

**Implementation Review Group
of the United Nations Convention
against Corruption**

Resumed First Session

Vienna, 29 November-1 December 2010

Item 3 (a) of the provisional agenda*

26 November 2010

English only

Country reviews: organization and schedule of reviews

Background paper prepared by the Secretariat

The present paper contains an overview of procedural issues relating to the work of the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption established by the Conference of the States Parties in resolution 3/1 (referred to as “Review mechanism”). It also outlines lessons learned from the training workshops organized by the Secretariat pursuant to paragraph 32 of the Terms of Reference of the Review Mechanism as well as practical guidance for focal points of States parties under review and governmental experts of reviewing States parties.

I. Procedural issues relating to the Review Mechanism

A. Drawing of lots

1. In accordance with paragraph 14 of the Terms of reference of the Review Mechanism, “[t]he selection of States parties participating in the review process in a given year of a review cycle shall be carried out by the drawing of lots at the beginning of each review cycle”. Furthermore, paragraph 19 provides that “[t]he selection of the reviewing States parties shall be carried out by the drawing of lots at the beginning of each year of the cycle, with the understanding that States parties shall not undertake mutual reviews”.
2. At the first session of the Implementation Review Group (hereinafter IRG), held in Vienna from 28 June to 2 July 2010, a drawing of lots was carried out to determine the States parties under review in each year of the first review cycle, as well as the reviewing States parties for the first year. In some cases (see below), the drawing of lots had to be carried out or repeated at the intersessional meeting of the IRG held on 23 August 2010.
3. A link to the updated list of country review pairings is available on the website of UNODC: http://www.unodc.org/documents/corruption/Microsoft_Word_-_Country_pairings_-_Year_1-4.pdf

* CAC/COSP/IRG/2010/1/Add.1.



Selection of States parties under review

Deferrals

4. In accordance with the Terms of reference, a State party selected for review in a given year, may, with a reasonable justification, defer participation to the following year of the review cycle. At the first session of the IRG it was decided that in case a State party decided to defer its participation to the second year, the selection of the two reviewing States parties would be carried out at the time of the drawing of lots for the second year.

Consequences of a deferral on the reviews of other States parties

5. As a result of deferrals of States parties selected to undergo review in the first year of the review cycle, the number of States parties of each regional group to undergo review proved to be lower than the proportional number of States parties for the first year, and increased correspondingly for the second year. When a selected State party exercised its right to defer, the States parties from the same regional group selected to be reviewed the following year 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.

Selection of reviewing States parties

Selection of the second reviewing State party

6. Paragraph 19 of the Terms of reference provides that one of the two reviewing States parties shall be from the same geographical region as the State party under review. Two distinct boxes were therefore used for the drawing of lots: one containing all States parties from the same regional group and a second one containing the States parties without consideration of regional groups. In five country review pairings, both reviewing States parties belong to the same regional group as the State party under review.

Selection of States parties that had not submitted a list of governmental experts at the time of the drawing of lots

7. In accordance with paragraph 21 of the Terms of reference, each State party shall appoint up to 15 governmental experts for the purpose of the review process. At the time of drawing of lots during the first session of the IRG, 94 States parties had submitted their list of experts and the question was raised how this would affect the drawing of lots for reviewing States parties. Several States parties drawn to undergo review in the first year of the cycle did not consider the absence of such a list as a reason to request a redraw.
8. 64 States parties were selected to conduct a review in the first year of the review cycle, from which 16 had not submitted a list of governmental experts for the purpose of the Review Mechanism at the time of the drawing of lots.

9. From those 16 States, six had complied with the requirement to submit a list of governmental experts one month after the drawing of lots. At the end of August 2010, three additional States parties had submitted a list of governmental experts to participate in the Review Mechanism.
10. From the States parties that had submitted their list of experts by 2 July 2010, approximately half amended their list following the same procedure between the first session of the IRG and its intersessional meeting held on 23 August 2010.

Date of the beginning of reviews

11. In cases where the State party under review had indicated its readiness to undergo review and where a reviewing State party had not submitted a list of governmental experts as at 5 August 2010 (seven reviews in total¹), four States parties under review requested a repeated drawing of lots so as to select a new reviewing State party. In these cases, the date of the beginning of the review process was set at 23 August 2010, when the outcome of the repeated drawing of lots was endorsed by the IRG at its intersessional meeting. The same date was set for those reviews where the selection of reviewing States parties was completed on 23 August 2010 (three country pairings). In one case, the Group agreed, at the request of the concerned State party under review, to give additional time to a reviewing State party to submit its list of experts. The State party complied with the agreed deadline and submitted its list of experts on 27 August 2010.

B. Schedule of country reviews conducted in the first year

12. At its first session, the IRG finalized the guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat in the conduct of country reviews (“the Guidelines”). The Guidelines set out indicative time lines for country reviews in order to ensure the consistency and efficiency of the review process. The purpose of this section is to give an overview of various technical issues that arose with regard to the indicative schedule as defined in the Terms of reference and the Guidelines.

Late confirmation of readiness to undergo review

13. At the first session of the IRG, 34 States parties were selected by drawing of lots to undergo review in the first year of the review cycle.
14. From these 34 States parties, 19 had indicated their readiness to undergo review by the adjournment of the session, whereas six States parties had notified the IRG that they wished to defer their participation to the following year in accordance with paragraph 14 of the terms of reference of the Review Mechanism. Four States parties selected to undergo review in the second year volunteered to advance their review, thus taking the place of deferring States parties from the same regional group.

¹ In two cases where a reviewing State party had not complied with the obligation to submit a list of governmental experts for the Review Mechanism, the State party under review decided to defer its participation to the following year.

15. In paragraph 42 of its report, the IRG requested the Secretariat to inform those States parties selected for review during the first year of the cycle but not present at the session that they should indicate within two weeks after the drawing of lots their readiness for such a review. From these nine States parties, three had notified the Secretariat of their readiness to undergo review in the first year of the review cycle and three had indicated their wish to defer their participation to the following year at the time of the intersessional meeting of the IRG held on 23 August 2010. As at 26 November 2010, one additional State party had communicated its wish to defer its review and two States parties had not officially informed the Secretariat of their decision.

Delay in the appointment of a focal point to coordinate the participation of a State party under review

16. In accordance with paragraph 17 of the Terms of reference and paragraph 13 of the Guidelines, a State party under review, within three weeks of officially being informed, shall appoint a focal point – and shall inform the secretariat accordingly – to coordinate its participation in the review.

17. As at 26 November 2010, 26 States parties had indicated their readiness to undergo review in the first year of the review cycle. The figures below reflect the time period between the beginning of the review and the official notification of the appointment of a focal point:

Less than 3 weeks: 17 States parties;

3 to 5 weeks: four States parties;

Over 5 weeks: four States parties.

18. The delay in appointing focal points affected the participation of States parties under review in training workshops organized by the Secretariat to familiarize focal points with the Review Mechanism, including the self-assessment checklist. Furthermore, it entailed delays in the submission of the response to the self-assessment checklist, which ought to be submitted within two months after the official notification of the beginning of the country review according to the Guidelines. Finally, the initial telephone conference and dialogue with the reviewing States parties could not be initiated as long as the focal point had not been appointed by the State party under review.

19. As at 26 November 2010, one State party under review had not officially informed the Secretariat through its Permanent Mission of the appointment of a focal point for the country review.

Late communication of contact details of governmental experts by reviewing States parties

20. Paragraph 16 of the Guidelines provides that a telephone conference shall be organized within one month after the State party under review has officially been informed of the beginning of the conduct of the country review. This telephone conference involves the State party under review, the reviewing States parties and the Secretariat staff assigned to the country review. With a view to organizing the initial telephone conference, the Secretariat requested reviewing States parties to designate

contact persons among the governmental experts and to communicate their contact details.

21. The figures below reflect the time period between the beginning of the review and the communication of contact details of governmental experts designated to participate in the country review²:
 - Less than 3 weeks: 33 States parties;
 - 3 to 5 weeks: 12 States parties;
 - Over 5 weeks: six States parties.
22. As the communication of contact details of governmental experts is a prerequisite for the organization of the initial telephone conference, this introduction could not always be held within the timeframe indicated in the Guidelines. The information on contact details of governmental experts had to be transmitted to the Secretariat separately from the curricula vitae of the governmental experts. As at 26 November 2010, one reviewing State party had not officially communicated the contact details of governmental experts designated to participate in the country review through its Permanent Mission.

Status of the reviews as at 26 November 2010

23. Initial introductions had been held in 23 of the 26 country pairings. One was to be held during the resumed session of the IRG and a further two were delayed by the State party that had not officially communicated its focal point and contact details for governmental experts through its Permanent Mission. Several country pairings were to hold meetings at the margins of the resumed session of the IRG.
24. During the initial introductions and in accordance with the guidelines, reviewing experts were invited to take a decision on how to divide tasks and issues among themselves, taking into account their respective fields of expertise. In several cases the reviewing experts agreed to divide their work according to the two chapters under review and in others they decided that both sets of reviewing experts would work on both chapters. A few decisions were still pending as experts agreed to discuss division of labour at a later stage or only upon receipt of the responses to the self-assessment checklist.
25. Twelve States parties under review had submitted their final response to the self-assessment checklist as well as supporting materials, and three States parties under review had submitted a tentative or partial response. Several States under review also agreed to submit information relevant to the implementation of the Convention produced by competent international organizations whose mandates covers anti-corruption issues or regional or international mechanisms for combating and preventing corruption of which they were members. The average length of complete responses to the self-assessment checklist excluding attachments was 287 pages.

² Data based on the 26 country reviews confirmed as at 19 November 2010.

26. One outcome of desk review had been submitted to the Secretariat for transmission to the State party under review. Preliminary comments on the responses to the self-assessment were made by several reviewing States.
27. During the initial introductions, 19 of the States parties under review indicated that they would request or consider requesting further means of direct dialogue such as a country visit or joint meeting at the United Nations in Vienna. Where the State party under review has requested direct means of dialogue, i.e. a country visit or joint meeting at the United Office at Vienna, in accordance with paragraphs 29 of the Terms of reference and 24 of the Guidelines, the Secretariat has secured funding from voluntary contributions for one of these means of direct dialogue.
28. In certain cases, States parties under review expressed the willingness to consider requesting a country visit before formally receiving the outcome of the desk review, while taking into account translation requirements and planning and organization of country visits. Standard host country agreements must be agreed upon well in advance of the country visit in order to facilitate logistics and practical arrangements to be undertaken by the Secretariat as well as the reviewing experts.
29. One country visit has been conducted, from 22 to 25 November 2010.

C. Language issues

30. In accordance with paragraph 51 of the Terms of reference, “[t]he country review process may be conducted in any of the working languages of the Mechanism. The secretariat shall be responsible for providing the required translation and interpretation into any of the working languages of the Mechanism, as necessary for its efficient functioning.”
31. Pursuant to paragraphs 12 to 14 of Resolution 3/1 of the Conference of the States Parties, the IRG considered the resource requirements of the Review Mechanism at its first session. In its Resolution 1/1, entitled “Resource requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption for the biennium 2012-2013”, the IRG “welcomes the voluntary contributions received so far, which cover partially the operational requirements of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption for the biennium 2010-2011, including the costs of communication and translation from and into the working language or languages of the Mechanism designated for individual reviews, travel and daily subsistence allowance for representatives of least developed countries to attend the annual sessions of the Implementation Review Group, training and general operating expenses, as well as country visits, joint meetings in Vienna, and translation and interpretation into languages other than the six working languages of the Mechanism, if requested by a State party under review” (paragraph 1) and “requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, in accordance with the terms of reference of the Review Mechanism, to seek voluntary contributions to cover costs of the Mechanism not covered by the regular budget”.

32. From the 25 country reviews which had begun by 26 November 2010, ten are conducted in one language, thirteen are conducted in two languages, and two in three languages. While the translation of the complete response to the UNCAC self-assessment checklist was foreseen, States parties under review were requested to select most relevant supporting documents to be submitted for translation as well. In accordance with paragraph 52 of the Terms of reference, the Secretariat has also provided translation from and into two languages which are not working languages of the Mechanism. As at 26 November the Secretariat had received eleven responses to the self-assessment checklist requiring translation.

II. Lessons Learned from Training Workshops and Practical Guidance

A. Training workshops for focal points and governmental experts

33. In accordance with the terms of reference of the Review Mechanism for the implementation of UNCAC and the guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat, UNODC organized training workshops to familiarize focal points of States parties under review and governmental experts of reviewing States parties with the substantive provisions of UNCAC and the methodology of the review process. These workshops were funded through voluntary contributions and based on a regional and linguistic distribution of States. Seven workshops were held, in Dakar, Panama, Rabat, Moscow, Vienna, Jakarta and Pretoria. A last ad hoc workshop will be organized during the week of the resumed session of the Implementation Review Group for States parties that were unable to attend any of the other workshops, thus ensuring that all States parties under review and reviewing States parties had an opportunity for training.
34. As a follow-up to regional workshops, several States parties expressed interest in and carried out national training workshops. Within available resources, the Secretariat provided assistance in such workshops to the extent possible. The availability of national training opportunities on the self-assessment checklist for States parties under review might be considered by the IRG in view of its mandate regarding technical assistance in the implementation of the UNCAC. UNODC is exploring ways to support countries under review in the second year of the current cycle, upon request, to prepare the self-assessment as early as possible, including through the UNODC Field Office Network.
35. During the workshops, focal points and governmental experts participated in interactive exercises on the substantive provisions of Chapters III and IV of UNCAC, in order to gain a deeper understanding of the provisions' content and with a view to using the Travaux Préparatoires of UNCAC and the Legislative Guide, as appropriate. Brief presentations were delivered on the key aspects of methodology and the work of the Conference and the IRG. The participants performed mock reviews covering every aspect of the country review process: filling out the self-assessment checklist for selected articles using the omnibus software; analyzing responses to the checklist and preparing a desk review; engaging in dialogue including further means of direct dialogue; and, preparing and agreeing on a report drafted using the blueprint for country review reports.

36. UNODC staff delivered the training, which was also attended in some cases by UNDP and bilateral technical assistance providers. The participants were requested to fill out evaluation questionnaires in each workshop, thus providing the Secretariat with an assessment of the workshops, their delivery and content, as well as lessons learned for future workshops and the review process in general. The following are issues and questions that arose during the training workshops or were submitted to the Secretariat.

B. Practical guidance for focal points of States parties under review

37. Focal points have been designated in accordance with paragraph 17 of the terms of reference in almost all States parties under review. To date the focal points of 25 out of the 26 States parties under review in the first year have been trained. While the work of focal points extends throughout the review process, efforts were focused on assisting focal points with the completion and submission of responses to the self-assessment checklist.

Completing the self-assessment

38. Focal points were assisted in installing the omnibus software on their computers during the training workshops as well as remotely. The use of browsers such as Windows 7 and Vista gave rise to technical problems that were addressed by UNODC Information Technology services and solved on a case-by-case basis.
39. Focal points of States parties under review should bear in mind the possibility to seek assistance, including technical support, from the Secretariat when completing the UNCAC self-assessment checklist. In several cases, communications with the Secretariat allowed to address technical difficulties in a speedy manner, thus facilitating the self-assessment. The self-assessment clinic will continue to be offered to States parties during the meetings of the IRG and upon request during the working groups on asset recovery and prevention.
40. The first question of the self-assessment entitled 'General information' is to be answered with a view to providing the reviewing experts with adequate background knowledge of the legal and institutional framework of the State party under review, as well as basic information to be later reflected in the introductory part of the country review report (ratification/accession, implementing legislation, effect of international treaties).
41. As regards the substantive provisions of UNCAC, only the questions related to Chapters III ("Criminalization and law enforcement") and IV ("International cooperation") are to be answered. The implementation of all provisions of these two chapters, whether mandatory or optional, is to be assessed, in accordance with Resolution 3/1 that refers to the two chapters in their entirety.
42. Where possible and appropriate, focal points should make use of the 'template answers' that provide a framework for responses. Similarly, where responses to a question flow are identical to those provided for another article, focal points may

refer to previous responses, clearly indicating under which article they have been inserted.

43. States parties under review that had provided limited or partial responses to the self-assessment checklist have been given the XML files enabling them to import the answers and accept them where appropriate.
44. If checklist responses are to be provided by several users, they must save their responses in XML format in order to provide the focal point with those files for merging into the final version of the self-assessment response. The focal point must save the XML file on the computer that is being used to import and merge it into the final self-assessment report.
45. Concerning the question flow on evaluation of the efficiency of measures adopted, focal points may indicate whether they wish reviews of sectoral or regional instruments to be submitted to the reviewers as part of the supporting materials. In addition, where internal or other evaluations exist, they may also be submitted. The question flow on evaluations was included inter alia to reflect the follow-up procedures for country reviews in accordance with paragraph 40 of the terms of reference to submit information on progress achieved in updates to the self-assessment.

Submitting the self-assessment

46. Attachments up to 2 megabytes can be inserted into the checklist responses. However, where feasible, focal points are encouraged to send the attachments separately by email clearly indicating to which article they relate and only enclosing the relevant text. Where the relevant text has already been copied and pasted into the self-assessment report it is not necessary to send the attachment. A list of attachments should be provided in order to check that the full set of materials has been received by the Secretariat, and it should be indicated which attachments are to be translated, where required.
47. Once the responses to the self-assessment are complete, focal points must save the response both in PDF and XML/DAT format for submission to the Secretariat. Both files are needed in order to process the data in the self-assessment and to update the Technical Assistance Matrix requested by the Conference of the States parties.
48. While the quality and thoroughness of responses to the self-assessment are crucial to the review process, focal points should bear in mind translation constraints in reviews conducted in two or more languages and quote only laws or other measures specifically relevant to the implementation of provisions under review. In addition and where the deadline for submission of responses is close or past, focal points may wish to consider submitting the responses to the two chapters separately if they are complete at different intervals.

Conducting the review

49. Once the responses to the self-assessment checklist have been submitted, the Secretariat will forward them directly to the reviewing experts, or submit the

responses for translation where agreed during the initial introduction. The reviewing experts are notified of the relevant dates and kept informed of any delays or significant changes in the individual schedule for the country review as agreed in the initial introduction.

50. Focal points are requested to inform the Secretariat in a timely manner of their possible attendance to meetings of the Implementation Review Group, as well as the working groups on asset recovery and prevention, in order to organize and schedule joint meetings with the reviewing experts where requested by the State party under review.

C. Practical guidance for governmental experts of reviewing States parties

51. Reviewing States parties have submitted their lists of governmental experts and were requested by the Secretariat to further designate one or more experts on that list for the purposes of organizing the initial introduction and to participate in the training workshops. All experts performing reviews are on the lists of governmental experts and where appropriate for the purposes of conducting reviews, reviewing States parties have added experts to their lists by the same procedure. States parties under review have been notified of the relevant changes.

Preparing for the review

52. In accordance with the guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat, reviewing experts are to prepare themselves for the review by studying UNCAC, the terms of reference and the guidelines, and by familiarizing themselves with the Legislative Guide and the Travaux Préparatoires. It should be noted that the Legislative Guide is for information purposes only and provides guidance to States parties wishing to implement UNCAC, whereas the interpretative notes contained in the Travaux Préparatoires were adopted by the Ad-Hoc Committee and are therefore authoritative.
53. During the initial introductions and in accordance with the guidelines, reviewing experts were invited to take a decision on how to divide tasks and issues among themselves, taking into account their respective fields of competence. Where decisions were pending, the Secretariat sent reminders and proposed to organize teleconferences or meetings, where appropriate.

Conducting the review

54. Once the reviewing experts have received complete responses to the self-assessment checklist and any supplementary information, they have one month to submit the outcome of the desk review. This includes requests for clarification or additional information or supplementary questions. Where experts received partial responses or advance responses pending translation, they could begin to analyze those responses though the one month deadline for the outcome of the desk review would still be in effect.

55. In order to facilitate the experts' work in this respect, the outcome of the desk review may be submitted to the Secretariat in the form of free-text observations or as a list, with reference to the relevant articles. The Secretariat will then organize the outcome of the desk review according to the report blueprint format. Reviewing experts may also request the Secretariat for any further assistance with the production of the outcome of the desk review. The involvement of the Secretariat throughout the review process contributes to the consistency of standards used by reviewers in their conclusions.
56. For the review of compliance with obligations to consider, governmental experts were advised to not only analyze whether the State party under review considered the measures foreseen by the relevant provisions, but also review the content of such measure itself where appropriate.
57. In accordance with paragraph 18 of the guidelines, reviewing experts shall establish open lines of communication with the State party under review, but the Secretariat must be kept abreast of all these communications. Experts may wish to engage in such communication while preparing the outcome of the desk review, in particular for requests for additional materials or information.
58. Similarly to focal points, governmental experts are requested to inform the Secretariat in a timely manner of their possible attendance to meetings of the Implementation Review group, as well as the working groups on asset recovery and prevention, in order to organize and schedule joint meetings with the focal points of States parties under review where requested by the State party under review.

III. Process issues requiring further consideration by the IRG

59. The Secretariat is in the process of collecting, recording and organizing process and practical issues which have emerged from the review process or are coming up in individual reviews. A paper containing all these issues will be prepared and submitted to the IRG at its second session for its consideration and to enable it to provide guidance to the Secretariat.

UNCAC REVIEW MECHANISM -COUNTRY PAIRINGS
YEAR 1

<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
	<i>Cameroon</i>	<i>Madagascar</i>	<i>Netherlands</i>
	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
	<i>Papua New Guinea</i>	<i>Tajikistan</i>	<i>Malawi</i>
	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	FYRM
	Finland	Greece	Tunisia
	Spain	Belgium	Lithuania
	France	Denmark	Cape Verde

YEAR 2

State party under review

Group of African States	Seychelles
	Mauritius
	Benin
	Mozambique
	Congo
	Cape Verde
	Central African Republic
	Mauritania
	Sierra Leone
	South Africa^a
	Zimbabwe^a
Group of Asian States	Brunei Darussalam
	Iraq
	Lao People's Democratic Republic
	Sri Lanka
	Kazakhstan
	Philippines
	Viet Nam
	Timor Leste^a
	United Arab Emirates^a
Islamic Republic of Iran^a	
Kuwait^a	
Group of Eastern European States	Slovakia
	Serbia
	Montenegro
	Estonia
	Azerbaijan
	Russian Federation
	Georgia^a
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Cuba
	Uruguay
	El Salvador
	Nicaragua
	Colombia
	Panama
	Dominica^a
Jamaica^a	
Group of Western European and other States	Australia
	Norway
	United Kingdom
	Portugal
	Switzerland ^a

^a Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

YEAR 3

	<i>State party under review</i>
Group of African States	Egypt Mali Lesotho Djibouti Algeria Ghana United Republic of Tanzania Burkina Faso Tunisia Guinea-Bissau Angola
Group of Asian States	Republic of Korea Yemen Cyprus Cambodia Malaysia Pakistan Qatar Afghanistan
Group of Eastern European States	Hungary Slovenia Latvia Romania The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia Armenia
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Mexico Paraguay Plurinational State of Bolivia Trinidad and Tobago Guyana Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela
Group of Western European and other States	Sweden Canada Luxembourg Italy Netherlands Austria Malta ^a

^a Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

YEAR 4

State party under review

Group of African States	Senegal
	Liberia
	Kenya
	Nigeria
	Gabon
	Malawi
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
	Madagascar
	Namibia
	Ethiopia
Group of Asian States	Kyrgyzstan
	Maldives
	Lebanon
	Uzbekistan
	Palau
	Turkmenistan
	Singapore
	China
	Tajikistan
Group of Eastern European States	Poland
	Belarus
	Bosnia and Herzegovina
	Albania
	Republic of Moldova
Group of Latin American and Caribbean States	Ecuador
	Haiti
	Costa Rica
	Honduras
	Guatemala
	Antigua and Barbuda
Bahamas	
Group of Western European and other States	Turkey
	Greece
	Belgium
	Denmark
	Israel
