

Strasbourg, 20 May 2015

Greco (2015) 5E

67th GRECO Plenary Meeting
(Strasbourg, 23-27 March 2015)

SUMMARY REPORT

I. Opening of the meeting

1. The 67th Plenary Meeting was chaired by Mr Marin MRČELA, President of GRECO (Croatia) who opened the meeting by welcoming all participants, referring in particular to newly nominated representatives.
2. The list of participants appears in Appendix I.

II. Adoption of the Agenda

3. The agenda was adopted as it appears in Appendix II. The presentation by Professor Johann LAMBSDORF (item 10) was cancelled.

III. Information Items

4. Delegations were asked to refer, in particular, to the information presented in the report of the 71st Meeting of the Bureau (Greco (2015) 3E).

The President

5. The most recent States to ratify the ***Additional Protocol to the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption*** (ETS 191) are Andorra, Hungary, Portugal and Turkey bringing the total number of parties to the treaty to forty-one.
6. The President informed the Plenary of his forthcoming ***speaking engagements***:
 - “A future without corruption – one vision, multiple strategies” conference to be held by the Organising Committee of the 6th Symposium of the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) of Hong Kong (Hong Kong, 11-13 May 2015)
 - Global Conference on Money and Politics that will be hosted jointly by the Electoral Tribunal of the Federal Judiciary of Mexico and the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) (Mexico City, 3-5 September).
7. With reference to the work of the ***Bureau at its 71st Meeting*** (Ljubljana, 20 February 2015) he first thanked warmly the authorities of Slovenia for hosting the meeting.
8. The Bureau had discussed the issue of the presence, or not, of the national authorities during meetings held on-site between GRECO Evaluation Teams, the Secretariat and representatives of civil society – notably ***NGOs and media representatives*** - and concluded that the policy should be that the national authorities leave the room during such meetings. This generally accepted practise facilitates open discussions.
9. Due to some difficulties that had been experienced, the Bureau called on Delegations to ensure that ***evaluators*** are well-informed of the requirements of their role even before they are designated for inclusion on the list of evaluators. The guidelines for evaluators are to be amended to further clarify the competences required (including professional profiles and language skills). The CVs of evaluators are to be systematically provided to the secretariat so that the Bureau has a clearer view of the pool of experts when it makes its proposals for the composition of Evaluation Teams. Such measures will be in place for the Fifth Evaluation Round and can be tested in the Fourth Evaluation Round in case of changes to the list of evaluators.
10. The Bureau had been concerned about some member states delaying the publication of evaluation and compliance reports. The specific case of ***Belarus***, where the confidentiality of reports

adopted in June 2012 and June 2014 has still not been lifted, is dealt with under Item 13 of the Agenda of the present meeting. The President urged the other member States with reports adopted in 2014 that are still confidential to authorise their publication as a matter of priority.

The Executive Secretary

11. GRECO delegations had received three documents for information. First, the ***Western Balkan Recommendation on Disclosure of Finances and Interests by Public Officials*** prepared with financial support from the EU and adopted in July 2014 by the Ethics and Integrity Network of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) that refers extensively to GRECO and to the results of the Fourth Evaluation Round. Second, the ***Rome Charter***, an opinion of the Council of Europe's Consultative Council of European Prosecutors on European norms and principles concerning prosecutors, it is a very pertinent text for GRECO's work on prosecutors. It goes relatively far on the question of independence, stating that the "independence and autonomy of prosecution services constitute an indispensable corollary to the independence of the judiciary", it also contains a reminder that "prosecutors should be autonomous in their decision-making and should perform their duties free from external pressure or interference" which is an interesting choice of language in that not only political interference is referred to. Another principle states unambiguously that "prosecutors should not benefit from any immunity". Third, the ***White Paper on Transnational Organised Crime*** prepared by the European Committee on Crime Problems (CDPC) that will proceed with the preparation of a related Action Plan by a Working Group in consultation with various bodies. Elena KONCEVICIUTE (Lithuania) will represent GRECO in that context.

12. ***Kyrgyzstan*** has expressed concrete interest in joining GRECO. The country is a beneficiary of the Council of Europe's Neighbourhood Cooperation Programmes and in that context, a delegation will visit Strasbourg later in the month and GRECO's Secretariat has been asked to provide them with information on the Criminal and Civil Law Conventions on Corruption (ETS 173 and 174) to which Kyrgyzstan might become a party. An exchange of views, before the country officially requests an invitation to join GRECO, is foreseen at the June plenary meeting (GRECO 68). The Committee of Ministers is discussing a review of the procedure for accession to Council of Europe conventions by non-member States. Under the current procedure all member States of the Council of Europe are first consulted informally on whether they could support the accession, then non-member States that are already party to the convention are consulted, then a unanimous decision to invite the country to accede has to be taken. The same process applies with respect to the accession of a non-member State to GRECO. The proposal under discussion is to speed up the process by carrying out both consultations in one go.

13. The Executive Secretary would take part in a joint hearing on "***Towards a high degree of accountability, transparency and integrity in the EU institutions***" (Brussels, 26 March 2015) organised by four key European Parliament committees: the Committee on Budgetary Control, the Committee on Legal Affairs, the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs and the Committee on Constitutional Affairs. He would participate in a panel on the prevention of corruption in the EU and possible accession of the EU to GRECO.

14. One of the priorities of the Secretary General presented in his outline for the ***Council of Europe's Programme and Budget*** for the period 2016-2017 is the rule of law. In that context he mentions the fight against corruption, the independence and efficiency of justice and refers to the important role GRECO will have to play in that context. The policy of zero nominal growth will be maintained which is problematic for some of the partial/enlarged agreements of the Organisation, of which GRECO is one. However, that will be counterbalanced thanks to a pledge made by Turkey to become a major contributor to the budgets of the Organisation which would mean a welcome and significant increase to GRECO's budget. These exceptional circumstances will give GRECO an opportunity to strengthen its activities, for example, by doing more horizontal work, looking into good

practice, drawing more conclusions from the existing monitoring work and taking additional action to further the implementation of its recommendations.

IV. Fourth Evaluation Round

Prevention of corruption in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors

Evaluation procedures

15. The delegations of all GRECO member States that make up the Plenary review the draft evaluation reports in a first reading that involves the participation of a delegation from the country concerned and the Evaluation Teams that carried out the on-site evaluation visits and contributed to the drawing up of the draft report. A second reading of revisions made in light of the first is carried out before the formal adoption of the texts.

16. GRECO adopted Fourth Round Evaluation Reports – including formal recommendations – on **Bulgaria** (Greco Eval IV Rep (2014) 7E – published on 13 May 2015) and **Hungary** (Greco Eval IV Rep (2014) 10E – publication pending). The deadline of 30 September 2016 was set for the submission of Situation Reports on measures taken to implement the recommendations in both cases.

Compliance procedures

17. In a set of compliance reports, GRECO pronounced itself on the level of compliance of member States with its recommendations. A Situation Report submitted by the authorities of a member State provides the basis for the assessments made. Rapporteurs designated by other member States are associated with the preparation of the draft reports tabled.

18. The Fourth Round Compliance Reports on **Estonia** (Greco RC-IV (2015) 1E – published on 17 April 2015) and **Finland** (Greco RC-IV (2015) 4E – published on 1 April 2015) were adopted and the deadline of 30 September 2016 was set for the submission of Situation Reports on further measures taken to implement the recommendations in both cases.

Rule 32 procedures – non-compliance

19. In the Fourth Round Compliance Reports on **Iceland** (Greco RC-IV (2015) 3E – published on 1 April 2015) and **Latvia** (Greco RC-IV (2015) 2E – published on 14 April 2015) GRECO concluded that the level of compliance with its recommendations was “globally unsatisfactory” in the meaning of Rule 31, paragraph 8.3 of the Rules of Procedure. Rule 32 was therefore applied and, pursuant to paragraph 2(i) of that rule, the authorities of Iceland and Latvia have been asked to provide a report on progress in implementing the recommendations by 30 September 2015.

V. Third Evaluation Round

Theme I “Incriminations” / Theme II “Transparency of party funding”

20. In a set of compliance reports, and *interim* compliance reports – in cases where Rule 32 has been applied – examined by the Plenary, GRECO pronounced itself on the level of compliance of member States with its recommendations. A Situation Report submitted by the authorities of a member State provides the basis for the assessments made. Rapporteurs designated by other member States are associated with the preparation of the draft reports tabled.

Compliance procedures

21. The 2nd Third Round Compliance Reports on the **Republic of Moldova** (Greco RC-III (2015) 3E – published on 1 April 2015) and **Portugal** (Greco RC-III (2015) 2E – published on 1 April 2015) were

adopted and, in accordance with Rule 31, paragraph 9 of the Rules of Procedure, the respective authorities were asked to provide additional information regarding the implementation of certain recommendations by 31 December 2015 at the latest.

Rule 32 procedures – non-compliance

22. In the 2nd Third Round Compliance Report on **Cyprus** (Greco RC-III (2015) 1E – published on 29 April 2015) GRECO concluded that the level of compliance with the recommendations is “globally unsatisfactory” in the meaning of Rule 31, paragraph 8.3 of the Rules of Procedure. Rule 32 was therefore applied and, pursuant to paragraph 2(i) of that rule, the authorities of Cyprus have been asked to provide a report on progress in implementing the recommendations by 30 September 2015.

VI. Publication, translation and availability of adopted reports (www.coe.int/greco)

23. The authorities of the members concerned were invited to authorise the publication of the reports adopted at the present meeting as soon as possible and were reminded of the action to be taken when publishing a report in order to enhance the visibility of GRECO’s work.¹

VII. Publication of a Summary of the Joint First and Second Round Compliance Report on Belarus

24. In an unprecedented departure from GRECO’s long-standing practice, **Belarus** had still not authorised the lifting of the confidentiality of the Joint First and Second Round Evaluation Report and the Joint First and Second Round Compliance Report addressed to the authorities by GRECO in June 2012 and June 2014 respectively.

25. The authorities evoked the fact that the Rules of Procedure place no obligation on member States to publish, that GRECO’s findings provide important input to the country’s anti-corruption efforts and that work on implementing recommendations is ongoing, but that the conclusions reached in the compliance report are contentious.

26. The Plenary referred to its previous decision to publish a Summary of the Evaluation Report (GRECO 62, December 2013, Decisions 25 and 26²) and adopted, pursuant to Rule 34, paragraph 2 of the Rules of Procedure, a Summary of the Joint First and Second Round Compliance Report on Belarus and decided that the summary will be made public on 27 May 2015 if the authorities do not authorise publication of the entire report by that date.

27. The representative of Belarus was asked to draw the attention of his authorities to the importance GRECO accords to transparency having in mind the need to maximise the impact GRECO’s findings and recommendations can have on national law and policy making, and to inform them that they are again urged to lift the confidentiality of both reports.

VIII. Preparation of the Fifth Evaluation Round

28. Following on from the first open discussion on possible themes for the Fifth Evaluation Round (GRECO 65), GRECO held a second open discussion. It had at its disposal a reworked inventory of

¹ GRECO asks its members to:

- agree a same-day publication date with the Secretariat
- clearly mark both the date of adoption and date of publication on the cover page
- make the national language version available and easily accessible on a domestic website
- notify the Secretariat of the location of the report by communicating the internet link to it
- include a link on the domestic website to the official language versions on GRECO’s website.

² In February 2014, GRECO exceptionally published a summary of the Joint First and Second Round Evaluation Report on Belarus in an effort to pave the way for publication of the full report which can only happen with the authorisation of the national authorities:
[http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/news/News\(20140203\)Eval1&2Belarus_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/news/News(20140203)Eval1&2Belarus_en.asp)

thematic options (Greco (2015) Misc 1E Revised). The sources and rationale behind that document, are detailed in the Bureau 71 Report (Greco (2015) 3E).

29. At the close of the discussion, twenty-two of the forty-nine GRECO delegations had taken the floor across the two plenary meetings and it was decided that a *tour de table* would be held at GRECO 68 (June 2015) to hear the proposals and opinions of all delegations. A specific date and time is to be foreseen on the draft Agenda for GRECO 68 in order to allow for full participation. The secretariat was instructed to provide all delegations with an up-date of the inventory of thematic options that takes account of the views expressed and specific requests made at the present meeting and at the following Bureau 72 meeting. On receipt of that document, delegations will be encouraged to submit written proposals to the secretariat in advance of the *Tour de Table*.

30. It was agreed that a final decision on the theme, and on the mandate and composition of a working party to prepare the draft questionnaire and other proposals related to the Fifth Evaluation Round will be taken by end 2015 (GRECO 69 in October or GRECO 70 in December).

IX. General Activity Report 2014

31. GRECO adopted its Fifteenth General Activity Report (Greco (2015) 1E Final) which outlines the results of its core evaluation and compliance as well as other work in 2014. It also showcases the Council of Europe's multidisciplinary approach to corruption through a variety of structures of the Organisation and provides details of GRECO's extensive external relations. The annual thematic article is devoted to the theme of corruption in sport and the manipulation of sports competitions, authored by Wendela KUPER, Head of sports, security and international affairs, Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport of the Netherlands and Chair of the Governing Board of the Council of Europe's Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport (EPAS).

32. The report is to be forwarded to GRECO's Statutory Committee and to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 1, iii of the Statute and GRECO's President will present it to the Ministers' Deputies at their 1231st meeting (17 June 2015). It will be made publicly available (web and print editions) after that date. GRECO delegations are invited to maximise its distribution and in particular, translate the thematic article into their national languages and make it available to a broad readership.

X. Exchange of views – International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI)

33. The President welcomed and introduced Robert SATTLER who is Head of the Cabinet of the Austrian Court of Audit which provides the General Secretariat of INTOSAI, an umbrella organisation for the external government (public) audit community, with 193 full members (the supreme audit institutions of nearly all UN member States). In addition, seven world regions have their own groupings under that umbrella (the African, Arab, Asian, Caribbean, European, Latin American and Pacific Regional Organisations).

34. The highest body, the Congress of Supreme Audit Institutions (INCOSAI) meets every three years, the Governing Board meets annually. INTOSAI's four strategic goals are the development of professional standards, institutional capacity building, knowledge sharing (where one of several working parties focuses on the fight against corruption) and the efficient organisation and governance of INTOSAI. It provides an institutionalised framework for supreme audit institutions (SAIs) to improve government auditing worldwide and to enhance the professional capacity, standing and influence of SAIs in their respective countries.

35. In 1998, the INTOSAI Congress in Montevideo identified the areas of government that are particularly vulnerable to corruption and issued a set of recommendations to SAIs on how to effectively

contribute to the fight against corruption that require financial, functional and operational independence of SAIs, comprehensive audit mandates, the use of performance audits to monitor the irregularity of administrative processes, and a focus of audit strategies on those areas and transactions that are the most susceptible to corruption.

36. The fight against corruption is included in the priorities of the Strategic Plan 2011-2016. A Working Group dedicated to the fight against Corruption and Money Laundering is further developing the standard and guidance framework, with a focus, *inter alia*, on developing guidelines on controls on public fiscal transparency, stolen assets recovery, audit of corruption prevention in public procurement and fighting money laundering, and on developing a framework for coordinated anti-corruption and anti-money laundering audit. Eight of the International Standards for Supreme Audit Institutions (ISSAIs) address fraud and corruption (ISSAI nos. 1, 10, 100, 200, 300 and 400 as well as specialised fraud and corruption standards nos. 5530 and 5700, cf. <http://www.intosai.org/about-us/issai.html>).

37. In the framework of the UN Post-2015 Development Agenda, INTOSAI has called for the independence and capacity building of SAIs and the improvement of public accounting systems to be incorporated into the Sustainable Development Goals or into the set of related indicators as a means to increase transparency and accountability. Moreover, in December 2014, the UN General Assembly approved the UN Resolution on “Promoting and fostering the efficiency, accountability, effectiveness and transparency of public administration by strengthening supreme audit institutions” which constitutes a highly important call from the international community for furthering adherence to INTOSAI’s standards worldwide.

38. In the ensuing exchange of views, Mr SATTLER clarified the following points:

- the independence of SAIs heads and their members can be facilitated by providing security of tenure and immunity in the normal discharge of duties (i.e. functional immunity);
- even though the collection and verification of asset declarations of high-level public officials is not a core task of SAIs, as they are often seen as being strongly independent bodies, a number of them have been given that or similar tasks; this is not, in principle, problematic, unless it means that significant resources are directed away from core audit tasks;
- SAIs are increasingly volunteering to have INTOSAI’s “Performance measurement framework” tool applied to themselves in the context of external audits of their own implementation of INTOSAI standards;
- nationally, there is sometimes still a tendency to keep certain areas out of the scope of auditing but internationally, in the context of the UN Sustainable Development Goals – that will be applied in all UN member States - increased transparency and accountability at all levels, including at local and regional level is being sought.

39. Mr SATTLER referred to the tremendous impact GRECO evaluations can have and hoped that in that context emphasis could be put on the independence and capacity-building of supreme audit institutions as a means to improve transparency and accountability to the benefit of the fight against corruption.

XI. Corruption in Sport

40. Stanislas FROSSARD, Executive Secretary of the Council of Europe’s Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport (EPAS) informed the Plenary that the Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions (CETS n° 215), that had been opened for signature in Magglingen (Switzerland) in September 2014, had so far been signed by 18 Council of Europe member States and ratified by one. It is the first

international legally binding tool in the fight against match-fixing and will improve coordination between sports organisations, betting operators and public authorities (including law enforcement) so countries will be better able to tackle suspicious activity. The convention is not only being actively promoted by the Council of Europe, but also by other international organisations - Interpol, UNODC, UNESCO, the World Bank, OECD, the European Union and the Commonwealth, by the international sports movement – IOC, FIFA, UEFA, SportAccord, and by both private sector betting operators and national lotteries. The preparatory work benefitted from exceptionally good cooperation between the world of sport and public authorities. It is rare to reach such consensus among such varied stakeholders. The objective is to reach the benchmark set by the Anti-Doping Convention (ETS n° 135) that has been ratified by all Council of Europe member States, and to also secure the accession of non-European States – many of which have shown a keen interest in the text – as it deals with issues of worldwide importance. The processes for ratification in some federal states where regulation of the betting market can fall within the remit of the federated entities may be challenging. Also, the internal EU process on the sharing of competencies between the EU and its members might delay the ratification process for those States, but it is hoped that the treaty will enter into force in 2016. For that five ratifications are needed. In the meantime, the European Commission is strongly backing the treaty and has called on all EU members to sign and ratify it.

41. Resolution no. 1 on Corruption in Sport, adopted by the 13th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Sport (Magglingen, 18 September 2014) had been transmitted by the Committee of Ministers (1213th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies) to GRECO for it to take it into account in its future work (cf. Summary Report of GRECO 66, document Greco (2014) 18E). The Executive Secretary of EPAS informed the Plenary that the Council of Europe had played a pioneering role in the field of good governance in sport, identifying in 2005 a number of principles of good governance including transparency, democratic process and, accountability. It is now broadly acknowledged that there can be no autonomy of the sports movement without a sincere commitment to good governance. In Magglingen corruption in sport had been put on the agenda of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers for the first time. As follow-up, EPAS will promote the principles of good governance through cooperation activities and awareness-raising initiatives, the implementation of indicators to measure compliance with the principles, training and some form of monitoring.³

42. EPAS has been invited by the Conference to draw the attention of GRECO and the CDPC to possible loopholes in legislation, to liaise with GRECO in connection with the possible review of the anti-corruption standards pertaining to good governance in sport at regional and international level, to support the implementation of the UNODC handbook that proposes a strategy for safeguarding against corruption in major public events, to support a possible international conference on corruption in sport – where the added value would be to bring together the sports movement and public authorities, and to promote good practices on the auditing of subsidies given to sports organisations and on anti-corruption and good governance in sport. The latter will be implemented through a survey of examples from EPAS member states.

43. GRECO will be informed of any anti-corruption issues raised specifically in the context of implementation of CETS n° 215. EPAS would welcome any information that might come to light in the framework of GRECO evaluations that might be of relevance to the fight against corruption and good governance in sport and would bring to GRECO's attention cases and policies noted in its member States. Furthermore, GRECO experts will be invited to be associated with pertinent components of activities organised in pursuance of the resolutions adopted by the Conference of Ministers.

³ In-depth information of the coordinated mobilisation of the Council of Europe, other international organisations, the sports movement, NGOs and other stakeholders on the issues of match-fixing and good governance in sport are included in the Thematic Article to be published in GRECO's 15th General Activity Report (cf. paragraphs 31-32 of this report).

XII. Item 4 - Topical anti-corruption developments/events in member States

44. Under Item 4 of the plenary's agendas, delegations are given an opportunity to share information outside of the statutory evaluation and compliance reporting cycles.

ALBANIA

The National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2015-2020 and its Action Plan 2015-2017 was approved by the Council of Ministers on 20 March 2015. During the drafting process, a series of consultative meetings with relevant institutions and interested actors, including NGOs and the business community were held. The Strategy has a three-pronged approach: prevention, repression and awareness-raising. The Action Plan is a living document that will be updated at the end of each year based on an evaluation of its implementation – monitoring will be carried out on a quarterly basis and an annual report published at the end of each year. A National Consultative Forum will be established to monitor anti-corruption policies and will include, among others, representatives of civil society.

In May 2014, the National Coordinator against Corruption, in collaboration with the Ministry of Justice and with the assistance of the Dutch government channelled through Utrecht University, began drafting a Whistleblower Protection Act which will serve to increase transparency in the public and private sectors by creating a better environment for employees to step up and signal acts of corruption. Several rounds of consultations on the draft law have been organised with relevant stakeholders. The text defines the scope of the law on corruption related offences, delineates the competences of the internal mechanisms, and pinpoints which body should serve as the external reporting mechanism and how the protection of whistleblowers should be ensured. Further improvements that draw on examples of best practice internationally and from individual countries will be written into the draft and it will be aligned with the national legal and institutional framework before it goes to parliament for adoption (probably in July 2015).

On 2 February 2015, the Government launched a nationwide campaign to address the issue of corruption. One component was the launching of a unique, single portal for the anonymous reporting of acts of corruption in the public institutions (www.stopkorrupsionit.al). Follow-up to reports is provided within 30 working days by officials from the institution concerned. An operation unit monitors the proper implementation of the stated service level and the follow-up given to reports and users are provided with feedback on the status of their case. Monthly statistics will be published on the number of cases reported, closed, investigated and resolved. Alongside this initiative, in March 2015, an SMS feedback mechanism was introduced in the hospitals and immovable property registration offices to collect the views of citizens on the quality of public services and to allow them to report any bribes requested by public officials.

From April 2014 to January 2015, a European Commission Anti-corruption Framework Assessment project (ACFA) in Albania has provided an insightful analysis of the current set-up of institutions working in the anti-corruption area.

CROATIA

On 27 February 2015, the parliament of Croatia issued the national Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2015-2020. During its preparation, due consideration was given to GRECO's fourth round recommendations, among other relevant documents. The strategy is divided into two parts: "Horizontal Objectives" and "Specific Goals for Priority Areas". The horizontal objectives deal with integrity within the political system and the Administration. The measures envisaged include enhancing transparency of election campaign financing, regulation of referendum campaigns and regulation of lobbying. Local and regional government, public procurement, state-owned companies and conflicts of interest are also included, as are the right to access to information and the role of civil society, citizens and the media in fighting corruption. Under the specific goals for priority areas, special reference is made to the judiciary where the measures prescribed cover the proactive application of ethical standards and the

management of conflicts of interest within the judiciary, improving the system for verifying asset declarations by judicial officials and creating a system for the notification of corrupt conduct as well as regulating the protection of whistleblowers. The same part of the Strategy also deals with the economy, public finances, culture, health, science, education and sport and infrastructure, the environment and transport. The Action Plan for implementation of the Strategy is under preparation. The plenary will be provided with information once it is completed.

DENMARK

A case of corruption in sport involving match-fixing had recently opened and had given rise to a lot of public and media attention. Two people who had gambled on the outcome of a Danish second league football match have been indicted for bribing some of the players in order to influence the outcome of the match. Charges have been brought against the players involved. It is said that the match was fixed following a meeting in Macao where it was possible to gamble on the match. It has also transpired that significant sums of money are being gambled in Macao even on third league – amateur – football matches in Denmark. It is thought that such betting is organised on the assumption that amateur players might be cheaper to buy.

Match-fixing is generally punishable under the articles of the Criminal Code concerning fraud. In order to cover situations where that is not possible, the Minister of Culture has put a proposal to parliament in January and it is hoped that it will be adopted in June 2015 (or in the autumn if general elections are held in June). It is proposed to change the title of the Law on the Ban on Doping in Sport to the Law on Integrity in Sport and to add two new articles concerning match-fixing.

The first article would authorise the Minister of Culture to impose on certain sports associations a duty to establish and enforce rules to fight the manipulation of sports matches. If they do not they would lose their subsidies. The second article would be similar to provisions on bribery and would be used only in situations where the more stringent provisions of the penal law are not appropriate (in Denmark, under the Penal Code, fraud carries a sentence of up to 8 years' imprisonment). The new article would provide for a prison sentence of up to one year if one grants, promises or offers to a person who takes part in, or acts as an official in, a sporting competition of a certain level, held either at home or abroad, a gift or other advantage in order to induce that person to act or refrain from acting in relation to the outcome of the match. In aggravated circumstances the prison sentence could be increased to 2 years.

With regard to efforts in the field of political party financing in the framework of GRECO's Third Round compliance procedures, in March 2014 the government had appointed a Committee of experts on the Transparency of Party Funding. It had been given the task to review the Danish rules on party funding and to draw up models for a possible future regulation of public and private funding of political parties in Denmark. The resulting report and the recommendations of the Ministry of Justice had been delivered to GRECO's secretariat during the week of the current meeting.

GEORGIA

In February 2015, with the participation of civil society representatives, the business sector and with the involvement of international organisations, the Anti-Corruption Council (ACC) finalised the revision process of the *Anti-Corruption Strategy* and the elaboration of the *2015-2016 Anti-Corruption Action Plan* and adopted those texts. The work on these strategic documents was guided by 13 strategic anti-corruption priorities, including, for example, prevention in the defence sector and prevention in the health sector, and based on a performance assessment of the 2010-2013 Action Plan as well as other sources such as recommendations from international organisations. Outcome related, rather than process related, objectives have been set.

The ACC also developed and adopted *a new methodology for its monitoring and assessment of anticorruption strategy documents* with three components: progress report and monitoring tool, monitoring report, and evaluation report.

The third phase of the institutional *reform of the judiciary* was launched with a focus on guarantees of independence for individual judges and their involvement in the activities of court management. Amendments to the relevant draft legislation will be refined in line with expertise provided by the Venice Commission.

In December, 2014 on the initiative of the Prime-Minister the government of Georgia made a commitment to carry out institutional reform of the Prosecutor's Office aimed at increasing its independence and enhancing transparency and accountability - taking into account international standards and recommendations addressed to Georgia. Moreover, in January 2015, a specialised *Anti-Corruption Unit was established within the Chief Prosecutor's Office*.

The government is pursuing work on a stand-alone *Freedom of Information Act*. The drafting process is being led by the Ministry of Justice within the structure of the Anti-Corruption Council (ACC), in collaboration with relevant NGOs, international organisations and experts, state agencies and the judiciary.

The government continues to support Open Government Partnership (OGP) reforms. Georgia's second OGP National Action Plan for 2014-2015 was developed on the basis of nationwide public consultations. The ACC adopted the OGP action plan and in February 2015 approved the new *methodology for the monitoring and assessment of implementation of the OGP Action Plan*. In August 2014, Georgia was elected by the OGP partner countries to sit on the OGP Steering Committee, which is taken to be a sign of high levels of confidence and trust in the good governance and transparency reforms in Georgia.

GERMANY

The draft law to amend the Act governing the Legal Status of Members of the Federal Government and the Act governing the Legal Status of Parliamentary State Secretaries, (the "Legal Waiting Period Act") was adopted by the Federal Cabinet on 4 February 2015. It aims to establish a transparent procedure by introducing notification duties and the possibility to issue an employment ban for a "waiting period" at the end of a term of office. A legal waiting period would apply to ministers (and to the Federal Chancellor) who intend to enter employment outside the public service after leaving office and it is feared that conflicts of interest may arise. Members of the Federal Government would need to notify their intent to enter employment outside the public service for a period of 18 months once they are no longer in office. The ban, which as a general rule would not exceed one year (18 months in exceptional cases), might be imposed if it is felt that the public interest would be compromised. The decision to impose an employment ban would be taken by the Federal Government based on the recommendation of an advisory body composed of members who have held positions of leadership in governmental or social institutions or who have experience of an important political office. Both the decision and the recommendation would be published. In case of a ban, the person affected would be entitled to the payment of a transitional allowance during the waiting period.

With reference to the information provided by Denmark, mention was made of a case in Germany where a referee involved in match fixing had been convicted for aiding fraud and sentenced to prison for two years and five months, accompanied by a life-time bar from refereeing.

GREECE

A new law on auditing the financing of political parties and elected members of the Hellenic Parliament and Greek members of the European Parliament, adopted on 23 October 2014, entered into force on 1 January 2015. The law creates a comprehensive system where financial control – sufficiently

independent from Parliament – is carried out by the Audit Committee (replacing the previous Control Committee). All income and all expenditure of each party or coalition of parties, is to move through one bank account (for candidates), or up to three bank accounts kept with the three credit institutions of their choice (for political parties). Opening and maintaining other bank accounts, within or outside Greek territory, is prohibited. Strict private funding limits have been introduced. The penal sanctions applicable for violations of this law will be accompanied by administrative sanctions such as deprivation of parliamentary allowances. The whole system is subject to public scrutiny.

HUNGARY

In August 2014, corruption prevention and the coordination of governmental anti-corruption measures became the responsibility of the Ministry of Interior. Prior to that, corruption prevention fell under the competence of the Ministry of Public Administration and Justice (MPAJ). The MPAJ's public administration branch started the implementation of Hungary's first anti-corruption programme entitled 'Public Administration Corruption Prevention Programme' in 2012. The measures foreseen in the two-year programme were successfully implemented by 2014, with the exception of an awareness raising campaign which will start in May 2015. The main achievements of the Programme are the adoption of a whistle-blower act and the launch of an electronic whistleblowing system; large-scale corruption prevention training attended by 10% of civil servants; the introduction of an integrity-management system and the training of integrity advisors.

In the context of these organisational changes, the public administration related tasks of the MPAJ were taken over by other ministries and the Ministry of Justice was given a more focused scope of responsibilities. Corruption prevention related responsibilities, including those in the framework of work in the OECD Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions and in GRECO, were referred to the Ministry of the Interior in order to bring together the prevention and law enforcement sides of the fight against corruption, and thus make the anti-corruption policy more efficient.

Given the important role and experience in the fight against corruption of the National Protective Service (NPS) – a police body under the direction of the Ministry of Interior, a Department for Corruption Prevention was established within it in October 2014. The main responsibility of the NPS is the prevention and detection of corruption within the police by carrying out detection activities, integrity tests and so-called "lifestyle monitoring". More information can be found at the following link: <http://nvsz.hu/en/activities>

The Department for Corruption Prevention operates with a permanent staff of ten which represents a considerable increase in the allocation of resources. The Department for Corruption Prevention supports the integrity advisors' network, advises administrative bodies in integrity and corruption prevention issues, participates in the formulation of the National Corruption Prevention Strategy and will coordinate its implementation once it is adopted.

IRELAND

The Minister of Justice and Equality initiated a review of judicial appointment provisions and procedures at end 2013 and a comprehensive public consultation was conducted in 2014. The review of the operation of the judicial appointment system ensures that it reflects current best-practices, that it is open, transparent and accountable and that it promotes diversity. The Judicial Appointments Bill is now part of the revised agreed programme for government and it is expected that the legislation will be advanced over the next few months having regard to the comprehensive range of views received during the public consultation process. A key issue will be the need to engage fully with stakeholders, particularly the judiciary in advancing the proposed measures.

The Regulation of Lobbying Act 2015 – was signed by the President on 11 March 2015. The purpose of the legislation is to make information available to the public on the identity of those who are communicating with government and senior civil and public servants on public policy matters. A Head

of Lobbying Regulation is due to be appointed shortly. The Act establishes web-based registration of lobbying activity. Those who are engaged in such activity will give returns three times a year of their lobbying activity and the details provided will be available to members of the public. The key dates for the Registration of Lobbying Act are: launch of the web-based register on 1 May 2015. From that date the system will be available to potential registrants to allow them to familiarise themselves with the system. On 1 September 2015, the legislative provisions will come into effect and registration will be mandatory for anybody engaged in lobbying activities. The first return will be due by 21 January 2016.

(Note: At the request of the President of GRECO, a copy of the Regulation of Lobbying Act 2015 was forwarded to all GRECO representatives for information by the Secretariat, by e-mail, on 2 April 2015).

ITALY

Article 416ter of the Penal Code "*scambio elettorale politico-mafioso*" which in its first formulation from 1992 did not cover public services or public contracts granted in return for votes secured by the mafia, was extended in 2014 to cover the acceptance by any individual of a promise of votes secured by the mafia in return for a payment or any other advantage (or promise thereof). The sentence applicable is 4 to 10 years' imprisonment.

A draft law approved by the first chamber of parliament foresees an important reform of the statute of limitations – which can be a major hindrance to the fight against corruption – whereby, among other things, the limitation period would be suspended between the date of the first instance judgment to the date of the second instance judgment for a duration of no longer than 2 years, and between the date of a court of appeal decision to the date of the final judgment of the Court of Cassation for a duration of no longer than 1 year.

The Justice Committee of the senate has recently examined draft legislation to deal effectively with offences committed by public officials by raising the maximum (principal) penalties (which are used as the basis for setting ordinary limitation periods) for the offences of embezzlement, corruption whether in the context of a breach of duties or not, corruption in relation to judicial proceedings, undue inducement to provide or promise services. It is also foreseen to reinforce the accessory penalties by increasing the maximum length of time over which a prohibition on negotiating or concluding contracts with central or local government authorities can be applied. Moreover, it is foreseen to broaden the scope of the accessory penalty of termination of public employment if the official concerned is sentenced to at least 2 years imprisonment for embezzlement, corruption or undue inducement.

A further measure that is foreseen would consist in obliging the court, when a serious offence has been committed against the public administration, to rule that financial compensation in a sum that is equal to the corrupt payment or the value of the services received is to be paid by the perpetrator to the branch of the administration concerned. Following a strategy that has been successful in the fight against the mafia, the draft law combines enforcement of sanctions with a compensation mechanism. Moreover, the draft law proposes an important reform with regard to the mitigating circumstances: the applicable sanctions can be reduced if the perpetrator has collaborated with the investigation. Another important measure is the provision which establishes that a sentence bargain cannot be concluded unless the perpetrator accepts to reimburse the total value of the proceeds of the corrupt act(s) of which s/he is convicted.

As regards corruption prevention, in August 2014, Italy adopted Law no. 114, pursuant to which the authority responsible for the supervision of public tenders (the AVCP) was incorporated into the independent authority for the prevention of corruption (the ANAC). The aim of the legislative amendments is to prevent corruption in any activity which involves the public administration, including when contracting with private entities. Uniting the functions of the two institutions and the consequent extension of the powers of the ANAC has laid the grounds for more effective oversight of contracts and public procurement procedures – areas that are particularly prone to corruption. The ANAC exercises:

- regulatory power through the adoption of guidelines
- supervisory power through the adoption of advisory opinions
- control of the transparency obligations incumbent on the public administration in Italy through the adoption of orders
- deep supervision of public procurement procedures and enforcement.

The ANAC's powers are strong. In the case of a suspected violation of public procurement rules, the ANAC can request the judicial authorities to open legal proceedings, and can advise the local prefect (*prefetto*) to put businesses into compulsory administration. The latter procedure has been applied four times over a recent period of 6 months.

LITHUANIA

On 10 March 2015, parliament adopted a new Anti-Corruption Strategy that is likely to span the next ten years. The preliminary budget identified for its implementation is around 20 million Euros. Not only the costs, but also its potential economic benefits are being analysed. Action Plans will be adopted every three years. The electronic voting system foreseen is considered to be the jewel in the crown of the strategy.

LUXEMBOURG

In the continuum of the governmental programme of 10 December 2013, in which the Government announced its intention to undertake the drafting of a code of ethics for the members of the *Conseil d'Etat* (CE), the latter took the lead in 2014 by offering the Government its collaboration in the drafting of these rules.

The Government accepted and designated the Minister of Justice as intermediary.

The *Conseil d'Etat* declared in an explanatory memorandum that the aim of the text was to clarify the existing legal provisions concerning ethics for the members of the *Conseil d'Etat*, including the amended law reforming the *Conseil d'Etat*, Article 11 (oath sworn) and Article 18 (disqualification from sitting, deliberating or deciding in case of personal interest within an extended family circle).

The ethical rules adopted are based on the following keywords:

- confidentiality
- integrity (with direct reference to Article 246 of the Penal Code on passive corruption)
- independence (meaning impartiality in respect of any pressure or exertion of influence from outside)
- exactitude (in terms of diligence and readiness).

The ethical rules were approved by a Grand Ducal Regulation of 2 February 2015 as an Appendix to the *Conseil d'Etat* Rules of Procedure dealing with ethical rules for members of the *Conseil d'Etat*.

THE NETHERLANDS

A number of recent cases had resulted from the increased attention - both in parliament and in the media - paid to the question of integrity of MPs. All three cases involved MPs from the same main governing party. One MP had stepped down when the press had revealed how, in a former position as a provincial governor, he had claimed for very expensive dinners with private parties and had used his official car for private purposes. A second, who had been suspended temporarily because of fraud related to his home (to which he had pleaded guilty), had subsequently been refused a new seat in parliament by the party. He however chose to ignore the uproar his request to return had caused both in parliament and in the national press, insisting that as he had been punished and had paid the fine imposed, he could sit again. He obtained a new seat as an independent member. As a result he is now ignored by other members of the house. In a third case, which followed closely behind the

aforementioned case, an MP suddenly declared a conflict of interests that stemmed from a paid accessory job he had omitted to inform parliament of – he also had to step down.

THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Regarding the system for financial accountability of public officials (declarations), a law adopted by parliament in December 2014 introduced the notion of a “minor offence” – applicable in cases where, for example, an official makes a purely technical mistake in a declaration (i.e. a minor error). Previously such mistakes had constituted a false declaration, an offence that entails severe sanctions. Now, in such cases a warning to take care when completing future declarations can be issued. In addition, in 2015, several types of declaration have been combined into one. Expenditure declarations (established in legislation that has been in place since 2012) have been combined, in one package, with income, asset and liabilities declarations and the official is to file the expenditure part of the combined declaration only if expenditure exceeds income (including that of the spouse) over the previous three years. Since 2012, the burden of proof has been reversed with regard to expenditure whereby the prosecution can file charges if a declarant fails to prove the legal origin of the income from which expenditure has been made. Charges have recently been filed by the prosecution in the first case under this system.

SERBIA

In January 2015, the Ministry of Justice had formed a working group to examine the draft New Model Law on the Anti-corruption Agency, submitted to the ministry by the Anti-corruption Agency. The draft is based on the practical experience of the agency so far and adheres to international standards and recommendations. The working group has 17 members – including representatives of the agency; it started its work in February.

SLOVENIA

Since the last meeting, a number of advances in the area of corruption prevention had been made. The National Assembly has passed new legislation on judges and prosecutors, so there are now no more obstacles for the implementation of related GRECO recommendations from the Fourth Evaluation Round. The changes had not necessarily been popular among judges and prosecutors.

Amendments to the Criminal Code are under preparation that would raise penalties for corruption related criminal offences and consequently the jurisdiction would be transferred from the local courts to the district courts.

A decision of the Commission for the Prevention of Corruption (CPC) had been revoked by the Supreme Court – it concerned checks made of asset declarations made by a former Prime Minister which had led to a vote of no confidence in the National Assembly in January 2013. The Supreme Court had found that there had been a procedural violation – the CPC will continue its work taking due account of the court’s decision.

The CPC has published an up-dated web application called *Supervisor*. It is an application that allows anyone to easily browse details of financial transactions from the financial records of the entire public sector in a user-friendly format. At the beginning of March 2015, the CPC had published in the application data on financial transactions that stemmed from contracts concluded between public sector entities and natural persons – persons who in the last 12 years had received more than 200 000 Euros (a very significant sum of money in Slovenia), from such contracts. It had been discovered that the Minister of Education was among those persons. She had received approximately 600 000 Euros from such contracts, mostly with the university faculty she was the Dean of before she was appointed minister. Since the publication of that information, she has stepped down. The increased transparency that has thus been given to public spending by the universities has triggered a heated public and media debate and may well lead to reform.

SPAIN

The preparation of the following draft legislation had been reported on at GRECO 66: i) a draft Act amending the Penal Code, ii) a draft Act on the economic activity of political parties, iii) a draft Act on the status of high senior officials aimed at setting up a register to control conflicts of interest and, iv) a draft Act amending the Criminal Procedure Code. The Act amending the Penal Code and the Act on the economic activity of political parties were adopted by congress (final step of the parliamentary procedure) during the week of the present meeting (and subsequently published in the official journal on 31 March 2015). Both pieces of legislation are important for the fight against corruption. Among the measures that have entered into force with regard to the transparency of party funding, one can note, for instance, that a new criminal offence of illegal funding has been established which reflects a significant commitment on the part of the government and of parliament to establishing clear standards for fighting corruption in that field. These advances will be examined by GRECO in the context of the ongoing Third Round compliance procedure in respect of Spain.

Several corruption cases being dealt with in the courts had given rise to significant media attention in Spain recently. In most of those cases final judgments are pending.

“THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA”

In January 2015, the Basic Public Prosecution office for organised crime and corruption had filed criminal charges against the former director of the Agency for State Security – for espionage (art.316 of the Criminal Code) and violence against representatives of the highest state authorities (art. 311 of the Criminal Code), against two other persons for assisting in those crimes, and against the president of the largest opposition party – for an attempted crime of violence against representatives of the highest state authorities (art. 311). The prosecution services also opened investigations into three persons on 8 February 2015. The first is the above-mentioned former director of the Agency for State Security and the other two are officials of the Ministry of the Interior who are suspected of assisting him in committing acts of espionage (art. 316 of the Criminal Code), of unauthorised tapping and audio recording (art. 151 of the Criminal Code), and of other acts of espionage. One of the suspects concluded a plea agreement with the prosecutor, confirmed by the investigative judge, and has been sentenced to three years in prison.

On 9 February, the president of the largest opposition party announced to the press the content of illegally obtained recorded conversations and made allegations about improper government involvement in the electoral process, the judiciary, the media, and corruption.

The prosecution in both cases is being conducted in accordance with all international standards for guaranteeing an independent, fair and impartial trial and in full respect of procedural rules. No comment can therefore be made on the source and authenticity of the illegally obtained recordings. Moreover, the Office of the State Public Prosecutor has requested expert assistance from the European Union.

GRECO has sometimes referred to Balkan Insight as a source of information on the political situation in the country. It is a product of the Balkan Investigative Reporting Network (BIRN) which affiliates non-governmental organisations from across the region and is funded by foreign governments, NGOs and charitable foundations with an interest in the region. In the view of the authorities, Balkan Insight should not be taken as the sole source of information but read in conjunction with other media sources in order to obtain a balanced picture of ongoing events.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Even though the Federal Government has no part to play in state and local government policy on public administration (procurement, access to information, etc.), things are different when it comes to investigations and enforcement regarding the criminal law on corruption. In the State of Connecticut a task force has recently been set up by the federal government that connects the various federal agencies with the various state and local agencies of Connecticut to target specifically public sector corruption. Comparable task forces are in place in a number of states.

In Connecticut, the initiative stemmed from strong public demand following convictions for corruption of a former Governor and of several of the most powerful mayors in the state.

A multiplicity of statutes derives from the multiplicity of actors - state, local and federal government. Some statutes are highly effective and comprehensive, some do not cover passive bribery for example. Prosecutions have been possible by federal prosecutors under a theory called "the loyal and faithful services" theory of mail fraud but some doubts have been cast by the Supreme Court of the United States as to the theory's viability for the prosecution of corruption, particularly at the state and local levels. Other differences exist with regard to capacity to carry out long-term investigations; the Federal Government has that capacity while some states do not.

The task force format solves a number of pragmatic issues by co-locating state, federal and local prosecutors and police. It increases the number of people assigned to investigations, it brings an understanding of who might be the principal actors or decision makers, and of how best to obtain pertinent records. It also sends a political message to the public that conveys a commitment to accountability. It provides additional resources - for example, state and local police can be paid overtime through federal funds. The often more rigorous federal asset forfeiture programme can be brought to bear. In some cases state laws may be better adapted to certain kinds of misconduct than federal laws. As the US system is driven by an "opportunity" theory, prosecutors are able to draw on a wider range of statutes when choosing which charges to bring and how best to secure a conviction.

XIII. Adoption of decisions

45. The decisions of the 67th Plenary Meeting were adopted as they appear in document Greco (2015) 3E.

XIV. Forthcoming meetings

46. At the invitation of the authorities of Croatia, the Bureau will hold its 72nd meeting in Zagreb on 22 May 2015. GRECO's 68th Plenary Meeting will be held in Strasbourg on 15-19 June 2015.

APPENDIX I
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

ALBANIA / ALBANIE

Ms Erisa PROKO

Adviser, Minister of State on Local Issues, National Coordinator Against Corruption, Prime Minister's Office

ANDORRA / ANDORRE

Apologised / excusé

ARMENIA / ARMENIE

Ms Anna MARGARYAN

Chair of Criminal Law and Criminology, Yerevan State University

AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE

Mr Christian MANQUET (Head of delegation)

Vice-President of GRECO / Vice-président du GRECO

Head of Department, Directorate for Penal Legislation, Ministry of Justice

AZERBAIJAN / AZERBAIDJAN

Mr Elnur MUSAYEV

Senior Prosecutor, Anticorruption Directorate, General Prosecutor's Office

BELARUS

Mr Igor SEVRUK

Head of Department, Supervision over the National Investigative Committee, General Prosecutor's office

BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

M. Frederik DECRUYENAERE (Chef de délégation)

Attaché au Service des Infractions et Procédures Particulières, Service Public Fédéral Justice (SPF Justice)

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / BOSNIE-HERZEGOVINE

Mr Vjekoslav VUKOVIC (Head of delegation)

Assistant Minister, Sector for Fight against Terrorism, Organised Crime and Drugs Abuse, Ministry of Security

BULGARIA / BULGARIE

Mr Georgi RUPCHEV (Head of delegation)

State Expert, Criminal Law Division, Directorate of International Cooperation and European Affairs, Ministry of Justice

Mr Atanas ZAFIROV

Member of Parliament

Mr Ivan IVANOV

Member of Parliament

Ms Nezabravka STOEVA

Member of the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC), Chair of the SJC's Commission on Prevention of Conflict of Interest and Interaction with SJC's Inspectorate

Mr Yasen TODOROV

Member of the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC), Chair of the SJC's Commission on Professional Ethics and Prevention of Corruption

Mr Paskal BOYADJIYSKI

Member of the Commission for Prevention and Ascertainment of Conflicts of Interest

Ms Silvia KADREVA

Director of Public Registry Directorate, National Audit Office

Mr Plamen KOSTOV

Head of International Relations, National Audit Office

Ms Mariana PAMPOROVA-STOICHEVA
Interpreter

Ms Malina STEFANOVA
Interpreter

CROATIA / CROATIE

Mr Marin MRČELA
President of GRECO / Président du GRECO
Justice at the Supreme Court

Mr Dražen JELENIĆ (Head of delegation)
Deputy State Attorney General

CYPRUS / CHYPRE

Mr Philippos KOMODROMOS (Head of delegation)
Counsel of the Republic, Office of the Attorney General

CZECH REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

Ms Helena LIŠUCHOVÁ (Head of delegation)
Head of the International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Justice

Mr Václav MLYNAŘÍK
Security Policy Expert, Security Policy Department, Ministry of the Interior

Mr Tomáš HUDEČEK (evaluator – Hungary)
Legal expert, International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Justice

DENMARK / DANEMARK

Mr Flemming DENKER (Representative and evaluator - Lithuania)
Special Advisor, State Prosecutor for Serious Economic and International Crime

ESTONIA / ESTONIE

Mr Urvo KLOPETS
Advisor, Analysis Division, Criminal Policy Department, Ministry of Justice

Mr Tanel KALMET
Advisor, Penal Law and Procedure Division, Criminal Policy Department, Ministry of Justice

FINLAND / FINLANDE

Ms Tiina KANGAS-ALKU (Head of delegation)
Ministerial Adviser, Department of Criminal Policy, Ministry of Justice

Mr Jouko HUHTAMÄKI
Ministerial Adviser, Police department, Ministry of the Interior

Ms Marja TUOKILA
Counsel to the Legal Affairs Committee, Parliament

FRANCE

M. François BADIE
Chef du Service Central de Prévention de la Corruption (SCPC), Ministère de la Justice

Mme Sidonie DESSART (évaluatrice – Bulgarie)
Vice-Présidente au Tribunal d'Instance de Bobigny, 1 prom Jean Rostand, 93000 BOBIGNY
Tel. +33 1 48 96 90 63, ✉ sidonie.dessart@justice.fr

GEORGIA / GEORGIE

Ms Gulisa KAKHNIASHVILI
Advisor, Strategic Development Unit, Secretariat of the Anti-Corruption Council, Ministry of Justice

GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Mr Danny POLK
Ministry of Justice and Consumer Protection, Administrative Officer, Criminal law suppression of economic crime, computer crime, corruption-related crime and environmental crime

Mr Stefan SINNER
Head of Division PM1, Remuneration of Parliamentarians, Administration of the *Bundestag*

Ms Cornelia GÄDIGK (evaluator – Bulgaria)
Chief Public Prosecutor, Prosecution office Hamburg

GREECE / GRECE

Mr Dimosthenis STINGAS (representative + evaluator – Hungary)
Chairman of the Court of First Instance of Serres, Presiding Judge of the District Court of Serres

Ms Panagiota VATIKALOU
Investigative Judge, Court of First Instance of Chania

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Ms Nóra BAUS
Anti-corruption Officer, Department for European Cooperation, Ministry of the Interior

Mr Krisztián EPERJES
Secretary General of the Office of the Prosecutor General

Mr Balázs GERENCSÉR
Prosecutor at the Office of the Prosecutor General

Mr Áron László TÓTH
Head of Cabinet, National Office for the Judiciary

Ms Mária HÁZINÉ VARGA
Deputy Director General for Legislation at the Office of the National Assembly

Ms Zsóka MAGYAR
Expert at the Department of Codification of the Office of the National Assembly

ICELAND / ISLANDE

Mr Helgi Magnús GUNNARSSON
Deputy Director of Public Prosecution, Office of the Director of Public Prosecution

IRELAND / IRLANDE

Mr Aidan MOORE
Assistant Principal Officer, Standards Commission Secretariat, Standards in Public Office Commission

Mr Martin SWITZER
Deputy to the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the Council of Europe

Mr David WADDELL (evaluator – Bulgaria)
Secretary to the Irish Standards Commission (retired), Secretary, Standards in Public Office Commission

ITALY / ITALIE

Mr Raffaele PICCIRILLO (Chef de déléation)
Directeur Général de justice pénale, Ministère de la Justice

Mme Nicoletta PARISI
National Anti-Corruption Authority

LATVIA / LETTONIE

Mr Jaroslavs STRELCENOKS (Head of delegation)
Director, Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau

Mr Alvilis STRIKERIS
Head of Policy Planning Division, Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau

Ms Anna SKRJABINA
Director of EU Affairs Department, Ministry of Justice

Mr Aleksejs LOSKUTOVS
Parliamentary representative

Mr Juris SILINS
President of the Latvian Association of Judges

Mr Rolands LAPPUĶE
Permanent Representative of Latvia to the Council of Europe

Mr Mārtiņš KLĪVE
Deputy Permanent Representative of Latvia to the Council of Europe

LIECHTENSTEIN

Mr Patrick RITTER (Chef de délégation)
Deputy Director, Office for Foreign Affairs

LITHUANIA / LITUANIE

Mr Paulius GRICIUNAS (Head of delegation)
Vice Minister, Ministry of Justice

LUXEMBOURG

Mme Doris WOLTZ (Chef de délégation)
Procureur d'Etat adjoint, Tribunal d'Arrondissement de Luxembourg

MALTA / MALTE

Mr Kevin VALLETTA (Head of delegation) – **Apologised / excusé**
Office of the Attorney General

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA / REPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA

Mme Cornelia VICLEANSCHI (Chef de délégation)
Procureur, Chef de la Section Générale, Bureau du Procureur Général

MONACO

M. Jean-Marc GUALANDI
Conseiller Technique – SICCFIN, Service d'Information et de Contrôle sur les Circuits Financiers Département des Finances et de l'Economie

M. Eric SENNA
Conseiller à la Cour d'Appel

MONTENEGRO

Mr Dušan DRAKIC
Senior Advisor, Directorate for Anti-Corruption Initiative

NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Mr Hans ABMA (Head of delegation)
Senior Policy Advisor, Ministry of Security and Justice, Law Enforcement Department

Ms Anneloes van der ZIJDE
Policy Advisor, Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations

NORWAY / NORVEGE

Mr Atle ROALDSOY (Head of delegation)
Policy Director, Section for European and International Affairs, Ministry of Justice and Public Security

POLAND / POLOGNE

Mr Rafał KIERZYNKA (Head of delegation)
Judge in European Criminal Law Division, Criminal Law Department, Ministry of Justice

PORTUGAL

Mr Daniel MARINHO PIRES
Legal Adviser, Directorate General for Justice Policy, International Affairs Department, Ministry of Justice

ROMANIA / ROUMANIE

Mr Andrei FURDUI

Legal Advisor, National Office for Crime Prevention and Asset Recovery, Ministry of Justice

Ms Oana Andrea SCHIMIDT HAINEALA

Prosecutor, Member of the Superior Council of Magistracy

RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE

Mr Aslan YUSUFOV

Deputy Head of Directorate, Head of Section of supervision over implementation of anti-corruption legislation

Prosecutor General's Office

SAN MARINO / SAINT MARIN

Mr Eros GASPERONI (Head of delegation)

First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

SERBIA / SERBIE

Mr Vladan JOKSIMOVIC

Deputy Director of Anti-Corruption Agency

SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE

Ms Alexandra KAPISOVSKA (Head of delegation)

Legal Adviser, Ministry of Justice

SLOVENIA / SLOVENIE

Mr Matjaž MEŠNJAK

Adviser, Public Integrity and Prevention, Commission for the Prevention of Corruption

SPAIN / ESPAGNE

Mr Rafael VAILLO RAMOS

Technical Adviser, DG for International Cooperation, Ministry of Justice

SWEDEN / SUEDE

Ms Elin CARBELL-BRUNNER (Head of delegation)

Legal Advisor, Division for Criminal Law, Ministry of Justice

SWITZERLAND / SUISSE

M. Ernst GNAEGI (Chef de délégation)

Chef de l'unité du droit pénal international, Office fédéral de la Justice

M. Olivier GONIN

Conseiller scientifique, Unité du droit pénal international, Office fédéral de la justice

“THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA” / « L'EX-RÉPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACÉDOINE »

Ms Aneta ARNAUDOVSKA (Head of delegation)

Judge, Director of the Academy for Judges and Public Prosecutors

TURKEY / TURQUIE

Mr Ferhat KARAŞ

Chief Inspector, Deputy Head of the Prime Ministry Inspection Board

Ms Ayben İYİSOY

Judge, Head of Section, General Directorate of International Law and Foreign Relations, Ministry of Justice

Mr Güray GÜÇLÜ

Judge, Ministry of Justice, Dep. of International Law and Foreign Relations, Ministry of Justice

UKRAINE

Mr Robert SIVERS

Head of the Anticorruption Policy Department, Ministry of Justice

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Apologised / excusée

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA / ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Ms Jane LEY

Senior Anticorruption Advisor, International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Bureau, U.S Department of State

Mr Michael OLMSTED

Senior Counsel for the European Union, U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Mission to the European Union

EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON CRIME PROBLEMS (CDPC) / COMITE EUROPEEN POUR LES PROBLEMES CRIMINELS (CDPC)

Ms Helena LIŠUCHOVÁ (Head of delegation)

Head of the International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Justice

EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON LEGAL CO-OPERATION (CDCJ) / COMITE EUROPEEN DE COOPERATION JURIDIQUE (CDCJ)

Apologised / excusé

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

Apologised / excusée

COUNCIL OF EUROPE DEVELOPMENT BANK / BANQUE DE DEVELOPPEMENT DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Apologised / excusée

OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS

UNITED NATIONS – UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME (UNODC) /

NATIONS UNIES – OFFICE DES NATIONS UNIES CONTRE LA DROGUE ET LE CRIME (ONU DC)

Apologised / excusées

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD) /

ORGANISATION DE COOPERATION ET DE DEVELOPPEMENT ECONOMIQUES (OCDE)

Apologised / excusée

INTERNATIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION ACADEMY /

L'ACADEMIE INTERNATIONALE DE LUTTE CONTRE LA CORRUPTION (IACA)

Apologised / excusée

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (OAS) /

ORGANISATION DES ETATS AMERICAINS (OEA)

Apologised / excusée

EVALUATION TEAMS / EQUIPES D'EVALUATION

Fourth Round Evaluation Report on Bulgaria / Rapport d'Evaluation du Quatrième Cycle sur la Bulgarie

Mr Vladimir LAFITSKIY – **Apologised / excusé**

Deputy Director of the Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law Studies at the Government of the Russian Federation

Mr David WADDELL

Secretary to the Irish Standards Commission (retired), Secretary, Standards in Public Office Commission

Mme Sidonie DESSART

Vice-Présidente au Tribunal d'Instance de Bobigny

Ms Cornelia GÄDIGK

Chief Public Prosecutor, Prosecution office Hamburg

Fourth Round Evaluation Report on Hungary / Rapport d'Evaluation du Quatrième Cycle sur la Hongrie

Mr Flemming DENKER

Former Deputy State Prosecutor

Mr Tomáš HUDEČEK

Legal expert, International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Justice

Ms Rusudan MIKHELIDZE – **Apologised / excusée**

Former Director of Analytical Department, Secretariat of the Anti-Corruption Council, Ministry of Justice

Mr Dimosthenis STINGAS

Chairman of the Court of First Instance of Serres, Presiding Judge of the District Court of Serres

RAPPORTEURS

Fourth Round – Compliance Reports / *Quatrième Cycle – Rapports de Conformité*

Estonia / Estonie

Ms Marja TUOKILA (Finland / *Finlande*)

Ms Norá BAUS (Hungary / *Hongrie*)

Finland / Finlande

Mr Rafał KIERZYNKA (Poland / *Pologne*)

Ms Elin CARBELL-BRUNNER (Sweden / *Suède*)

Iceland / Islande

Mr Kevin VALLETTA (Malta / *Malte*) – **Apologised / excusé**

Mr Atle ROALDSOY (Norway / *Norvège*)

Latvia / Lettonie

Mr Urvo KLOPETS (Estonia / *Estonie*)

Ms Anneloes van der ZIJDE (Netherlands / *Pays-Bas*)

Third Round – Second Compliance Reports / *Troisième Cycle – Deuxièmes Rapports de Conformité*

Cyprus / Chypre

Mr Aidan MOORE (Ireland / *Irlande*)

Mr Dražen JELENIĆ (Croatia / *Croatie*)

Republic of Moldova / République de Moldova

M. Frederik DECRUYENAERE (Belgium / *Belgique*)

Mme Doris WOLTZ (Luxembourg)

Portugal

M. Jean-Marc GUALANDI (Monaco)

Mr Hans ABMA (Netherlands / *Pays-Bas*)

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS / *ECHANGE DE VUES*

Mr Robert SATTLER, Director, General Secretariat of the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSA) / *Directeur, Secrétariat général de l'Organisation internationale des Institutions Supérieures de Contrôle des Finances Publiques* (INTOSA)

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

Mr Wolfgang RAU, *Executive Secretary of GRECO / Secrétaire Exécutif du GRECO*

Ms Elspeth REILLY, Personal Assistant to the Executive Secretary / *Assistante Particulière du Secrétaire Exécutif*

Administrative Officers / *Administrateurs*

M. Björn JANSON, Deputy to the Executive Secretary of GRECO

M. Christophe SPECKBACHER

Ms Laura SANZ-LEVIA

Ms Sophie MEUDAL-LEENDERS

Mr Michael JANSSEN

Ms Lioubov SAMOKHINA

Ms Valentina D'AGOSTINO

Central Office / *Bureau Central*

Ms Penelope PREBENSEN, Administrative Assistant / *Assistante Administrative*

Mme Laure PINCEMAILLE, Assistant / *Assistante*

Mme Marie-Rose PREVOST, Assistant / *Assistante*

Webmaster

Ms Simona GHITA, Directorate General 1 - Human Rights and Rule of Law / *Direction générale des droits de l'Homme et état de droit*

Mme Marie-Rose PREVOST, GRECO

Interpreters / *Interprètes*

M. Grégoire DEVICTOR (25-27/03)

Mme Maryline NEUSCHWANDER (23-24/03)

Mme Isabelle MARCHINI

M. Jean-Jacques PEDUSSAUD

APPENDIX II
AGENDA

67th GRECO PLENARY MEETING
Strasbourg, 23-27 March 2015
Council of Europe, Palais - room 5

AGENDA

67^{ème} REUNION PLENIERE DU GRECO
Strasbourg, 23-27 mars 2015
Conseil de l'Europe, Palais - salle 5

ORDRE DU JOUR

1. Opening of the meeting	<u>9.30 am</u>	Ouverture de la réunion	<u>09h30</u>
2. Adoption of the agenda		Adoption de l'ordre du jour	
3. Information from the President and the Executive Secretary		Communication du Président et du Secrétaire Exécutif	
4. Topical anti-corruption developments/events in member States		Développements/événements anti-corruption d'actualité dans les Etats membres	
5. First reading Evaluation Reports - Fourth Round Bulgaria Hungary	Monday Tuesday	Première lecture Rapports d'Evaluation - Quatrième Cycle Bulgarie Hongrie	Lundi Mardi
6. Adoption Compliance Reports - Fourth Round Estonia Finland Iceland Latvia		Adoption Rapports de Conformité - Quatrième Cycle Estonie Finlande Islande Lettonie	
7. Adoption 2 nd Compliance Reports – Third Round Cyprus Republic of Moldova Portugal		Adoption 2 ^e Rapports de Conformité - Troisième Cycle Chypre République de Moldova Portugal	
8. Fifth Evaluation Round Continuation of the discussion held at GRECO 66 - thematic options - next steps		Cinquième Cycle d'Evaluation Suite de la discussion tenue lors du GRECO 66 - options thématiques - prochaines étapes	
9. 15th General Activity Report – 2014 Adoption (draft approved by Bureau 71)		15^e Rapport général d'activités – 2014 Adoption (projet approuvé par le Bureau 71)	
10. Presentation <i>Corruption and the diffusion of responsibility</i> Johann GRAF LAMBSDORFF, Professor in Economic Theory, University of Passau, Germany	cancelled	Présentation <i>Corruption et diffusion de la responsabilité</i> Johann GRAF LAMBSDORF, Titulaire de la chaire de théorie économique, Université de Passau, Allemagne	annulée
11. Exchange of views Robert SATTLER, Director, General Secretariat of the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI)	Thursday – 12 noon	Echange de vues Robert SATTLER, Directeur, Secrétariat général de l'Organisation Internationale des Institutions Supérieures de Contrôle des Finances Publiques (INTOSAI)	Jeudi – 12h00

<p>12. Corruption in Sport <i>13th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Sport: Results and follow-up</i> Information provided by the Executive Secretary of the Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport (EPAS), Stanislas FROSSARD</p>	<p>Corruption dans le sport <i>13e Conférence du Conseil de l'Europe des ministres responsables du sport : Résultats et suites à donner</i> Informations de la part du Secrétaire Exécutif de l'Accord partiel élargi sur le sport (APES), Stanislas FROSSARD</p>
<p>13. Joint First and Second Round Compliance Report on Belarus (adopted by GRECO 64 – June 2014) Publication of a summary of the report, pursuant to Rule 34, paragraph 2 of the Rules of Procedure, pending authorisation by the authorities to publish the whole report</p>	<p>Rapport de Conformité des Premier et Deuxième Cycles conjoints sur le Bélarus (adopté par le GRECO 64 – juin 2014) Publication d'un résumé du rapport, en vertu de l'Article 34, paragraphe 2 du Règlement intérieur, en attendant l'autorisation des autorités de publier le rapport dans son intégralité</p>
<p>14. Second reading and adoption Evaluation Reports - Fourth Round Bulgaria Hungary</p>	<p>Deuxième lecture et adoption Rapports d'évaluation - Quatrième Cycle Bulgarie Hongrie</p>
<p>15. Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Divers</p>
<p>16. Adoption of decisions</p>	<p>Adoption des décisions</p>
<p>17. Dates of next meetings</p>	<p>Dates des prochaines réunions</p>
<p>18. Close of the meeting</p>	<p>Fin de la réunion</p>

Friday, 1 pm

Vendredi, 13h00