

---

**Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations  
Convention against Corruption  
Open-ended Intergovernmental Working  
Group on Technical Assistance  
Vienna, 1 and 2 October 2007**

**Report of the International Cooperation Workshop on  
Technical Assistance for the Implementation of the United  
Nations Convention against Corruption, hosted by the  
Government of Uruguay, Montevideo, 30 May-1 June 2007**

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1-6	2
II. Agenda .....	7	2
III. Documentation .....	8	3
IV. Attendance .....	9	3
V. Chairman .....	10	3
VI. Discussions .....	11-43	3
A. Opening of the Meeting .....	11-14	3
B. The United Nations Convention against Corruption as a framework for development assistance .....	15-22	4
C. Implementing the United Nations Convention against Corruption as an essential element of sustainable development .....	23-31	5
D. Ensuring consistency and coherence in the delivery of technical assistance..	32-43	6
VII. Conclusions .....	44-47	8
 Annexes		
Annex I. Chairman's summary.....		9
Annex II. Donor declaration .....		12
Annex III. List of participants .....		13

## **I. Introduction**

1. The Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption at its first session, held in Jordan from 10 to 14 December 2006, adopted resolution 1/6 which recommended that a workshop of relevant practitioners and experts, including from multilateral and bilateral donor agencies and recipient countries, be held within six months after the first session, bringing together, inter alia, development and legal expertise related to anti-corruption policies, the main purpose being to contribute to mutual understanding among experts in this field, discussing, inter alia, issues related to best practices and coordination.
2. In the same resolution, the Conference of the States Parties requested the Secretariat, in close collaboration with interested parties and subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources, to facilitate the organization of the workshop.
3. Pursuant to this resolution and thanks to the contributions of Finland, France, Germany, Norway and the United Kingdom and the offer of the Government of Uruguay to act as host, the International Cooperation Workshop on Technical Assistance was held in Montevideo from 30 May to 1 June 2006.
4. The Intergovernmental Cooperation Workshop on Technical Assistance for the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption has been held in Montevideo from 30 May to 1 June 2007 pursuant to resolution 1/6 of the Conference of the State Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption on its first session, held in Amman from 10 to 14 December 2006 (CAC/COSP/2006/12).
5. The report provides an account of the workshop's discussions, which analyzed the United Nations Convention as a framework for development assistance, focusing on the implementation of the Convention as an essential element of sustainable development and on the issues of consistency and coherence in the delivery of technical assistance.
6. The report addresses lessons learnt and best practices, strategies for the promotion of mutual understanding among development and legal experts and for improving coordination and maximizing impact of technical assistance. The report contains conclusions and recommendations. It will be made available to the Working Group on Technical Assistance at its First Meeting (Vienna, Austria, 1-2 October 2007) and to the Conference of State Parties at its Second Session (Bali-Indonesia, 28 January – 1 February 2008).

## **II. Agenda**

7. The Meeting organized the work according to the following agenda:
  1. Opening
  2. The United Nations Convention against Corruption as a framework for development assistance:
    - (a) Promoting mutual understanding among development and legal experts

- (b) Making use of existing initiatives
- (c) Sharing lessons learnt and best practices
- 3. Implementing the United Nations Convention against Corruption as an essential element of sustainable development:
  - (a) Mainstreaming the United Nations Convention as a safeguard to development
  - (b) Promoting governance through the effective implementation of the Convention
- 4. Ensuring consistency and coherence in the delivery of technical assistance:
  - (a) Matching technical assistance with needs and priorities of requesting States
  - (b) Working towards improved coordination and maximized impact of technical assistance
  - (c) Enhancing transparency and accountability in assistance delivery
- 5. Conclusions

### **III. Documentation**

8. The meeting had before it: (i) Resolution 1/6 of the Conference of the State Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption entitled “International cooperation workshop on technical assistance of the United Nations Convention against Corruption”; (ii) Background paper prepared by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland; (iii) Background paper prepared by the U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre; as well as a range of related material made available to the meeting by participating Governments and organizations.

### **IV. Attendance**

9. The meeting was attended by 75 experts from 37 countries; and 14 experts from international and non-governmental organizations. A list of participants is contained in Annex III of the present report.

### **V. Chairman**

10. Mr. Eugenio Curia, in his capacity as Vice President of the Conference of the States Parties chaired the workshop.

### **VI. Discussions**

#### **A. Opening of the meeting**

11. The Meeting was opened, on 30 May 2007, by the Foreign Minister of Uruguay, Mr. Reinaldo Gargano. He expressed thanks to the donors for funding the organization of the workshop in Uruguay and his pleasure that the United Nations had accepted the Uruguayan Government’s offer to host the International

Cooperation Workshop. He wished the participants every success in achieving the objectives of the meeting.

12. The representative of UNODC recognized the extensive input and assistance provided by the Government of Uruguay in organizing the workshop and expressed his gratitude to the donors that provided voluntary contributions that made the workshop possible. He recalled the negotiations of resolution 1/6 at the first session of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and particularly noted the objectives the negotiators gave to the workshop. He noted the relevance of the workshop for the intergovernmental working group on technical assistance established by resolution 1/5 of the Conference and for the second session of the Conference of the States Parties to be held in Indonesia from 28 January to 1 February 2008.

13. Participants expressed their gratitude to the Government of Uruguay for their generosity in hosting the workshop, to the donors for providing the resources that made the workshop possible and to UNODC for the organization of the event.

14. Before starting the substantive items, the Chairman invited the meeting to discuss issues interactively in order to foster exchanges of views and experiences.

## **B. The United Nations Convention against Corruption as a framework for development assistance**

15. The meeting heard presentations summarizing the two background papers commissioned by Norway and Finland. Subsequent presentations on promoting mutual understanding among development and legal experts, making use of existing initiatives, and sharing lessons learnt and good practices were made by NORAD, the U4, OECD, the World Bank, UNDP and GTZ.

16. The Convention highlighted a range of issues of great importance for development, including the principles of proper management of public affairs and public property, fairness, responsibility and equality before the law and the need to safeguard integrity and foster a culture of rejection of corrupt practices. In this context, the meeting discussed the role of the Convention for development assistance, particularly for governance issues and reform. The value of the Convention as an implementation and programming framework for donor countries was noted. Due to its nature as a consensus instrument, the Convention established common standards for determining needs, setting goals, implementation and progress assessments. Particularly articles 60 to 62 of the Convention identified the key components of the partnership between donor and recipient countries with respect to development assistance: Capacity-building and training; information analysis; and the sharing and transfer of knowledge.

17. The meeting highlighted the key challenge of making it a common tool and engaging all Member States. The current membership of 93 countries which was steadily growing, this would be an issue high on the political agenda of many countries. In this context, participants found the two background papers to contain useful suggestions which should be submitted in the lead up to the intergovernmental working group on technical assistance and the Conference of the States Parties.

18. It was noted that the different chapters of the Convention called for different kinds of technical assistance, for example assistance with the implementation of the prevention chapter of the Convention was closely related to development assistance, while the implementation of measures aimed at combating corruption

often required assistance to law enforcement agencies. The Convention could provide the comprehensive framework to ensure that these inter-connected problems were addressed through integrated responses and strategic interventions. This in turn would aid development agencies to base their interventions on a systematic and structured institutional knowledge and avoid practitioners “reinventing the wheel” and strategy formulation to take place in a vacuum.

19. Without being overly prescriptive of the process, the meeting recognized the need to mainstream the implementation of anti-corruption efforts into ongoing and planned development assistance programmes, including into the regular United Nations budget and by way of providing additional voluntary contributions.

20. The meeting noted that the potential of implementing the Convention for the overall development goals was underestimated. While many development assistance projects de facto contributed to its implementation, the Convention was often unknown and not mentioned in the projects. The meeting recognized the responsibility of donors to ensure that technical assistance for the implementation of the Convention is carefully integrated into broader governance plans to avoid duplication and contradicting advice.

21. Participants highlighted that the guiding principles for development assistance set out in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and lessons learned in aid effectiveness could be applied to implementation assistance under the Convention. The Paris Declaration and the Convention were regarded as mutually reinforcing.

22. The meeting discussed the nature of article 62 of the Convention which requested that technical assistance be rendered for the implementation of the Convention. In this context, some speakers raised the concern that by linking technical assistance for the implementation of the Convention to development assistance, potential conditions placed on anti-corruption efforts could lead to derailing development efforts, by making governance a pre-condition for development. One speaker expressed the view that the relationship between corruption, governance and development needed to be further researched. The meeting recognized the legitimate concern of donors to see that their aid projects were effective, showed the intended results and thus that money was well spent. However, it was also stressed that technical assistance under the Convention was to be provided with no conditions attached. The meeting discussed the principle of “Zero tolerance for corruption” which did not entail that once corruption is discovered in assistance project, all assistance to the country is put on halt, but requires that measures are put in place to prevent further acts of corruption.

### **C. Implementing the United Nations Convention against Corruption as an essential element of sustainable development assistance**

23. Presentations on “mainstreaming the United Nations Convention as a safeguard to development” and “promoting governance through the effective implementation of the Convention” were made by the World Bank, the IADB, ADB and the IMF.

24. The General Assembly when adopting the United Nations Convention against Corruption (resolution 58/4) expressed its concern about the threats posed by corruption to sustainable development and the rule of law.

25. Having highlighted that no country was corruption free, the meeting noted the role of the Convention in setting out the behaviour citizens should follow. It subscribed open and competitive systems and provided a set of norms which, properly applied, would greatly contribute to sustainable development.

26. The meeting focused the discussion on the links and relationship between development assistance and action against corruption, as such action has now been shaped and defined by the Convention. The meeting noted the importance of the implementation of the Convention for sustainable development.

27. The meeting agreed that the Convention should permeate work of development banks by way of providing a framework for their anti-corruption work. Particularly the example of the OECD ADB Asia Pacific Initiative was commended as a good practice.

28. The field of asset recovery was particularly highlighted as an area which had a particular impact on sustainable development in the country where the assets had been looted.

29. The Convention was an instrument of unity of purpose which reflected the consensus among Member States. There was general agreement that the Convention presented an opportunity and gave new momentum to addressing some of the core development challenges such as improving governance, strengthening institutions and reducing vulnerability to corruption. In this respect, the meeting discussed the need to implement pilot programmes to see the value of streamlining the Convention into development assistance programmes.

30. The meeting recognized a general need for more expertise in this field. Practitioners within the development community needed information on how the United Nations Convention against Corruption may serve as a framework for development activities targeting corruption. Legal experts needed knowledge on challenges and lessons learned from relevant development activities already taking place within the fields of good governance and rule of law. The positive role played by the initiatives such as the U4 centre as a platform for partner agencies to share lessons and experiences, and facilitate cooperation on anti-corruption strategies was noted. Particularly the work done on systematically collecting information and communicate experiences, through research outputs, training courses, a project database, helpdesks and selected donor projects was recognized. In this context, the proposal to train a pool of experts from different regions as a pool of trainers who could disseminate knowledge and experience was discussed as an important capacity building initiative.

31. The meeting expressed strong support for the notion of the recipient country determining the development priorities and that while the Convention was a good framework for assistance programmes, these needed to be tailored to the needs of the country. In this context, the needs for donors and recipients to establish a close dialogue was emphasized.

#### **D. Ensuring consistency and coherence in the delivery of technical assistance**

32. After the introduction of the item, speakers addressed three sub-items on: Matching technical assistance with the needs and priorities of requesting states, working towards improved coordination and maximized impact of technical assistance and enhancing transparency and accountability in assistance delivery.

33. The meeting discussed a range of issues within the area of technical assistance delivery, such as the need to identify political will and promoting ownership, identifying good practices and successful knowledge management, effective coordination with other donors and the need for country or culture specific support.

34. One of the key point of the discussion was on how to improve technical assistance and make it more effective. The entry into force of the Convention and the rapid increase in the number of Parties from the developing world presented an opportunity to look at the technical assistance provided with a view to learn lessons from each other, apply these lessons in practice and avoid duplication.

35. While the meeting recognized the need to have a better overall picture of how much technical assistance was already provided and how much was needed, there was an increased demand for technical assistance dedicated to the implementation of the Convention. This increased the already formidable challenge for donors to be coherent and coordinate efforts efficiently and effectively.

36. Together with the need to coordinate the technical assistance interventions, the meeting recognized the requirement for inserting mechanisms to ensure quality control, assessing progress and measuring results of technical assistance. Where assistance was not coordinated or provided in a way which did not comply with certain standards, it could lead to a loss of momentum, support and credibility. Some participants encouraged the organization of joint corruption assessments for example between the OECD and UNODC. The elaboration of a code of conduct on harmonized donor responses was also discussed.

37. The meeting discussed various existing coordination mechanisms, such as the OECD DAC, the IGAC, the U4 centre, as well as the ADB Asia and Pacific Anti-Corruption Initiative. These initiatives were aimed at improving the effectiveness of aid by avoiding duplication and promote joint initiatives. The meeting was informed that both IGAC and the U4 centre are creating databases of ongoing and planned anti-corruption projects as part of their clearing house functions. The meeting took note of these initiatives as important steps for facilitating and enhancing coordination and collaboration of anti-corruption efforts at the national and international levels. Coordination was particularly emphasized in view of the fact that the means for technical assistance were limited and available resources needed to be utilized optimally in order to avoid duplication. Suggestions were made with respect to expanding the existing initiatives, particularly with a view to finding ways to supplement the information in the databases with national level information and to ensure that the participating assistance providers enter and update the information regularly.

38. The meeting recognized the need to link the need for technical assistance with the supply of technical assistance. In this context, the Convention could be used as a framework for drawing guidelines for technical assistance in the anti-corruption field.

39. On a national level, the implementation of the Convention required engagement of a variety of national actors with multiple and sometimes conflicting interests. Using the Convention as the basis for domestic anti-corruption interventions could facilitate donor coordination and cooperation on these efforts and the sharing of lessons learned. For example, the private sector was hardly represented in anti-corruption activities, it could be brought into the process on the basis of the Convention.

40. The meeting emphasized the need for technical assistance to be based on the strong political will in the recipient country to implement anti-corruption measures. In order to ensure that this political will is there, some donors made technical assistance dependent on certain premises in particular for technical assistance plans to be developed in the recipient country and to be country led creating a spirit of ownership and self responsibility. Other speakers emphasized the need for the recipient country to commit to an evaluation of the impact of the technical assistance received.

41. Bilateral donors, the United Nations system, the multi-lateral development banks and recipient countries, needed to strive for better alignment, co-operation and coordination in the field of anti-corruption and good governance to avoid overall and waste of resources. Taking into account that funding decisions are often made on the country level, the meeting discussed possible ways of enhancing coordination and ensuring the flow of information from the field to capital/headquarters. One idea was the creation of a dedicated donor coordination mechanism building on the concept of the “Mini Dublin Groups” for drug control and establishing “Mini-Montevideo Groups”. Others felt that there was no need for the creation of new coordination mechanisms and that donors should make every effort to include assistance provided for the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption into the already existing coordination mechanisms. In this context, depending on the region, the issue could also form part of the Mini Dublin Groups.

42. In this context, the meeting was informed of the recently launched the “One UN” pilot programme in nine countries which was put in place in order to account for the need to approach development assistance from a country level and coordinate United Nations responses on the country level.

43. Recipient countries had a responsibility to avoid the proliferation of identical requests for assistance, thus ensuring that the assistance they receive is tailored to the need, applicable and sustainable and contradictory assistance is avoided.

## **VI. Conclusion**

44. The International Cooperation Workshop emphasized its mandate to prepare “food for thought” for intergovernmental expert group on technical assistance and the second session of the Conference. It recognized that while there would always be room for diverging views, there had been a considerable evolution in thinking on the issues the workshop addressed since the negotiation of the Convention. Particularly the way the Convention fitted into broader governance issues, as well as its role as a tool that would bring consistency in decision making process on programming without losing discretion were issues that warranted further thinking and discussion.

45. The Conference of the States Parties has a great potential as a forum to achieve greater consistency, efficiency and coherence as it brings together recipient and donor countries, as well as the existing coordination mechanisms. The meeting recognized its potential to serve as a platform to increase dialogue among those groups. At the same time the interim open-ended working group on technical assistance established by Conference of the States Parties in resolution 1/5 has a mandate to review and prioritize the needs for technical assistance and promote the coordination of technical assistance. Properly utilized the Conference and its working group have a potential to facilitate coordination and to bring together the requests for technical assistance with the available resources and expertise.

46. Therefore the meeting decided to submit the report of the Workshop to the intergovernmental working group on technical assistance, as well as to the Conference of the States Parties, together with one background paper comprising of the salient parts of the two background papers submitted to the Workshop.

47. Closing statements were made by UNODC and the Chairman and by a number of delegations. In the closing remarks, they expressed their gratitude to the Government of Uruguay for hosting the International Cooperation Workshop.

## **Annex I**

### **Chairman's summary**

This summary of the discussion was presented by the Chair to the workshop. While discussion on the content took place and some concrete suggestions made are included in the following text, it should not be considered as a negotiated text of the participants.

The workshop discussed a number of items starting from “the United Nations Convention against Corruption as a framework for development assistance” “Implementing the United Nations Convention against Corruption as an essential element of sustainable development” to “Ensuring consistency and coherence in the delivery of technical assistance”. Most the discussions on the items and the various sub-items were interrelated and this summary does not adhere to the organization of work followed by the meeting.

Participants shared their experiences in the field of development assistance, coordination and cooperation. Inputs were made on mainstreaming the United Nations Convention as a safeguard to development and promoting governance through the effective implementation of the Convention. Considerable emphasis was placed on how technical assistance can best respond to the needs and priorities of requesting states and how the impact of technical assistance can be maximized through improved coordination. The meeting heard several presentations and statements on existing initiatives and how to best utilize them.

The discussions revealed a considerable evolution in thinking since the time of the negotiation of the Convention. The workshop has found some common denominators but discussions also led to the realization that in some areas views were diverging and more thought was necessary. The meeting was an important forum for exchanging views and developing ideas to be presented to the intergovernmental expert group on technical assistance and to the second session of Conference of States Parties. Participants would in the meantime further discuss the various proposals made at the workshop within their governments and/or agencies, as well as in other regional forums, as appropriate.

The discussions addressed the question of how the Convention fits into broader context of governance and development. The Convention highlights a range of issues of great importance for development, including the principles of proper management of public affairs and public property, fairness, responsibility and equality before the law and the need to safeguard integrity and foster a culture of rejection of corrupt practices. Improving governance, strengthening institutions and reducing vulnerability to corruption are core development challenges. In view of its potential to function as a consensus framework to address these challenges, the implementation of the Convention should form an integral part of development assistance.

There was discussion about the potential of the UNCAC to function as a conceptual framework/platform as well as an instrumental tool that would bring consistency in decision-making process on programming of development assistance and dedicated technical assistance for the implementation of the Convention, without compromising the discretion built into activities financed through voluntary means. The Convention is a consensus instrument which sets common standards for determining needs, setting goals, and assessing progress in implementation and can thus provide a framework for programming and implementation of assistance, both for the recipient country and for the donor.

The workshop identified the pressing need to enhance knowledge of the Convention among development practitioners, particularly on the country level where the institutional knowledge base was often weak and where practitioners were “reinventing the wheel”. The Convention was often unknown, while many projects had the potential to contribute to its implementation.

At the same time there was a need to align assistance efforts on the ground through increased donor coordination, cooperation and coherence. The meeting confirmed that this was in keeping with the Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness. These could include developing shared, country-focused anti-corruption approaches and joint country assessments among development partners as a starting point. There was also the question of which coordination modalities between donor organisations on the ground can be used as good practice. Various ideas of how the Convention can form the basis for this coordination process were discussed, including through extending the mandates of existing groups to include the Convention, such as in the “Mini Dublin Groups” and in the ABD Asia Pacific Initiative. The possibility of developing a special-purpose group (which could be called the “Montevideo Group”) drawing inspiration from the existing coordination mechanisms was also discussed. The role of the U4 as a platform for partner agencies to share lessons and experiences, and facilitate cooperation on anti-corruption strategies was noted as well as the role of the OECD DAC with respect to joint corruption assessments, as well as principles on harmonized donor responses. Already strong links have been created between the Convention and the OECD DAC. The role of IGAC as an effort to coordinate international and bilateral aid on anti-corruption was also noted. Much of these coordination activities were also carried out with the awareness that the resources available for technical assistance are not unlimited and that the use of available resources needs to be optimized.

There was also agreement that there is no “best practice” anti-corruption reform that could be uniformly applied to all countries. In other words, it was emphasized that assistance must avoid the “one-size-fits-all approach”. Local economic conditions, institutional constraints, administrative capacity, culture and history are important factors that must be taken into consideration when designing and implementing anti-corruption reforms. The context matters.

There were discussions of what were the prerequisites of effective technical assistance. For many the existence of a political will to fight corruption was of great importance. Many highlighted the need for the technical assistance requirements to be determined by the recipient country itself. In order to ensure that the priorities are properly integrated into donor programmes, the dialogue between donors and recipients needs to be strengthened, resulting in a jointly agreed roadmap. Effective programmes answer the needs as expressed by the recipients. The need to ensure recipient party ownership has underlined as a fundamental principal of technical assistance. While there was a legitimate concern for donors to ensure the efficiency and good results of development projects the Convention left no room to impose conditions on the provision of technical assistance.

The meeting also emphasized the importance of identifying and disseminating expertise. There was an overload of information and quality control needed to be improved. To compound the problem, expertise on the various areas covered by the Convention, especially the newer and more innovative ones like asset recovery, was very scarce and in high demand, and as a result quite costly. The workshop agreed that this is a matter of priority that needs to be addressed in order to ensure quality assistance, accurate advice and consistency in implementation efforts. The role of UNODC as a broker to facilitate that those who have the expertise can assist the countries in need was discussed. The concrete modalities for this needed to be further examined, and there was discussion of the possibility of establishing a pool

of experts who would go through a specially developed intensive training programme and then function both as trainers and experts to offer advice and assistance on request as part of technical assistance programmes.

The Conference of the States Parties could address some of the concerns in the development assistance field by facilitating donor coordination and cooperation on anti-corruption efforts of the involved development agencies, including sharing lessons and experiences. Coordination could be summarized as consisting of Coherence Efficiency Delivery Reliability Impact and Consistency “CEDRIC”. When striving towards CEDRIC, the Conference has a great potential as a forum to bring together all existing mechanisms, as well as other emerging donors. The dialogue among those two groups is essential. At the same time the Conference can function as a forum for dialogue between recipients and assistance providers. It can play a facilitating role to enable spreading all needs for assistance among the pool of donors.

In summary, the Convention can be an important framework to improve technical assistance and coordination. Principles on development assistance and UNCAC are mutually reinforcing. The ideas raised in the workshop could easily be integrated in ongoing work on coordination and development assistance. The key challenge remains how to get all Member States engaged and how to integrate the Convention as a common tool.

Finally, on behalf of all participants, the Chairman expressed his gratitude to the Government of Uruguay for their generosity in hosting the workshop and to the Governments of Finland, France, Germany, Norway and the United Kingdom for providing the resources that made the workshop possible.

## **Annex II**

### **Note of Donors to UNODC Workshop on Technical Assistance, Montevideo 30 May – 1 June 2007: Linkages between the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the development agenda**

To contribute to the record, the donor countries and agencies of Finland, France, Germany, Norway, United Kingdom, United States, as well as the World Bank, Asian Development Bank and United Nations Development Program, present at the Montevideo workshop provide the following summary of ideas about assistance as a means to implement the United Nations Convention against Corruption and about the linkages between the Convention and broader development assistance. The following statements are the opinion of the aforementioned donor delegates and are at this point subject to discussion with and agreement of donor headquarters.

- The United Nations Convention against Corruption is welcomed as a statement of shared commitment by all development partners to promote the fight against corruption as one of the central elements of sustainable development. The Convention is a valuable guiding framework for the range of activities that promote effective anticorruption efforts.
- Recognizing that Chapter VI of the Convention provides a number of provisions for technical assistance, it is also understood that a wider range of Development Assistance activities help promote the overall objectives of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
- In keeping with the Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness, it is understood that effective assistance for implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption and achievement of its objectives require country-specific approaches that reflect local ownership. There is no single model for an effective program against corruption, and achieving results requires an ongoing dialogue between development partners in every country. In this regard, the Paris Declaration represents principles that support the Convention and the achievement of its goals.
- Given the breadth of ongoing and new activities related to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the fight against corruption, it is important to ensure consistency and coherence. In this regard, it is recognized that while existing coordination mechanisms may need to incorporate the Convention more effectively, there is need to make the best use of these mechanisms before considering new coordinating structures. UNODC, in conjunction with the States Parties, should reach out to existing networks to improve understanding of the United Nations Convention against Corruption and its inclusion in the development dialogue.

## Annex III

### List of Participants

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>NAME</b>
<b>Albania</b>	Petrika Jorgji, Counsellor, Directorate of International Organizations, UN Division
<b>Algeria</b>	Adlej Pici, Director, ISO Zineb Dris, Deputy Director, Department of International Affairs, Ministry of Justice
<b>Angola</b>	Fidelio Loy de Jesus Figueiredo, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of Angola, Vienna Dulce Gomes, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Angola, Vienna
<b>Argentina</b>	Eugenio Curia, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of Argentina to the UN in Vienna Laura Geler, Lawyer, Anti Corruption Office
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	Anar Rzayev, General Prosecutor's Office, Department of International Relations Fakhraddin Panahov, General Prosecutor's Office, Anti-Corruption Department
<b>Brazil</b>	Maximiliano Barbosa Fraga, Brazilian Embassy, Uruguay Yves Zamboni, International Affairs, Advisor
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	Traore Amadou, Ministre Conseiller, Permanent Mission in Vienna Traore Malobaly Alphonse, Président Haute Autorité Coordination Lutte contre Corruption
<b>China</b>	CHEN Yujiang, Deputy Director-General, Department of Policies, Laws and Regulations, Ministry of Supervision WAN Yajun, Officer, Department of Treaty and Law, Ministry of Foreign Affairs WANG Wei, Officer Department of Policies, Laws and Regulations, Ministry of Supervision ZHOU Congyuan, Officer, Department of Foreign Affairs
<b>Dominican Republic</b>	Pedro Manuel Duran Bello, Director Ejecutivo Comision Nacional de Etica y Combate a la Corupcion Octavio Lister Henriquez, Director, Dept. de Prevencion de la Corrupcion Administrativa (DCPA)Procuraduria General de la Republica
<b>Ecuador</b>	Ana Michelle Artieda López, Lawyer, International Affairs, Commission for the Civic Control of Corruption Jose Luis Cortazar Lascano, Anti Corruption National Secretary
<b>Egypt</b>	Ayman Elgammal, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Egypt in Vienna
<b>Finland</b>	Martti Artola, Adviser for Global Governance, Ministry for Foreign Affairs Ritva Jolkkonen, Ambassador

<b>France</b>	<p>Eliette Germe, Adjointe de M MAGRO ( sous-directeur de la Gouvernance démocratique à la DGCID), Ministère des Affaires Etrangères</p> <p>Xavier Cousquer, Bureau de la coopération au SAEI du Ministère de la Justice</p>
<b>Germany</b>	<p>Hannes Hechler, Anti-Corruption Focal Point, GTZ</p> <p>Johanna Wysluch, GTZ</p>
<b>Guatemala</b>	Juan Luis Florido, Fiscal General
<b>India</b>	<p>P.K. Tripathi, Joint Secretary, Government of India, Department of Personnel and Training</p> <p>Ravi Kumar Seenambhat Joshi, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India, Vienna</p>
<b>Indonesia</b>	<p>Krishna Adi Poetranto, Deputy Director for Treaties on Political Security and Territorial Affairs, Department of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Muhammad Yusufidli Adhyaksana, Deputy Head of International Cooperation Division, Legal Bureau, Attorney General's Office</p>
<b>Islamic Rep. of Iran</b>	Ali H. Saryazdi, Alternate Permanent Representative to UNOV/UNODC
<b>Japan</b>	Chisato Hirota, Embassy of Japan, Uruguay
<b>Latvia</b>	<p>Dace Dubova, Senior Specialist of International Cooperation Division, Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau</p> <p>Anete Stipniece, Senior Desk Officer, Legal Department, International Law Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
<b>Lithuania</b>	<p>Algimantas Kliunka, Chief Prosecutor of Organised Crima and Corruption, Investigation Department of Prosecutor General's Office</p> <p>Zimantas Pacevicius, Deputy Director of the Lithuanian Special Investigation Service</p>
<b>Mexico</b>	<p>Martha Vazquez, Subdirectora de Cooperacion Internacional, Secretaria de Relaciones Exterior</p> <p>Paulina Guadalupe Grobet Vallarta, Head Of The Transparency Networking Unit, Ministry Of Public Administration</p> <p>Jose Antonio Perez Bravo, Asesor Subprocurador Juridico y de Asuntos Internacionales P.G.R.</p> <p>Mariana Lopez Alvarez, Subdirectora en la Visitaduna General de la Procuraduria General de la Republica</p>
<b>Morocco</b>	<p>Abdessalam El Aymani, Magistrate of the Moroccan Court in Rabat</p> <p>Mohamed El Orch, President in the Supreme Court</p>
<b>Namibia</b>	<p>Paulus Noa, Director, Anti-Corruption Agency</p> <p>Anna-Letu Haitembu, Principle Legal Officer, Ministry of Justice</p>
<b>Norway</b>	<p>Ingunn Klepsvik, Assistant Director General, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation - NORAD</p> <p>Trond H. Glomnes Rudi, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Norway, Vienna</p>

<b>Pakistan</b>	<p>Mohammed Mohsin Khan, Director General National Accountability Bureau, Islamabad</p> <p>Sajid Bilal, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan, Vienna</p>
<b>Paraguay</b>	<p>Maria Soledad Machuca de Gaona, Fiscal Adjunta, Ministerio Publico y Representante ante el Consejo Impulsor del Sistema Nacional de Integridad</p>
<b>Poland</b>	<p>Dominika Krois, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Poland in Vienna</p> <p>Agnieszka Stawiarz, Ministry of Justice - Prosecutor Judicial Assistance &amp; European Law Department, Division of International Cooperation</p>
<b>Portugal</b>	<p>Maria do Carmo Costa, Directora de Serviços do Gabinete para as Relações Internacionais, Europeias e de Cooperação do Ministerio da Justica</p>
<b>Peru</b>	<p>Erasmio Reyna Alcantara, Vice Minister of Justice, President of the National Anti-Corruption Commission</p> <p>Romulo Acurio, Minister Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Member National Anti-Corruption Commission</p>
<b>Romania</b>	<p>Catalina Stroe, Legal Adviser, Department for the Relation with the Public Ministry Prevention of Crime and Corruption, Ministry of Justice</p> <p>Costin Varlan, Prosecutor - International Cooperation Department National Anticorruption Directorate Prosecutor's Office Attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice</p>
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<p>S.V. Tihomirov, Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>A.M. Nikitin, Federal Security Service</p> <p>O.P. Sidorov, Federal Security Service</p> <p>A.S. Shevchenko, Russian Embassy, Uruguay</p>
<b>Serbia (Rep. of)</b> <b>Thailand</b>	<p>Aleksandra Popovic, Assistant Minister for Justice</p> <p>Chaiyot Sintuprasit, Director of Policy Planning, Office of the National Counter Corruption Commission</p> <p>Ruenvadee Suwanmongkol, Director, Legal Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Justice</p> <p>Piyatida Chongudomliuk, NCCC Officer/ International Cooperation Section/ International Affairs Bureau Office of the National Counter Corruption Commission[NCCC]</p> <p>Raviwan Jaturapittaporn, Legal Officer, Legal Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Justice</p>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	<p>Alison Crocket, First Secretary, UK Permanent Mission to the UN, Vienna</p>
<b>United States of America</b>	<p>Elizabeth Hart, Senior Anti-Corruption Adviser, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, US Agency for Development</p> <p>Christine Cline, Foreign Affairs Officer, Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, US Department of State</p>

<b>Uruguay</b>	<p>Jorge Pérez Otermin, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of Uruguay in Vienna</p> <p>Adolfo Perez Piera, Presidente - Junta Asesora en Materia Economico Financiera del Estado</p> <p>Beatriz Pereira de Polito, Vice Presidenta - Junta Asesora en Materia Economico Financiera del Estado</p> <p>Carlos Soares de Lima, Miembro - Junta Asesora en Materia Economico Financiera del Estado</p>
<b>INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS and INSTITUTIONS</b>	
<b>Asian Development Bank</b>	Kathleen Moktan, Director, Capacity Development and Governance Division, Regional and Sustainable Development Department
<b>Commonwealth Secretariat</b>	Martin Polaine, Consultant, Legal & Constitutional Affairs Division - Criminal Law Section
<b>Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI)</b>	Odd-Helge Fjeldstad, Research Director, Cr. Michelsen Institute (CMI), Director, U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre
<b>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</b>	Patrick Moulette, Head, Anti-Corruption Division, Directorate for Financial and Enterprise Affairs
<b>World Bank</b>	Richard E. Messick, Sr. Public Sector Specialist, Co-Director, Law and Justice Thematic Group, Public Sector Governance Poverty Reduction and Economic Management
<b>UNDP</b>	Phil Matsheza, Policy Advisor: Anti-Corruption
<b>Inter-American Development Bank</b>	Stephen Zimmermann, Chief, Office of the Institutional Integrity
<b>International Monetary Fund</b>	Jennifer Lester, Senior Counsel, Legal Department
<b>Poder Ciudadano</b>	Julieta Arias
<b>Transparency International Uruguay</b>	Manuel Flores Silva
<b>UNODC</b>	<p>Dimitri Vlassis, Chief, Crime Conventions Section</p> <p>Brigitte Strobel-Shaw, Crime Prevention &amp; Criminal Justice Officer</p> <p>Oliver Stolpe, Crime Prevention &amp; Criminal Justice Officer</p>
<b>Individual Expert</b>	Nikos Passas, Professor Northeastern University, College of Criminal Justice, Boston