



# Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

Distr.: General  
6 June 2018

Original: English

**Working Group of Government  
Experts on Technical Assistance**

Vienna, 28–31 May 2018

**Working Group on  
International Cooperation**

Vienna, 28–31 May 2018

## Report on the meetings of the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance and the Working Group on International Cooperation held in Vienna from 28 to 31 May 2018

### I. Introduction

#### A. Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance

1. The Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance was established pursuant to decision 2/6 of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. In its decision 4/3, the Conference decided that the Working Group was to be a constant element of the Conference. The Working Group held its tenth meeting in Vienna from 10 to 13 October 2017.

2. In its resolution 7/1, entitled “Strengthening the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto”, the Conference decided that the working groups established by it were to continue to analyse, in a comprehensive manner, the implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, making the best use of the information gathered, in full respect of the principle of multilingualism.

3. Furthermore, in its resolution 8/4, entitled “Implementation of the provisions on technical assistance of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime”, the Conference noted that technical assistance was a fundamental part of the work carried out by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) to assist Member States in the effective implementation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto.

#### B. Working Group on International Cooperation

4. In its decision 2/2, the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime decided to establish an open-ended working group to hold substantive discussions on practical issues pertaining to extradition, mutual legal assistance and international cooperation for the purpose of confiscation. In its decision 3/2, the Conference decided that an open-ended working group on international cooperation would be a constant element



of the Conference. The Working Group on International Cooperation, established pursuant to that decision, holds substantive discussions on practical issues pertaining to different forms of international cooperation, including extradition, mutual legal assistance and international cooperation for the purpose of confiscation. The Working Group convened its first meeting during the third session of the Conference, which was held in Vienna from 9 to 18 October 2006. It has consistently met on a biennial basis and during the regular sessions of the Conference. Since 2014, however, the meetings have been convened on an annual basis based on resolution 7/1 of the Conference, in which the Conference encouraged the Working Group on International Cooperation and the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance to consider meeting on an annual basis, as needed, and to hold their meetings consecutively, in order to ensure the effective use of resources. The Working Group held its eighth meeting in Vienna from 9 to 13 October 2017.

## **II. Recommendations**

### **A. Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance**

5. The Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance formulated the following recommendations:

(a) States are invited to encourage their training and learning institutes to participate in the development, dissemination and utilization of teaching material, in particular the newly developed teaching modules on organized crime under the UNODC Education for Justice programme;

(b) States should consider encouraging interaction between academics and practitioners, and engaging criminal justice practitioners in delivering education against organized crime;

(c) UNODC should continue developing, in close consultation with States parties, multidisciplinary and interactive teaching material and other technical assistance tools on organized crime at the primary, secondary and, in particular, tertiary levels. Such teaching material ought to be based on identified needs and be adaptable to local circumstances and the local cultural context;

(d) States should consider providing extrabudgetary resources to support education against organized crime and to enable UNODC to further develop and regionalize teaching materials and tools promoting the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention and the Protocols thereto;

(e) States and other technical assistance providers should work closely with beneficiary countries to design and implement capacity-building programmes directed against transnational organized crime and ensure that those programmes are aligned with the needs and objectives of the beneficiary country, and to facilitate donor coordination efforts at the local level.

### **B. Working Group on International Cooperation**

6. The Working Group on International Cooperation formulated the following recommendations:

(a) States parties to the Organized Crime Convention should consider providing to the Secretariat information about their procedural requirements for incoming extradition and mutual legal assistance requests so that the Secretariat may further disseminate that information or make it more widely available, as appropriate and for technical assistance needs;

(b) States parties, in their extradition practice, should give due consideration to article 16, paragraph 5 (b), of the Convention, which governs the conclusion of

treaties on extradition, and should consider simplifying evidentiary requirements in extradition proceedings in accordance with paragraph 8 of that article;

(c) States parties are encouraged to consider making more frequent or regular use of informal consultations at different stages of extradition proceedings, mutual legal assistance proceedings and proceedings to transfer sentenced persons, so as to enable the exchange of information on legal requirements or facilitate decision-making in such proceedings, including, where appropriate, prior to and after the refusal of such requests. Such efforts could include steps to inform the requesting countries of potential problems with the requests. With regard to extradition, such efforts could also include informing requesting States of likely defence arguments that could be raised, and giving the requesting State an opportunity to provide additional information or evidence to support an extradition request. The requested State should also inform the requesting State about an adverse court decision in time to allow the requesting State, where appropriate, to provide the information needed for an appeal within the proper time frame;

(d) States parties are encouraged to devote further attention to the need to raise awareness about the utility and added value of the Convention as a legal basis for international cooperation and to enhance the effectiveness of implementation of its pertinent provisions through training and capacity-building;

(e) States parties should consider to further promote the direct transmission of international cooperation requests between central authorities to streamline and expedite international cooperation in criminal matters under the Organized Crime Convention, in accordance with article 18, paragraph 13, of that Convention;

(f) States parties are encouraged to make the best possible use of resources to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of central and/or other competent authorities in dealing with international cooperation requests. In doing so, States parties may wish to consider putting in place or request technical assistance, for the development of case management systems within their central authorities to monitor and better administer the increasing workload occasioned by such requests;

(g) States and other technical assistance providers, including UNODC, are encouraged to incorporate measures to enhance training and technical assistance for central authorities responsible for mutual legal assistance, and competent authorities for extradition to help States parties in their implementation of the Convention;

(h) States parties are encouraged to facilitate the active participation of national experts in mutual legal assistance and extradition in forums such as the Working Group on International Cooperation, thus facilitating the exchange of good practices and challenges, promoting direct dialogue between practitioners regarding the implementation of the Convention and maximizing the value of such forums.

## **C. Joint items of the Working Group on International Cooperation and the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance**

### **Preparation of the questionnaire to review the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention**

7. The working groups recommend that the Conference may wish to consider for adoption the self-assessment questionnaires for all four instruments and the procedures and rules for the functioning of the review mechanism of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto, once all finalized, as one document.

8. The Conference may wish to consider different arrangements of the questions of the questionnaire given the varying degree of obligations each provision of the Convention carries, in order to make the review as efficient as possible.

9. Questions relating to provisions of the Convention that are applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Protocols in accordance with article 1, paragraph 2, of each Protocol, should be included once, namely in the questionnaire regarding the Convention.

10. When the review of questionnaires by the relevant working groups has been completed, the Secretariat should review them for consistency and inform States parties accordingly.

### **III. Summary of deliberations**

#### **A. Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance**

##### **Good practices for effective training and legislative assistance to enhance the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention**

11. At its 1st meeting, on 28 May, the Working Group considered agenda item 2, entitled “Good practices for effective training and legislative assistance to enhance the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention”. The discussion was facilitated by the Secretariat, which gave a presentation.

12. Several speakers expressed their appreciation to the Secretariat for preparing the teaching modules on organized crime and some expressed their interest in integrating the modules into national curricula. Many speakers appreciated the multidisciplinary and interactive nature of the teaching modules. Speakers further emphasized the importance of multilingualism in general, as well as of regionalizing the teaching modules to reflect the specificities and legal traditions of each region. One speaker highlighted the need for tailor-made initiatives in primary, secondary and tertiary education against organized crime. Furthermore, one speaker highlighted the importance of developing teaching material exploring the linkages between organized crime and terrorism and between organized crime and emerging forms of crime. Another speaker stressed the importance of taking into account gender and human rights concerns in the teaching material. In the context of training delivery, many speakers encouraged interaction between academics and practitioners such as judges, prosecutors, law enforcement and central authorities for international cooperation. Finally, several speakers mentioned technical assistance needs in effective education against organized crime.

#### **B. Working Group on International Cooperation**

##### **Discussing challenges faced in the course of extradition proceedings**

13. At its first and second meetings, on 28 May, the Working Group considered agenda item 2, entitled “Discussing challenges faced in the course of extradition proceedings, including through: (a) consultations between the requested and requesting States; (b) sharing of information regarding extradition proceedings, and (c) technical assistance at the regional and global levels to support central authorities”. The discussion on the agenda item was facilitated by the panellist Philomena Creffield (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

14. The panellist delivered a presentation on the work of the central authority of the United Kingdom in the field of international cooperation in criminal matters. The presentation focused on the country’s operating model and iCasework case management system. The presentation outlined the main challenges faced in the daily casework handled by the central authority and demonstrated its good practices, especially with regard to the case management system used in administering its caseload.

15. Speakers shared their experiences in international cooperation in criminal matters, including good practices, such as the posting of liaison officers abroad. Some speakers provided a brief update of applicable laws and treaties in their countries to

regulate international cooperation issues. One speaker also referred to the principle of reciprocity as a legal basis to extradite in the absence of a treaty.

16. Many speakers referred to the main challenges encountered in extradition proceedings, such as differences between legal systems of the requested and requesting States; varying evidentiary requirements to grant an extradition request; concurrent extradition requests and criteria to be taken into account when deciding which of them to prioritize; identification of offenders, especially in cross-border cases involving cybercrime; humanitarian considerations, including the state of health of a fugitive; prison conditions in the requesting State; and the statute of limitations and applicable laws.

17. Some speakers highlighted that the increasing number of incoming and outgoing requests, coupled with the limited skills and capacity of staff, had posed serious challenges to the effectiveness of international cooperation.

18. Many speakers underlined the importance of informal consultations in extradition proceedings as a means of exchanging information on legal requirements and standards. This was considered particularly pertinent for competing requests and in cases where difficulties were encountered in fulfilling the dual criminality requirement. In informal consultations, as necessary, additional clarifications could be provided or assurances linked to the surrender of the person sought could be given, especially where human rights or humanitarian considerations were involved. Death penalty cases and cases where concerns existed about potential torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment were given as examples. The Secretariat cautioned that there was a need to protect human rights, including in informal police-to-police cooperation.

19. Some speakers noted that confidentiality was a constant challenge for practitioners, especially in extradition cases and in cases where that confidentiality conflicted with disclosure obligations imposed by the law. In mutual legal assistance cases, confidentiality had gained significance as a practical issue in view of the risk that premature disclosure could be damaging to a case, particularly at the investigative stage. One speaker was in favour of developing a protocol to delineate operational standards for addressing confidentiality issues in mutual legal assistance cases.

20. A number of speakers highlighted the importance of international cooperation to combat terrorism and its growing links to transnational organized crime. One speaker underlined the lack of judicial cooperation and parallel asylum proceedings in certain cases as a major challenge. The same speaker referred to the application of the principle of *aut dedere aut judicare* (extradite or prosecute) as an alternative to avoid impunity of criminals, particularly those who perpetrate terrorist acts.

21. Many speakers stressed the pivotal role of central authorities in overcoming practical challenges and delays in international cooperation by enhancing, among other things, coordination with domestic execution authorities. Speakers also mentioned that, in addition to their core functions of sending and receiving requests, central authorities were facilitating international cooperation, for example by giving other States information on their national mutual legal assistance laws and procedures before they submitted a formal request.

22. Some speakers indicated that the central authority, as a single focal point for incoming and outgoing requests, may act as a collector and provider of statistical information on related issues. They highlighted the importance of giving careful consideration to the collection of data, making the best possible use of statistics and putting in place workflow processes and case management systems within the central authority to improve standard practices.

## **C. Joint items of the Working Group on International Cooperation and the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance**

### **1. Preparation of the questionnaire to review the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention**

23. At their 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th meetings, on 28, 29, 30 and 31 May, the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance and the Working Group on International Cooperation considered the agenda item entitled “Preparation of the questionnaire to review the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention” as a joint item.

24. The working groups built on work that had already been undertaken in their meetings held back to back from 9 to 13 October 2017 and with joint meetings to discuss a draft questionnaire for the review of the implementation of the Convention in accordance with resolution 8/2 of the Conference of the Parties.

25. Against this background, the working groups completed a second detailed reading of the draft questionnaire, as contained in document CTOC/COP/WG.2/2018/CRP.1–CTOC/COP/WG.3/2018/CRP.1, entitled “Non-paper containing a draft questionnaire for the review of the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime”.

26. Several speakers expressed their appreciation for the way in which the Secretariat had facilitated the discussions on the draft questionnaire. They noted that the wording of the questionnaire should be consistent with that of the Convention, while at the same time the text should be short, concise and focused on implementation of the Convention. One speaker noted that the questionnaire should not impose an undue burden on expert practitioners who would be involved in a future review mechanism either as reviewers or as experts of countries under review. The same speaker referred to resolution 8/2 of the Conference of the Parties and recalled that States parties were still being called upon to complete the questionnaires on the review of implementation of the Convention of 2004 and 2005.

27. Particular attention was devoted to the distinction between mandatory and optional provisions of the Convention and to whether the questionnaire should be adjusted to take this distinction into consideration. There was an exchange of views on the scope of the term “optional”. One speaker noted that it refers to questions that are based on provisions of the Convention that are either non-mandatory or whose evaluation was subjective in nature and that it would therefore not be straightforward to set benchmarks for the technical evaluation of those provisions by third parties. Other speakers suggested to use the term “non-mandatory” instead of “optional”. Another speaker referred to the updated version of the *Legislative Guides for the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols Thereto* and the distinction it made between measures that were mandatory (either absolutely or where specified conditions have been met), measures that States parties should consider applying or endeavour to apply, and measures that were optional.

28. At the request of the Chair, a mapping exercise was carried out with the voluntary participation of several States parties to indicate throughout the questionnaire which questions related to mandatory provisions of the Convention, which ones to non-mandatory provisions and which ones to provisions that required judgmental evaluation. The mapping exercise was held for the sole purpose of facilitating the deliberations and without any intention to provide or suggest specific qualifications regarding the requirements set forth in the provisions of the Convention and accordingly reflected in the questionnaire.

29. Some speakers expressed the view that the questionnaire was an information-gathering tool and that binding and non-binding provisions of the Convention should

not be broken up into separate annexes, as this would distort the questionnaire's coherence, structure and continuity.

30. On the other hand, different views were expressed regarding the questions that States parties would be obliged to answer under a future review mechanism. Some speakers underlined that it was not the task of the working groups but of the Conference itself to decide on this issue. Another speaker noted that the Working Group should defer the matter to the meeting for the purpose of defining the specific procedures and rules for the functioning of the review mechanism for the Convention and the Protocols thereto. One speaker highlighted that, pursuant to article 34 of the Convention, States parties to the Convention were obliged to take the necessary measures to ensure the implementation of their obligations under the Convention, viewed as requirements stemming from the mandatory provisions of the Convention. Some speakers recalled that the Conference of the Parties, in its resolution 8/2, had decided that the review mechanism was to progressively address all the articles of the Convention and the Protocols thereto.

31. There was a consensus among the speakers that questions relating to general provisions of the Convention that were also applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Protocols in accordance with article 1, paragraph 2, of each Protocol, would be dealt with only in the questionnaire on the review of implementation of the Convention. It was the view of the working groups that, in order to streamline the review process under a future review mechanism, it would suffice to have one single question and one single reply in the questionnaire for provisions of the Convention that were also applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Protocols.

32. The working groups did not reach an agreement on the issue of information on the implementation of certain provisions of the Convention that had already been provided in the context of other review mechanisms or intergovernmental processes. To avoid duplication of efforts and make the best possible use of resources, several speakers proposed that States parties respond to certain questions in the questionnaire by providing links or references to corresponding answers they had given previously under other intergovernmental processes, such as the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention against Corruption.

33. One speaker noted that, on a voluntary basis, provisions relating to legislation already reviewed under another mechanism need not be reviewed again except to confirm that the legislation applies equally to offences under the Convention and the Protocols thereto. The same speaker suggested that the President of the Conference of the Parties should further examine the overlap between information gathered under the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the information to be reviewed under the review mechanism for the Convention and the Protocols thereto, taking into account the guidance contained in resolution 8/2. However, other speakers urged caution about the use of other sources of information that may involve national practitioners from different institutions or agencies.

34. In general, the working groups were of the opinion that the issue under discussion was complex and, particularly in relation to the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention against Corruption, that it was subject to certain conditionalities. Furthermore, practical questions were still open and had to be given further consideration. One such matter was that it may be necessary to use not only the full country review reports (to the extent that they were publicly available), but also the responses to the self-assessment checklist from States parties to the Convention against Corruption as cross-reference material. In that scenario, another such question was whether and how the consent of States parties could be given for further use in the context of a future review mechanism of the Convention. One speaker argued in favour of acknowledging that there was a corpus of knowledge available within the Secretariat and that the Working Group was not responsible for making a decision on how to utilize such information for a future review mechanism, as appropriate. Another speaker noted that the issue could be dealt with through

informal consultations among States parties or by the Conference itself, but not by the Extended Bureau of the Conference.

35. It was noted that, according to the annex to resolution 8/2, the reporting obligation under the future review mechanism for articles 8 and 9 of the Convention would apply only to those States parties that were not parties to the Convention against Corruption, unless a State party deemed it appropriate to update the information provided during that review process.

36. One speaker shared her understanding that, once the draft questionnaire had been finalized and a review mechanism was in place, the review process would be gradual and States parties would not fill in the questionnaire in its entirety from the very beginning. Instead, they would do so gradually, based on the review cycles to be decided. Therefore, the final questions referring to the difficulties encountered and assistance required should touch upon all the relevant clusters and should be addressed as part of each cycle. The same speaker noted that subsections should be provided for separate answers to questions relating to (a) what steps had to be taken if domestic legislation had not been adapted to the requirements under the Convention; and (b) whether the State party required legal technical assistance to overcome difficulties in adopting adequate national legislation. The subsections she envisioned were: definition and criminalization; law enforcement and the judicial system; international cooperation in criminal matters; and prevention, technical assistance and other measures. The speaker further noted that, as a preferred alternative, and given the general nature of the questions in part VI of the draft questionnaire, a corpus of general questions could be inserted at the end of the group of articles under review within each review cycle. These general questions would refer to part VI, but would be tailored to the specific themes under review. Another option would be to adjust the questions in part VI to each of the clusters, but this would be more complicated and time-consuming.

37. Another speaker supported this observation and noted that the government experts participating in the Working Group on International Cooperation were not given an opportunity to comment on the annex to resolution 8/2. From a practitioner's perspective, that annex appeared to be impractical in some respects.

38. To conclude the agenda item, the Chair requested the Secretariat to prepare a new version of the draft questionnaire reflecting the comments made during the deliberations and to circulate it as a non-paper. The Chair also requested the Secretariat to make available on the web pages of the working groups the text as projected on the screen in the meeting room for information and reference.

## **2. Other matters**

39. The working groups considered the agenda item entitled "Other matters" on the morning of 31 May. Under the agenda item, the Secretariat delivered presentations on the work of UNODC in the field of international cooperation in criminal matters and judicial cooperation networks; the activities of the network of prosecutors and central authorities from source, transit and destination countries to combat transnational organized crime in Central Asia and the Southern Caucasus; the activities of the West African Network of Central Authorities and Prosecutors; and the latest developments relating to the expansion of the directory of central authorities.

40. The working groups were briefed about the release and the online availability of the redeveloped version of the Mutual Legal Assistance Request Writer Tool. The Tool had been designed and revised to include additional types of mutual legal assistance and additional means to provide it, and was to serve as guidance for practitioners involved in the drafting of requests for mutual legal assistance. The Tool was made available as an open resource on the UNODC website.

41. The Secretariat further informed the working groups about the outcome of the sixth open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption, which had been

held in Vienna on 6 and 7 November 2017, and the framework for the discussions to be held at the seventh meeting, on 8 June 2018.

42. The Chair informed the working groups that the extended Bureau of the Conference was conducting a parallel process to identify the substantive agenda item for the tenth meeting of the Working Group on International Cooperation, to be held on 16 October 2018 as part of the ninth session of the Conference. As he noted, States parties were invited to provide their views and proposal on this matter through the respective Regional Groups by 14 June 2018.

## **IV. Organization of the meetings**

### **A. Duration of the meetings**

43. The Working Group on International Cooperation held seven meetings, from 28 to 31 May. The Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance held six meetings, from 28 to 31 May. The meetings of both working groups were chaired by Thomas Burrows (United States of America).

### **B. Statements**

44. Under agenda item 2 of the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance, statements were made by representatives of the following States parties to the Convention: Argentina, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Italy, Uganda, United Kingdom and United States.

45. Under agenda item 2 of the Working Group on International Cooperation, statements were made by representatives of the following States parties to the Convention: Algeria, Benin, China, Colombia, Honduras, Jamaica, Japan, Namibia, Russian Federation, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, United States and Zimbabwe.

46. The observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran also made a statement.

47. Representatives of the Secretariat delivered presentations under agenda item 2 of the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance, agenda item 2 of the Working Group on International Cooperation and agenda items 3 and 4 of the joint meeting.

48. Under joint agenda item 3, entitled "Preparation of the questionnaire to review the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention", statements were made by representatives of the following States parties to the Convention: Argentina, Benin, Brazil, Canada, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Germany, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Russian Federation, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

49. The observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran also made a statement.

50. A representative of the Secretariat delivered a presentation under joint agenda item 3.

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

#### **1. Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance**

51. At its 1st meeting, on 28 May, the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance adopted the following agenda, as orally amended:

1. Organizational matters:
  - (a) Opening of the meeting;

- (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
2. Good practices for effective training and legislative assistance to enhance the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention.
3. Preparation of the questionnaire to review the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention (*joint item of the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance and the Working Group on International Cooperation*).
4. Other matters (*joint item*).
5. Adoption of the report (*joint item*).

## 2. Working Group on International Cooperation

52. At its 1st meeting, on 28 May, the Working Group on International Cooperation adopted the following agenda, as orally amended:

1. Organizational matters:
  - (a) Opening of the meeting;
  - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
2. Discussing challenges faced in the course of extradition proceedings, including through:
  - (a) Consultations between the requested and requesting States;
  - (b) Sharing of information regarding extradition proceedings;
  - (c) Technical assistance at the regional and global levels to support central authorities.
3. Preparation of the questionnaire to review the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention (*joint item of the Working Group on International Cooperation and the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance*).
4. Other matters (*joint item*).
5. Adoption of the report (*joint item*).

## D. Attendance

53. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the meeting: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and Zimbabwe. Of those, Chile and Ecuador attended only the meeting of the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance, and Switzerland only the meeting of the Working Group on International Cooperation.

54. The Islamic Republic of Iran, a signatory State to the Convention, was represented by an observer.

## **E. Documentation**

### **1. Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance**

55. The Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance had before it the following documents:

(a) Annotated provisional agendas ([CTOC/COP/WG.2/2018/1–CTOC/COP/WG.3/2018/1](#));

(b) Background paper prepared by the Secretariat on good practices for effective training and legislative assistance to enhance the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime ([CTOC/COP/WG.2/2018/2](#));

(c) Non-paper containing a draft questionnaire for the review of the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (CTOC/COP/WG.2/2018/CRP.1–CTOC/COP/WG.3/2018/CRP.1).

### **2. Working Group on International Cooperation**

56. The Working Group on International Cooperation had before it the following documents:

(a) Annotated provisional agendas ([CTOC/COP/WG.2/2018/1–CTOC/COP/WG.3/2018/1](#));

(b) Background paper prepared by the Secretariat entitled “Discussion of challenges faced in the course of extradition proceedings” ([CTOC/COP/WG.3/2018/2](#));

(c) Non-paper containing a draft questionnaire for the review of the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (CTOC/COP/WG.2/2018/CRP.1–CTOC/COP/WG.3/2018/CRP.1).

## **V. Adoption of the report**

57. On 31 May, the working groups adopted the present joint report on their meetings, as orally amended.

---