

26 September 2014

English only

Seventh session

Vienna, 6-10 October 2014

Item 2 of the provisional agenda*

**Review of the implementation of the United Nations
Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and
the Protocols thereto****Non-paper by Italy****Food for thought on the establishment of a mechanism to review
the implementation of the United Nations Convention against
Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto**

May 2014

1. Introduction

At the eleventh meeting of the Extended Bureau (EB) of the Conference of the Parties (CoP) to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC), held on 7 October 2013, H.E. Ambassador Rachmat Budiman, Permanent Representative of Indonesia and President of the sixth session of the CoP, invited Italy, on behalf of the EB, to facilitate the informal consultations on the establishment of a mechanism to review the implementation of the UNTOC and the Protocols thereto.

On the basis of this invitation, since October 2013, Italy has been conducting informal consultations with a large number of delegations, including the chairs of all Regional Groups.

On 17 December 2013 Italy shared with the EB its intentions on the continuation of the informal consultations, underlining the need to guarantee an inclusive, open, transparent and constructive consultation process.

On 4 April 2014 H.E. Ambassador Filippo Formica, Permanent Representative of Italy, briefed the EB on the status of the informal consultations and promised to circulate a non-paper with some ideas on the establishment of a review mechanism.

* CTOC/COP/2014/1.



2. Objective

Eleven years since the entry into force of the UNTOC, the challenge for the CoP is to open a new chapter, adopting a mechanism to review the implementation of the Convention and of the Protocols thereto, pursuant to art. 32 of the Convention.

This non-paper was elaborated by Italy on the basis of the outcome of the informal consultations. It is intended to further deepen the reflection on the possible ways and means to reach consensus within the membership on a review mechanism (RM). Whilst it is not intended to present an exhaustive and predetermined set of solutions, the purpose of this non-paper is:

(a) To summarize the outcome of the informal consultations held between October 2013 and May 2014;

(b) To provide States Parties with ideas and possible solutions to overcome the two main controversial issues that did not allow the CoP to adopt a RM at the 6th session of the CoP, on the basis of the complex negotiations facilitated by Mexico: the funding of the RM and the involvement of the civil society;

(c) To provide States Parties and the EB with an informed and updated basis in order to continue and deepen the consultations, in view of the seventh session of the CoP (Vienna, 6-10 October 2014).

3. Main outcome of the informal consultations

The informal consultations demonstrated that there is broad agreement on the fact that a future UNTOC RM should not simply replicate the UNCAC (United Nations Convention against Corruption) RM.

Many Members States underlined the need to elaborate innovative solutions with regards to the terms of reference for a RM elaborated in view of the sixth session of the CoP in 2012.¹

At the same time, many Member States underlined that both the experience of the first five years within the UNCAC RM and the outcome of the 2012 negotiations should be duly taken into consideration in the elaboration of an UNTOC RM.

The experience gained by the Secretariat and by States Parties during the two reporting cycles on the implementation of the UNTOC and the Protocols thereto² and during the pilot programme to review implementation of the UNTOC³ should also be considered in the elaboration of the RM.

In the informal consultations Member States also recalled that the last sessions of the CoP Working Groups (WGs) on Technical Assistance, Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants showed that the WGs should work in a more systematic way.⁴ In light of this, several Member States supported the proposal put forward by Romania to elaborate and adopt multiyear work-plans for the WGs, in order to make

¹ www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CTOC/working-group-on-review-mechanism-2012.html.

² First reporting cycle: CTOC/COP/2005/2/rev.2; CTOC/COP/2005/3/rev.2; CTOC/COP/2005/4/rev.2. Second reporting cycle: CTOC/COP/2006/2/Rev.1; CTOC/COP/2006/6/Rev.1; CTOC/COP/2006/7/Rev.1; CTOC/COP/2006/8/Rev.1.

³ CTOC/COP/2012/CRP.3.

⁴ CTOC/COP/WG.2/2013/5; CTOC/COP/WG.4/2013/5; CTOC/COP/WG.7/2013/5.

the best use of the resources allocated to the WGs, taking into consideration also the work which has been already carried out by each WG.

The informal consultations highlighted the need to strike the balance between two main objectives:

(a) The RM should be effective in order to assist the States Parties, with the assistance of the Secretariat, in identifying gaps and priorities towards the full and universal implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto;

(b) The RM should be efficient and agile, in order not to overburden Member States with a heavy review process.

As far as the funding of the RM is concerned, the informal consultations confirmed that there is broad support to two main aspects:

(a) The RM should be funded both from the regular budget and through voluntary contributions;

(b) The RM should be cost-effective.

With regards to the characteristics of the review process, some States Parties indicated a preference for a thematic “expert review”, whilst other States Parties highlighted the role of the country-focused “peer review” as a crucial element to foster international cooperation and promote the understanding of the challenges in the implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto.

With regards to the involvement of civil society in the review process, the informal consultations showed that the solution agreed upon within the UNCAC RM should be considered as a reference, i.e. resolution 4/6 “Non-governmental organizations and the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Conventions against Corruption”, adopted by the Conference of the States Parties in Marrakech in October 2011.⁵

Nonetheless, whilst some States Parties would prefer to keep the same degree of involvement for Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) as in the UNCAC RM, other States Parties indicated the need to strengthen the involvement of CSOs.

4. Ideas on the elaboration of a review mechanism

On the basis of the above-mentioned elements, States Parties could consider to review the implementation of the UNTOC and the Protocols thereto through the existing five WGs already established by the CoP, using in a systematic manner all the relevant tools so far elaborated by the Secretariat to promote the implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto.

This idea seems to have the following advantages:

- The relevant existing tools would be used in order to implement art. 32 of the Convention, instead of establishing new structures (e.g. one or more new ad hoc implementation review working groups);
- The regular budget resources allocated for the WGs should be the main funding source of the RM, supplemented by voluntary contributions;

⁵ www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/CAC-COSP-session4-resolutions.html.

- The WGs could perform their tasks in a more scientific and systematic way, perfectly matching the above-mentioned recommendation to define multiyear work-plans for the WGs; the nature and objectives of the WGs would not be altered, as they would still be able to perform their exploratory role, through exchange of views on challenges and information sharing about best practices;
- Only the States Parties to the Convention and to the relevant Protocol would be involved in the review process in the relevant WG, thus avoiding overlapping membership between the Convention and each Protocol.

4.1. Guiding principles and characteristics of the review mechanism

The RM should be based on the same guiding principles and characteristics consensually agreed upon by Member States for the UNCAC RM and for the 2012 proposal for an UNTOC RM.

The RM should therefore be “transparent, efficient, non-intrusive, inclusive and impartial”. Cost-effectiveness should be an additional guiding principle for the RM.

4.2. Possible structure of the review mechanism

The review could be carried out through the five WGs established by the CoP, whose mandate and organization of work could be accordingly revised by the Conference.

The International Cooperation WG and the Technical Assistance WG could be entrusted with the review of the implementation of the Convention. The three Protocol-based WGs (Trafficking in Persons, Smuggling of Migrants, Firearms) could review the implementation of the relevant Protocol.

The five WGs could work on the basis of multi-year workplans, focused on the relevant articles of the Convention and of the Protocols thereto. The allocation of articles could be examined also on the basis of the discussions held in 2012 within the open-ended intergovernmental working group on the review of the implementation of the UNTOC and the Protocols thereto.⁶

The review should be carried out in parallel by the five WGs. The Conference should coordinate the whole process and ensure coherence.

4.3. Possible scheme of the review process

The process of the review of the implementation of the UNTOC and the Protocols thereto should be gradual. The review could be carried out during 10-year Phases, including two 5-year Cycles (Annex A and B).

⁶ CTOC/COP/WG.5/2012/CRP.9.

Cycle I

Cycle I could consist in a thematic expert review, based on information collected by the Secretariat through the Omnibus Survey Software (OSS). The current OSS could be accordingly improved in order to include a web-based application linked to the Sharing Electronic Resources and Laws against Organized Crime (SHERLOC) portal. Cycle I could provide an opportunity for all States Parties to reach the same level of understanding of the implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, based on best practices and sharing information, as well as to help preparing for Cycle II. Whilst replying to the OSS, States Parties could also outline technical assistance needs and priorities in order to strengthen their capacities in the implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto.

Therefore, Cycle I could include the following two steps:

Step 1: information gathering process

The Secretariat could collect information from States Parties through the OSS. During each year of Cycle I a certain number of States Parties could reply to the OSS, providing the Secretariat also with information through the SHERLOC portal. Each State Party would have 12 months to provide the Secretariat with the information on the implementation of the Convention and of the Protocols thereto, through a gradual and sustainable process. Technical assistance needs and priorities would be included by States Parties in the information transmitted to the Secretariat. The Secretariat could draw up the list of States Parties replying in each year of Cycle I, based on the date of ratification of the Convention and the relevant Protocol by each State Party: the first States that ratified the relevant instrument would be the first to reply to the OSS.

Step 2: thematic expert review process

Based on the replies by States Parties, an expert review process could take place within the existing five WGs. For each meeting of the WGs, the Secretariat could stimulate the debate among States Parties through “thematic” analytical reports, on the basis of the relevant information collected in a given year through the OSS. The WGs should propose to the CoP specific recommendations in order to strengthen the implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto.

Cycle II

Step 3: country-focused review

After the collection of information by Member States (Step 1) and the expert review process (Step 2), Cycle II of the review process could focus on the implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto by each State Party. The country-focused review, gradually prepared by the previous Steps 1 and 2, could be carried out through a peer review by two different Member States. As foreseen in the UNCAC RM, one of the reviewing States could belong to the same region of the reviewed State. The review could consist in a desk review and, if requested, a country visit, that would be funded only through voluntary contributions.

The outcome of the country-focused review, in the form of a country-specific report, could feed the debate within the five WGs, together with complementary thematic analytical reports elaborated by the Secretariat.

4.4. Follow up mechanism

The review process could also include ways to monitor, through the WGs, the actions taken by States Parties in order to follow up to the recommendations stemming from the review.

4.5. Revision of the review mechanism

The review mechanism could include a provision allowing States Parties, with the assistance of the Secretariat, to assess the effectiveness, the cost-effectiveness and utility of the process. In this way, the CoP could consider possible improvements and changes for the following 10-year Phase.

5. Funding of the review mechanism

The RM should be funded from the regular budget of the United Nations and from voluntary contributions.

The regular budget resources allocated by the CoP for the five WGs could be the core funding source of the mechanism. States Parties could decide to dedicate the additional regular budget resources required for the management and the analysis of the information gathered through the review process by the Secretariat, including for translation purposes.

Voluntary contributions should be used to fund activities such as country visits and the training of experts.

5.1. Cost-saving measures

Concrete ways to reduce the cost of the RM, without prejudice to the quality of the review, could be identified, also in light of the estimated financial requirements elaborated for the RM in 2012⁷. Some possible cost-saving measures could be the following:

(a) In order to avoid developing new tools or duplicating the work for States Parties and the Secretariat, the relevant tools elaborated by the Secretariat in the framework of the implementation of the Convention and of the Protocols thereto should be exploited in a systematic manner; these include, for example, the OSS, the SHERLOC Portal, the Needs assessment tools and the Model Laws (Annex C);

(b) States Parties, with the assistance of the Secretariat, could take advantage of the information collected within the UNCAC review process, where relevant also for the implementation of the UNTOC and the Protocols thereto (e.g. international cooperation);

(c) The outcome document of the country-focused peer review could be a single final country-specific report, including a 2-page executive summary, thus

⁷ CTOC/COP/2012/14.

avoiding two separate and longer documents (i.e. an executive summary and a report);

(d) Without prejudice to the quality of the analysis, all documents produced in the review process could have a limited number of pages: documents prepared by the Secretariat — such as the final country report — could respect the limits established for parliamentary documentation (16 pages), whilst responses to the OSS could not exceed a certain number of pages;

(e) The gradual approach of the review could ensure a less cumbersome and expensive process, both for States Parties and the Secretariat: during Cycle I States Parties could gradually prepare for the country-focused peer review to be carried out in Cycle II; as a result, also considering the benefits of the full use of the above-mentioned Vienna-managed IT tools, no additional posts in the UNODC regional offices could be needed;

(f) Country visits could last not more than 3 days and a limit to the number of experts participating in the visit could be established;

(g) In order to avoid the drawing of lots at the beginning of Cycle I, the list of Member States replying to the OSS for each year could be automatically established by the Secretariat on the basis of the date of ratification of the relevant instrument (Convention or Protocol).

6. Transparency and involvement of civil society

In order to guarantee a deep and systematic understanding of the challenges and best practices experienced by States Parties in the implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, the RM should draw from a wide range of information sources and make use of expertise outside the public sector, ensuring the necessary degree of transparency.

The following measures could be envisaged to this aim:

(a) The Secretariat could invite the Institutes comprising the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network as well as other research and academic institutes to provide their input to thematic reports and to country-specific reviews;

(b) States Parties could hold, in all phases of the review process, broad consultations at the national level with all relevant stakeholders, including the private sector, academia, individual experts and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs);

(c) On a voluntary basis, States Parties could publish their responses to the OSS;

(d) Member States could decide to publish both the executive summary and the final report of the country-focused review;

(e) Member States could also consider publishing, on a voluntary basis, information on the actions taken at the national level to implement the recommendations stemming from the review.

Also building on the experience gained in the UNCAC RM, the UNTOC RM should ensure an effective and constructive involvement of the civil society.

In this regard, during the informal consultations some States Parties underlined the important role that civil society should play in the review process and therefore highlighted that the UNTOC RM should ensure a stronger involvement of CSOs in comparison with the degree of involvement currently foreseen within the UNCAC RM.

On the contrary, some other Member States highlighted the intergovernmental nature of the review process and therefore underlined that they would not support any solution for the future UNTOC RM going beyond the compromise agreed within the UNCAC RM, in particular with regards to the participation by CSOs as observers in the WGs of the CoP.

Taking into account these two different positions within the membership, in the informal consultations some States Parties considered as a possible compromise a different degree of involvement of civil society in the WGs, based on a thematic approach, per WG or agenda item, or on the status/registration of individual NGOs.

The involvement of civil society in the UNTOC review process should be thoroughly discussed in the continuation of the informal consultations, considering the different positions within the membership.

The above-mentioned ideas are not intended as a “perfect” solution, but as a pragmatic way to encourage Member States to reach consensus on this very controversial aspect of the review process, hopefully allowing Member States to achieve the ultimate and main objective: the establishment of a mechanism to review the implementation of the UNTOC and the Protocols thereto.

7. Possible steps in view of the seventh session of the CoP (6-10 October 2014)

Italy is fully committed to continuing the informal consultations, also on the basis of the further suggestions and comments by Member States on the ideas presented in this non-paper. In due time, the facilitator will be ready to report back to the President of the EB.

Annex A

Possible scheme of the review process

PHASE I (10 years)

CYCLE I (5 years): Expert review process, based on information gathering

- During the first 5-year Cycle, all States Parties reply to the Omnibus Survey Software. The replies shall not exceed a certain number of pages (e.g. 100);
- States Parties also use the Needs Assessment Guide; information on national legislation is inserted into the SHERLOC Portal;
- Based on the replies by States Parties, the Secretariat prepares thematic reports/issue papers, that stimulate the meetings of the relevant Working Group;
- Based on this “expert review”, the Working Groups elaborate recommendations for the Conference of the Parties.

CYCLE II (5 years): Country-focused review

- Two States Parties are chosen to review one State Party, through the drawing of lots;
- On the basis of the preparation process during Cycle I, the two reviewing States Parties carry out the desk review, with the assistance of the Secretariat;
- If requested, a country visit takes place;
- The two reviewing States Parties finalize, with the assistance of the Secretariat and in consultation with the reviewed State Party, the 8.500 word Country Report, including a two-page Executive Summary;
- The Executive Summary and the country Report are published together with, on a voluntary basis, the replies to the Omnibus Survey Software;
- The outcome of the country-focused peer review stimulate the discussions of the Working Groups, together with thematic reports by the Secretariat, also with a regional focus, including analysis on technical assistance needs by States Parties.

PHASE II (10 years)

In Phase II, the two Cycles start again, in order to assess the added value of the work accomplished in Phase I and the follow up actions taken by States Parties on the basis of the review.

CYCLE I — Expert review process, based on information gathering

CYCLE II — Country-focused review

Annex B**Possible calendar of the review process**

PHASE I (10 years)		
CYCLE I (5 years)		
CYCLE I — INFORMATION GATHERING AND EXPERT REVIEW	WORKING GROUP	UNTOC/PROTOCOL
Year 1: 45 Year 2: 45 Year 3: 45 Year 4: 44 Year 5: buffer year	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, CRIMINALIZATION AND OTHER MEASURES	United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (179 States Parties)
Year 1: 45 Year 2: 45 Year 3: 45 Year 4: 44 Year 5: buffer year	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION	United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (179 States Parties)
Year 1: 40 Year 2: 40 Year 3: 40 Year 4: 39 Year 5: buffer year	TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS	Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (159 States Parties)
Year 1: 35 Year 2: 35 Year 3: 34 Year 4: 34 Year 5: buffer year	SMUGGLING OF MIGRANTS	Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air (138 States Parties)
Year 1: 28 Year 2: 27 Year 3: 27 Year 4: 27 Year 5: buffer year	FIREARMS	Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition (109 States Parties)

CYCLE II (5 years)		
CYCLE II — COUNTRY REVIEW	WORKING GROUP	UNTOC/Protocols
Year 6: 45 Year 7: 45 Year 8: 45 Year 9: 44 Year 10: buffer year	CRIMINALIZATION, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER MEASURES	United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (179 States Parties)
Year 6: 45 Year 7: 45 Year 8: 45 Year 9: 44 Year 10: buffer year	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION	United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (179 States Parties)
Year 6: 40 Year 7: 40 Year 8: 40 Year 9: 39 Year 10: buffer year	TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS	Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (159 States Parties)
Year 6: 35 Year 7: 35 Year 8: 34 Year 9: 34 Year 10: buffer year	SMUGGLING OF MIGRANTS	Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air (138 States Parties)
Year 6: 28 Year 7: 27 Year 8: 27 Year 9: 27 Year 10: buffer year	FIREARMS	Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition (109 States Parties)

Annex C

Tools elaborated by the Secretariat to be used in the review process

1. Omnibus Survey Software (OSS)

www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CTOC/omnibus-tool.html

An interactive tool conceived to simplify reporting obligations vis-a-vis the UNTOC and the Protocols thereto. Designed as a self-assessment checklist, the OSS enables States parties to:

- (a) Assess national legislation for compliance with the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto and the United Nations Convention against Corruption;
- (b) Identify technical and legal assistance needs;
- (c) Share good practices.

The Omnibus Survey Software also includes:

- (a) Hyperlinks to legislative guides;
- (b) The ability to cross-reference information relevant to crime related treaties;
- (c) The option to merge the responses of national officials with different expertise into a single national self-assessment report.

2. Sharing Electronic Resources and Laws against Organized Crime (SHERLOC) Portal

www.unodc.org/cld/index-sherloc.jsp

SHERLOC facilitates the dissemination of information regarding the implementation of the UNTOC and its three Protocols. It contains a database of national legislation and a case law database, including on the basis of the Digest of Organized Crime Cases (www.unodc.org/unodc/en/organized-crime/digest-of-organized-crime-cases.html)

3. Needs Assessment Tools on the Organized Crime Convention

The Secretariat plans to issue these tools in view of the 7th session of the Conference of the Parties (October 2014). They include a set of indicators and questions designed to enable experts from international organizations, national governments, civil society and relevant institutions to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the implementation of the Convention, allowing the following functions:

- i. identifying gaps in the existing legislation and its implementation;
- ii. facilitating the formulation and development of technical assistance;
- iii. facilitating the development of performance indicators for evaluating progress in implementation.

4. Model Laws

www.unodc.org/unodc/en/legal-tools/model-treaties-and-laws.html

Model Legislative Provisions against Organized Crime (2012), Model Law against Trafficking in Persons (2010), Model Law against Smuggling of Migrants (2010), Model Law on Illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, their parts and components and ammunition (2011), Model Laws on International Cooperation: these tools could be used to assess the implementation of the Convention and its three Protocols by Member States.

Informal consultations on the establishment of a mechanism to review the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto

Explanatory note with Annexes D-J

6 August 2014

On the basis of the non-paper “Food for thought on the establishment of a mechanism to review the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto”, Italy is pleased to transmit some additional documentation, based on the information provided by the Secretariat in the framework of the informal consultations.

The attached documentation supplement the non-paper and its three Annexes (A-B-C), in order to provide additional information on some of the ideas presented in the non-paper, in particular on some of the possible cost-saving measures and on the financial implications of the review of the implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto through the Working Groups.

Italy is fully committed to continuing the informal consultations at the beginning of September, in view of the seventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNTOC (Vienna, 6-10 October 2014).

Annex D

Lists of the States Parties to United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) and to the Protocols thereto.

The States Parties involved in the review process of the four legal instruments are indicated in the following lists.

Annex D.1: List of the 179 States Parties to the UNTOC, according to the date of ratification

Annex D.2: List of the 159 States Parties to the Trafficking in Persons Protocol, according to the date of ratification

Annex D.3: List of the 138 States Parties to the Smuggling of Migrants Protocol, according to the date of ratification

Annex D.4: List of the 109 States Parties to the Firearms Protocol, according to the date of ratification

Annex D.5: List of the 103 States Parties to United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) and all the Protocols thereto

Annex E

Entitlements for meetings and documentation for the Working Groups established by the Conference of the Parties to the UNTOC

The table contains information on the resources used in the past years and foreseen in the current biennium (2014-2015) for the UNTOC CoP Working Groups: International Cooperation (IC), Technical Assistance (TA), Trafficking in Persons (TiP), Smuggling of Migrants (SoM), Firearms (FA).

Annex F**Budget for the CoP Working Groups 2012-2013**

The table summarizes the regular budget and extrabudgetary resources used for the five CoP Working Groups in the 2012-2013 biennium, with detailed information on the following meetings held in 2012 and 2013.

Annex G**Standard cost of a 16 page report**

The table shows the standard cost for and intergovernmental report (10,700 words) and a Secretariat report (8,500 words).

Annex H**Preliminary estimates for a web-based information gathering tool on UNTOC and the Protocols thereto**

As mentioned in the non-paper, a web-based tool could be developed in order to facilitate the information gathering process.

Annex I**Possible entitlements for the Working Groups for a thematic expert review (Cycle I)**

The table contains preliminary information on the possible resources that could be used in order to carry out a thematic expert review through the CoP Working Groups. The table should be analysed in connection with Annex E.

It does not include information on the possible additional resources needed by the Secretariat for the analysis of the information provided by Member States — through the Omnibus Survey Software — on the implementation of the UNTOC and the Protocols thereto.

Annex J**Main costs for the thematic expert review process (Cycle II)**

The table contains preliminary information on the possible resources needed to carry out a country focused review, applying some of the cost-saving measure indicated in the non-paper (para 5.1.), in particular limiting the number of pages for the country-reports. The table should be analysed in connection with Annex E and Annex G.

**Annex D1 — Chronological Ratification Table of the
United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime**
New York, 15 November 2000

Status: 16 July 2014

Country	Ratification	Signature
Monaco	05 June 2001	13 Dec 2000
Nigeria	28 June 2001	13 Dec 2000
Serbia	06 September 2001	12 Dec 2000
Poland	12 November 2001	12 Dec 2000
Bulgaria	05 December 2001	13 Dec 2000
Latvia	07 December 2001	13 Dec 2000
Peru	23 January 2002	14 Dec 2000
Spain	01 March 2002	13 Dec 2000
Mali	12 April 2002	15 Dec 2000
Bosnia and Herzegovina	24 April 2002	12 Dec 2000
Lithuania	09 May 2002	13 Dec 2000
Canada	13 May 2002	14 Dec 2000
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	13 May 2002	14 Dec 2000
Burkina Faso	15 May 2002	15 Dec 2000
Philippines	28 May 2002	14 Dec 2000
Tajikistan	08 July 2002	12 Dec 2000
New Zealand	19 July 2002	14 Dec 2000
Antigua and Barbuda	24 July 2002	26 Sep 2001
Namibia	16 August 2002	13 Dec 2000
Albania	21 August 2002	12 Dec 2000
Botswana	29 August 2002	10 Apr 2002
Nicaragua	09 September 2002	14 Dec 2000
Ecuador	17 September 2002	13 Dec 2000
Morocco	19 September 2002	13 Dec 2000

Algeria	07 October 2002	12 Dec 2000
France	29 October 2002	12 Dec 2000
Argentina	19 November 2002	12 Dec 2000
Romania	04 December 2002	14 Dec 2000
Croatia	24 January 2003	12 Dec 2000
Equatorial Guinea	07 February 2003	14 Dec 2000
Estonia	10 February 2003	14 Dec 2000
Mexico	04 March 2003	13 Dec 2000
Turkey	25 March 2003	13 Dec 2000
Mauritius	21 April 2003	12 Dec 2000
Cyprus	22 April 2003	12 Dec 2000
Seychelles	22 April 2003	12 Dec 2000
Gambia	05 May 2003	14 Dec 2000
Tunisia	19 June 2003	13 Dec 2000
Belarus	25 June 2003	14 Dec 2000
Armenia	01 July 2003	15 Nov 2001
Costa Rica	24 July 2003	16 Mar 2001
<u>China</u>	23 September 2003	12 Dec 2000
Norway	23 September 2003	13 Dec 2000
Afghanistan	24 September 2003	14 Dec 2000
Lesotho	24 September 2003	14 Dec 2000
Malta	24 September 2003	14 Dec 2000
Comoros	25 September 2003	
Guatemala	25 September 2003	12 Dec 2000
Belize	26 September 2003	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	26 September 2003	
Rwanda	26 September 2003	14 Dec 2000
Jamaica	29 September 2003	26 Sep 2001
Denmark	30 September 2003	12 Dec 2000
Kyrgyzstan	02 October 2003	13 Dec 2000

Senegal	27 October 2003	13 Dec 2000
Azerbaijan	30 October 2003	12 Dec 2000
Honduras	02 December 2003	14 Dec 2000
Slovakia	03 December 2003	14 Dec 2000
Uzbekistan	09 December 2003	13 Dec 2000
Brazil	29 January 2004	12 Dec 2000
Finland	10 February 2004	12 Dec 2000
South Africa	20 February 2004	14 Dec 2000
Cook Islands	04 March 2004	
Egypt	05 March 2004	13 Dec 2000
El Salvador	18 March 2004	14 Dec 2000
Myanmar	30 March 2004	
Sweden	30 April 2004	12 Dec 2000
Portugal	10 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
European Union	21 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
Grenada	21 May 2004	
Slovenia	21 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
St. Kitts and Nevis	21 May 2004	20 Nov 2001
Ukraine	21 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
Micronesia (Federated States of)	24 May 2004	
Netherlands	26 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
Russian Federation	26 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
Australia	27 May 2004	13 Dec 2000
Bahrain	07 June 2004	
Kenya	16 June 2004	
Libya	18 June 2004	13 Nov 2001
Togo	02 July 2004	12 Dec 2000
Cabo Verde	15 July 2004	13 Dec 2000
Colombia	04 August 2004	12 Dec 2000
Belgium	11 August 2004	12 Dec 2000

Panama	18 August 2004	13 Dec 2000
Benin	30 August 2004	13 Dec 2000
Central African Republic	14 September 2004	
Guyana	14 September 2004	
Liberia	22 September 2004	
Paraguay	22 September 2004	12 Dec 2000
Austria	23 September 2004	12 Dec 2000
Malaysia	24 September 2004	26 Sep 2002
Niger	30 September 2004	21 Aug 2001
Guinea	09 November 2004	
Chile	29 November 2004	13 Dec 2000
Sudan	10 December 2004	15 Dec 2000
Gabon	15 December 2004	
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 January 2005	12 Dec 2000
Saudi Arabia	18 January 2005	12 Dec 2000
Uruguay	04 March 2005	13 Dec 2000
Uganda	09 March 2005	12 Dec 2000
Malawi	17 March 2005	13 Dec 2000
Turkmenistan	28 March 2005	
Djibouti	20 April 2005	
Zambia	24 April 2005	
Oman	13 May 2005	
Mauritania	22 July 2005	
Kiribati	15 September 2005	
Madagascar	15 September 2005	14 Dec 2000
Republic of Moldova	16 September 2005	14 Dec 2000
Lebanon	05 October 2005	18 Dec 2001
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	10 October 2005	12 Dec 2000
Democratic Republic of the Congo	28 October 2005	
United States of America	03 November 2005	13 Dec 2000

Cambodia	12 December 2005	11 Nov 2001
Vanuatu	04 January 2006	
Cameroon	06 February 2006	13 Dec 2000
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	09 February 2006	14 Dec 2000
Sao Tome and Principe	12 April 2006	
Kuwait	12 May 2006	12 Dec 2000
United Republic of Tanzania	24 May 2006	13 Dec 2000
Germany	14 June 2006	12 Dec 2000
Italy	02 August 2006	12 Dec 2000
Georgia	05 September 2006	13 Dec 2000
Mozambique	20 September 2006	15 Dec 2000
Sri Lanka	22 September 2006	13 Dec 2000
Montenegro	23 October 2006	
Dominican Republic	26 October 2006	13 Dec 2000
Switzerland	27 October 2006	12 Dec 2000
Hungary	22 December 2006	14 Dec 2000
Israel	27 December 2006	13 Dec 2000
Cuba	09 February 2007	13 Dec 2000
United Arab Emirates	07 May 2007	9 Dec 2002
Suriname	25 May 2007	
Ethiopia	23 July 2007	14 Dec 2000
Singapore	28 August 2007	13 Dec 2000
Guinea-Bissau	10 September 2007	14 Dec 2000
Trinidad and Tobago	06 November 2007	26 Sep 2001
Zimbabwe	12 December 2007	12 Dec 2000
Liechtenstein	20 February 2008	12 Dec 2000
Qatar	10 March 2008	
Iraq	17 March 2008	
Brunei Darussalam	25 March 2008	
Luxembourg	12 May 2008	13 Dec 2000

Mongolia	27 June 2008	
Kazakhstan	31 July 2008	13 Dec 2000
Bahamas	26 September 2008	9 Apr 2001
Syrian Arab Republic	08 April 2009	13 Dec 2000
Indonesia	20 April 2009	12 Dec 2000
Jordan	22 May 2009	26 Nov 2002
Chad	18 August 2009	
Timor-Leste	09 November 2009	
Pakistan	13 January 2010	14 Dec 2000
Yemen	08 February 2010	15 Dec 2000
Iceland	13 May 2010	13 Dec 2000
Ireland	17 June 2010	13 Dec 2000
San Marino	20 July 2010	14 Dec 2000
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	29 October 2010	24 Jul 2002
Greece	11 January 2011	13 Dec 2000
Haiti	19 April 2011	13 Dec 2000
India	05 May 2011	12 Dec 2002
Marshall Islands	15 June 2011	
Bangladesh	13 July 2011	
Andorra	22 September 2011	11 Nov 2001
Nepal	23 December 2011	12 Dec 2002
Holy See	25 January 2012	
Burundi	24 May 2012	14 Dec 2000
Viet Nam	08 June 2012	13 Dec 2000
Nauru	12 July 2012	12 Nov 2001
Niue	16 July 2012	
Ghana	21 August 2012	
Swaziland	24 September 2012	14 Dec 2000
Côte d'Ivoire	25 October 2012	15 Dec 2000
Maldives	04 February 2013	

Angola	01 April 2013	13 Dec 2000
Dominica	17 May 2013	
St. Lucia	16 July 2013	26 Sep 2001
Czech Republic	24 September 2013	12 Dec 2000
Thailand	17 October 2013	13 Dec 2000
Barbados		26 Sep 2001
Congo		14 Dec 2000
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		12 Dec 2000
Japan		12 Dec 2000
Republic of Korea		13 Dec 2000
Sierra Leone		27 Nov 2001

**Annex D2 — Chronological Ratification Table of the
Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations
Convention against Transnational Organized Crime**
New York, 15 November 2000

Status: 16 July 2014

Country	Ratification	Signature
Monaco	5 June 2001	13 Dec 2000
Nigeria	28 June 2001	13 Dec 2000
Serbia	6 September 2001	12 Dec 2000
Bulgaria	5 December 2001	13 Dec 2000
Peru	23 January 2002	14 Dec 2000
Spain	1 March 2002	13 Dec 2000
Mali	12 April 2002	15 Dec 2000
Bosnia and Herzegovina	24 April 2002	12 Dec 2000
Canada	13 May 2002	14 Dec 2000
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	13 May 2002	14 Dec 2000
Burkina Faso	15 May 2002	15 Dec 2000
Philippines	28 May 2002	14 Dec 2000
Tajikistan	8 July 2002	
New Zealand	19 July 2002	14 Dec 2000
Namibia	16 August 2002	13 Dec 2000
Albania	21 August 2002	12 Dec 2000
Botswana	29 August 2002	10 Apr 2002
Ecuador	17 September 2002	13 Dec 2000
France	29 October 2002	12 Dec 2000
Argentina	19 November 2002	12 Dec 2000
Romania	4 December 2002	14 Dec 2000
Croatia	24 January 2003	12 Dec 2000
Equatorial Guinea	7 February 2003	14 Dec 2000
Mexico	4 March 2003	13 Dec 2000

Turkey	25 March 2003	13 Dec 2000
Gambia	5 May 2003	14 Dec 2000
Lithuania	23 June 2003	25 Apr 2002
Belarus	25 June 2003	14 Dec 2000
Armenia	1 July 2003	15 Nov 2001
Tunisia	14 July 2003	13 Dec 2000
Cyprus	6 August 2003	12 Dec 2000
Costa Rica	9 September 2003	16 Mar 2001
Norway	23 September 2003	13 Dec 2000
Lesotho	24 September 2003	14 Dec 2000
Malta	24 September 2003	14 Dec 2000
Mauritius	24 September 2003	
Belize	26 September 2003	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	26 September 2003	
Poland	26 September 2003	4 Oct 2001
Rwanda	26 September 2003	14 Dec 2000
Jamaica	29 September 2003	13 Feb 2002
Denmark	30 September 2003	12 Dec 2000
Kyrgyzstan	2 October 2003	13 Dec 2000
Senegal	27 October 2003	13 Dec 2000
Azerbaijan	30 October 2003	12 Dec 2000
Brazil	29 January 2004	12 Dec 2000
South Africa	20 February 2004	14 Dec 2000
Egypt	5 March 2004	1 May 2002
Algeria	9 March 2004	6 Jun 2001
El Salvador	18 March 2004	15 Aug 2002
Myanmar	30 March 2004	
Guatemala	1 April 2004	
Portugal	10 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
Estonia	12 May 2004	20 Sep 2002

Grenada	21 May 2004	21 May 2004	15 Nov 2001
Slovenia	21 May 2004	21 May 2004	15 Nov 2001
St. Kitts and Nevis	21 May 2004	21 May 2004	15 Nov 2001
Ukraine	21 May 2004	21 May 2004	15 Nov 2001
Latvia	25 May 2004	25 May 2004	10 Dec 2002
Russian Federation	26 May 2004	26 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
Bahrain	7 June 2004	7 June 2004	12 Dec 2000
Seychelles	22 June 2004	22 June 2004	22 Jul 2002
Sweden	1 July 2004	1 July 2004	12 Dec 2000
Cabo Verde	15 July 2004	15 July 2004	13 Dec 2000
Colombia	4 August 2004	4 August 2004	12 Dec 2000
Belgium	11 August 2004	11 August 2004	12 Dec 2000
Panama	18 August 2004	18 August 2004	13 Dec 2000
Benin	30 August 2004	30 August 2004	13 Dec 2000
Guyana	14 September 2004	14 September 2004	13 Dec 2000
Slovakia	21 September 2004	21 September 2004	15 Nov 2001
Liberia	22 September 2004	22 September 2004	15 Nov 2001
Paraguay	22 September 2004	22 September 2004	12 Dec 2000
Libya	24 September 2004	24 September 2004	13 Nov 2001
Niger	30 September 2004	30 September 2004	21 Aug 2001
Nicaragua	12 October 2004	12 October 2004	21 Aug 2001
Guinea	9 November 2004	9 November 2004	8 Aug 2002
Chile	29 November 2004	29 November 2004	8 Aug 2002
Kenya	5 January 2005	5 January 2005	8 Aug 2002
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 January 2005	12 January 2005	12 Dec 2000
Uruguay	4 March 2005	4 March 2005	13 Dec 2000
Malawi	17 March 2005	17 March 2005	13 Dec 2000
Turkmenistan	28 March 2005	28 March 2005	13 Dec 2000
Djibouti	20 April 2005	20 April 2005	13 Dec 2000
Zambia	24 April 2005	24 April 2005	13 Dec 2000

Oman	13 May 2005	
Mauritania	22 July 2005	12 Dec 2000
Netherlands	27 July 2005	11 Dec 2002
Australia	14 September 2005	12 Dec 2000
Austria	15 September 2005	14 Dec 2000
Kiribati	15 September 2005	14 Dec 2000
Madagascar	16 September 2005	9 Dec 2002
Republic of Moldova	5 October 2005	13 Dec 2000
Lebanon	28 October 2005	13 Dec 2000
Democratic Republic of the Congo	3 November 2005	13 Dec 2000
United States of America	6 February 2006	14 Dec 2000
Cameroon	9 February 2006	14 Dec 2000
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	12 May 2006	12 Dec 2000
Kuwait	18 May 2006	13 Dec 2000
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	24 May 2006	12 Dec 2000
United Republic of Tanzania	14 June 2006	15 Dec 2000
Germany	2 August 2006	12 Dec 2000
Italy	23 August 2006	13 Dec 2000
Sao Tome and Principe	5 September 2006	12 Dec 2000
Georgia	6 September 2006	12 Dec 2000
European Union	7 September 2006	15 Dec 2000
Finland	20 September 2006	
Mozambique	6 October 2006	
Central African Republic	23 October 2006	
Montenegro	27 October 2006	2 Apr 2002
Switzerland	22 December 2006	14 Dec 2000
Hungary	25 May 2007	
Suriname	2 July 2007	11 Nov 2001
Cambodia	20 July 2007	10 Dec 2002

Guinea-Bissau	10 September 2007	14 Dec 2000
Trinidad and Tobago	6 November 2007	26 Sep 2001
Dominican Republic	5 February 2008	15 Dec 2000
Liechtenstein	20 February 2008	14 Mar 2001
Honduras	1 April 2008	
Mongolia	27 June 2008	
Israel	23 July 2008	14 Nov 2001
Kazakhstan	31 July 2008	
Uzbekistan	12 August 2008	28 Jun 2001
Bahamas	26 September 2008	9 Apr 2001
United Arab Emirates	21 January 2009	
Iraq	9 February 2009	
Malaysia	26 February 2009	
Syrian Arab Republic	8 April 2009	13 Dec 2000
Luxembourg	20 April 2009	13 Dec 2000
Togo	8 May 2009	12 Dec 2000
Qatar	29 May 2009	
Jordan	11 June 2009	
Chad	18 August 2009	
Indonesia	28 September 2009	12 Dec 2000
Timor-Leste	9 November 2009	
China	8 February 2010	
Antigua and Barbuda	17 February 2010	
Ireland	17 June 2010	13 Dec 2000
Iceland	22 June 2010	13 Dec 2000
San Marino	20 July 2010	14 Dec 2000
Gabon	22 September 2010	
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	29 October 2010	20 Nov 2002
Greece	11 January 2011	13 Dec 2000
Haiti	19 April 2011	13 Dec 2000

Morocco	25 April 2011	
India	5 May 2011	12 Dec 2002
Micronesia (Federated States of)	2 November 2011	
Burundi	24 May 2012	14 Dec 2000
Viet Nam	8 June 2012	
Ethiopia	22 June 2012	
Nauru	12 July 2012	12 Nov 2001
Ghana	21 August 2012	
Swaziland	24 September 2012	8 Jan 2001
Côte d'Ivoire	25 October 2012	
Dominica	17 May 2013	
Cuba	20 June 2013	
St. Lucia	16 July 2013	
Thailand	17 October 2013	18 Dec 2001
Zimbabwe	13 December 2013	
Barbados		26 Sep 2001
Congo		14 Dec 2000
Czech Republic		10 Dec 2002
Japan		9 Dec 2002
Republic of Korea		13 Dec 2000
Sierra Leone		27 Nov 2001
Sri Lanka		13 Dec 2000
Uganda		12 Dec 2000

**Annex D3 — Chronological Ratification Table of the
Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against
Transnational Organized Crime**
New York, 15 November 2000

Status: 16 July 2014

Country	Ratification	Signature
Monaco	05 June 2001	13 Dec 2000
Serbia	06 September 2001	12 Dec 2000
Nigeria	27 September 2001	13 Dec 2000
Bulgaria	05 December 2001	13 Dec 2000
Peru	23 January 2002	14 Dec 2000
Spain	01 March 2002	13 Dec 2000
Mali	12 April 2002	15 Dec 2000
Bosnia and Herzegovina	24 April 2002	12 Dec 2000
Canada	13 May 2002	14 Dec 2000
Burkina Faso	15 May 2002	15 Dec 2000
Philippines	28 May 2002	14 Dec 2000
Tajikistan	08 July 2002	
New Zealand	19 July 2002	14 Dec 2000
Namibia	16 August 2002	13 Dec 2000
Albania	21 August 2002	12 Dec 2000
Botswana	29 August 2002	10 Apr 2002
Ecuador	17 September 2002	13 Dec 2000
France	29 October 2002	12 Dec 2000
Argentina	19 November 2002	12 Dec 2000
Romania	04 December 2002	14 Dec 2000
Croatia	24 January 2003	12 Dec 2000
Mexico	04 March 2003	13 Dec 2000
Turkey	25 March 2003	13 Dec 2000
Latvia	23 April 2003	10 Dec 2002

Gambia	05 May 2003	14 Dec 2000
Lithuania	12 May 2003	25 Apr 2002
Belarus	25 June 2003	14 Dec 2000
Armenia	01 July 2003	15 Nov 2001
Tunisia	14 July 2003	13 Dec 2000
Cyprus	06 August 2003	12 Dec 2000
Costa Rica	07 August 2003	16 Mar 2001
Norway	23 September 2003	13 Dec 2000
Malta	24 September 2003	14 Dec 2000
Mauritius	24 September 2003	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	26 September 2003	
Poland	26 September 2003	4 Oct 2001
Jamaica	29 September 2003	13 Feb 2002
Kyrgyzstan	02 October 2003	13 Dec 2000
Senegal	27 October 2003	13 Dec 2000
Azerbaijan	30 October 2003	12 Dec 2000
Brazil	29 January 2004	12 Dec 2000
South Africa	20 February 2004	14 Dec 2000
Algeria	09 March 2004	6 Jun 2001
El Salvador	18 March 2004	15 Aug 2002
Myanmar	30 March 2004	
Guatemala	01 April 2004	
Portugal	10 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
Estonia	12 May 2004	20 Sep 2002
Grenada	21 May 2004	
Slovenia	21 May 2004	15 Nov 2001
St. Kitts and Nevis	21 May 2004	
Ukraine	21 May 2004	15 Nov 2001
Russian Federation	26 May 2004	12 Dec 2000
Australia	27 May 2004	21 Dec 2001

Bahrain	07 June 2004	
Seychelles	22 June 2004	22 Jul 2002
Cabo Verde	15 July 2004	13 Dec 2000
Belgium	11 August 2004	12 Dec 2000
Panama	18 August 2004	13 Dec 2000
Benin	30 August 2004	17 May 2002
Slovakia	21 September 2004	15 Nov 2001
Liberia	22 September 2004	
Lesotho	24 September 2004	14 Dec 2000
Libya	24 September 2004	13 Nov 2001
Chile	29 November 2004	8 Aug 2002
Kenya	05 January 2005	
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 January 2005	12 Dec 2000
Egypt	01 March 2005	
Uruguay	04 March 2005	13 Dec 2000
Malawi	17 March 2005	
Turkmenistan	28 March 2005	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	19 April 2005	14 Dec 2000
Djibouti	20 April 2005	
Zambia	24 April 2005	
Oman	13 May 2005	
Guinea	08 June 2005	
Mauritania	22 July 2005	
Netherlands	27 July 2005	12 Dec 2000
Kiribati	15 September 2005	
Madagascar	15 September 2005	14 Dec 2000
Republic of Moldova	16 September 2005	14 Dec 2000
Lebanon	05 October 2005	26 Sep 2002
Democratic Republic of the Congo	28 October 2005	
United States of America	03 November 2005	13 Dec 2000

Cambodia	12 December 2005	11 Nov 2001
Cameroon	06 February 2006	13 Dec 2000
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	09 February 2006	14 Dec 2000
Nicaragua	15 February 2006	
Sao Tome and Principe	12 April 2006	
Kuwait	12 May 2006	
United Republic of Tanzania	24 May 2006	13 Dec 2000
Germany	14 June 2006	12 Dec 2000
Italy	02 August 2006	12 Dec 2000
Georgia	05 September 2006	13 Dec 2000
European Union	06 September 2006	12 Dec 2000
Sweden	06 September 2006	12 Dec 2000
Finland	07 September 2006	12 Dec 2000
Belize	14 September 2006	
Mozambique	20 September 2006	15 Dec 2000
Rwanda	04 October 2006	14 Dec 2000
Central African Republic	06 October 2006	
Montenegro	23 October 2006	
Switzerland	27 October 2006	2 Apr 2002
Denmark	08 December 2006	12 Dec 2000
Hungary	22 December 2006	14 Dec 2000
Suriname	25 May 2007	
Saudi Arabia	20 July 2007	10 Dec 2002
Trinidad and Tobago	06 November 2007	26 Sep 2001
Austria	30 November 2007	12 Dec 2000
Dominican Republic	10 December 2007	15 Dec 2000
Liechtenstein	20 February 2008	14 Mar 2001
Guyana	16 April 2008	
Mongolia	27 June 2008	
Kazakhstan	31 July 2008	

Paraguay	23 September 2008	
Bahamas	26 September 2008	9 Apr 2001
Honduras	18 November 2008	
Iraq	09 January 2009	
Niger	18 March 2009	
Syrian Arab Republic	08 April 2009	13 Dec 2000
Indonesia	28 September 2009	12 Dec 2000
Timor-Leste	09 November 2009	
Antigua and Barbuda	17 February 2010	
San Marino	20 July 2010	14 Dec 2000
Togo	28 September 2010	12 Dec 2000
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	29 October 2010	20 Nov 2002
Greece	11 January 2011	13 Dec 2000
Haiti	19 April 2011	13 Dec 2000
India	05 May 2011	12 Dec 2002
Burundi	26 May 2012	14 Dec 2000
Ethiopia	22 June 2012	
Nauru	12 July 2012	12 Nov 2001
Ghana	21 August 2012	
Luxembourg	24 September 2012	12 Dec 2000
Swaziland	24 September 2012	8 Jan 2001
Dominica	17 May 2013	
Cuba	20 June 2013	
Czech Republic	24 September 2013	10 Dec 2002
Barbados		26 Sep 2001
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)		12 Dec 2000
Congo		14 Dec 2000
Equatorial Guinea		14 Dec 2000
Guinea-Bissau		14 Dec 2000
Iceland		13 Dec 2000

Ireland	13 Dec 2000
Japan	9 Dec 2002
Republic of Korea	13 Dec 2000
Sierra Leone	27 Nov 2001
Sri Lanka	13 Dec 2000
Thailand	18 Dec 2001
Uganda	12 Dec 2000
Uzbekistan	28 Jun 2001

**Annex D4 — Chronological Ratification Table of the
Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition,
supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime**
New York, 31 May 2001

Status: 16 July 2014

Country	Ratification	Signature
Mali	03 May 2002	11 Jul 2001
Burkina Faso	15 May 2002	17 Oct 2001
Bulgaria	06 August 2002	15 Feb 2002
Mexico	10 April 2003	31 Dec 2001
Cyprus	06 August 2003	14 Aug 2002
Costa Rica	09 September 2003	12 Nov 2001
Norway	23 September 2003	10 May 2002
Peru	23 September 2003	
Lesotho	24 September 2003	
Mauritius	24 September 2003	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	26 September 2003	
Jamaica	29 September 2003	13 Nov 2001
South Africa	20 February 2004	14 Oct 2002
El Salvador	18 March 2004	15 Aug 2002
Guatemala	01 April 2004	
Romania	16 April 2004	
Turkey	04 May 2004	28 Jun 2002
Estonia	12 May 2004	20 Sep 2002
Grenada	21 May 2004	
Slovenia	21 May 2004	15 Nov 2001
St. Kitts and Nevis	21 May 2004	
Libya	18 June 2004	13 Nov 2001
Cabo Verde	15 July 2004	
Latvia	28 July 2004	

Panama	18 August 2004	5 Oct 2001
Algeria	25 August 2004	
Benin	30 August 2004	17 May 2002
Slovakia	21 September 2004	26 Aug 2002
Liberia	22 September 2004	
Belgium	24 September 2004	11 Jun 2002
Belarus	06 October 2004	
Azerbaijan	03 December 2004	
Kenya	05 January 2005	
Croatia	07 February 2005	
Netherlands	08 February 2005	
Lithuania	24 February 2005	12 Dec 2002
Uganda	09 March 2005	
Malawi	17 March 2005	
Turkmenistan	28 March 2005	
Poland	04 April 2005	12 Dec 2002
Zambia	24 April 2005	
Oman	13 May 2005	
Mauritania	22 July 2005	
Madagascar	15 September 2005	13 Nov 2001
Democratic Republic of the Congo	28 October 2005	
Cambodia	12 December 2005	
Serbia	20 December 2005	
Republic of Moldova	28 February 2006	
Nigeria	03 March 2006	13 Nov 2001
Brazil	31 March 2006	11 Jul 2001
Senegal	07 April 2006	17 Jan 2002
Sao Tome and Principe	12 April 2006	
United Republic of Tanzania	24 May 2006	
Italy	02 August 2006	14 Nov 2001

Mozambique	20 September 2006
Rwanda	04 October 2006
Central African Republic	06 October 2006
Montenegro	23 October 2006
Lebanon	13 November 2006
Argentina	18 December 2006
Cuba	09 February 2007
<u>Spain</u>	09 February 2007
Nicaragua	02 July 2007
Kuwait	30 July 2007
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	14 September 2007
Paraguay	27 September 2007
Trinidad and Tobago	06 November 2007
Albania	08 February 2008
Saudi Arabia	11 March 2008
Bosnia and Herzegovina	01 April 2008
Honduras	01 April 2008
Uruguay	03 April 2008
Tunisia	10 April 2008
Guyana	02 May 2008
Mongolia	27 June 2008
Kazakhstan	31 July 2008
Bahamas	26 September 2008
Dominican Republic	07 April 2009
Morocco	08 April 2009
Antigua and Barbuda	27 April 2010
Chile	17 June 2010
Gabon	22 September 2010
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	29 October 2010
Greece	11 January 2011
	10 Oct 2002

Haiti	19 April 2011	
India	05 May 2011	12 Dec 2002
Finland	17 May 2011	23 Jan 2002
Portugal	03 June 2011	3 Sep 2002
Sweden	28 June 2011	10 Jan 2002
Hungary	13 July 2011	
Armenia	26 January 2012	
Burundi	24 May 2012	
Ethiopia	22 June 2012	
Nauru	12 July 2012	12 Nov 2001
Togo	17 July 2012	
Swaziland	24 September 2012	
Côte d'Ivoire	25 October 2012	
Switzerland	29 November 2012	
Dominica	17 May 2013	
Iraq	23 May 2013	
Ukraine	04 June 2013	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	10 June 2013	
Czech Republic	24 September 2013	
Guinea-Bissau	24 September 2013	
Ecuador	25 September 2013	12 Oct 2001
Austria	09 October 2013	12 Nov 2001
Liechtenstein	10 December 2013	
European Union	21 March 2014	16 Jan 2002
Ghana	14 June 2014	
Australia		21 Dec 2001
Barbados		26 Sep 2001
Canada		20 Mar 2002
China		9 Dec 2002
Denmark		27 Aug 2002

Germany	3 Sep 2002
Iceland	15 Nov 2001
Japan	9 Dec 2002
Luxembourg	11 Dec 2002
Monaco	24 Jun 2002
Republic of Korea	4 Oct 2001
Seychelles	22 Jul 2002
Sierra Leone	27 Nov 2001
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	6 May 2002

Annex D5 — List of States Parties to the Organized Crime Convention and all its Protocols

Status of 22 July 2014

1. Albania	22. Croatia	42. India
2. Algeria	23. Cuba	43. Iraq
3. Antigua and Barbuda	24. Cyprus	44. Italy
4. Argentina	25. Democratic Republic of the Congo	45. Jamaica
5. Armenia	26. Dominica	46. Kazakhstan
6. Austria	27. Dominican Republic	47. Kenya
7. Azerbaijan	28. Ecuador	48. Kuwait
8. Bahamas	29. El Salvador	49. Lao People's Democratic Republic
9. Belarus	30. Estonia	50. Latvia
10. Belgium	31. Ethiopia	51. Lebanon
11. Benin	32. European Union	52. Lesotho
12. Bosnia and Herzegovina	33. Finland	53. Liberia
13. Brazil	34. Ghana	54. Libya
14. Bulgaria	35. Greece	55. Liechtenstein
15. Burkina Faso	36. Grenada	56. Lithuania
16. Burundi	37. Guatemala	57. Madagascar
17. Cabo Verde	38. Guyana	58. Malawi
18. Cambodia	39. Haiti	59. Mali
19. Central African Republic	40. Honduras	60. Mauritania
20. Chile	41. Hungary	61. Mauritius
21. Costa Rica		

62.	Mexico		
63.	Mongolia		
64.	Montenegro		
65.	Mozambique		
66.	Nauru		
67.	Netherlands		
68.	Nicaragua		
69.	Nigeria		
70.	Norway		
71.	Oman		
72.	Panama		
73.	Paraguay		
74.	Peru		
75.	Poland		
76.	Portugal		
77.	Republic of Moldova		
78.	Romania		
79.	Rwanda		
80.	Sao Tome and Principe		
81.	Saudi Arabia		
82.	Senegal		
83.	Serbia		
84.	Slovakia		
85.	Slovenia		
86.	South Africa		
87.	Spain		
88.	St. Kitts and Nevis		
89.	St. Vincent and the Grenadines		
90.	Swaziland		
91.	Sweden		
92.	Switzerland		
93.	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		
94.	Togo		
95.	Trinidad and Tobago		
96.	Tunisia		
97.	Turkey		
98.	Turkmenistan		
99.	Ukraine		
100.	United Republic of Tanzania		
101.	Uruguay		
102.	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		
103.	Zambia		

Annex E — Entitlements for meetings and documentation for the UNTOC CoP and Working Groups

WG	2004-2005	2006-2007	2008-2009	2010-2011	2012-2013	2014-2015 *
CoP	July 2004: Meetings: 10 (8 Days) Documents: 6 October 2005: Meetings: 20 (10 days) Documents: 14 Not applicable.	Meetings: 16 (8 days) Documents: 15	Meetings: 16 (8 days) Documents: 13	Meetings: 10 (days 5) Documents: 17	Meetings: 10 (days 5) Documents: 15	Meetings: 10 (5 days) Documents: 1 + final report
IC	Not applicable.	Meetings: 4 (2 Days) Documents: 4 ⁸	Meetings: 4 (3 days) Documents: 2 ⁹	Meetings: 4 (2 Days) Documents: 1	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 4 147.440 ** (RB)	Meetings: 5 (2,5 days) Documents for one session per biennium: 6 + final report
TA	Not applicable.	October 2006: Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 2 ¹⁰ October 2007: Meetings: 6 (Days 3) Documents: 3 ¹¹	October 2009: Meetings: 4 (2 Days) Documents: 4 October 2008: Meetings: 4 (2days) Documents: 3 ¹¹	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 1	Meetings: 9 (4,5 days) Documents: 3 138.842 (RB)	Meetings: 5 (2,5 days) Documents for one session per biennium: 6 + final report

⁸ CTOC/COP/2006/2/Rev.1, CTOC/COP/2006/6/Rev.1, CTOC/COP/2006/7/Rev.1, CTOC/COP/2006/8/Rev.1.

⁹ CTOC/COP/2008/5, CTOC/COP/2008/18

¹⁰ CTOC/COP/2006/9, CTOC/COP/2006/11

¹¹ CTOC/COP/2008/7, CTOC/COP/2008/16, CTOC/COP/2008/17

TIP	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Meetings: 4 (2 Days) Documents: 2	January 2010: Meetings: 6 (3 days) Documents: 6 October 2010: Meetings: 1 (1 Day) Documents: 1 October 2011 Meetings: 6 (3 Days) Documents: 8	Meetings: 6 (3 days) Documents: 5 138.363 (RB)	Meetings: 8 (4 days) Documents for one session per biennium: 6 + final report
SoM	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Meetings: 6 (3 days) Documents: 6 116.269 (RB) 160.189 (EB)	Meetings: 8 (4 days) Documents for one session per biennium: 5 + final report
FA	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 4 116.995 (RB)	Meetings: 8 (4 days) Documents for one session per biennium: 3 + final report
Grand Total					Meetings: 29 (RB) + 6 (EB) Documents: 27 (RB) + 6 (EB) 818.098	Meetings: 44 (RB) Documents: 32 (RB)

Notes:

* Based on the Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015, A/68/6 (Sect. 16)

** All figures are in US\$

Annex F

Expenditure incurred for COP Working Groups 2012-2013	
<u>Summary</u>	
Regular Budget	(USD)
WG FA 21-22 May 2012	\$116.995
WG IC 15-16 Oct 2012 and WG TA 17-18 Oct 2012	\$147.440
WG TA 28-30 Oct 2013	\$138.842
WG TiP 6-8 Nov 2013	\$138.363
WG SoM 11-13 Nov 2013 (less Travel)	\$116.269
Sub Total RB	\$657.909
Extrabudgetary resources	(USD)
WG SoM 30 May- 1 Jun 2012	\$154.357
WG SoM 11-13 Nov 2013 Travel of LDCs	\$5.832
Sub Total XB	\$160.189
	(USD)
Grant Total	\$818.098

Annex G — Standard cost of a 16 page report

Translation cost	Manuscript pages	Conversion New (530/330)	ESP	Translation per ESP	Languages	US\$ Actual	Translation per Manuscript page
Inter-governmental 10,700 words	20	1.61	32.43	\$250	5	\$40,500.00	\$401
UN Secretariat 8,500 words	16	1.61	25.76	\$250	5	\$32,200.00	\$401

Annex H — Preliminary estimates for a web-based information gathering tool on UNTOC and the Protocols thereto

I. Background

A new, light and web-based information gathering tool could be developed as a further component of SHERLOC (Sharing Electronic Resources and Laws On Crime) in order to gather much needed information on implementation of UNTOC and its Protocols from States parties, regardless of the adoption of a formal review mechanism. This tool would be account-based with password protection for security and complemented by a paper-based questionnaire for countries which may at times face difficulties with the web. In this way, States parties could easily and quickly input or update national data on laws and technical assistance needs. States parties could also more easily coordinate inputs across government agencies in order to ensure timely completion of submissions. This information could be used as a first step to assess needs in States requesting technical or legislative assistance, to monitor trends and patterns, or as part of a larger monitoring exercise, subject to mandate from the Conference of the Parties or other governing body.

In coordination with ITS, UNODC will design and develop this new tool, using the already developed and user-friendly schema of the existing SHERLOC portal. An informal expert group of international practitioners in the fields of organized crime, trafficking in persons, smuggling in migrants and trafficking in firearms would aid the development of the tool, to ensure the relevance and effectiveness of the tool as well as its applicability to a range of national contexts and crime types. The estimates do not include IT maintenance costs.

II. Estimates

Budget (Preliminary estimates) 2015

Coordinator (Consultant for 24 months)	110,000 \$
Informal Expert Group Meeting to develop tool	40,000\$
IT costs	117,000\$
Translation of SHERLOC into the 6 official languages	70,000\$
SUB-TOTAL	337,000\$
PSC — 13%	43,810\$
TOTAL in USD	380,810\$

Annex I — Possible entitlements for the Working Groups for a thematic expert review (Cycle I)

WG	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Grand Total
UNTOC (IC) WG*	Meetings: 5 (2,5 days) Documents: 3 + final report		Meetings: 5 (2,5 days) Documents: 3 + final report		Meetings: 10 (5 days) Documents: 6 + 2 final reports
UNTOC (TA) WG*		Meetings: 5 (2,5 days) Documents: 3 + final report:		Meetings: 5 (2,5 days) Documents: 3 + final report	Meetings: 10 (5 days) Documents: 6 + 2 final reports
TIP WG**	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report	Meetings: 16 (8 days) Documents: 12 + 4 final reports
SoM WG	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report	Meetings: 16 (8 days) Documents: 12 + 4 final reports
FA WG	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 2 + final report	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 2 + final report	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 2 + final report	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 2 + final report	Meetings: 16 (8 days) Documents: 8 + 4 final reports

* The IC and TA Working Groups — and their entitlements — could be merged in order to have a 2,5-day meeting on a yearly basis.

** The thematic expert review could be carried out by the Protocol based Working Groups using the same entitlements foreseen in the current financial biennium (2014-2015); an additional cost would be a final report for each WG on a yearly basis.

The additional costs related to the analysis of the replies by States Parties, to be carried out by the Secretariat, and to translation are not included in this table.

Annex J — Possible entitlements for a country focused review (Cycle II)

WG	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Grand Total	Costs for a 16 pages report (US\$)
UNTOC (IC) WG*	Meetings: 5 (2,5 days) Documents: 3 + final report 45 country reports		Meetings: 5 (2,5 days) Documents: 3 + final report 45 country reports		Meetings: 10 (5 days) Documents: 6 + 2 final reports 90 country reports	2.898.800
UNTOC (TA) WG*		Meetings: 5 (2,5 days) Documents: 3 + final report: 45 country reports		Meetings: Documents: 3 + final report 44 country reports	Meetings: 10 (5 days) Documents: 6 + 2 final reports 89 country reports	2.865.800
TIP WG**	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report 40 country reports	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report 40 country reports	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report 40 country reports	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report 39 country reports	Meetings: 16 (8 days) Documents: 12 + 4 final reports 159 country reports	5.119.800
SoM WG	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report 35 country reports	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report 35 country reports	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report 34 country reports	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 3 + final report 34 country reports	Meetings: 16 (8 days) Documents: 12 + 4 final reports 138 country reports	4.443.600
FA WG	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 2 + final report 28 country reports	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 2 + final report 27 country reports	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 2 + final report 27 country reports	Meetings: 4 (2 days) Documents: 2 + final report 27 country reports	Meetings: 16 (8 days) Documents: 8 + 4 final reports 109 country reports	3.509.800
						18.837.800

* The IC and TA Working Groups — and their entitlements — could be merged in order to have a 2,5-day meeting on a yearly basis.

The potential additional costs related to the analysis of the replies by States Parties, to be carried out by the Secretariat, and to translations are not included in this table.