

19 October 2017

English only

**Experts convened to enhance international
cooperation under the United Nations
Convention against Corruption
Sixth Meeting**

Vienna, 6-7 November 2017

**Responses received from States parties with regard to
existing software programmes for case management systems
in the field of international cooperation**

Note by the Secretariat

Summary

The present note provides an analytical summary of the responses received from States parties to note verbale CU 2017/80/DTA/CEB/CSS, dated 14 March 2017, which collected information on the use of software programmes for case management systems in the field of international cooperation.



I. Background

1. At the fifth open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption, held in Vienna on 17 and 18 November 2016, participants emphasized the importance of data collection in the field of international cooperation, along with the existence of effective case management systems. In that regard, the sharing of information with respect to existing software programmes in use domestically was encouraged. As indicated in paragraph 38 of the report of that meeting ([CAC/COSP/EG.1/2016/2](#)), the secretariat was requested to facilitate such sharing of information.

2. Following up on this mandate, the secretariat circulated note verbale CU 2017/80/DTA/CEB/CSS, dated 14 March 2017, with a view to collect from member States information on the use of software programmes for case management systems in the field of international cooperation. The note contained the following questionnaire attached to it in an annex:

Information on existing software programmes for case management systems in the field of international cooperation
<p>1. If you use a software programme to manage incoming and outgoing requests for international cooperation, including mutual legal assistance and extradition requests, please include in your response information regarding the following specific features of these programmes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. For which areas of international cooperation do you have software programmes in place; and is this part of the same programme or several different programmes? b. Do you use standard commercial software or a custom made one; and if you use custom made software, would you consider making it available to other States parties to the UNCAC? c. The main functionalities of the software. d. The approximate costs of implementing the software solution. e. The system requirements of the software. f. Is the software largely self-explanatory or does it need extensive training? g. The use of the software to draft outgoing requests. h. The ability to scan incoming requests and work fully on electronic files (paperless). i. The ability to create statistics on incoming and outgoing requests, and related to this, the function to keep track of deadlines and the (average) length of time needed to respond to incoming requests. j. Has the software produced improvements in terms of the quality of responses to requests? k. Has the software produced efficiencies in terms of the timely follow-up to requests? l. Has the use of the software facilitated the reporting on international cooperation?
<p>2. If you use software programmes for case management in the field of international cooperation, are these part of a more comprehensive case management system (e.g. for the criminal justice system as a whole) or are they a stand-alone system?</p>

3. As of 15 August 2017, the secretariat had received replies from 21 Member States. Fifteen of them indicated that they used software programmes for case management in the field of international cooperation.

II. Summary of the replies received from member States

4. All of the States that use software programmes do so for all areas of international cooperation, including extradition and mutual legal assistance in criminal matters (see question 1(a)). However, with only one exception, these were stand-alone systems which did not form part of a more comprehensive case management system (e.g. for the criminal justice system as a whole) (question 2). Likewise, almost all States indicated that the software solutions they used were custom-built applications (question 1(b)). For this reason, most countries responded that they were not prepared to make them available to other States parties or thought that this would be impractical because of the amount of adaptation required. Only two States parties from Latin America explicitly stated their willingness, in principle, to share the software with other States.

5. In their replies, two States parties referred to existing channels of communication between law enforcement agencies and to platforms for the exchange of confidential information, i.e. INTERPOL's I-24/7 network, the Egmont Secure Web operated by the Egmont group of financial intelligence units, Europol's Secure Information Exchange Network Application (Siena) and the EU's Schengen Information System (SIS II) and Sirene networks. However, it was not entirely clear from the replies how these databases were used as domestic case management systems for international cooperation. One State party responded that it was planning to introduce a commercial software solution, namely "Time Matters" by Lexis-Nexis.

6. The functionalities of the systems (question 1(c)) varied greatly. While some were mere case registration systems, in one case only based on spreadsheets and Microsoft Office programmes, others were full-fledged case management systems which could also monitor deadlines, produce statistics and contain templates for the drafting of outgoing requests. Six of these systems allowed for working fully on electronic files (paperless), while almost all could create statistics; and a majority could keep track of deadlines (questions 1(g), (h) and (i)). The possibility to calculate the (average) length of time needed to respond to incoming requests was not always available.

7. Most of the existing systems were client/server-based solutions which sometimes required a more complex hardware and software architecture (including Microsoft, Oracle and SAP database software) but four were web-based applications which only needed a compatible browser as a user interface (question 1(e)). Almost all these systems were described as largely self-explanatory, requiring little to no training (question 1(f)). Most respondents could not specify the cost of the system but those who did indicated amounts between EUR 50,000 in one case and USD 15 million in another (question 1(d)).

8. Finally, all respondents agreed that the use of the software had greatly facilitated the reporting on international cooperation (question 1(l)), and all but one that it had produced efficiencies in terms of the timely follow-up to requests (question 1(k)). While most also answered in the affirmative whether the software had produced improvements in terms of the quality of responses to requests (question 1(j)), it was not always clear what the basis for this assessment was. Indeed, a few States which answered in the negative pointed out that the use of software applications as such had no impact on the quality of the substantive content of the responses to requests for international cooperation.