



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

Distr.: Limited
2 July 2010

Original: English

Implementation Review Group of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

First Meeting

Vienna, 28 June-2 July 2010

Draft report*

I. Introduction

1. In its resolutions 1/1, 2/1 and 3/1, the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption recalled article 63 of the Convention, in particular paragraph 7, according to which the Conference would establish, if it deemed it necessary, any appropriate mechanism or body to assist in the effective implementation of the Convention.
2. In its resolution 3/1, the Conference adopted the terms of reference of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption contained in the annex to the aforementioned resolution, and the draft guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat in the conduct of country reviews and the draft blueprint for country review reports, contained in the appendix to the annex, which will be finalized by the Implementation Review Group.
3. In the same resolution, and in accordance with article 42 of the terms of reference of the review mechanism, the Implementation Review Group shall be an open-ended intergovernmental group of States parties, which should operate under the authority of and report to the Conference. The Conference decided that the functions of the Implementation Review Group should be to have an overview of the review process in order to identify challenges and good practices and to consider technical assistance requirements in order to ensure effective implementation of the Convention. The Conference also decided that the IRG should hold meetings at least once a year in Vienna.
4. Also in the same resolution, and in accordance with article 59, signatory states to the Convention may participate in the Mechanism as a State under review on a

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



voluntary basis. Furthermore, in the context of the review process, information from competent international organizations whose mandates cover anti-corruption issues or regional or international mechanisms for combating and preventing corruption shall be considered.

5. In the same resolution, the Conference took note with appreciation of the work of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption at its five intersessional meetings.

6. Also in the same resolution, the Conference decided that the Implementation Review Group shall be in charge of following up and continuing the work undertaken previously by the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on Technical Assistance.

7. In its resolution 3/4 entitled “Technical assistance to implement the United Nations Convention against Corruption”, the Conference took note of the recommendations of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on Technical Assistance contained in the report of the Secretariat on the work of that Working Group.¹

II. Organization of the meeting

A. Opening of the meeting

8. The Implementation Review Group of the United Nations Convention against Corruption held its first session in Vienna from 28 June to 2 July 2010.

9. The first to fifth meetings of the Implementation Review Group were chaired by Ms. Elizabeth Verville (United States of America), Vice-President of the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention, and the sixth to tenth meetings were chaired by Ms. Taous Feroukhi (Algeria), Vice-President of the Conference. In her introductory remarks, the Chair highlighted that the review mechanism was the fruit of the same constructive and positive spirit that had guided the negotiations of the Convention itself. She urged all States to work together in a similar manner for the implementation of the mechanism.

10. The Chairperson invited the Officer-in-Charge of the Division of Treaty Affairs of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) to make opening remarks.

11. The Officer-in-Charge of the UNODC Division of Treaty Affairs noted that resolution 3/1 of the Conference marked the culmination of almost two years of negotiation of the Conference and its Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on Review of Implementation. He pointed out that the work of the review mechanism would forge partnerships and foster the dialogue among States. He called on States to rise to the challenge and show that they were serious about combating corruption and about assisting each other to do so.

¹ CAC/COSP/2009/8.

12. The Secretary of the Conference of the States Parties welcomed the fact that more than 800 nominations of experts from more than 96 countries had been received. He suggested the drawing of lots be conducted manually since the available software solutions for random selection could not take in account all parameters required by the Terms of Reference.

13. The Representative from the Group of 77 and China highlighted the international importance of the review process. She stressed the qualities of the Review Mechanism for gathering information and stressed the goals and guiding principles of the mechanism, particularly with regard to technical assistance. While welcoming voluntary contributions, she reiterated the view of the Group that the mechanism should be funded through the regular budget of the United Nations. She proposed that the Implementation Review Group should start from its first meeting on to examine procedures on information-gathering on technical assistance requirements.

14. The Representative of Spain spoke on behalf of the European Union; Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, Liechtenstein, Norway, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Armenia associated themselves with the European Union's statement. The speaker welcomed the review mechanism and the establishment of the Implementation Review Group. All EU countries considered it necessary and were committed to ensuring the participation of civil society and the private sector, accept country visits and publish country reports. He encouraged States parties to avoid deferring participation in the process and repetition of the drawing of lots. He conveyed the support of the EU for the active work towards funding the future requirements of the review mechanism through the regular budget of the United Nations.

15. The Representative of Costa Rica, speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean countries, welcomed the mechanism and reiterated its goals and guiding principles. He highlighted the need for timely compliance with its requirements. He encouraged States Parties to submit their technical assistance needs through the self-assessment checklist and held that the Secretariat should submit periodic reports on technical assistance to the Group to systematically identify regional and thematic tendencies. The speaker stressed the need for sustainable and transparent funding of the mechanism as set out in resolution 3/1 of the Conference. States Parties should learn from the experience of follow-up mechanisms of regional anti-corruption instruments and establish collaboration with them from the beginning.

16. The Minister for Institutional Transparency and Fight against Corruption of Bolivia, Nardi Suxo Iturry, welcomed the launching of a methodologically sound, knowledge-based review mechanism that enabled follow-up on national anti-corruption efforts among equal peers. She reported on anti-corruption action taken by her country, including the adoption of a new Constitution which placed high emphasis on the matter, the adoption and implementation of new anti-corruption legislation, the creation of dedicated institutions and Bolivia's full commitment to international cooperation in criminal matters. She further referred to the participation of her country in the pilot programme for the review of implementation of the Convention and in regional anti-corruption efforts.

17. Speakers welcomed the launching of the mechanism for the review of implementation of the Convention as an important step for ensuring the full implementation of the Convention, and expressed their full commitment to the work of the mechanism. They highlighted the fundamental agreement that was reached in Doha, pointing out that the mechanism was the first peer review mechanism for a United Nations Convention, and reiterated the goals and guiding principles of the mechanism.

18. It was recognized that governmental experts should receive comprehensive training for the conduct of reviews, and reiterated that technical assistance was accorded high priority in the framework of the review mechanism. One speaker referred to the importance of confidentiality of information as set out in the Terms of Reference. Some speakers reported on their national and regional anti-corruption efforts, including efforts for the ratification of the Convention, the adoption of policies for its implementation and the participation in regional anti-corruption initiatives.

19. Speakers highlighted the important tasks lying ahead of the Implementation Review Group at its inaugural session. They pointed out that the Guidelines for Reviewing Experts and the Blueprint of the Country Report were important documents to guide the work of the mechanism. They further recalled resolution 3/1, in which the Conference of the States Parties adopted the two documents and gave the Implementation Review Group the mandate to finalize them.

B. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

20. On 28 June, the Implementation Review Group adopted the following agenda:

1. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Opening of the meeting;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
2. Guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat and blueprint of country review report.
3. Country reviews:
 - (a) Drawing of lots;
 - (b) Organization and schedule for reviews.
4. Resource requirements for the Mechanism.
5. Technical assistance.
6. Provisional agenda for the second meeting of the Implementation Review Group.
7. Other matters.
8. Adoption of the report of the Implementation Review Group on its first meeting.

21. The Group decided to hold subsequent meetings as closed meetings and further decided to discuss participation of observers under agenda item 7 “Other matters”.

C. Attendance

22. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the meeting of the Implementation Review Group: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

23. The European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, was represented at the meeting.

24. The following States signatories to the Convention were represented by observers: Bahrain, Cote d’Ivoire, Czech Republic, Germany, India, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Syrian Arab Republic and Thailand.

25. The following observer States were also represented: Andorra and Oman.

26. Palestine, an entity maintaining a permanent observer mission to the United Nations, was represented.

27. The following Secretariat units, United Nations bodies, funds and programmes, institutes of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme network, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system were represented by observers: United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, United Nations Development Programme, Basel Institute on Governance, World Bank and the World Food Programme.

28. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers: Asian Development Bank, Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization, Council of Europe, Council of Ministers of Interior, International Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities, International Organization for Migration, Offshore Group of Banking Supervisors, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Red Iberoamericana de Cooperación Jurídica Internacional and World Customs Organization.

29. The Sovereign Military Order of Malta, an entity maintaining a permanent observer office at Headquarters, was represented.

III. Guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat and blueprint of country review report

30. For its consideration of agenda item 2, the Group had before it document CAC/COSP/2010/2 and a proposal submitted by China and the Russian Federation. In resolution 3/1, the Conference adopted the draft guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat in the conduct of country reviews (guidelines) and the draft blueprint for country review reports (blueprint) and requested the Group to finalize those documents. The Secretariat prepared document CAC/COSP/2010/2 with a view to ensuring consistency of the guidelines and the blueprint with the terms of reference adopted in resolution 3/1.

31. In finalizing the Guidelines, the understanding of the Group was that paragraphs 24 to 29 addressed further means of direct dialogue, which in accordance with paragraphs 29 of the terms of reference were optional.

32. Informal consultations were held on 29 and 30 June 2010, led by the representatives of the Russian Federation and Peru, to consider the chapter entitled "Specific Guidance" of the draft guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat in the conduct of country reviews. The outcome of these consultations was submitted to the Implementation Review Group.

33. The Group finalized the Guidelines for governmental experts and the blueprint for country review reports as reflected in annex I.

IV. Country reviews

34. The selection of the States parties under review was carried out pursuant to paragraph 3 of resolution 3/1 of the Conference of the States parties and paragraph 14 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism. Lots were drawn to select the States parties to be reviewed in each of the first four years of the first review cycle.

35. The number of States parties from each regional group to be reviewed in each year was proportionate to the size of that regional group and the number of its members which were parties to the Convention (see below table). The Group had the understanding that States which would ratify or accede to the Convention after the drawing of lots would be reviewed in the 5th year of the review cycle.

36. According to paragraph 14 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism, any State party selected for review in a given year may, with a reasonable justification, defer participation to the following year of the review cycle. State parties in attendance were asked to indicate whether they wished to exercise that right. States parties not in attendance would be notified by the Secretariat and given a reasonable deadline for exercising their right to defer. When a State party exercised its right to defer, the States parties from the same regional group that had been 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 understood that if no State party volunteered to advance its review, the review of the deferring State party would be carried out in the following year in addition to the reviews already scheduled].

37. Before the drawing of lots, the Secretary of the Conference of the States parties placed the ballots into boxes, in the presence of the Group. The lots were drawn by two representatives of the respective regional group. The African Group was represented by Ethiopia and Uganda; the Asian Group by the Republic of Korea and the Maldives; the Eastern European Group by Lithuania and the Russian Federation; the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States by El Salvador and Venezuela; and the Western European and Others Group by Spain and the United States of America.

38. The selection of the reviewing States parties was carried out pursuant to paragraph 3 of resolution 3/1 of the Conference of the States Parties and paragraphs 18 to 21 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism. Lots were drawn for the selection of the reviewing States parties for the first year of the first review cycle. One of the two reviewing States was selected from the same regional group as the State party under review; the second reviewing State was selected from a pool of all States parties.

39. According to paragraph 21 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism, reviewing States parties shall appoint up to 15 governmental experts for the purpose of the review process. At the time of the draw, 94 States parties had submitted lists of experts. It was agreed that the Secretariat would set an appropriate deadline for the remaining States parties to comply with their obligation.

40. [According to paragraph 19 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism, the State party under review may request, a maximum of two times, that the drawing of lots be repeated. In exceptional circumstances, the drawing of lots may be repeated more than twice. [The Group understood that a request of a State party to have the drawing of lots repeated because the State party or States parties drawn to review it had not complied with paragraph 21 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism constituted such an exceptional circumstance.]]

41. A similar procedure was adopted for the selection of the reviewing States parties as for the selection of the States parties under review. The Secretary of the Conference of the States Parties placed the ballots into boxes in the presence of the Group. The same two representatives of each regional group as for the previous drawing of lots drew the lots for the selection of the reviewing States parties for countries of their group.

42. Some States parties which had already been selected as reviewed States for the first year were also selected as reviewing States and expressed their readiness to serve in both capacities. Other States parties made use of their right to defer serving as a reviewing and reviewed State party in the same year, according to paragraph 20 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism. In such cases, the drawing was repeated. The same procedure applied to those States parties that were selected to serve as reviewing States parties for more than one country in the first year.

V. Resource requirements for the Mechanism

43. During its consideration of agenda item 4 on the resource requirements for the functioning of the Review Mechanism, the Group had before it document CAC/COSP/IRG/2010/5 prepared by the Secretariat pursuant to paragraphs 13 and 15 of Resolution 3/1 of the Conference of the States Parties.

44. With regard to the funding requirements for the biennium 2010-2011, the Secretary recalled the decisions taken by the General Assembly to include the staffing requirements for the Secretariat necessary to implement the Mechanism in the programme budget for this biennium. He recalled the mandate given by the Conference to the Implementation Review Group to decide on further means of funding the implementation of the Mechanism in the current biennium and provided an update on the voluntary contributions received for this purpose. He further noted the mandate given to the Group to consider the resource requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for the biennium 2012-2013 and drew the attention of the Group to the budget requirements contained in above referenced document.

45. Speakers noted with appreciation the compromise reached by the Conference at its third session on the funding of the Mechanism. Speakers expressed their appreciation for the voluntary contributions made towards the implementation of the Mechanism which would allow for the implementation to commence. At the same time, speakers underlined the need to base the Review Mechanism on sustainable and secure funding and thus highlighted the need to secure additional funding for the functioning of the Mechanism from the United Nations regular budget for future bienniums. Specifically, speakers stressed the urgent need for timely action with regard to advocating for additional resources for the biennium 2012-2013. One speaker suggested holding a number of informal consultations during the following months with a view to considering the resource requirements for the functioning of the Mechanism for the biennium 2012-2013 and developing a plan of action.

46. The Secretariat was requested to continue submitting budgetary information to the Implementation Review Group. It was emphasized that this information should contain an outline of the estimated costs and information on the expenditures.

47. Speakers underlined the importance of securing resources for technical assistance by appropriate allocation of voluntary contributions.

Annex I

Guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat in the conduct of country reviews

I. General guidance

1. Throughout the review process, governmental experts and the secretariat shall be guided by the relevant provisions of the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the terms of reference of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.
2. In particular, governmental experts shall bear in mind article 4, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which states that States parties shall carry out their obligations under the Convention in a manner consistent with the principles of sovereign equality and territorial integrity of States and of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States.
3. Furthermore, governmental experts shall carry out the reviews in full recognition of the purpose of the review process as specified in paragraph 11 of the terms of reference.
4. During all interactions within the review process, governmental experts shall respect the collective approach. Governmental experts are expected to act with courtesy and diplomacy, and shall remain objective and impartial. Governmental experts need to be flexible in their approach and ready to adapt to changes in schedules.
5. Governmental experts and the secretariat shall maintain the confidentiality of all information obtained in the course of, or used in, the country review process, as well as the country review report, as stipulated in the terms of reference. If there are serious grounds for believing that a governmental expert or a member of the secretariat has violated the obligation of confidentiality, the States parties concerned or the secretariat may inform the Implementation Review Group for appropriate consideration and action, including referring the matter to the Conference.
6. It is also expected that governmental experts are not to be influenced in their assessment of the implementation of the Convention. While information generated through competent international organizations whose mandates cover anti-corruption issues or regional and international mechanisms for combating and preventing corruption, to which the State party under review is a member, is to be taken into account, governmental experts shall make their own analysis of the facts provided by the State party under review in order to present findings that are in line with all the specific requirements of the Convention provisions under review.
7. Throughout the review process, governmental experts are encouraged to contact the secretariat for any assistance required.

II. Specific guidance for the conduct of the review

8. In accordance with the terms of reference and consistent with the importance of ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of the review process, reviews shall be conducted in a spirit of constructive collaboration, dialogue and mutual trust.
9. States parties and the secretariat shall endeavour to adhere to the indicative timelines in the paragraphs below.
10. The governmental experts shall prepare themselves by:
 - (a) Studying thoroughly the Convention and the terms of reference of the Mechanism, including the present guidelines;
 - (b) Familiarizing themselves with the *Legislative Guide for the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption*,² as well as the *Travaux Préparatoires*, particularly those parts pertaining to the articles that are the subject of the relevant review cycle;
 - (c) Reviewing the responses provided by the State party under review in its comprehensive self-assessment checklist and supplementary documentation and familiarizing themselves with the issues addressed by the State party under review;
 - (d) Informing the secretariat if additional information and material are required and highlighting issues requiring further clarification.
11. The Secretariat shall organize periodic training courses for governmental experts who participate in the review process, in order to familiarize themselves with the guidelines and increase their capacity to participate in the review process.
12. The secretariat, within one month after the drawing of lots, shall inform officially the State party under review and the reviewing States parties of the beginning of the conduct of the country review, as well as of all relevant procedural matters, including the schedule for the training of experts and a provisional schedule of the country review.
13. The State party under review, within three weeks after officially being informed, shall appoint and inform the secretariat of a focal point to coordinate its participation in the review, in accordance with paragraph 17 of the terms of reference. The secretariat shall assign a staff member to each review.
14. The secretariat shall undertake consultations with the State party under review and the reviewing States parties on the establishment of schedules and requirements of the country review, including the selection of working language or languages of the country review in accordance with chapter VI of the terms of reference. The translation to and from those languages shall be provided by the secretariat within the whole review process.
15. The State party under review, within two months of being officially informed of the beginning of the conduct of the country review, shall provide to the secretariat the information required on its compliance with and implementation of the Convention, using the comprehensive self-assessment checklist as an initial step

² United Nations publication, Sales No. E.06.IV.16.

for that purpose. Assistance in the preparation of the responses shall be provided by the secretariat to the State party requesting such assistance. The secretariat shall, within one month after receipt of the checklist response, submit such response for translation and circulate it to the governmental experts.

16. Within one month after the State party under review has officially been informed about the beginning of the conduct of the country review, governmental experts shall participate in a telephone conference or videoconference, to be organized by the secretariat for the purpose of an initial introduction of the reviewing States parties, the State party under review and the staff member of the secretariat assigned to the country review, as well as for general orientation, including a review of the schedule and requirements established for the review.

17. Governmental experts from reviewing States parties shall take a decision on how to divide tasks and issues among themselves, taking into account their respective fields of competence.

18. While governmental experts shall establish open lines of communication with the State party under review, experts shall keep the secretariat abreast of all these communications.

19. Throughout the process, the governmental experts shall appropriately consider the information and material provided by the State party under review through the different means of communication as described in the terms of reference.

20. When seeking additional information and asking for clarification, governmental experts shall bear in mind the non-adversarial, non-intrusive and non-punitive character of the review and the overall goal of assisting the State party under review to reach full implementation of the Convention.

21. Within one month of the receipt of the response to the comprehensive self-assessment checklist and any supplementary information provided by the State party under review, governmental experts shall submit to the secretariat the outcome of the desk review, including requests for clarifications, additional information or supplementary questions, to be translated into the designated languages of the review and provided to the State party under review.

22. During the desk review, governmental experts shall avoid duplicating texts already contained in the comprehensive self-assessment checklist. The desk review is to be concise and factual and is to include solid reasoning for the outcome of the desk review. Objective and impersonal language will aid understanding. When abbreviations and acronyms are used, these shall be defined upon their first use.

23. After the State party under review receives the outcome of the desk review, the secretariat will organize a telephone conference or videoconference bringing together the governmental experts of the reviewing States parties and the State party under review. During the conference call, governmental experts from the reviewing States parties shall introduce their parts of the desk review and explain the findings. The ensuing dialogue shall ideally last up to two months and consist of requests for additional information or specific questions from the governmental experts, to which the State party under review will respond, using various means of dialogue including conference calls, videoconferences, e-mail exchanges or further means of direct dialogue as mentioned in paragraph 29 of the terms of reference and specified below.

24. If agreed by the State party under review, the desk review should be complemented with any further means of direct dialogue, such as a country visit or a joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna. The country visit or joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna shall be planned and organized by the State party under review. While the secretariat will facilitate all practical arrangements, governmental experts shall take all necessary measures from their side to participate in the country visit or joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna, bearing in mind paragraph 30 of the terms of reference.
25. During the country visit or joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna, governmental experts shall uphold the principles and standards outlined in the general guidance above.
26. Governmental experts are expected to actively and constructively participate in all meetings, including at internal debriefings at the end of each working day, or at the end of the country visit or joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna.
27. Governmental experts are expected to be respectful and courteous in meetings, respecting time frames set in the programme and allowing time for all members to participate. At the same time, governmental experts are expected to be flexible, as the programme may change during the country visit or the joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna.
28. Questions should seek to complement information already provided by the State party under review and relate only to the review process. Governmental experts shall therefore remain neutral and not voice personal opinions during the meetings.
29. Governmental experts are expected to take notes during all meetings, which they can refer to for the production of the final country review report. They shall share their opinions and preliminary findings in writing among themselves and the secretariat within two weeks after the country visit or the joint meeting at the United Nations Office at Vienna.
30. At the final stage of the country review process and preferably within five months of the beginning of the review, based on the blueprint format, the governmental experts shall, with the assistance of the secretariat, prepare a draft country review report and send it to the State party under review in the designated language of the review. The report shall identify successes, good practices and challenges and make observations for the implementation of the Convention. Where appropriate, the report shall include the identification of technical assistance needs for the purpose of improving implementation of the Convention. The comments of the State party under review shall be incorporated in the draft country review report.
31. Governmental experts shall include observations with respect to the implementation in national law of the articles of the Convention under review, as well as their application in practice.
32. Governmental experts shall further identify successes and good practices, challenges, observations with respect to the implementation of the articles of the Convention under review, and areas where technical assistance may be required.

33. At the request of the State party under review and as required, governmental experts may also be asked to provide the State party under review with explanations of how to address the challenges identified so as to allow the country to fully and effectively implement the relevant articles of the Convention.

34. The secretariat shall send this draft country review report to the State party under review for agreement. In case of disagreement, there shall be a dialogue between the State party under review and the governmental experts to arrive at a consensual final report. An executive summary shall subsequently be prepared and agreed to.

Appendix I

Blueprint for country review reports and executive summaries

Review by [names of reviewing States] of the implementation by [name of State under review] of article[s] [number(s) of articles] of the United Nations Convention against Corruption for the review cycle [time frame]

I. Introduction

1. The Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption was established pursuant to article 63 of the Convention to, inter alia, promote and review the implementation of the Convention.
2. In accordance with article 63, paragraph 7, of the Convention, the Conference established at its third session, held in Doha from 9 to 13 November 2009, the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention. The Mechanism was established also pursuant to article 4, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which states that States parties shall carry out their obligations under the Convention in a manner consistent with the principles of sovereign equality and territorial integrity of States and of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States.
3. The Review Mechanism is an intergovernmental process whose overall goal is to assist States parties in implementing the Convention.
4. The review process is based on the terms of reference of the Mechanism.

II. Process

5. The following review of the implementation by [name of State under review] of the Convention is based on the response to the comprehensive self-assessment checklist received from [name of State under review], and any supplementary information provided in accordance with paragraph 27 of the terms of reference and the outcome of the constructive dialogue between the governmental experts from [names of the two reviewing States and the State under review], by means of [telephone conferences, videoconferences, e-mail exchanges, or any further means of direct dialogue in accordance with the terms of reference] and involving [names of experts involved].

[Optional: 6. A country visit, agreed to by [name of State under review] was conducted from [date] to [date].]

OR

[A joint meeting between [name of State under review] and [names of reviewing States] was held at the United Nations Office at Vienna from [date] to [date].]

III. Executive summary

7. [Summary of the following:

- (a) *Successes and good practices;*
- (b) *Challenges in implementation, where applicable;*
- (c) *Observations on the implementation of the articles under review;*
- (d) *Technical assistance needs identified to improve implementation of the Convention.*]

IV. Implementation of the Convention

A. Ratification of the Convention

8. [Name of State under review] signed the Convention on [date] and ratified it on [date]. [Name of State under review] deposited its instrument of ratification with the Secretary-General on [date].

9. The implementing legislation — in other words, the [title of act ratifying the Convention] — was adopted by [name of national legislative body] on [date], entered into force on [date] and was published in [name, number and date of official publication communicating adoption of the act]. The implementing legislation includes [summary of ratification legislation].

B. Legal system of [name of State under review]

10. Article [number of article] of the Constitution states that [discuss whether treaties are self-executing or require implementing legislation, where the Convention fits into the hierarchy of law, etc.].

C. Implementation of selected articles

Article [number of article]

[title of article]

[Text of the article, block indented]

(a) Summary of information relevant to reviewing the implementation of the article

11. [Information provided by the State under review through the comprehensive self-assessment checklist, any supplementary information provided in accordance

with paragraph 27 of the terms of reference, and in the context of the constructive dialogue]

(b) Observations on the implementation of the article

12. *[Observations of the governmental experts with regard to the implementation of the article. Depending on the scope of the review cycle, findings with respect to the way in which national law has been brought into line with the article, as well as to the implementation of the article in practice]*

13. *[Observations on the status of implementation of the article, including successes, good practices and challenges in implementation]*

(c) Successes and good practices

14. *[Identification of successes and good practices in implementing the article, where applicable]*

(d) Challenges, where applicable

15. *[Identification of any challenges in implementation, where applicable]*

(e) Technical assistance needs

16. *[Identification of technical assistance needs, priorities and actions to improve implementation of the Convention, where applicable]*

Annex II

RESULTS OF THE DRAWING OF LOTS

YEAR 1 — 30 reviews

		<i>State party under review</i>	<i>Reviewer from same region</i>	<i>Other reviewer</i>
African Group	1	<i>Zambia</i>	Zimbabwe	Malta
	2	<i>South Africa</i>	Congo	Pakistan
	3	Togo	Tanzania	Uganda
	4	Morocco	South Africa	Slovakia
	5	Zimbabwe	Kenya	Mauritania
	6	<i>Sao Tome</i>	Ethiopia	Mongolia
	7	Rwanda	Senegal	Lebanon
	8	Niger	Djibouti	Russian Federation
	9	<i>Cameroon</i>	Madagascar	Netherlands
	10	Burundi	Egypt	Venezuela
Asia Pacific Group	1	Jordan	Maldives	Nigeria
	2	<i>Bangladesh</i>	Iran	Togo
	3	(UAE)*		
	4	<i>Fiji</i>	Bangladesh	USA
	5	<i>Papua New Guinea</i>	Tajikistan	Malawi
	6	(Iran)*		
	7	(Kuwait)*		
	8	<i>Timor Leste</i>	Philippines	Zimbabwe
Eastern European Group	1	Lithuania	Russian Federation	Egypt
	2	Croatia	Montenegro	Laos
	3	<i>Bulgaria</i>	Albania	Sweden
	4	<i>Georgia</i>	Armenia	Romania
	5	<i>Ukraine</i>	Slovenia	Poland
GRULAC	1	Chile	El Salvador	Ukraine
	2	<i>Dominica</i>	Trinidad and Tobago	Norway
	3	<i>Dominican Republic</i>	Nicaragua	Uruguay
	4	Argentina	Panama	<i>Nicaragua</i>
	5	<i>Jamaica</i>	Costa Rica	Qatar
	6	<i>Peru</i>	Bolivia	Ecuador
WEOG	1	USA	<i>Sweden</i>	Niger
	2	Finland	Greece	Tunisia
	3	Spain	Belgium	Lithuania
	4	(Switzerland)*		
	5	France	Denmark	Cape Verde

* Deferred to year 2 of the cycle.

YEAR 2 — 41 reviews

<i>State party under review</i>		
African Group	1	Seychelles
	2	Mauritius
	3	Benin
	4	Mozambique
	5	Congo
	6	Cape Verde
	7	Central African Republic
	8	Uganda
	9	Mauritania
	10	Sierra Leone
Asia Pacific Group	1	Brunei Darussalam
	2	Iraq
	3	Laos
	4	Sri Lanka
	5	Kazakhstan
	6	Philippines
	7	Indonesia
	8	Mongolia
	9	Vietnam
	10	UAE*
	11	Iran*
	12	Kuwait*
Eastern European Group	1	Slovakia
	2	Serbia
	3	Montenegro
	4	Estonia
	5	Azerbaijan
	6	Russian Federation
GRULAC	1	Brazil
	2	Cuba
	3	Uruguay
	4	El Salvador
	5	Nicaragua
	6	Colombia
	7	Panama
WEOG	1	Malta
	2	Australia
	3	Norway
	4	UK
	5	Portugal
	6	Switzerland*

* Deferred from previous year of the cycle.

YEAR 3 — 37 reviews

<i>State party under review</i>		
African Group	1	Egypt
	2	Mali
	3	Lesotho
	4	Djibouti
	5	Algeria
	6	Ghana
	7	Tanzania
	8	Burkina Faso
	9	Tunisia
	10	Guinea-Bissau
	11	Angola
Asia Pacific Group	1	Republic of Korea
	2	Yemen
	3	Cyprus
	4	Cambodia
	5	Malaysia
	6	Pakistan
	7	Qatar
	8	Afghanistan
Eastern European Group	1	Hungary
	2	Slovenia
	3	Latvia
	4	Romania
	5	FYROM
	6	Armenia
GRULAC	1	Mexico
	2	Paraguay
	3	Bolivia
	4	Trinidad and Tobago
	5	Guyana
	6	Venezuela
WEOG	1	Sweden
	2	Canada
	3	Luxembourg
	4	Italy
	5	The Netherlands
	6	Austria

YEAR 4 — 36 reviews

<i>State party under review</i>		
African Group	1	Senegal
	2	Liberia
	3	Kenya
	4	Nigeria
	5	Gabon
	6	Malawi
	7	Libya
	8	Madagascar
	9	Namibia
	10	Ethiopia
Asia Pacific Group	1	Kyrgyzstan
	2	Maldives
	3	Lebanon
	4	Uzbekistan
	5	Palau
	6	Turkmenistan
	7	Singapore
	8	China
	9	Tajikistan
Eastern European Group	1	Poland
	2	Belarus
	3	Bosnia and Herzegovina
	4	Albania
	5	Moldova
GRULAC	1	Ecuador
	2	Haiti
	3	Costa Rica
	4	Honduras
	5	Guatemala
	6	Antigua and Barbuda
	7	Bahamas
WEOG	1	Turkey
	2	Greece
	3	Belgium
	4	Denmark
	5	Israel
