



Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Distr.: General
16 October 2014

Original: English

Implementation Review Group

Resumed fifth session

Vienna, 13-15 October 2014

Report of the Implementation Review Group on its resumed fifth session, held in Vienna from 13 to 15 October 2014

Addendum

I. Introduction

1. The Implementation Review Group was established by the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption in its resolution 3/1, entitled “Review mechanism”, as an open-ended intergovernmental group of States parties to operate under its authority and report to it. The Group is to have an overview of the review process in order to identify challenges and good practices and to consider technical assistance requirements in order to ensure effective implementation of the Convention.

II. Organization of the session

A. Opening of the session

2. The Implementation Review Group held its resumed fifth session in Vienna from 13 to 15 October 2014.

3. The resumed session was chaired by the Vice-President of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, Paulus Noa (Namibia).

B. Organization of work

4. The secretariat provided details on the organization of work.



C. Attendance

5. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the resumed fifth session of the Implementation Review Group: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

6. The European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, was represented at the resumed session.

7. In accordance with rule 1 of Conference resolution 4/5, entitled "Participation of signatories, non-signatories, entities and intergovernmental organizations in the work of the Implementation Review Group", the Conference decided that States signatories should be entitled to participate in the Implementation Review Group.

8. The following States signatories to the Convention were represented by observers: Germany and Japan.

9. In accordance with rule 3 of Conference resolution 4/5, the Conference decided that non-signatory States would be invited to attend the deliberations of the Implementation Review Group provided that they had notified the Group, through the secretariat, of their intention or decision to ratify, accept, approve or accede to the Convention, in accordance with article 67, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Convention.

10. In accordance with rule 2 of resolution 4/5, the Conference decided that intergovernmental organizations, Secretariat units, United Nations bodies, funds and programmes, institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network and specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system may be invited to participate in the sessions of the Implementation Review Group.

11. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers: Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization, Commonwealth Secretariat,

Council of Europe, International Anti-Corruption Academy and International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL).

12. The following Secretariat units, United Nations bodies, funds and programmes, institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system were represented by observers: United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, Department of Safety and Security of the Secretariat, United Nations Development Programme and College for Criminal Law Science of Beijing Normal University.

13. The Sovereign Military Order of Malta, an entity maintaining a permanent observer office at Headquarters, was represented by an observer.

III. Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

A. Drawing of lots

14. The Group drew lots to select States parties to review the Sudan, which had become party to the Convention after the first part of the fifth session of the Group when lots had previously been drawn. Angola and the State of Palestine were drawn as reviewing States parties for the Sudan. In addition, some States whose reviews had been initiated in the third and fourth years of the first review cycle had encountered unresponsiveness on the part of their reviewing States parties and requested that lots should be drawn to select new ones. Following past practice, the results of those new draws were provisional, with two weeks being given for the unresponsive States to comply with their obligations. If those States continued to be unresponsive, the provisional reviewing State would take over. Liberia was drawn as the provisional regional reviewer for Djibouti. Côte d'Ivoire was drawn as the provisional regional reviewer for Tunisia. The Sudan was drawn as the provisional regional reviewer for Comoros. The Federated States of Micronesia were drawn as the provisional other reviewer for the State of Palestine.

B. Progress report

15. The secretariat provided an oral update on the progress made in the country reviews, the different steps involved in the organization of the reviews, the schedule and other procedural requirements. Several States had been unresponsive at various stages of either their own review or the reviews of other States. After sending them communications to this effect, the secretariat brought the matter to the attention of the Group.

C. Outcome of the country review process

16. The secretariat presented an overview of the key findings on the thematic and regional implementation of chapters III and IV of the Convention analysing 68 completed country reviews. It explained that, overall, the trends and findings had

remained consistent with those identified in the reports previously presented to the Conference and the Group. The secretariat drew the Group's attention to the study entitled "State of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: criminalization, law enforcement and international cooperation" (CAC/COSP/2013/CRP.7) which had been presented to the Conference at its fifth session. An update based on all completed reviews was being prepared for presentation to the Conference at its sixth session. The secretariat also recalled the paper entitled "Implementation of chapters III (Criminalization and law enforcement) of the United Nations Convention against Corruption and IV (International cooperation): thematic overview of recommendations" (CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/10). It was suggested that the Group might wish to expand the scope of its deliberations and consider ways to ensure the consistency of the country reviews and assist governmental experts in drafting review reports.

17. The secretariat also analysed the key challenges and the most prevalent good practices in the implementation of the chapters under review.

18. Concerning the implementation of chapter III of the Convention it was noted that there was a balanced geographic representation of regional groups, in that Asia-Pacific, Africa and Eastern Europe together comprised nearly three-quarters of the completed reviews. Most challenges still related to prosecution, adjudication and sanctions (article 30 of the Convention), freezing, seizure and confiscation of assets (article 31), specialized authorities (article 36) and bribery of national public officials (article 15). Challenges were also identified regarding illicit enrichment (article 20), laundering of proceeds of crime (article 23), bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations (article 16), and protection of reporting persons (article 33). As before, good practices in implementation related to specialized authorities (article 36), freezing, seizure and confiscation of assets (article 31), cooperation between national authorities (article 38) and prosecution, adjudication and sanctions (article 30).

19. With regard to chapter IV the 68 completed reviews clearly confirmed the general implementation trends identified in previous analyses. For example, data confirmed even more clearly than before that the majority of countries did not need a treaty basis for extradition and mutual legal assistance, even if in practice all States parties made frequent use of bilateral or regional treaties. For law enforcement cooperation States parties relied primarily on institutional agreements, treaties or informal ad hoc arrangements. A number of States parties confirmed that the Convention could be used as a legal basis for international cooperation, although the new sample also confirmed that this option was not frequently used in practice. Speakers reported that various measures had been taken to expedite proceedings or define a proactive role for central authorities responsible for mutual legal assistance. The sample showed a number of new challenges and good practices. One of the most important conclusions in many of the completed reviews was that information on international cooperation should be compiled in a systematic manner so as to develop practical guidelines for use by foreign counterparts. Challenges were also reported with regard to access to banking information and the conduct of hearings by videoconference. New good practices included the conclusion of memorandums of understanding between national authorities to expedite international cooperation as well as the provision of mutual legal assistance in the context of administrative

proceedings. The use of electronic communication to monitor the status of assistance requests was also highlighted.

20. In accordance with guidance provided by the Group, a panel discussion was organized to facilitate the Group's deliberations on the review of implementation. Representatives of Botswana, Kuwait and Viet Nam were invited to participate as panellists.

21. The panellist from Botswana described institutional arrangements in her country that had been conducive to anti-corruption efforts, including the mandate and operational arrangements of the Directorate on Corruption and Economic Crime and cooperation among law enforcement, judicial and criminal justice authorities. The panellist explained that the success of anti-corruption measures could be attributed to strong political will and the commitment to the fight against corruption as the Government continuously reviewed its achievements and developed new initiatives. The Directorate of Public Prosecution had established an anti-corruption unit, to which the Directorate on Corruption and Economic Crime had seconded a number of legal officers to assist in addressing the backlog of cases. The creation of the anti-corruption unit also led to the establishment of a dedicated anti-corruption court. Recent legislative and policy changes included amendments to the Corruption and Economic Crime Act introduced in 2013 and the Proceeds and Instruments of Crime Act, which introduced non-conviction-based forfeiture, criminalized trading in influence and conflicts of interest, and amended the definition of the term "public officer". During the ensuing discussion, examples of effective inter-agency coordination were mentioned. These included measures to avoid an overlap of functions by clearly defining mandates and separating administrative functions from the investigation of criminal misconduct by dedicated anti-corruption authorities or the police. Engaging the judiciary in current legal and policy developments continued to pose a challenge. Legislation on asset and income disclosure systems was being developed, together with legislation on witness and whistle-blower protection. Botswana shared its experience through organizations such as the Southern African Forum against Corruption and the Commonwealth Africa Anti-Corruption Centre, a centre of excellence and learning for Commonwealth States in Africa based in Gaborone.

22. The panellist from Kuwait reported on extensive legislative and institutional reforms undertaken by his country in response to the country review and to the observations made in the country report. He reported that the general legislative framework had been reformed; this included the creation of an independent anti-corruption authority and a financial investigations unit, the adoption of an asset declaration system, and a new law against money-laundering. A set of legislative amendments had been prepared comprising, among other provisions, a new definition for the offence of illicit enrichment, the criminal liability of managers of legal persons, measures preventing legal persons from exercising their activities permanently or temporarily, bribery in the private sector, and bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations. Specific legislation had been introduced that linked the embezzlement of public funds to the new offence of illicit enrichment. Legislative guidelines to detect money-laundering and regulations implementing the law on money-laundering had been issued, thereby establishing a close link between the follow-up to the country review and the follow-up to the recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force.

Furthermore, regulations on the suspension and dismissal of public officials and employees of public companies or organizations had been issued. The panellist explained that inter-institutional cooperation had been facilitated both by the Anti-Corruption Commission's maintaining a close link with the judiciary and by its concluding a memorandum of understanding with the prosecutor's office on operational measures and on joint training programmes about the Convention and Kuwaiti laws and executive regulations.

23. The representative of Viet Nam spoke about the experiences from his country's 2012 review. He highlighted the main findings and challenges identified, including the lack of provisions criminalizing bribery and embezzlement in the private sector and establishing the criminal liability of legal persons. Measures for the protection of witnesses and reporting persons had been developed as a result of shortcomings identified in the review. They were aimed at keeping confidential the identity of witnesses and reporting persons and included their physical protection and the protection of their employment conditions. Another result was that the penalties for corruption offences had been increased and now included not only imprisonment but also fines of up to five times the value of embezzled property. Currently Viet Nam was revising its Criminal Code to improve the level of compliance with both mandatory and non-mandatory provisions of the Convention against Corruption. The revision concerned in particular the definition of bribery and the liability of legal persons. Also the country was overhauling its confiscation regime to bring it fully into line with the Convention and to introduce non-conviction-based asset forfeiture.

24. A number of speakers expressed their appreciation of the structure of the panel discussion and their satisfaction at the manner in which the discussion was being led. The panel presentations were welcomed as conducive to sharing information about experience and good practices among States parties.

25. During the ensuing discussion speakers commended the quality of the thematic and regional reports. The documentation prepared by the secretariat had facilitated the analytical work of the Group, in particular with regard to substantive issues, good practices and challenges in implementation. Speakers welcomed the increased and focused efforts to implement the Convention. They highlighted national reform measures, which were also considered to be a driving force for the success of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention against Corruption and the fully active participation of States parties in it. Speakers acknowledged that the Mechanism had enabled States parties to benefit from each other's experience by means of the country reviews. Some speakers emphasized the importance of involving a broader range of stakeholders in national anti-corruption efforts, including members of the public, and reiterated the importance of strong political will and commitment to the fight against corruption.

26. Some speakers shared their countries' experience in introducing the offence of illicit enrichment and implementing the related asset declaration systems. While several countries had criminalized illicit enrichment, some had not prosecuted cases or obtained convictions owing to constitutional rules regarding the presumption of innocence and the burden of proof in criminal proceedings. In one State party that had established a specialized court for illicit enrichment cases, the constitutional court had expressly rejected legal challenges to the introduction of the offence, while in other countries the supreme courts had not yet ruled on the issue. Speakers

welcomed that additional examples of experience and good practices on this non-mandatory provision of the Convention were being shared. Several speakers described their asset declaration schemes and changes made to them as a follow-up to the review recommendations or as a result of national reform efforts. Challenges in the design of asset declaration schemes were noted, such as decisions about the designation of responsible authorities.

27. With respect to delays in implementing anti-corruption measures speakers described institutional arrangements, in particular the role of specialized authorities. They noted the importance of a sound procedural legal framework to address the backlog of cases and the benefits of shared experience on the matter. One speaker shared his country's experience in the establishment of anti-corruption courts, which had contributed to an increased conviction rate owing to the specialization of judges and the imposition of time frames for disposing of cases.

28. A number of speakers identified national inter-agency coordination as a challenge. They noted that their participation in the Mechanism had had positive effects, including the role national focal points had played in coordinating the reviews and enhancing national coordination. Those positive effects extended beyond the limits of the review process. Some speakers shared their national experience with measures taken to follow up on the review recommendations, especially speakers from States parties that had been under review in the early years of the Mechanism. For example, one speaker highlighted the steps his country had taken to publish its country review report and develop an implementation action plan for competent authorities, which included legislative amendments and institutional measures to strengthen the specialization of relevant investigating institutions on one hand, and improve the management of corruption cases and the collection and use of statistics on the other. Some speakers welcomed that additional good practices were being shared, and several speakers noted the importance of needs-based technical assistance in implementing national anti-corruption measures. Reference was also made to the note prepared by the secretariat entitled "Translating commitment into results: impact of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption" (CAC/COSP/2013/14), which analysed the impact of the country reviews in terms of national reforms, coordination efforts and measures to address the review recommendations.

29. With regard to chapter IV of the Convention a number of speakers reported on their measures to implement the review recommendations and the challenges encountered in international cooperation. One speaker made reference to a recommendation included in the country review report for his country to continue to actively seek bilateral and multilateral agreements. As a result his country had concluded five inter-institutional agreements with foreign competent authorities, while six agreements were currently being prepared. Cooperation programmes with offices in other States parties had also been launched, two of them run by the ministry of the interior, which specifically had implementation of the Convention as their objective.

30. In the context of the thematic analysis on extradition one speaker referred to the relatively high percentage of States that could not extradite their nationals. She further urged States to make use of the Convention as a legal basis for international cooperation with a view to harmonizing procedural requirements and minimizing, to

the extent possible, instances of refusal of extradition and assistance owing to the differing procedures established under the laws of the requested States.

31. One speaker made reference to the recommendations frequently occurring in country reports to establish systems for the collection of statistical data on extradition and mutual legal assistance. While the general usefulness of such systems was unquestioned, it was thought that they may not be sufficient to assess the efficiency of the international cooperation systems countries had in place and that priority should be given to the quality and efficient use of existing legal frameworks.

32. The speaker from the Commonwealth Secretariat informed the Group about the activities of the Commonwealth Africa Anti-Corruption Centre based in Gaborone and noted that similar centres were being planned in the Pacific and the Caribbean.

33. A representative of INTERPOL provided an update on the Global Focal Point Initiative established by INTERPOL and the Stolen Asset Recovery (StAR) Initiative, which provided focal points and practitioners with an opportunity to access tools and good practices and to continue building relationships so as to enhance international cooperation in asset recovery. The INTERPOL representative also noted the progress made in building a secure network for exchanging information on asset recovery cases.

IV. Performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

34. The Conference, in its decision 5/1, decided that the Group should begin promptly to collect, with the support of the secretariat, and discuss relevant information to facilitate the assessment of performance in accordance with paragraph 48 of the terms of reference, following the completion of the first review cycle, and that the Group should include in its future sessions an agenda item allowing for the discussion of such information.

35. In order to facilitate the discussion under this agenda item, the secretariat had prepared a note entitled “Assessment of the performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption” (CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/12). The note was based on contributions provided by States parties, past experience of the secretariat with the country review process overall, and discussions held during the first part of the Group’s fifth session. Comments provided by States focused, *inter alia*, on the outcome of the country review process, the thematic reports, the good practices identified during the country reviews and suggestions for the follow-up procedures for country reviews. States also commented on the draft comprehensive self-assessment checklist to be used for the second review cycle.

36. Several speakers shared their experience with the review process both as State parties under review and as reviewing States, and welcomed the positive impact of the Mechanism on the fight against corruption in their countries. One speaker pointed out that the country review had been an opportunity for many States to

undertake their first comprehensive assessment of their anti-corruption framework. The intergovernmental nature of the Mechanism was reiterated and emphasized.

37. It was suggested that the Bureau could conduct the drawing of lots in advance of meetings of the Group in order to increase efficiency and enable States to allow time for consultations on the drawing of lots prior to sessions of the Conference. A specific proposal to mitigate the effects of unresponsiveness of reviewing States parties on States' review processes was to enable the Bureau to draw lots for such States between sessions of the Group, thereby avoiding further delays.

38. The self-assessment process had been beneficial in some States, as it had provided an accurate and in-depth picture of where implementation stood and what challenges were being encountered, including with respect to coordination among institutions. The usefulness of direct dialogue as a complement to the desk reviews was noted and some States underlined the importance of having adopted an inclusive and participatory approach to their country reviews. Several speakers highlighted the importance of benefiting from the experience of non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders in the review process and the implementation of the Convention. Transparency in the work of the Mechanism was emphasized. Some speakers also addressed the challenges faced in the review process, such as delays in receiving responses to the self-assessment owing to the need for translation.

39. Several States referred to the usefulness of their country review processes and provided updates on their national efforts to implement the Convention, often undertaken in response to those reviews. Implementation efforts included the adoption of new anti-corruption legislation, the establishment of national centres to which corruption offences could be reported, the establishment of steering committees and working groups to advise the Government on the implementation of the Convention and the creation of anti-corruption academies to provide training to practitioners.

40. Some speakers also highlighted the importance of taking the fight against corruption into consideration when carrying out legislative reforms focusing on good governance, broader economic and political reforms and national development agendas. Several speakers also highlighted their requirements for technical assistance based on the needs identified in their reviews, and some speakers reported on technical assistance received in the preparation of their self-assessments and as a result of their country review. Several speakers welcomed the technical assistance and assistance in capacity-building provided by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and other partners. One speaker also noted that technical cooperation had been provided by one of its reviewing States as a result of the country review process.

41. With regard to the comprehensive self-assessment checklist for the second review cycle, several speakers welcomed the proposed streamlining of the self-assessment checklist and highlighted that the number of questions should be reduced without diminishing the depth of the analysis provided by the version currently used for the first review cycle. One speaker expressed doubts as to the practicality of making repeated requests in the checklist for reports, studies and information material, as providing those could prove to be overly burdensome. Several speakers stressed that the level of detail and the comprehensiveness of the

checklist had to be maintained, as it allowed for in-depth reporting and analysis. In order to provide the Group, for its consideration, with an updated version of the comprehensive self-assessment checklist in all official languages at its next session, the secretariat was requested to continue collecting and consolidating comments and input from States on the draft checklist.

42. Several speakers addressed the issue of following up the observations resulting from the review process, stressing the importance of taking appropriate follow-up action to implement the Convention, to achieve the goals of the review process and to ensure the efficient use of resources dedicated to the Mechanism. In particular the development of national action plans for implementation was welcomed, and the importance of continuing to address recommendations on implementing chapters III and IV during the second review cycle was noted by several speakers.

43. Some speakers referred to a possible organization of work for the second review cycle to ensure that all chapters of the Convention are discussed during the cycle while avoiding potential overlaps. The need for consistency across the country review reports and executive summaries was also emphasized. Some speakers suggested the compilation of non-binding recommendations for the implementation of the Convention and of common best practices into a document to serve as a reference. They suggested that States could voluntarily report on actions taken to follow up on the recommendations issued during the first review cycle.

44. Several speakers noted that a range of improvements to the work of the Mechanism could be undertaken by adopting a flexible and pragmatic approach that was also progressive and comprehensive. Several speakers noted that the assessment of the performance of the Mechanism was to be carried out in accordance with paragraph 48 of the terms of reference at the conclusion of the first cycle. Others noted that the lessons learned from the assessment should be implemented in the second review cycle. Speakers stressed the need to abide by the guiding principles and characteristics described in the terms of reference of the Mechanism. Several speakers stated that the Mechanism should be funded through the regular budget of the United Nations.

V. Technical assistance

45. The secretariat orally provided information to update the documentation that had been prepared for the first part of the fifth session of the Group on technical assistance (CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/2 and CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/3). Out of the 68 States parties that had completed country review reports, 42 had identified needs for technical assistance. An overview was presented of the numbers of States per region and the types of needs identified. Attention was drawn to the predefined categories of technical assistance needs contained in the self-assessment checklist and the fact that many needs identified in the reviews would fall under the “other” category, which would raise the question of the need to reconsider the predefined categories in the run-up to the second cycle. The overall trends in the needs identified per article of the Convention and types of assistance being requested were highlighted and specific examples were given.

46. A panel discussion was held to facilitate the Group's deliberations. Representatives of Paraguay and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) participated.

47. The Minister responsible for the National Anti-Corruption Secretariat of Paraguay (SENAC) explained that SENAC had been established to lead government policy in the fields of transparency, integrity, anti-corruption and good governance. She indicated that SENAC had received technical assistance enabling the establishment of a case monitoring system to facilitate the compilation of statistics on criminal cases and administrative proceedings. She stressed that SENAC had been established relatively recently and highlighted the importance of further technical assistance and capacity-building. She noted that the rule of law and good governance were fundamental to combating corruption and highlighted the benefits of coordinating technical assistance to avoid duplication of efforts.

48. The representative from UNDP underscored the importance of the link between the Mechanism and technical assistance for the full implementation of the Convention. Assistance consisted in part of joint UNDP-UNODC initiatives to enhance consistency, coherence and the quality of the technical assistance delivered. The representative gave several examples of joint activities and initiatives. He highlighted that the United Nations Convention against Corruption was an important tool for development programming and that technical assistance providers therefore needed to be familiar with its principles. He noted that the reviews were entry points for national governance reforms, and that such reforms were triggered especially when review recommendations were being followed up and technical assistance needs met. He recognized that corruption hindered the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, and stressed that the Convention and the Mechanism could support global commitments to monitor governance variables in the post-2015 development agenda.

49. Speakers expressed appreciation for the quality of the information provided to assist the Group in identifying and following up on technical assistance needs. In the ensuing discussion, several speakers emphasized the importance of technical assistance in implementing the Convention, expressed their support for efforts to strengthen the Mechanism in that respect and renewed their commitment to promote and facilitate technical assistance delivery. Speakers reiterated the importance of using information collected through country reviews to ensure the delivery of coordinated, country-led and country-based technical assistance in line with Conference resolution 3/4, including by sharing information from country review reports. The importance of the Mechanism in prioritizing technical assistance needs was underlined, and the role of UNODC regional and national anti-corruption advisers was recognized, in particular in identifying appropriate, targeted and effective assistance. One speaker noted the valuable impact of the review process itself in sharing information about experience and good practices among governmental experts.

50. Speakers described their experience in furthering national anti-corruption measures as both recipients and providers of technical assistance, including through bilateral and regional cooperation. Speakers gave examples of how technical assistance supported the development of action plans, legislative reforms and the establishment of new institutions and furthered cooperation between national institutions. One speaker suggested that national action plans be made available on

the UNODC country profile pages to help in identifying entry points for technical assistance. Some speakers requested the continued provision of technical assistance to support national anti-corruption measures and the implementation of review recommendations. It was noted that the self-assessment checklist for the second cycle should reflect the specific nature of the provisions to be reviewed in its categories and questions concerning technical assistance. The ongoing support and technical assistance activities of UNODC and the World Bank through the joint StAR Initiative were noted, as was the important role of development partners, including UNDP. The support provided through international forums such as the Group of Twenty Anti-Corruption Working Group was also mentioned. A representative of the International Anti-Corruption Academy provided an overview of the institutional framework and capacity-building efforts of that institution to ensure coordination in the provision of technical assistance, in the form of standardized, tailor-made and joint trainings.

51. One speaker requested that each State submit to UNODC official copies of its main laws, its laws related to the fight against corruption and its legislative guide on extradition and mutual legal assistance — if it had one — for translation into the official languages of the United Nations and inclusion on the UNODC website. This would give States parties access to the laws on corruption, extradition and mutual legal assistance of other States parties.

VI. Financial and budgetary matters

52. The Secretariat submitted updated budgetary information on expenditures incurred so far for all five years of operation of the Mechanism, revised estimates for the second to fourth years of the Mechanism, resources received from both the regular budget of the United Nations and voluntary contributions, resource requirements for the fifth year of the Mechanism and cost-saving measures.

53. The Secretary expressed his appreciation for the voluntary contributions made by States to support the Mechanism, including pledges announced shortly before and during the present session of the Group.

54. The need for sustainable, predictable and transparent funding for the Mechanism was highlighted. Several speakers stated their support for the current funding model of the Mechanism, according to which some parts were covered by the regular budget of the United Nations and other parts by voluntary contributions, in line with the terms of reference of the Mechanism. However, others were of the view that the Mechanism should be fully covered by the regular budget. One speaker stressed that voluntary contributions should not entail any conditions or attempts to exercise influence.

55. Several speakers encouraged the Secretariat to present financial estimates for the second cycle and present them to the Group. The Secretary indicated that the proposals for regular budget resources for the biennium 2016-2017 would be based on data collected and analysed during the operation of the Mechanism and assumptions about the resources needed for the second review cycle. He also expressed the Secretariat's willingness to produce a forecast of resource requirements for the second cycle of the Mechanism for the consideration of the Group at its sixth session.

56. With regard to documentation the Secretariat explained that efforts to absorb additional requirements within existing resources had so far been successful. As an example of a cost-saving measure it mentioned that, every other session, documents periodically updated and issued in all languages were exceptionally being presented as conference room papers. One speaker highlighted that the increase in the volume of documentation was a positive sign, because it showed that more work was being completed under the Mechanism. The need to produce documents in all the official languages of the United Nations was also mentioned.

57. It was reported that voluntary contributions had allowed the Secretariat to provide technical assistance to some States parties in complying with their obligations under the Mechanism, for example by offering training courses or assistance in the preparation of self-assessment checklists. Technical assistance for the implementation of the findings of the reviews was covered by funding sources other than those of the Mechanism.

VII. Other matters

58. Speakers reaffirmed the importance of the principle of multilingualism.

VIII. Adoption of the report

59. On 15 October 2014, the Implementation Review Group adopted the report on its resumed fifth session.

Annex I

Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: country pairings for the first review cycle

First year

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of African States	Zambia	Zimbabwe	Italy
	Uganda	Ghana	Romania
	Togo	United Republic of Tanzania	Uganda
	Morocco	South Africa	Slovakia
	Sao Tome and Principe	Ethiopia	Mongolia
	Rwanda	Senegal	Lebanon
	Niger	Mauritius	Russian Federation
	Burundi	Egypt	Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela
Group of Asia-Pacific States	Jordan	Maldives	Nigeria
	Bangladesh	Islamic Republic of Iran	Paraguay
	Mongolia	Yemen	Kenya
	Fiji	Bangladesh	United States
	Papua New Guinea	Tajikistan	Malawi
	Indonesia	Uzbekistan	United Kingdom
Group of Eastern European States	Lithuania	Russian Federation	Egypt
	Croatia	Montenegro	Lao People's Democratic Republic
	Bulgaria	Albania	Sweden
	Ukraine	Slovenia	Poland
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Chile	El Salvador	Ukraine
	Brazil	Mexico	Haiti
	Dominican Republic	Nicaragua	Uruguay
	Argentina	Panama	Singapore
	Peru	Plurinational State of Bolivia	Ecuador
Group of Western European and Other States	United States	Sweden	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
	Finland	Greece	Tunisia
	Spain	Belgium	Lithuania
	France	Denmark	Cabo Verde

Second year

	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of African States	Seychelles	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Sao Tome and Principe
	Mauritius	Guinea-Bissau	Lesotho
	Benin	Zimbabwe	Finland
	Mozambique	Burkina Faso	Dominican Republic
	Congo	Morocco	Serbia
	Cabo Verde	Malawi	Costa Rica
	Central African Republic	Tunisia	Ghana
	Sierra Leone	Benin	Thailand
	South Africa ^a	Senegal	Mali
	Zimbabwe ^a	Madagascar	Malawi
	Cameroon ^a	Angola	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Group of Asia-Pacific States	Brunei Darussalam	Yemen	Liechtenstein
	Iraq	Malaysia	Jordan
	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Mongolia	Luxembourg
	Kazakhstan	Pakistan	Qatar
	Philippines	Bangladesh	Egypt
	Viet Nam	Lebanon	Italy
	Timor-Leste ^a	Fiji	Namibia
	United Arab Emirates ^a	Maldives	Portugal
	Islamic Republic of Iran ^a	Indonesia	Belarus
	Kuwait ^a	Sri Lanka	Ethiopia
Group of Eastern European States	Slovakia	Poland	Malta
	Serbia	Romania	Ukraine
	Montenegro	Armenia	United Kingdom
	Estonia	Albania	Burundi
	Azerbaijan	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guatemala
	Russian Federation	Ukraine	Ecuador
	Georgia ^a	Hungary	Cyprus
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Cuba	Brazil	Guatemala
	Uruguay	Argentina	Brazil
	El Salvador	Plurinational State of Bolivia	Singapore
	Nicaragua	Cuba	Nepal
	Colombia	Honduras	Slovenia
	Panama	Bahamas	Estonia
	Dominica ^a	Chile	Paraguay
	Jamaica ^a	Trinidad and Tobago	Netherlands

	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of Western European and Other States	Australia	United States	Turkey
	Norway	Sweden	Kuwait
	United Kingdom	Israel	Greece
	Portugal	Spain	Morocco
	Switzerland ^a	Finland	Algeria

^a Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

Third year

	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of African States	Lesotho	Botswana	Gabon
	Djibouti	Libya [Liberia]	Peru
	Algeria	Niger	Latvia
	Ghana	Rwanda	Swaziland
	United Republic of Tanzania	Sierra Leone	Australia
	Burkina Faso	Guinea	Rwanda
	Tunisia	Seychelles [Côte d'Ivoire]	Togo
	Angola	Liberia	Timor-Leste
Mauritania ^a	Central African Republic	Marshall Islands	
Group of Asia-Pacific States	Republic of Korea	India	Bulgaria
	Cyprus	Nauru	Austria
	Malaysia	Philippines	Kenya
	Pakistan	Solomon Islands	Norway
	Qatar	Federated States of Micronesia	Dominica
	Afghanistan	China	Brunei Darussalam
	Sri Lanka ^a	Papua New Guinea	China
Group of Eastern European States	Hungary	Republic of Moldova	Jamaica
	Slovenia	Latvia	Djibouti
	Latvia	Georgia	Ireland
	Romania	Estonia	France
	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Croatia	Iceland
	Armenia	Lithuania	Kyrgyzstan
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Mexico	Peru	Azerbaijan
	Paraguay	Colombia	Philippines
	Plurinational State of Bolivia	Costa Rica	Zambia
	Trinidad and Tobago	Argentina	Palau
	Guyana	Cuba	Vanuatu
	Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	Chile	United Arab Emirates

	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of Western European and Other States	Sweden	France	Canada
	Canada	Switzerland	Iraq
	Luxembourg	Austria	Switzerland
	Italy	Liechtenstein	Kazakhstan
	Netherlands	Australia	Uruguay
	Austria	Israel	Viet Nam
	Malta ^a	Spain	Cambodia

^a Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

Fourth year

	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of African States	Senegal	Comoros	Croatia
	Liberia	Benin	South Africa
	Kenya	Cabo Verde	Papua New Guinea
	Nigeria	Lesotho	Montenegro
	Gabon	Sierra Leone	Lao People's Democratic Republic
	Malawi	Djibouti	Kuwait
	Libya	Mozambique	Namibia
	Madagascar	Nigeria	Nicaragua
	Namibia	Ethiopia	Canada
	Ethiopia	Togo	Malta
	Democratic Republic of the Congo ^a	Mauritius	Viet Nam
	Botswana ^a	Burundi	Bulgaria
	Egypt ^b	Burkina Faso	Algeria
	Guinea-Bissau ^b	Cameroon	Palau
	Swaziland ^a	Botswana	Sri Lanka
	Comoros ^a	Seychelles [Sudan]	Trinidad and Tobago
	Côte d'Ivoire ^a	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Azerbaijan
	Mali ^b	Niger	Afghanistan
	Guinea ^a	Mauritania	Saint Lucia
	Sudan ^a	Angola	State of Palestine

	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of Asia-Pacific States	Kyrgyzstan	Indonesia	Pakistan
	Maldives	Palau	Cabo Verde
	Lebanon	Islamic Republic of Iran	Seychelles
	Uzbekistan	Sri Lanka	Georgia
	Palau	Malaysia	Cambodia
	Turkmenistan	Kyrgyzstan	Cyprus
	Singapore	Lebanon	Swaziland
	China	Viet Nam	Bahamas
	Tajikistan	Cook Islands	Hungary
	Bahrain ^a	Jordan	Honduras
	Thailand ^a	Nepal	Bahrain
	India ^a	Kazakhstan	Uganda
	Nepal ^a	Fiji	Benin
	Vanuatu ^a	Solomon Islands	India
	Cook Islands ^a	Qatar	Belarus
	Marshall Islands ^a	Papua New Guinea	Central African Republic
	Solomon Islands ^a	Iraq	Slovakia
	Federated States of Micronesia ^a	Mongolia	Republic of Korea
	Nauru ^a	Timor-Leste	Jamaica
	Yemen ^b	United Arab Emirates	Sao Tome and Principe
	Cambodia ^b	Myanmar	Togo
	Myanmar ^a	Thailand	Burundi
	Saudi Arabia ^a	Cambodia	Mozambique
	Kiribati ^a	Vanuatu	Côte d'Ivoire
Oman ^a	Kiribati	Saudi Arabia	
State of Palestine ^a	Oman	Guyana [Federated States of Micronesia]	
Group of Eastern European States	Poland	Serbia	Mauritius
	Belarus	Georgia	Republic of Moldova
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Hungary	Portugal
	Albania	Armenia	Mali
	Republic of Moldova	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Norway
	Czech Republic ^a	Republic of Moldova	Turkmenistan
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Ecuador	Guatemala	Dominica
	Haiti	Colombia	Indonesia
	Costa Rica	Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	Democratic Republic of the Congo
	Honduras	Dominican Republic	Nauru
	Guatemala	Panama	Antigua and Barbuda
	Antigua and Barbuda	Brazil	Fiji
	Bahamas	El Salvador	Zambia
	Saint Lucia ^a	Cuba	Marshall Islands

	<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i>	<i>Other reviewing State party</i>
Group of Western European and Other States	Turkey	Belgium	Malaysia
	Greece	Ireland	Gabon
	Belgium	Netherlands	Mexico
	Denmark	Austria	United Republic of Tanzania
	Israel	Greece	Uzbekistan
	Liechtenstein ^a	Canada	United Arab Emirates
	Iceland ^a	Norway	Madagascar
	Ireland ^a	Luxembourg	Brunei Darussalam

^a State party that ratified or acceded to the Convention after the drawing of lots at the first session of the Implementation Review Group.

^b Deferred from previous year of the cycle.