth, and the Organization of American States), Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt (through the African Union, the League of Arab States and the Community of Sahelo-Saharan States), El Salvador (through the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD) of the Organization of American States), France (through the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and UNODC), Germany (through the European Union), Greece (through the European Union), Portugal (through UNODC), Spain (through INTERPOL and the European Police Office), Switzerland (through the Organized Crime Training Network for operational managers in South Eastern Europe), Tunisia (through the United Nations, the African Union, the League of Arab States and the European Union), United Republic of Tanzania (through the Eastern and Southern Africa Anti-Money Laundering Group) and United States (through UNODC, the International Organization for Migration, CICAD, the International Labour Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), the Financial Action Task Force, the Asia/Pacific Group on Money Laundering, the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force, the Council of Europe, the Eastern and Southern Africa Anti-Money Laundering Group, the Eurasian Group on Combating Money Laundering and Financing of Terrorism, the Financial Action Task Force against Money Laundering in South America and the Pacific Islands Forum).

### III. Conclusions and recommendations

106. Replies received to the questionnaire have shown a number of gaps in the compliance of States parties with mandatory provisions of the Convention, which the present report has pointed out. These have been identified in the area of establishing criminal offences as required under the Convention: criminalization of participation in an organized criminal group (see para. 8 above for gaps in the establishment of the offence of organizing, directing, aiding, abetting, facilitating or counselling the commission of a serious crime); criminalization of laundering of proceeds of crime (see para. 9 on gaps in establishing the basic criminal offence and paras. 11 and 12 for gaps in the predicate offence coverage); criminalization of corruption (para. 17); criminalization of obstruction of justice (paras. 23-25); and liability of legal persons (para. 40). Replies received on the issue of jurisdiction indicated that mandatory establishment of jurisdiction had been satisfactorily established by all responding States. In the area of confiscation and seizure at the national level, a number of departures of national legislation from the requirements of the Convention have been identified (see paras. 46-50 on restriction on type of proceeds to which confiscation applies and para. 51 on lack of investigative and restraint powers).

107. As regards international cooperation requirements, responses have indicated that a few States parties have not brought the legislative basis to a level that would not hamper the provision of extradition (see para. 57 above) or else continue to allow refusal of extradition for offences involving fiscal matters (see para. 63). A number of parties are not able to provide mutual legal assistance to other parties in the absence of a treaty (see para. 76), are not able to provide all types of assistance listed under article 18 (para. 77), permit refusal of assistance on the ground of bank secrecy (para. 81) or are not able to provide assistance to other parties in confiscation and related measures pursuant to a foreign request (paras. 86 and 90). It should be noted that a number of parties whose legislation appeared not to be in compliance with mandatory provisions of the Convention have reported having taken steps to upgrade their legislation or have identified difficulties in remedying the situation and have indicated their need for technical assistance. The Conference, when considering the gaps in the compliance of States parties with mandatory provisions of the Convention identified in the present report, may wish to refer to the report of the Secretariat on clarification from States parties on non-compliance for the first reporting cycle (CTOC/COP/2006/3).

108. The present report has also presented information on the implementation of optional provisions of the Convention or provisions subject to safeguard clauses (e.g. "if permitted by the basic principles of a State party's legal system"). Such provisions when implemented enhance the efficiency of the Convention and the Conference may wish to recommend, in the light of the responses received, that parties endeavour to implement optional provisions more extensively, for instance provisions on criminalization of acquisition, possession and use of proceeds (see para. 14 above), criminalization of ancillary offences to money-laundering (para. 15), establishment of jurisdiction on the basis of optional grounds (paras. 30-33), use of the full range of variants to prosecution such as conditional surrender or enforcement of sentences imposed abroad on nationals (paras. 68 and 69), simplification of extradition procedures and minimization of

evidentiary requirements for extradition (para. 71), flexibility in the application of the dual criminality requirement in the case of mutual legal assistance (para. 82), limitation of the grounds for refusal of a mutual legal assistance request (para. 84), enhancement of agreements on disposal of property confiscated upon request by another party (paras. 94 and 95).

## Annex I

### Relevant legislation and website addresses received from States

1. The Secretariat received information from a number of States in response to its request for a copy of relevant legislation and/or website addresses for relevant online information. The following States sent copies of relevant legislation.

<i>State</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>Language</i>
Argentina	Concealment and laundering of assets of criminal origin Decree 169/2001 Excerpts of the Penal Code	Spanish
Belgium	Law on criminal organizations (1999) Law on the prevention and utilization of the financial market for the purposes of money-laundering and financing of terrorism Excerpts of the penal code Law on the repression of corruption (1999) Law establishing the criminal liability of legal persons Law on international cooperation related to seizure and confiscation (1997) Law on the extension of seizure and confiscation possibilities in penal matters	French
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Criminal Code of Bosnia and Herzegovina	English
Brazil	Excerpts of legislation	Portuguese
Colombia	Excerpts of legislation	Spanish
Costa Rica	Constitution	Spanish
Croatia	Criminal code, 2004 Act on the responsibility of legal persons for criminal offences Extract from the Criminal Procedure Act Act on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Law on Prevention of Money-Laundering	English
Czech Republic	Extracts of the criminal code Extracts of the Code of Criminal Procedure Act of July 29, 2004, Amending Act No. 141/1961 Coll., Criminal Proceedings Code as amended, and some other laws	English
Egypt	Extract of legislation	Arabic
Finland	Penal Code of Finland (39/1889, including amendments up to 515/2003)	English
Germany	Relevant legal provisions against trafficking in human beings Criminal code	English and German

<i>State</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>Language</i>
Iceland	Penal code Act on Foreigners No. 96/2002 Regulation on Foreigners (No. 53 of January 2003) Extradition of Criminals and Other Assistance in Criminal Proceedings Act. No. 13. 17 April 1984	English
Jamaica	The Maritime Drug Trafficking (Suppression) Act, 1998 The Drug Offences (Forfeiture of Proceeds) Act, 1994 The Mutual Assistance (Criminal Matters) Act, 1995	English
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Extract of legislation	Arabic
Malaysia	Penal Code, Act 574 (revised 1997) Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 2002, Act 621 Anti-Money-Laundering Act 2001, Act 613 Extra-Territorial Offences Act 1976, Act 163	English
Malta	Extracts of the Criminal Code Extradition Act Prevention of Money Laundering Act Dangerous Drugs Act	English
Mauritius	Financial Intelligence and Anti-Money-Laundering Act 2002 Prevention of Corruption Act 2002 The Harare Scheme on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters London Scheme for Extradition within the Commonwealth, 2002 Transfer of Prisoners Act, 2001 Protocol on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Protocol on Extradition Mutual Assistance in Criminal and related Matters, Act 2003 Extradition, 1982	English
Mexico	Federal penal code	Spanish
Montenegro	Excerpts of legislation	English
Morocco	Extracts of the penal code Extracts of the Code of Penal Procedure Law bearing on the fight against terrorism	French
Myanmar	Mutual Assistance on Criminal Matters Law (2004) Control of Money Laundering Law (2002) Law Relating to Overseas Employment (1999) Penal code Myanmar Immigration (Emergency Provision) Act (1947) Suppression of Prostitution Act (1949) Suppression of Corruption Act (1948)	English

<i>State</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>Language</i>
	Child Law (1993)	
Namibia	Prevention of Organised Crime Act, 2004 (Act No. 29 of 2004) Anti-Corruption Act, 2003 (Act No. 8 of 2003) Extradition Act, 1996 (Act No. 11 of 1996) International Cooperation in Criminal Matters Act, 2000 (Act No. 9 of 2000) Regulations of International Cooperation in Criminal Matters	English
Netherlands	Extract of several pieces of legislation in relation to Matters of Organized Crime	Dutch
New Zealand	Crimes Act 1961 Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 1992 Extradition Act 1999	English
Niger	Extracts of the penal code Law on the Fight against Money-Laundering	French
Norway	Extract from the penal code and Criminal Procedures Act	English
Panama	Several pieces of legislation regarding organized crime	Spanish
Peru	Extradition Act Aliens Act Money-Laundering Act	English
Philippines	Republic Act No. 9160 on the Crime of Money-Laundering Revised implementing rules and regulations R.A. No. 9160	English
Portugal	Extracts of the criminal code Decree No. 28/84 of 20 January Law No. 144/99 of 31 August Other relevant legislation	English and French
Romania	Law No. 302 of 28 June 2004 on international judicial cooperation in criminal matters	English
Serbia	Collection of legislation and draft laws	English
South Africa	Extract of Criminal Procedure Act, No. 51 of 1977 Witness Protection Act Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act, 2003 Financial Intelligence Centre Act, No. 38 of 2001 Prevention of Organised Crime Act, No. 121 of 1998 Extradition Act, No. 67 of 1962 International Cooperation in Criminal Matters Act, No. 75 of 1996	English
Sweden	Extracts of legislation concerning organized crime	English
Switzerland	Extracts of the penal code	French

<i>State</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>Language</i>
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Extracts of the law for changes and additions of the criminal law, enacted in March 2004	English
Tunisia	Extract of legislation	Arabic
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Extracts of legislation related to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime	English

2. The following States sent website addresses:

<i>State</i>	<i>Website address</i>
<b>Albania</b>	<a href="http://www.moi.gov.al">www.moi.gov.al</a>
<b>Australia</b>	<a href="http://www.comlaw.gov.au">www.comlaw.gov.au</a>
<b>Belgium</b>	<a href="http://www.just.fgov.be/index_fr.htm">www.just.fgov.be/index_fr.htm</a>
<b>Brazil</b>	<a href="http://www.presidencia.gov.br">www.presidencia.gov.br</a>
<b>Canada</b>	<a href="http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/index.html">http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/index.html</a>
<b>Colombia</b>	<a href="http://www.ramajudicial.gov.co">www.ramajudicial.gov.co</a>
<b>Democratic Republic of the Congo</b>	<a href="http://www.glin.gov">www.glin.gov</a>
<b>Estonia</b>	<a href="http://www.legaltext.ee/indexen.htm">www.legaltext.ee/indexen.htm</a>
<b>Honduras</b>	<a href="http://www.gob.hn">www.gob.hn</a>
<b>Malta</b>	<a href="http://docs.justice.gov.mt/">http://docs.justice.gov.mt/</a>
<b>Saudi Arabia</b>	<a href="http://www.moj.gov.sa">www.moj.gov.sa</a> <a href="http://www.boe.gov.sa">www.boe.gov.sa</a>
<b>Serbia</b>	<a href="http://www.mpravde.sr.gov.yu">www.mpravde.sr.gov.yu</a>
<b>Switzerland</b>	<a href="http://www.bk.admin.ch/">www.bk.admin.ch/</a>
<b>Thailand</b>	<a href="http://www.imolin.org">www.imolin.org</a>
<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>	<a href="http://www.parliament.go.tz">www.parliament.go.tz</a>

## Annex II

### Status of responses to the questionnaire on the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime: first reporting cycle

<i>State</i>	<i>Date of signature</i>	<i>Date of ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a) or succession (d)</i>	<i>Year responses received</i>	<i>Year update to responses received</i>
Afghanistan	14 Dec. 2000	24 Sept. 2003	2005	-
Albania	12 Dec. 2000	21 Aug. 2002	2008	-
			Partial response	
Algeria	12 Dec. 2000	7 Oct. 2002	2005	2008
Angola	13 Dec. 2000	-	2005	-
Argentina	12 Dec. 2000	19 Nov. 2002	2005	-
Australia	13 Dec. 2000	27 May 2004	2006	-
Austria	12 Dec. 2000	23 Sept. 2004	2005	2008
Azerbaijan	12 Dec. 2000	30 Oct. 2003	2005	-
Bahrain	-	7 June 2004 (a)	2005	-
Barbados	26 Sept. 2001	-	2005	-
Belarus	14 Dec. 2000	25 June 2003	2005	-
Belgium	12 Dec. 2000	11 Aug. 2004	2005	2008
Benin	13 Dec. 2000	30 Aug. 2004	2008	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 Dec. 2000	24 Apr. 2002	2008	-
			Partial response	
Brazil	12 Dec. 2000	29 Jan. 2004	2005	-
Bulgaria	13 Dec. 2000	5 Dec. 2001	2006	2008
Burkina Faso	15 Dec. 2000	15 May 2002	2008	-
Burundi	14 Dec. 2000	-	2008	-
Cambodia	11 Nov. 2001	12 Dec. 2005	2005	-
Cameroon	13 Dec. 2000	6 Feb. 2006	2008	-
Canada	14 Dec. 2000	13 May 2002	2005	-
Cape Verde	13 Dec. 2000	15 July 2004	2008	-
Central African Republic	-	14 Sept. 2004 (a)	2008	-
Chad	-	-	2008	-
Chile	13 Dec. 2000	29 Nov. 2004	2005	-
			Partial response	
China	12 Dec. 2000	23 Sept. 2003	2005	2008
Colombia	12 Dec. 2000	4 Aug. 2004	2006	-
Comoros	-	25 Sept. 2003 (a)	2008	-
Congo	14 Dec. 2000	-	2008	-

<i>State</i>	<i>Date of signature</i>	<i>Date of ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a) or succession (d)</i>	<i>Year responses received</i>	<i>Year update to responses received</i>
Costa Rica	16 Mar. 2001	24 July 2003	2005	-
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Dec. 2000	-	2008	-
Croatia	12 Dec. 2000	24 Jan. 2003	2005	2008
Cyprus	12 Dec. 2000	22 Apr. 2003	2005	-
Czech Republic	12 Dec. 2000	-	2005	2008
Democratic Republic of the Congo	-	28 Oct. 2005 (a)	2008	-
Djibouti	-	20 Apr. 2005 (a)	2008	-
Ecuador	13 Dec. 2000	17 Sept. 2002	2005	-
Egypt	13 Dec. 2000	5 Mar. 2004	2005	-
El Salvador	14 Dec. 2000	18 Mar. 2004	2005	-
Estonia	14 Dec. 2000	10 Feb. 2003	2005	2008
Finland	12 Dec. 2000	10 Feb. 2004	2005	-
France	12 Dec. 2000	29 Oct. 2002	2005	2008
Gabon	-	15 Dec. 2004 (a)	2008	-
Germany	12 Dec. 2000	14 June 2006	2005	2008
Greece	13 Dec. 2000	-	2005	-
Guatemala	12 Dec. 2000	25 Sept. 2003	2005	2008
Guinea	-	9 Nov. 2004 (a)	2008	-
Guinea-Bissau	14 Dec. 2000	10 Sept. 2007	2008	-
Honduras	14 Dec. 2000	2 Dec. 2003	2005	-
Iceland	13 Dec. 2000	-	2005	-
Indonesia	12 Dec. 2000	-	2005	-
Ireland	13 Dec. 2000	-	2005	-
Italy	12 Dec. 2000	2 Aug. 2006	2005	-
Jamaica	26 Sept. 2001	29 Sept. 2003	2005	-
Jordan	26 Nov. 2002	-	2005	-
Kazakhstan	13 Dec. 2000	31 July 2008	2005	-
Kuwait	12 Dec. 2000	12 May 2006	2005	-
Latvia	13 Dec. 2000	7 Dec. 2001	2005	-
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Nov. 2001	18 June 2004	2005	-
Lithuania	13 Dec. 2000	9 May 2002	2005	-
Madagascar	14 Dec. 2000	15 Sept. 2005	2006	2008
Malaysia	26 Sept. 2002	24 Sept. 2004	2005	-
Mali	15 Dec. 2000	12 Apr. 2002	2008	-
Malta	14 Dec. 2000	24 Sept. 2003	2005	2008
Mauritius	12 Dec. 2000	21 Apr. 2003	2005	-
Mexico	13 Dec. 2000	4 Mar. 2003	2005	-

<i>State</i>	<i>Date of signature</i>	<i>Date of ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a) or succession (d)</i>	<i>Year responses received</i>	<i>Year update to responses received</i>
Moldova	14 Dec. 2000	16 Sept. 2005	2005	-
Montenegro <sup>a</sup>	-	23 Oct. 2006 (d)	2008	-
			Partial response	
Morocco	13 Dec. 2000	19 Sept. 2002	2005	2008
Myanmar	-	30 Mar. 2004 (a)	2005	-
Namibia	13 Dec. 2000	16 Aug. 2002	2005	-
Netherlands	12 Dec. 2000	26 May 2004	2005	-
New Zealand	14 Dec. 2000	19 July 2002	2005	-
Niger	21 Aug. 2001	30 Sept. 2004	2008	-
Nigeria	13 Dec. 2000	28 June 2001	2005	-
Norway	13 Dec. 2000	23 Sept. 2003	2005	-
Paraguay	12 Dec. 2000	22 Sept. 2004	2008	-
Peru	14 Dec. 2000	23 Jan. 2002	2005	-
Philippines	14 Dec. 2000	28 May 2002	2005	-
Poland	12 Dec. 2000	12 Nov. 2001	2005	2008
Portugal	12 Dec. 2000	10 May 2004	2005	-
Romania	14 Dec. 2000	4 Dec. 2002	2005	-
Russian Federation	12 Dec. 2000	26 May 2004	2005	-
Sao Tome and Principe	-	12 Apr. 2006 (a)	2008	-
Senegal	13 Dec. 2000	27 Oct. 2003	2006	-
Serbia	12 Dec. 2000 <sup>b</sup>	6 Sept. 2001 <sup>b</sup>	2005 <sup>b</sup>	2008 <sup>b</sup>
Slovakia	14 Dec. 2000	3 Dec. 2003	2005	2008
Slovenia	12 Dec. 2000	21 May 2004	2005	-
South Africa	14 Dec. 2000	20 Feb. 2004	2005	-
Spain	13 Dec. 2000	1 Mar. 2002	2005	2008
Sweden	12 Dec. 2000	30 Apr. 2004	2005	2008
Switzerland	12 Dec. 2000	27 Oct 2006	2005	2008
Syrian Arab Republic	13 Dec. 2000	-	2005	-
Tajikistan	12 Dec. 2000	8 July 2002	2006	-
Thailand	13 Dec. 2000	-	2006	-
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 Dec. 2000	12 Jan. 2005	2005	-
Togo	12 Dec. 2000	2 July 2004	2008	-
Tunisia	13 Dec. 2000	19 June 2003	2005	2008
Turkey	13 Dec. 2000	25 Mar. 2003	2006	-
Ukraine	12 Dec. 2000	21 May 2004	2005	-

<i>State</i>	<i>Date of signature</i>	<i>Date of ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a) or succession (d)</i>	<i>Year responses received</i>	<i>Year update to responses received</i>
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 Dec. 2000	9 Feb. 2006	2005	-
United Republic of Tanzania	13 Dec. 2000	24 May 2006	2005	-
United States of America	13 Dec. 2000	3 Nov. 2005	2005	2008
Uzbekistan	13 Dec. 2000	9 Dec. 2003	2005	2008

<sup>a</sup> On 3 June 2006, Montenegro became an independent State.

<sup>b</sup> On 3 June 2006, the membership of Serbia and Montenegro in the United Nations was continued by Serbia.