



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

Distr.: General  
1 October 2014

Original: English

---

**Implementation Review Group**

**Sixth session**

Vienna, 1-5 June 2015

Item 2 of the provisional agenda\*\*

**Review of implementation of the United Nations  
Convention against Corruption**

**Executive summary**

**Note by the Secretariat**

**Addendum**

**Contents**

	<i>Page</i>
II. Executive summary.....	2
Dominica .....	2

---

\* Reissued for technical reasons on 26 March 2015.

\*\* CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/1.



## II. Executive summary

### Dominica

#### 1. Introduction: Overview of the legal and institutional framework of Dominica in the context of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Dominica acceded to the Convention on May 28, 2010. The Dominican legal system is founded in the common law tradition. Dominica has a contradictory/accusatory criminal process. Treaties ratified by Dominica are not applied automatically, but must be incorporated in its legislation, and therefore cannot be applied directly. The fundamental penal norms are contained in common law and various statutes including the Criminal Law and Procedure Act, the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act and the Integrity in Public Office Act.

Dominica has reformed its legal framework to strengthen its regime against corruption. The cornerstone in this fight is the Integrity in Public Office Act, which was passed by the Parliament on April 30, 2003. The Integrity in Public Office (Commencement) Order 2008 defined September 1, 2008, as the effective date of the entry into force of the Act. This Act provides for the creation of an Integrity Commission with the purpose of establishing integrity and accountability for public officials.

The most prominent institutions in the fight against corruption are the Financial Intelligence Unit, the Police, the Customs Department, the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Integrity Commission, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

#### 2. Chapter III: Criminalization and law enforcement

##### 2.1. Observations on the implementation of the articles under review

###### *Bribery and trading in influence (arts. 15, 16, 18 and 21)*

Section 37 of the Integrity in Public Office Act establishes the concept of public official for criminal purposes. Based on this provision and on its judicial interpretation, the concept of “public official” is defined broadly. However, it is restricted to high-ranking public officials and excludes the judiciary.

Active bribery is defined in section 38 (1) of the Integrity in Public Office Act, which explicitly covers some elements of the offence of active bribery, except the terms promising and giving. Passive bribery is regulated in section 38 (2) of the same Act. These offences do not contain the elements of indirect conduct and benefit for third parties.

Dominica has no legal norms on transnational bribery.

Active and passive trading in influence are regulated in section 39 of the Integrity in Public Office Act. However, these definitions do not contain all the elements and their sphere of application is limited (procurement, public official). Section 42 (2) of the referenced legal text defines undue influence in a criminal process by offences regulated in the Integrity in Public Office Act.

No statutory definition has been established for active bribery in the private sector. Passive bribery in the private sector is regulated in the Cooperative Societies Act and the Building Societies Act, applicable to a limited segment of the private sector and without covering all the elements provided for in the Convention.

*Money-laundering, concealment (arts. 23 and 24)*

The offence of money-laundering is established in the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act 2011, section 3. The norm does not contemplate the elements “acquisition” or “use” of assets obtained through crime; however, those elements can be understood as included when interpreting the norm in force. The element of concealment is regulated only generally. All corruption offences are considered predicate offences.

Concealment is regulated in the legislation against money-laundering and there is no more generic regulation; however, there is no indication that the current regulation includes continued retention.

*Embezzlement, abuse of functions and illicit enrichment (arts. 17, 19, 20 and 22)*

Dominica has not enacted legislation that specifically addresses embezzlement in the public or private sector. Notwithstanding, the acts described in Article 17 of the Convention are contained in the Theft Act Number 38 of 1982, as amended in 1995 and in 2010, which covers theft and misappropriation in general terms.

Similarly, there is no regulation on abuse of functions.

Illicit enrichment is criminalized in section 47 (1) of the Integrity in Public Office Act. When public officials leave the civil service, they must continue to declare their assets for two years and can be subject to prosecution for the next 5 years.

*Obstruction of justice (art. 25)*

The conduct described in Article 25, paragraph (a), is not regulated. Section 54 of the Integrity in Public Office Act defines the conduct described in Article 25, paragraph (b); however, it covers only officials of the Integrity Commission.

*Liability of legal persons (art. 26)*

Criminal liability of legal persons is established for the offences regulated in the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act and sections 1 to 4 of the Financial Services Unit Act No. 18 of 2008.

Administrative liability of legal persons is dealt with in sections 3, 11, 22 of the Banking Act No. 16 of 2005.

Civil liability of legal persons is dealt with in section 114 of the International Business Companies Act No. 10 of 1996 and, sections 7 and 68 of the Cooperative Societies Act No. 2 of 2011.

*Participation and attempt (art. 27)*

The different forms of participation in corruption crimes are regulated in section 41 of the Integrity in Public Office Act, section 7 of the Criminal Law and Procedure Act and in section 3 (2) of the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act of 2011.

Likewise, attempt is covered in sections 35 and 36 of the Criminal Law and Procedure Act, subject to the discretion of a judge.

*Prosecution, adjudication and sanctions; cooperation with law enforcement authorities (arts. 30 and 37)*

All the aforementioned offences may be punished with penalties of imprisonment, fines, and disqualification, and the confiscation of proceeds, thus taking into account the gravity of the respective offences.

The legal regime provides jurisdictional privileges for the President only for his term of office.

Prosecution is governed by the principle of opportunity of investigation and accusation.

As regards alternatives to pretrial detention, although bail is regulated, it applies only for offences that carry penalties of less than two years of imprisonment, and therefore cannot apply for offences of corruption.

The suspension, reassignment, or transfer of a public official accused of an offence, and any disqualification, is imposed by the Dominican authorities as a practice, without a specific regulation.

Any disciplinary action taken is the responsibility of the Public Service Commission; however, the pertinent norms exclude lower ranking officials.

As regards collaboration with the justice system, substantial cooperation may be considered a mitigating circumstance for sentencing purposes. There is no legal framework that provides protection for persons collaborating with justice.

*Protection of witnesses and reporting persons (arts. 32 and 33)*

The absence of legislation or a programme for protection of witnesses, experts, and victims, as well as for protection of whistle-blowers, was noted. There is a bill on witness protection.

*Freezing, seizing and confiscation; bank secrecy (arts. 31 and 40)*

The Proceeds of Crime Act, Integrity in Public Office Act, and the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act provide for confiscation of products and instruments used to commit an offence, but not of instruments destined for use in committing an offence. Seizure is regulated only in relation to money-laundering, and a freezing order loses its legal force after seven days if the alleged offender is not accused in that time.

There is no regime to manage confiscated assets, nor a comprehensive regime to manage seized assets. The system of confiscation in Dominica is based on criminal conviction and on the value of the proceeds of crime, and consequently includes assets transformed into other assets, intermingled with assets from legitimate sources, and income of other benefits derived from assets. The rights of bona fide third parties are regulated only in relation to confiscation and seizure for offences of money-laundering.

Judicial authorization is required to lift bank secrecy.

*Statute of limitations; criminal record (arts. 29 and 41)*

The statute of limitations is 6 years. Also, the Integrity in Public Office Act stipulates that public officials may be prosecuted for a term of 5 years after they leave office.

A prior conviction in any Member State of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States may be used against a detainee, but this provision excludes judgements of guilt originating in other States.

*Jurisdiction (art. 42)*

The Integrity in Public Office Act and the Criminal Law and Procedure Act do not address the issue of jurisdiction. There are rules on jurisdiction in the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act, but they do not cover acts of participation in the predicate offences of money-laundering committed abroad.

*Consequences of acts of corruption; compensation for damage (arts. 34 and 35)*

There are no regulations on eliminating the consequences of acts of corruption.

Any person or entity that considers itself aggrieved has access to the civil and criminal courts to seek the necessary compensation. It was noted that there is a preference for the civil courts because they have a lower standard of proof.

*Specialized authorities and inter-agency coordination (arts. 36, 38 and 39)*

The most important institutions in the fight against corruption are the Integrity Commission, the Financial Intelligence Unit, the Police, the Customs Department, and the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Although no agency has been designated to handle coordination, there is a high level of cooperation among domestic agencies responsible for investigating and prosecuting crimes which have joint operations.

There is also good cooperation between the private sector and the authorities, which should be increased. No measures have been taken to encourage citizens to report cases of corruption.

**2.2. Successes and good practices**

- Dominica has a legislative framework which includes the Integrity in Public Office Act, under which an Integrity Commission was created; the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act; the Tax Information Exchange Act; the Extradition Act; and the Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act, which allow implementation of several provisions of the Convention.
- There is a high level of cooperation among domestic agencies responsible for investigating and prosecuting crimes of corruption, and between them and the country's public authorities.

### 2.3. Challenges in implementation

- In general terms, it was recommended to adapt the concept of public official to the definition of Article 2 of the Convention.
- Further, a lack of statistics and concrete examples of application of the Convention was noted and it was recommended to create a database to generate statistics that show not only the types of cases treated but the time it has taken to resolve them.

The following recommendations were made, by article:

- Article 15 (a): Amend the offence of active bribery of public officials to include the elements of “promise” and “giving” as well as the direct and indirect forms of conduct and benefits for third parties. On the element “without reasonable justification”, it would be advisable to establish norms that bring uniformity to the treatment of cases to avoid impunity in cases of bribery.
- Article 15 (b): Complement section 38, paragraph 2, to include the direct and indirect forms of conduct in all modalities, as well as the benefits for third parties. Regarding the element “without reasonable justification”, it would be advisable to establish norms that define cases in which an official has legal authority, establish cases of reasonable justification, and help unify the treatment of cases to avoid impunity in cases of bribery.
- Article 16: Paragraph 1: Criminalize active bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations.
- Article 16: Paragraphs 2, 19, 21 (a): Consider criminalizing passive bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations, abuse of functions, and active bribery in the private sector.
- Article 17: Include a specific provision on misappropriation in the public sector.
- Article 18: Consider including the elements “give or promise”, benefits for third parties, and direct or indirect forms of conduct, and expanding the scope of application of the norm.
- Article 21 (b): Consider amending the offence to cover all entities in the private sector and all elements such as “soliciting” or “breach of duty”.
- Article 22: Consider adapting the law to cover the distinctive element of embezzlement, by specifically sanctioning the person to whom private assets, funds, or instruments have been entrusted “by reason of his position”.
- Article 23: Specify the verb “conceal” to define its scope; provide a copy of the anti-money-laundering legislation to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
- Article 24: Consider amending the offence of money-laundering to include the element of continued retention.
- Article 25 (a): Criminalize obstruction of justice as described in the mentioned provision.

- Article 25 (b): Expand the norm to cover officials of the judiciary and law enforcement officers.
- Article 26: Consider extending the responsibility of legal persons to all offences covered by the Convention.
- Article 27, paragraph 2: Ensure that attempt is mandatorily criminalized. If the judiciary does not interpret the law in this manner, this may imply the need for a legislative reform.
- Article 27, paragraph 3: Dominica could adopt measures to define the preparation for an offence.
- Article 28: Bearing in mind that the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act contains a specific regulation, consider extending it to all crimes of corruption.
- Article 29: Consider establishing legislation on interruption/suspension of the statute of limitations, and establish legislation on fugitives from justice.
- Article 30: Paragraph 2: Consider revising the criminal immunity of the President of Dominica during his term of office. Paragraph 3: Establish objective criteria for starting and continuing investigations to avoid arbitrary decisions, and ensure that public prosecutors have control over investigations and reports made to the Police. Paragraph 5: Take measures to ensure that the gravity of crimes of corruption is taken into account when granting early release or parole. Paragraphs 6 and 7: Consider creating pertinent legislation. Paragraph 8: Unify norms on the disciplinary system, taking into consideration the need to create a system that allows for the independence of the administrative system from the criminal system. Paragraph 10: Support social reintegration of persons sentenced for crimes of corruption.
- Article 31: Paragraph 1: Regulate confiscation of assets “destined for use”. Paragraph 2: Regulate seizure or freezing of the proceeds and instruments of all crimes of corruption; consider extending the 7-day term of a freezing order. Paragraph 3: Comprehensively regulate management by the competent authorities of seized, frozen, or confiscated assets, including more complex assets, and create the pertinent capacities. Paragraph 8: Consider the possibility of requiring an offender to prove the legal origin of the alleged proceeds of crime or other assets liable to confiscation in cases of corruption. Paragraph 9: Ensure mechanisms to protect the right of bona fide third parties in the system of confiscation and seizure or freezing for all offences, not only for crimes of money-laundering.
- Article 32: Take all legislative and institutional measures to protect witnesses, experts, and victims. Promote the approval of the Witness Protection Bill currently in Parliament. Take suitable measures to permit victims to present their views and concerns in criminal proceedings.
- Article 33: Consider providing protection against unjustified treatment for persons reporting crimes of corruption.
- Article 34: Consider adopting legal norms on addressing the consequences of acts of corruption.

- Article 36: Allocate the human resources necessary for the effective execution of the work of both the Integrity Commission and the Director of Public Prosecutions, and develop local capacities for officers of the Commission, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Financial Intelligence Unit.
- Article 36: Provide functional and financial autonomy to both the Integrity Commission and the Director of Public Prosecutions.
- Article 36: As regards the Integrity Commission:
  - Objectively define the scope of discretionary power to pursue an investigation or dismiss it.
  - Create an investigative body for cases of corruption.
  - Allocate the human resources necessary for the Integrity Commission and the Director of Public Prosecutions to perform their work effectively, and develop local capabilities.
  - Provide the means necessary to create a legal library for the Integrity Commission.
  - Provide technical assistance in combating corruption through training and development of capacities for members of the Commission, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Financial Intelligence Unit.
  - Negotiate the necessary mechanisms to provide functional and financial autonomy to both the Integrity Commission and the Director of Public Prosecutions' Office to ensure the sustainability of both institutions. The Integrity Commission would then have a budget allocated by Parliament to ensure its functional independence.
  - Provide technical assistance to strengthen the investigative capacities of the Integrity Commission, the Financial Intelligence Unit, the Chambers of the Attorney General, and the Police Force.
- Article 37: Consider the possibility of granting judicial immunity to collaborators with justice; create a legal framework for their protection; consider concluding agreements or arrangements on collaboration with law enforcement of other States parties.
- Article 38: Consider training domestic agencies responsible for anti-corruption investigations in matters of prevention.
- Article 39: Consider taking measures to encourage reporting of criminal offences.
- Article 41: Dominica could extend its regulations on taking into account previous convictions in other States to all States parties to the Convention.
- Article 42: Establish rules on jurisdiction for crimes of corruption which cover all the elements covered in this article.

#### **2.4. Technical assistance needs identified to improve implementation of the Convention**

- Articles 15 and 16: Summary of good practices and lessons learned, on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert, development of a plan of action for implementation and capacity-building for employees in the Commission for Integrity, investigators, and operative personnel.
- Article 17: Legislative drafting; model legislation.
- Article 18: On-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; development of an action plan for implementation.
- Article 19: Model legislation and legislative drafting.
- Article 20: On-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; development of an action plan for implementation.
- Article 21: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model legislation; legislative drafting; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; development of an action plan for implementation.
- Article 22: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model legislation and legislative drafting.
- Article 23: Model legislation; legislative drafting; legal advice, assistance in capacity-building for forensic analysis and investigation.
- Article 24: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model legislation; legislative drafting; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; development of an action plan for application.
- Article 25: Model legislation; legislative drafting.
- Article 26: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; legislative drafting; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; model legislation; development of an action plan for application.
- Article 29: Legislative drafting; legal advice; model legislation.
- Article 30: Legislative drafting; legal advice; model legislation.
- Article 31: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model legislation; legislative drafting; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; capacity-building programmes for authorities responsible for identifying and tracing of assets or instruments; capacity-building programmes for authorities responsible for establishment and management of systems for management of frozen, seized or confiscated assets.
- Article 32: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model legislation; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; model agreements and arrangements; capacity-building programmes for authorities responsible for establishment and management of programmes for protection of witnesses, experts, and victims.
- Article 33: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model legislation; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; capacity-building programmes

for authorities responsible for establishing and managing programmes for protection of whistle-blowers.

- Article 35: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert.
- Article 36: Capacity-building for officials who exercise technical functions of the Financial Intelligence Unit in forensic investigation and analysis, proper use of software; strengthening the investigative capability of the Integrity Commission; strengthening the capabilities of the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Police.
- Article 37: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model legislation; legislative drafting; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; capacity-building programmes for authorities responsible for the establishment and management of protection programmes.
- Article 38: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert.
- Article 39: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model legislation; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; development of an action plan for implementation.
- Article 40: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; legal advice; capacity-building programmes for relevant legislative and investigating authorities.
- Article 42: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; legislative drafting; legal advice; capacity-building programmes for investigative, prosecution or judicial authorities on cross-border cooperation and coordination mechanisms.

### **3. Chapter IV: International cooperation**

#### **3.1. Observations on the implementation of the articles under review**

*Extradition; transfer of sentenced persons; transfer of criminal proceedings  
(arts. 44, 45 and 47)*

Extradition in Dominica is regulated in the Extradition Act, Chapter 12:04, of the revised legislation of Dominica of 1981 (approved in 1983) and authorized by the “Legislative Rules and Orders” (LRO) of 1990.

The requirements for extradition are dual criminality, a minimum penalty of 12 months of imprisonment, and that the offences be included in the Schedule of the Extradition Act (*Numerus Clausus*). Of crimes of corruption, the Schedule includes only bribery, embezzlement, and money-laundering. Extradition for accessory offences is not covered.

Dominica does not subject extradition to the existence of a treaty in its relations with other members of the Commonwealth, but does with States outside the Commonwealth, although in the absence of a treaty, the Director of Public Prosecutions is authorized to accept a request for extradition if it meets certain conditions. Dominica cannot use the Convention as a legal basis for extradition.

The Extradition Act permits detention of persons sought for extradition.

Dominica has no impediment to extraditing its nationals, and guarantees fair treatment of defendants. Extradition for fiscal offences is not restricted.

Dominica does not keep statistics on extradition.

Dominica has some bilateral and multilateral extradition treaties.

The Repatriation of Prisoners Act of 2009 provides for international agreements for the transfer of sentenced persons. Dominica has completed a pertinent agreement.

Dominica has not adopted measures to implement transfer of criminal proceedings. However, the central authority has the prerogative to determine the best jurisdiction for the proceedings.

*Mutual legal assistance (art. 46)*

Mutual legal assistance is regulated in the Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act (1990) and in bilateral treaties concluded by Dominica. Parts II and III of the law are applicable to Member States of the Commonwealth, any country that has a bilateral treaty with Dominica or that is a State Party to the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988. Part IV refers to external States. Notwithstanding, Dominica does not subject provision of mutual legal assistance to the existence of a treaty but acts on a basis of reciprocity.

Spontaneous transmission of information, in absence of a legal stipulation, can occur in practice; however, there are no cases of application.

Dominica applies a strict requirement of dual criminality, although based on Section 6 of the Mutual Assistance Act a broader requirement could be applied. Differences in the denomination of offences between two jurisdictions do not constitute an impediment to providing assistance.

Transfer of a person to another State for purposes of identification, testimony, or other proceedings is regulated only in relation to other countries in the Commonwealth and countries to which part II and III of the Act apply.

Among the grounds to refuse requests for mutual legal assistance no mention is made of bank secrecy or tax matters.

The central authority is the Attorney General. The post of Attorney General is held by a former Magistrate. He heads the Chambers of the Attorney General. The official procedure is handled directly through the central authorities. All requests sent via the Central Authority must be in writing.

Dominica can provide assistance in accordance with the procedures specified in the request, to the extent it does not contravene domestic law.

Although the legislation contains no objection to it, Dominica does not yet conduct hearings of witnesses or experts by videoconference.

Dominica must provide reasons for any denial of assistance, except cases of requests for transfer of detainees for purposes of surrender.

*Law enforcement cooperation; joint investigations; special investigative techniques (arts. 48, 49 and 50)*

On cooperation in law enforcement, the Dominican Financial Intelligence Unit and the Attorney General cooperate fully with their counterparts through memorandums of understanding and through informal channels. Police-to-Police requests for assistance are sent through INTERPOL.

Joint investigative teams have not yet been established.

The use of special investigative techniques is not regulated in Dominica, although there are considerations in that regard.

### **3.2. Successes and good practices**

- Good practices were observed in the area of informal cooperation among domestic agencies responsible for investigation in prosecuting crimes of corruption, and the fluid cooperation of the Financial Intelligence Unit with its regional counterparts.

### **3.3. Challenges in implementation**

The following recommendations were made, by article:

- Article 44:
  - Keep a record of requests for mutual legal assistance and extradition, which includes the time required to process requests.
  - Dominica could allow extradition in the absence of double criminality, and extradition for related offences.
  - Ensure that all crimes of corruption are considered extraditable and are included in future bilateral treaties.
  - Consider using the Convention as the legal basis for extradition or otherwise apply Parts II and III of the Extradition Act to all States parties to the Convention.
  - Regulate the criteria for intervention of the Attorney General in relation to extradition not based on a treaty.
  - Extend the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral treaties on extradition with States parties to the Convention.
  - Notify the Secretary-General in relation to the use of the Convention as the legal basis for extradition.
  - Include rules in domestic legislation and treaties to simplify and expedite extradition proceedings.
- Article 45: Conclude additional agreements on transfer of sentenced persons.
- Article 46:
  - Use the Convention as the legal basis, or otherwise apply parts II and III of the Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act to all States parties to the Convention against Corruption.

- Continue to provide assistance based on the principle of reciprocity.
  - More specifically regulate the granting of provisional measures such as freezing and seizure of assets in the context of mutual legal assistance.
  - Provide assistance that does not entail coercive measures in the absence of dual criminality.
  - In relation to detainees who are transferred to provide testimony, etc., adopt a regulation for countries that are not members of the Commonwealth to which Parts II and III of the Act could not be applied.
  - Notify the Secretary-General of the central authority and the language required for requests for assistance.
  - Where possible and where the States parties agree, consider accepting mutual legal assistance requests, in urgent circumstances, through the International Criminal Police Organization.
  - Dominica could apply the mechanism of videoconference for witness hearings. Apply the principle of speciality in practice.
  - Regulate the obligation to justify any denial of assistance in all cases.
  - Apply the Convention directly in cases that require postponement of assistance if it interferes with ongoing proceedings.
  - Adopt a system that provides for absorbing the ordinary costs of a request.
  - Provide a legal framework for cooperation on the basis of reciprocity.
  - Conclude additional bilateral agreements.
- Article 47: Implement the measures necessary for transfer of criminal proceedings.
  - Article 48: Strengthen cooperation and exchange of information through agreements on cooperation in law enforcement; formalize processes for exchange of information and inter-institutional cooperation; promote the use of the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation.
  - Article 49: Consider searching for channels of cooperation with other States to establish joint investigative teams, and establish the normative framework that regulates coordination of international teams.
  - Article 50: Adopt special investigative techniques, establishing objective criteria for starting and pursuing investigations of acts of corruption; consider adopting bilateral or regional agreements on their use in international cooperation; allow such cooperation on a case-by-case basis.

#### **3.4. Technical assistance needs identified to improve implementation of the Convention**

Dominica has requested technical assistance both in legislative matters and for capacity-building.

- Article 44: Model treaties; summary of good practices and lessons learned; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; capacity-building

programmes for authorities responsible for international cooperation in criminal matters.

- Article 45: Model treaties; summary of good practices and lessons learned; legal advice.
  - Article 46: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; treaties, model agreements and arrangements; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; capacity-building programmes for authorities responsible for international cooperation in criminal matters.
  - Article 48: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; capacity-building programmes for authorities responsible for cross-border legal cooperation; model agreements and arrangements; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; development of an action plan for implementation.
  - Article 49: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model agreements and arrangements; capacity-building programmes for authorities responsible for legal cooperation.
  - Article 50: Summary of good practices and lessons learned; model agreements and arrangements; legal advice; on-site assistance by an anti-corruption expert; capacity-building programmes for authorities responsible for international cooperation in criminal matters and investigation and authorities responsible for designing and managing the use of special investigative techniques.
-