

12 February 2010

Original: English

Report on the meeting of the expert group on protection against trafficking in cultural property held in Vienna from 24 to 26 November 2009

I. Introduction

1. The Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 2008/23, entitled “Protection against trafficking in cultural property”, reiterated the request made in its resolution 2004/34 that the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), in close cooperation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), convene an open-ended intergovernmental expert group meeting to submit relevant recommendations on protection against trafficking in cultural property to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. Those recommendations were to include ways of making more effective the model treaty for the prevention of crimes that infringe on the cultural heritage of peoples in the form of movable property.¹

2. The meeting of the expert group on protection against trafficking in cultural property was held in Vienna from 24 to 26 November 2009. Pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 2008/23, the recommendations of the expert group will be submitted to the Commission (E/CN.15/2010/5).

II. Recommendations

3. At its 5th and 6th meetings, on 26 November, the expert group on protection against trafficking in cultural property adopted the recommendations below.

¹ *Eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Havana, 27 August-7 September 1990: report prepared by the Secretariat* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.91.IV.2), chap. I, sect. B.1, annex.



A. International instruments

4. All States are encouraged to consider ratifying the conventions related to protection against trafficking in cultural property, in particular the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property,² the 1995 Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects³ and the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.⁴
5. UNODC, UNESCO and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (Unidroit), within their respective mandates, should jointly explore linkages and synergies between those three conventions, as well as with other relevant instruments, when applicable.
6. As a complement to existing work, and in close cooperation with UNESCO, Unidroit and other competent organizations, UNODC, within its mandate, should explore the development of specific guidelines for crime prevention with respect to trafficking in cultural property including, inter alia, the criteria of due diligence when acquiring a cultural object.
7. UNODC should continue to invite all Member States to submit in writing their views on the model treaty for the prevention of crimes that infringe on the cultural heritage of peoples in the form of movable property, including on the practical utility of the model treaty and on whether any improvements to it should be considered. A report on those views should be submitted to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.
8. UNODC, within its mandate, should encourage all Member States to use the model export certificate for movable cultural property jointly drafted by UNESCO and the World Customs Organization, and assist them in its use.
9. The Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime should be invited to consider using the Convention to protect against trafficking in cultural property, bearing in mind that in it the General Assembly expressed its strong conviction that the Convention would constitute an effective tool and the necessary legal framework for international cooperation in combating, inter alia, offences against cultural heritage.

B. Prevention

10. States and competent international organizations should enhance and, as appropriate, create databases of stolen or missing objects.
11. States should take effective measures to prevent the transfer of illicitly acquired cultural property, in particular by:
 - (a) Encouraging institutions dealing with auctions, including through the Internet, to ascertain the true provenance of cultural objects to be auctioned, as well

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 823, No. 11806.

³ Available from www.unidroit.org.

⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2225, No. 39574.

as to provide in advance, as far as feasible, information on the provenance of such cultural objects;

(b) Better regulating the export of cultural objects by using, as appropriate, the model export certificate designed by UNESCO and the World Customs Organization;

(c) Promptly reporting, when feasible and preferably to the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), information on losses of cultural property;

(d) Using, as appropriate, the “Object-ID” international standard to facilitate prompt circulation of information in case of crime;

(e) Encouraging and, when appropriate, increasing regulation and supervision of dealers in antiquities and similar institutions, for example by keeping a registry of all transactions of cultural objects, including sales, purchases and exchanges; considering developing codes of conduct, keeping in mind the UNESCO international code of ethics for dealers in cultural property; and, as appropriate, by introducing professional requirements by way of licensing;

(f) Conducting checks of cultural property, in particular suspicious or questionable cultural property, using all relevant sources of information, including the INTERPOL stolen works of art database;

(g) Extending, as much as possible and whenever appropriate, the registration, guarding, monitoring and policing of archaeological sites, including of those in which illegal excavations could be conducted, preferably with the participation of local communities and making use of new technologies.

12. States should explore the feasibility of marking or otherwise identifying cultural property to prevent it from being trafficked. Such marking or identification should be conducted with the assistance of competent international organizations, such as the International Council of Museums, inter alia, by the collection of best practices.

13. The Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption should be invited to consider using the Convention to protect against trafficking in cultural property.

C. Criminalization

14. States should have legislation that is appropriate for criminalizing trafficking in cultural property and that takes into account the specificities of such property.

15. States should criminalize activities related to trafficking in cultural property by using a wide definition that can be applied to all stolen and illicitly exported cultural property. They should also criminalize the import, export or transfer of cultural property in accordance with article 3 of the 1970 Convention. States should also consider making trafficking in cultural property (including stealing and looting at archaeological sites) a serious crime in accordance with their national legislation and article 2 of the Organized Crime Convention, especially when organized criminal groups are involved.

16. If consistent with their legal systems, including the fundamental principles of their legal systems, States are invited to consider:

(a) Allowing cultural property to be seized when those in possession of the property cannot prove the licit provenance of the objects or that they have a reasonable belief in the licit provenance of the objects;

(b) Confiscating the proceeds of crime. In this regard, the Organized Crime Convention may constitute a useful basis.

17. In coordination with INTERPOL, and on the basis of replies to questionnaires submitted by Member States on the implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 2008/23 and pursuant to Council resolutions 1984/48 and 2009/25, UNODC, within its mandate, should expand and update existing statistics on trafficking in cultural property and complement such statistics with relevant data, including on illicit excavations.

18. States, with the assistance of competent international organizations, should consider adopting measures to discourage the demand for stolen or trafficked cultural property.

D. Cooperation

19. UNODC should join the already established network between UNESCO, Unidroit, the World Customs Organization, INTERPOL and the International Council of Museums, and collaborate with competent institutions in order to address the crime prevention and criminal justice aspects of trafficking in cultural property.

20. States should consider including, in their cooperation agreements on protection against trafficking in cultural property, specific provisions for information exchange; coordinated follow-up of the flow of cultural objects, whenever feasible; and the return or, as appropriate, the restitution of stolen cultural property to its rightful owner.

21. States should provide adequate resources to establish or develop central authorities focused on the protection of cultural property, including cultural heritage, and cooperate with each other, inter alia, with regard to checking the market (including Internet auctions) and to informing the competent international organizations about such authorities.

22. States should promote inter-agency cooperation for the purpose of strengthening mechanisms for protection against trafficking in cultural property.

23. For the purpose of providing each other with the widest possible mutual legal assistance in protection against trafficking in cultural property, including with regard to investigation, prosecution and confiscation, States should endeavour to use the relevant existing instruments, including the Organized Crime Convention. In that regard, the Conference of the Parties to the Organized Crime Convention is invited to explore ways of using the provisions of the Convention as a legal basis for international cooperation.

24. In order to complement existing multilateral agreements, States are invited, *inter alia*, to enter into bilateral agreements for protection against trafficking in cultural property.

E. Awareness-raising, capacity-building and technical assistance

25. States and competent international organizations such as UNESCO and the International Council of Museums, within their existing mandates, should promote education and launch awareness-raising campaigns involving, *inter alia*, the media, in order to disseminate information on the theft and pillaging of cultural property targeting, for example and when appropriate, tourists visiting archaeological sites. They should also discourage buyers from collecting antiquities whose provenance cannot be ascertained by making such collecting socially unacceptable. In addition, States should encourage their citizens to report finds and discourage speculative looting.

26. UNODC, UNESCO, INTERPOL, Unidroit, the World Customs Organization, the International Council of Museums and other relevant organizations, within their respective mandates, should continue and, where feasible, strengthen their efforts to jointly promote and organize seminars, workshops and similar events for the following purposes:

(a) To build capacity and raise awareness about the drafting of criminal legislation on trafficking in cultural property;

(b) To raise awareness at the community and policymaking levels about the importance of protecting cultural property and of preventing and combating trafficking in such property;

(c) To build capacity and raise awareness about the development of appropriate national inventories of cultural property;

(d) To build capacity and raise awareness about the uses of the Organized Crime Convention and the United Nations Convention against Corruption⁵ for protection against trafficking in cultural property.

27. States should provide, with the assistance of INTERPOL and the International Council of Museums, specialized training for police, customs and border services and museum personnel.

28. UNODC, in close cooperation with UNESCO, Unidroit and other relevant organizations, should identify technical assistance requirements for the implementation of crime prevention provisions applicable to protection against trafficking in cultural property.

F. Use of new technologies

29. States, consistent with their international legal obligations, including those relating to freedom of expression, should take effective measures to counter trafficking in cultural property via the Internet.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. 2349, No. 42146.

30. States should be encouraged to promote cooperation between representatives of the public and private sectors (such as Internet providers) to track the Internet sites dealing in cultural property.

31. UNODC is encouraged, in close cooperation with competent organizations, to collect and disseminate best practices in countering trafficking in cultural property via the Internet.

32. UNODC should periodically report on the implementation of the present recommendations to the Commission for consideration and possible action.

III. Organization of the meeting

A. Opening of the meeting

33. The meeting of the expert group on protection against trafficking in cultural property was held in Vienna from 24 to 26 November 2009. On behalf of the Chair of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its eighteenth session, Cosmin Dinescu (Romania), the meeting was opened by Eugenio María Curia (Argentina) in his capacity as First Vice-Chair of the Commission.

B. Attendance

34. The meeting was attended by experts from 61 States. A list of participants is contained in the annex to the present report.

C. Election of officers

35. At its 1st meeting, on 24 November, the expert group elected the following officers, who had been designated by proposal of the extended Bureau of the eighteenth session of the Commission:

<i>Chair:</i>	Ariel González (Argentina)
<i>Vice-Chair:</i>	Simona Marin (Romania)
<i>Rapporteur:</i>	Zohra Zerara (Algeria)

D. Adoption of the agenda

36. At its 1st meeting, on 24 November, the expert group adopted the following agenda (UNODC/CCPCJ/EG.1/2009/1):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Election of the bureau.
3. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.

4. Development of recommendations on protection against trafficking in cultural property, including ways of making more effective the model treaty for the prevention of crimes that infringe on the cultural heritage of peoples in the form of movable property.
 5. Conclusions and recommendations.
 6. Adoption of the report and closing of the meeting.
37. Also at the 1st meeting, the expert group adopted the following structure of substantive clusters for its deliberations and the presentation of its report and recommendations:
- (a) Existing international instruments and mechanisms for their implementation, including their assessment from the perspective of crime prevention;
 - (b) Preventive measures;
 - (c) Criminalization;
 - (d) International cooperation;
 - (e) Awareness-raising, capacity-building and technical assistance;
 - (f) Other aspects relevant to protection against trafficking in cultural property, such as the use of new technologies.

IV. Summary of deliberations

A. Existing international instruments and mechanisms for their implementation, including their assessment from the perspective of crime prevention

38. At its 1st and 2nd meetings, on 24 November, the expert group considered the substantive cluster (see para. 37 above) on existing international instruments and mechanisms for their implementation, including their assessment from the perspective of crime prevention. The observers for UNESCO, Unidroit and UNODC made audio-visual presentations. The meeting had before it a conference room paper containing background information on the matter (UNODC/CCPCJ/EG.1/2009/CRP.1). Statements were made by the representatives of China, Germany, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nigeria, Romania, the Russian Federation, the Sudan and the United States of America. The observers for Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Egypt, Pakistan and Switzerland also made statements. Statements were also made by the observers for UNESCO, Unidroit, UNODC, the International Council of Museums and the World Customs Organization.

39. The First Vice-Chair of the Commission recalled the aim of Economic and Social Council resolutions 2004/34 and 2008/23, which was to explore, within the mandate of UNODC and from a crime prevention and criminal justice perspective, relevant ways to complement the work already carried out in the area of protection against trafficking in cultural property by such entities as UNESCO, Unidroit, the

World Customs Organization, INTERPOL and the International Council of Museums.

40. The First Vice-Chair highlighted three aspects in relation to the resolutions. First, he drew attention to the existing international instruments relevant to the area of trafficking in cultural property, in particular the 1970 Convention, the 1995 Convention, the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict⁶ and the two protocols thereto and the Declaration concerning the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage. Second, he emphasized the need for concrete solutions to deal with this form of crime, such as studying ways to make more effective the model treaty for the prevention of crimes that infringe on the cultural heritage of peoples in the form of movable property. Finally, he identified specific aspects that could serve as guidance to the work of the expert group, such as criminalization, prevention, capacity-building, awareness-raising, technical assistance and international cooperation, including the process of restitution and return of cultural property.

41. The observers for UNESCO and Unidroit presented the main provisions of the 1970 Convention and the 1995 Convention, and an observer for UNODC presented the Organized Crime Convention. In relation to the concern expressed at the growing problem of trafficking in cultural property, the effectiveness of the various international instruments and the mechanisms for their implementation were discussed, as were approaches and preventive measures to combat the problem.

42. Several speakers described the challenges faced in the implementation of the conventions in the context of national law, especially in destination States. Several speakers mentioned the problem of the large costs borne by Governments when returning illegally acquired cultural property to the source State or when requesting such return, especially through private law channels.

43. The role of transit States in the trafficking process was emphasized, including the further difficulties such circumstances posed to the effective tracing of cultural property and, more particularly, to the identification of illicitly acquired cultural property.

44. The problem of assessing a purchaser's knowledge of the source of an object was mentioned, in particular in the context of the due diligence requirement under the 1995 Convention.

45. Many speakers supported the proposal to use export certificates. The issue of counterfeit or false objects and certificates and the complications arising from trafficking through transit States were recognized as being important in considering the form of export certification to be required. One speaker referred to the problem of illegal excavation and the failure of States to assert ownership of discovered and excavated objects of cultural value. UNESCO was developing a model law for source States to use in that regard.

46. The monitoring of illegal excavation and theft of cultural property within States was viewed as both difficult and complex.

47. One speaker suggested the harmonization of the key features of the different conventions; that idea was supported by several speakers.

⁶ Ibid., vol. 249, No. 3511.

48. Other speakers felt that it was too ambitious to draw up a new convention and proposed instead that an assessment of the existing legal instruments be conducted in order to suggest improvements. It was noted in this regard that the 1970 Convention and the 1995 Convention were complementary and that the Organized Crime Convention was capable of adding further complementarity in respect of crime prevention. It was suggested that the overall coverage provided by those complementary instruments should be fully explored.

49. Some speakers mentioned that the Organized Crime Convention would be the appropriate legal basis for addressing trafficking in cultural property.

B. Preventive measures

50. At its 2nd and 3rd meetings, on 24 and 25 November, the expert group considered the substantive cluster on preventive measures. The observers for the International Council of Museums, the World Customs Organization and UNODC made audio-visual presentations. Statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, Germany and the United States. The observers for Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Italy, Lebanon, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru and Spain also made statements. The observers for UNESCO, INTERPOL, Unidroit and UNODC also made statements.

51. The observer for the International Council of Museums described the use of a code of ethics and “red lists” of missing objects to prevent trafficking and raise awareness on stolen items.

52. With regard to the effectiveness of using export licences, some speakers felt such licences to be useful, while others preferred using electronic forms. Concern was expressed about the ability of traffickers to circumvent laws and abuse legal loopholes. Several speakers drew attention to the work of INTERPOL regarding databases and statistical information. There was concern, however, about the capacity to provide such information and data without the cooperation and input of States at the national level and between relevant authorities.

53. Many speakers supported improving inventories of cultural property. Several speakers mentioned the use or creation of different databases listing cultural property. A number of speakers shared information about provisions in national law relating to the protection of and trafficking in cultural property. Several speakers mentioned the training of special police forces and customs staff in collaboration with museum staff. Most speakers expressed reservations about the system of “partage”, whereby objects were divided between the State of origin’s cultural authority and the person or entity having physical possession; that system was not seen as an effective way to protect and prevent trafficking in cultural property, and the view was expressed that States had other effective measures at their disposal to achieve that. Speakers placed emphasis on capacity-building, awareness-raising and the importance of national legislation, in particular penal legislation, as a preventive measure.

54. One speaker raised the issue of insufficient security for objects returned to the source State. Others expressed concern about the lack of means, including technological means, of ensuring the physical security of objects in some States.

55. One speaker proposed eliminating the grey market by requiring sellers to provide an export licence and by focusing on cooperation with auction houses and Internet platforms. One speaker suggested the documentation of illegal excavation and the sharing of information between States regarding persons prosecuted for and convicted of offences related to trafficking in cultural property, so that successful practices and procedures in combating trafficking could be shared.

56. There were calls by numerous speakers for further criminalization of trafficking in cultural property. One speaker drew attention to the impact of such criminalization on cooperation by Internet platforms with national authorities in terms of limiting trafficking in cultural property online. It was mentioned that transit States might require specific prevention measures, owing to the complexity of transnational trafficking in cultural property. The issue of export and ownership certificates was also raised in relation to transit States.

57. Several speakers referred to the need to decrease illicit demand for artefacts and thereby reduce the incentive for trafficking in cultural property. One speaker raised the issue of corruption in the cultural sector being a major cause or facilitator of the loss of and trafficking in cultural property.

C. Criminalization

58. At its 3rd and 4th meetings, on 25 November, the expert group considered the substantive cluster on criminalization. The observer for UNODC made audio-visual presentations on the gathering of statistics on crimes related to cultural property and legislative aspects of criminalization. Statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, China, Germany, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Romania, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United States. The observers for Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Mexico, Switzerland and Zimbabwe also made statements. The observers for UNESCO, Unidroit, INTERPOL and UNODC also made statements.

59. The Chair of the meeting invited speakers to focus their contributions on the following specific issues regarding the criminalization of cultural property: (a) the availability of statistical data at the national level; (b) the existence of specific legislation on trafficking in cultural property and potential challenges in developing specific legislation; (c) the imposition of strong penalties for trafficking in cultural property; (d) the existence of penalties directed at specific stakeholders or sectors; (e) the question of reversing the burden of proof; (f) criminal law measures criminalizing those requesting and purchasing illicit cultural property; and (g) the use of new technologies in the fight against trafficking in cultural property and the criminalization of such use when done for illicit purposes.

60. Speakers expressed the need to adopt a two-pronged approach to criminalization in the area of trafficking in cultural property. Not only traffickers and facilitators but also the person requesting and receiving the trafficked cultural property should be the object of criminalization.

61. Several speakers discussed the positive effect of bilateral agreements, which enabled States to return and request the return of cultural property.

62. The issue of reverse burden of proof was addressed by several speakers. Ways in which greater due diligence could be demanded from the purchaser were mentioned as a means of overcoming the differences between civil and common law countries on the issue of burden of proof.
63. Many speakers mentioned the need to address the demand for cultural property as a means of reducing criminality in that area. The sanctions imposed on offenders were considered harsh enough but might not have a deterrent effect on all offenders. One speaker commented that criminalization was more likely to be effective against white-collar offenders. Sanctions also needed to be swiftly and consistently applied. More frequent use of existing criminal sanctions against looters, dealers and traffickers was agreed to be important.
64. It was stated that a comprehensive data management system would provide a secure way to document objects. There was a proposal to establish a central database providing access to different national inventories.
65. Concern was expressed that the use of new technologies to support the criminalization of trafficking in cultural property would generate very high costs.
66. Several speakers called for further specific legislation and further criminalization of trafficking in cultural property. One speaker cited the positive impact of increased sanctions in terms of the perceived drop in the number of cases of trafficking in his country after new criminal sanctions had been introduced; however, no evaluation report was yet available to verify that view.
67. One speaker raised the need for ways to overcome the difficulties faced by source States in asserting ownership, particularly in international litigation to recover objects. One idea was to develop a legal form of trust that could be established by source States sharing territory occupied by ancient civilizations in order to litigate such cases on those States' collective behalf.
68. One speaker referred to the difficulty of establishing inventories that included all cultural property, especially property yet to be discovered. However, the importance of having at the national level a centralized database on cultural property was recognized.
69. Many speakers drew attention to the lack of data in the area of trafficking in cultural property. Emphasis was placed on the need to collect relevant data, especially by way of comparable statistics, to increase the response from Member States and enhance coordination in international data collection exercises.
70. There was a proposal by one speaker to include the criminalization of alteration or forgery of cultural property.

D. International cooperation

71. At its 3rd and 4th meetings, on 25 November, the expert group considered the substantive cluster on international cooperation. An observer for UNODC made an audio-visual presentation on the international cooperation provisions of the Organized Crime Convention that could be applied to trafficking in cultural property. An audio-visual presentation was also made by the observer for INTERPOL. Statements were made by the representatives of China, Germany,

India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nigeria, Romania, the Russian Federation, Turkey and the United States. The observers for Egypt, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands and Yemen also made statements. The observers for UNESCO, INTERPOL and UNODC also made statements.

72. The Chair invited speakers to focus their contributions on the following specific issues regarding international cooperation to protect cultural property: (a) the relative importance of bilateral, regional and international cooperation; (b) the way judicial cooperation works in practice in cases of trafficking in cultural property; (c) the importance of speed in sharing information in relation to trafficking in cultural property; (d) cooperation efforts both between States and within States; and (e) the question of the Organized Crime Convention being a basis for cooperation against trafficking in cultural property.

73. The observer for INTERPOL presented that organization's tools for promoting cooperation between police forces, in particular the network connecting all member States and the database of works of art, as well as training seminars.

74. Speakers emphasized the importance of using bilateral agreements as a means for restitution of illicitly acquired cultural property, especially when quick action was required. It was agreed that multilateral agreements were important in establishing the framework for cooperation, in particular in the regional context.

75. Most speakers recognized the complementarity of all types of cooperation, including bilateral, regional and international cooperation. One speaker stated that recourse to these different levels of cooperation should follow a bottom-up approach, since all levels of cooperation interacted. Bilateral cooperation, when used, was likely to produce a faster result, which was sometimes essential in such cases. It also had the benefit of bringing national officials into close contact with each other on a regular basis, which had associated benefits in terms of information-sharing and informal cooperation.

76. One speaker referred to the need to recognize the cultural and historical specificities of certain regions in order to have efficient restitution measures in place. The importance of local knowledge was crucial in the assessment of the ownership of cultural property.

77. Some speakers noted the need for greater emphasis on international mechanisms for restitution of stolen cultural property. The observer for UNESCO made reference to the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation, as well as the rules being developed for the purpose of mediation of restitution.

78. Several speakers provided examples of successful cases of cooperation using the Internet as a tool for tracing dealers and requested information to be provided on similar cases. Some speakers noted that the Internet had become a main venue for auctions. Cooperation in monitoring the Internet could be strengthened, possibly with the assistance of the International Council of Museums.

79. Some speakers supported the idea of collecting at the global level information on auctions held in auction houses and on the Internet and of requiring traditional and Internet-based auction houses to provide, at least two weeks prior to the auction, public information about the provenance of cultural objects being sold.

80. Speakers noted the need for cooperation to be characterized by a multidisciplinary approach.

81. Speakers discussed the importance of national coordination in facilitating international cooperation, for instance by providing a single focal point for such cases and by coordinating efforts of police, courts, cultural experts and others. One speaker mentioned the importance of ministers being involved in that area.

82. Speakers commented on the potential of making use of the Organized Crime Convention provisions in the context of combating trafficking and requested that that legal route be further developed.

83. Speakers emphasized the importance of cooperation among international bodies such as INTERPOL and UNODC.

V. Adoption of the report and closing of the meeting

84. At its 6th meeting, the expert group adopted its report, including the recommendations that would be submitted to the Commission at its nineteenth session pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 2008/23.

85. The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made a statement to the effect that the recommendations did not sufficiently reflect, in his view, the extent of the discussion on the Organized Crime Convention. The representative of the Russian Federation stressed the importance of full implementation of the resolutions establishing language arrangements for the official languages of the United Nations. The observer for Yemen raised the issue of the lack of Arabic interpretation for the second half of the last day of the meeting. A representative of the secretariat replied that, as the meeting had been convened on the basis of extrabudgetary funding, it had been agreed that during the meeting there would be interpretation in English, French and Spanish, and any additional interpretation would be provided on an “as available” basis.

Annex

List of participants

States members of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice

Algeria	Baziz Larras, Younsi Nawel-Dahmani, Zohra Zerara
Argentina	Eugenio María Curia, Ariel Walter González
Austria	Helmut Böck, Brigitte Fasz binder-Brueckler, Claudia Scherzer-Reiteter, Sàrolta Schredl, Erika Pieler, Anita Gach
Brazil	Eduardo Da Costa Farias, Franco Perazzoni, Wivian Patrícia Pinto Diniz
China	Yong Sun, Qinmin Shen
El Salvador	Vanessa Interiano, Julia Villatoro
Germany	Silvelie Karfeld, Thomas Tietz, Michael Lamber, Klaus Aldinger, Frithjof Berger, Robert Peters
India	Abhijit Halder
Indonesia	Rainer Louhanapessy, Lalu M. Iqbal, Riena Dwi Astuty, Ahmad Gunawan Wicaksono
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Omid Ghanami, Mohammad Hossein Ghaniei
Japan	Katsutoshi Ishikawa
Kenya	Njeri Wachira, Rhodah Amulele-Ogoma, Consolata Kiragu, Arown K. Suge, Esther M. Magiti
Nigeria	O.J. Eboreime
Republic of Korea	Sungho Han
Romania	Simona Marin, Mariana Cimpean
Russian Federation	Victor Petrakov, Inga Meshkova, Sergey Goncharov, Sofia Zakharova
Saudi Arabia	Saud Bin Talal bin Bader, Omar al-Zahrani, Fahad al-Bakr, Khalil al-Jehani, Abdullah al-Rashed
Sudan	Sitona Abdella Osman, Jeshua Agwet Nykai
Turkey	Zeynep Cizmeli Ögün, Nehir Ünel
Ukraine	Yurii Savchuk
United Arab Emirates	Ayad al-Yassiri
United States of America	Thomas Michael Peay, John Brandolino

Member States of the United Nations represented by observers

Angola	Dulce Gomes
Armenia	Armenak Sargsyan
Australia	Kim Allen, Simon Mamouney
Azerbaijan	Javad Huseynov, Javad Nasirov
Belarus	Vadim Pisarevich
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Nogardo Jiménez Villa, Ricardo Javier Martínez Covarrubias, Paul Marca Paco, Julio Lázaro Mollinedo Claros, Laura Suárez Torres
Bulgaria	Borislav Ivanov Pavlov, Milen Dimitrov
Chile	Richard Oliva Gallardo, Mila Francisco Ferrada
Croatia	Vesna Baus
Denmark	Peter Navntoft
Dominican Republic	Ramón Quiñones, Wendy Olivero
Ecuador	Juan Diego Stacey Moreno, María Elena Moreira
Egypt	Ehab Fawzy, Heba Negm, Aly Mohamed Omar El-Hawary, Ashraf Abdel Wahab El-Ashmawy, Ali Radwan
Estonia	Elika Brosman, Viljar Vissel
France	Isabelle Tempestini, Valery Turcey, Marie Terracol
Ireland	Niamh Neylon
Italy	Raffaele Mancino, Alexander Zelger
Jordan	Mutaz Masadeh
Kuwait	Shehab Abdel Hameed Shehab, Falah Al-Mutairi
Latvia	Liana Liepa
Lebanon	Omar Halablab, Jeanne Mrad
Malaysia	Hamizan Hashim
Mexico	Alejandro Díaz y Pérez Duarte, Ulises Canchola Gutiérrez, Pedro Luis Echeverría Alegría, Erasmo Lara Cabrera, Enrique Camargo
Mongolia	Gerelmaa Davaasuren
Morocco	Abderrahman Fyad

Netherlands	Alphons Hamer, Alain Ancion, Marja Van Heese, Nout Van Woudenberg, Arda Scholte, Joël Meggelaars
Pakistan	Khurshid Anwar, Asif Hussain Memon, Usman Iqbal Jadoon
Panama	Luis Enrique Martínez Cruz, Déborah Siraze
Peru	Antonio García Revilla, Rómulo Acurio Traversa, Carlos García Castillo
Poland	Slawomir Piwowarczyk
Philippines	Linglingay F. Lacanlale, Mariel Algabre, Maria Antonia Bosa
Singapore	Heidi Tan, Joshua Lau
Spain	José L. Roselló, Martina González Antolín, Ignacio Baylina Ruiz
Sweden	Kart Nilsson
Switzerland	Benno Widmer, Jean-Robert Gisler, Alberto Groff
Tunisia	Mohamed Habib Haddad, Lamia Siala
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Rodrigo Yáñez Pilgrim, Jacqueline Petersen Parra
Yemen	Ahmed al-Alwani, Marwan Ali Noman al-Dobhany
Zimbabwe	Godfrey Mahachi

Entities represented by observers

Palestine	Zuheir Elwazer, Safaa Shabat
-----------	------------------------------

Intergovernmental organizations represented by observers

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), International Council of Museums, International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, World Customs Organization