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Progress report on implementing the mandates of the expert group on international cooperation

Background document prepared by the Secretariat

Corrigendum

The following should be inserted after paragraph 32:

**El Salvador**

32 bis. El Salvador provided information compiled by the Supreme Court of Justice and the Attorney General’s Office. The Supreme Court is the institution responsible for dealing with requests for mutual assistance pursuant to article 182, paragraph 3 of the Constitution, which grants it the authority “to order letters of request or letters rogatory to be issued for the taking of evidence abroad and to ensure compliance with those from other countries, without prejudice to treaty provisions; and to grant extradition.” The Supreme Court reported that, within its sphere of competence and according to the internal report of the Unit of International Technical Evaluation, there was no evidence that letters of request were processed in 2011 or 2012 regarding mutual legal assistance on the basis of the United Nations Convention against Corruption in relation to offences committed by legal persons.

32 ter. For its part, the Attorney General’s Office is another institution that is actively involved in international assistance, for which its powers are established by article 193 of the Constitution — in particular, the power to coordinate criminal investigations in partnership with the National Civil Police and to instigate criminal
proceedings — and by its designation as the central authority in some international treaties. The Attorney General’s Office reported that, to date, there had been effective cooperation with various legal entities in El Salvador and that no obstacles had been encountered with regard to requests to other States for assistance. In addition, it stated that no comments had been made on the fulfilment of the requirements established by the framework instruments in force. Nevertheless, with respect to the difficulties encountered with requests of this type, the Attorney General’s Office warned that responses to such requests are received after a long period of time. It therefore felt that the partial delivery of the documents requested would facilitate the expeditious processing of cases.