

**Transparency International Statement
Sixth Session of the Conference of the States Parties
to the United Nations Convention against Corruption
Plenary session on the UNCAC Review Mechanism
Thursday 5 November 2015, St. Petersburg, Russia**

Gillian Dell, Head of Conventions Unit, Transparency International

Mr. Chair, distinguished delegates, thank you for the opportunity to speak here today. My name is Gillian Dell and I am speaking in this plenary on behalf of Transparency International. We extend our condolences to the people of Russia for their tragic loss in the recent airplane crash in Egypt.

The United Nations Convention against Corruption is the landmark international anti-corruption treaty, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in October 2003. It is the key instrument for overcoming corruption around the world. The negotiation of this comprehensive treaty and its ratification by 177 countries is one of the most outstanding achievements in the field of anti-corruption, providing a “global response to a global problem.”

Transparency International has actively supported the Convention from the early days, beginning with the Vienna negotiations in 2001-2003, and participated in the 2003 signing conference in Merida. Transparency International has emphasized all along that a follow-up monitoring system would be needed to ensure effective implementation of the Convention by Governments and played a leading role in the six-year effort that resulted in the adoption of the Review Mechanism at the Third Conference of the States Parties in Doha in 2009. Transparency International and its national chapters have closely followed the Implementation review process since it started operating in 2010 and prepared overview reports on the first three years of reviews.

It is important to recognize that the Implementation Review Mechanism must deal with daunting challenges that are orders of magnitude greater than those of other anti-corruption treaties. These result from the Convention’s extremely comprehensive scope and its worldwide membership of countries with large differences in political and legal systems. What has been accomplished in five years is impressive, but the process is still evolving.

There is room for improvement in a number of key areas:

No follow-up process has been established to address the implementation by Governments of the recommendations made in the country reviews. Without timely follow-up it is not possible to ensure that the recommendations are acted upon and that the purpose of the review process is fulfilled.

The Sixth Conference should call on States parties to prepare national action plans to respond to recommendations made in the country review reports. Action plans should be developed with the participation of CSOs and should be submitted to UNODC, the two peer review countries and the Implementation Review Group, as well as published on the UNODC website. The action plans should include information on technical assistance required, where applicable and efforts should be made

to provide such assistance. To overcome delays in the review process UNODC's resources should be increased to enable the secretariat to provide adequate support to the country reviews.

110 executive summaries have been completed and published on the country pages of the UNODC website. Only 50 full country review reports have been published so far, but the number is steadily increasing. We recommend to make public the country review reports as well as government self-assessment reports on the UNODC website and also publish them on national websites.

We also recommend that the role of civil society in UNCAC reviews should be better reflected in the review outputs. All country review reports should include a section on civil society involvement in the review process and in national implementation. UNODC's periodic status reports on progress with the review process and its thematic reports should reference civil society contributions to the reviews.

The Implementation Review Group and other subsidiary bodies established under article 63 of the Convention against Corruption are not being respected. NGOs have been denied admission as observers to the Implementation Review Group and the intergovernmental working groups on asset recovery and the prevention of corruption. UNODC arranged briefings for NGOs on the outcomes of the review process at meetings of the Implementation Review Group. These briefings resulted in useful exchanges but were not adequate substitutes to granting NGOs full observer status.

The CoSP should clarify that civil society representatives are able to participate as observers in the Open-Ended Intergovernmental Working Groups and, with regard to the Working Group on Prevention, should it continue to exist, should call for that working group to proactively solicit civil society views on implementation of Chapter II: Prevention, including Articles 10 and 13. In this connection it should be noted that the Working Groups do not form part of the Implementation Review Mechanism (IRM), not subject to any special IRM arrangements and that it is common United Nations practice for United Nations open ended working groups to hold open meetings with NGO observers, whether in Geneva or otherwise

The CoSP should include a standing agenda item on civil society participation at every CoSP session until CSOs are admitted as observers into CoSP subsidiary bodies. Subsidiary bodies should be tasked with the collection, reporting and consideration of civil society experience and recommendations.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.