

**PROGRESS REPORT ON THE G20 SELF-ASSESSMENT ON
COMBATING THE BRIBERY OF FOREIGN PUBLIC OFFICIALS**

June 2015

Introduction

1. At the meeting of the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group (ACWG) in February 2014, the ACWG agreed the following:

“In order to continue to lead by example, and building on the Principles on the Enforcement of the Foreign Bribery Offence endorsed by Leaders in 2013, the Group agreed to complete in 2014 a questionnaire facilitating a high-level self-assessment of their domestic foreign bribery frameworks and outlining any next steps they intend to take in implementing their G20 commitments on foreign bribery to conduct a self-assessment survey on the foreign bribery frameworks of the G20 countries”.

The survey was prepared to elicit information from the G20 countries on their implementation of measures consistent with the [Guiding Principles on Enforcement of the Foreign Bribery Offence in G20 Countries](#), the foreign bribery provisions in the [2013-2014 G20 Anti-Corruption Plan](#), and the [St. Petersburg G20 Leaders’ Declaration](#). The results of the survey presented here aim at guiding G20 countries in outlining their next steps to implements such commitments.

2. This paper, prepared by the OECD for the ACWG, summarises the information provided by the G20 countries in response to the self-assessment survey, and identifies possible issues for further consideration. The countries’ responses to the survey are provided in the **Annex** to this report. The individual countries’ survey responses should be read in conjunction with the report to provide a holistic view of the report’s distillation of the responses.

3. All G20 members and one permanent observer submitted responses to the self-assessment survey.¹ Sixteen of the countries that submitted responses are members of the OECD Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions (WGB).

4. Part I of the paper summarises the information in the self-assessment surveys on implementation of the Guiding Principles on Enforcement of the Foreign Bribery Offence in the G20 Countries, including progress on countries’ legislative framework for combating foreign bribery, detection, investigation and prosecution, and mutual legal assistance (MLA). Part II summarises the information in the self-assessment surveys on implementation of the 2013-2014 G20 Anti-Corruption Plan, and St. Petersburg G20 Leaders’ Declaration, including steps taken by countries to improve foreign bribery enforcement, and engage with the private sector to encourage the adoption of effective internal controls, ethics and compliance measures for preventing and detecting foreign bribery. Part II also considers the next steps by countries regarding engagement with the WGB. Part III of the paper provides tentative recommendations that could help to identify next steps.

¹ The countries that responded to the self-assessment survey are, in alphabetical order: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States.

I. Implementation of Guiding Principles on Enforcement of the foreign Bribery Offence in G20 Countries

A. Summary of Countries' Responses to Survey

1. Legislative Framework for Combating Foreign Bribery

a) Foreign Bribery Offence

Survey question 1:

Is there a clear and explicit foreign bribery offence that covers the key elements of the internationally agreed definition for foreign bribery, including offering, promising or giving of a bribe, bribery through intermediaries, and bribes paid to third party beneficiaries?

- *If your jurisdiction criminalises foreign bribery*, please provide references to the relevant provisions and/or the full text, if possible.
- *If your jurisdiction does not have a foreign bribery offence*:
 - Please note whether an offence has been “drafted”, “submitted for government review”, or “adopted but not yet entered into force”.
 - Please provide a timeline for the entry into force of draft legislation, where applicable.

5. All the countries that responded to the self-assessment survey except for two² reports that they have criminalised the supply-side of bribing foreign public officials in international business transactions.

6. Of the 18 countries that have criminalised foreign bribery, twelve have a foreign bribery offence that expressly covers offering, promising and giving a bribe to a foreign public official. Of the remaining countries, two do not cover promising, and it is uncertain from the information provided whether three other countries cover all three situations.

7. Nine of the countries state that their offences expressly cover bribing foreign public officials through intermediaries. It is unclear from the information provided whether the remaining countries cover bribery through intermediaries, expressly or implicitly.

8. The offence in twelve of the countries expressly covers the case where a bribe is transferred directly to a third party beneficiary with the knowledge or direction of the foreign public official. With the remaining countries, there is insufficient information to determine whether they are able to cover this situation through other means, such as the application of relevant jurisprudence.

9. Six of the countries have in place a foreign bribery offence that clearly covers all of the categories of foreign public officials required to be covered by the Anti-Bribery Convention. The remaining countries either do not cover all the categories, or did not provide enough information to allow for an assessment in this regard. Of the countries that do not clearly cover all the categories, an important trend is a lack of clarity on whether they cover the bribery of a person performing a public function for a state owned/controlled enterprise.

² One country that does not yet have a foreign bribery offence has prepared a draft law for this purpose which is currently under review by the government. The draft law has not been submitted to Parliament. Due its early stage, information about what is contained in the draft law is not included in this progress report. The second country explains that a bill for establishing a foreign bribery offence is under active consideration.

b) Statute of Limitations

Survey question 2:

What is the statute of limitations for investigating and prosecuting foreign bribery? Please indicate the criteria for suspension, interruption or extension of the statute of limitations?

10. Thirteen of the countries provide a statute of limitations for the foreign bribery offence. Among these countries, the longest statute of limitations is 20 years and the shortest is 13.5 months (for non-aggravated bribery). The average (mean) length of the upper limit³ of the statute of limitations for these countries is 9.8 years and the median length is eight years. The other seven countries do not impose a statute of limitations for the foreign bribery offence.

11. The vast majority of countries that provide a statute of limitations for foreign bribery report that the statute can be interrupted or suspended by law enforcement activity, such as the filing of a complaint, indictment, issuing of a search warrant, or request for MLA from a foreign country. In two countries, judicial approval is required to interrupt or suspend the statute. In two countries, interruptions and suspensions cannot exceed a maximum period of ten and 12 years respectively. In one country, interruptions cannot exceed a maximum period of ten years, which is twice the statutory period.

c) Jurisdiction

Survey question 3:

Please describe the form of jurisdiction available over the foreign bribery offence (i.e. territorial or nationality jurisdiction).

i. Territorial jurisdiction

12. Six countries do not address whether they can establish territorial jurisdiction over the offence of bribing a foreign public official. Of the fourteen that address this question in the survey, nine simply explain that they can establish territorial jurisdiction, or that they have jurisdiction over foreign bribery offences that occur in their territory. Three countries state that they have jurisdiction over foreign bribery offences that take place in whole or in part in their territory. One country has jurisdiction over offences that take place in its territory, or where the effects of the offence are felt in its territory. One country has jurisdiction over offences committed by issuers and domestic concerns, as well as their officers, directors, employees, agents, and stockholders acting on their behalf, by using the country's mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce in further a corrupt payment to a foreign public official.

ii. Nationality jurisdiction

13. Seventeen countries⁴ can clearly prosecute their nationals for foreign bribery offences committed wholly abroad. Of these countries, five provide information that they are also able to prosecute legal persons considered nationals. One country states that it cannot prosecute companies that are nationals and

³ Some countries prescribe different statutes of limitations according to the severity of the offence. The calculation in this sentence refers to the length of the statute of limitations for the most severe offences.

⁴ The information on one country is not clear in this respect.

commit foreign bribery abroad, and the rest do not provide information regarding jurisdiction over legal persons for offences committed abroad.

14. Four of these countries explain that certain criteria must be met in order to be able to prosecute nationals for foreign bribery committed abroad. The main requirements in this respect are dual criminality, the absence of double-jeopardy, and the presence of the accused in the prosecuting country's territory. Of the remaining sixteen countries, one-half state that they do not apply criteria for prosecuting nationals for foreign bribery abroad, other than that the accused person is a national of the prosecuting state. The other half does not indicate whether any specific criteria must be met for the application of nationality jurisdiction to acts of foreign bribery occurring abroad.

d) Corporate Liability

Survey question 4:

Please indicate whether your jurisdiction has a corporate liability regime for the offence of foreign bribery.

If your jurisdiction does not have a corporate liability regime for the offence of foreign bribery, please provide a timeline for implementation of corporate liability.

i. Standard of liability

15. Seventeen countries state that they are able to establish the liability of legal persons for foreign bribery. In one country that does not have such liability, a draft bill for this purpose is under consideration.

16. Most of the countries do not address whether their approach to the liability of legal persons is broad enough to capture the following most frequent methodologies used by legal persons to bribe foreign public officials: 1) a person with the highest level managerial authority offers, promises or gives a bribe to a foreign public official; 2) a person with the highest level managerial authority directs a lower level person to bribe a foreign public official; and 3) a person with the highest level managerial authority fails to prevent a lower level person from bribing a foreign public official, including through a failure to supervise the person who bribes or a failure to implement adequate internal controls, ethics and compliance measures.

17. In addition, most of the countries do not indicate whether their legal frameworks address the bribery of a foreign public official by a legal person using a third party intermediary abroad, such as a related legal person, to offer, promise or give a bribe on its behalf. However, two countries provide information that indicates that a legal person can be held responsible for bribing abroad through a related legal person such as a foreign subsidiary.

ii. Sanctions

18. In three countries, the fine available for legal persons convicted of foreign bribery is unlimited. In eleven countries, a maximum fine for foreign bribery is specified. Two of the remaining countries state that they can impose fines on legal persons, but do not provide further information on the level of the fine. One country does not provide information on the sanctions available for legal persons.

19. Of the eleven countries that prescribe a maximum fine for legal persons, seven prescribe it in the form of a specified amount, and the rest prescribe it in another form, such as by relating it to the income or

revenue of the company, the benefit obtained from bribing, or the amount of the bribe. Of those countries that prescribe the maximum amount of the fine, the lowest maximum fine is equivalent to USD 1.3 million and the highest is USD 15.8 million. Of these countries, five permit an increase in the maximum fine according to some formula (e.g., related to the benefit derived from the bribery).

20. Thirteen countries state that they are able to confiscate the proceeds of bribery as a sanction for foreign bribery by legal persons. Six state they can debar companies from participating in public procurement contracting. Two state they can suspend or dissolve companies as a sanction.

21. In practice, eight of the countries report imposing sanctions on legal persons for the bribery of foreign public officials. The number of companies that have been sanctioned by individual countries ranges from one to 145. Based on the statistics provided, a total of 164 companies have been sanctioned. The country that reports the largest number of sanctions has done this on conviction in almost one-quarter of the cases, and on either discontinued prosecution or pursuant to administrative proceedings in the rest of the cases.

e) Criminal Sanctions for Natural Persons

Survey question 5:

5(a) Please describe the sanctions and confiscation measures available for natural and legal persons for the crime of foreign bribery.

5(b) Please provide the number of criminal, administrative, and civil cases of foreign bribery that have resulted in a final disposition, and indicate (i) how many of these cases have resulted in a criminal conviction or acquittal, or similar findings under an administrative or civil procedure, and (ii) the number of natural and legal persons who have been convicted or otherwise sanctioned.

Where possible, please provide references to the relevant provisions and/or the full text, if possible.

12. Seventeen of the countries provide information about the criminal sanctions available for natural persons convicted of foreign bribery. Of these countries, the maximum term of imprisonment ranges from five years to 18 years (or life). The average (mean) maximum term of imprisonment for all the countries is 9.6 years and the median is ten years. Two countries prescribe one range of sanctions for non-aggravated bribery, and a higher range for aggravated bribery.

13. Thirteen of these countries also state that they provide for fines for natural persons convicted of foreign bribery. Six prescribe the maximum fine in the form of a specified amount, two provide for a fine up to twice the benefit derived from bribing, one provides for a fine up to 90 times the amount of the bribe, and one provides for a fine linked to the daily net income of the person convicted. Of the six countries that prescribe the maximum fine in the form of a specified amount, the fines range from USD 47,000 to an unlimited amount in three countries. Among these countries, in specific circumstances, the fine can be increased beyond the maximum limit to two times the amount of the proceeds obtained. The average available fine for natural persons among these countries is USD 800,000 and the median is USD 775,000.

14. Out of the 17 countries that provide information on sanctions for natural persons, eleven have the authority to impose confiscation of the proceeds of bribery as a sanction. Four can debar natural persons

from public procurement contracting on conviction of foreign bribery, one can disqualify those convicted from exercising public functions, and one can impose disqualification from corporate management.

15. Seven countries report having imposed criminal sanctions on natural persons convicted of foreign bribery. Of these seven, the individual countries reported the following numbers of individuals who were sanctioned: one person, four persons, 88 persons, nine persons, seven persons, 17 persons, and 57 persons, respectively. In one of these countries, one person was also subject to discontinued prosecution with sanctions. The country with the largest number of sanctions imposed them through a combination of sanctions (21 persons) and agreed sanctions (67 persons). The vast majority of the countries do not provide information about the nature and level of sanctions applied in practice.

f) Detection of Foreign Bribery and Domestic Coordination

Survey question 6:

What steps have been taken to engage with relevant agencies, such as overseas missions, broader tax administrations, trade promotion, public procurement and export credit agencies, as well as with the private sector, on issues related to implementation and enforcement of the foreign bribery offence?

Where possible, please cite specific examples.

16. Thirteen countries report having conducted a wide range of activities to engage with the relevant government agencies about foreign bribery and the need to coordinate for the purpose of detection. Among these countries, engagement has been led by the following government authorities: overseas missions, trade promotion bodies, tax administrations, public procurement bodies, export credit agencies, public security organs, and health bodies.

17. Thirteen countries also report having taken extensive steps to engage with the private sector to raise awareness of the foreign bribery offence. Of these countries, the majority describe significant steps to encourage the private sector to establish internal controls, ethics and compliance measures to prevent and detect foreign bribery, including through the provision of training and other awareness-raising activities.

Survey question 7:

7(a) Are appropriate reporting channels available for whistleblowers in both the private and public sectors?

7(b) Are appropriate protections available for whistleblowers in both the private and public sectors?

Where possible, specific reference should be made to implementation of the G20 Study on Whistleblower Protection Frameworks, Compendium of Best Practices and Guiding Principles for Legislation.⁶

18. Twelve countries state they have reporting channels for whistle-blowers in the public sector that could be used for reporting foreign bribery. Ten countries state they have legal provisions for protecting whistle-blowers in the public sector from retaliation in the work place. One country explains that its

legislation for this purpose was recently amended, and another is currently considering whether its whistle-blower protections are adequate.

19. Eight countries state that they have reporting channels for whistleblowing by private sector employees. Ten countries explain that they have legal protections for whistle-blowers in the private sector. One country is preparing provisions for establishing a channel for anonymous complaints by private sector whistle-blowers. Two countries are considering new provisions to protect whistle-blowers in the private sector.

20. One country is developing draft legislation on reporting channels for whistle-blowers and whistle-blower protections. This country does not state whether this initiative targets whistle-blowers in the public, private, or both sectors.

g) Investigation and Prosecution of Foreign Bribery

Survey question 8:

8(a) Please describe the investigative powers granted to law enforcement authorities to proactively and effectively investigate and prosecute foreign bribery.

8(b) Please describe the specialized training on detecting, investigating and prosecuting foreign bribery provided and/or planned to be provided to law enforcement authorities.

21. Thirteen countries provide detailed information about their investigative powers for foreign bribery cases, and of these countries, seven report having a wide range of powers for foreign bribery, including, for instance, physical and electronic surveillance, controlled delivery, delayed arrests for monitoring purposes, and undercover operations. The other six report having a normal range of investigative powers for foreign bribery, such as the search and seizure of financial and company records, pre-trial detention, taking witness statements and MLA.

22. Sixteen of the countries report providing enforcement authorities with specialised training on investigating corruption. Twelve report holding training sessions specifically on investigating the offence of foreign bribery.

h) Mutual Legal Assistance

Survey question 9:

9(a) Please describe the procedures in place for ensuring prompt and effective handling of outgoing and incoming mutual legal assistance requests in relation to foreign bribery cases.

9(b) Please describe how informal assistance is encouraged, in conformity with your jurisdiction's legal system.

Where possible, specific reference should be made to implementation of the G20 High-Level Principles on Mutual Legal Assistance

23. Sixteen countries provide information about MLA in foreign bribery cases. All 16 of these countries are able to provide MLA in foreign bribery cases to G20 countries. Fourteen can provide MLA

on the basis of bilateral and multilateral treaties and among these, four may also provide MLA on the basis of reciprocity. Three countries can provide MLA just on the basis of legislation, without a treaty or reciprocity. One country has broad powers to provide MLA also on the basis of letters rogatory, letters of request from ministers of justice, memoranda of understanding and informal means.

24. Thirteen countries confirm having central authorities for executing MLA requests in foreign bribery cases.

B. Overview of Implementation of Guiding Principles on Foreign Bribery Enforcement

25. In the responses to the self-assessment survey, the following trends are observed on implementation of the Guiding Principles on Foreign Bribery:

- (i) Eighteen of the 20 countries have an offence prohibiting the bribery of foreign public officials in international business transactions that applies to natural persons.
- (ii) Seven countries have no statute of limitations. Of those that do, the longest maximum statute of limitations is 20 years, the shortest is 13.5 months (for non-aggravated bribery) and the mean length is 9.8 years. Most of the countries' statutes of limitations can be suspended or interrupted when law enforcement actions are instituted.
- (iii) The vast majority of countries can prosecute their nationals for foreign bribery offences committed wholly abroad, and approximately one-third indicates that they can prosecute legal persons considered nationals for offences committed abroad.
- (iv) Seventeen countries have established the liability of legal persons for the foreign bribery offence. One country is considering a draft bill for this purpose.
- (v) In practice, seven of the countries report imposing sanctions on natural persons and eight on legal persons for foreign bribery. Between the countries that have imposed sanctions, there is a substantial variation in the number of natural and legal persons sanctioned. Thirteen countries report that substantial steps have been taken to ensure engagement between relevant government agencies, including on the need for coordination for the purpose of detecting foreign bribery cases, and most report engagement with the private sector. Many also encourage companies to adopt internal controls, ethics and compliance measures for preventing and detecting foreign bribery.
- (vi) Twelve countries have reporting channels for whistleblowing in the public sector and eight have similar channels for the private sector. Ten have legal provisions to protect whistle-blowers in the public and private sectors from retaliation in the work place. Legislative activity is ongoing on these issues in at least three countries.
- (vii) Many of the countries indicate having a normal to wide range of powers for investigating foreign bribery. Most countries also report having provided specialised training on investigating corruption.
- (viii) Many of the countries report that they are able to provide mutual legal assistance (MLA) on the basis of multilateral and bilateral treaties and/or on the basis of reciprocity. Three do not need a treaty or reciprocity.

II. Implementation of Foreign Bribery Provisions in 2013-2014 G20 Anti-Corruption Action Plan and St. Petersburg Declaration

A. Summary of Countries' Responses to Questionnaire

1. Next Steps for Continuing Efforts to Adopt and Enforce Laws and Measures to Combat Foreign Bribery

a) Steps for Improving Enforcement

Survey question 10:

Please specify next steps for continuing “efforts to adopt and enforce laws and other measures against foreign bribery”.⁶

26. One country that does not yet have a foreign bribery offence submitted a draft law for this purpose for government review in 2013. The draft law has not yet been submitted to Parliament. The second country without a foreign bribery offence is actively considering a bill for this purpose.

27. Several countries have recently taken or plan to take a wide range of measures to improve enforcement of their foreign bribery offences. A large number of these measures involve legislative amendments to strengthen their foreign bribery offences, such as broadening the definition of a foreign public official, increasing sanctions, or expanding jurisdiction.

28. One country has eliminated the exception for facilitation payments. Another country that has a defence for facilitation payments is considering the defence. One country recently adopted legislation on facilitation payments, and another is reviewing government materials on the treatment of such payments.

29. Several countries also reported improving their institutional frameworks for detecting and investigating foreign bribery. One country has plans for training its police on corporate liability for foreign bribery. This country is also developing bilateral memoranda for increasing coordination and sharing information between relevant government authorities, including its financial intelligence unit (FIU), on foreign bribery cases. One country has taken substantial steps to improve the detection and reporting of foreign bribery by its tax authorities by enabling the disclosure of tax information to the law enforcement authorities when reasonable grounds exist to believe that such information will afford evidence of foreign bribery, and to allow the sharing of tax information with foreign law enforcement authorities in specified circumstances.

30. One country has designated newly specialised prosecutors for foreign bribery cases in its largest prosecutors' offices. Another country is working towards establishing specialised prosecution resources for foreign bribery.

31. One country amended its prosecution policy to clarify that prosecution decision-making in foreign bribery cases will not be influenced by political considerations.

32. One country mounted a special campaign against bribery in business transactions in 2005, which has resulted in a significant number of investigations and fines.

33. One country recently approved an Action Plan for implementing various recommendations of the OECD Working Group on Bribery, including for the purpose of addressing gaps in the coverage of its foreign bribery offence, eliminating a defence not foreseen by the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention,

confiscation of the proceeds of bribery, developing legislation on false accounting offences, enhancing MLA, and cooperation between law enforcement agencies.

b) Private Sector Engagement

Survey question 6:

What steps have been taken to engage with relevant agencies, such as overseas missions, broader tax administrations, trade promotion, public procurement and export credit agencies, as well as with the private sector, on issues related to implementation and enforcement of the foreign bribery offence?

- *Where possible, please cite specific examples.*

44. Several countries report taking various measures to raise private sector awareness of the need to improve internal controls, ethics and compliance measures for detecting and preventing foreign bribery. One of these countries is raising awareness of the need for companies to conduct due diligence on agents. One country has been encouraging companies to adopt a zero-tolerance approach to foreign bribery, and has widely consulted with the private sector on initiatives relating to corporate transparency and accountability. One country intends to collaborate with the private sector to draft national guidelines on corporate anti-corruption policies and programs that will encourage companies to extend such measures to their subsidiaries and business partners. One country states that it requires that its enterprises strictly follow local laws and regulations.

2. Next Steps for Engagement with OECD Working Group on Bribery

Survey question 11:

Please specify next steps for engagement with the OECD Working Group on Bribery with a view to explore possible adherence to the OECD Anti-bribery Convention as appropriate. Specifically and where applicable, please indicate any plans to:

- Attend meetings of the WGB in 2014;
- Co-organize or attend meetings on foreign bribery; and/or
- Engage in technical assistance activities on the issue of implementation and enforcement of the foreign bribery offence;
- Open discussion for Membership in the WGB, with a view to acceding to the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention

34. All the members of the OECD Working Group on Bribery that responded to the self-assessment survey indicate that they will continue to actively participate in the activities of the Working Group. They will continue to regularly attend meetings of the Group. They will also continue to participate in monitoring as countries under review, where still ongoing, and as lead examiners in the review of other members, where relevant.

35. One member of the OECD Working Group on Bribery reports taking active steps to work with “partner countries” to build capacity to combat transnational bribery, including through policing, MLA and

extradition. Another member of the Working Group is interested in continuing to provide technical assistance on foreign bribery and holding meetings on issues related to foreign bribery.

36. Regarding countries that are not members of the Working Group on Bribery, one stated that it is exploring possible participation in Working Group meetings, and is interested in organising meetings on foreign bribery. This country also welcomes technical assistance on the implementation and enforcement of foreign bribery offences. A second country indicates its intent to attend meetings of the Working Group in 2014, co-organise and attend meetings on foreign bribery, and is open to discussions on acceding to the Anti-Bribery Convention and joining the Working Group. A third country has attended Working Group on Bribery meetings since 2007, co-organised a technical seminar with the OECD in 2010, and co-organised an APEC High Level Seminar on foreign bribery with the OECD in 2014. This country does not indicate its next steps for engaging with the Working Group. A fourth country regularly attends meetings of the Working Group, and states that it considers the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) as the major initiative on anti-corruption, and is adhering to its provisions.

B. Overview of Implementation of Foreign Bribery Provisions in 2013-2014 G20 Anti-Corruption Plan and St. Petersburg Declaration

37. In the responses to the self-assessment survey, the following trends are observed on implementation of the Foreign Bribery Provisions in the 2013-2014 G20 Anti-Corruption Plan and St. Petersburg Declaration:

- (i) Several countries have recently taken or plan to strengthen their foreign bribery offences. In addition to working on amendments to broaden the definition of foreign public official, increase sanctions, and broaden jurisdiction, a significant number of the countries have made or are considering making changes on how they approach facilitation payments.
- (ii) Several countries report making improvements to their institutional frameworks for detecting and investigating foreign bribery, such as regarding training and coordination between relevant government agencies, improving detection and reporting by tax authorities of information on foreign bribery, and establishing specialised prosecution resources.
- (iii) Several countries have engaged closely with the private sector on the need for improve internal controls, ethics and compliance measures for detecting and preventing foreign bribery.
- (iv) All sixteen countries that are members of the Working Group on Bribery intend to continue participating actively in the activities of the Working Group, including monitoring. Two of these countries are interested in providing technical assistance on foreign bribery.
- (v) Regarding the four non-members of the Working Group on Bribery, one indicates that it seeks closer engagement with the Group, and welcomes technical assistance on implementing and enforcing foreign bribery offences. The second is open to discussions on accession to the Anti-Bribery Convention and joining the Working Group. The third does not address this issue, and the fourth states that it considers the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) as the major initiative on anti-corruption, and is adhering to its provisions.