



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

Distr.: General
6 August 2020

Original: English

**Implementation Review Group
First resumed eleventh session
Vienna, 31 August–2 September 2020
Agenda item 4
State of implementation of the United Nations
Convention against Corruption**

Executive summary

Note by the Secretariat

Addendum

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
II. Executive summary	2
Guyana.	2



II. Executive summary

Guyana

1. Introduction: overview of the legal and institutional framework of Guyana in the context of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Guyana acceded to the United Nations Convention against Corruption on 16 April 2008. The Convention entered into force for Guyana on 16 May 2008.

The implementing legislation includes primarily the Criminal Law (Offences) Act, the Anti-Money-Laundering and Countering the Financing of Terrorism Act, the Summary Jurisdiction (Offences) Act, the State Assets Recovery Act, the Criminal Law (Procedure) Act, the Fugitive Offenders Act and the Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act.

The main institutions tasked with mandates relevant to preventing and combating corruption include the Guyana Police Force Serious Organized Crime Unit, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Financial Intelligence Unit and the State Assets Recovery Agency.

The Constitution is the supreme law of Guyana. It outlines the branches and powers of Government, establishes qualifications and times for elections, lists basic human rights and sets up independent institutions to protect those rights. All laws made by Parliament must be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution.

2. Chapter III: criminalization and law enforcement

2.1. Observations on the implementation of the articles under review

The narrow definition of “public service” in article 233, paragraph 5, of the Constitution excludes several categories of public officials from the scope of application of the offences established under chapter III of the Convention. Furthermore, in regard to public servants, only persons receiving emoluments from the State are covered.

Bribery and trading in influence (arts. 15, 16, 18 and 21)

Passive bribery (art. 15 (b) of the Convention) is criminalized under section 334 of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act. However, acts of indirect bribery are not specifically covered.

In addition, Guyana has partially criminalized active bribery as a stand-alone offence, in line with article 15 (a) of the Convention. Section 335 of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act creates the offence of “taking a gratification in order, by corrupt or illegal means, to influence a public servant”. This does not encompass acts of bribery where the briber has not received a prior gratification to influence a public servant.

Guyana has not criminalized the active or passive bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations.

Trading in influence is partially criminalized (sects. 335–338 of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act). While section 336 of that Act addresses passive trading in influence (art. 18 (b) of the Convention), active trading in influence (art. 18 (a)) is not covered.

There is no offence of bribery in the private sector.

Money-laundering, concealment (arts. 23 and 24)

Guyana has criminalized money-laundering in line with the Convention (sect. 3, para. 1, of the Anti-Money-Laundering Act). The offence applies to proceeds of any “serious offence”, defined using a combined approach that includes offences punishable by a maximum penalty of death, life imprisonment or imprisonment of six months or more, and offences listed in the second schedule to the Act. Serious

offences include the offences established under the Convention that are criminalized in Guyana, whether committed domestically or abroad.

The concealment or disguise of the true nature, origin, location, disposition, movement or ownership of property is criminalized (sect. 3, para. 1 (b), of the Anti-Money-Laundering Act).

Embezzlement, abuse of functions and illicit enrichment (arts. 17, 19, 20 and 22)

Guyana has criminalized embezzlement, misappropriation or other diversion of property by public servants (sect. 192 of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act). The scope of covered property does not include immovable and other types of property.

The abuse of functions is addressed through the common law offence of misfeasance in public office.

Guyana has criminalized the possession of unaccounted property or pecuniary resources (sect. 41 of the Integrity Commission Act). The provision applies to “a person who is or was a person in public life” (including public officers), as defined in section 42 of and schedule I to the Act.

Guyana has partially criminalized the embezzlement of property in the private sector (sects. 198–199, 203–205 and 209 of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act). Only acts of embezzlement by specified persons (i.e., officers and members) and private sector entities (bodies corporate and public companies) are covered.

Obstruction of justice (art. 25)

Guyana has criminalized perjury and subornation of perjury, conspiracy and attempts to obstruct justice, as well as corrupt interference with witnesses or jurors.

Section 332 of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act covers dissuading or attempting to dissuade any person, by threat, bribe or other corrupt means, from giving evidence in a civil or criminal proceeding.

Sections 330 and 331 of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act cover conspiracy to obstruct the course of justice and attempts to obstruct the course of justice, respectively. In addition, section 46 covers assault to resist apprehension or custody, as well as obstructing or resisting peace officers. Assault with intent to resist lawful apprehension is criminalized under the Summary Jurisdiction (Offences) Act, together with assaulting, obstructing or resisting any peace officer and assault on judicial officers.

Liability of legal persons (art. 26)

Guyana has established the criminal liability of legal persons primarily through provisions in the Criminal Law (Offences) Act and the Anti-Money-Laundering Act. Measures on civil and administrative liability against legal persons are included in the State Assets Recovery Act and the Anti-Money-Laundering Act.

Unlike for money-laundering, the law does not specify the liability of legal persons for corruption offences without prejudice to the criminal liability of natural persons. There are reported challenges in holding legal persons accountable for criminal offences.

Unlike the Anti-Money-Laundering Act (sect. 3, para. 6 (b)), penalties for legal persons for corruption offences are not specified in the legislation. Although section 19 (Alternative punishments) of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act allows for the imposition of a fine in lieu of imprisonment for indictable offences, no information was available on how fines were calculated or how Guyana could ensure that sanctions against legal entities had a sufficiently deterrent effect.

Participation and attempt (art. 27)

The Criminal Law (Offences) Act establishes criminal liability for accessories, abetment, conspiracy and incitement as the main participatory acts (sects. 24–37). Attempt and incitement are criminalized under sections 35 to 37. Guyana has not criminalized the preparation for an offence.

Prosecution, adjudication and sanctions; cooperation with law enforcement authorities (arts. 30 and 37)

The majority of corruption offences are classified as misdemeanours subject to imprisonment for one to three years (sects. 334–337 of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act). The provisions on criminal punishment have not been revised recently to align them with the heightened punishment for money-laundering. In the absence of sentencing guidelines, the wide margin of discretion afforded under article 19 (Alternative punishment) of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act presents challenges in terms of inconsistent sentences and non-dissuasive punishment being applied.

Article 182 of the Constitution gives the President of Guyana immunity from legal action and covers criminal indictments and civil suits. This immunity is subject to article 180 of the Constitution, which deals with the removal of the President by the National Assembly. Apart from the President, no other officials enjoy immunity from criminal proceedings in Guyana. However, as noted above, a large number of public officials are excluded from the application of Convention offences (art. 233, para. 5, of the Constitution).

Discretionary prosecution powers are established in the Constitution (art. 187) and the Criminal Law (Offences) Act (arts. 114–115). Furthermore, prosecutions may not be instituted without the consent of the Director of Public Prosecutions for certain corruption offences (sects. 202 (Fraudulent disposition of property by trustee thereof) and 338 (Punishment of corrupt transactions with agents) of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act). Decisions not to prosecute may be subject to review by the High Court. Moreover, a code of conduct for prosecutors has recently been developed.

The rules on bail in the Criminal Law (Offences) Act prescribe conditions designed to ensure the presence of the defendant at subsequent criminal proceedings (sects. 82, 83 and 85).

The Parole Act prescribes conditions for the supervised release of convicted persons who have served a specified period of the sentence (sects. 4–7).

Public servants charged with criminal offences may be suspended or reassigned and removed from office, in accordance with rules on interdiction in the Public Service Rules of 2004. Disciplinary punishment for public servants who engage in corruption is dismissal from the public service.

The Rehabilitation of Offenders Act promotes the reintegration into society of convicted persons, and a prisoner reintegration programme has been established.

Plea bargaining is regulated under the Criminal Procedure (Plea Bargaining and Plea Agreement) Act. In addition, prosecutors can grant immunity from prosecution by designating persons as witnesses for the prosecution, both before and after the laying of charges, and witness protection may be provided. Courts generally have powers to recognize an offender's cooperation at sentencing, although mitigated punishment is less frequently applied, to ensure due process.

Protection of witnesses and reporting persons (arts. 32 and 33)

The Witness Protection Act was passed by the National Assembly on 19 January 2018. However, the Act has not entered into force, owing to the lack of resources for the necessary implementing structures. Pending its entry into force, only basic measures are available to protect witnesses, experts and victims in appropriate cases. Victims are generally entitled to the same protection as witnesses, and their views may be considered at appropriate stages of criminal proceedings.

The Protected Disclosures Act was passed by the National Assembly on 17 January 2018. However, the Act has not entered into force, owing to the absence of necessary resources. Pending its entry into force, no effective measures are in place to protect reporting persons from any unjustified treatment or retaliation.

Freezing, seizing and confiscation; bank secrecy (arts. 31 and 40)

Part IV of the Anti-Money-Laundering Act provides for the forfeiture of property that constitutes proceeds of a serious offence, including Convention offences, as well as property and instrumentalities used in or intended to be used in the commission of a serious offence. Property liable to confiscation includes indirect proceeds of crime, as well as income, profits or other benefits and assets of every kind, whether tangible or intangible (sect. 2, para. 1, of the Anti-Money-Laundering Act).

The range of available measures includes the ability to identify, freeze, restrain, seize and confiscate assets. Section 51 (Payment instead of a forfeiture order) of the Anti-Money-Laundering Act allows the court to order a convicted person to pay an amount equal to the value of property (or any part or interest therein), and sections 54 to 58 provide for pecuniary penalty orders. Provisions on the civil recovery of State property unlawfully acquired by public officials or any other persons are included in the State Assets Recovery Act.

Article 46, paragraph 2 (b), of the Anti-Money-Laundering Act establishes an evidentiary presumption of unexplained wealth in relation to a person's legitimate income for property acquired within six years of the commission of the offence.

There are adequate provisions for the protection of the rights of bona fide third parties.

Apart from the possibility of having court-appointed receivers or asset managers in civil recovery proceedings, no other regulations or guidelines on asset management were referred to by the authorities of Guyana. The authorities expressed an interest in strengthening measures relating to asset management.

Provisions in the Anti-Money-Laundering Act override the secrecy obligations imposed by other legislation or common law (sect. 22, para. 2, sect. 76, para. 5, and sect. 111).

Statute of limitations; criminal record (arts. 29 and 41)

There is no prescription period for indictable offences in Guyana. For summary offences, the limitations period is six months, unless another law provides otherwise. In Guyana, corruption and money-laundering offences are classified as both indictable and summary offences.

Courts may take foreign sentences into consideration in making sentencing decisions.

Jurisdiction (art. 42)

There is no express provision in the Criminal Law (Offences) Act providing for jurisdiction over offences committed under the Act.

Consequences of acts of corruption; compensation for damage (arts. 34 and 35)

Some measures are in place to address the consequences of corruption, namely, the disqualification of suppliers from public procurement and the withdrawal of licences.

Compensation for damages may be had by application to the High Court for any breach of the protective provisions of the Constitution (art. 153).

Specialized authorities and inter-agency coordination (arts. 36, 38 and 39)

The main institutions tasked with combating corruption through law enforcement include the Serious Organized Crime Unit and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Other institutions with mandates relevant to preventing and combating corruption include the Financial Intelligence Unit and the State Assets Recovery

Agency. Measures to ensure the independence of the institutions are provided by law. However, there is a need for further resources and capacity-building in those agencies to develop specialized skills and expertise in order to combat corruption and economic crime effectively.

There are no requirements for public officials in Guyana to report corruption and other misconduct to the relevant authorities or to cooperate in investigations or prosecutions. The entry into force of the Protected Disclosures Act would provide incentives for cooperation with law enforcement.

The work of the Financial Intelligence Unit ensures coordination among authorities. In addition, Guyana has taken some steps to encourage the cooperation of the private sector in investigations and prosecutions and the reporting of incidents of corruption to the relevant authorities.

2.2. Successes and good practices

- Recent amendments to the Anti-Money-Laundering Act have brought the legal regime to combat money-laundering in line with international standards (art. 23).

2.3. Challenges in implementation

It is recommended that Guyana:

- Amend its legislation to ensure that all public officials, as defined in article 2 of the Convention, are covered by the scope of the relevant offences established in accordance with the Convention (chap. III).
- Criminalize active bribery of public officials as a stand-alone offence (art. 15 (a)) and specify that bribery offences also cover indirect acts (art. 15 (a) and (b)).
- Criminalize active bribery and consider criminalizing passive bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations (art. 16).
- Amend its legislation on embezzlement to cover a wider scope of property, in line with the definition in article 2 of the Convention (arts. 17 and 22).
- Consider establishing active trading in influence as a stand-alone offence (art. 18 (a)).
- Consider criminalizing the abuse of functions (art. 19).
- Consider criminalizing bribery in the private sector (art. 21).
- Expand the offence of embezzlement in the private sector to cover acts committed by any person who directs or works, in any capacity, in a private sector entity (art. 22).
- Adopt measures to establish the liability of legal persons for Convention offences, without prejudice to the criminal liability of natural persons (art. 26, para. 3), and amend legislation to ensure that legal persons are subject to effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal or non-criminal sanctions, including monetary sanctions (art. 26, para. 4).
- Review the prescription period for corruption offences classified as summary offences, to ensure a sufficiently long statute of limitations period in which to commence proceedings, and establish a longer statute of limitations period (or provide for its suspension) where the alleged offender has evaded the administration of justice (art. 29).
- Regarding sentences: (a) develop sentencing guidelines; (b) review and amend its legislation to ensure that sanctions for corruption offences are effective, proportionate and dissuasive, including by eliminating section 19 of the

Criminal Law (Offences) Act; and (c) adopt measures to disaggregate statistics on convictions in criminal cases by category of crime (art. 30, para. 1).

- Eliminate the requirement to obtain the consent of the Director of Public Prosecutions before instituting prosecutions for certain corruption offences (sects. 202 (Fraudulent disposition of property by trustee thereof) and 338 (Punishment of corrupt transactions with agents) of the Criminal Law (Offences) Act), and consider developing prosecution guidelines (art. 30, para. 3).
- Continue to strengthen procedures to regulate the administration of frozen, seized or confiscated property (art. 31, para. 3).
- Take steps to implement the Witness Protection Act as a matter of priority and ensure adequate protection for victims in corruption cases (art. 32).
- Take steps to implement the Protected Disclosures Act as a matter of priority (art. 33).
- Review its measures giving effect to article 34 to ensure that it addresses the consequences of corruption effectively.
- Continue to invest resources to fund the operations of anti-corruption institutions adequately, as well as into the training and capacity-building of personnel, to develop specialized skills and expertise to combat corruption and economic crime effectively (art. 36).
- Continue to strengthen measures for public officials to report corruption to the relevant authorities and to cooperate in investigations and prosecutions (art. 38).
- Continue to strengthen measures to encourage cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities and entities of the private sector and to encourage the reporting of corruption to the authorities (art. 39).
- Amend its legislation to establish jurisdiction over Convention offences, as provided in article 42, paragraph 1, and consider establishing jurisdiction in accordance with article 42, paragraph 2 (a), (b) and (d).

2.4. Technical assistance needs identified to improve implementation of the Convention

- Capacity-building for the Integrity Commission and legal advice to establish its independence (art. 20).
- Legislative assistance and capacity-building (art. 26).
- Legislative assistance to develop sentencing guidelines and review and amend sanctions for corruption offences (art. 30, para. 1).
- Capacity-building: training of prosecutors and the judiciary, financial analysis training for the Financial Intelligence Unit and training for the State Assets Recovery Agency on asset management and recovery (art. 36).

3. Chapter IV: international cooperation

3.1. Observations on the implementation of the articles under review

Extradition; transfer of sentenced persons; transfer of criminal proceedings (arts. 44, 45 and 47)

Extradition is governed by the Fugitive Offenders Act. Under the Act, extradition is limited to Commonwealth countries (sect. 3) and countries that have concluded an arrangement relating to extradition with Guyana or countries in respect to which the Minister of Public Security has declared, by order, that the provisions of the Act apply (sect. 4, para. 2).¹ At the time of review, only one arrangement with a foreign country

¹ Pursuant to section 4, paragraph 1, of the Fugitive Offenders Act, extradition is also possible to and from any “treaty territory” in respect of which an extradition arrangement has been made

had been concluded. In special circumstances, extradition may be granted in respect of non-Commonwealth countries even in the absence of a special arrangement (sect. 36 of the Fugitive Offenders Act). However, this provision has never been applied. Guyana does not consider the Convention as a legal basis for extradition, unless the Minister so decides, in accordance with section 36. Guyana has not informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations of whether the Convention may be used as a legal basis for extradition, in line with article 44, paragraph 6, of the Convention.

Guyana has concluded one extradition treaty, with the United States of America, which does not cover Convention offences except for bribery (art. 3). It is also bound by the London Scheme for Extradition within the Commonwealth.

Extraditable offences are those punishable, in both Guyana and the foreign State, with death or imprisonment of more than two years (sect. 5 of the Fugitive Offenders Act). This threshold means that not all Convention offences are extraditable offences. Guyana does not provide for accessory extradition in line with article 44, paragraph 3 of the Convention. No extradition cases in connection with Convention offences have been reported.

The grounds for refusing extradition include the political character of the offence and prosecution or punishment on account of the requested person's race, tribe, sex, religion, nationality or political opinions (sect. 8 of the Fugitive Offenders Act). Extradition may not be refused solely on the ground that the offence is also considered to involve fiscal matters.

Guyana may extradite its nationals and does not make such extradition conditional on an undertaking that the person will be returned to serve the sentence imposed.

Guyana has not adopted measures to expedite extradition procedures and simplify evidentiary requirements.

Article 144 of the Constitution contains provisions to secure the fairness of a trial of any person charged with a criminal offence. However, fair treatment principles are not specifically addressed in the Fugitive Offenders Act. In addition, under section 17 of the Act, a person committed to custody may make an application for habeas corpus to the High Court. Before discharging a person from custody, the requesting State may apply to the High Court for a review of the order of discharge (sect. 19). However, there are no specific measures providing for consultations to be held with requesting States before extradition is refused.

Guyana has not concluded any agreements on the transfer of sentenced persons. There are no provisions for the transfer of criminal proceedings.

Mutual legal assistance (art. 46)

Mutual legal assistance in criminal matters is governed by the Mutual Assistance Act. Under the Act, such assistance may be granted to any country that has a bilateral or multilateral mutual legal assistance treaty with Guyana, which, according to the authorities of Guyana, includes the Convention (sect. 38 of the Act).

The Mutual Assistance Act provides for most of the measures listed in article 46, paragraph 3, of the Convention (part 3 and sect. 38 of the Act). There are no provisions for the spontaneous transmission of information. However, according to the authorities of Guyana, nothing prevents Guyana from spontaneously sharing information on the basis of reciprocity. As provided under section 6 of the Act, the development of other forms of cooperation, whether formal or informal, is possible.

Sections 2 and 3 of the Mutual Assistance Act designate the Minister for Home Affairs as the central authority for mutual legal assistance. However, as per the depositary

between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland prior to 26 May 1966, which remains in force in Guyana.

notification made by Guyana on 21 June 2011, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was appointed as central authority under the Convention.

Section 23, paragraph 2, of the Mutual Assistance Act lists mandatory grounds for refusal of mutual legal assistance, and section 23, paragraph 3, gives the central authority discretion to refuse a request in certain situations, such as interference with an ongoing investigation or prosecution or if the request could not be accommodated within existing legal practices and procedures in Guyana. While the absence of dual criminality is a discretionary ground for refusal, there is no obligation for Guyana to render non-coercive assistance as provided in article 46, paragraph 9 (b), of the Convention. Bank secrecy is not a ground for refusal. Before refusing a request, the central authority must consider whether the request can be carried out subject to certain conditions, which would be proposed to the requesting State (sect. 23, para. 5, of the Mutual Assistance Act). Reasons for refusal of assistance must be given (sect. 25).

The outbound transfer of detained witnesses is governed by section 31 of the Mutual Assistance Act. Section 12 requires Guyana to comply with any condition with respect to the prisoner's custody, release, return or any other matter. In addition, such person, may not be detained, prosecuted or punished for prior acts and may refuse to answer questions or provide evidence (sect. 20).

According to section 23, paragraph 1, of the Mutual Assistance Act, the central authority must accept and carry out requests as soon as practicable. However, there are no specific procedures to ensure the expeditious execution or transmission of requests. Information on the average time needed to respond to requests was not provided.

Section 22 of and the schedule to the Mutual Assistance Act set out the requirements for the form and content of requests made to Guyana for mutual legal assistance. A request must be made in English and should be in writing; if made orally owing to urgency, it must be followed by a confirmation in writing within seven days.

While there have been cases where hearings were conducted involving foreign judicial authorities, there are no provisions for hearings conducted by videoconference.

The rule of speciality is observed (sect. 18 of the Mutual Assistance Act), and the confidentiality of information pertaining to requests is protected (sect. 19).

The costs of executing a request is to be borne by the requesting State, unless the central authority decides otherwise (sect. 24 and sect. 38, para. 2, of the Mutual Assistance Act).

Guyana is a party to the Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters and the Inter-American Convention against Corruption, which also contains mutual legal assistance provisions, and has concluded one bilateral mutual legal assistance treaty, with the United States. The Scheme relating to Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters within the Commonwealth may also be used.

Law enforcement cooperation; joint investigations; special investigative techniques (arts. 48, 49 and 50)

Parts 3 and 4 of the Mutual Assistance Act establish the framework for assistance to be provided to a foreign State upon request, which includes several types of law enforcement assistance. In addition, law enforcement authorities cooperate through organizations and networks, such as the Hemispheric Network for Legal Cooperation on Criminal Matters, the Association of Caribbean Commissioners of Police, the Implementation Agency for Crime and Security of the Caribbean Community, the International Criminal Police Organization and the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units. In addition, liaison officers from foreign countries are stationed in Guyana.

Guyana has not entered into any agreements or arrangements that provide for joint investigations with other States.

The Interception of Communication Act allows for electronic surveillance in money-laundering cases. The legislation of Guyana does not contain provisions for special investigative techniques, such as controlled delivery, in cases involving Convention offences.

3.2. Successes and good practices

- The possibility of taking statements from persons by or in the presence of the legal representative of the requesting country or any other person specified in the request (sect. 26, para. 5, of the Mutual Assistance Act) (art. 46, para. 3).

3.3. Challenges in implementation

It is recommended that Guyana:

- Strengthen measures to collect and maintain statistics on extradition and mutual legal assistance (chap. IV).
- Adopt measures to ensure that Convention offences are extraditable in respect of States parties to the Convention by removing the restrictions relating to designated States and providing for the possibility of extradition in the absence of an arrangement (sect. 4 of the Fugitive Offenders Act); otherwise, consider concluding additional arrangements relating to extradition and widening the scope of countries designated for extradition (art. 44, para. 1).
- Ensure that all Convention offences are extraditable, including by lowering the minimum punishment threshold for extradition offences (sect. 5 of the Fugitive Offenders Act) (art. 44, para. 1).
- Consider adopting a provision on accessory extradition (art. 44, para. 3).
- Specify that Convention offences are not considered to be political offences under the Fugitive Offenders Act (art. 44, para. 4).
- Notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations as to whether the Convention may be used as a legal basis for extradition (art. 44, para. 6 (a)).
- Adopt measures to expedite extradition procedures and simplify evidentiary requirements (art. 44, para. 9).
- Ensure the consistent application of fair treatment principles in extradition proceedings (art. 44, para. 14).
- Establish a procedure for consultations to be held with requesting States before extradition is refused (art. 44, para. 17).
- Consider entering into agreements or arrangements on the transfer of sentenced persons and adopting measures on the transfer of criminal proceedings (arts. 45 and 47).
- Amend the Mutual Assistance Act to provide for non-coercive assistance to be rendered in the absence of dual criminality (art. 46, para. 9 (b)).
- Consider updating the contact information of the central authority of Guyana in the Directory of Competent National Authorities maintained by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime under the Convention, in the light of sections 2 and 3 of the Mutual Assistance Act (art. 46, para. 13).
- Adopt measures to ensure the speedy and proper execution or transmission of requests (art. 46, para. 13).
- Consider adopting measures to permit hearings to take place by videoconference (art. 46, para. 18).

- Amend legislation to regulate the ordinary costs of executing requests for mutual legal assistance in line with the Convention (art. 46, para. 28).
 - Consider the possibility of concluding additional agreements or arrangements to enhance mutual legal assistance (art. 46, para. 30).
 - Consider concluding agreements or arrangements on joint investigations with foreign States (art. 49).
 - Take measures to allow for the use of special investigative techniques in cases involving Convention offences and allow for the admissibility in court of evidence derived therefrom (art. 50).
-