



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

Distr.: General
28 October 2016

Original: English

Working Group on International Cooperation

Vienna, 19-21 October 2016

Report on the meeting of the Working Group on International Cooperation held in Vienna from 19 to 21 October 2016

I. Introduction

1. 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 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. The seventh meeting of the Working Group was held in Vienna from 19 to 21 October 2016, marking the tenth anniversary of the Working Group.

II. Recommendations

2. The following recommendations were formulated by the Working Group:

(a) States parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime should provide information, in particular statistical data, on the use of the Convention for international cooperation in criminal matters, including data identified in paragraph 13 of Conference resolution 8/1, entitled “Enhancing the effectiveness of central authorities in international cooperation in criminal matters to counter transnational organized crime”, in order to support an active dialogue in the Working Group and a more thorough understanding of the effectiveness of the Convention;

(b) States parties to the Organized Crime Convention should review and update, if appropriate, their notifications and declarations on articles related to international cooperation, in particular articles 13, 16 and 18, received by the Secretary-General at the time of deposit of their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, and also made in accordance with pertinent



decisions of the Conference, with a view to facilitating more flexible and effective implementation of those provisions;

(c) States parties should enhance measures for the identification, tracing, freezing, seizure and recovery of proceeds of crime, where derived from offences covered by the Convention, including those related to tax evasion, for the purpose of their eventual confiscation and for their transparent disposal;

(d) States parties should consider developing mechanisms that would allow for more timely and effective cooperation between central authorities, as well as law enforcement authorities, prosecutors and judicial authorities, in border areas, particularly in conurbation areas, and should also consider sharing such experiences in future meetings of the Working Group;

(e) Concerned States parties should consider developing and promoting existing regional networks, such as the Network of West African Central Authorities and Prosecutors against Organized Crime, the Ibero-American Network for International Legal Cooperation, the Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network and the Arab Judicial Cooperation Network of the League of Arab States, to continue building trust and confidence and improving international cooperation in criminal matters, and further promoting meetings for face-to-face interaction, using established mechanisms and bodies;

(f) The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) should, in addition to its work in regularly updating the directory of competent national authorities, create and regularly update a mailing list of experts and practitioners from States parties to the Convention, containing their contact details, which can be made available in a secure environment or further circulated among experts;

(g) The Conference should make use of all information available to the Working Group on International Cooperation for, inter alia, giving effect to the provisions of article 32 of the Convention as a means of reducing the burden for practitioners and avoiding duplication, where appropriate, by using the knowledge management portal known as Sharing Electronic Resources and Laws on Crime;

(h) The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime should, in cooperation with other partner organizations active in the field of international cooperation to combat transnational organized crime, where appropriate and subject to the availability of resources, undertake training activities on the use of the Organized Crime Convention to foster such cooperation, including for the purpose of raising awareness about the usefulness of the Mutual Legal Assistance Request Writer Tool and for training practitioners who work in central authorities on the use of the Tool and disseminating the Tool further at the national, regional and international levels.

3. The Working Group recommended that the Conference include the following issues in thematic discussions at future meetings of the Working Group:

(a) Practical considerations, good practices and challenges encountered in the area of transfer of criminal proceedings as a separate form of international cooperation in criminal matters;

(b) Sharing of electronic evidence and pertinent challenges in the field of international cooperation, including how to cooperate with respect to the use of virtual currency in criminal activities and, where appropriate, issues regarding decrypting data;

(c) Mutual legal assistance with respect to investigations, prosecutions and judicial proceedings in relation to offences covered by the Organized Crime Convention for which a legal person may be held liable (article 18, paragraph 2, in

conjunction with article 10 of the Convention), taking into account the work done by States parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption in that regard;

(d) International cooperation in civil and administrative proceedings in relation to offences covered by the Convention, including for the identification, freezing and confiscation of assets derived from such offences, and the interplay of those proceedings with international cooperation in criminal matters, taking into account the work done by States parties to the Convention against Corruption in this regard.

4. The Working Group also recommended that the Conference continue including in the agenda of future meetings of the Working Group the issue of implementation of articles 13 and 14 of the Convention.

III. Summary of deliberations

A. Reflection on the work of the Working Group on International Cooperation over the past 10 years

5. At its 1st meeting, on 19 October 2016, the Working Group considered agenda item 2, entitled “Reflection on the work of the Working Group on International Cooperation over the past 10 years”. With the Chair presiding, the discussion focused on the impact of the Working Group on promoting the implementation of the international cooperation provisions of the Organized Crime Convention. Speakers welcomed the contribution of the Working Group to the work of the Conference, both as its constant element and as a technical expert body on matters pertaining to international cooperation, and in line with article 32, paragraph 3, of the Convention.

6. A number of speakers highlighted that over the years the conclusions and recommendations of the Working Group had formed the basis and provided inspiration for the adoption of relevant resolutions by the Conference. They also noted that the action-oriented recommendations provided useful guidance for fostering international cooperation in criminal matters and for using the Convention as a legal basis for that purpose.

7. With regard to the future work of the Working Group, a number of speakers recalled that its role was being considered within the framework of ongoing negotiations on a possible review mechanism for the Convention and the Protocols thereto. In that regard, questions were raised as to whether the substantive work of the Working Group would be affected in future by potential assignments or tasks that might be added in its agenda, should such a review mechanism be established.

8. A number of speakers expressed caution about potential displacement of the clear focus of the Working Group if linked to a possible review mechanism for the Convention and its Protocols. Several speakers expressed concern that, if the Working Group needed to work intersessionally or with a specified periodicity for the purposes of a review mechanism, that might entail an additional burden on practitioners in States parties, who were often tasked with providing responses in multiple reviews and to various review mechanisms.

B. Efforts by States parties to use the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime as a basis for international cooperation

9. At its 1st meeting, on 19 October 2016, and 2nd meeting, on 20 October 2016, the Working Group considered agenda item 3, entitled “States parties’ efforts to use the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime as a basis for international cooperation”. The discussion on the agenda item was facilitated by the panellist Carolina Yumi de Souza (Brazil).

10. Speakers shared experiences and views on the use of the Organized Crime Convention as a legal basis for international cooperation in criminal matters. Some speakers expressed support for the great potential that the wide scope of application of the Convention could have in addressing a broader range of crimes. One speaker reported on the actual use of the Convention by the competent authorities of his country in cases concerning international cooperation with other States. Another speaker highlighted challenges pertaining to the denial of extradition in the absence of an applicable treaty and in that regard was in favour of the elaboration of an additional international instrument to promote international cooperation for combating all forms of crime.

11. Some speakers underscored that the Convention could be used in conjunction with existing bilateral and/or regional instruments on international cooperation. Other speakers confirmed that the Convention could be used as a legal basis for international cooperation subject to the principle of reciprocity. One speaker argued that a possible reason for the use by States parties of bilateral agreements or arrangements in lieu of the Convention was the more detailed content of those bilateral instruments.

12. A number of speakers underlined with concern the lack of cooperation and/or long delays in responding to requests for mutual legal assistance submitted on the basis of the Convention in the absence of a bilateral treaty. Upon the invitation of the Chair to consider ways to overcome problems relating to a lack of responsiveness among requested States in cases involving mutual legal assistance, speakers made the following practical suggestions: considering the establishment of a virtual network of experts or creating a mailing list containing contact details of practitioners or experts from central authorities involved in international cooperation; further promoting networking and meetings for face-to-face interaction, the building of trust and confidence and mutual exchange of views; using already established mechanisms or bodies tasked with fostering coordination among competent authorities, such as Eurojust, the Ibero-American Network for International Legal Cooperation and the European Judicial Network; attending plenary meetings of existing networks; examining the option of establishing contacts through liaison officers placed overseas, where applicable; and using the Working Group as a forum for bringing together practitioners from different jurisdictions for exchange of experiences and views.

13. Many speakers argued in support of UNODC “repository functions” for the purpose of compiling useful information on contact details of competent practitioners of States parties involved in international cooperation in criminal matters. In addition to the work of UNODC, which was highly praised by speakers, in regularly updating the directory of competent national authorities, many speakers said that they favoured the idea of creating a mailing list of experts and practitioners with their contact details, which could then be made available in a data-protected and secure environment or further circulated among experts. Building on that proposal, an initial list was circulated during the meeting of the Working Group for the purpose of compiling the contact information of practitioners and experts from central authorities attending the meeting.

14. Several speakers referred to the importance of informal consultations among counterparts in international cooperation practice. Such consultations were deemed necessary for more effective cooperation in dealing with extradition and requests for mutual legal assistance. The relevance of article 27 of the Organized Crime Convention on law enforcement cooperation was also stressed in that regard.

15. One speaker emphasized that the divergent national approaches in relation to the nature of liability of legal persons for the commission of criminal offences (criminal, civil or administrative) might entail consequent challenges in international cooperation cases involving such legal persons.

16. Some speakers referred to problems arising from the denial of extradition on the basis of nationality of the person sought, while others reported on challenges in extradition proceedings emerging from the dual nationality of the person sought, who often might flee to the jurisdiction of his or her second nationality to achieve impunity. Alternatives such as establishing flexible jurisdictional bases, for example, through the application of the active personality principle, as well as allowing for domestic prosecution in the requested State on the basis of *aut dedere aut judicare*, were reported and identified as good practices. One speaker stressed that domestic prosecution in lieu of extradition was chosen in his country only in specific cases, owing to the high cost and practical challenges (including translation of documents and transfer of witnesses) associated with the transfer of prosecution of the offender(s). Another speaker emphasized the need for timely communication to the transferring State of the outcome of transfers of prosecution and related trials with a view to, inter alia, avoiding risks of violation of the *ne bis in idem* principle.

17. Several speakers reported on national practices to promote informal and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, including the strengthening of joint operations; cooperation with the Global Container Programme of UNODC, which had resulted in an increase in seizures; subregional agreements on the exchange of advance passenger and migration alert information; the strengthening of central authorities and the creation of bodies or structures, such as security centres, to foster law enforcement cooperation; the existence of websites with information on procedures in place for extradition purposes; systems allowing access to data on extradition requests, as well as exchange of information; the use of information technologies; and training activities, including pilot programmes among countries with increased casework in international cooperation and frequent exchange of communication in that field.

18. Speakers expressed support for the activities developed within existing networks, such as the Ibero-American Network for International Legal Cooperation, the Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network and the Network of West African Central Authorities and Prosecutors against Organized Crime. One speaker reported on the latter Network as a joint initiative of the UNODC Global Programme for Strengthening the Capacities of Member States to Prevent and Combat Organized and Serious Crime and the Economic Community of West African States Secretariat, and as a good practice in enhancing regional and interregional cooperation for mutual legal assistance and extradition through training, sharing professional experience, building trust and facilitating direct contacts among national focal points. Another speaker reported on the development, within the League of Arab States, of a network of liaison officers in the Arab region to cooperate in combating transnational organized crime and terrorism through regular exchange of information on, among other things, legislation and cases.

19. One speaker stressed the importance of the use of new secure information and communication technologies for the submission of requests for mutual legal assistance. In that regard, she referred to the elaboration in the framework of the Conference of Ministers of Justice of the Ibero-American Countries/IberRed of a draft

agreement within the context of the Organization of Ibero-American States on the electronic transmission of requests for international cooperation between central authorities of the member States of the Organization, as well as other similar initiatives on a bilateral basis.

20. Another speaker reported on efforts to enhance international cooperation to combat trafficking in persons in the Asia and Pacific region. Such efforts included the promotion of joint investigations, the development of relevant tools such as the ASEAN Handbook on International Legal Cooperation in Trafficking in Persons Cases (the first of its kind in the world) and training activities. Future efforts in that context would revolve around cooperation with UNODC for the organization of expert group meetings in 2017, with a view to creating a more “internationalized” version of the aforementioned handbook, as well as revising existing UNODC guidance material in that field.

C. Joint investigations as a modality for international cooperation to combat cross-border organized crime

21. At its 2nd and 3rd meetings, on 20 October 2016, the Working Group considered agenda item 4, entitled “Joint investigations as a modality for international cooperation to combat cross-border organized crime”. The discussion on the agenda item was facilitated by the panellists Rongli Zhu (China), Vladimir Aras (Brazil) and Ricardo Pael Ardenghi (Brazil).

22. One speaker referred to the Convention on Joint Investigations concluded in the framework of the Commonwealth of Independent States in 2015. The speaker highlighted a provision in the Convention that allowed for the sending of requests for mutual legal assistance, in the framework of such joint investigation teams, directly to chiefs of the national parts of the joint investigation team. Other speakers referred to the significance of joint investigations for evidence-gathering purposes across borders. Specific mechanisms of joint operations at borders were suggested as good practices, along with practices to simplify the exchange of information for the purpose of conducting such operations. International instruments, such as the Organized Crime Convention and the Convention against Corruption, as well as regional standards for conducting joint investigations, such as the Convention on Joint Investigations in the framework of the Conference of Ministers of Justice of the Ibero-American Countries and the initiative on that topic in the framework of the Organization of American States, were highlighted. Different models of conducting joint investigations were referred to, while challenges regarding the identification of the most suitable agreement in particular cases were mentioned. One speaker referred to the significance of Eurojust as a facilitator for joint investigations.

23. Further discussion on the topic revolved around practical challenges, including lack of specific legislation; different legal systems and practices of cooperating States; problems relating to validity of the evidence obtained; language barriers; potential confusion regarding objectives of investigative action (establishment of joint investigative teams vis-à-vis coordinating parallel investigations); lack of experience and expertise concerning how to negotiate agreement on the establishment of joint investigative teams; doubts about the adequate kind or nature of agreement on the establishment of such teams; and lack of guidance on the specific role of central authorities in coordinating that specific form of international cooperation.

24. Speakers provided guidance to UNODC in relation to a draft report of an informal expert working group entitled “Joint investigations: conclusions and recommendations”, elaborated in 2008 and recirculated at the Working Group as reference material. Speakers expressed support for the finalization and adoption of the

draft report as it currently stood and proposed that UNODC make the report available on the Sharing Electronic Resources and Laws on Crime portal, after making editorial amendments, as necessary. Additionally, and bearing in mind that the aforementioned report reflected developments as of 2008, speakers were in favour of gathering good practices and experiences on the establishment of joint investigative teams at the national and regional levels and uploading them on the Sharing Electronic Resources and Laws on Crime portal. Speakers noted that the elaboration of a new report based on those practices and experiences could be discussed at a future meeting of the Working Group.

**D. Sharing of best practices and challenges in implementing:
(a) international cooperation for purposes of confiscation
(art. 13 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational
Organized Crime); and (b) disposal of confiscated proceeds of crime
or property (art. 14 of the United Nations Convention against
Transnational Organized Crime)**

25. At its 1st meeting, on 19 October 2016, and 3rd meeting, on 20 October 2016, the Working Group considered agenda item 5, entitled “Sharing of best practices and challenges in implementing: (a) international cooperation for purposes of confiscation (art. 13 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime); and (b) disposal of confiscated proceeds of crime or property (art. 14 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime)”. The discussion on the agenda item was facilitated by the panellists Raluca Simion (Romania) and Dina Juliani (Indonesia).

26. Reference was made to successful examples of international cooperation for purposes of confiscation among States parties, including regional instruments on mutual legal assistance, money-laundering and mutual recognition of confiscation orders. At the same time, challenges encountered in that regard were highlighted, including the diversity of legal systems of cooperating States, the different case-handling procedures in various States, translation issues, difficulties in establishing the nexus between the crimes and the proceeds in question, and lack of political will, trust and commitment. Consultations among counterparts prior to decisions on granting related requests were identified as a good practice.

27. Several speakers referred to the practice of non-conviction-based confiscation. They noted that, although an increasing number of jurisdictions had adopted legislation permitting confiscation without a conviction, there were still countries that required the existence of a criminal conviction to allow for confiscation and that relied on strict application of the dual criminality requirement in that regard. Furthermore, in cases in which non-conviction-based confiscation was accepted, international cooperation could still be challenging due to varying requirements in the cooperating legal systems, both in the identification of the court (civil or criminal) and the procedural and substantive elements, such as the standard of proof (balance of probabilities or beyond reasonable doubt).

28. Several speakers reported on innovative practices designed to overcome related obstacles, such as the promotion of informal cooperation among law enforcement authorities, including through such networks as the Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network, along with the initiation of money-laundering proceedings to enable restraint orders and the forfeiture of proceeds of crime without necessarily referring to predicate offences, especially in cases of unexplained wealth.

29. On the issue of disposal of confiscated proceeds of crime or property, several speakers noted that the compensation of victims should be the priority consideration among cooperating States. Another speaker highlighted the use of confiscated proceeds of crime for the benefit of local communities.

30. Reference was made to existing international standards, including the relevant provisions of the Organized Crime Convention and the Convention against Corruption, which differed in their scope of application, requirements for use and authorized action. The Model Bilateral Agreement on the Sharing of Confiscated Proceeds of Crime or Property, as adopted by the Economic and Social Council in 2005 to provide guidance for negotiating bilateral agreements to share confiscated proceeds of crime or property derived from offences covered by the Organized Crime Convention and the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988, was also mentioned.

31. One speaker referred to challenges in implementing article 14 of the Organized Crime Convention and stressed the need for a more detailed and comprehensive regulatory framework concerning the return of confiscated proceeds of crime or property. The same speaker suggested that all confiscated property should be returned to the requesting State, with the exception of extraordinary costs incurred in the disposal process, which the requested State could deduct from the confiscated proceeds, if the parties agreed to do so.

E. Update by the Secretariat on its tools related to international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

32. At its 4th meeting, on 21 October 2016, the Working Group considered agenda item 6, entitled “Update by the Secretariat on its tools related to international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime”. The discussion on the agenda item was facilitated by presentations by a representative of the Secretariat.

33. Reference was made to the UNODC Mutual Legal Assistance Request Writer Tool. Speakers commended UNODC for its efforts to redevelop the tool and expand its content to include additional substantive features, such as guiding elements for practitioners on requesting assistance through videoconferencing, drafting requests on the transfer of criminal proceedings and requesting assistance involving electronic evidence, as well as guidance on other forms of assistance such as joint investigations and cooperation for conducting controlled deliveries. It was noted that the Tool, in its final redeveloped form, was to be used by practitioners working in central authorities, who were often called upon to draft requests under time pressure. The added value of the tool in future capacity-building activities and programmes was stressed.

34. The UNODC directory of competent national authorities was further mentioned as a means of facilitating contacts and networking among practitioners (see paras. 2 (f) and 13 above). The redeveloped structure and content of the directory, in line with the previous recommendation of the Working Group, were presented to the Working Group and were very positively received.

F. Other matters

35. At its 4th meeting, on 21 October 2016, the Working Group considered agenda item 7, entitled "Other matters". The Chair noted that the Secretariat would facilitate the reporting of the salient points emanating from the deliberations of the Working Group, as well as its recommendations, to the fifth open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the Convention against Corruption, to be held in Vienna on 17 and 18 November 2016. The purpose, as noted, would be to continue fostering the interrelationship and exchange of information between the two expert bodies.

IV. Organization of the meeting

A. Opening of the meeting

36. The Working Group met from 19 to 21 October 2016, holding a total of four meetings. The meetings were chaired by Thomas Burrows (United States of America).

B. Statements

37. Under agenda items 2 to 6, statements were made by representatives of the following States parties to the Convention: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Germany, Guinea, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, South Africa, Sudan, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates and United States.

38. A representative of the European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, also made a statement.

39. The observers for the Conference of the Ministers of Justice of the Ibero-American Countries (IberRed), League of Arab States and Japan also made statements.

40. A representative of the Secretariat delivered presentations under agenda items 2 to 6.

C. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

41. At its 1st meeting, on 19 October 2016, the Working Group adopted the following agenda:

1. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Opening of the meeting;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
2. Reflection on the work of the Working Group on International Cooperation over the past 10 years.
3. States parties' efforts to use the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime as a basis for international cooperation.
4. Joint investigations as a modality for international cooperation to combat cross-border organized crime.

5. Sharing of best practices and challenges in implementing:
 - (a) International cooperation for purposes of confiscation (art. 13 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime);
 - (b) Disposal of confiscated proceeds of crime or property (art. 14 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime).
6. Update by the Secretariat on its tools related to international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.
7. Other matters.
8. Adoption of the report.

D. Attendance

42. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the meeting: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Guinea, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

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

44. Japan, a signatory State to the Convention, was represented by an observer.

45. The following specialized agency of the United Nations system was represented by an observer: United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs.

46. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers: Conference of the Ministers of Justice of the Ibero-American Countries (IberRed), Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network, League of Arab States, International Anti-Corruption Academy, Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization, Central Asian Regional Information and Coordination Centre, Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, International Criminal Police Organization and Organization of American States.

E. Documentation

47. The Working Group had before it the following:

- (a) Provisional agenda and annotations (CTOC/COP/WG.3/2016/1);
- (b) Background paper prepared by the Secretariat on the Working Group on International Cooperation established by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime: an overview of mandates and work since its establishment (CTOC/COP/WG.3/2016/2);

(c) Background paper prepared by the Secretariat on the implementation of articles 13 and 14 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime: international cooperation for purposes of confiscation and disposal of confiscated proceeds of crime or property (CTOC/COP/WG.3/2016/3);

(d) Conference room paper containing information provided by the Secretariat on the notification requirement of article 16, paragraph 5 (a), of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (CTOC/COP/WG.3/2016/CRP.1);

(e) Conference room paper entitled “Informal expert working group on joint investigations: conclusions and recommendations” (CTOC/COP/2008/CRP.5).

V. Adoption of the report

48. On 21 October 2016, the Working Group adopted the present report on its meeting, as amended.
