



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

Distr.: General  
12 July 2016

Original: English

**Implementation Review Group**

**Seventh session**

Vienna, 20-24 June 2016

**Report of the Implementation Review Group on its  
seventh session, held in Vienna from 20 to 24 June 2016**

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction . . . . .	3
II. Organization of the session . . . . .	3
A. Opening of the session . . . . .	3
B. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work . . . . .	5
C. Attendance . . . . .	5
III. Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption . . . . .	6
A. Drawing of lots . . . . .	6
B. Progress report . . . . .	7
C. Preparations for the second cycle . . . . .	8
D. Outcome of the reviews . . . . .	12
IV. Performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption . . . . .	15
V. Technical assistance . . . . .	18
VI. Financial and budgetary matters . . . . .	20
VII. Other matters . . . . .	22
VIII. Provisional agenda for the eighth session . . . . .	22
IX. Adoption of the report . . . . .	22



Annexes

I.	Provisional agenda for the eighth session of the Implementation Review Group .....	23
II.	Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: country pairings for the first review cycle .....	24
III.	Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: country pairings for the second review cycle .....	29

## **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 of the United Nations Convention against Corruption held its seventh session in Vienna from 20 to 24 June 2016.

3. The first to the fifth meetings of the Implementation Review Group were chaired by Alexander Konovalov (Russian Federation) and the sixth to the tenth meetings were chaired by Andrés Lamoliatte Vargas (Chile).

4. In his initial statement, the Secretary of the Conference highlighted key issues for consideration by the Group at its seventh session. With regard to the first review cycle, those issues included the substantive outcome of the reviews, the progress made in the completion of first cycle reviews, and the sharing of information on good practices, experiences and relevant measures taken after the completion of the country reviews. Furthermore, the question of how to address issues related to the delay of completion of certain first-cycle reviews was discussed. With regard to the second review cycle, the Secretary drew the Group’s attention to the preliminary outcome of the drawing of lots for the second cycle, the revised self-assessment checklist on the implementation of chapters II (Preventive measures) and V (Asset recovery) of the Convention (which had been made available in all official languages of the United Nations), and the consideration of financial and budgetary matters.

5. With a view to successfully starting the new cycle and meeting the requirements of Conference resolution 6/1, the Secretary underscored the importance of completing the required 36 reviews per year in each of the five years of the cycle, while avoiding an excessive use of deferrals or delays and ensuring the reliable and timely availability of extrabudgetary resources, in particular in view of the fact that certain staffing costs had been included in the extrabudgetary segment of the Implementation Review Mechanism through resolution 6/1. The Secretary also appealed to States parties to make greater efforts to finalize their country reviews in accordance with the established timelines, and highlighted the challenges posed by the funding shortfall for the first two years of the second cycle.

6. Speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, the representative of the Dominican Republic highlighted the efforts made by members of that Group in preventing and fighting corruption. He referred to the importance of creating synergies with other international mechanisms and processes aimed at

preventing and combating corruption. In that regard he welcomed the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which established several targets relevant to the fight against corruption. The speaker further alluded to the political declaration of Quito of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States on the occasion of its fourth summit meeting, which also stressed the importance of fighting corruption. He reiterated the important role of the Mechanism in sharing experiences and good practices relating to the implementation of the Convention and in creating a global community of experts. He noted the importance of following up on the recommendations emanating from the first-cycle reviews. The speaker also referred to the important role of the Mechanism in facilitating international cooperation and fostering mutual trust, and highlighted the lessons learned in the first cycle. In that regard, the speaker welcomed the improvements made to the comprehensive self-assessment checklist in preparation for the second cycle. In addition, the representative underscored the importance of adhering to the guiding principles of the Mechanism and of ensuring the Mechanism's continued operation through stable, predictable funding from the regular budget of the United Nations.

7. The representative of the European Union spoke on behalf of the European Union, its member States and Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, and Ukraine. He reiterated that fighting corruption was a key priority and highlighted the steps taken by the European Union and its member States in preventing and fighting corruption. The speaker also welcomed the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which explicitly mentioned the need to substantially reduce corruption and bribery and strengthen asset recovery, while recognizing the importance of effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels. The speaker highlighted the importance of the review in identifying progress made, good practices and challenges in the implementation of the Convention. He further welcomed the launch of the second cycle and highlighted the need for it to be transparent, inclusive and cost efficient. The speaker commended the efforts made by the secretariat in identifying synergies with other anti-corruption review instruments and mechanisms, and reiterated the need for States parties to make optimal use of all information and expertise available, including from civil society. He also referred to the efforts made by the European Union and its member States to effectively prevent and prosecute all forms of corruption, focusing on money-laundering, tax evasion, issues with the identification of beneficial ownership, and due diligence. The speaker further shared information on technical assistance, financial and other support provided by the European Union to partner States wishing to reform their public administration and build the capacity of civil society, to audit institutions and to parliaments in their oversight and control functions. In addition, the speaker referred to his organization's cooperation with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and its support to the Office regarding the implementation of the Convention. The speaker further welcomed the anti-corruption summit held in London in May 2016, at which the central role of the Convention in fighting corruption was acknowledged and a call was launched for fast-tracking the implementation of the Convention.

## **B. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work**

8. On 20 June 2016, the Implementation Review Group adopted the following agenda as amended:
1. Organizational matters:
    - (a) Opening of the session;
    - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
  2. Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
  3. Performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
  4. Technical assistance.
  5. Financial and budgetary matters.
  6. Other matters.
  7. Provisional agenda for the eighth session of the Implementation Review Group.
  8. Adoption of the report of the Implementation Review Group on its seventh session.

## **C. Attendance**

9. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the meeting of the Implementation Review Group: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, 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, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and Zambia.

10. The European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, was represented at the meeting.

11. 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 were entitled to participate in the Implementation Review Group.

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

13. The Holy See was represented by an observer.

14. 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, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system may be invited to participate in the sessions of the Implementation Review Group.

15. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers: Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization, Commonwealth Secretariat, Council of Europe, Economic Community of West African States, European Public Law Organization, International Anti-Corruption Academy, International Criminal Police Organization, International Organization for Migration, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Regional Anti-Corruption Initiative secretariat, Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies.

16. 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, United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, College for Criminal Law Science of Beijing Normal University, Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, and World Bank.

17. 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**

18. In its resolution 6/1 the Conference requested the Group to proceed, at the beginning of its seventh session, to the selection of reviewed and reviewing States parties for the second review cycle by the drawing of lots in accordance with paragraphs 14 and 19 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism, and to hold intersessional meetings open to all States parties, for the purpose of the drawing of

lots in accordance with paragraph 19 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism and without prejudice to the right of a State party to request that the drawing of lots be repeated at the Group's subsequent intersessional meeting or regular session.

19. The Chair informed the Group that, in accordance with Conference resolution 6/1, the Bureau had endorsed the secretariat's suggestion to draw lots at an intersessional meeting open to all States parties on Friday, 17 June 2016. Some States requested redraws, which were carried out during the seventh session of the Group.

20. With regard to the first cycle of the Mechanism, lots were drawn to select the reviewing States parties for New Zealand, which had ratified the United Nations Convention against Corruption after the sixth session of the Conference. Turkey and Cameroon were drawn as reviewing States for New Zealand. Following requests for redraws, Cameroon and Iceland were drawn as reviewers for South Sudan, and Afghanistan was drawn as regional reviewer for Tuvalu (see annex II).

21. With regard to the second cycle of the Mechanism, lots were drawn for the selection of States parties to be reviewed in each of the five years of the second review cycle (see annex III). In accordance with paragraph 6 of Conference resolution 6/1, one fifth of the States parties was to be reviewed in each of the five years of the second review cycle. The number of States parties from each regional group to be reviewed in each year was proportionate to the size of that regional group and the number of its members that were parties to the Convention.

22. In accordance with paragraph 14 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism, any State party selected for review in a given year may, with a reasonable justification, defer participation to the following year of the review cycle. When a selected State party exercised its right to defer, other States parties selected to be reviewed in the following years of the second review cycle were invited to indicate whether they wished to take the place of the deferring State party. The Group was of the understanding that if no State party volunteered to advance its review, the review of the deferring State party would be added to the reviews already scheduled for the following year.

23. The selection of the reviewing States parties was carried out pursuant to paragraphs 19 and 20 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism. Lots were drawn to select the reviewing States parties for the first year of the second review cycle. For each State party selected to be reviewed, one of the two reviewing States was selected from the same regional group and the second reviewing State was selected from a pool of all States parties.

## **B. Progress report**

24. The secretariat provided an oral update on the progress made in the country reviews of the first cycle. It highlighted that, at the time of reporting, responses to the self-assessment checklist had been provided by 166 States parties under review, 155 direct dialogues had taken place, and 136 executive summaries had been finalized. A further 13 executive summaries were close to being concluded. This showed that substantial progress had been achieved with regard to the first review cycle. However, some reviews were suffering delays and were hindering the

completion of the first cycle. With regard to those delays, the secretariat informed the Group that, in the majority of cases, the initial time frame during which feedback is requested from focal points and governmental experts was not being respected. Nonetheless that time frame had been set taking into account the workload of focal points and experts, as well as the amount of time required to carry out each step of the review.

### **C. Preparations for the second cycle**

25. Speakers shared the experiences of their countries with the first cycle of the Mechanism. Several speakers expressed their continued commitment to the Mechanism and noted the importance of implementing the recommendations emanating from the review process. Speakers noted that the first cycle had proved valuable in identifying weaknesses and strengths in anti-corruption systems, leading to national reforms, creating direct dialogue, allowing for information-sharing and strengthening international cooperation. Several speakers highlighted the usefulness of making the full country reports publicly available.

26. Speakers welcomed the launch of the second cycle of the Mechanism and stressed the importance of the Convention's chapters on preventive measures and asset recovery. In that context, several speakers acknowledged the secretariat's preparatory work for the second cycle, including the revision of the self-assessment checklist.

27. Several speakers emphasized that the second cycle should incorporate the lessons learned from the first cycle in order to increase its effectiveness and efficiency. It was highlighted that the second cycle should follow the guiding principles of the Mechanism set out in its terms of reference, and as such should be carried out on the basis of transparency, efficiency, non-intrusiveness, inclusivity, impartiality, equality and objectivity, and should not produce any form of ranking. Some speakers also emphasized the intergovernmental nature of the Mechanism as one of its fundamental principles. In addition, it was noted that the second cycle of the Mechanism should be funded through regular budget resources.

28. With a view to informing the Group of the preparations undertaken for the second review cycle, the secretariat presented the revised self-assessment checklist on the implementation of chapters II and V of the Convention. Pursuant to Conference resolution 6/1, the secretariat had continued to improve the checklist in consultation with States parties.

29. In order to facilitate deliberations on the matter, a discussion panel had brought together panellists from States parties that had already completed or were nearing the completion of their responses to the self-assessment checklist for the review of implementation of chapters II and V of the Convention.

30. A panellist from Sierra Leone informed the Group that Sierra Leone had established a task force for the completion of the self-assessment checklist under the country's Anti-Corruption Commission. The task force had held an initial workshop about the Review Mechanism for a number of governmental authorities and non-State actors, in particular the self-assessment checklist. As stakeholders, those bodies had subsequently collected the information required for completing the



self-assessment checklist and transmitted it to the task force through a focal point. The task force then used that information to fill out the self-assessment checklist. The panellist confirmed the usefulness of the guidance notes prepared by the secretariat in completing the self-assessment checklist. The panellist further reported that gathering information for the purposes of completing the self-assessment checklist for chapter II had been particularly challenging, since it had required collecting information about a wide range of policies and regulations that often were only available at the level of the relevant agency or ministry.

31. A panellist from Mauritius highlighted how the lessons learned from the first cycle had been used to ensure the swift completion of the self-assessment checklist for the second review cycle. In accordance with those lessons, a dedicated team was established to complete the checklist. The team liaised with all relevant stakeholders. The panellist noted that the revised checklist had proved to be much more user-friendly than the previous version. He explained that, owing to the wide range of measures covered by chapter II of the Convention, innovative approaches had been used to gather information on the implementation of chapter II and, at the same time, raise awareness of the review process, such as by holding a model conference of the States parties to the Convention in Mauritius and holding a video clip competition to raise awareness of corruption.

32. Panellists from El Salvador shared information on a project supported by UNODC aimed at assisting El Salvador in addressing the recommendations emanating from the first cycle and preparing the country for the review of chapters II and V of the Convention. The panellists explained that, under the project, governmental institutions and representatives of both civil society and the private sector held several workshops on completing the self-assessment checklist for the second cycle. Based on the experiences with the self-assessment checklist for the first cycle, the panellists underlined the importance of completing the self-assessment checklist early and involving a broad range of stakeholders in the discussions. The panellists highlighted that this approach allowed for better understanding of the state of implementation of the Convention in El Salvador and for developing more effective anti-corruption strategies.

33. Many speakers welcomed the improvements made to the self-assessment checklist, highlighting its consistency with the methodology and comprehensiveness of the self-assessment checklist used during the first cycle of the Mechanism.

34. The Group endorsed the revised self-assessment checklist on the implementation of chapters II and V of the Convention (CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/4).

35. Several speakers expressed their view that while presentations on the experiences of individual countries were valuable, the main purpose of the Group's deliberations was to discuss substantive issues such as the outcomes of the first cycle of the Mechanism, the progress made in the preparation for the second cycle and the multi-year workplan.

36. The secretariat acknowledged the support expressed by delegations for its work in facilitating the country review process and the suggestions made by them to continue improving the efficiency of country reviews and the work of the Group. Several speakers noted the important function of the Group in serving as a platform for States parties to share their experiences, good practices and lessons learned in the conduct of the reviews, and in enhancing cooperation and mutual trust. Speakers

also noted the need to give the secretariat continued political and financial support so that it can carry out its functions. Given the technical nature of the chapters under review in the second cycle, several speakers raised the need for further training of governmental experts in preparation for the reviews. The secretariat indicated that such training could be organized consecutively to the working group meetings, or at the regional, subregional or national level.

37. Regarding the structure of the Group's deliberations, several options were noted, namely: (a) a focus on substantive issues, such as nuances in the interpretation and application of the provisions of the Convention, as had been discussed in previous sessions of the Conference; (b) a substantive dialogue on measures taken by States parties to address the challenges encountered during the reviews; and (c) a discussion on measures taken by States parties to address the outcomes, observations and recommendations emanating from the completed reviews, such as implementation action plans and other domestic reforms. Option (c) was considered useful as a way to enhance the value of the Group as a forum for the exchange of information and experiences among States and to prepare the ground for the discussion on the follow-up to the country reviews.

38. With regard to considering a multi-year workplan for the Group in accordance with Conference resolution 6/1, some speakers indicated that the purpose of such a workplan should be to attract more technical experts to the meetings of the Implementation Review Group. That could be achieved by holding meetings back-to-back with thematically related meetings of other subsidiary bodies of the Conference.

39. The secretariat presented a proposal for a multi-year workplan that took into account those considerations (see CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/CRP.2). According to that proposal, the Group would, at its resumed seventh session, in 2016, focus on the performance of the Mechanism during its first cycle. In 2017, at its eighth session, the Group would focus on the review of implementation of chapter III of the Convention, while at its resumed eighth session the Group would consider the performance of the Mechanism during its first and second cycles. In 2018, at its ninth session, the Group would discuss issues related to the review of chapter V of the Convention. That session could also be held back-to-back with a meeting of the Working Group on Asset Recovery. At its resumed ninth session the Group would focus on the review of implementation of chapter IV of the Convention. That session could be held back-to-back with a meeting of the open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the Convention. In 2019, the tenth session of the Group, which could be held back-to-back with a meeting of the Working Group on Prevention, would focus on the review of chapter II of the Convention. The resumed tenth session would examine the performance of the Mechanism in its second cycle.

40. One speaker provided a concrete proposal to structure the workplan in such a way as to increase synergies and hold meetings back-to-back while avoiding any changes to the agenda or format of the subsidiary bodies and their respective meeting entitlements. The speaker stressed that the Group's analytical work became more important as the amount of information received through the Mechanism increased. Accordingly, it was necessary to attract the most competent governmental experts to the Group's sessions. The speaker made several concrete proposals to achieve this, such as: holding the resumed seventh session of the

Group back-to-back with the fifth session of the open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the Convention in November 2016; holding the ninth session of the Group back-to-back with the ninth session of the Working Group on Prevention in June 2018; holding the first resumed ninth session of the Group back-to-back with the twelfth session of the Working Group on Asset Recovery in August 2018; and holding the second resumed ninth session of the Group back-to-back with the seventh session of the open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting in November 2018. The speaker made a conference room paper available detailing those proposals (CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/CRP.17).

41. Another speaker introduced a proposal for a multi-year workplan modelled after the proposal of the secretariat (see CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/CRP.18). Its main purpose was to reflect progress made in specific thematic areas at each of the Group's sessions by drawing on the lessons from previous sessions of the Group. Under the proposal, the resumed seventh session would be focused on an initial discussion of the outcome document of the first review cycle with a view to proposing a summary of good practices and lessons learned from the first cycle for consideration by the Conference. At its eighth session the Group would focus on an advanced discussion of the outcome document of the review of chapter III, for consideration and endorsement by the Conference. In 2018, at its resumed ninth session, the Group would focus on an advanced discussion of the outcome document for the reviews of chapter IV. It was suggested that the thematic reports could serve as a basis for the expert discussions in the Group. Time would be reserved during the ninth and tenth sessions for sharing experiences and good practices in preparing the replies to the self-assessment checklist used in the first and second review cycles. Finally, for the resumed sessions of the Group the proposal provided for sharing experiences, good practices and relevant measures taken by States parties after the completion of the country reviews based on voluntary reports by States parties under review. Those activities could be held within a determined time period following the completion of the reviews, and a separate agenda item in the resumed session could be dedicated to the sharing by States parties of those experiences.

42. One speaker welcomed the three proposals concerning the multi-year workplan and emphasized that careful consideration should be given to each one. However, the speaker highlighted that when discussing the workplan, the Group should not lose sight of the existing mandates and entitlements of the other subsidiary bodies of the Conference. The speaker also stressed that as the first cycle was still ongoing, the Group should continue paying sufficient attention to procedural matters. The same speaker also underscored that the sharing of information on measures taken by States parties to address the outcomes of the country reviews should remain voluntary.

43. One speaker presented the Group with an overview of the outcome of the informal consultations on the three proposals concerning the multi-year workplan. It was noted that the informal consultations had served to explore options and to exchange views, but that no consensus had been reached yet. He noted that there had been questions regarding the availability of regular and extrabudgetary resources and the balance between the thematic areas to be discussed in the sessions of the Group. There was a clear sense that the workplan should be of a technical

nature and that, in accordance with resolution 6/1, the work of the Group should be coordinated with the meetings of the other working groups of the Conference with a view to facilitating the attendance of experts and allowing the Group to determine the focus of its work efficiently. Further consultations were needed; accordingly, the Group would take up the matter of adopting the workplan again at its resumed seventh session.

#### **D. Outcome of the reviews**

44. In his opening statement, the Minister of Justice and Law of Bangladesh, Anisul Huq, reaffirmed his country's commitment to the fight against corruption and to cooperating with other States parties in the full implementation of the Convention. He noted that his country had taken various legislative and institutional measures as part of its anti-corruption reform, such as laws on access to information and whistle-blower protection, and amendments to its anti-corruption and criminal laws. He also reported on the positive impact the country's participation in the Review Mechanism had had, both as a State party under review and as a reviewing State party, in that it had advanced domestic reforms in corruption prevention and asset recovery.

45. The Minister for Institutional Transparency and the Fight against Corruption of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Lenny Valdivia Bautista, expressed satisfaction with the results achieved and the commitment demonstrated by States parties in the first cycle of the Mechanism, in particular in strengthening measures to effectively fight corruption and furthering international cooperation and asset recovery. The Mechanism had produced a valuable body of information on policies, good practices, experiences and challenges related to the prevention of and fight against corruption, and the executive summaries and country review reports had served as useful tools to other States parties. Noting her country's participation in the pilot programme of the Mechanism, as both a State party under review and a reviewing State party, she reported on domestic reforms in the criminalization of corruption and in international cooperation. The reforms included the creation of transparency units in public bodies, enhanced inter-agency cooperation, the promulgation of new offences and laws against corruption, and taking a risk-based approach to the prevention and fight against corruption.

46. The secretariat presented an overview of the key thematic findings concerning the implementation of chapters III and IV of the Convention based on the 123 completed country reviews covered in its regional implementation report (CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/5) and its thematic reports (CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/6 to 8). The overall trends and findings had remained largely consistent with those identified in previous reports presented to the Conference and the Group.

47. Concerning the implementation of chapter III of the Convention, challenges continued to relate most often to the prosecution, adjudication and sanctioning of corruption-related offences (article 30 of the Convention), the freezing, seizure and confiscation of assets (article 31) and the bribery of national public officials (article 15). Challenges were also identified regarding the bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations (article 16), the protection of witnesses, experts and victims (article 32) and specialized authorities

(article 36). These issues were also highlighted in resolution 5/2, on strengthening the implementation of the criminalization provisions of the Convention, in particular with regard to solicitation.

48. It was noted that the reviews had identified several key issues that reflected a certain diversity in interpretation of provisions of the Convention and consequently had led to disparate recommendations being issued. Those differences were observed most notably in the areas of immunities for persons who self-reported the commission of offences (sometimes termed “effective regret” or “spontaneous confession” provisions) and in the assessment of the effectiveness of sanctions for corruption offences. The secretariat noted that those issues could benefit from further analysis, as the Conference and the Group considered how to ensure consistency of reviews, in particular in the second review cycle.

49. Speakers appreciated the continuously improving quality of the thematic and regional reports and their practical importance to the Group’s analytical work regarding, in particular, substantive issues, good practices and challenges in implementation at the global and regional levels. It was noted that the reports provided crucial information that assisted States parties in their efforts to implement the Convention. It was also noted that the reports had been adapted to reflect the suggestions and recommendations of the Group. Speakers also noted the usefulness of the reports in that they informed the design and delivery of technical assistance.

50. With respect to chapter III of the Convention, the Group discussed issues that had been identified in the thematic and country review reports. Several speakers emphasized the need to train judges, prosecutors and investigators in handling corruption cases, in particular in the areas of financial investigations, confiscation and asset recovery.

51. Regarding measures to enhance criminal justice under chapter III, it was noted that the issue of sanctions for corruption offences should be further examined to ensure the consistency and coherence of sanctions and the reintegration of convicts.

52. Several speakers stated that broad recommendations to reassess the category of persons who enjoy immunities and jurisdictional privileges should be considered in the light of the national context and constitutional frameworks of each country. An alternative to lifting immunities entirely would be to adopt procedures for lifting immunities in appropriate cases, for example through parliamentary procedures, or to exempt corruption offences. The need was observed to ensure that pretrial investigative measures could be carried out in relevant cases. In that context it was necessary to differentiate between investigatory measures aimed at persons (such as arrest, search and pretrial detention) and investigative steps that could alert persons to the investigation.

53. Regarding article 31 of the Convention, several speakers emphasized the need to adopt appropriate measures to strengthen the management and disposal of frozen, seized and confiscated assets, for example through the establishment of dedicated asset management capacities.

54. Regarding the provisions on the detection of corruption and on enforcement, recommendations to improve inter-institutional coordination with a view to clarifying roles and responsibilities were considered useful. On the other hand, one speaker expressed caution regarding recommendations to overhaul

anti-corruption bodies. While these were appropriate for some States parties, the same objective could be achieved through recommendations to enhance the mandate or efficiency of existing institutions. Recommendations to adopt or strengthen laws and systems for the protection of witnesses, experts and whistle-blowers were also considered useful.

55. With respect to recommendations to States parties to consider criminalizing private-sector bribery it was noted that alternative approaches existed, namely to include corporate officials of publicly listed companies in the definition of public officer, or to establish a relevant fraud offence.

56. Challenges with regard to chapter IV of the Convention related most often to the strict application of the dual criminality requirement, in particular to requests for extradition, the use of the Convention as a legal basis for international cooperation by a limited number of States parties, gaps in domestic legal frameworks on international cooperation, a lack of statistical information on the receipt and processing of requests for international cooperation, a lack of effective case management systems in many States parties, and the limited capacity and resources available to central authorities. It was observed that the Mechanism resulted in an unprecedented amount of information on the implementation of the Convention, which gave States parties the unique opportunity to identify the areas where further efforts were needed to effectively implement the Convention. In that regard it was noted that States parties could consider making better use of the relevant subsidiary bodies of the Conference to find new and innovative ways to overcome some of the challenges identified.

57. A number of delegates highlighted their States' commitment to enhancing international cooperation under the Convention and to implementing the requirements of chapter IV. They also reported on the progress in the implementation of relevant recommendations emanating from the review process. Delegates further outlined the importance of capacity-building in the area of international cooperation and asset recovery.

58. Some speakers called on all States parties to explore making direct use of the provisions of chapter IV as a basis for international cooperation. Speakers noted that differences in legal systems should not create obstacles to international cooperation. In that regard, a number of delegates suggested more in-depth discussions on matters of international cooperation, in particular on enhancing the use of the Convention as a basis for international cooperation while maintaining the balance with fundamental principles of domestic law, and on sharing good practices to overcome obstacles to international cooperation (such as dual criminality).

59. One delegate stressed that it was important that States notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations as to whether they will take the Convention as the legal basis for extradition in accordance with paragraph 6 (a) of article 44. Another delegate noted the possibility of using diplomatic channels for international cooperation. One speaker noted that it might be more feasible for some States to use special investigative techniques based on informal international arrangements. He also referred to limitations in domestic legal frameworks that could prevent the establishment of deadlines in proceedings relevant to international cooperation and suggested that written status updates could be useful.

60. Regarding recommendations to address the lack of case management, tracking systems and statistics on international cooperation, it was noted that similar results could be achieved by alternative means and that some States parties were able to respond effectively to international cooperation requests in the absence of such systems.

61. 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* (see CAC/COSP/2015/5), which had been presented to the Conference at its fifth session and was available to delegates in all official languages of the United Nations.

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

62. The Conference, in its decision 5/1, determined that the Implementation Review Group should begin promptly to collect, with the support of the secretariat, and discuss relevant information to facilitate the assessment of performance of the Mechanism in accordance with paragraph 48 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism, following the completion of the first review cycle. It further decided that the Group should include in its future sessions an agenda item allowing for the discussion of such information. Furthermore, in its resolution 6/1, the Conference encouraged States parties to continue to voluntarily share information on good practices, experiences and relevant measures taken after the completion of the country review reports.

63. In order to facilitate the discussion the secretariat presented an oral update that built on its assessment of the Mechanism's performance presented at the sixth Conference of the States Parties (see CAC/COSP/2015/6) and on submissions by States, provided in response to the secretariat's calls for information, on steps taken to address the outcomes of their country reviews.

64. The secretariat noted that the information gathered could be grouped under six key points exemplifying the Mechanism's impact. First, the Mechanism had served as a catalyst for both legislative and institutional reform at the national level. Second, the reviews and their outcomes had helped to enhance domestic coordination efforts among national institutions. Third, the implementation reviews in general and the country visits in particular had increased the engagement with external stakeholders, such as civil society, academia and the private sector. Fourth, the outcome of the reviews provided an opportunity for donors to align their programmes with domestic priorities, commitments and obligations in the fight against corruption. Fifth, the Mechanism could foster coordination between the States reviewed and donors as well as coordination among donors themselves, for example through donor briefings subsequent to the country visit. Sixth, in the outcomes of the reviews implementation gaps were identified in a technically sound and authoritative manner.

65. Echoing the information provided by States in their written submissions, many speakers reiterated their countries' commitment to the Mechanism as a tool for the

identification of gaps in the implementation of the Convention, and noted the concrete success achieved by the Mechanism to date. Many speakers highlighted how the Mechanism and the recommendations emanating from their country reviews had stimulated anti-corruption reforms and the specific steps taken by their countries in response to these recommendations.

66. In particular, many speakers informed the Group about amendments to national legislation and institutional reforms undertaken in order to implement the recommendations. Furthermore, several speakers indicated that anti-corruption strategies and action plans had been formulated based on the outcome of the reviews in order to ensure the full implementation of the recommendations. One State party noted that an action plan had been adopted even before the review had been finalized. Several speakers also noted that awareness-raising campaigns and training courses on the prevention of and fight against corruption had been conducted. One speaker informed the Group that a public procurement portal had been created in accordance with a recommendation made during the review. Another speaker informed the Group that, upon the completion of both the executive summary and the full country report, press releases had been issued.

67. Several speakers underscored that the mutual trust that had been created through the Mechanism played a central role, and indicated that that trust had greatly bolstered international cooperation efforts. Some speakers referred to their efforts to conclude bilateral and multilateral treaties to further international cooperation for the purposes of the Convention, and encouraged States parties to treat the Convention as the legal basis for extradition or to conclude treaties on extradition with other States parties so as to implement the Convention.

68. Several speakers noted that reviews had also identified the need to establish and enhance specialized capacities within existing national structures. In that respect it was deemed of great importance to have specialized prosecutors and give judges specialized training. Speakers exemplified how recommendations to that effect had been addressed through, for example the establishment of a special anti-corruption court or a specialized economic and other specialized institutional structures mandated to investigate and prosecute corruption offences. Other speakers noted how their national financial intelligence units had been strengthened and restructured following legislative amendments in order to allow for an enhanced national and international role in the fight against corruption and money-laundering.

69. Several speakers noted that the immunity that members of parliament enjoyed was often enshrined in a State's constitution and that it would be challenging to implement recommendations in that area. One speaker suggested that the issue might be addressed by exempting corruption offences from the scope of parliamentary immunity. A few speakers mentioned how their governments' enhanced commitment to fighting corruption following the review process had led to the resolution of high-profile cases, including cases that involved politicians and parliamentarians, and to the removal of certain public officials who had held their office for a long time.

70. Several speakers noted their efforts to establish and strengthen witness protection measures in response to the outcome of the implementation reviews. Such measures were frequently mentioned in connection with legislative efforts to



protect whistle-blowers or reporting persons. In one case that included the establishment of a dedicated hotline and physical protection measures.

71. Bribery in the private sector and bribery of foreign officials and of officials of international organizations were mentioned by a number of speakers as areas where new legislation had been adopted to implement the recommendations.

72. Several speakers mentioned the need for better coordination among national anti-corruption and law enforcement bodies and referred to the recommendations made on this point. One speaker reported that a new scheme would be introduced to clarify the roles and responsibilities of various institutions and increase their cooperation in the fight against corruption. The inclusion of non-State actors in those national coordination efforts was noted by several speakers as a direct result of the Review Mechanism. Such efforts had included the participation of non-State actors in the monitoring structure of the national anti-corruption authority and their inclusion in a national consultative working group.

73. Many speakers also highlighted how support in addressing recommendations from the reviews had required various forms of technical assistance. Speakers emphasized the need to ensure that such assistance, including that provided through UNODC, was made available in a timely manner. Several speakers made reference to paragraphs 40 and 41 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism and discussed how follow-up would be given to the reviews. The follow-up would include written reports to the secretariat on the implementation of the recommendations emanating from the first cycle. Other speakers made it clear that, under paragraph 40 of the terms of reference, the follow-up would not be considered until the first phase was completed, i.e. after the two cycles had been completed. The secretariat stated its view that both approaches were correct. The discussion on follow-up procedures had already begun and would allow for a vision to crystallize regarding how the Group wished to address them in preparation for the second phase of the Mechanism, on the understanding that decisions might be taken by the Conference after the conclusion of the second cycle. Some speakers emphasized that follow-up procedures should be conducted in accordance with the terms of reference in their entirety. Several speakers emphasized that the terms of reference of the Mechanism, and in particular its intergovernmental nature, should be observed and respected throughout the process.

74. Several speakers underlined the importance of respecting multilingualism.

75. Furthermore, building on resolution 6/1, the secretariat briefed the Group on its initiative to enhance synergies with the secretariats of other anti-corruption review mechanisms, such as 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, the Working Group on Bribery of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the secretariat of the OECD Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia. To enhance the synergies with those secretariats, a workshop would be held in September 2016 to advance the sharing of experiences and engage in a peer-learning exercise. The secretariat also intended to enhance its participation in the relevant meetings of the Group of States against Corruption and the Working Group on Bribery, resources permitting.

76. In the ensuing discussion, all speakers welcomed the initiative and requested the secretariat to keep them informed about the outcome of the workshop. Many speakers expressed the hope that the exercise would lead to greater synergies, would prevent duplication of efforts and would further increase the quality of the review reports. While some speakers suggested that States parties could be invited as observers, one speaker thought that, at the present stage, doing so would not be useful. The delegate of the European Union pointed out that once every two years the European Commission issued an anti-corruption report that could contribute valuable information. A speaker suggested to include the African Union Advisory Board on Corruption in the workshops. Several speakers stressed that their countries were subject to three or more review mechanisms in the fields of anti-corruption and anti-money-laundering. They expressed the hope that the burden those mechanisms created for their practitioners could be eased, for example by organizing joint country visits. On this point, one speaker reported that his country had hosted such a joint visit by the secretariats of OECD and the team reviewing the implementation of the Convention, and he pointed out the advantages. Another speaker suggested that the workshop could become an annual meeting.

77. In reply to some of the remarks, the secretariat underlined that the workshop had been conceived as a peer learning exercise. That arrangement would make the participation of States impractical, in part because of the number of countries involved in the various review mechanisms. Moreover, in view of the financial constraints of UNODC, organizing the workshop would not have been possible without the generous offer made by OECD to host the event.

## **V. Technical assistance**

78. The secretariat provided a general overview of how the Mechanism had impacted the provision of technical assistance by defining needs and creating new opportunities for technical cooperation. The continued importance of the provision of technical assistance to support the efforts of States parties to implement the recommendations of the reviews was stressed.

79. The secretariat provided an oral update on the technical assistance needs identified in the country reviews that had been finalized since the resumed sixth session of the Group. Technical assistance needs had been identified in 18 of the 22 recently completed executive summaries. They had been categorized by article of the Convention, the type of technical assistance required and geographic area.

80. It was underlined that the number of instances where technical assistance needs had been identified was growing. The recently completed reviews had identified an additional 651 such instances, bringing the total number for the first cycle of the Mechanism to 2,819.

81. The secretariat noted a continuing need for resources to meet this rising demand for technical assistance globally and to address the growing technical assistance gap. It was emphasized that by identifying cross-cutting needs at the regional and global levels, the Mechanism provided an opportunity to address technical assistance needs in an effective and cost-efficient manner.

82. The secretariat also provided an overview of the technical assistance provided by UNODC at the global, regional and national levels. The role of UNODC was underlined as both a provider of technical assistance needed to address the outcome of the review process and a facilitator helping to match the needs identified in the reviews with technical assistance providers other than UNODC.

83. Speakers highlighted the importance of the Convention as the basis for anti-corruption efforts and noted that technical assistance was a vital component of the Convention and the Review Mechanism. Several speakers underlined their preparations for the second review cycle. They requested training to prepare them for their participation in the upcoming reviews and technical assistance in relation to prevention and asset recovery. One speaker stated that it would be beneficial for States parties under review and reviewing States parties if UNODC could provide specific technical assistance to help governmental experts to familiarize themselves with the self-assessment checklist.

84. Speakers confirmed the need for country-led and country-based technical assistance to address the outcomes of the review process. They further expressed the hope that sufficient resources would be made available to the secretariat to bridge the technical assistance gap.

85. Speakers recognized the importance of individual country review reports to develop prioritized and strategic national reform processes. Some speakers suggested adopting detailed implementation plans that would serve as a reference point to technical assistance providers and would help coordinate efforts, promote synergies and avoid overlap and duplication.

86. Speakers gave examples of their countries' reform efforts in response to the recommendations from the completed reviews. Those included the development of anti-corruption strategies, the adoption of new legislation or amendments to existing legislation, the establishment of new institutions and the strengthening of the capacity of anti-corruption practitioners. A number of speakers expressed their appreciation for the efforts of UNODC and other technical assistance providers to support States parties in addressing the recommendations emanating from the reviews and highlighted the importance of addressing remaining technical assistance needs.

87. Many speakers welcomed the technical assistance received or facilitated by bilateral donors and multilateral organizations such as the Commonwealth Secretariat, the International Anti-Corruption Academy, the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank, as well as that received through the joint UNODC/World Bank Stolen Asset Recovery (StAR) Initiative.

88. Several speakers reported the positive experiences they had had in providing bilateral technical assistance relating to anti-corruption and broader good governance reform, and stressed the importance of the emerging knowledge base on the Convention. Examples of development assistance programming to address needs emanating from the review process were provided. One speaker reiterated that full reports were useful in identifying technical assistance needs and encouraged States parties to make their completed self-assessment checklists and full reports public.

89. Some speakers highlighted that the provision of technical assistance at the regional and subregional levels either through regional organizations or in

cooperation with them had been very good for peer learning and South-South cooperation, given the similarities in countries' traditions, legal systems, institutional design and in the challenges they faced.

90. Speakers underlined the importance of involving civil society organizations and the private sector as partners in identifying and addressing technical assistance needs formulated by States parties.

91. Several speakers pointed out that, while short-term training events were useful, longer-term support modalities such as regional advisers, resident mentors and regional train-the-trainer programmes should also be explored to improve the sustainability of reform efforts.

## **VI. Financial and budgetary matters**

92. The secretariat submitted information on the expenditures incurred to date for the operation of the first and second cycles of the Review Mechanism as at 31 March 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 cost-saving measures it had put in place.

93. The secretariat drew attention to the funding gap between the voluntary contributions received and the resource requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism to be covered by voluntary contributions. The secretariat informed the Group that, whereas voluntary contributions covered the expenditures incurred and those anticipated for the first cycle of the Review Mechanism on the assumption that the first cycle would be completed by 30 June 2017, there was a significant funding gap of 4.28 million United States dollars in relation to the operation of the first two years of the second cycle. The secretariat concluded that that situation endangered the effective operation of the second cycle during its first two years.

94. The secretariat expressed its appreciation for the voluntary contributions and the pledges made by States to support the Mechanism.

95. Speakers expressed their full satisfaction with the transparency of the financial reporting on the expenditures and funding requirements of the Mechanism and with the clarity of the document before them. They requested that such detailed financial reporting be continued. Many speakers voiced concern about the funding shortfall with regard to the operation of the second cycle and proposed measures to increase cost efficiency and generate cost savings, including through further streamlining of work processes. With a view to reducing costs, several countries more specifically proposed to suggest an indicative limit to the length of both the responses to the self-assessment checklist and the country review reports. Some countries proposed that States refrain from transmitting entire legal codes. One speaker welcomed such measures as they would also reduce the workload of States parties under review, of reviewing States parties and of the secretariat. Nonetheless, according to the speaker such measures, while necessary, would only result in minor cost savings. Several other speakers proposed to generate cost savings by distributing executive summaries electronically, limiting printing to one copy per delegation and ceasing

the reprinting of previously issued documents. However, one speaker specifically requested that executive summaries be made available also in printed form if requested by a State party. Several countries proposed to make a more efficient use of the sessions of the Group by including more focused discussion items in the agenda that would facilitate more analytical and substantive discussions. Some countries invited the secretariat to put forward proposals to increase cost efficiency and realize further savings. One speaker expressed concern about the increased costs for the second cycle.

96. Speakers concurred in underscoring the importance of the Mechanism and their countries' unwavering support for it. They underlined that cost efficiencies should not impact negatively the thoroughness and quality of the reviews of the second cycle. Some speakers stressed the importance of upholding the multilingual nature of the Mechanism. Some speakers cautioned against cost-saving measures that would reduce the quality of the country reviews. Some speakers stated that financial decisions would have to be taken by the Conference of the States Parties, whereas some others stated that such measures could be agreed upon on an ad hoc, voluntary basis by concerned States.

97. A number of speakers expressed the view that the staff supporting the Mechanism should be funded from the regular budget of the United Nations in line with the terms of reference of the Mechanism. Some speakers voiced their continued support to the current mixed funding model, with parts of operation of the Mechanism funded from the regular budget of the United Nations and other parts from voluntary contributions, in line with resolutions 3/1 and 6/1 of the Conference and with the terms of reference of the Mechanism. Some speakers questioned whether funding the three additional posts to support the second cycle of the Mechanism through voluntary contributions was in line with the terms of reference of the Mechanism. Some speakers stated that cost-saving measures might not solve the problem and pointed to the lack of voluntary contributions as the major issue of concern, while calling upon States to provide sufficient voluntary contributions in support of the Mechanism.

98. The secretariat clarified that the resources required that were to be covered by voluntary contributions related to travel by participants for country visits and joint meetings, the translation of working documentation during country reviews, the participation of least developed countries in the sessions of the Group and the Conference of the States Parties, the training of governmental experts, and the three additional posts in support of operating the second cycle of the Mechanism. The secretariat added that reducing the meeting entitlements covered by the regular budget under section 2 would not have an impact on these cost items. The secretariat recalled the detailed documentation, including a workload analysis, provided to States parties in preparation for the sixth session of the Conference of the States Parties and emphasized that the Secretariat's staff had already taken on an extremely heavy workload that could not be further increased. While welcoming voluntary arrangements by countries to limit the amount of working documentation and thus reduce the need for translation, the secretariat stressed that it was not clear at the present stage whether such action might jeopardize the nature of the Mechanism or the quality and depth of reviews and thus create a risk of the Mechanism producing superficial results.

99. One speaker proposed to request the Bureau of the Conference to the Convention to raise awareness among States parties of the current funding situation with a view to mobilizing appropriate resources to finance the second review cycle.

## **VII. Other matters**

100. A summary of the briefing for non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in accordance with resolution 4/6 of the Conference was made available to the Group (see CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/CRP.4).

101. Speakers expressed their satisfaction with the high quality of the panel presentations and discussions at the NGO briefing. While affirming the contribution of civil society to anti-corruption efforts, some speakers recalled Conference resolution 4/6 and emphasized the need to fully conform with its provisions. They suggested that, in the future, thought be given to the organization and timing of the briefings. In their view several options could be explored, such as holding the briefings in parallel to the Group's sessions, holding them before or after the sessions, or shortening the briefings. This would lead to efficiency gains for both States parties and the secretariat. Other speakers did not believe that such options should be explored. One speaker suggested scheduling NGO briefings earlier in the Group's sessions. The secretariat clarified that the session of the Group had not been suspended for the briefing. In fact, the day in question had provided an opportunity to States parties to hold informal consultations and bilateral and trilateral meetings to organize country reviews.

## **VIII. Provisional agenda for the eighth session**

102. At its 10th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Implementation Review Group adopted the provisional agenda for the eighth session of the Implementation Review Group (CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/L.2). One speaker proposed to include a specific reference to the review of the implementation of chapters III and IV of the Convention in order to allow the Group to focus on the main outcomes of the first review cycle. The secretariat clarified that such a reference could be included in the annotated agenda.

## **IX. Adoption of the report**

103. On 24 June 2016, the Implementation Review Group adopted the report on its seventh session (CAC/COSP/IRG/2016/L.1 and Add. 1-5).

---

## Annex I

### **Provisional agenda for the eighth session of the Implementation Review Group**

1. Organizational matters:
  - (a) Opening of the session;
  - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
2. Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
3. Performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
4. Technical assistance.
5. Financial and budgetary matters.
6. Other matters.
7. Provisional agenda for the ninth session of the Implementation Review Group.
8. Adoption of the report of the Implementation Review Group on its eighth session.

## 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>
<b>Group of African States</b>	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	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
<b>Group of Asia-Pacific States</b>	Jordan	Maldives	Nigeria
	Bangladesh	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Paraguay
	Mongolia	Yemen	Kenya
	Fiji	Bangladesh	United States
	Papua New Guinea	Tajikistan	Malawi
	Indonesia	Uzbekistan	United Kingdom
<b>Group of Eastern European States</b>	Lithuania	Russian Federation	Egypt
	Croatia	Montenegro	Lao People's Democratic Republic
	Bulgaria	Albania	Sweden
	Ukraine	Slovenia	Poland
<b>Group of Latin American and Caribbean States</b>	Chile	El Salvador	Ukraine
	Brazil	Mexico	Haiti
	Dominican Republic	Nicaragua	Uruguay
	Argentina	Panama	Singapore
	Peru	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Ecuador
<b>Group of Western European and other States</b>	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>
<b>Group of African States</b>	Seychelles	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Sao Tome and Principe
	Mauritius		Lesotho
	Benin	Guinea-Bissau	Finland
	Mozambique	Zimbabwe	Dominican Republic



<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>
	Congo	Burkina Faso	Serbia
	Cabo Verde	Morocco	Costa Rica
	Central African Republic	Malawi	Ghana
	Sierra Leone	Tunisia	Thailand
	South Africa	Benin	Mali
	Zimbabwe <sup>a</sup>	Senegal	Malawi
	Cameroon <sup>a</sup>	Madagascar	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
		Angola	
<b>Group of Asia-Pacific States</b>	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 <sup>a</sup>	Fiji	Namibia
	United Arab Emirates <sup>a</sup>	Maldives	Portugal
	Iran (Islamic Republic of) <sup>a</sup>	Indonesia	Belarus
	Kuwait <sup>a</sup>	Sri Lanka	Ethiopia
<b>Group of Eastern European States</b>	Slovakia	Poland	Malta
	Serbia	Romania	Ukraine
	Montenegro	Armenia	United Kingdom
	Estonia	Albania	Burundi
	Azerbaijan	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guatemala
	Russian Federation	Ukraine	Ecuador
	Georgia <sup>a</sup>	Hungary	Cyprus
<b>Group of Latin American and Caribbean States</b>	Cuba	Brazil	Guatemala
	Uruguay	Argentina	Brazil
	El Salvador	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Singapore
	Nicaragua	Cuba	Nepal
	Colombia	Honduras	Slovenia
	Panama	Bahamas	Estonia
	Dominica <sup>a</sup>	Chile	Paraguay
	Jamaica <sup>a</sup>	Trinidad and Tobago	Netherlands
<b>Group of Western European and other States</b>	Australia	United States	Turkey
	Norway	Sweden	Kuwait
	United Kingdom	Israel	Greece
	Portugal	Spain	Morocco
	Switzerland <sup>a</sup>	Finland	Algeria

<sup>a</sup> 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>
<b>Group of African States</b>	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 <sup>a</sup>	Central African Republic	Marshall Islands
<b>Group of Asia-Pacific States</b>	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 <sup>a</sup>	Papua New Guinea	China
<b>Group of Eastern European States</b>	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
<b>Group of Latin American and Caribbean States</b>	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
<b>Group of Western European and other States</b>	Sweden	France	Canada
	Canada	Switzerland	Iraq
	Luxembourg	Austria	Switzerland
	Italy	Liechtenstein	Kazakhstan
	Netherlands	Australia	Uruguay
	Austria	Israel	Viet Nam
	Malta <sup>a</sup>	Spain	Cambodia

<sup>a</sup> 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>
<b>Group of African States</b>	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 <sup>a</sup>	Mauritius	Viet Nam
	Botswana <sup>a</sup>	Burundi	Bulgaria
	Egypt <sup>b</sup>	Burkina Faso	Algeria
	Guinea-Bissau <sup>b</sup>	Guinea	Palau
	Swaziland <sup>a</sup>	Botswana	Sri Lanka
	Comoros <sup>a</sup>	Sudan	Trinidad and Tobago
	Côte d'Ivoire <sup>a</sup>	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Azerbaijan
	Mali <sup>b</sup>	Niger	Afghanistan
	Guinea <sup>a</sup>	Mauritania	Cameroon
	Sudan <sup>a</sup>	Angola	State of Palestine
South Sudan <sup>a</sup>	Cameroon	Iceland	
Gambia <sup>a</sup>	Sudan	Guyana	
<b>Group of Asia-Pacific States</b>	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 <sup>a</sup>	Jordan	Honduras
	Thailand <sup>a</sup>	Nepal	Bahrain
	India <sup>a</sup>	Kazakhstan	Uganda
	Nepal <sup>a</sup>	Fiji	Benin
	Vanuatu <sup>a</sup>	Solomon Islands	India
	Cook Islands <sup>a</sup>	Qatar	Belarus
	Marshall Islands <sup>a</sup>	Papua New Guinea	Central African Republic
	Solomon Islands <sup>a</sup>	Iraq	Slovakia
	Micronesia (Federated States of) <sup>a</sup>	Mongolia	Republic of Korea
	Nauru <sup>a</sup>	Timor-Leste	Jamaica
	Yemen <sup>b</sup>	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 <sup>b</sup>	Myanmar	Togo
	Myanmar <sup>a</sup>	Thailand	Burundi
	Saudi Arabia <sup>a</sup>	Cambodia	Mozambique
	Oman <sup>a</sup>	Kiribati	Saudi Arabia
	State of Palestine <sup>a</sup>	Oman	Micronesia (Federated States of)
	Tuvalu <sup>a</sup>	Afghanistan	Grenada
<b>Group of Eastern European States</b>	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 <sup>a</sup>	Republic of Moldova	Turkmenistan
<b>Group of Latin American and Caribbean States</b>	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 <sup>a</sup>	Cuba	Marshall Islands
	Grenada <sup>a</sup>	Antigua and Barbuda	Germany
<b>Group of Western European and other States</b>	Turkey	Belgium	Malaysia
	Greece	Ireland	Gabon
	Belgium	Netherlands	Mexico
	Denmark	Austria	United Republic of Tanzania
	Israel	Greece	Uzbekistan
	Liechtenstein <sup>a</sup>	Canada	United Arab Emirates
	Iceland <sup>a</sup>	Norway	Madagascar
	Ireland <sup>a</sup>	Luxembourg	Brunei Darussalam
	Germany <sup>a</sup>	Denmark	Czech Republic
	New Zealand <sup>c</sup>	Turkey	Cameroon

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

<sup>b</sup> Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

<sup>c</sup> 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 31 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>
<b>Group of African States (total: 10)</b>	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 <sup>a</sup>	Mali	Kiribati
	Mauritius <sup>a</sup>	Mauritania	Panama
<b>Group of Asia-Pacific States (total: 9)</b>	Malaysia <sup>a</sup>	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
	Micronesia (Federated States of)	Iraq	Hungary
	Indonesia <sup>a</sup>	Yemen	Ghana
	Solomon Islands <sup>a</sup>	Viet Nam	Republic of Korea
Sri Lanka <sup>a</sup>	Palau	Brunei Darussalam	
<b>Group of Eastern European States (total: 4)</b>	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
<b>Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (total: 6)</b>	Mexico	Guatemala	Sao Tome and Principe
	Honduras	Trinidad and Tobago	Cook Islands
	Grenada	Chile	Nauru
	Saint Lucia	Guyana	Canada
	Bolivia (Plurinational State of) <sup>a</sup>	Honduras	Slovenia
	Panama <sup>a</sup>	Jamaica	United Arab Emirates
<b>Group of Western European and other States (total: 2)</b>	Belgium	Malta	Czech Republic
	Liechtenstein <sup>a</sup>	Australia	Namibia

<sup>a</sup> Volunteered to advance its review from one of the following years of the second cycle.

In the second year, a total of 47 reviews will be conducted.

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>
<b>Group of African States (total: 11)</b>	United Republic of Tanzania Egypt Zimbabwe Cameroon Central African Republic Sudan Swaziland Mauritania Guinea-Bissau Kenya <sup>a</sup> Djibouti <sup>a</sup>
<b>Group of Asia-Pacific States (total: 14)</b>	Nepal Kiribati Lao People's Democratic Republic Oman Bahrain Cook Islands Nauru Tajikistan State of Palestine Afghanistan <sup>a</sup> Thailand <sup>a</sup> Viet Nam <sup>a</sup> Kuwait <sup>a</sup> Myanmar <sup>a</sup>
<b>Group of Eastern European States (total: 6)</b>	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia Azerbaijan Slovenia Lithuania Czech Republic Russian Federation <sup>a</sup>
<b>Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (total: 7)</b>	Peru Dominica Guyana Uruguay Antigua and Barbuda Haiti <sup>a</sup> Trinidad and Tobago <sup>a</sup>
<b>Group of Western European and other States (total: 9)</b>	France Australia Ireland Greece Italy Portugal <sup>a</sup> United Kingdom <sup>a</sup> Germany <sup>a</sup> Malta <sup>a</sup>

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

<sup>a</sup> Volunteered to advance its review from one of the following years of the second cycle.

<sup>b</sup> Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

In the fourth year, a total of 34 reviews will be conducted.

<i>Regional group</i>	<i>State party under review</i>
<b>Group of African States (total: 7)</b>	Sao Tome and Principe Ethiopia Zambia Seychelles South Africa Congo Gabon
<b>Group of Asia-Pacific States (total: 12)</b>	Brunei Darussalam United Arab Emirates Papua New Guinea Yemen Vanuatu Jordan Mongolia Iraq China Turkmenistan <sup>b</sup> Pakistan <sup>a</sup> Republic of Korea <sup>b</sup>
<b>Group of Eastern European States (total: 5)</b>	Hungary Ukraine Estonia Romania Montenegro
<b>Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (total: 6)</b>	Jamaica Chile Brazil Guatemala Colombia Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Group of Western European and other States (total: 4)</b>	Denmark Norway Netherlands Sweden

<sup>a</sup> Volunteered to advance its review from one of the following years of the second cycle.

<sup>b</sup> 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>
<b>Group of African States (total: 9)</b>	Niger Lesotho Angola Gambia Madagascar Namibia Tunisia Guinea Rwanda
<b>Group of Asia-Pacific States (total: 7)</b>	Bangladesh Uzbekistan Qatar India Kazakhstan Singapore Lebanon
<b>Group of Eastern European States (total: 3)</b>	Slovakia Bulgaria Serbia
<b>Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (total: 4)</b>	Ecuador Costa Rica El Salvador Paraguay
<b>Group of Western European and other States (total: 6)</b>	New Zealand <sup>a</sup> Spain Canada Switzerland Israel Luxembourg

<sup>a</sup> State party that ratified the Convention after the sixth session of the Conference of the States Parties.