



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

Distr.: General
28 November 2016

Original: English

Report of the Implementation Review Group on its resumed seventh session, held in Vienna from 14 to 16 November 2016

Addendum

I. Introduction

1. At its seventh session, held in Vienna from 20 to 24 June 2016, the Implementation Review Group of the United Nations Convention against Corruption decided to hold a resumed session of three days' duration before the end of the year to continue its deliberations.

II. Organization of the meeting

A. Opening of the meeting

2. The Implementation Review Group held its resumed seventh session in Vienna from 14 to 16 November 2016.

3. The resumed session was chaired by Alexander Konovalov (Russian Federation).

4. The Secretary of the Conference welcomed Bhutan and the Holy See as the newest States parties to the Convention and noted that with currently 180 States parties, the goal of universal adherence to the Convention as expressed by the General Assembly and the Conference of the States Parties appeared to come within reach. In addition, the Secretary highlighted key issues for consideration by the Group at its resumed session. With regard to the first and second review cycles, he referred to the update on the progress made in the implementation of the mandates of the Group, the sharing of information on good practices, experiences and relevant measures taken after the completion of the country reviews, and the catalyst function of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption. Furthermore, he noted the widening gap between the need for technical assistance and the ability to provide it. Ultimately, the Secretary highlighted the persistent gap between voluntary contributions received and funding required for the proper operation of the second cycle of the Implementation Review Mechanism.

5. With regard to the second review cycle, the Secretary referred to the deadlines established for the nomination of focal points and governmental experts, as well as for the provision of responses to the self-assessment checklist. He informed the Group that several nominations and the majority of responses to the self-assessment checklist were still outstanding, and appealed to States parties to make greater efforts to finalize



their country reviews in accordance with the established timelines. He underscored the importance of avoiding excessive delays and completing the reviews of the first year of the second cycle before the eighth session of the Group. The Secretary informed the Group that informal consultations on a multi-year workplan for the Group had been held and that discussions on the matter were at an advanced stage.

B. Organization of work

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

C. Attendance

7. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the resumed seventh session of the Implementation Review Group: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, 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 and Zambia.

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

9. 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", States signatories are entitled to participate in the Group.

10. The following State signatory to the Convention was represented: Japan.

11. In accordance with rule 2 of Conference resolution 4/5, intergovernmental organizations, 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 may be invited to participate in the sessions of the Group.

12. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers: Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization, Commonwealth Secretariat, International Anti-Corruption Academy, International Organization for Migration, Islamic Development Bank Group and League of Arab States.

13. 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: Ethics Office and World Bank.

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

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

A. Drawing of lots

15. With regard to the review of chapters III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and IV (International cooperation), the Group drew lots for the review of Bhutan, which had ratified the United Nations Convention against Corruption after the sixth session of the Conference. Tajikistan and the Cook Islands were drawn as reviewing States for Bhutan.

16. With regard to the second review cycle, the Dominican Republic was drawn as regional reviewing State for the Plurinational State of Bolivia, which had requested a redraw.

B. Progress report and outcome of the reviews

17. The secretariat provided an oral update on the progress made in the country reviews of the first and second review cycles. With regard to the first review cycle, the secretariat informed the Group that, at the time of reporting, 170 States parties under review had provided responses to the self-assessment checklist, 161 direct dialogues had been held, and 144 executive summaries had been finalized and made available to the Group. A further seven executive summaries were close to being finalized, and 66 States parties under review had requested the secretariat to publish their country review report on its website.

18. With regard to the second review cycle, three of the 29 States parties under review in the first year of the second cycle had not yet nominated their focal point at the time of reporting. Eight States parties under review had submitted their responses to the self-assessment checklist, and several country visits were being planned.

C. Conduct of the second review cycle

19. The secretariat provided an overview of the progress in the ongoing conduct of the second review cycle. It informed the Group that several training courses had been held to assist focal points and governmental experts participating in the second cycle in familiarizing themselves with the chapters of the Convention under review and the review methodology. The training was held immediately after the resumed session, which meant that all States parties participating in the first year of the second review cycle had been offered the opportunity to attend.

20. Several speakers emphasized that the second cycle should incorporate the lessons learned from the first cycle in order to increase its effectiveness and efficiency. Some speakers expressed an interest in continuing to explore meaningful ways to improve the efficiency of the Review Mechanism and minimize the workload of the experts, without compromising thoroughness. A proposal was made to voluntarily

limit the number of pages of the responses to the self-assessment checklist. However, it was noted that in doing so, the substantive complexity of the second review cycle should be taken into consideration. The efforts already taken by the secretariat to improve the efficiency of the Mechanism were noted. Speakers reiterated the guiding principles of the Mechanism, in particular its intergovernmental, transparent, efficient, non-intrusive and inclusive nature.

21. Several speakers discussed the efficiency of the Review Mechanism. One speaker put forward proposals to improve efficiency and begin to address the funding gap by reconsidering the organization and mandates of the subsidiary bodies of the Conference, prioritizing review-related expenses according to their relevance, and considering the possibility of making the executive summaries of the country reports available to the Group as conference room papers. Several speakers underlined the importance of respecting multilingualism, as it contributed to the inclusiveness of the Mechanism and to a sense of ownership among its parties.

22. A number of speakers reiterated the need, in the light of Conference resolution 6/1, to adhere to the indicative timelines established for the reviews and to minimize delays, in particular due to the large number of reviews in the second and subsequent years of the second cycle as a result of deferrals, which had a direct impact on the costs of the Review Mechanism.

23. Several speakers reported on action taken to prepare for the second review cycle, including preliminary assessments, consultative meetings and the establishment of committees of experts in anticipation of reviews. Several speakers noted that valuable lessons had been learned from the first cycle, for example that it was beneficial to involve a wide range of stakeholders in the reviews, and that States parties needed to draw on those lessons as part of their implementation efforts. A request was made to strike a proper balance between the lessons from the first cycle and progress in the second. One speaker described the steps his State had taken to increase transparency on the impact of the country review exercise, and assured the audience of that State's commitment to publish its review schedule, focal point information, self-assessment checklist response and final review report, and to conduct public briefings on the review results.

24. It was noted that the reviews were affected by issues of proximity of legal systems among reviewing and reviewed States parties. However, following the first cycle, the diversity of legal traditions was considered a positive feature of the Review Mechanism because it offered the parties an opportunity to learn from each other and exposed government experts to solutions chosen or explored by other countries.

25. Informal consultations on a potential multi-year workplan for the Group had been held prior to the resumed session. The delegate chairing the informal consultations provided information on the outcome of those consultations and highlighted that the proposal presented to the Group in document CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/CRP.24 was aimed at better focusing substantive discussions in the Group's sessions while safeguarding the balance of topics analysed. In that regard he indicated that the proposed multi-year workplan provided further guidance on the topics the Group's analytical work was to focus on in each session, in accordance with paragraph 10 of Conference resolution 6/1. Furthermore, the delegate clarified that the proposal did not alter the Group's agenda, which would remain as established, and did not preclude the Group from carrying out its other functions, such as discussing financial and budgetary matters and other standing agenda items. He expressed his hope that if sessions of the Group and the discussions on the review of implementation of the Convention were held back-to-back with sessions of other subsidiary bodies of the Conference, experts in specific substantive areas of the Convention would participate in the Group's sessions. He further noted that expert participation became more important as more information

was collected through the country reviews and made available to the Group to support its analytical work.

26. Speakers welcomed the proposed workplan as a way to fine-tune the work of the Group in the light of budgetary considerations and the lessons learned from the first review cycle, and to maximize the value of the analytical work done under the Review Mechanism. Given the need to foster the presence of relevant experts at the meetings of the Group, speakers welcomed the thematic emphasis proposed for the Group's work in line with resolution 6/1 and the outcomes of the first review cycle, especially in the light of the complexity of the chapters of the Convention under review, the analytical value of the reviews and the technical nature of the work of the subsidiary bodies. It was also noted that, at future sessions, sufficient time should be allocated to the thematic discussion of the substantive provisions under review in the second cycle and to lessons learned from the conduct by States parties of the second-cycle reviews, including the preparation of the self-assessments, the desk reviews and the on-site visits.

27. Some speakers questioned the need for a second resumed session of the Group, as it could have cost implications for delegations. One speaker supported holding a second resumed session as a means to increase the analytical value of the Group's work while maximizing the presence of technical experts, without budgetary implications for the subsidiary bodies.

28. The Secretary clarified that the proposed multi-year workplan would provide guidance on how to focus the discussions under the agenda item on implementation review at future sessions of the Group, but would not affect the remainder of the standing agenda items. He indicated that the proposal contained in document CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/CRP.24 remained within the meeting entitlements of the Group and other subsidiary bodies.

29. The Secretary reiterated that the secretariat remained committed to implementing all the resolutions of the Conference, in particular resolution 4/6. With regard to a second resumed session of the Group and the concerns expressed by some States parties regarding potential additional costs for delegations, the Secretary indicated that the secretariat would explore the possibility of combining the proposed three meeting blocks in 2018 and 2019 into two, but that doing so would entail planning blocks longer than five working days. The Secretary assured the Group that the secretariat would analyse all scheduling options and present the results to the Group at its eighth session. If necessary, the workplan could be amended accordingly.

30. Finally, the Secretary highlighted the importance of adopting the multi-year workplan for the implementation of paragraph 9 of Conference resolution 6/1, in which the Conference requested the secretariat *inter alia* to structure the provisional agendas of the Group and other subsidiary bodies in such a way as to avoid the duplication of discussions, while respecting their mandates.

31. Based on the proposal and clarifications provided, as well as the ensuing discussion, the Group adopted the multi-year workplan as contained in annex I to the present report.

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

32. The Conference, in its decision 5/1, decided that the Group would 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 of the Review Mechanism, following the completion of the first review cycle, and that the Group would include in its future sessions an agenda item allowing for the discussion of such information.

33. In its resolution 6/1, the Conference encouraged States parties to continue voluntarily sharing information on good practices, experiences and relevant measures taken after the completion of their country review reports, including information on technical assistance, and to consider providing such information to the secretariat for publication on its website (see www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/IRG-session7-resumed.html).

34. In order to facilitate the discussion, the secretariat introduced the note of the Secretariat on good practices and experiences (CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/12), which consolidated submissions received via note verbale or e-mail from 35 States parties.

35. The secretariat noted that the salient findings had been grouped into five themes. First, 89 per cent of the responses reflected that the review process had served as a catalyst for domestic reforms and played an important role in identifying gaps and shortcomings in national anti-corruption frameworks. Second, 77 per cent of the submissions relayed that the Review Mechanism had triggered legislative reforms and changes through the adoption of new laws or the amendment of current laws to bring them into line with the provisions of chapters III and IV of the Convention. Third, as noted in 60 per cent of the submissions, the Mechanism had improved institutional cooperation, thus strengthening the overall institutional framework and its effective functioning as a cornerstone of the fight against corruption. Fourth, 60 per cent of States highlighted how the Mechanism had contributed to enhancing information-sharing among national stakeholders and led to the establishment of communication channels or the strengthening of existing ones. Finally, 49 per cent of States indicated that the Mechanism showed in practice that the international community was working together to fight corruption.

36. The secretariat briefed the Group on the outcome of a workshop of international anti-corruption peer review bodies held in Paris on 22 and 23 September. The workshop had been organized by the secretariat jointly with the Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions of the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) in implementation of the mandate contained in Conference resolution 6/1 so as to enhance synergies and cooperate with the secretariats of other relevant mechanisms. The purpose of the workshop, which was hosted by OECD, was to bring together the secretariats of five anti-corruption peer review mechanisms, i.e. the OECD Working Group on Bribery, the OECD Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan), the Group of States against Corruption of the Council of Europe, the Mechanism for Follow-up on the Implementation of the Inter-American Convention against Corruption of the Organization of American States and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), to share experiences, discuss challenges, explore ways to reduce overlaps, and enhance the implementation of their respective instruments.

37. The Chair introduced a panel convened to facilitate deliberations, which was composed of representatives of States parties that had finalized their reviews and had already undertaken various measures in response to the outcomes of the reviews.

38. A panellist from Kenya shared the positive experience of his country in relation to the first cycle of the Review Mechanism and provided an overview of activities undertaken after the completion of Kenya's review. A national workshop had been held with support from UNODC that brought together a broad range of national stakeholders and had resulted in the development of a matrix for the implementation

of the recommendations issued during the review. Following the workshop, a new interministerial technical committee had been established to oversee the implementation of the matrix. Kenya had taken numerous concrete measures to date, such as the drafting of several new bills, including the Bribery Bill, the Whistle-Blower Protection Bill, and the Anti-Corruption Laws (Amendment) Bill. Furthermore, a draft national ethics and anti-corruption policy had been prepared. The panellist explained that, during the review, Kenya had identified a number of technical assistance needs and indicated that a donor meeting had been organized to support Kenya in its endeavours to strengthen its anti-corruption framework. The panellist underscored the value of the peer-learning aspect of the Mechanism and its participatory nature, and noted the importance of allocating sufficient funds to support the Mechanism.

39. The panellist from Indonesia stated that although his country had already participated in a pilot programme to analyse the gaps in its anti-corruption framework, it had greatly benefited from the implementation review and the resulting recommendations. Indonesia had received a number of recommendations to strengthen national legislation relating to criminalization, law enforcement, extradition and mutual legal assistance, and those had triggered important legislative and institutional changes. As a consequence the country had adopted, inter alia, a national strategy on preventing and combating corruption, a law on asset forfeiture and amendments to the laws on anti-corruption, mutual legal assistance and extradition. In addition, the Supreme Court had handed down a decree on the liability of legal persons. The panellist emphasized that the review had also highlighted good practices, such as having an effective anti-corruption agency and a specialized anti-corruption court.

40. The panellist from Greece briefed the Group on his country's experience with the Review Mechanism and follow-up action undertaken to implement the review results. He pointed out that the country visit had been conducted jointly with the third-phase review visit of the OECD Working Group on Bribery. He presented to the Group three concrete examples of measures that could be taken to implement the recommendations. Firstly, under articles 36, 38 and 39 of the Convention, the country had established a mechanism for coordination between specialized agencies and the exchange between them of information on investigations into corruption, and had set up a special coordinating body. Secondly, under articles 32 and 33, the system for the protection of witnesses and reporting persons was being strengthened, in particular to effectively cover the private sector. Thirdly, the responsible ministries had launched an initiative to improve data-collection systems to track corruption-related cases and international cooperation.

41. A panellist from the United Kingdom provided an overview of her country's experience with the review process. She noted the collaborative, cooperative, transparent and inclusive manner in which the review had been conducted. In particular, civil society had been invited to contribute at all stages of the process, including the country visit and the finalization of the country review report. In response, the United Kingdom had made several legislative and institutional changes. It had made amendments to the Bribery Act 2010, established a central policy coordination unit and a dedicated international anti-corruption unit, and introduced measures to strengthen information-sharing among authorities. The panellist reminded the Group of the initiatives stemming from the Anti-Corruption Summit held in London in 2016, such as the establishment of a global forum for asset recovery. Referring to CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/12, the panellist encouraged further replies from States parties on follow-up action, in particular from least developed countries, and pointed out the apparent need to provide assistance to least developed countries to better prioritize their needs.

42. During the ensuing deliberations, a majority of the speakers echoed the findings that the secretariat had presented in CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/12. Several speakers noted that the Review Mechanism had already had the impact envisaged at its inception, and recalled that its guiding principles remained the cornerstone of its success. In particular, a number of speakers underscored its intergovernmental, transparent, efficient, non-intrusive, inclusive and impartial nature. A number of speakers noted the importance of improving the transparency on the results of the Mechanism and consulting with stakeholders during the second cycle, in particular with civil society, in line with the terms of reference of the Mechanism. Several speakers emphasized that the intergovernmental nature of the Mechanism should be maintained, without prejudice to other actors who, because of their role in the fight against corruption, participated and played an active role in the Conference in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.

43. Several speakers reported on domestic reforms and measures their countries had taken to address the outcomes and findings of the reviews, many of which were in line with national development priorities. The examples given included new legislation in various domains, such as the protection of witnesses and reporting persons in the public and private sectors; the alignment of domestic criminalization provisions with the articles of the Convention; the amendment of laws on international cooperation; and the adoption of national anti-corruption strategies and action plans.

44. A number of speakers highlighted the importance the Review Mechanism had had in terms of strengthening coordination and cooperation across national institutions and raising awareness. For example, many countries had created national multi-stakeholder committees to coordinate action and enhance communication across agencies. One speaker noted that the amount of effort needed to collect information to complete the self-assessment checklist for the second cycle had underscored the necessity of enhancing channels of communication and cooperation.

45. A number of speakers reported that the review process had led to a more precise identification of gaps, challenges and good practices in implementation. It had also significantly strengthened the capacity of governmental experts and other stakeholders to participate in the review exercise and address the outcomes and findings. In that context several speakers noted the positive learning value of the workshops and regional training courses that had been organized by the secretariat for focal points and governmental experts on the second review cycle, which had assisted Governments in taking steps to address the review results. It was also noted that States parties had invested significant amounts of time and resources, often in a context of competing priorities and limited capacity. In that regard a number of speakers welcomed the technical assistance they had received in enhancing their implementation efforts. Some delegates also noted the importance of continued, sustainable, effective and coordinated technical assistance to implement measures in response to the review outcomes.

46. A few speakers highlighted efforts to strengthen data collection systems and enhance capacity to gather and generate statistics as examples of concrete measures taken in response to recommendations issued in their country reviews. Other speakers explained how specialized anti-corruption expertise in prosecution services and the judiciary had strengthened the capacity of their countries to prosecute and adjudicate corruption offences.

47. A number of speakers highlighted the importance of political will and commitment to implement reforms. They described how their national efforts to address the recommendations and findings had been endorsed at the highest political level, such as the prime minister or the president. One speaker noted that the follow-up actions had even led to a constitutional amendment to establish an

independent body to fight corruption. Another speaker underscored that the global nature of the Review Mechanism gave it significant practical and political impact.

48. Some speakers welcomed the efforts of the Group and the secretariat to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Review Mechanism in line with Conference resolution 6/1, in particular by holding intersessional drawings of lots and considering the adoption of a multi-year workplan for the Group. Several speakers noted with satisfaction the workshop held in Paris by the secretariats of international anti-corruption peer review bodies on 22 and 23 September. In particular, several speakers made reference to a briefing by OECD at which the high quality of the workshop had been underscored. Speakers encouraged the secretariat to continue to explore synergies and coordination with other mechanisms, including through possible joint reviews and country visits, taking into account the different phases of the reviews under each mechanism and the divergence between their respective guiding principles. Several delegations requested the secretariat to prepare a written report on the workshop.

49. Several speakers mentioned that they were better prepared for the second review cycle owing to the momentum generated by and the lessons learned from the first cycle. For example, they had followed the workshops organized by UNODC and other partners or established focal points and national inter-agency committees at an early stage. A number of speakers reported on early steps taken in preparation for the second review cycle. They welcomed the further sharing of experiences by States parties involved in the first year of the second cycle in taking on challenges and adhering to the timelines established for the reviews. A number of concrete national measures relating to chapters II and V of the Convention were highlighted, such as the reform of public procurement systems and the establishment of e-governance initiatives. In preparation for the second review cycle some States parties had established specialized asset recovery expertise and developed handbooks or guidance on asset recovery. One speaker highlighted that chapter V of the Convention had played an important role in reaching agreement on an ethics pact against tax havens and for the effective recovery of assets resulting from corruption.

50. A number of speakers encouraged States parties to share, on a voluntary basis, additional information on good practices, experiences and measures taken after the completion of their country reviews, including information on technical assistance, so as to maximize the benefit that could be drawn from the outcomes of the first-cycle reviews and assist the Group in formulating possible recommendations to the Conference in accordance with paragraph 11 of Conference resolution 6/1. Several speakers welcomed further substantive discussion on various thematic areas that had emerged as priority areas and in which sufficient data had been generated from the first-cycle reviews. As priority areas in the field of international cooperation that the Conference and its subsidiary bodies could address they noted in particular the significant role of central authorities, the possibility to use the Convention as a legal basis for cooperation in the absence of bilateral treaties and the issue of international financial centres.

V. Technical assistance

51. In its resolution 3/1, the Conference of the States Parties decided that the Implementation Review Group would be in charge of following up and continuing the work undertaken previously by the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on Technical Assistance.

52. To facilitate the discussion, the secretariat presented a note analysing the technical assistance needs emerging from the country reviews (CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/13). The

note contained updated information on the needs identified in the first cycle by States parties under review, as well as a holistic analysis of the needs identified in the executive summaries and reports completed at the time of drafting. A total of 3,109 technical assistance needs had been identified. The proportion of States identifying needs had increased from 58 per cent at the previous analysis (59 of 101 States) to 63 per cent (87 of 137 States).

53. In relation to chapter III of the Convention, the secretariat noted that the need for summaries of good practices and lessons learned continued to be the most frequently identified category, followed by the need for legislative assistance. The need for capacity-building showed the largest increase (61 per cent), which was a new trend. In connection with chapter IV, the three categories most commonly identified were, in descending order, the need for capacity-building, the need for summaries of good practices and lessons learned, and the need for legislative assistance. This represented a shift from trends observed in previous analyses, where the need for legislative assistance had been the most commonly identified category.

54. It is likely that a significant proportion of States will identify a similar number of needs during the second cycle, taking into account the complexity of the chapters to be reviewed. The requirements of States parties are to be given due consideration when providing assistance in this area.

55. The secretariat presented a note on technical assistance (CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/11) to provide the Group with an overview of the response UNODC had given to the technical assistance needs identified and requests made. The note focused on technical assistance activities implemented at the global, regional and national levels between August 2015 and August 2016.

56. UNODC had provided support to States parties in the prevention, investigation and prosecution of corruption, in particular by supporting the development of national anti-corruption strategies, the building of capacity among anti-corruption and law enforcement bodies, the strengthening of international cooperation and asset recovery (including through the joint UNODC/World Bank Stolen Asset Recovery (StAR) Initiative), the strengthening of integrity and the promotion of anti-corruption education (including through the Anti-Corruption Academic Initiative), and by providing targeted legislative assistance.

57. The needs identified in the country reviews often required more robust multi-year assistance, and a strategic approach was needed to ensure that assistance providers considered the outcomes of the reviews when programming new technical assistance or incorporating technical assistance into ongoing programmes. In that respect, the secretariat emphasized the important role played by the regional anti-corruption advisers of UNODC who served as key focal points for the provision of technical assistance at the regional and national levels. The secretariat stressed the need to bridge the growing discrepancy between the increase in the demand for services provided by UNODC and the capacity of UNODC to deliver the support expected from States parties.

58. In the ensuing discussion the importance of country-led and country-based, integrated and coordinated programming and technical assistance delivery for the implementation of the Convention was noted. States parties underlined that the technical assistance UNODC provided in the course of the implementation review process, including assistance in completing the self-assessment checklist, was instrumental in enabling countries to participate in the Review Mechanism successfully. One speaker highlighted that technical assistance will be given a pivotal role in the forthcoming deliberations of the G-20 Anti-Corruption Working Group and welcomed input from UNODC.

59. Several countries emphasized their continued commitment to providing technical assistance, including by supporting good governance and strengthening oversight bodies as an important aspect of their efforts to promote the implementation of the Convention through interregional, regional, bilateral and national initiatives in the fight against corruption. Their technical assistance programmes covered areas such as the prevention of corruption, criminal justice reform, legislative assistance, asset recovery reform, and engagement with civil society and the private sector. In particular enhanced efforts to prevent and counter corruption in the private sector were regarded deserving further consideration by the Conference and the Group.

VI. Financial and budgetary matters

60. The secretariat provided information on the expenditures incurred for the operation of the first and second cycles of the Review Mechanism as at 31 July 2016, on projected expenditures for the completion of the first cycle, and on projected expenditures for the operation of the first two years of the second cycle. The secretariat also provided details on the resources received from both the regular budget of the United Nations and voluntary contributions, and gave information about the existing cost-saving measures.

61. While expressing its appreciation for the voluntary contributions and the pledges made by States to support the Review Mechanism, the secretariat drew attention to the funding gap between the voluntary contributions received and the extrabudgetary resources required for the functioning of the Mechanism. The secretariat informed the Group that, whereas voluntary contributions covered the expenditure incurred and anticipated for the first cycle of the Mechanism (on the assumption that the first cycle would be completed by 30 June 2017), there was a significant funding gap of \$4.23 million for the operation of the first two years of the second cycle. The secretariat further noted that by taking into account the expenditures incurred since 1 August 2016 for the implementation of the second cycle, the total second-cycle expenditures amounted to \$720,000. As a result, the second-cycle cash balance was less than \$660,000. The secretariat concluded that the overall financial situation endangered the effective operation of the Mechanism.

62. The secretariat informed the Group that, as requested by the Conference in its resolution 6/1, it had examined the shortfall on resource requirements for the functioning of the Review Mechanism during the first two years of its second cycle, and concluded that the remainder of the shortfall could not be adequately addressed through further cost-efficiency and saving measures. Therefore, the secretariat would take the shortfall in the support for the second cycle into account when submitting the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019, in accordance with section VII of the terms of reference and in line with Conference resolution 6/1.

63. In view of the financial situation, the secretariat proposed the following temporary cost-cutting measures: (a) high-income and upper middle-income countries (as listed in the statistical annex to the report *World Economic Situation and Prospects*, issued by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs) would be asked to fund their own participation in the training of governmental experts and the country visits and joint meetings; (b) high-income and upper middle-income countries would be asked to consider to fund travel costs and accommodation for visiting governmental experts from low-income, lower middle-income and least developed countries participating in their own reviews; (c) the secretariat would fund the participation in country visits of only one expert per reviewing country from among least developed, low-income or lower middle-income countries; (d) countries would be encouraged to arrange for the translation of working documents and to provide interpretation during country visits as in-kind contributions to the Review Mechanism; (e) States parties

would be encouraged to avoid providing duplicative or unrelated information in the self-assessment checklist; and (f) States parties would be encouraged to make every effort to limit the number of languages of each review to two.

64. Several speakers announced that their countries were considering providing concrete voluntary contributions to the Review Mechanism. Several speakers took note of the proposed cost-cutting measures, but indicated that further consideration would be necessary. Some speakers supported voluntary limits on the length of the checklist responses, provided that those would not compromise the quality of the country review reports. The multilingual nature of the Mechanism was highlighted as an important component that ensured inclusiveness and participation, and the need for its retention was emphasized. One speaker proposed to redraft the Group's agenda in order to clarify further in a more specific manner the issues to be discussed under each agenda item in order to streamline the discussions in the Group and to assist States parties in preparing for the discussions.

65. One speaker, while welcoming the cost-cutting measures proposed by the secretariat, expressed his concern about the cost implications of the multi-year workplan, in particular with regard to the requirements for financing the participation of representatives from least developed countries in the sessions of the Group and the overall efficiency of the Review Mechanism. Some speakers noted that in its resolution 3/1, the Conference had underlined that the Mechanism required a budget that ensured its efficient, continued and impartial functioning. One speaker noted that, should the financial situation not improve, a review of the funding model for the Mechanism might be required together with a review of certain provisions in the terms of reference whose impact on the financial requirements of the Mechanism had proved to be significant. The speaker proposed to include these issues in the agenda of the eighth session of the Group. Some speakers objected to the idea of revisiting the terms of reference, indicating that doing so might jeopardize the current consensus on the functioning of the Mechanism. Speakers expressed the hope that, in response to the funding shortfall, more contributions would be forthcoming in 2017.

66. The secretariat emphasized its full commitment to multilingualism and assured the Group that the practice of translating executive summaries into all official languages of the United Nations was not in question. The secretariat noted that while the proposed cost-cutting measures would be implemented immediately on a voluntary basis, other cost-cutting measures required a decision by the Group, which could be taken during its eighth session, should the financial situation not improve. The secretariat clarified that the current cost projection for the second cycle included the facilitation of the participation of representatives of least developed countries in two sessions of the group per year. A revised cost projection would be required if the sessions of the Group were to be organized in three separate blocks per year.

VII. Adoption of the report

67. On 16 November 2016, the Implementation Review Group adopted the report on its resumed seventh session (CAC/COSP/IRG/L.1/Add.6-10).

Annex I

Multi-year workplan for the analytical work of the Implementation Review Group, covering the period 2017-2019

1. Pursuant to the request of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption in its resolution 6/1, the Implementation Review Group considered a multi-year workplan to continue its analytical work during the period 2017-2019.
2. In developing the multi-year workplan, the Group acted on the understanding that the aim was to enhance the focus of its discussions on the review of implementation of the Convention, a standing item on the Group's agenda, pursuant to Conference resolution 6/1 and in line with the terms of reference of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention. The Group also acted on the understanding that the financial support for participation of least developed countries in the sessions of the Group remained subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources.
3. The following multi-year workplan for the analytical work of the Group for the years 2017-2019 was agreed by the Group in accordance with paragraph 10 of resolution 6/1:

2017

Regular eighth session

Main topic: analysis of information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs emanating from the country reviews of chapter III (Criminalization and law enforcement) of the Convention.

Resumed eighth session

Main topic: analysis of information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs emanating from the country reviews of chapter IV (International cooperation) of the Convention.

2018

Regular ninth session

Main topic: analysis of information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs emanating from the country reviews of chapter V (Asset recovery) of the Convention.

The regular ninth session should be scheduled back-to-back with a meeting of the Working Group on Asset Recovery. Both meetings should be held within a period of five working days.

First resumed ninth session

Main topic: analysis of information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs emanating from the country reviews of chapter II (Preventive measures) of the Convention.

The first resumed ninth session should be scheduled back-to-back with a meeting of the Working Group on Prevention of Corruption. Both meetings should be held within a period of five working days.

Second resumed ninth session

Main topic: analysis of information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs emanating from the country reviews of chapter III (Criminalization and law enforcement).

The second resumed ninth session should be scheduled back-to-back with a meeting of the open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption. Both meetings should be held within a period of five working days.

2019

Regular tenth session

Main topic: analysis of information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs emanating from the country reviews of chapter V (Asset recovery) of the Convention.

The regular tenth session should be scheduled back-to-back with a meeting of the Working Group on Asset Recovery. Both meetings should be held within a period of five working days.

First resumed tenth session

Main topic: analysis of information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs emanating from the country reviews of chapter II (Preventive measures) of the Convention.

The first resumed tenth session should be scheduled back-to-back with a meeting of the Working Group on Prevention of Corruption. Both meetings should be held within a period of five working days.

Second resumed tenth session

Main topic: analysis of information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs emanating from the country reviews of chapter IV (International cooperation) of the Convention.

The second resumed tenth session will be held during the eighth session of the Conference of the States Parties and should be scheduled back-to-back with a meeting of the open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

Annex II

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
Group of Asia-Pacific States	Burundi	Egypt	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
	Jordan	Maldives	Nigeria
	Bangladesh	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Paraguay
	Mongolia	Yemen	Kenya
	Fiji	Bangladesh	United States of America
	Papua New Guinea	Tajikistan	Malawi
Group of Eastern European States	Indonesia	Uzbekistan	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	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	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	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>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	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	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
	Iran (Islamic Republic of) ^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	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Singapore
	Nicaragua	Cuba	Nepal
	Colombia	Honduras	Slovenia
	Panama	Bahamas	Estonia
	Dominica ^a	Chile	Paraguay
Jamaica ^a	Trinidad and Tobago	Netherlands	
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>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	Lesotho	Botswana	Gabon
	Djibouti	Liberia	Peru
	Algeria	Niger	Latvia
	Ghana	Rwanda	Swaziland
	United Republic of Tanzania	Sierra Leone	Australia
	Burkina Faso	Guinea	Rwanda
	Tunisia	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	Micronesia (Federated States of)	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
	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Costa Rica	Zambia
	Trinidad and Tobago	Argentina	Palau
	Guyana	Cuba	Vanuatu
	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Chile	United Arab Emirates
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>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	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	Guinea	Palau	
	Swaziland ^a	Botswana	Sri Lanka	
	Comoros ^a	Sudan	Trinidad and Tobago	
	Côte d'Ivoire ^a	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Azerbaijan	
	Mali ^b	Niger	Afghanistan	
	Guinea ^a	Mauritania	Cameroon	
	Sudan ^a	Angola	State of Palestine	
	South Sudan ^a	Cameroon	Iceland	
	Gambia ^a	Sudan	Guyana	
	Group of Asia-Pacific States	Kyrgyzstan	Indonesia	Pakistan
		Maldives	Palau	Cabo Verde
		Lebanon	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	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	
Micronesia (Federated States of) ^a		Mongolia	Republic of Korea	
Nauru ^a		Timor-Leste	Jamaica	
Yemen ^b		United Arab Emirates	Sao Tome and Principe	

<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>
	Cambodia ^b	Myanmar	Togo
	Myanmar ^a	Thailand	Burundi
	Saudi Arabia ^a	Cambodia	Mozambique
	Oman ^a	Kiribati	Saudi Arabia
	State of Palestine ^a	Oman	Micronesia (Federated States of)
	Tuvalu ^a	Afghanistan	Grenada
	Bhutan ^c	Tajikistan	Cook Islands
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
	Czechia ^a	Republic of Moldova	Turkmenistan
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Ecuador	Guatemala	Dominica
	Haiti	Colombia	Indonesia
	Costa Rica	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	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
	Grenada ^a	Antigua and Barbuda	Germany
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
	Germany ^a	Denmark	Czechia
	New Zealand ^c	Turkey	Cameroon

^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.

^c State party that ratified the Convention after the sixth session of the Conference of the States Parties.

Annex III

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

In the first year, a total of 29 reviews will be conducted.

<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 (total: 10)	Sierra Leone	Togo	Luxembourg
	Mozambique	Mauritius	Qatar
	Burkina Faso	Uganda	Lao People's Democratic Republic
	Burundi	Cameroon	Germany
	Nigeria	Côte d'Ivoire	Myanmar
	Cabo Verde	Senegal	Madagascar
	Morocco	Senegal	Finland
	Botswana	Guinea	Sri Lanka
	Senegal ^a	Mali	Kiribati
	Mauritius ^a	Mauritania	Panama
Group of Asia-Pacific States (total: 8)	Malaysia ^a	Timor-Leste	Swaziland
	Marshall Islands	Kazakhstan	Lithuania
	Saudi Arabia	Nauru	Ireland
	Cyprus	Micronesia (Federated States of)	Brazil
	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	State of Palestine	Armenia
	Indonesia ^a	Yemen	Ghana
	Solomon Islands ^a	Viet Nam	Republic of Korea
	Sri Lanka ^a	Palau	Brunei Darussalam
Group of Eastern European States (total: 4)	Belarus	Ukraine	Mozambique
	Albania	Azerbaijan	Liberia
	Republic of Moldova	Russian Federation	State of Palestine
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Trinidad and Tobago
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (total: 5)	Mexico	Guatemala	Sao Tome and Principe
	Honduras	Trinidad and Tobago	Cook Islands
	Grenada	Chile	Nauru
	Bolivia (Plurinational State of) ^a	Dominican Republic	Slovenia
	Panama ^a	Jamaica	United Arab Emirates
Group of Western European and other States (total: 2)	Belgium	Malta	Czechia
	Liechtenstein ^a	Australia	Namibia

^a Volunteered to advance its review from one of the following years of the second cycle.

In the second year, a total of 49 reviews will be conducted.

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>
Group of African States (total: 11)	United Republic of Tanzania Egypt Zimbabwe Cameroon Central African Republic Sudan Swaziland Mauritania Guinea-Bissau Kenya ^a Djibouti ^a
Group of Asia-Pacific States (total: 15)	Nepal Kiribati Lao People's Democratic Republic Oman Bahrain Cook Islands Nauru Tajikistan State of Palestine Afghanistan ^a Thailand ^a Viet Nam ^a Kuwait ^a Myanmar ^a Micronesia (Federated States of) ^a
Group of Eastern European States (total: 6)	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia Azerbaijan Slovenia Lithuania Czechia Russian Federation ^a
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (total: 8)	Peru Dominica Guyana Uruguay Antigua and Barbuda Haiti ^a Trinidad and Tobago ^a Saint Lucia ^a
Group of Western European and other States (total: 9)	France Australia Ireland Greece Italy Portugal ^a United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ^a Germany ^a Malta ^a

^a Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

In the third year, a total of 36 reviews will be conducted.

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>
Group of African States (total: 13)	Uganda
	Algeria
	Mali
	Togo
	Ghana
	Malawi
	Democratic Republic of the Congo
	Libya
	Benin
	Liberia
	Côte d'Ivoire ^a
	Comoros ^a
	South Sudan ^b
Group of Asia-Pacific States (total: 8)	Palau
	Cambodia
	Fiji
	Tuvalu
	Philippines
	Kyrgyzstan
	Maldives
Timor-Leste ^b	
Group of Eastern European States (total: 5)	Croatia
	Armenia
	Poland
	Latvia
	Georgia
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (total: 5)	Argentina
	Cuba
	Bahamas
	Dominican Republic
	Nicaragua
Group of Western European and other States (total: 5)	Finland
	Austria
	Iceland
	United States of America
	Turkey

^a Volunteered to advance its review from one of the following years of the second cycle.

^b Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

In the fourth year, a total of 35 reviews will be conducted.

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>
Group of African States (total: 7)	Sao Tome and Principe
	Ethiopia
	Zambia
	Seychelles
	South Africa
	Congo
	Gabon
Group of Asia-Pacific States (total: 12)	Brunei Darussalam
	United Arab Emirates
	Papua New Guinea
	Yemen
	Vanuatu
	Jordan
	Mongolia
	Iraq
	China
	Turkmenistan ^b
	Pakistan ^a
	Republic of Korea ^b
Group of Eastern European States (total: 5)	Hungary
	Ukraine
	Estonia
	Romania
	Montenegro
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (total: 7)	Jamaica
	Chile
	Brazil
	Guatemala
	Colombia
	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) ^b
	Costa Rica ^a
Group of Western European and other States (total: 4)	Denmark
	Norway
	Netherlands
	Sweden

^a Volunteered to advance its review from one of the following years of the second cycle.

^b Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

In the fifth year, a total of 29 reviews will be conducted.

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>
Group of African States (total: 9)	Niger
	Lesotho
	Angola
	Gambia
	Madagascar
	Namibia
	Tunisia
	Guinea
	Rwanda
Group of Asia-Pacific States (total: 8)	Bangladesh
	Uzbekistan
	Qatar
	India
	Kazakhstan
	Singapore
	Lebanon
Bhutan ^a	
Group of Eastern European States (total: 3)	Slovakia
	Bulgaria
	Serbia
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (total: 3)	Ecuador
	El Salvador
	Paraguay
Group of Western European and other States (total: 6)	New Zealand ^a
	Spain
	Canada
	Switzerland
	Israel
	Luxembourg

^a State party that ratified the Convention after the sixth session of the Conference of the States Parties.