



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

Distr.: General
28 November 2013

Original: English

Implementation Review Group

Resumed fourth session

Panama City, 26 and 27 November 2013

Report of the Implementation Review Group on its resumed fourth session, held in Panama City on 26 and 27 November 2013

Addendum

I. Introduction

1. At the first part of its fourth session, which was held in Vienna from 27 to 31 May 2013, the Implementation Review Group of the United Nations Convention against Corruption decided to hold a resumed session of one day's duration before the end of the year to continue its deliberations.

II. Organization of the session

A. Opening of the session

2. The Implementation Review Group held its resumed fourth session in Panama City on 26 and 27 November 2013.

3. The resumed session was chaired by the Vice-President of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, Ignacio Baylina Ruiz (Spain).

B. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

4. On 27 May 2013, the Implementation Review Group adopted the following agenda for its fourth session:

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. Technical assistance.
4. Financial and budgetary matters.
5. Other matters.
6. Provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Implementation Review Group.
7. Adoption of the report of the Implementation Review Group on its fourth session.

C. Attendance

5. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the resumed fourth session of the Implementation Review Group: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cook Islands, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
6. The European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, was represented at the resumed session.
7. In accordance with rule 1 of Conference resolution 4/5, entitled “Participation of signatories, non-signatories, entities and intergovernmental organizations in the work of the Implementation Review Group”, the Conference decided that States signatories should be entitled to participate in the Implementation Review Group.
8. The following States signatories to the Convention were represented by observers: Czech Republic, Germany and Japan.
9. In accordance with rule 3 of Conference resolution 4/5, the Conference decided that non-signatory States would be invited to attend the deliberations of the Implementation Review Group provided that such a State had notified the Group, through the secretariat, of its intention or decision to ratify, accept, approve or accede to the Convention, in accordance with article 67, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Convention.
10. The following observer State was represented: South Sudan.

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

A. Drawing of lots

11. The Group drew lots for Guinea and Kiribati, which had both become party to the Convention after the drawing of lots conducted at the first part of the fourth session of the Group, held from 27 to 31 May 2013. Mauritania and Saint Lucia were drawn as reviewing States for Guinea. Côte d'Ivoire and Vanuatu were drawn as reviewing States for Kiribati.

B. Progress report

12. Speakers highlighted the usefulness of the country review process, both to States under review and to reviewing States. The work of States involved in reviews and of the secretariat was commended, and speakers welcomed the growing number of reviews being finalized and the documentation being prepared on that basis. Speakers recalled the guiding principles of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention and provided details of their own experience of the review process at the national level. Some speakers noted the positive impact of having an inclusive and transparent review process, and some speakers recalled the intergovernmental nature of the Mechanism. Some speakers commented on the comprehensive self-assessment checklist, which was seen as a useful tool for gathering information on implementation of the Convention at the national level. It was noted that the checklist could be further improved by simplifying and shortening it while maintaining the quality and depth of the information and analysis provided. In that regard, some speakers urged caution and noted that further thought was needed to assess the results of the first cycle in order to improve the checklist. They stated that the secretariat did not have the mandate to attempt to streamline the self-assessment checklist on its own initiative. Some other speakers disagreed. A draft outline of the question flow for the chapters under review in the next cycle was provided to States for comment in document CAC/COSP/2013/3 and in CAC/COSP/2013/CRP.6. Some speakers highlighted possible avenues for follow-up of the results of the first review cycle and supported continued discussion of lessons learned in the Implementation Review Group prior to the second cycle, and some speakers noted that the work for the second cycle was at the initial stage.

C. Outcome of reviews

13. Speakers welcomed the quality of the thematic and regional reports and their increasing usefulness for the Group's analysis of substantive issues, in particular the challenges and the good practices that took into account the Group's previous recommendations. It was noted that additional examples of implementation could be useful, bearing in mind the thematic nature of the reports in accordance with the terms of reference (paras. 35 and 44). It was suggested that separate reports could further illustrate good practices, drawing on the experiences and implementation examples of select countries, provided on a voluntary basis. Some speakers noted that a thematic overview of the recommendations made in the reviews could inform the Group's substantive deliberations, including in the context of the follow-up to

the reviews and technical assistance. Further updates to the thematic and regional reports, as supplemented by the document entitled “State of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: criminalization, law enforcement and international cooperation” (CAC/COSP/2013/CRP.7), were requested.

IV. Technical assistance

14. Speakers highlighted the fact that the Implementation Review Mechanism was a tool to help States parties to identify and substantiate specific technical assistance needs and priorities, and to promote and facilitate the provision of technical assistance, thus underscoring the integral importance of technical assistance to the work of the Mechanism. The important role of the Mechanism in leading to the identification of specific technical assistance needs and in informing the delivery of sustained and coherent support was noted. Some speakers said that they would welcome more detailed information at the country level to facilitate the analysis of technical assistance needs and the provision of support. The role of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) as a provider of technical assistance, specifically in the context of follow-up to the reviews, was noted. Speakers emphasized the importance of ensuring effective follow-up to the reviews and the requests for assistance, involving all relevant stakeholders, bilateral and multilateral donors and assistance providers. The importance of country-led and country-based, integrated and coordinated technical assistance programme delivery, in line with Conference resolution 3/4, was reiterated. In that context, several speakers gave examples of successful technical assistance provided by bilateral donors, multilateral organizations and UNODC, and discussed their experience as providers of technical assistance. Speakers also noted their ongoing support of the anti-corruption and technical assistance activities of UNODC. Some speakers expressed appreciation for the panel discussions previously organized by the secretariat to facilitate the Group’s deliberations on technical assistance and said that they would welcome the organization of similar panel discussions for future sessions.

V. Financial and budgetary matters

15. The Secretariat submitted updated budgetary information on expenditures incurred so far for the first four years of the Mechanism, revised estimates for the first four years of the Mechanism, resources received from both the regular budget of the United Nations and extrabudgetary contributions, resource requirements for the fourth year of the Mechanism and interim cost-saving measures. One delegation clarified that the funding of the Mechanism and the financing of technical assistance to follow up on the needs identified through the country reviews should continue to be discussed separately.

VI. Adoption of the report

16. On 27 November 2013, the Implementation Review Group adopted the report on its resumed fourth session.