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Summary

The present document provides a summary of the views shared by States parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the deliberations held during the sessions of the Implementation Review Group in 2022 and 2023 and during the tenth session of the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention, in December 2023, on the scope and thematic sequence of the next phase of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption. The experiences of other review mechanisms are presented as illustrative examples. The document contains recommendations and outlines possible next steps regarding the second phase of the Mechanism.

* CAC/COSP/IRG/2024/1.
I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 8/2, the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption encouraged States parties, with the help of the secretariat, to voluntarily share their views in the Implementation Review Group, without prejudice to the existing mandates of the Group and the terms of reference of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, on the possible ways forward following the end of the first review phase, and requested that the Group submit its report to the Conference at its tenth session. Also in the same resolution, the Conference requested the Implementation Review Group to continue to collect, with the support of the secretariat, relevant information, including the views of States parties, pertaining to the performance of the Implementation Review Mechanism, with a view to continuing, at the appropriate time, the Group’s assessment of the performance of the Mechanism, as provided for in paragraph 48 of the terms of reference of the Mechanism and Conference decision 5/1, and in that regard to continue to report to the Conference on progress made, bearing in mind the request in paragraph 5 of Conference resolution 3/1 for the evaluation of the terms of reference at the conclusion of each review cycle.

2. Moreover, in the political declaration entitled “Our common commitment to effectively addressing challenges and implementing measures to prevent and combat corruption and strengthen international cooperation”, adopted by the General Assembly at its special session against corruption in June 2021, Member States and parties to the Convention welcomed the achievements of the Implementation Review Mechanism, committed to fully and effectively following up on the conclusions and observations from the review process, and welcomed the efforts by the Conference to assess the performance of the Mechanism and adapt, where appropriate, procedures and requirements for the follow-up.

3. Furthermore, in its decision 10/2, the Conference decided that the Implementation Review Group should dedicate the time necessary to continue its discussions on assessing the performance of the Implementation Review Mechanism, as well as on the scope, thematic sequence and details of the next review phase, including through additional resumed sessions of the Group, if possible back to back with sessions of the Group, within existing resources or subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources, to submit recommendations to the Conference at its eleventh session in this regard and to endeavour to launch the next phase as soon as possible.

4. The present document provides an overview of the views shared by States parties and the deliberations held during the sessions of the Implementation Review Group in 2022 and 2023 and during the tenth session of the Conference, in December 2023, on the scope and thematic sequence of the next phase of the Implementation Review Mechanism, in accordance with Conference resolution 8/2 and decision 10/2. The analysis is intended to inform the development by the Group of recommendations, to be submitted to the Conference at its eleventh session, on the performance of the Mechanism, in particular the scope, thematic sequence and details of the next review phase, with a view to launching the next phase as soon as possible, as decided by the Conference in its decision 10/2. It is also aimed at informing the deliberations of the Group on the scope and thematic sequence of the next review phase.

5. The analysis draws from and builds on the notes by the Secretariat on the performance of the Implementation Review Mechanism and the measures required for the completion of the first phase, as well as considerations regarding the next phase (CAC/COSP/2023/3); on views of States parties on the performance of the Mechanism (CAC/COSP/2021/4); on the performance of the Mechanism, in particular its second review cycle and the measures required for its completion (CAC/COSP/2019/12); on lessons learned and views on potential areas for improvement of the Mechanism (CAC/COSP/IRG/2023/3); on lessons learned from other review mechanisms on their operation and transition to a next phase: experiences collected in transitions by other peer review mechanisms (part I) (CAC/COSP/IRG/2023/8); and on lessons learned from other review mechanisms on their operation and transition to a
next phase: elements of peer review mechanisms subject to transitions, observations and trends (part II) (CAC/COSP/IRG/2023/8/Add.1).

II. Considerations on the scope and thematic sequence of the next review phase

6. In line with Conference resolution 3/1 and the terms of reference of the Implementation Review Mechanism, more than one review phase is envisaged. Pursuant to paragraph 47 of the terms of reference, the Conference is expected to establish the phases and cycles of the review process, as well as the scope, thematic sequence and details of the review. The Conference, through the Implementation Review Group, must also assess and adapt, where appropriate, the procedures and requirements for the follow-up to the conclusions and observations emerging from the review process, as contemplated in paragraphs 40 and 41 of the terms of reference.

7. The present section provides an overview of the views shared by States parties on the scope and thematic sequence of the next review phase and the deliberations on the matter held during the sessions of the Implementation Review Group in 2022 and 2023 and during the tenth session of the Conference. Section III outlines some recommendations and possible next steps regarding the next phase of the Mechanism.

8. The Implementation Review Group began deliberations on the next review phase at its first resumed thirteenth session, held in September 2022, and has continued those deliberations at all subsequent sessions, including resumed sessions, to date. The deliberations reflect many of the same views and considerations shared by States parties in their written submissions, as discussed below. In addition, at the tenth session of the Conference, speakers highlighted the impact of the Mechanism and shared their views in relation to the scope and thematic sequence of the second phase and how they relate to the follow-up to the first review phase.

9. The present note attempts to summarize these deliberations, as well as the views shared by States parties in their written responses to a questionnaire sent by note verbale in February 2023 on the scope and themes of the next review phase, as analysed in the note by the Secretariat on lessons learned and views on potential areas for improvement of the Mechanism (CAC/COSP/IRG/2023/3). The note was prepared pursuant to Conference resolution 8/2 and the deliberations held during the previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group.

10. Overall, in the responses and deliberations it was noted that the design of the next phase needed to build on the lessons learned in the first phase and the experiences of other related mechanisms, while safeguarding the principle of non-intrusiveness and the non-punitive nature of the Mechanism.

11. A number of speakers at the aforementioned previous sessions (the sessions of the Implementation Review Group held in 2022 and 2023 and the tenth session of the Conference of States Parties) emphasized that adherence to the guiding principles was a cornerstone of the Mechanism. In that regard, they underlined the importance of the guiding principles, including those relating to sovereign equality and non-interference in the domestic affairs of States parties, transparency, efficiency, non-intrusiveness, inclusivity and impartiality, as well as the non-punitive nature of the Mechanism and the absence of any form of ranking, and stressed that those principles should continue to be adhered to in the second phase. Several speakers also stressed the value of the intergovernmental nature of the Mechanism. Some speakers noted that adherence to
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1 For further details of the deliberations, see the reports of the Implementation Review Group on its first resumed thirteenth session (CAC/COSP/IRG/2022/6/Add.1), second resumed thirteenth session (CAC/COSP/IRG/2022/6/Add.2) and fourteenth session (CAC/COSP/IRG/2023/7).

2 The present note builds on a related note by the Secretariat submitted to the Conference at its ninth session pursuant to resolution 8/2 and decision 5/1, which contains an analysis of the views of 26 States parties on the performance of the Mechanism (CAC/COSP/2021/4) (to be read in conjunction with CAC/COSP/2021/CRP.3).
the guiding principles did not preclude efforts to identify ways to render the Mechanism more effective.

12. On several occasions, speakers underscored that the lessons learned in the first review phase, the outcome of the evaluation of the performance of the Mechanism and the experiences of other review mechanisms should guide the deliberations regarding the next phase. Several speakers noted that the Implementation Review Group should allocate enough time for the deliberations on the next review phase, including the scope, thematic sequence and details, with one speaker emphasizing the importance of a transparent intergovernmental process, taking into account the progress of the current phase and the interests of all States parties. One speaker expressed the view that organizational aspects, including the format and time frame for collecting information, should be considered after defining the topics for the next phase.

13. The following options and considerations regarding the scope, thematic sequence and structure of the next review phase were highlighted.

1. Maintenance of the current structure in accordance with Conference resolution 3/1

14. Overall, the majority of States parties responding to the 2023 questionnaire preferred to maintain the current structure rather than reconsider the sequence of chapters. More than 80 per cent of the respondents considered the current structure of the Mechanism, whereby chapter III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and chapter IV (International cooperation) of the Convention were reviewed in the first cycle, and chapter II (Preventive measures) and chapter V (Asset recovery) were reviewed in the second cycle, to be very useful or rather useful. Furthermore, in the previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group and the tenth session of the Conference, it was suggested that the next phase should continue to follow the current approach referred to in Conference resolution 3/1, in which the Conference had decided to review chapters III and IV of the Convention in the first cycle and chapters II and V in the second cycle.

15. A common challenge was identified in relation to chapter II, for which the review required more time due to the breadth and complexity of the areas covered. Some States parties noted that the current structure had led to a long time elapsing for some States parties between the reviews under the first and second cycles. Although the current structure was assessed positively by the majority of respondents, over 70 concrete suggestions for the next review phase were made, which are analysed below.

2. A greater focus on assessing the effectiveness of measures taken and practical implementation

16. Among the specific suggestions for changes to the scope and thematic sequence of country reviews, the option of placing a greater focus on assessing the effectiveness of measures taken and practical implementation received the most support from respondents to the 2023 questionnaire; the number of respondents supporting this option was more than twice the average than for the other options. It should be noted that this approach was not considered as a stand-alone option but in combination with other options described in this section.

17. Similarly, many speakers at the previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group and the tenth session of the Conference highlighted the impact of the Mechanism and the importance of continuity in the next phase and suggested that the next phase should place a greater focus on practical implementation and the effectiveness and impact of measures taken. The experience of other mechanisms indicated that assessments of effectiveness required robust indicators and sound methods, as well as training, guidance and capacity-building, both for States parties under review and for reviewing States parties, including adequate resources for the secretariat. In that regard, it was noted that the resources of the secretariat of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime were limited in comparison with those of
other mechanisms. It was also underscored that a focus on effectiveness entailed greater complexity and was generally more time- and resource-intensive, but was not prohibitive given the experiences learned from other mechanisms. Experience also demonstrated that the possibility of assessing effectiveness did not preclude the identification of new topics of relevance to the membership. Further information regarding the experience of other review mechanisms in relation to effectiveness is provided in box 1 below.

**Box 1. Experience of other review mechanisms with regard to effectiveness**

One non-exclusive way of making the transition to a new phase is to focus on the effective implementation of agreed standards. Most review mechanisms under consideration (the Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the Mechanism for Follow-up on the Implementation of the Inter-American Convention against Corruption (MESICIC), the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and the Group of States against Corruption of the Council of Europe (GRECO)) started by assessing the adequacy of legal and institutional frameworks in States parties under review and then moved on to reviewing practical implementation, that is, assessing whether domestic legislation was achieving the desired outcome. All the review mechanisms under consideration also decided to focus on how recommendations made during previous assessments were implemented, either from the very inception of the review mechanism or early on in its existence. FATF and the Working Group on Bribery have pursued this strategy by focusing on areas where serious deficiencies or risks were identified in previous reviews. The scoping exercise carried out by FATF is a good example of this approach, which also entails determining the focus of reviews for each country using a risk-based approach. Likewise, MESICIC includes questions about the implementation of earlier recommendations in its self-assessment questionnaires. The United Nations universal periodic review also tracks the extent to which States have followed up on accepted recommendations and seeks to engage civil society and other United Nations entities in that effort.

The advantages of focusing on the effectiveness of domestic anti-corruption policies are obvious in terms of obtaining a more realistic and complete view of the situation on the ground. Moreover, reviewing how previous recommendations are addressed can enhance the authority and credibility of the review exercise and address persisting deficits. However, there are also caveats. Challenges mentioned by interviewees, for instance in FATF, MESICIC, the Working Group on Bribery and GRECO, concern the methodological effort involved in assessments of effectiveness, the need for robust methodologies to ensure a common understanding of how to assess the effectiveness and the application of those methodologies in practice, and the qualitative and quantitative data to be produced, which involved an increase in the resources required to conduct reviews. During the necessary consensus-building among the membership, secretariats have to rely on their authority as technical experts with the institutional memory needed to ensure a fair and equitable application of the review process throughout a review’s life cycle. These norms of fairness and equality (i.e. submitting all States parties to the same standards of review) play a key role in the success of peer review exercises as accountability measures for implementing multilateral, treaty-based commitments. The assessment of effective implementation can lead to a demanding and complex review programme and requires sufficient training of reviewers and sufficient capacity in the secretariats of the review mechanisms. This is especially the case where States parties have the option of submitting updates on their progress in implementing recommendations between review cycles.

3. Use of a mixed approach, whereby all (or certain) articles are reviewed for all States parties in combination with following up on the implementation of recommendations

18. The option of a mixed approach was preferred by a slightly higher number of respondents to the 2023 questionnaire than other suggestions for changes to the scope and thematic sequence of country reviews. The combined approach entails reviewing all or some articles of the Convention for a given country in parallel with a follow-up assessment of how recommendations and conclusions resulting from the first review phase were addressed. The combined approach is considered useful as it allows for the consideration of changes and new developments that might have occurred since the first phase and takes into account the possibility that some recommendations might have become less relevant since the first phase.

19. Similarly, in the previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group and the tenth session of the Conference, the absence of a dedicated follow-up mechanism was regarded by several speakers as the main weakness of the Implementation Review Mechanism, and a number of speakers suggested that such a follow-up mechanism be established for the next phase. In that context, several speakers noted that the next phase should focus on the implementation of the recommendations and findings emanating from the first phase. Some speakers indicated that the next phase should cover all provisions of the Convention under review, or that the follow-up process should be combined with a review of all the articles of the Convention, taking into account the possibility that some recommendations might have lost relevance since the first phase. One speaker suggested that the next phase should follow a combined approach based on the same formal process as the current structure, using a self-assessment checklist following the same sequence of cycles conducted so far combined with a formal reporting process on how recommendations, good practices and challenges were addressed, on the outcome of technical assistance and on initiatives taken after the review process, and that this information should be elicited in the checklist. Another speaker expressed the view that the second phase should not be limited to follow-up and could entail a more tailor-made approach.

4. A greater (or exclusive) focus on following up on the implementation of the recommendations and findings emanating from the first phase

20. With respect to the option of a greater (or exclusive) focus on following up on the implementation of the recommendations and findings emanating from the first phase, a slightly smaller number of respondents to the 2023 questionnaire preferred this option to the combined approach referred to above. Although a number of respondents expressed the need to follow up on the outcomes of the first phase (as discussed below), it was recognized that a follow-up process might not be carried out in isolation but in combination with another review of implementation of the articles of the Convention.

21. Furthermore, in the previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group, some speakers were of the view that a follow-up process should be carried out without repeating the review. While one speaker indicated that the next phase should concentrate on following up on the implementation of recommendations, another speaker cautioned against limiting the next phase to follow-up, as changes might have occurred. One speaker indicated a preference for keeping the review and follow-up processes separate, while others noted the resource implications of multiple follow-up processes.

5. Other considerations and additional suggestions

22. While there was no consensus among States parties regarding the thematic focus and sequence of chapters, the following options were discussed:

(a) **Covering all provisions of the Convention under review, in addition to a chapter that had not previously been reviewed.** There was moderate support for this option. One speaker at the previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group
suggested conducting the review of another chapter that had not previously been reviewed;

(b) **Reconsidering how the different chapters are combined for each review cycle.** Although some States parties that responded to the 2023 questionnaire supported the option of covering one chapter of the Convention per review cycle, others expressed concern over the resources and time that would be required under that approach. Some speakers at the previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group and the tenth session of the Conference suggested that, in view of the workload involved in the reviews, the next phase should cover one chapter of the Convention per review cycle, while others suggested reconsidering how the different chapters were combined for each review cycle, taking into account the complexities of collecting information, in particular on chapter II. One speaker suggested reviewing chapter II of the Convention on its own, given its complexity, and noted that the second phase should also address technical assistance that had been provided. Various suggestions were made as to how the chapters could be combined, although no clear trend was identified. As noted above, the majority of States parties preferred to maintain the current structure rather than change the sequence of chapters;

(c) **The possibility of a thematic approach.** Some speakers at the previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group suggested combining the follow-up process with a thematic focus for the next phase. Several suggestions regarding a possible thematic focus were made, although there was no overall consensus. One speaker underscored the importance of ensuring that the Mechanism remained adaptable to new and emerging challenges, such as the links between corruption and climate change and corruption risks in emergency preparedness and response and the health-care sector. Another speaker noted that the thematic focus of the next phase should take into account the most pressing issues and practical aspects and cautioned that defining a list of prospective topics relevant to all States parties required careful deliberation, taking into account the methodology used to measure the effectiveness of other review mechanisms. The experience of other review mechanisms with regard to a thematic focus of the reviews is outlined in box 2;

(d) **The possibility of tailoring the reviews to the State party under review.** There was little support for this option, which deviated significantly in terms of the number of responses, with only three States parties supporting a tailor-made approach. Overall, respondents emphasized the need for a uniform approach and equal treatment, with the same standards of review applied to all States parties;

(e) **Considering organizational aspects of the reviews after defining the scope and thematic sequence of the next phase.** The suggestion was made that other modalities of the review process, such as the format of the information-gathering tools, outcome documents and time frames and schedules for reviews, should be considered only once the scope and thematic sequence had been defined.

**Box 2. Experience of other review mechanisms with regard to a thematic focus of the reviews**

Agreeing on new topics to be included requires reflection and negotiation to build consensus while keeping the entire membership on board. Interviewees report on the importance of finding topics that: (a) address new developments; (b) are relevant to and resonate with all States parties; and (c) are feasible in terms of the workload involved for the membership and the secretariat. This element is especially important in staggered review processes, in which unresolved recommendations from a previous cycle are carried over to the next.

*Source: CAC/COSP/IRG/2023/8/Add.1.*

6. **Additional considerations with regard to follow-up**

23. The main weakness of the Implementation Review Mechanism identified in the responses to the 2023 questionnaire and during the deliberations in the
Implementation Review Group was the lack of a dedicated follow-up procedure, as contemplated in paragraph 40 of the terms of reference, which refers to a subsequent review phase.

24. Suggestions were made with respect to establishing such a follow-up procedure for the next phase. These included:

   (a) Establishing a formal follow-up process;
   (b) Organizing panel discussions on action taken to support other States parties during sessions of the Implementation Review Group and the Conference;
   (c) Giving presentations on the outcomes of country reviews and measures taken as follow-up during sessions of the Implementation Review Group;
   (d) Preparing compliance reports;
   (e) Allowing States parties under review to work with the secretariat and their reviewing States parties to follow up on recommendations;
   (f) Organizing a round of voluntary follow-up activities in relation to specific recommendations so as to facilitate the provision of technical assistance.

25. One State party cautioned against any rigid reporting mechanism and suggested that the next phase should instead focus on implementation, since mandatory reporting on follow-up could interfere with the guiding principles and non-intrusive nature of the Mechanism.

26. Several speakers at the previous sessions of the Implementation Review Group and the tenth session of the Conference emphasized that any follow-up to the implementation of previous recommendations should take into account lessons learned from other mechanisms (as analysed in CAC/COSP/IRG/2023/8 and CAC/COSP/IRG/2023/8/Add.1). For example, in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, outstanding recommendations were automatically carried over to new phases and significant issues could prevent progress to the next phase. In all cases, ownership of the process and its outcomes by the State party under review was key to preventing recommendations from being diluted or not implemented.

27. In this context, one speaker noted that, although the need for a follow-up process was evident, the next phase should not necessarily be limited to follow-up, to allow for changes in national anti-corruption frameworks to be considered, including those that may have rendered recommendations less relevant or, conversely, more pressing. The follow-up process could be designed more flexibly than the regular reviews, provided that common standards were maintained. To support the follow-up process, some speakers suggested the development of tools such as a dashboard of recommendations and further opportunities to assist States in following up on recommendations and utilizing the review outcomes to formulate common solutions. One speaker referred to Conference resolution 8/2, in which the Conference encouraged States parties to keep using the Implementation Review Group as a platform for the voluntary exchange of information on national measures taken during and after the completion of country reviews. Another speaker referred to the commitment made by States parties in the political declaration entitled “Our common commitment to effectively address challenges and implementing measures to prevent and combat corruption and strengthen international cooperation” to fully and effectively follow up on the findings and observations of the review process.

28. Regular or interim follow-up reporting was discussed, with one speaker noting that progress reports should be voluntary, as regular reporting was too labour intensive, and that presentations could be given by States parties during the sessions of the Implementation Review Group. The importance of including technical assistance as part of the follow-up was also noted.

29. The experience of other review mechanisms with regard to follow-up is outlined in box 3.
Box 3. Experience of other review mechanisms with regard to follow-up

The organization of the follow-up to country reviews has been the focus of numerous reform discussions. All of the review mechanisms under consideration have experienced some changes in this respect. The key consideration was how to make sure that recommendations or observations from the reviews are revisited at a later stage, with a view to triggering implementation efforts, facilitating peer learning from successful policies and identifying bottlenecks or technical assistance needs for implementing recommendations. Returning to the findings of earlier review cycles can enhance the political status and credibility of peer reviews, as it helps to ensure that country reports and recommendations are meaningfully implemented and used for further improvement in later phases of the review process. Such efforts, however, need to be balanced with the proliferation of follow-up measures and processes as the review cycle matures, as is the case in the Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions.

In terms of how to organize follow-up procedures, there are various options that have been employed in past transitions:

(a) Mandatory reporting, in which the State party under review provides information on how recommendations and problems have been addressed. This is a standard element in the evaluation process of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), the Group of States against Corruption of the Council of Europe (GRECO), the Working Group on Bribery and the Mechanism for Follow-up on the Implementation of the Inter-American Convention against Corruption (MESISIC). It allows the secretariat and peers to return to the full set of findings and recommendations during the next review cycle and to ensure that recommendations from earlier reviews are heeded. GRECO in particular has put great effort into developing an elaborate compliance procedure in which progress in implementing recommendations is reviewed in several iterations. There can also be lighter reviews in which only the most urgent or significant changes or recommendations are revisited;

(b) Optional reporting between regular review cycles, in which States parties can report voluntarily on how they have addressed specific recommendations and observations made by their peers. Such an option is, for instance, provided for in the Implementation Review Mechanism for the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and in the monitoring system of the Working Group on Bribery and may work as an incentive to implement recommendations more quickly. One problem in this respect is the workload involved in assessing the substance of individual improvements, which is borne by the secretariat and the reviewers;

(c) FATF, the Working Group on Bribery and GRECO have the option of both continued monitoring and exerting strong pressure on countries with implementation gaps through additional follow-up measures. Such measures include publishing the names of the respective countries, sending letters to ministers, issuing starkly worded press statements, sending high-level or technical missions and requiring additional oral or written follow-up reports (Working Group on Bribery, GRECO). A system of publicly naming countries that have strategic deficiencies in implementing the agreed standards (as implemented by FATF) similarly sends signals to the private sector and the international community. Such sanctions are found to be damaging from a reputational perspective and may lead to a more rigorous form of peer review follow-up monitoring, as observed by one of the interviewees;

(d) GRECO maintains the option of “ad hoc procedures” (rule 34). These are extraordinary reviews that can be triggered in the case of concerns about backsliding. If GRECO receives reliable information indicating that an institutional reform, legislative initiative or procedural change in a member State may result in a serious violation of a Council of Europe anti-corruption standard that has been the subject of any GRECO evaluation rounds, GRECO may initiate an ad hoc procedure in respect of that member State and can issue corresponding recommendations, which are then followed up.

III. Recommendations and possible next steps

30. The Implementation Review Group, as part of its effort to develop recommendations on the performance of the Implementation Review Mechanism, in particular the scope, thematic sequence and details of the next review phase, for the Conference at its eleventh session, may wish to build on the views and considerations outlined in the present note.

31. In developing recommendations, the Group may wish to consider the outcomes of the present analysis, in particular the need to take into account the lessons learned in the first review phase and the experiences of other related mechanisms, while safeguarding the guiding principles of the Mechanism. Moreover, as highlighted by a number of States parties, further consideration could be given to assessing the benefits of a balanced approach that combines elements of a follow-up process with a greater focus on the effectiveness of the reviews, without excluding the consideration of changes and new developments that might have occurred in the implementation of the articles under review since the first phase.

32. Taking into account these continuing discussions, the secretariat will prepare an updated analysis of the views of States parties on the next review phase, on the basis of a revised questionnaire soliciting responses and contributions, for the consideration of the Group.