



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

Distr.: Limited
4 September 2019

Original: English

Implementation Review Group

First resumed tenth session

Vienna, 2–4 September 2019

Draft report of the Implementation Review Group on its first resumed tenth session, held in Vienna, 2–4 September 2019

Addendum

VI. Other matters

1. Gratitude was expressed to the Government of the United Arab Emirates for hosting the eighth session of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the secretariat was requested to provide a briefing on the status of preparations for the Conference to the Group.

2. The Secretary provided the following information on the preparations for the eighth session of the Conference: (a) the draft provisional agenda for the eighth session of the Conference was agreed at informal consultations held on 28 February 2019; (b) the host country agreement between UNODC and the Government of the United Arab Emirates was signed on 30 July; (c) the invitations were issued on 15 August and the information note for participants would be made available shortly; (d) the Conference venue will be the Abu Dhabi National Exhibition Centre; (e) the host Government had developed a logo and a website for the Conference, in close coordination with the secretariat and the website would be going online shortly; (f) the call for applications for special events had been issued and would also be circulated through a special message to permanent missions, together with the extension of the deadline for such applications to 30 September 2019; and (g) the Conference will be preceded by three events to be held on 14 and 15 December: a youth event to be organized by the host Government; the annual general conference of the International Partnership Against Corruption in Sport; and a meeting bringing together anti-corruption authorities and state audit institutions.

3. One speaker reiterated his delegation's request for the secretariat to provide to States parties in advance of the eighth session of the Conference, in written form, information on the expected duration of the second cycle, given the current pace of reviews, and the budgetary implications of the delayed completion of the country reviews under the second cycle. Another speaker recalled that the terms of reference for the Mechanism had been the subject of protracted negotiations and that, although the country reviews under the first cycle had been nearing completion, the reviews under the second cycle were subject to delays. It was also recalled that the current workplan for all subsidiary bodies of the Conference was coming to an end and that a new workplan was needed to be discussed and adopted, as it would provide guidance



on the future work of the Group, including the length of its sessions. In this regard, it was also noted that a decision on the multi-year workplan would be closely connected to the programme of work of the Group and that the secretariat should contribute to such discussions.

4. Several speakers further emphasized the need for the Group to start discussing the following review phase in line with paragraph 40 of the terms of reference, which stated that “[i]n the following review phase, each State party shall submit information in its responses to the comprehensive self-assessment checklist on progress achieved in connection with the observations contained in its previous country review reports.” In accordance with that paragraph, States parties, as appropriate, were also to provide information on whether technical assistance needs requested by them in relation to their country review reports have been provided. In this regard, some speakers noted that the inclusion of the new agenda item, as proposed by Switzerland, could be a way of developing the practices on how States reported on measures taken and the Group could gain a better understanding on measures and practices that could be useful.

5. It was noted that the experience of other review mechanisms in transitioning from the first to second phases could be useful and the Secretary informed the Group that this work was already underway and that information on this would be presented to the Conference as part of the secretariat’s report on enhancing synergies with other review bodies. One speaker referred to a draft Conference resolution proposed by her Government, which, *inter alia*, called for deliberations on the next phase of the Mechanism.

6. In response to the comments raised, the Secretary referred to the two components for consideration, namely the duration of the second cycle under the first phase of the Mechanism and the conceptualization of the second phase. She noted that the informal consultations on the working methods of the subsidiary bodies could also consider the future of the Mechanism and that the secretariat stood ready to support those informal consultations.

7. Several speakers reported on measures taken in their countries to implement the Convention as well as good practices and challenges identified in the process. Several speakers mentioned that new legal frameworks had been adopted to strengthen the capacity of authorities to effectively prevent and combat corruption and recover proceeds of corruption. New institutions such as specialized preventive, investigative, prosecutorial bodies as well as national anti-corruption courts and task forces had been established. It was stressed that new technologies already existed or were in the process of being introduced to increase transparency of government operations and to improve the capacity of authorities to effectively detect, prevent and investigate corruption offences. Some speakers highlighted specific examples of successful cooperation in the form of provision of technical assistance, workshops and study visits with other States, including examples of South-South cooperation. One speaker noted with appreciation the good practices shared by other speakers and suggested that relevant thematic reports of the Secretariat on findings of country reviews, when listing good practices, could mention States parties for which such good practices had been identified, including in particular with regard to the establishment of national anti-corruption courts, in order to facilitate the exchange of information.
