



**Conference of the States Parties
to the United Nations
Convention against Corruption**

Distr.: General
11 June 2015

Original: English

Implementation Review Group

Sixth session

Vienna, 1-5 June 2015


**Report of the Implementation Review Group on its
sixth session, held in Vienna from 1 to 5 June 2015**

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	2
II. Organization of the session	2
A. Opening of the session	2
B. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work	3
C. Attendance	4
III. Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption	5
A. Progress report	5
B. Outcome of the reviews	5
C. Drawing of lots	10
IV. Performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption	11
V. Technical assistance	14
VI. Financial and budgetary matters	16
VII. Other matters	17
VIII. Provisional agenda for the seventh session	18
IX. Adoption of the report	18
Annexes	
I. Provisional agenda for the seventh session of the Implementation Review Group	19
II. Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: country pairings for the first review cycle	20

V.15-04265 (E) 230615 240615



Please recycle 

I. Introduction

1. The Implementation Review Group was established by the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption in its resolution 3/1, entitled “Review mechanism”, as an open-ended intergovernmental group of States parties to operate under its authority and report to it. The Group is to have an overview of the review process in order to identify challenges and good practices and to consider technical assistance requirements in order to ensure effective implementation of the Convention.

II. Organization of the session

A. Opening of the session

2. The Implementation Review Group held its sixth session in Vienna from 1 to 5 June 2015.

3. The first, second, fourth, sixth, seventh, eighth and tenth meetings of the sixth session were chaired by Paulus Noa (Namibia); the third, fifth and ninth meetings were chaired by Angélica Maytín Justiniani (Panama).

4. In his initial statement, the Secretary of the Conference outlined the most important issues for the consideration of the Group in preparation for the sixth session of the Conference. One of the key issues at the time of the sixth session was the timing of the launch of the second review cycle. Moreover, if the second review cycle was launched at the sixth session of the Conference and initiated its operations at the seventh session of the Group in June 2016, it was to be determined how to deal with States that had not finalized their reviews by that date. A further question was how the Group wished to handle the few cases in which States parties had remained or become unresponsive to relevant communications by the secretariat. Furthermore, the Secretary drew the attention of the Group to the revised draft self-assessment checklist for the second cycle, which had been made available to the Group as a conference room paper at its sixth session in all official languages of the United Nations (CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/CRP.1). Further pending issues included when and how to conclude the assessment of performance of the Review Mechanism, whether to make any adjustments to it, and when and how to start collecting and sharing information on action for the implementation of recommendations made during the first review cycle. Finally, the estimated resource requirements for the functioning of the second cycle were to be discussed.

5. The representative of the European Union spoke on behalf of the European Union, its member States and Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova, Turkey, Serbia and Ukraine. He highlighted that the European Union was continually streamlining its measures against corruption in its internal and external policies, such as the recently amended procurement rules and new legislation on the freezing, confiscation and recovery of assets. He also mentioned requirements for large companies to disclose information on anti-corruption policies, and the monitoring of relevant activities in the framework of the European Semester of Economic Governance. The speaker highlighted the

merits of the Mechanism and referred to its challenges with regard to delays and cost efficiency. He stressed that the second review cycle had to be built on the lessons learned from the first cycle, and confirmed the will of the European Union, its member States and the countries that associated themselves with the statement to reach improvements through constructive dialogue before and during the sixth session of the Conference. He reiterated the position in favour of a more transparent Mechanism in which States could make optimal use of all information, including from non-governmental organizations (NGOs). He stressed that the European Union considered that the participation of NGOs in intergovernmental bodies was in full compliance with the rules of procedure of the Conference.

6. Speaking on behalf of the African Group, the representative of Nigeria highlighted the importance of the Mechanism and the Group as platforms for sharing experiences and assisting countries in implementing the Convention. The Mechanism as established by resolution 3/1 played a crucial role in assisting States parties in identifying challenges and good practices, as well as in considering technical assistance requirements. The representative emphasized that the terms of reference of the Mechanism, in particular its guiding principles, continued to provide an adequate and appropriate framework and should be fully and consistently complied with throughout the review process. The speaker stressed the intergovernmental nature of the Mechanism, also stressed that the rules of procedure of the Conference did not allow for the participation of NGOs in intergovernmental bodies and all working groups of the Conference and noted the compromise that had been reached in resolution 4/6. Further, the Group considered that the Mechanism should be funded from the regular budget of the United Nations. The speaker encouraged all States parties to actively participate in the second review cycle, which would encompass the review of all provisions of chapters II (Preventive measures) and V (Asset recovery) of the Convention, in full compliance with resolution 3/1, and said that he considered that the review of those chapters would produce tangible and useful results. He expressed satisfaction with the self-assessment checklist used during the first review cycle, and its level of detail, and emphasized that the same comprehensive self-assessment checklist that was used in the first cycle should continue to be used in the second cycle. In addition, the speaker called for the full implementation of the resolutions of the Conference on the prevention of corruption and emphasized the importance of asset recovery as a fundamental principle of the Convention. He called upon States to expedite procedures and remove barriers to asset recovery. Furthermore, the speaker highlighted the importance of international cooperation, including the exchange of information, collection of data, and mutual legal assistance in the fight against corruption.

B. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

7. On 1 June, the Implementation Review Group adopted the following agenda as amended:

1. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Opening of the session;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.

2. Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
3. Performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
4. Technical assistance.
5. Financial and budgetary matters.
6. Other matters.
7. Provisional agenda for the seventh session of the Implementation Review Group.
8. Adoption of the report of the Implementation Review Group on its sixth session.

C. Attendance

8. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the sixth session of the Implementation Review Group: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and Zambia.

9. The European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, was represented at the meeting.

10. In accordance with rule 1 of resolution 4/5, entitled "Participation of signatories, non-signatories, entities and intergovernmental organizations in the work of the Implementation Review Group", the Conference decided that States signatories would be entitled to participate in the session of the Group.

11. The following State signatory to the Convention was represented: Japan.

12. In accordance with rule 2 of resolution 4/5, the Conference decided that intergovernmental organizations, secretariat units, United Nations bodies, funds and

programmes, institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system could be invited to participate in the sessions of the Group.

13. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers: Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization, Council of Europe, International Anti-Corruption Academy, League of Arab States and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

14. The following secretariat units, United Nations bodies, funds and programmes, institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system were represented by observers: Beijing Normal University (China).

15. The Sovereign Military Order of Malta, an entity maintaining a permanent observer office at Headquarters, was represented.

III. Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

A. Progress report

16. The secretariat provided an oral update on the progress made in the country reviews, highlighting that, at the time of reporting, responses to the self-assessment checklist had been provided by 158 States parties under review, 133 direct dialogues had taken place, and 97 executive summaries had been finalized. This showed that substantial progress was being achieved overall for the first cycle of reviews. However, challenges in communication had arisen with several States at various stages of either their own review or the reviews of other States. After sending reminders to that effect, the secretariat had brought the matter to the attention of the Group and highlighted the readiness of the Office to provide technical assistance on the different steps of the review, if requested.

B. Outcome of the reviews

17. In an opening statement, Pakdee Pothisiri, member of the National Anti-Corruption Commission of Thailand, described that country's experience as a State party under review and its national anti-corruption strategy. Kitti Wasinondh, member of the National Legislative Assembly of Thailand and chair of the ad hoc committee on the draft organic act on countering corruption, informed the Group about the measures taken by his country to effectively implement the Convention, and in particular about the legislative amendments that had been drafted by an ad hoc committee chaired by him. Those amendments included the criminalization of bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations, modifications to the sanctions regime for Convention-related offences, the introduction of value-based confiscation in addition to property-based forfeiture, the amendment of the statute of limitations to suspend it in cases in which the alleged offender had evaded the administration of justice, and the establishment of liability of legal persons for convention offences. Moreover, the powers and mandate of the

National Anti-Corruption Commission were to be extended. A member of that Commission also gave an account of the country's experience as a State party under review and made reference to Thailand's new national anti-corruption strategy.

18. The Minister for Institutional Transparency and the Fight against Corruption of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Lenny Valdivia, underlined that her country had prioritized the fight against corruption. She pointed out areas where progress in implementation had recently been made, including the criminalization of foreign bribery, illicit enrichment and obstruction of justice, as well as the protection of witnesses and whistle-blowers. Moreover, the national asset declaration system had been strengthened with the introduction of a verification mechanism. While underlining the importance of the role of NGOs in the fight against corruption, she also voiced concern about the rankings produced by some of those organizations and highlighted the guiding principles of the Mechanism, in particular its intergovernmental nature, as contained in its terms of reference.

19. The secretariat drew the Group's attention to the study on the "State of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: criminalization, law enforcement and international cooperation" (see CAC/COSP/2013/CRP.7), which had been presented to the Conference at its fifth session. An update to that document was being prepared based on the completed reviews for presentation to the Conference at its sixth session. The secretariat also recalled the report prepared by the secretariat containing a thematic overview of recommendations with respect to the implementation of chapters III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and IV (International cooperation) of the Convention (CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/10) and noted that the Group might wish to expand on its deliberations and consider how to ensure the consistency of the country reviews, with a view to also assisting governmental experts in conducting the reviews, including drafting the country reports and formulating recommendations.

20. The secretariat presented an overview of the key thematic findings in the implementation of chapters III and IV of the Convention, analysing 68 completed country reviews. The oral update also responded to resolution 5/2, on strengthening the implementation of the criminalization provisions of the Convention against Corruption, in particular with regard to solicitation, in which the Conference had requested the secretariat to provide a short update on the progress made and the challenges encountered in implementing that resolution. The overall trends and findings had remained largely consistent with those identified in the thematic and regional implementation reports previously presented to the Conference and the Group.

21. Concerning the implementation of chapter III of the Convention, challenges continued to relate most often to the prosecution, adjudication and sanctioning of corruption-related offences (article 30 of the Convention), the freezing, seizure and confiscation of assets (article 31), specialized authorities (article 36) and the bribery of national public officials (article 15). Challenges were also identified regarding illicit enrichment (article 20), the laundering of proceeds of crime (article 23), the bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations (article 16) and the protection of reporting persons (article 33). With respect to good practices in implementation, those continued to relate to the establishment and strengthening of specialized authorities (article 36), the freezing, seizure and confiscation of assets (article 31), cooperation between national authorities

(article 38) and the prosecution, adjudication and sanctioning of corruption-related offences (article 30).

22. It was noted that the reviews had identified several key issues that reflected a certain diversity in interpretation of provisions of the Convention and consequently had led to disparate recommendations being issued. Those differences were observed most notably in the areas of immunities for persons who self-reported the commission of offences (sometimes termed “effective regret” or “spontaneous confession” provisions) and in the assessment of the effectiveness of sanctions for corruption offences. The matter of reporting on the practical application of the Convention was also highlighted, as a number of States parties had encountered challenges in the collection, consolidation and accessibility of statistical data on implementation, which presented challenges in the practical assessment and evaluation of effectiveness in implementation. The secretariat noted that those issues could benefit from further analysis, as the Conference and the Group considered the assessment of the follow-up measures taken by States to the reviews of the first cycle and the structuring of the next review cycle.

23. With regard to chapter IV of the Convention, the secretariat reported on the most important trends arising from the completed reviews of the ongoing first cycle of the Mechanism. The presentation included an analysis of the most prevalent challenges and good practices and the cross-cutting findings of the reviews, such as the importance of statistical data collection and the time needed for granting international cooperation. Further, topics with regard to which divergent conclusions had been made in the country reports were discussed, and ongoing discussions and developments in the interpretation of the Convention presented. Those concerned requirements related to extraditable offences, dual criminality, process guarantees in extradition procedures, and compliance with article 46, paragraphs 7 and 9-29 of the Convention (direct application of the framework provided by the Convention to mutual legal assistance requests).

24. According to guidance provided by the Group, a panel discussion was organized to facilitate the Group’s deliberations on the review of implementation.

25. A panellist from Israel underlined that the Mechanism had proved very useful in assessing the implementation of the Convention in his country. Israel had taken steps to bring domestic law into compliance with the Convention even before ratification. Those steps had included the adoption of new and more specific criminalization provisions, for example, on bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations, and the implementation of some of the optional provisions of the Convention, such as trading in influence. Concerning the lessons learned from the review of his country, he emphasized the value of making the review process as inclusive as possible, involving not only a great number of officials on all levels, but also civil society and the private sector. Another aspect of the review process that was viewed favourably was the possibility to comment on the draft observations and recommendations. That greatly helped to align recommendations with the country’s legal system and thus facilitate the subsequent implementation of recommendations.

26. A panellist from the Philippines also stressed the advantages of an inclusive review process, reporting that stakeholders from all three branches of Government, as well as civil society, had been involved in a national dialogue. After the

publication of the review report, a national conference had been organized to review the recommendations identified in the review and to prioritize their implementation. As a result, in 2014, the President had issued Executive Order No. 171 to provide for the effective implementation of the Convention and the establishment of a high-level oversight committee related to the Convention. That committee, which was headed by the Office of the President, was tasked with overseeing the implementation, coordination, monitoring and review of the country's compliance with the Convention. It also included, among other things, representatives from relevant civil society organizations and non-governmental organizations engaged in anti-corruption advocacy and initiatives as might be determined by the Committee. It was mandated to invite representatives from the Office of the Ombudsman, the Commission on Audit, the Civil Service Commission, the Anti-Money Laundering Council, both houses of Congress and the judiciary to harmonize the country's anti-corruption programmes.

27. A panellist from Ghana reported that his country had identified a number of legislative gaps immediately after acceding to the Convention. As a consequence, existing laws had been amended and new laws passed, including laws on public procurement, money-laundering, conflicts of interest and whistle-blower protection. He noted that, as a consequence of the country review process, the legislative and institutional framework would again be strengthened and brought further into line with the Convention. A new fund had been established to provide funding to independent institutions like the Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice, which was responsible for countering corruption. Finally, the panellist highlighted that the anti-corruption action plan was being updated to implement the remaining recommendations from the review report.

28. In the ensuing discussion on chapter III, many States reported to the Group on their national implementation efforts and provided updates on domestic reform measures taken in preparation for or during the course of the reviews, including concrete follow-up actions taken to address recommendations made during the course of the review. Most frequently, the actions undertaken at the domestic level related to the development of national strategies against corruption in line with the Convention; legislative reforms, including in respect of transnational bribery, money-laundering and illicit enrichment; strengthening investigative, prosecutorial and judicial capacity; enhancing inter-agency coordination; and establishing measures to protect witnesses, experts and reporting persons.

29. Several speakers highlighted measures their countries had adopted with a view to facilitating the seizure and confiscation of the proceeds of corruption, including the introduction of value-based, extended and non-conviction-based confiscation, as well as the establishment of specialized agencies or units tasked with asset recovery and the management of seized and confiscated assets. One speaker highlighted the issue of unaccounted-for money found in safe havens, its confiscation and eventual return. Moreover, one speaker highlighted the possibility of using technology to achieve the equivalent effect of the rapid lifting of bank secrecy. It was noted that, in designing national reform measures, a number of States parties had been oriented by the good practices and lessons learned in other countries as identified through the country reviews, and had specifically consulted the publicly available country review reports and executive summaries. States also reported on enhanced enforcement action, leading in many cases to the conviction of offenders in

high-level corruption cases, as well as the successful recovery of significant amounts of proceeds of corruption.

30. In a number of countries, national action plans had been created to follow up on review recommendations and coordinate activities. Several speakers reported on the benefits of undergoing the review process, including with respect to the exchange of ideas and experience among States and to identifying areas for policy reform, as well as technical assistance needs. The important role of the Mechanism in enhancing implementation and cooperation among States was emphasized by many speakers.

31. Many speakers reported that a key outcome for States participating in the review process was the opportunity to establish or enhance domestic coordination mechanisms, in particular as a tool for implementing the recommendations of the reviews. In a number of States parties, national steering committees or intergovernmental task teams had been created to coordinate the implementation of the Convention and the review process itself. That coordination was described as indispensable for the effectiveness of the process.

32. Several speakers highlighted the important role of broad consultations at the national level, including those involving non-governmental stakeholders, in the context of the Mechanism, both at an early stage in preparation of the self-assessment and during the country visit, as well as in the process of the accompanying reforms. That engagement was considered especially important in raising broad public awareness of the Convention and the Mechanism.

33. One positive by-product of undergoing country reviews had been the establishment or strengthening of national systems on data collection and statistical reporting. Although several speakers highlighted challenges in that area and the need for additional work to identify appropriate indicators, echoing the introductory remarks by the secretariat, speakers also noted that statistics should not be the exclusive measure used to assess effectiveness in implementation of the Convention.

34. The need to ensure consistency in the observations and recommendations emanating from the reviews was noted as indispensable for ensuring effective implementation of the Convention. The secretariat's attempts to identify those areas and strengthen consistency among reviews were welcomed. Some speakers suggested that the recommendations issued in the reviews should be compiled in a list, with a view to issuing standardized recommendations for the provisions of the Convention and allowing a fuller analysis of technical assistance needs. In that context States were urged to consider publishing the full review reports. Some speakers highlighted the need for States to implement non-mandatory provisions of the Convention. Speakers also welcomed efforts to ensure synergies of the reviews with other international review mechanisms. Finally, several speakers thanked UNODC and other technical cooperation partners, as well as donors, for supporting States parties in implementing the Convention and participating in the reviews.

35. With regard to chapter IV, speakers emphasized measures taken for the implementation of relevant provisions of the Convention and presented recent national reforms and initiatives relating to practical aspects of international cooperation under the Convention. Several speakers reported that international cooperation legislation had been updated or relevant legislative amendments had

been initiated, based on the recommendations from country reviews. One speaker reported that a mutual legal assistance law with detailed procedural requirements had been created on the basis of the recommendations contained in the country report, and that the number of international cooperation cases had since increased.

36. Some speakers reported on the conclusion of new treaties on mutual legal assistance and the establishment of joint investigative teams. Another speaker highlighted the strengthening of cooperation between the police, tax and financial intelligence authorities of his country and their counterparts. Further, measures to strengthen regional cooperation were reported.

37. One speaker reported on the successful completion of an extradition by another country in the same region. A number of speakers highlighted the importance of asset recovery. They welcomed successful asset recovery measures and highlighted the persisting challenges in that regard, calling upon States parties to remove barriers to asset recovery and making reference to the upcoming second review cycle. Also in regard to the second cycle, some speakers reported on preventive measures that had been adopted or strengthened in their countries.

38. Focusing on the consistency of review recommendations, one speaker stated that the recommendation to conclude new treaties could in some cases be replaced by a recommendation to provide assistance without a treaty basis or to use the Convention as a legal basis. With regard to extraditable offences, another speaker highlighted that States should have some flexibility with regard to non-mandatory offences under the Convention.

C. Drawing of lots

39. The Group drew lots for the reviews of Germany, Grenada and South Sudan, which had become States parties to the Convention after the drawing of lots conducted at the resumed fifth session of the Group. To date, 32 States had performed three reviews; 111 States had performed two reviews; 24 States had performed one review; and 7 States had not yet performed a review. In order to comply with the requirement that by the end of a given cycle all States parties must have performed a minimum of one and a maximum of three reviews, the Group drew lots from among those States that had not yet performed a review or only one review, as necessary.

40. Saint Lucia and South Sudan were drawn as reviewing States for Grenada. Seychelles and Congo were drawn as reviewing States for South Sudan. Iceland and Congo were drawn as reviewing States for Germany. Following past practice, provisional redraws were requested and carried out. The Czech Republic and Denmark were drawn as the provisional reviewing States for Germany. Guinea was drawn as a provisional regional reviewer for Guinea-Bissau.

IV. Performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

41. The Conference, in its decision 5/1, decided that the Group should begin promptly to collect, with the support of the secretariat, and discuss relevant information to facilitate the assessment of performance of the Mechanism in accordance with paragraph 48 of the terms of reference, following the completion of the first review cycle. It also decided that the Group should include in its future sessions an agenda item allowing for the discussion of such information.

42. In order to facilitate the discussion under this agenda item, a note by the secretariat on assessment of the performance of the Mechanism (CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/3) was presented. This note built on discussions held by the Group at its fifth and resumed fifth sessions on matters related to the performance of the Mechanism and documentation provided by States in response to calls for information to be provided in the implementation of decision 5/1 of the Conference.

43. Contributions received from States on the assessment of the performance of the Mechanism were contained in conference room paper CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/CRP.5. Such comments focused, *inter alia*, on suggestions for the follow-up to the first cycle, funding, timelines for country reviews and the effectiveness of the review process, as well as the launch and the scope of the second review cycle. In the introduction of the agenda item, reference was made to the impact of the Mechanism at the national level, and several contributions referred to the Mechanism as a well-functioning tool for the review of implementation of the Convention. The preparation of national action plans and increased domestic coordination as a result of the review process were outlined.

44. Some speakers emphasized that the Conference could launch the second cycle at its sixth session, with the drawing of lots being carried out at the subsequent session of the Group, in June 2016. Some speakers, while concurring that the launch could take place at the sixth session of the Conference, noted that the drawing of lots could be conducted at a later time. In addition, the possibility of the Conference reconsidering the architecture of its subsidiary bodies in order to avoid any overlaps between issues discussed by the Group and those discussed by the working groups was pointed out. With regard to the substantive outcome of the reviews and the analytical work done on implementation of the Convention, a potential shift in focus of the Mechanism towards results might be envisaged. In that respect, States would need to be able to collect, collate, process and evaluate information on implementation, and technical assistance would need to be available in supporting the achievement of such results.

45. The revised draft of the comprehensive self-assessment checklist for the review of chapters II and V of the Convention was made available to the Group in all official languages of the United Nations for discussion (CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/CRP.1). The secretariat provided an overview of the developments and consultations regarding the revised draft. Detailed explanations on the proposed flow of questions and the introduction of additional features, such as guidance boxes, were provided. It was emphasized that the guidance boxes were merely suggestions designed to assist focal points in providing focused and relevant

information on implementation. In addition, a comparison was made of the length of the revised draft of the document with the previous version, highlighting the streamlining effort made, while preserving the methodology as well as the depth and quality of the self-assessment checklist.

46. Many speakers highlighted the importance of the Mechanism in the fight against corruption, and expressed their confidence in the Mechanism as a well-functioning tool. In addition, the important role the Mechanism had played in fostering international cooperation in the implementation of the Convention was underscored. A number of speakers referred to the guiding principles and characteristics of the Mechanism, in particular its intergovernmental nature, and emphasized the need for those to be preserved.

47. Several speakers shared their experience of the review process, both as reviewing States and as States parties under review. Several speakers underscored the importance of direct dialogue in fostering better understanding of the implementation of the Convention, as well as exchanging experiences. The difficulties in complying with the indicative timelines, in particular for the completion of the self-assessment checklist, were noted. Some speakers reaffirmed the need for flexibility in that regard and noted that the timelines were indicative in nature. Some speakers underlined the potential for improving processes and procedures in order to conduct evaluations in a reasonable time frame. The complementary nature of other regional and sectoral anti-corruption review mechanisms was also mentioned. Several speakers welcomed steps towards transparency in the review process and informed the Group that their country review reports had been made publicly available, encouraging others to take similar steps.

48. Several speakers referred to the guiding principles of the inclusivity and intergovernmental nature of the Mechanism, and welcomed the overall trend in direct dialogue of stakeholders such as NGOs, the private sector and academia being involved in national country review processes. Speakers stressed that the participation of NGOs as observers in the working groups and the Group itself would enhance the work of the Mechanism. In that context, it was suggested to consider opening the standing agenda item on technical assistance to NGO participation. Several other speakers, however, stressed that the terms of reference of the Mechanism provided States with the possibility of allowing for the participation of representatives of civil society in the Mechanism, recalled the guiding principle of the intergovernmental character of the Mechanism, as well as the intergovernmental nature of the Implementation Review Group, and further recalled the delicate compromise reached at the third and fourth sessions of the Conference.

49. Several speakers welcomed the ongoing work of the secretariat on preparing a draft analytical study on the state of implementation of chapters III and IV of the Convention, to be presented to the Conference at its sixth session. Several speakers also referred to the issue of consistency across reviews, noting that the Mechanism was an ongoing learning exercise for all concerned. The diversity of legal systems and approaches to implementation were to be taken into account, and the secretariat had played a role in supporting consistency in the observations, as well as the interpretation of the provisions of the Convention by States parties. Some suggestions were made for improving substantive consistency, such as an overview of common observations per article.

50. Many speakers urged the Group to seize the opportunity of the first cycle drawing to a close and highlighted the importance of follow-up to the observations made in the country review reports. In that regard, several speakers expressed their preference for a structured approach. Suggestions were made concerning the format that could be used for such follow-up, including scheduled oral reports to the Group under a possible stand-alone agenda item, as well as short written updates. It was indicated that the terms of reference stipulated that this follow-up should be provided through the responses to the self-assessment. National action plans were noted as a useful tool to implement the observations emerging from the country reviews.

51. It was also indicated that the first measure to follow up on the conclusions and observations stemming from the Mechanism must be an offer of technical assistance to States, upon their request, in order to meet their needs identified during the review process, as that was one of the main objectives stipulated in the Mechanism and in Conference resolution 4/1.

52. Some speakers expressed the view that the mandate of the current subsidiary bodies of the Conference might be reconsidered when the second cycle became operational in order to better align substantive discussions with those that would be taking place in the Group. Proposals for avoiding overlap included refocusing the existing working groups on issues related to criminalization and international cooperation in order to follow up on the recommendations made in the first cycle, and folding the thematic discussions on chapters II and V into the work of the Group. Another proposal aimed at maintaining the working groups on asset recovery and on prevention focused on the substantive discussion of the outcomes of the second-cycle reviews, while the Group would focus on the general review of progress, as well as issues related to process. One additional proposal was to maintain the working groups on prevention and asset recovery and establish additional working groups to consider follow-up to the implementation of the chapters under review in the first cycle. With regards to international cooperation, there was a team of governmental experts for international cooperation tasked with discussing that chapter which could be transformed into a working group. Moreover, working groups could also be formed to discuss the other chapters for which there was no dedicated working group.

53. Several speakers welcomed the revised draft of the comprehensive self-assessment checklist made available to the Group. Some speakers continued to voice concern about its length and level of detail, assuming that further improvements in focusing the flow of questions could be achieved, while one speaker voiced concern about some questions in the revised draft of the checklist and several others stated their preference for preserving the self-assessment checklist used during the first cycle of the Mechanism. Some speakers expressed their readiness to recommend that the Conference endorse the revised draft, while others indicated that they were not yet in a position to do so. One speaker highlighted that the checklist should be shortened and simplified, while keeping a balanced approach that highlighted compliance and elicited more information on gaps that had not been covered in the country under review.

54. Several speakers indicated that the scope of the second cycle should remain as decided by the Conference in resolution 3/1 and include both chapter II and chapter V of the Convention, while some indicated their preference for focusing on

one of these chapters or on specific selected provisions of the Convention, with the remaining provisions to be reviewed in a subsequent cycle.

55. With regard to the second cycle of the Mechanism, several speakers reiterated their readiness to see it launched at the sixth session of the Conference, and to initiate the reviews for the second cycle by the drawing of lots at the seventh session of the Group, to be held in June 2016, while other speakers stated that the drawing of lots for the second cycle should take place only after the completion of the first cycle. The issue of completion of the first cycle was referred to, with some States noting that, owing to the ongoing ratification and accession process, new States parties to the Convention would have to undergo first-cycle reviews, and their second-cycle reviews should be deferred to the last year of that cycle.

56. The case of those States whose reviews were likely not to be completed by the seventh session of the Group, including States with which difficulties in communication had arisen, would need to be considered by the Conference. It was suggested that those States could be invited to provide a voluntary action plan for the finalization of their review. One speaker felt that those States would have no objection to their fellow States proceeding with reviews of the second cycle. In determining action to be taken, both the non-punitive nature of the Mechanism and the need for an effective review process were recalled. It was also noted that practical measures to improve the functioning of the Mechanism could be adopted, such as the bureau or extended bureau conducting the drawing of lots.

57. In order to advance in the consideration of those issues, several speakers welcomed the proposal that informal consultations should be convened under the auspices of the bureau in the period leading up to the sixth session of the Conference. Speakers recalled that the Conference had the sole authority to adopt resolutions or decisions. In that context, some speakers emphasized the importance of clearly defining the scope of such consultations and stated that the terms of reference of the Mechanism should not be renegotiated.

58. The Group was informed of the decision by the bureau to invite States parties and signatories to submit their proposals on the scope, content and modalities of informal consultations in preparation of the important decisions concerning the Mechanism to be taken by the Conference at its sixth session.

V. Technical assistance

59. The secretariat provided a general overview of how the Mechanism had impacted the provision of technical assistance by defining needs and creating new opportunities for technical cooperation. The importance of the provision of technical assistance to support the efforts of States to implement the recommendations of the reviews was stressed.

60. The secretariat provided an oral update on technical assistance needs identified through the individual country review processes that had been finalized since the resumed fifth session of the Group. In total, needs for technical assistance had been identified in 59 out of the 97 executive summaries that had been completed. An overview was presented of the number of States per region and the types of need identified. Attention was drawn to the predefined categories of technical assistance

needs contained in the self-assessment checklist and how those could be grouped to give a better indication of the types of assistance that were required. The secretariat further highlighted recent trends in the needs identified under each article of the Convention.

61. A panel discussion was held to facilitate the Group's deliberations. A panellist from the International Cooperation Unit of the Federal Prosecution Service of Brazil made a presentation on the cooperation currently under way with the Prosecution Service of Sao Tome and Principe, which was based on the findings of the review of the latter country. She outlined that support provided through the cooperation project ranged from training programmes, to the development of practical manuals, to the provision of books, computers and electronic equipment. Brazil further reported that similar cooperation was being provided to Cabo Verde, Cuba and Mozambique.

62. A panellist from the Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission explained that he had been part of the group of experts that had been involved in the review of Palau. Subsequent to that, and in cooperation with the secretariat, Malaysia had been engaged to support Palau's preparation of the draft self-assessment checklist (CAC/COSP/2013/3) for chapter II of the Convention. The experts' knowledge of the legislation of Palau and the relevant stakeholders, drawn from their participation in the review of Palau, had been of great benefit to that process.

63. A panellist from the Federated States of Micronesia made a presentation on how the Government of that country had embedded a legal specialist within the Department of Justice to ensure follow-up to and coordination of the efforts to address the findings of their review. The panellist highlighted how the specific challenges of small island developing States had impacted their capacity to effectively implement national anti-corruption reforms. She stressed that the Mechanism and the support provided by the secretariat, both before and after the review, had allowed the Federated States of Micronesia to make significant progress in addressing such challenges and in fighting corruption. Assistance had included legislative drafting support, as well as a host of training events for judges, prosecutors and investigators.

64. Several speakers thanked the panellists for their interventions and highlighted the importance of technical assistance as part of the Mechanism. The usefulness of the country review process was noted by a number of speakers, who outlined efforts that had been made to implement the recommendations of the reviews. To that end, they reported that support from UNODC, as well as other development partners, had been crucial in their national anti-corruption reform efforts and had taken the form of legislative drafting assistance, as well as capacity-building. They also expressed the hope that further technical assistance would be available.

65. Several speakers reported on technical assistance in support of the implementation of the Convention that they were providing at the bilateral, regional and global levels. One speaker referred to its cooperation with the secretariat in providing training on the Mechanism.

66. One speaker reported on efforts to disseminate executive summaries of the review to its technical assistance providers. He noted that making the full country review reports public would facilitate the identification of areas in which technical

assistance was needed and provide for better informed and effective programmes of assistance.

67. Several speakers referred to efforts to use public-private partnerships to address technical assistance needs and also noted the role of civil society in technical assistance delivery.

VI. Financial and budgetary matters

68. The secretariat submitted updated budgetary information on expenditures incurred to date for all five years of operating the first cycle of the Mechanism, revised estimates for the second to fifth years until the end of 2015, and projected resources required after 2015 to fully complete the first cycle. The secretariat stressed that the post-2015 projections would change depending on the date of launch of the second cycle. The secretariat also detailed the resources received from both the regular budget of the United Nations and voluntary contributions, along with cost-saving measures it had put in place.

69. In addition, and in response to a request by the Group at its resumed fifth session, the secretariat presented to the Group the projected costs for the functioning of the second cycle of the Mechanism during its first two years of operation, which the secretariat estimated to total \$10,995,000 for the review of 90 States parties. In comparison, the secretariat informed the Group that the projected costs for the full completion of the first cycle were estimated to total \$23,995,000 for the review of all States parties. The secretariat clarified that additional projected costs for the second cycle resulted from a required increase in staffing and translation.

70. The secretariat expressed its appreciation for the voluntary contributions made by States to support the Mechanism, including pledges announced shortly before and during the present session of the Group.

71. Speakers expressed their satisfaction with the transparency of reporting on the funding of the Mechanism and the clarity of the documents before them. Several speakers welcomed the sound financial management exercised by the secretariat and the overall cost-effectiveness and good value for money of the Mechanism. One speaker highlighted that the cost-saving policy followed by the secretariat had resulted in decreasing expenditures. Another speaker contrasted the moderate costs of the Mechanism with the high global financial and economic costs of corruption, and stressed that the Mechanism was the only existing peer review mechanism with a nearly global constituency. Speakers discussed the funding requirements detailed in CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/CRP.6, especially with regard to the requirements for translation, interpretation and staffing. Some speakers noted that an increase in regular budget and programme budget implications was not acceptable. Some speakers called for strengthened measures to increase cost efficiency, including through the further streamlining of work processes. One speaker expressed concern at the increased workload of the secretariat described in CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/CRP.6 and noted the need to reduce the workload of the secretariat, without undermining the quality of its work, bearing in mind paragraph 33 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism. It was emphasized that full compliance with the terms of reference must be ensured, in particular section 7, on funding, and in that regard emphasized that the additional

financial requirements for the second review cycle should be funded from the regular budget. It was stressed that the projected costs for the functioning of the second cycle of the Mechanism that would be presented to the Conference at its sixth session should be in full conformity with section 7 of the terms of reference. It was also stated that resolution 4/1 was intended only to deal with unknown financial gaps that might arise between the sessions of the Conference and thus could not apply to the additional financial requirements presented by the secretariat for the second review cycle. Many speakers emphasized that the funding of the Mechanism should be from the regular budget, including the translation of all working documents during the review process. Some speakers stressed that it was the prerogative of the General Assembly, especially its Fifth Committee, and not of the Group, to decide on budget matters.

72. With regard to the financing of the second cycle of the Mechanism, a number of speakers underlined the importance of sufficient and predictable funding that enabled the Mechanism to function in an impartial and objective manner. Some speakers expressed concern about the remaining uncertainty regarding how to meet the funding requirements for the second review cycle.

73. Many speakers stated their support for the current mixed funding model, with parts of the support for and operation of the Mechanism funded from the regular budget and other parts from voluntary contributions, in line with Conference resolution 3/1 and the terms of reference of the Mechanism. They also expressed their continuing support for the corresponding model of covering shortfalls, in line with resolution 4/1. Other speakers expressed the view that the Mechanism should be funded from the regular budget in order to ensure sustainability and impartiality. On the other hand, some speakers objected to submitting additional funding requirements through the regular budget process, and one speaker stressed that an agreement on the launch and scope of the second cycle required clarity on the corresponding funding models. One speaker stated that the compromise reached in resolution 4/1 could be extended over a longer period of time. Generally, it was stressed that decisions on the regular budget could be taken only by the appropriate bodies established by the General Assembly.

VII. Other matters

74. The representative of the Russian Federation briefed the Group on preparations for the upcoming sixth session of the Conference, to be held from 2 to 6 November 2015 in Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation. The offer of the Russian Federation to host the sixth session had been welcomed at the fourth session of the Conference, held in 2011 in Marrakech, Morocco, and a national organizing committee had subsequently been established. The organizing committee was headed by the Minister of Justice and was represented by its secretary at the session of the Group. The Committee was working together with a range of institutions to prepare logistics and schedules, and had selected an operator company to assist. The venue had been identified and was in the centre of the city, with transport to be provided for delegations to and from hotels. The venue was appropriate for large meetings and had sufficient space to accommodate the plenary, parallel meetings, the media and secretariat facilities. A planning mission by UNODC under the auspices of the Committee had been carried out and had enabled consultations on

such matters as security, media, technical infrastructure and protocol. The national organizing committee had concluded agreements with 10 hotels for preferential room rates for delegates. The Committee had set up a template for the host country's conference website and logo, and the central bank of the Russian Federation was to issue a commemorative coin. The host country agreement between the Russian Federation and the United Nations was in its final stages of negotiation.

75. A summary of the briefing for NGOs, held in accordance with resolution 4/6 of the Conference, was made available to the Group (CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/CRP.4).

76. Some speakers expressed their gratitude to the NGOs that had participated in the briefing, and support for the convening of such briefings was reaffirmed. The briefings provided an opportunity to build trust and to share expertise and information with NGOs that contributed to the implementation of the Convention. Speakers encouraged NGOs to continue to focus on the outcomes of the Mechanism, including its follow-up and technical assistance activities in accordance with the needs identified. Speakers also praised the substantive discussions held during the briefing, noting that the information provided on money-laundering and asset recovery could be useful in the next cycle. Many speakers reiterated the need to comply with the terms of resolution 4/6, as recalled at the outset of the briefing by the Chair and the secretariat, including the need to avoid the mention of country-specific situations. One speaker noted that most participants had respected those terms. One speaker welcomed the participation of NGOs in activities at the national level and in the review process, and called for greater representation of NGOs from developing countries.

77. In terms of money-laundering, one speaker noted the usefulness of the discussions at the briefing, particularly in light of the relevant recommendations of international organizations that considered the risk of non-profit organizations being abused to launder the proceeds of organized crime and to facilitate the financing of terrorism.

VIII. Provisional agenda for the seventh session

78. At its 10th meeting, on 5 June 2015, the Implementation Review Group adopted the provisional agenda for its seventh session (CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/L.2).

IX. Adoption of the report

79. On 5 June 2015, the Implementation Review Group adopted the report on its sixth session (CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/L.1 and Add.1-4).

Annex I

Provisional agenda for the seventh session of the Implementation Review Group

1. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Opening of the session;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
2. Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
3. Performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
4. Technical assistance.
5. Financial and budgetary matters.
6. Other matters.
7. Provisional agenda for the eighth session of the Implementation Review Group.
8. Adoption of the report of the Implementation Review Group on its seventh session.

Annex II

Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: country pairings for the first review cycle

First year

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of African States	Zambia	Zimbabwe	Italy
	Uganda	Ghana	Romania
	Togo	United Republic of Tanzania	Uganda
	Morocco	South Africa	Slovakia
	Sao Tome and Principe	Ethiopia	Mongolia
	Rwanda	Senegal	Lebanon
	Niger	Mauritius	Russian Federation
	Burundi	Egypt	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Group of Asia-Pacific States	Jordan	Maldives	Nigeria
	Bangladesh	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Paraguay
	Mongolia	Yemen	Kenya
	Fiji	Bangladesh	United States
	Papua New Guinea	Tajikistan	Malawi
	Indonesia	Uzbekistan	United Kingdom
Group of Eastern European States	Lithuania	Russian Federation	Egypt
	Croatia	Montenegro	Lao People's Democratic Republic
	Bulgaria	Albania	Sweden
	Ukraine	Slovenia	Poland
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Chile	El Salvador	Ukraine
	Brazil	Mexico	Haiti
	Dominican Republic	Nicaragua	Uruguay
	Argentina	Panama	Singapore
	Peru	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Ecuador
Group of Western European and Other States	United States	Sweden	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
	Finland	Greece	Tunisia
	Spain	Belgium	Lithuania
	France	Denmark	Cabo Verde

Second year

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>	
Group of African States	Seychelles	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Sao Tome and Principe	
	Mauritius	Guinea-Bissau	Lesotho	
	Benin	Zimbabwe	Finland	
	Mozambique	Burkina Faso	Dominican Republic	
	Congo	Morocco	Serbia	
	Cabo Verde	Malawi	Costa Rica	
	Central African Republic	Tunisia	Ghana	
	Sierra Leone	Benin	Thailand	
	South Africa ^a	Senegal	Mali	
	Zimbabwe ^a	Madagascar	Malawi	
Cameroon ^a	Angola	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		
Group of Asia-Pacific States	Brunei Darussalam	Yemen	Liechtenstein	
	Iraq	Malaysia	Jordan	
	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Mongolia	Luxembourg	
	Kazakhstan	Pakistan	Qatar	
	Philippines	Bangladesh	Egypt	
	Viet Nam	Lebanon	Italy	
	Timor-Leste ^a	Fiji	Namibia	
	United Arab Emirates ^a	Maldives	Portugal	
	Iran (Islamic Republic of) ^a	Indonesia	Belarus	
	Kuwait ^a	Sri Lanka	Ethiopia	
Group of Eastern European States	Slovakia	Poland	Malta	
	Serbia	Romania	Ukraine	
	Montenegro	Armenia	United Kingdom	
	Estonia	Albania	Burundi	
	Azerbaijan	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guatemala	
	Russian Federation	Ukraine	Ecuador	
	Georgia ^a	Hungary	Cyprus	
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Cuba	Brazil	Guatemala	
	Uruguay	Argentina	Brazil	
	El Salvador	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Singapore	
	Nicaragua	Cuba	Nepal	
	Colombia	Honduras	Slovenia	
	Panama	Bahamas	Estonia	
	Dominica ^a	Chile	Paraguay	
	Jamaica ^a	Trinidad and Tobago	Netherlands	
	Group of Western European and Other States	Australia	United States	Turkey
		Norway	Sweden	Kuwait
United Kingdom		Israel	Greece	
Portugal		Spain	Morocco	
Switzerland ^a		Finland	Algeria	

^a Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

Third year

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of African States	Lesotho	Botswana	Gabon
	Djibouti	Liberia	Peru
	Algeria	Niger	Latvia
	Ghana	Rwanda	Swaziland
	United Republic of Tanzania	Sierra Leone	Australia
	Burkina Faso	Guinea	Rwanda
	Tunisia	Côte d'Ivoire	Togo
	Angola	Liberia	Timor-Leste
	Mauritania ^a	Central African Republic	Marshall Islands
Group of Asia-Pacific States	Republic of Korea	India	Bulgaria
	Cyprus	Nauru	Austria
	Malaysia	Philippines	Kenya
	Pakistan	Solomon Islands	Norway
	Qatar	Micronesia (Federated States of)	Dominica
	Afghanistan	China	Brunei Darussalam
	Sri Lanka ^a	Papua New Guinea	China
Group of Eastern European States	Hungary	Republic of Moldova	Jamaica
	Slovenia	Latvia	Djibouti
	Latvia	Georgia	Ireland
	Romania	Estonia	France
	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Croatia	Iceland
	Armenia	Lithuania	Kyrgyzstan
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Mexico	Peru	Azerbaijan
	Paraguay	Colombia	Philippines
	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Costa Rica	Zambia
	Trinidad and Tobago	Argentina	Palau
	Guyana	Cuba	Vanuatu
	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Chile	United Arab Emirates
Group of Western European and Other States	Sweden	France	Canada
	Canada	Switzerland	Iraq
	Luxembourg	Austria	Switzerland
	Italy	Liechtenstein	Kazakhstan
	Netherlands	Australia	Uruguay
	Austria	Israel	Viet Nam
	Malta ^a	Spain	Cambodia

^a Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

Fourth year

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>	
Group of African States	Senegal	Comoros	Croatia	
	Liberia	Benin	South Africa	
	Kenya	Cabo Verde	Papua New Guinea	
	Nigeria	Lesotho	Montenegro	
	Gabon	Sierra Leone	Lao People's Democratic Republic	
	Malawi	Djibouti	Kuwait	
	Libya	Mozambique	Namibia	
	Madagascar	Nigeria	Nicaragua	
	Namibia	Ethiopia	Canada	
	Ethiopia	Togo	Malta	
	Democratic Republic of the Congo ^a	Mauritius	Viet Nam	
	Botswana ^a	Burundi	Bulgaria	
	Egypt ^b	Burkina Faso	Algeria	
	Guinea-Bissau ^b	Cameroon [Guinea]	Palau	
	Swaziland ^a	Botswana	Sri Lanka	
	Comoros ^a	Sudan	Trinidad and Tobago	
	Côte d'Ivoire ^a	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Azerbaijan	
	Mali ^b	Niger	Afghanistan	
	Guinea ^a	Mauritania	Saint Lucia	
	Sudan ^a	Angola	State of Palestine	
	South Sudan ^a	Seychelles	Congo	
	Group of Asia-Pacific States	Kyrgyzstan	Indonesia	Pakistan
		Maldives	Palau	Cabo Verde
		Lebanon	Islamic Republic of Iran	Seychelles
		Uzbekistan	Sri Lanka	Georgia
		Palau	Malaysia	Cambodia
		Turkmenistan	Kyrgyzstan	Cyprus
		Singapore	Lebanon	Swaziland
		China	Viet Nam	Bahamas
		Tajikistan	Cook Islands	Hungary
		Bahrain ^a	Jordan	Honduras
		Thailand ^a	Nepal	Bahrain
		India ^a	Kazakhstan	Uganda
Nepal ^a		Fiji	Benin	
Vanuatu ^a		Solomon Islands	India	
Cook Islands ^a		Qatar	Belarus	
Marshall Islands ^a		Papua New Guinea	Central African Republic	
Solomon Islands ^a		Iraq	Slovakia	
Micronesia (Federated States of) ^a		Mongolia	Republic of Korea	
Nauru ^a		Timor-Leste	Jamaica	
Yemen ^b		United Arab Emirates	Sao Tome and Principe	
Cambodia ^b	Myanmar	Togo		
Myanmar ^a	Thailand	Burundi		

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
	Saudi Arabia ^a	Cambodia	Mozambique
	Oman ^a	Kiribati	Saudi Arabia
	State of Palestine ^a	Oman	Micronesia (Federated States of)
Group of Eastern European States	Poland	Serbia	Mauritius
	Belarus	Georgia	Republic of Moldova
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Hungary	Portugal
	Albania	Armenia	Mali
	Republic of Moldova	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Norway
	Czech Republic ^a	Republic of Moldova	Turkmenistan
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Ecuador	Guatemala	Dominica
	Haiti	Colombia	Indonesia
	Costa Rica	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Democratic Republic of the Congo
	Honduras	Dominican Republic	Nauru
	Guatemala	Panama	Antigua and Barbuda
	Antigua and Barbuda	Brazil	Fiji
	Bahamas	El Salvador	Zambia
	Saint Lucia ^a	Cuba	Marshall Islands
	Grenada ^a	Saint Lucia	South Sudan
Group of Western European and Other States	Turkey	Belgium	Malaysia
	Greece	Ireland	Gabon
	Belgium	Netherlands	Mexico
	Denmark	Austria	United Republic of Tanzania
	Israel	Greece	Uzbekistan
	Liechtenstein ^a	Canada	United Arab Emirates
	Iceland ^a	Norway	Madagascar
	Ireland ^a	Luxembourg	Brunei Darussalam
	Germany ^a	Denmark	Congo [Czech Republic]

^a State party that ratified or acceded to the Convention after the drawing of lots at the first session of the Implementation Review Group.

^b Deferred from previous year of the cycle.