



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

Distr.: General  
3 June 2013

Original: English

**Implementation Review Group**

**Fourth session**

Vienna, 27-31 May 2013

**Report of the Implementation Review Group on its  
fourth session, held in Vienna from 27 to 31 May 2013**

Contents

|  | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| I. Introduction . . . . .  | 2           |
| II. Organization of the session . . . . .  | 2           |
| A. Opening of the session . . . . .  | 2           |
| B. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work . . . . .                                 | 2           |
| C. Attendance . . . . .  | 3           |
| III. Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption . . . . .  | 4           |
| A. Drawing of lots . . . . .   | 4           |
| B. Progress report . . . . .   | 4           |
| C. Thematic implementation reports and regional supplementary addenda . . . . .              | 7           |
| IV. Technical assistance . . . . .   | 9           |
| V. Financial and budgetary matters . . . . .   | 13          |
| VI. Other matters . . . . .  | 15          |
| VII. Provisional agenda for the fifth session . . . . .                                      | 17          |
| VIII. Adoption of the report . . . . .   | 17          |
| <b>Annexes</b>   |             |
| I. Provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Implementation Review Group . . . . .     | 18          |
| II. States parties selected for review and as reviewers for the first review cycle . . . . . | 19          |



## **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 United Nations Convention against Corruption.

## **II. Organization of the session**

### **A. Opening of the session**

2. The Implementation Review Group of the United Nations Convention against Corruption held its fourth session in Vienna from 27 to 31 May 2013.

3. The 1st to the 7th meetings of the Implementation Review Group were chaired by Ion Galea (Romania), and the 8th meeting was chaired by Rachmat Budiman (Indonesia). In his introductory remarks, the Chair recalled Conference resolution 3/1, containing the terms of reference of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption. He also made reference to the work carried out in previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group held since its inaugural meeting in June 2010.

4. At the invitation of the Chair, the Secretary of the Conference made opening remarks in which he welcomed the most recent States parties to participate in the Implementation Review Group since the resumed third session: Myanmar and Saudi Arabia. He further recalled the adoption of the terms of reference of the Review Mechanism in Conference resolution 3/1, adopted in Doha in 2009, and the commitment undertaken by States parties to strengthen their implementation of the Convention.

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

5. On 27 May, 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

6. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the meeting of the Implementation Review Group: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
7. The European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, was represented at the meeting.
8. 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 shall be entitled to participate in the Implementation Review Group.
9. The following States signatories to the Convention were represented by observers: Czech Republic, Germany, Japan and Syrian Arab Republic.
10. 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.
11. The following observer State was represented: Oman.

12. The State of Palestine, a non-member State maintaining a permanent observer mission to the United Nations, was represented.

13. Also in accordance with rule 2 of Conference 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.

14. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers: Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization, Council of Arab Ministers of Interior, Council of Europe, International Anti-Corruption Academy, International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

15. 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 Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute and Institute for Security Studies.

16. 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**

17. The Group conducted the drawing of lots to select the reviewing States of the reviews to be conducted in the fourth year of the first review cycle. The drawing was conducted in accordance with the terms of reference and past practice of the Group. Numerous redraws were necessary in order to fulfil the requirements of paragraphs 19 and 20 of the terms of reference. States parties that were drawn twice to perform reviews in the fourth year of the cycle were asked to confirm their readiness to do both reviews. States under review in the fourth year were asked to confirm their readiness to perform a review at the same time. Provisional redraws were conducted in certain cases where such confirmations had not been received by the end of the Group's fourth session. In order for the Group to keep a record of the procedural requirements for the drawing of lots and the practice followed by the Group in that respect, the Group requested the secretariat to prepare a compilation of those.

#### **B. Progress report**

18. Speakers reiterated their commitment to the process for review of implementation of the Convention. Several speakers referred to a "pre-Doha" state

and a “post-Doha” state with respect to implementation of the Convention: the peer review process had led States parties to acquire direct and concrete ownership of the Convention and its implementation. Speakers underscored the uniqueness of the exercise, as the Review Mechanism was the only global peer review mechanism, and many States had not had prior experience with such a process.

19. Several speakers noted that the positive engagement with other States parties during the review process was a valuable feature of the work of the Mechanism, as all involved learned how other States were implementing the Convention. Some speakers acknowledged challenges that arose owing to the diversity of languages and legal systems encountered in the different reviews, but several others noted that such a situation enriched the experience of States learning about different approaches to implementing the Convention.

20. The preparation of country reviews was discussed. Several speakers stated that it had been beneficial for them to serve as reviewers before their own State underwent review. That sequence had provided participants with valuable experience and insight. The need for States to ensure that the lists of governmental experts were kept up to date was noted. Speakers reported on measures taken to prepare their country for undergoing review, such as the establishment of national coordination committees, briefings for national stakeholders and the early nomination of focal points. Speakers expressed their appreciation for the assistance provided by the secretariat in preparing for the reviews, including training. Some discussions centred on challenges faced by some States because of concurrent reviews as a result of those States being parties to regional or sectoral conventions, in addition to being parties to the Convention against Corruption. The universal character of the Convention was acknowledged in that regard, and a suggestion was made that States participating in other regional or sectoral conventions should endeavour to modify the calendars of their respective reviews in order to reduce or avoid concurrent reviews. Speakers noted the various review processes of regional and sectoral anti-corruption instruments and stated that it was important at the national level to create synergies among those processes, including through timing.

21. Speakers took note of the volume of information that had to be gathered to prepare the responses to the comprehensive self-assessment checklist. Different approaches could be used to complete the responses to the checklist, such as listing legislation and regulations in place or providing summaries and analysis, and some speakers saw a need for the secretariat to provide States parties under review with guidance on which approach to use. The importance of providing case law and statistics as evidence of implementation was noted. In that context, several speakers referred to challenges with regard to the collection of statistics and quantitative data. Speakers reported on the formation of interdepartmental teams, including in some cases relevant actors from, for example, academia, civil society and the private sector, to provide input for the responses to the checklist, and some speakers noted that the process of compiling the responses had provided an opportunity for those States to re-examine their own systems in a new light. It was noted that a balance needed to be struck between adhering to the timelines for review, in particular in those reviews requiring the translation of documents, and ensuring the quality and comprehensiveness of the responses to the self-assessment checklist.

22. Speakers reported on their experience of dialogue between States parties under review and reviewing States. Some speakers referred in general to the

communication between the focal point and governmental experts, and among governmental experts themselves, underscoring the usefulness of informal communications and the preference for having a common language for discussions. The practice of holding trilateral meetings on the margins of the sessions of the Group or other meetings was noted as a key practice for advancing ongoing reviews. With respect to the forms of direct dialogue their States had agreed to, several speakers noted the benefits of engaging in detailed face-to-face discussions on information provided. One speaker noted with satisfaction that the team of governmental experts participating in a country review remained respectful while ensuring that they obtained the requisite information for the review. Some speakers reported on meetings held with other stakeholders, such as non-governmental organizations and the private sector, during the country visits.

23. With respect to the outcome of the review process, several speakers emphasized the importance of expediting the finalization of the country review reports and executive summaries of the ongoing reviews from previous years of the current cycle. Some speakers reported on the observations contained in their country's review report. Some speakers informed the Group of their State's decision to publish their country's full country review report and have it posted on the UNODC website. Reference was made to the useful information on implementation available on the UNODC website, including the material in the legal library of the Tools and Resources for Anti-Corruption Knowledge (TRACK) portal, which was being updated and validated as country reviews were finalized. Other States parties were encouraged to make more use of the legal library, which was found to be innovative and useful.

24. Speakers suggested possible improvements for future country reviews and for the preparation of the second review cycle, and encouraged the submission of proposals and recommendations to the Conference in that regard. The guiding principles of the Review Mechanism and its progressive and comprehensive approach were highlighted. Several speakers made suggestions on how to ensure that the lessons learned during the first cycle on the conduct of country reviews were fully taken into account. States parties were encouraged to report to the Conference on their experiences, challenges and good practices in the conduct of country reviews. Some speakers mentioned possibilities for including other stakeholders, such as civil society and the private sector, in future reviews. Some speakers suggested that the Secretariat, within its resources, should play a more active role in streamlining reports and ensuring their consistency, which would also facilitate the work in cases where governmental experts changed.

25. Speakers noted the efforts made to simplify and further structure the self-assessment checklist to ensure more focused questions, while maintaining a sufficient level of detail. It should be ensured that relevant parts of that checklist, including the general information questions and relevant information on implementation of chapter IV of the Convention, would be fully used during the second review cycle. It was stressed that providing examples of the application of national legislation was an integral part of the self-assessment, and States parties were encouraged to submit case examples and disaggregated statistical information. It was stressed that the preparation of States parties for the second cycle through gap analyses and early development of the responses to the self-assessment checklist could produce valuable lessons for the conduct of the second cycle.

26. Speakers discussed how the outcomes of the country reviews could be used more systematically to improve future implementation of the Convention. Many speakers encouraged States parties to explore ways to measure the impact of the country reviews and to follow up on the results of the first review cycle. The Group was encouraged to discuss avenues for follow-up and make proposals in that regard to the Conference. It was suggested that the follow-up to the first cycle should comprise not only efficient responses to technical assistance needs but also ways to measure the impact of the country reviews and how progress in countries' implementation of the Convention could be assessed. One speaker suggested that the secretariat establish a task group to develop a monitoring tool to measure the impact of the Mechanism.

27. Speakers discussed characteristics of future documentation to reflect the improvements suggested. One speaker suggested that difficulties highlighted in country and thematic reports should be matched with the good practices identified. Some speakers suggested that a more analytical approach should be taken and that information from country reviews should be used to highlight successful implementation practices.

### **C. Thematic implementation reports and regional supplementary addenda**

28. A representative of the secretariat summarized the main elements of the thematic implementation reports (CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/6, CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/7, CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/8 and CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/9), which contained information on the implementation of chapters III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and IV (International cooperation) of the Convention by States parties under review in the first and second years of the first cycle of the Review Mechanism. The reports had been prepared on the basis of information included in the review reports on 34 States parties that had been completed, or were close to completion, as at 4 March 2013. The reports contained examples of implementation, information on successes, good practices, challenges and observations. The regional supplementary addenda (CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/10 and CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/11), which contained information, organized by region, to supplement the thematic implementation reports, were also introduced.

29. Regarding changes in content and format of the thematic reports compared with previous ones, it was noted that, at the request of the Group, a concise summary and analysis of key challenges and discrepancies in implementation had been included in the thematic reports in table format and in individual charts. At the request of the Group, the reports made a clearer differentiation between mandatory and non-mandatory provisions of the Convention, and additional detail was included in the text boxes to highlight specific examples of implementation.

30. Speakers appreciated the quality of the thematic and regional reports and their usefulness for the Group's analytical work, in particular for the analysis of substantive issues. They acknowledged that changes to the content and format of the reports took into account the Group's previous recommendations, in particular concerning the analysis of implementation challenges. Speakers emphasized the usefulness of the reports in providing valuable information on good practices and

challenges in implementation, especially for States parties participating in the Review Mechanism, and that the reports could also assist the Group in identifying specific areas deserving more attention.

31. Noting the Group's task of formulating recommendations to the Conference, some speakers made suggestions for how to further improve the quality and the analytical value of the reports. Two speakers noted that a summary of good practices, for example, regarding sanctions for offences under the Convention, could be added to the analysis of implementation challenges. That information could be useful to States parties in reviewing and revising their own legislation and institutional arrangements.

32. The Group welcomed a discussion on particular substantive provisions of the Convention that were addressed in the thematic and regional reports, including sanctions for offences under the Convention (art. 30, para. 1), immunities and jurisdictional privileges of public officials (art. 30, para. 2), participation and attempt (art. 27) and the statute of limitations (art. 29). On the topic of illicit enrichment (art. 20), a non-mandatory provision of the Convention in which regional nuances in implementation were observed, several speakers shared their experiences and highlighted key aspects such as the applicable evidentiary standard and sanctions for undeclared wealth. Speakers welcomed further discussion and sharing of experiences on those issues.

33. Speakers also referred to mechanisms requiring an offender to demonstrate the lawful origin of alleged proceeds of corruption in confiscation proceedings. Such tools, if they were in conformity with a country's legal system, were found to be useful for the successful prosecution of national and mutual legal assistance cases, but challenges were noted in the application of the illicit enrichment offence against private persons. Further problems were noted in the enforcement of judgements in jurisdictions that, for constitutional reasons, had not criminalized illicit enrichment or allow for the shift of the burden of proof.

34. One speaker highlighted the importance of adequate systems to lift the immunity of high-ranking national officials.

35. Another speaker reported difficulties in the application of the provision on bribery of officials of foreign international organizations, and urged international organizations to provide cooperation and lift the immunity of alleged offenders.

36. Speakers further reported on their experiences in international cooperation in criminal matters. One speaker reported that his country had in a recent case used the Convention as a legal basis to extradite a person in the absence of a bilateral extradition treaty and highlighted the excellent cooperation with the requesting country. Another speaker reported on a case in which an extradition request had been rejected in the absence of a bilateral treaty and the use of the Convention as a legal basis had been denied, although the requested State had not made a notification to the contrary at the time of deposit of its instrument of ratification of the Convention. Speakers called upon States parties to use global instruments, in particular the Convention against Corruption, in order to overcome differences in legal systems and regional traditions. Speakers also urged States to ensure that national legislative frameworks on international cooperation were up to date and in line with the Convention. The importance of informal cooperation before the submission of a mutual legal assistance request was emphasized. One speaker drew



the attention of the Group to the mutual legal assistance guides prepared by the Group of 20. One speaker encouraged the practice of joint investigation teams at the international level.

37. With respect to difficulties encountered in international cooperation, one speaker reported on difficulties in the application of the principle of “extradite or prosecute” in cases where extradition of nationals was refused, which could in practice lead to impunity. The costs of contracting professional lawyers in complex cases were highlighted. One speaker reported that in some jurisdictions banking secrecy presented an obstacle to efficient information exchange and called for adequate rules to ensure that banking secrecy was not invoked to deny mutual legal assistance. The same speaker underlined article 43, paragraph 2, of the Convention, which called for a flexible approach to dual criminality. One speaker encouraged the Group to define good practices and submit recommendations encouraging international cooperation to the Conference.

38. One speaker mentioned the need to develop model legislation on different aspects of international cooperation in criminal matters. The same speaker suggested making greater efforts to include all sectors of society in the discussion and action on international cooperation.

#### **IV. Technical assistance**

39. The Chair recalled Conference resolution 3/1, in which the Conference tasked the Group with continuing the work previously undertaken by the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on Technical Assistance, and highlighted 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.

40. The Secretary introduced the note by the Secretariat on technical assistance in support of the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/2 and Corr.1) and the note by the Secretariat on analysis of technical assistance needs emerging from the country reviews (CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/3).

41. According to the guidance provided by the Group, two panels were organized to facilitate the Group’s deliberations, on support through the implementation review process and on responding to technical assistance needs, respectively.

42. Annie Demirjian, UNDP Democratic Governance Practice Leader for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States region, moderated the first panel, on support through the implementation review process, and, in her introduction, underlined the need for broad stakeholder engagement in the area of anti-corruption.

43. Joseph Fitzgerald Kamara, Commissioner of the Sierra Leone Anti-Corruption Commission, highlighted how the review process enabled States parties to identify gaps and challenges in their national systems and to learn from other States. He referred to his country’s experience in reforming the anti-corruption architecture and noted the support received from the United Nations and at the bilateral level. He underscored that, although it had been difficult, the Anti-Corruption Commission had successfully brought several high-level cases to court.

44. Peter Ainsworth, legal counsel in the United States Department of Justice, reported on his role as a consultant to Sierra Leone's Anti-Corruption Commission. He emphasized the importance of an independent prosecution to effectively pursue corruption cases. Mr. Ainsworth explained how the technical assistance he provided consisted of analysing both successful and unsuccessful anti-corruption cases of the Commission in order to identify lessons to be learned and determine whether operational improvements could be made.

45. Sofia Zakharova, senior counsellor in the Department of the Secretariat of the Administration of the President of the Russian Federation, outlined how her country supported the review process by bringing together governmental experts and focal points from States parties in annual training courses held in Moscow to share information and experiences in order to reinforce the implementation of the Convention. Further, the Russian Federation had supported a study by UNODC on preventing corruption in the organization of major public events, which would be presented to the Conference at its fifth session, as well as providing support for the legal library related to the Convention. A practical guide on anti-corruption, ethics and compliance programmes for businesses had also been produced with the support of the Russian Federation.

46. Aderito de Jesus Soares, Commissioner of the Anti-Corruption Commission of Timor-Leste, stated that the issue of fighting corruption was key to the enhancement of development efforts. The Anti-Corruption Commission of Timor-Leste had begun its activities in 2011 and had in a short period managed to employ and retain highly skilled staff. It had commenced the self-assessment process by holding a three-day seminar for prosecutors, police, civil society, parliamentarians and members of the judiciary. That review had provided an opportunity to learn from the reviewing States parties and to identify gaps in the national system, which were now being addressed.

47. Lilian Ekeanyanwu, Head of the Technical Unit on Governance and Anti-Corruption Reforms of Nigeria, moderated the second panel and invited panellists to explain how, from the point of view of their national contexts, the country reviews had resulted in the identification of implementation gaps and challenges.

48. Nardi Suxo Iturry, Minister of Institutional Transparency and the Fight Against Corruption of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, referred to his country's participation in the pilot programme for the review of implementation of the Convention against Corruption, to identify gaps in the national legal system. In follow-up to the report resulting from that pilot programme, efforts had been made, with the support of UNODC, to establish a whistle-blower and witness protection system, in order to reduce the risks of attacks, intimidation and reprisals against such individuals. It was underscored that the reviews had produced tangible results in helping the country make progress in the fight against corruption, and as an investment in the country's policy of zero tolerance for corruption.

49. Anthony Kevin Morais, Deputy Public Prosecutor of the Anti-Corruption Commission of Malaysia, described his country's experience as a reviewing State party and a country under review in the same year. He explained that carrying out the review of another State party prepared the officials to conduct their country's own review. The recommendations stemming from the review had led to changes in

Malaysia's legislation and ongoing constitutional reform to safeguard the independence of the Chief Commissioner.

50. Paulus Noah, Director of Namibia's Anti-Corruption Commission, emphasized that the country reviews were an important step in the implementation of the Convention. He explained that Namibia was actively participating in regional initiatives such as the Southern African Forum Against Corruption and the Commonwealth States. Those regional mechanisms provided further channels for participants to identify challenges in the implementation of the Convention and to identify ways to overcome them.

51. Anne Rivera Escobar, Chief Counsel of the Competence Centre for Contracts and Procurement of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, highlighted the safeguards her country had put in place to prevent corruption in development cooperation efforts. She highlighted aspects of Switzerland's technical cooperation programme to support governance and anti-corruption measures through broad-based and specific support initiatives.

52. Noting the challenges in implementation in all countries, panellists underscored the importance of international cooperation and partnerships among countries, and with regional and international organizations, including UNODC and UNDP. UNODC and other implementing partners had an important role in providing guidance and technical assistance and in the context of the Review Mechanism. Some speakers further recognized that South-South cooperation could enhance the provision of technical assistance in implementing the Convention and shared their experiences in that regard. Several panellists also acknowledged the important role of stakeholders, including civil society and the youth, in the fight against corruption. Speakers recognized the importance of transparency in the provision of technical assistance in order to avoid duplication and contribute to efficient, effective and coordinated technical assistance delivery.

53. Several speakers emphasized the importance of technical assistance in implementing the Convention and expressed their support for efforts to strengthen the Review Mechanism and to promote and facilitate the delivery of technical assistance. 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 to the anti-corruption and technical assistance activities of UNODC.

54. Speakers recognized that a thorough analysis of technical assistance needs should be carried out in the framework of the country reviews, drawing on information derived from the reviews, in order to assist States parties in implementing the Convention. In that context, the executive summaries were an important source of information on technical assistance needs identified through the country reviews, though they may not contain enough detail to inform programming decisions or potential technical assistance responses. A need for more detailed information to facilitate the analysis of technical assistance needs and the provision of support in the context of the Review Mechanism was noted. While full reports should be shared with technical assistance providers and donors at the country level,

speakers emphasized that channels outside the Review Mechanism, such as the development of an action plan for implementation, could also be used to analyse and prioritize needs in order to ensure that technical assistance was country-led and country-based, integrated and coordinated. That was particularly relevant when comprehensive assistance covering prevention and asset recovery was envisaged. In that context, the deployment of UNODC regional anti-corruption advisers was recognized as a positive measure to facilitate the provision of targeted technical assistance, as requested. Speakers summarized the conditions and methodology that bilateral donors and some other technical assistance providers used in focusing the delivery of assistance. In that context, one speaker reiterated that a mapping of donors and of technical assistance provided was a prerequisite for the effective, efficient and coordinated delivery of technical assistance and to avoid duplication. It was noted, however, that, pursuant to a previous recommendation of the Group to conduct such a mapping, the information received by the secretariat on the topic had been insufficient for such an exercise.

55. Speakers recognized the usefulness of the notes prepared by the Secretariat on technical assistance. It was noted that a further analysis of technical assistance needs at the regional or country level could be useful to inform programming decisions and identify correlations and trends with respect to technical assistance needs and challenges in implementation.

56. The need to support the full and effective implementation of the Convention in a manner that could be sustained in the long term was emphasized, and speakers welcomed a more in-depth discussion at the upcoming session of the Conference of the States Parties on how that could be done.

57. Reference was made to the importance of integrating three levels of technical assistance: national, regional and global. In that context, tools developed by UNODC and other organizations, such as the Convention against Corruption legal library, available through the TRACK portal, could serve as a useful tool to assist States parties in reviewing and revising their legislation. One speaker encouraged the expansion of the case law and jurisprudence content of the legal library and proposed that the secretariat look into processes put in place by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law to gather information on relevant case law from States parties. In that context, the information on asset recovery cases connected to offences under the Convention through links to the Stolen Asset Recovery (StAR) Initiative Asset Recovery Watch case database was highlighted.

58. Some speakers recognized that States parties should allocate appropriate funds for the provision of technical assistance, and a need for a fuller discussion on the relative advantages of comprehensive technical assistance delivery was noted, as it appeared that in some cases, assistance focused only on particular institutions at the individual country level.

59. Noting the Group's task to formulate recommendations to the Conference, reference was also made to the post-2015 development agenda of the United Nations, which should be taken into consideration by the Group in its deliberations, during the fifth session of the Conference, on how implementation of the Convention against Corruption could inform the broader policy decisions of the United Nations.

60. A speaker from the International Anti-Corruption Academy reported on the role of the Academy as a training institution to support international efforts to build capacity and share knowledge.

## V. Financial and budgetary matters

61. For its consideration of agenda item 4, on financial and budgetary matters, the Group was provided with information on expenditures incurred so far in the first three years of the Mechanism, on revised estimates for the same period, on resources received so far, both from the United Nations regular budget and from voluntary contributions, as well as on resource requirements for the fourth year.

62. The Secretary then provided detailed information on expenditures incurred from the regular budget for 2010-2011, as well as interim expenditures from the regular budget for 2012-2013. He noted in particular that the number of pages of official documentation per year allotted to the Implementation Review Group (100 pages) as approved under the regular budget had already been exceeded for the period 2012-2013, and that the secretariat was working with the Conference Management Services of the United Nations Office at Vienna to absorb the additional requirements within existing regular budget resources through the redeployment of existing resources or through the submission of conference room papers, for which no translation was provided.

63. The Secretary provided detailed information on interim extrabudgetary expenditures for the first three years of the Mechanism, highlighting that it was expected that there would be additional expenditures incurred for all years and that final calculations of expenditures would be made available as soon as all the reviews for a given year were completed. He also indicated that the revised estimates for the second and third years were lower than the estimates previously presented to the Group, as savings had been realized in particular by holding the training sessions of governmental experts back-to-back with sessions of the Implementation Review Group and the Conference, and in several instances through cost-sharing with UNDP, thus allowing for overall savings on the travel costs of participants from least developed countries and governmental experts. However, the costs of country visits were higher than originally estimated.

64. The Secretary then presented the resource requirements for the fourth year of the Review Mechanism. The Secretary first indicated that, as the United Nations Secretariat had been asked to cut its budget, no additional resources had been requested in the regular budget submission for the Mechanism for the biennium 2014-2015. He detailed the estimate of costs for the fourth year (\$3,606,300), which took into account the greater number of countries under review in that year; the increased participation of Pacific island States, which had an impact on the costs of country visits and/or joint meetings in Vienna, due to their geographical location; the increased cost of the new arrangements established with the translations services secured through a global procurement exercise (for some language combinations); as well as the greater number of States parties from least developed countries. He also noted that although the number of States under review would increase by 50 per cent in the fourth year, the work to be undertaken would be absorbed by existing staff and no additional posts would be sought.

65. The Secretary expressed appreciation for the voluntary contributions made by States to support the Mechanism in the first four years of its functioning, including recent pledges received after the document was drafted. Those voluntary contributions covered the costs of the first three years based on the revised estimates, but a shortfall of approximately \$1 million remained for the fourth year. He expressed concerns that the number of donors was decreasing, and that only one donor had provided multi-year funding, thereby hampering the financial predictability of the Mechanism.

66. In view of the situation, the secretariat had put in place interim cost-saving measures. First, it continued to organize training workshops for focal points and governmental experts, in accordance with the terms of reference of the Review Mechanism, but only covered the costs for focal points and governmental experts from countries that had newly ratified the Convention against Corruption, as well as for countries whose experts had never been trained. Secondly, the practice continued of organizing the training workshops of the least developed countries back-to-back with the sessions of the Implementation Review Group, for which the participation of those individuals had already been funded. Thirdly, the travel costs and per diem allowance were covered for the participation of only one governmental expert from each reviewing country participating in country visits/joint meetings in Vienna, instead of for two. Fourthly, the secretariat increasingly turned to developed countries (beyond the Group of Western European and other States) to fund their own participation in country visits/joint meetings, as well as to fund the travel costs and per diem allowance for the participation of visiting governmental experts (from developing countries and least developed countries) to their own countries. Fifthly, in-kind contributions were being sought from countries with translation capacities for the translation of their own documentation (in case the reviewing States work in a different language). Finally, the Secretariat was even more stringent in checking the necessity of translating multiple rounds of working documents into various languages during the review process.

67. Overall, the Secretary reaffirmed the transparency of the Mechanism in terms of budget and resources, and urged delegations to weigh its limited cost in comparison with the benefits derived from it, as highlighted throughout the fourth session of the Implementation Review Group.

68. Speakers expressed their satisfaction for the work of the secretariat and for the clarity of the note by the Secretariat on financial resources and expenditure for the functioning of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/5). They welcomed the cost-saving measures put in place by the secretariat, while cautioning at the same time that those measures should not impact on the quality of the work produced by the Mechanism and on the engagement of States parties. The Secretary welcomed practical recommendations from speakers on other cost-saving measures, and indicated that it was considering the development of a distance learning platform for the training of focal points and governmental experts, while reaffirming the importance of direct contacts with States parties in the early stages of the process. Speakers also mentioned the possibility of the country under review covering hospitality costs, and that answers to the self-assessment checklist could be made more concise without having an impact on the content. The Secretary indicated that it would monitor the impact of cost-saving measures, indicating

however that some costs, for example, staff costs, were inelastic. One speaker added that financial constraints should not negatively affect the international resolve to combat corruption and to implement the Convention against Corruption fully and faithfully.

69. Several speakers announced forthcoming voluntary contributions by their Government to the Mechanism, while others indicated that they would engage in more informed discussions with their capitals with regard to possible funding. The Secretary thanked delegations for new pledges and indicated the availability of the Secretariat to provide any additional information required. The Secretary also welcomed practical recommendations for improving the transparency and accessibility of the information provided by the secretariat.

70. Speakers also mentioned that the reviews foreseen for the fourth year of the cycle would be staggered over two years (fourth and fifth years of the review cycle). That would have an impact on the financing of the Review Mechanism, as it would allow for additional voluntary contributions to be collected and for the shortfall to be covered over the extended two-year period.

71. One speaker noted the importance of all articles and provisions of the Convention being fully implemented and the role of the Review Mechanism in that regard. Specifically, the chapter on asset recovery, whose implementation would be under review in the next review cycle, was important because repatriated proceeds could contribute to achieving international development goals.

72. Several speakers indicated that it was still too soon to assess the financial situation, and proposed that the overall financial model of the Mechanism be analysed after completion of the first full cycle. Lessons should also be extracted and learned from the first cycle before starting the second cycle, in particular with a view to decreasing the burden on the Member States and the secretariat.

73. Speakers also recalled Conference resolution 3/1, in which the Conference, *inter alia*, underlined that the Mechanism required a budget that ensured its efficient, continued and impartial functioning, as well as decision 1/1 of the Implementation Review Group, in which the Group, *inter alia*, requested the Secretary-General to include in his proposals for the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 the requirements necessary for the full functioning of the Review Mechanism, including posts and related general operating expenses, costs of communication and translation from and into the working language or languages of the Mechanism designated for individual reviews, functioning of the Group and participation by least developed countries in the Group's sessions, but excluding the items for country visits and training.

74. The Secretary indicated that predictability and stability of funding was a key element of the Review Mechanism. He also noted the readiness of the Secretariat to undertake a more detailed cost-benefit analysis, including a comparison with other existing review mechanisms.

## **VI. Other matters**

75. The representative of Panama informed the Group that her country had on 31 May 2013 signed with UNODC the host country agreement for the holding of the

fifth session of the Conference, to be held in Panama City from 25 to 29 November 2013, and that preparations for the fifth session were under way.

76. The representative of the European Union described the European Union's experience and measures taken in the fight against corruption, and made reference to the European Union's report on corruption, which would be published for the first time in 2013. One speaker made reference to the recent African Union summit of Heads of State, in which the importance of anti-corruption work for the funding of development was discussed.

77. Speakers welcomed the convening of the second briefing for non-governmental organizations organized in accordance with Conference resolution 4/6. A number of speakers appreciated the structure of the briefing, including the panel discussion, and expressed their satisfaction at the manner in which the briefing had been conducted by the Chair. Some speakers also commended the timing of the briefing and expressed appreciation for it as an opportunity to learn about the contributions and experiences of non-governmental organizations with regard to the fight against corruption while at the same time allowing the secretariat to provide an up-to-date briefing on matters related to the Implementation Review Mechanism to non-governmental organizations. Some speakers appreciated the fact that participants had largely abided by the terms of Conference resolution 4/6, even though a few instances of specific country situations were mentioned during the briefing. Some speakers considered that the briefing could promote a constructive dialogue between States and non-governmental organizations, and expressed the hope that the dialogue could lead in future to building trust and confidence in the role of non-governmental organizations in the Review Mechanism. Some speakers encouraged the participation of a broader scope of civil society, the business community, media and academia. A summary of the briefing for non-governmental organizations was made available to the Implementation Review Group in a conference room paper (CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/CRP.12).

78. Speakers welcomed the opportunity for States parties to hold trilateral meetings on country reviews throughout the session of the Implementation Review Group.

79. With regard to the drawing of lots for the second review cycle, some speakers suggested that the drawing of lots for both States parties under review and reviewing States should be carried out at the beginning of the cycle for all years of the cycle, thus allowing States to plan their involvement ahead of time. Other speakers drew attention to the wording of paragraph 19 of the terms of reference, which foresaw the drawing of lots for reviewing States at the beginning of each year of the cycle, thus providing States parties with flexibility, including by providing States the possibility of deferring their review or requesting a repetition of the drawing of lots. One suggestion was to include a larger number of States parties in the first year of the cycle, in order to facilitate the timely conclusion of country reviews and avoid the concentration of reviews in the second half of the cycle.



## **VII. Provisional agenda for the fifth session**

80. At its 8th meeting, on 31 May 2013, the Implementation Review Group adopted the provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Implementation Review Group (CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/L.2).

## **VIII. Adoption of the report**

81. On 31 May 2013, the Implementation Review Group adopted the report on its fourth session (CAC/COSP/IRG/2013/L.1 and Add.1-3).

## **Annex I**

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

## Annex II

### States parties selected for review and as reviewers for the first review cycle

Tables 1 to 4 reflect the pairings of States to be reviewed and reviewing States as selected for the four years of the first review cycle of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

Table 1  
Selection of States under review and reviewing States: year one

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

Table 2  
**Selection of States under review and reviewing States: year two**

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

| <i>Regional group</i>                      | <i>State party under review</i> | <i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i> | <i>Other reviewing State party</i> |
|--|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Group of Western European and other States | 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.

**Table 3**  
**Selection of States under review and reviewing States: year three**

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

| <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> |
|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
|  | Guyana                           | Cuba  | Vanuatu                            |
|  | Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela | Chile   | United Arab Emirates               |
| Group of Western European and other States | Sweden                           | France  | Canada                             |
|  | Canada                           | Switzerland   | Iraq                               |
|  | Luxembourg                       | Austria   | Switzerland                        |
|  | Italy                            | Liechtenstein   | Kazakhstan                         |
|  | Netherlands                      | Australia   | Uruguay                            |
|  | Austria                          | Israel  | Viet Nam                           |
|  | Malta <sup>a</sup>               | Spain   | Cambodia                           |

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

**Table 4**  
**Selection of States under review and reviewing States: year four**

| <i>Regional group</i>   | <i>State party under review</i>           | <i>Reviewing State party from same regional group</i> | <i>Other reviewing State party</i> |
|-------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Group of African States | Senegal                                   | Comoros   | Croatia                            |
|                         | Liberia                                   | Benin   | South Africa                       |
|                         | Kenya                                     | Cape 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 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>                | Cameroon  | Palau                              |
|                         | Swaziland <sup>a</sup>                    | Botswana  | Sri Lanka                          |
|                         | Comoros <sup>a</sup>                      | Seychelles  | Trinidad and Tobago                |
|                         | Côte d'Ivoire <sup>a</sup>                | Democratic Republic of the Congo                      | Azerbaijan                         |
|                         | Mali <sup>b</sup>                         | Niger   | Afghanistan                        |
| Group of Asian States   | Kyrgyzstan                                | Indonesia   | Pakistan                           |
|                         | Maldives                                  | Palau   | Cape Verde                         |
|                         | Lebanon                                   | Islamic Republic of Iran                              | Seychelles                         |
|                         | Uzbekistan                                | Sri Lanka   | Georgia                            |
|                         | Palau                                     | Malaysia  | Cambodia                           |
|                         | Turkmenistan                              | Kyrgyzstan  | Cyprus                             |

| <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> |
|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
|  | 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                           |
|  | Federated States of Micronesia <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              |
|  | Cambodia <sup>b</sup>                       | Myanmar   | Togo                               |
|  | Myanmar <sup>a</sup>                        | Thailand  | Burundi                            |
|  | Saudi Arabia <sup>a</sup>                   | Cambodia  | Mozambique                         |
| Group of Eastern European States             | Poland                                      | Serbia  | Mauritius                          |
|  | Belarus                                     | Georgia   | Republic of Moldova                |
|  | Bosnia and Herzegovina                      | Hungary   | Portugal                           |
|  | Albania                                     | Armenia   | Mali                               |
|  | Republic of Moldova                         | Bosnia and Herzegovina                                | Norway                             |
| Group of Latin American and Caribbean States | Ecuador                                     | Guatemala   | Dominica                           |
|  | Haiti                                       | Colombia  | Indonesia                          |
|  | Costa Rica                                  | Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela                      | Democratic Republic of the Congo   |
|  | Honduras                                    | Dominican Republic                                    | Nauru                              |
|  | Guatemala                                   | Panama  | Congo                              |
|  | Antigua and Barbuda                         | Brazil  | Fiji                               |
|  | Bahamas                                     | El Salvador   | Zambia                             |
|  | Saint Lucia <sup>a</sup>                    | Cuba  | Marshall Islands                   |
| Group of Western European and other States   | Turkey                                      | Belgium   | Malaysia                           |
|  | Greece                                      | Ireland   | Gabon                              |
|  | Belgium                                     | Netherlands   | Mexico                             |
|  | Denmark                                     | Austria   | United Republic of Tanzania        |
|  | Israel                                      | Greece  | Uzbekistan                         |
|  | Liechtenstein <sup>a</sup>                  | Canada  | United Arab Emirates               |
|  | Iceland <sup>a</sup>                        | Norway  | Madagascar                         |
|  | Ireland <sup>a</sup>                        | Luxembourg  | Brunei Darussalam                  |

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

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