



Strasbourg, 12 July 2002

Greco (2002) 26E

10th Plenary Meeting of GRECO
(Strasbourg, 8-12 July 2002)

Summary meeting report

I. Opening of the meeting

1. In the absence of the Chair, Mr Michel GAUTHIER (France), excused, the Vice-Chair, Mr Drago KOS (Slovenia), opened the 10th plenary meeting of GRECO on 8 July 2002 at 9.30 am. He welcomed the participants, a list of whom appears in Appendix I to this report.

II. Adoption of the agenda

2. The meeting agenda was adopted as set out in Appendix II to this report.

III. Statement by the Chair

3. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair of GRECO provided information on his participation in :

- (i) the Conference held by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) in London on 20 May 2002 on the theme "Tackling Corruption in Africa – Building a new partnership » ;
- (ii) the seminar on "Evaluation of the Existing Legal Framework and Assistance for Further Legislative Reforms including Police Ethics", 25-26 June 2002 in Kiev.

4. A summary of the discussions appears in document Greco (2002) 22.

IV. Statement by the Executive Secretary

5. The Executive Secretary of GRECO, Mr Manuel LEZERTUA, provided participants with information on the main events that had occurred in the Council of Europe since the last GRECO meeting. In particular, he reported on participation :

- (i) by the Chair of GRECO, Mr GAUTHIER (France), in the conference on the Council of Europe's contribution to the "acquis communautaire", held in Santiago De Compostela from 3 to 4 June 2002. At this conference, Mr Gauthier had presented a report on GRECO's achievements and their impact in the field of criminal law and criminal procedure, particularly in EU applicant states ;
- (ii) by the GRECO Secretariat in meetings of the bodies responsible for drafting a universal convention on corruption under the auspices of the United Nations [2nd Session of the committee on the drafting of the UN Convention against Corruption, Vienna, 17-28 June 2002 and the interinstitutional co-ordinating meeting to combat corruption of the Centre for International Crime Prevention (CICP) of the UN Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention, in Vienna, from 1 to 2 July 2002].

6. The Executive Secretary told GRECO that the reports on Bulgaria, Croatia and Latvia adopted at the 9th GRECO meeting (May 2002) had been published, including on the GRECO website, after the countries' authorities had notified the Secretariat of their wish to make the reports public. The Greek Representative told GRECO that the procedure for requesting publication of the Greek report was under way and that the internal co-ordinating procedure was expected to conclude in time for the next GRECO meeting. The report on Greece, which appears in document Greco Eval I Rep (2001) 15E, would remain confidential for the time being.

V. Examination of the draft evaluation report on Denmark

7. GRECO went on to examine, at first reading, the draft First Round Evaluation Report on Denmark, as set out in document Greco Eval I Rep (2002) 6E (P3).

8. To begin with, the members of the GRECO evaluation team which had visited Denmark, namely Mato BLAZANOVIC (Croatia) and Mr Arnt ANGELL (Norway) - Mr Richard M. ROGERS (United States) being excused -, gave an oral presentation of their assessment of the situation in Denmark with regard to action against corruption, in the light of the First Round evaluation themes.

9. The Danish representatives presented GRECO with their comments on the draft report. Following this presentation, the Georgian and Netherlands interveners, appointed by the GRECO Bureau (10-11 June 2002) under Article 29 paragraph 2 of the Rules of Procedure, put their questions on the evaluation report [Greco Eval I (2002) 30 et 31] to the Danish representatives.

10. GRECO went on to hold a general debate based on the available documents and explanations provided. It then held an initial discussion on the draft report, paragraph by paragraph, and agreed on the amendments to be made. Finally, GRECO examined the amended draft at the second reading.

11. After two readings, GRECO adopted the First Round Evaluation Report on Denmark, as set out in document Greco Eval I Rep (2002) 6E.

12. GRECO invited the Danish delegation to confirm as soon as possible the agreement of the Danish authorities to the lifting of the confidentiality of its Evaluation Report.

VI. Examination of the draft evaluation report on Norway

13. GRECO went on to examine, at first reading, the draft First Round Evaluation Report on Norway, as set out in document Greco Eval I Rep (2002) 3E (P3).

14. To begin with, the members of the GRECO evaluation team which had visited Norway, namely Dr. Jaroslav PAL'OV (Slovakia), Mr Flemming DENKER (Denmark) and Ms Mary WALDRON (United Kingdom), gave an oral presentation of their assessment of the situation in Norway with regard to action against corruption, in the light of the First Round evaluation themes.

15. The Norwegian representatives presented GRECO with their comments on the draft report. Following this presentation, the Lithuanian and Swedish interveners, appointed by the GRECO Bureau (10-11 June 2002) under Article 29 paragraph 2 of the Rules of Procedure, put their questions on the evaluation report [Greco Eval I (2002) 32 and 33] to the Norwegian representatives.

16. GRECO went on to hold a general debate based on the available documents and explanations provided. It then held an initial discussion on the draft report, paragraph by paragraph, and agreed on the amendments to be made. Finally, GRECO examined the amended draft at the second reading.

17. After two readings, GRECO adopted the First Round Evaluation Report on Norway, as set out in document Greco Eval I Rep (2002) 3E.

18. GRECO also noted with satisfaction the decision by the Norwegian authorities to authorise publication of their report, which would be distributed shortly, at a date to be agreed with the Secretariat.¹

¹ On 18 July 2002, the Norwegian delegation notified the Executive Secretary of the Norwegian government's decision to make the report public as from 25 July 2002.

VII. Organisation of GRECO's Second Evaluation Round

1. General

19. The Executive Secretary of GRECO pointed out that, further to the decisions taken by GRECO under its Statute and Rules of Procedure with regard to evaluation procedures, the First Evaluation Round would end on 31 December 2002. With regard to GRECO's subsequent activities, therefore, there was a need to decide on the provisions to be evaluated in the second round (Art. 10 § 3 of the Statute). GRECO also needed to decide how long this new round would last (Art. 10 § 2) and whether visits should be made to the countries to be evaluated (Art. 10 § 1) [Greco (2002) 18].

2. Selection of provisions to be evaluated in GRECO's second evaluation round

20. GRECO went on to examine the Bureau's proposals as set out in document Greco (2002) 17E. It also took account of the proposals made by several GRECO members with regard to the themes to be selected for the second evaluation round. The discussion focused both on the instruments and the themes to be evaluated. Three main strands of opinion emerged :

- some members felt, like Sweden [Greco (2002) 16], that the evaluation should focus solely on the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption [ETS 173], in its entirety (eg : Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Iceland) ;
- other members contended that only guiding principles should be evaluated (eg : Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, Slovakia, United Kingdom, United States). Some of these, such as Ireland, suggested evaluating all the remaining guiding principles [Greco (2002) 23], other than those which had already been evaluated in the First Round. Other members suggested selecting some of these guiding principles and focusing on a specific issue or a few specific principles. Of these members, some shared Estonia's view [Greco (2002) 23] that the provisions should relate to public officials and public administration (eg : Germany, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Lithuania), others that they should relate mainly to criminal corporate liability (eg : United States, France, Poland, Moldova). Several members mentioned the links between corruption, money laundering and organised crime (eg : Poland and Romania) and others the issue of public procurement (eg : Lithuania, etc.) ;
- in keeping with the suggestions made by the Bureau [Greco (2002) 17 and 18], a third group of participants proposed evaluating a selection of principles derived from the guiding principles, supplemented – in the case of countries which had ratified Convention ETS 173 or acceded to it – by the equivalent provisions from Convention ETS 173 (eg : Albania, Greece, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia).

21. In the course of the discussions, it was pointed out that not all states were in the same situation with regard to action against corruption. At domestic level, some states were more affected than others by the problem of corruption and wished to focus on certain aspects of prevention or punishment rather than others. Some states possessed a reasonable legal arsenal with which to prevent and combat corruption effectively. Others were still in the process of drafting legislation. Some countries, too, had been more successful than others in putting anti-corruption standards into practice and the monitoring of this process varied from one GRECO state to another.

22. At international level, 25 states to date had signed Convention ETS 173 and 17 states had already ratified it. Participants were reminded that the Convention had come into force on 1 July 2002 after fourteen states ratified it in accordance with the relevant provisions of

the treaty. Some participants felt that monitoring the implementation of all the provisions of the Convention in the second evaluation round would send a strong signal to any states which had not yet ratified the instrument to do so as soon as possible. Otherwise there was a risk that ratification of this instrument and, by the same token, international mutual assistance and co-operation in the field of corruption might be delayed in the case of some states.

23. Other participants observed that half of GRECO's members had still to ratify the convention. Given the very short time-frames, it was probable that some States Parties had not yet managed to adopt the legislative and other measures required to implement it. To assess the implementation of the entire Convention at this stage might be premature. Also, all the participants were anxious to avoid a division between GRECO members when carrying out the evaluation procedures.

24. Several delegations felt there was a danger that a blanket evaluation covering all the guiding principles – other than those evaluated in the First Round – might skim over what could be regarded as the most urgent and crucial problems. The whole merit of the GRECO reports was that they led to the adoption of clear, precise recommendations for national law-makers and practitioners in the member states concerned

25. Following the discussions, the Chair suggested a compromise, based on a selection of guiding principles and articles from Convention ETS 173 [Greco (2002) 1 bil]. Most of the delegations agreed to the idea of selecting six guiding principles for combating corruption from Resolution (97) 24, supplemented by the equivalent provisions from the Convention, in the case of members which had ratified or acceded to it. The Polish delegation argued that examining the guiding principles on public officials also meant taking account of Recommendation n° R (2000) 10 on codes of conduct for public officials.

26. The Executive Secretary reminded GRECO that, under its Statute, only members which were Parties to the Convention could participate in a vote leading to the adoption of evaluation reports on the implementation of the Convention (Art. 15 paragraph 4). Only the experts proposed by States Parties, moreover, could participate in the evaluation of the implementation of the Convention.

27. Following a vote (26 votes in favour, one against and one abstention), GRECO selected, under Article 10 paragraph 3 of its Statute, the provisions to be evaluated in the second round, ie :

- the application of Guiding Principles 4 (seizure and confiscation of proceeds of corruption) and 19 (connections between corruption and money laundering/organised crime), as supplemented, in the case of members having ratified the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption (ETS 173), by Articles 19 paras. 3, 13 and 23 of the Convention;
- the application of Guiding Principles 9 (public administration) and 10 (public officials);
- the application of Guiding Principles 5 (legal persons) and 8 (fiscal legislation), as supplemented, in the case of members having ratified the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption (ETS 173), by Articles 14, 18 and 19, paragraph 2 of the Convention.

3. Length of the Second Evaluation Round

28. GRECO turned its attention to the question of how long the second evaluation round should last. Some delegations were in favour of a quick evaluation (2 years) so that any recommendations made would have an impact on the debates under way in several member states, on the issue of corporate responsibility for example. Other participants favoured a three-year evaluation, pointing out that the first evaluation round would

ultimately have lasted three years and would have covered only 3 principles. The number of GRECO members was set to grow, moreover, with at least 13 new states expected to join. In addition, a monitoring procedure would be conducted alongside the second round evaluation procedure to see how GRECO members had complied with the recommendations made in the first round. And finally, a catch-up strategy should be introduced to assess new members joining GRECO at the end of a round, GRECO being opposed to the Bureau's proposal to exclude new member states from a first round evaluation

29. GRECO decided, in accordance with Article 10 paragraph 2 of its Statute, that the second evaluation round would run from 1 January 2003 to 1 July 2005 (ie two and a half years), it being understood that the round could be extended by six months in case of justified need.

4. Evaluation visits

30. The participants considered whether or not evaluation visits should be conducted in the second round, or whether they should be conducted only in the case of certain states. The criteria for determining which states would be subject to an evaluation preceded by an on-site visit would in that case have to be agreed in advance. GRECO, however, dismissed outright any discriminatory approach that would involve visiting some members and not others, even though such an approach would not be in breach of the Statute.

31. Some GRECO members felt that by clarifying certain questions and by obtaining full and accurate replies, they could perhaps dispense with the on-site visits. Other members believed that on-site visits were essential, because they guaranteed better results, better information about current practice and greater awareness, support and communication between the various national authorities involved in combating corruption and ensured that greater prominence was given to GRECO's mechanisms.

32. The Swedish Representative felt that it was too early to discuss evaluation visits given that no agreement had yet been reached on working methods and arrangements for conducting the second round evaluation procedure. Certain other members felt that once the possibility of selecting countries to be visited had been discounted, a decision to carry out visits was imperative.

33. GRECO decided, in accordance with Article 13 paragraph 1 of its Statute, that the evaluation teams appointed in the second evaluation round must undertake a visit to the member undergoing evaluation, such visits being an integral part of the second round evaluation procedure.

5. Appointment of evaluators for each member of GRECO

34. GRECO invited its members to appoint, by 30 September 2002, in accordance with Article 10 paragraph 4 of its Statute, a maximum of five experts in the fields provided for in decision 7 above. Should they fail to do so, the first round list would be automatically renewed.

6. Preparation of the questionnaire

35. Under Article 11 of its Statute, GRECO was required to adopt a questionnaire for each evaluation round. This questionnaire was sent to all the members involved in the evaluation. Under Article 11 paragraph 2 « the questionnaire shall provide the framework of the evaluation procedure ».

36. GRECO members discussed the timetable for adopting the questionnaire. Some of the experts asked that a preliminary draft questionnaire be prepared by the Bureau on the basis of a proposal by the Secretariat, and that it be examined and discussed by

GRECO and the evaluators in a select committee during the joint training seminar for evaluators in Cyprus, in November 2002.

37. Other participants took the view that the draft questionnaire should be prepared by the Bureau on the basis of a proposal by the Secretariat but that the practical details should be finalised by GRECO at its 11th meeting in October, so that the seminar could focus on training proper.

38. Following discussions, GRECO decided that, prior to the joint training seminar for evaluators, the Secretariat and the Bureau would prepare a draft questionnaire relating to the second evaluation round which would concern the provisions selected for the second round. It agreed to devote a substantial part of the forthcoming plenary meeting (GRECO 11, 14-18 October 2002) to examining the draft questionnaire for the second round.

VIII. Preparation of the seminar for evaluators for GRECO's second evaluation round

39. The Executive Secretary presented GRECO members with the revised document [GRECO (2002) 10 rev 2] concerning the programme for the 2nd Evaluation Round Training Seminar for Evaluators to be held in Paphos (Cyprus) from 20 to 22 November 2002. He told participants that this document had also been approved by the PC-R-EV at its previous meeting from 24 to 28 June and that the Cypriot authorities had already set about organising the conference and parallel sessions, as well as making arrangements to accommodate nearly 250 participants.

40. Some GRECO members thought that GRECO should have its own programme for the training seminar and asked that the joint sessions with the PC-R-EV be limited to the opening and closing sessions of the seminar. Others pointed out, however, that the second evaluation round would also concern the links between corruption and money laundering, and the seizure and confiscation of proceeds of corruption, and that the seminar would provide an opportunity to become better acquainted with one another. Other GRECO members felt that the seminar programme concerning GRECO should be confined mainly to training for evaluators. GRECO accordingly instructed the Secretariat to complete the seminar programme in the light of the discussions held at the present meeting.

41. Some GRECO members felt that GRECO's budget should cover travel and subsistence expenses for only two evaluators per country and not three. Others thought that all the evaluators appointed from the list of evaluators for each state should be entitled to the same training. It was therefore agreed that GRECO would cover the expenses of three evaluators per member, it being understood that members could nominate fewer evaluators or invite a maximum of two extra evaluators at their own expense.

42. GRECO decided that as well as the three evaluators, each delegation could send one representative to attend the seminar.

IX. Request for observer status by the OECD

43. The Executive Secretary informed GRECO of the steps taken after the Deputy Secretary-General of the OECD, Mr Seiichi KONDO, expressed an interest in participating in GRECO [Greco (2002) CS4 Bil]. As at 6 June 2002, no government had informed the Secretary General of the Council of Europe that it wished to submit this question to the Committee of Ministers. The OECD's request had therefore been placed on the agenda of the present meeting for a decision on whether to grant the OECD observer status.

44. At the end of the procedure referred to in document GRECO (2002) 13, GRECO agreed to allow the OECD to attend its proceedings as an observer.

X. Other business

1. Catch up strategy with regard to new members joining GRECO at the end of a round

45. GRECO members discussed the question of the applicability of the First Evaluation Round to countries joining GRECO after 15 July 2002. The schedule of meetings for examining the First Round Evaluation Reports already spilled over into 2003. The First Round ended, however, on 31 December 2002. The view taken by the Bureau was that there should be no more evaluation visits for countries joining GRECO after 15 July 2002. Instead, these states would merely have to complete the questionnaire and the report on these newcomers would deal purely with the first part of the questionnaire. These documents would be available to all GRECO members.

46. The majority of GRECO members, however, expressed support for the principle of equality of treatment between members, and said that they were in favour of maintaining a first round evaluation for newcomers. They also pointed out that there would be further accessions to GRECO in the future and in subsequent rounds, and that a catch up strategy ought to be introduced for these states. GRECO accordingly decided to ask the Bureau to propose a catch up strategy for evaluating new members joining GRECO at the end of a round on the basis of a proposal by the Secretariat.

2. Statements by GRECO members

47. Two GRECO members wished to make the following statements, for inclusion in the present meeting report :

- *Romania* had deposited the instrument of ratification of the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption [ETS 173] with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe on 11 July 2002. This was seen as further proof of the Romanian government's commitment to combating corruption by every means and developing international co-operation in all areas of the fight against corruption.
- With regard to *Poland*, two major laws had come into force on 29 June and 1 July 2002 respectively. These laws should be seen as very important measures for improving the existing anti-corruption machinery in Poland. The first law dismantled the structures of the former state security services and established two separate special services : one for internal security and the other for the secret services in conjunction with external security. One of the main tasks of the new Internal Security Agency was, *inter alia*, to recognise, prevent and detect corruption offences committed by public officials. The second legislative reform was connected with the amendment of the Fiscal Control Act of 18 September 1991. Under the new provisions, the fiscal supervisory authorities had the power to disclose and prevent corruption offences committed by public officials employed in the subordinate organisational units of the Ministry of Finance. In addition to these developments, it was expected that the provisions to combat money laundering would be crucial in improving the capacity of the Polish authorities and law enforcement agencies to fight corruption.

3. GRECO - personal

48. GRECO participants congratulated the CHIAROMONTES on the birth of their son, Andréa, born in Strasbourg at 2 am on 9 July 2002, and extended their best wishes to the entire family.

49. GRECO participants also asked the Chair to tell Mr Richard ROGERS that they wished him a full and speedy recovery and that they hoped to have the opportunity to work with

him again once he was feeling better. The Executive Secretary told GRECO that the Chair, Mr Drago KOS, had forwarded a letter dated 8 July 2002 to Mr ROGERS conveying the best wishes of all the GRECO participants.

XI. Dates of forthcoming meetings

50. The next meeting of the GRECO Bureau would be held in Paris from 30 September to 1 October 2002. The 11th plenary meeting of GRECO would be held in Strasbourg from 14 to 18 October 2002.

Appendix I**List of participants****ALBANIA / ALBANIE**

Mr Ardian DVORANI
General Director of Codification Department, Ministry of Justice (*attending Monday 8/7 to Wednesday 10/7*)

Ms Rezarta ABDIU
Adviser of the Minister of State to the Prime Minister, Council of Ministers

BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

Mme Isabelle VAN HEERS
Magistrat Fédéral, Palais de Justice – Extension

Mme Claire HUBERTS
Conseiller adjoint, Direction Générale de la Législation pénale et des Droits de l'Homme, Ministère de la Justice

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / BOSNIE-HERZEGOVINE

Mr Nedzad HADZIMUSIC
Director for Political Multilateral Relations and Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

BULGARIA / BULGARIE

Mr Georgi RUPCHEV
Head of Section "International Legal Cooperation", Ministry of Justice

CROATIA / CROATIE

Mr Željko HORVATIĆ – **Apologised / Excusé**
Professor, Faculty of Law

Mr Ivan PLEVKO
Deputy District Attorney, District Attorneys Office

Mr Mato BLAZANOVIC – *cf. Evaluation team / Equipe d'évaluation (page 8)*

CYPRUS / CHYPRE

Mr George PAPAIOANNOU – **Apologised / Excusé**
Counsel of the Republic, Law office of the Republic of Cyprus, Unit for Combating Money Laundering

Mrs Eva ROSSIDOU PAPAKYRIACOU – **Apologised / Excusée**
Counsel of the Republic, Law office of the Republic of Cyprus

CZECH REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

Mrs Kateřina CIZLOVA
Lawyer, International Department, Section for International Organisations and International Co-operation, Ministry of Justice

Mr Petr POSPISIL
Security policy Department, Section for Analyses and Strategies, Ministry of the Interior

DENMARK / DANEMARK

Mr Poul DAHL JENSEN
Public Prosecutor, Public Prosecutor's Office

Mr Flemming DENKER, Deputy Director, The Public Prosecutor for Serious Economic Crime

Ms Lise LAURITSEN
Ministry of Justice, Legal Advisor, Ministry of Justice

ESTONIA / ESTONIE

Mrs Ülle RAIG
Legal Adviser, Penal Law Department, Ministry of Justice

FINLAND / FINLANDE

Mr Kaarle J. LEHMUS
Inspector General of the Police, Ministry of the Interior, Police Department

Ms Raija TOIVIAINEN
State Prosecutor, The Office of the Prosecutor General

FRANCE

M. Michel GAUTHIER (**Président du GRECO / President of GRECO**) – **Apologised / Excusé**
Magistrat Chargé de Mission, Service des Affaires Européennes et Internationales (SAEI), Ministère de la Justice

Mme Claudine JACOB (Chef de délégation) – **Apologised / Excusé**
Magistrat, Chargée de mission auprès du Directeur des Affaires Juridiques, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères

M. Franck ZIENTARA
Magistrat, Administration Centrale, Bureau du droit économique et financier, Ministère de la Justice, Direction des affaires criminelles et des grâces

GEORGIA / GEORGIE

Mr Teimuraz BAKRADZE – **Apologised / Excusé**
Director of the International Law Dept., Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr Mamuka JGENTI
Head of Division of the Council of Europe and Human Rights Protection, Deputy Director of the International Law Dept., Ministry of Foreign Affairs

GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Mr Manfred MÖHRENSCHLAGER – **Apologised / Excusé**
Head of Section, Federal Ministry of Justice

Mr Fernando SANCHEZ-HERMOSILLA
Judge at the District Court, Federal Ministry of Justice

GREECE / GRECE

Mr Petros KAKALIS
Judge, Supreme Court of Athens

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Mr Akos KARA – **Apologised / Excusé**
Legal Adviser, Ministry of Justice

Mr Sandor DUSIK
Principal Counsellor, Ministry of Interior

ICELAND / ISLANDE

Ms Ragna ARNADOTTIR
Director of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Justice

IRELAND / IRLANDE

Ms Lucinda MacMAHON
Assistant Principal Officer, Criminal Law Reform Division, Department of Justice, Equality
and Law Reform

LATVIA / LETTONIE

Mr Rudolfs KALNINS – **Apologised / Excusé**
Chief Officer of the Secretariat to the Corruption Prevention, Council of Latvia

LITHUANIA / LITUANIE

Mr Jurgis JURGELIS
Advisor to the Director General of the State Security Department

LUXEMBOURG

M. Jean BOUR
Procureur d'Etat, Parquet du Tribunal d'Arrondissement de Diekirch

M. Jean-Paul FRISING – **Apologised / Excusé**
Procureur d'Etat adjoint, Parquet du Tribunal d'Arrondissement de Luxembourg

MALTA / MALTE

Mr Anthony BORG BARTHET
Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

MOLDOVA

Mme Cornelia VICLEANSCHI
Procureur, Chef du Département des Relations Internationales, Bureau du Procureur
Général

NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Mrs Iris van den HAUTEN-HINNEN
Policy Maker, Ministry of Justice, Directorate Generak for Law Enforcement

Mrs S.F.H.M STAAL-DOENSEN
Ministry of Justice, Directorate General for Law Enforcement (*attending Monday 8 July and Tuesday 9 July*)

Ms D. WESSELDIJK (trainee July)
Ministry of Justice, Directorate General for Law Enforcement

NORWAY / NORVEGE

Mr Arnt ANGELL
Chief Public Prosecutor, ØKOKRIM, National Authority for Investigation and Prosecution of Economic and Environmental Crime

Mr Lars STOLTENBERG
Chief Public Prosecutor, ØKOKRIM

Ms Anne BRODTKORB
Assistant Director General, Ministry of Justice

Mr Atle ROALDSØY
Senior Adviser, Ministry of Justice

POLAND / POLOGNE

Mr Jacek GARSTKA
Judge, Department of International Co-operation and European Law, Ministry of Justice (*attending Wed. 10/07 and Thur. 11/07*)

Mr Adam WRZOSEK
Chief Specialist, Ministry of Finance, Bureau of Fiscal Documentation (Fiscal Intelligence Service)

PORTUGAL

Mrs Luisa Maia GONÇALVES
Director of Department, International Relations, Ministry of Justice

ROMANIA / ROUMANIE

Mme Nicoleta ILIESCU
Conseillère du Ministre de la Justice, Direction des Etudes et Elaboration des Actes normatifs et Documentation, Ministère de la Justice

SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE

Mr Lubomir HANUS
Director, Department of International Relations and European Integration, Ministry of Interior

Dr Jaroslav PAL'OV - *cf. Evaluation team / Equipe d'évaluation (page 8)*

SLOVENIA / SLOVENIE

Mr Drago KOS (**Acting Chairman at Plenary 10 / Président en fonction à la 10ème réunion plénière**)
State Undersecretary, Office for the Prevention of Corruption of the Republic of Slovenia

Mr Roman PRAH
Assistant Director, Office for the Prevention of Corruption of the Republic of Slovenia

SPAIN / ESPAGNE

Mr Sancho IÑIGUEZ HERNÁNDEZ
 Legal Adviser, Legal Affairs with the European Union and International Organisations

SWEDEN / SUEDE

Mr Kazimir ÅBERG
 Head of the Director-General's Office, Economic Crimes Bureau, Division for International Affairs

Mr Håkan ÖBERG
 Director, Economic Crimes Bureau, Division for International Affairs

"THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA" / "L'EX-RÉPUBLIQUE YUGOSLAVE DE MACÉDOINE"

Mr Nikola TUPANCEVSKI
 Docent Ph.D. at the Law Faculty (Criminal Law), University "St. Cyril and Methodius"

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Mr Paul STEPHENSON
 Head of Corruption and Criminal Policy Section, Home Office, Sentencing and Offences Unit

Mr Phil MASON
 Anti-Corruption Co-ordinator, Department for International Development (DFID)
(attending Wed. 10/07 to Friday 12/07)

Ms Mary WALDRON - *cf. Evaluation team / Equipe d'évaluation (page 8)*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA / ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Mr Mark RICHARD
 Senior Counsellor for Criminal Justice Matters, US Mission to the European Union
(attending Monday 8/07 and Tuesday 9/07)

Mr Joseph E. GANGLOFF
 Senior Counsel, Office of International Affairs, U.S. Department of Justice

Mr John M. BRANDOLINO
 Director for Anticorruption and Governance Initiatives, US Department of State (INL)

Mr Richard M. ROGERS - *cf. Evaluation team / Equipe d'évaluation (page 8)* –
Apologised / Excusé

PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE / ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

MR CEVDET AKÇALI – **APOLOGISED / EXCUSÉ**
 Consul of Europe, Member of the Legal Affairs and Human Right Committee, Parliamentary Assembly, Delegation of Turkey, Council of Europe

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CDCJ / REPRÉSENTANT DU CDCJ

Mr Vincent A. DEGAETANO
 Judge, Superior Courts, Courts of Justice, Judges' Chambers, The Law Courts

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CDPC / REPRÉSENTANT DU CDPC

M. Daniel FONTANAUD – **Apologised / Excusé**
Président du CDPC, Commission des Communautés Européennes

SCIENTIFIC EXPERT / EXPERT SCIENTIFIQUE

Prof. Dr Albin ESER
Max Planck-Institute for Foreign and International Penal Law, Abteilung Strafrecht

Mr Michael KUBICIEL,
Scientific Expert

PRESIDENT OF THE STATUTORY COMMITTEE OF GRECO / PRÉSIDENT DU COMITÉ STATUTAIRE DU GRECO

M. Gérard PHILIPPS – **Apologised / Excusé**
Ambassadeur Extraordinaire et Plénipotentiaire, Représentant Permanent du Luxembourg auprès du Conseil de l'Europe

EXPERTS HAVING PARTICIPATED IN THE EVALUATION VISITS CARRIED OUT IN THE FOLLOWING COUNTRIES: / EXPERTS EVALUATEURS AYANT PARTICIPE AUX VISITES D'ÉVALUATION MENÉES DANS LES PAYS SUIVANTS :***Denmark / Danemark***

Date : 5 – 8 February/février 2002

Evaluation team / Equipe d'évaluation :

Mr Mato BLAZANOVIC, Criminal Police Officer, Ministry of Interior (Croatia / Croatie)

Mr Richard M. ROGERS, Senior Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice (United States of America / Etats-Unis d'Amérique)
- Apologised / Excusé

Mr Arnt ANGELL, Chief Public Prosecutor, ØKOKRIM, National Authority for Investigation and Prosecution of Economic and Environmental Crime (Norway / Norvège)

Norway/Norvège

Date : 12 – 15 March/mars 2002

Evaluation team / Equipe d'évaluation :

Dr Jaroslav PAL'OV, Deputy Director of Bureau of International Police Cooperation, Head of National Central Bureau of INTERPOL (Slovak Republic / République Slovaque)

Mr Flemming DENKER, Deputy Director, The Public Prosecutor for Serious Economic Crime (Denmark / Danemark)

Ms Mary WALDRON, Policy Adviser for corruption, Crown Prosecution Service, Headquarters (United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni)

COUNCIL OF EUROPE SECRETARIAT / SECRETARIAT DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Mr Manuel LEZERTUA, Executive Secretary to GRECO, Directorate General I, Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

M. Carlo CHIAROMONTE, Administrateur, Direction Générale des Affaires Juridiques, Conseil de l'Europe

Mr Bjorn JANSON, Administrative Officer, Directorate General of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

Mr Spyros TSOVILIS, Administrateur, Direction Générale des Affaires Juridiques, Conseil de l'Europe

M. Christophe SPECKBACHER, Administrateur, Direction Générale des Affaires Juridiques, Conseil de l'Europe

Mr Goran KLEMENCIC, Administrative Officer, Directorate General of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

Ms Fiona MYLES, Assistant, Directorate General of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

Mme Marie-Rose PREVOST, Assistante, Direction Générale des Affaires Juridiques, Conseil de l'Europe

Ms Penelope PREBENSEN, Assistant (Evaluation rounds), Directorate General of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

Mlle Laure PINCEMAILLE, Assistante (Cycles d'évaluation) / Direction Générale des Affaires Juridiques, Conseil de l'Europe

Miss Sonya FOLCA, Assistante, Direction Générale des Affaires Juridiques, Conseil de l'Europe

Ms Simona GHITA, Webmaster, Direction Générale des Affaires Juridiques, Conseil de l'Europe

INTERPRETERS / INTERPRETES

Mme Sally BAILEY

Mlle Isabelle MARCHINI

Mr Christopher TYCZKA (les 8 et 9 juillet 2002 / on 8 and 9 July 2002)

+ 1 interprète

Appendix II

Agenda / Ordre du jour

1. Opening of the meeting at 09h30 / *Ouverture de la réunion à 09h30*
2. Adoption of the agenda / *Adoption de l'ordre du jour*
3. Information by the President / *Information par le Président*
4. Information by the Executive Secretary / *Information par le Secrétaire Exécutif*
5. First reading and examination of the draft evaluation reports on the following countries: / *Première lecture et examen des projets de rapports d'évaluation des pays suivants :*
 - Denmark / *Danemark* : Monday / *lundi*, 10h00
 - Norway / *Norvège* : Tuesday / *mardi*, 9h30

The evaluators and the national delegations concerned are, nevertheless, requested to be available during the following periods: / *Les évaluateurs et délégations nationales concernés sont, toutefois, invités à être disponibles pendant les périodes suivantes :*

 - Denmark / *Danemark* : Monday all day and Tuesday morning / *lundi toute la journée et mardi matin ;*
 - Norway / *Norvège* : Monday afternoon, Tuesday all day and Wednesday morning / *lundi après-midi, mardi toute la journée et mercredi matin.*
6. Second reading and adoption of the draft evaluation reports (Friday, 12 July 2002) / *Deuxième lecture et adoption des projets de rapports d'évaluation (vendredi, 12 juillet 2002).*

[Friday's meeting may last until 13h00 / *La réunion de vendredi peut durer jusqu'à 13h00.*]
7. Organisation of GRECO's Second Evaluation Round / *Organisation du Deuxième Cycle d'Évaluation du GRECO*
8. Preparation of the seminar for evaluators for GRECO's Second Evaluation Round / *Préparation du séminaire pour les évaluateurs pour le Deuxième Cycle d'Évaluation du GRECO*
9. Request for observer status by the OECD / *Demande de l'OCDE d'obtenir le statut d'observateur*
10. Miscellaneous / *Divers*
11. Dates of the next meetings / *Dates des prochaines réunions*