Wed, 15 Dec – afternoon: Implementation review mechanism

**UNCAC Coalition**

Mr President,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

I would like to highlight that many non-governmental organizations are eager to contribute to the UNCAC implementation review process and that we would like the UNCAC review to be an engine for reforms.

Non-governmental organizations in 15 countries have this year finalised their own research reports on the implementation of the UNCAC in their respective countries, developing also recommendations for actions, and in this way contributing to the UNCAC implementation review mechanism.

The UNCAC Coalition’s Transparency Pledge for the 2nd review cycle has been so far signed by 31 States Parties that have committed to higher levels of transparency and civil society inclusion in the review process – we invite other States to join the Pledge.

I would like to invite you to a side event on the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism tomorrow afternoon, that we are hosting with Switzerland and Honduras.

Furthermore, the UNCAC Coalition will tomorrow release a research report providing a civil society analysis of the UNCAC implementation review mechanism. I also invite you to consult the written submission we made to the conference on strengthening the review process.

Specifically, we see the need to strengthen the inclusion of civil society, follow-up to the recommendations and also the transparency of the review mechanism.

For example, details on the updated schedules of individual reviews, the contact details of focal points should be made public, so that civil society can identify entry points to contribute.

Similarly, the key documents of the review process, the self-assessment and the full report, should be made public. Non-governmental organisations in many countries are requesting the release of these documents under national access to information legislation.

We also call for civil society to be allowed to observe the meetings of the IRG, as well as of other CoSP subsidiary bodies.

Follow-up on recommendations made by the review is important. So far, only one State Party in the context of the second cycle review has published information on followup to the recommendations it received. We propose to develop a streamlined template to facilitate the reporting of States Parties on follow-up actions.

More than 10 years after the first reviews were concluded, there is no systematic procedure to report on follow-up actions.

Furthermore, we urge States Parties to launch discussions on the future of the review mechanism beyond the 2nd cycle.

Finally, I would encourage you to contact us at the tables in the hallway if you are interested in learning more about the Transparency Pledge. We are also happy to share with you good practice approaches on how to ensure a transparency and inclusive review process.

Thank you.