

Strasbourg, 28 January 2015

Greco (2014) 18E

66th GRECO Plenary Meeting
(Strasbourg, 8-12 December 2014)

SUMMARY REPORT

I. Opening of the meeting

1. The 66th 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. The plenary bid farewell to Mr Jean Bour, Head of delegation of Luxembourg who was one of GRECO's longest standing representatives. He was praised for his sound judgment and ability to bring highly complicated issues back to the essentials. His contribution to GRECO's work will be sorely missed. Goodbyes were also said to Mr Don O'Flóinn, Head of delegation of the Netherlands and Mr Mete Demirci, representative of Turkey.

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 exchange of views (item 13) with the Director of the General Secretariat of the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) was postponed to a future meeting due to travel problems.

III. Information Items

4. Delegations were asked to refer, in particular, to the information presented in the report of the 70th Meeting of the Bureau (document Greco (2014)16E).

The President

5. The President had addressed the 3rd Assembly of the Parties of the *International Anti-Corruption Academy* - IACA (Baku, 19-21 November 2014) and commended it on its important anti-corruption education and research programme. Close ties are maintained with IACA which has observer status in GRECO.

6. At the informal meeting between the presidents of the monitoring mechanisms of the Council of Europe and the Secretary General, held on 2 December, the President had reported on the *framework for ad hoc focused dialogue* put in place by GRECO (cf. Greco (2014) 10E Final) to respond to the Secretary General's call on monitoring and advisory bodies to adapt their operational practices so that the Council of Europe can respond faster and more effectively to emergency situations and urgent requests from member States. The Secretary General had noted that even though GRECO accepts that there might occasionally be a need for a rapid reaction, it has a strong preference for dealing with such matters in the context of its established peer review procedures. The President had also stressed that the multiple layers of result validation and high level of process ownership in GRECO mean that the recommendations it issues are carefully tailored to target very specific needs identified in a member State.

7. The *UNDP survey on men and women in civil service* conceived by the UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre for Europe and the CIS in 2013 seeks to measure perceptions of men and women's vulnerabilities and risks associated with transparency, accountability and corruption within the civil service. Consent had been given by UNDP for participation in the survey to be opened up to all GRECO member States. The President encouraged members to do so as implementation of the survey would provide GRECO with access to primary data and supplement its own findings from the Second Evaluation Round and its work on gender and corruption. It would also be likely to give further visibility to GRECO's work and create synergies between the two organisations. The two broad questions posed were how male and female civil service employees perceive and experience transparency, accountability and corruption in the work place and what are the differentiated impacts of a lack of transparency and corruption on the recruitment and career development of male and female civil

service employees. Ms Helena Lišuchová, GRECO's Gender Equality Rapporteur, Ms Vita Habjan Barborič, Bureau Member (Slovenia) and Ms Liubov Samokhina from the Secretariat had provided input on the methodology and would be invited to contribute to the formulation of conclusions and recommendations.

8. For the open discussion to be held at the present meeting on GRECO's *Fifth Evaluation Round* (Item 10 – cf. paragraph 37) a document resulting from the Bureau's initial exchanges of views on possible options for the theme of the new round had been distributed to all GRECO representatives (Greco (2014) Misc 2E revised). As requested by several delegations at the previous plenary meeting, methodological or procedural matters could also be raised. All delegations were invited to take this opportunity to speak up, make proposals and to express any specific concerns they might have. The Bureau had welcomed the idea of holding as open a debate as possible at this early stage of the reflection process and had very deliberately refrained from recommending any order of priority in the thematic options tabled.

Gender Equality Rapporteur – Ms Helena Lišuchová (Czech Republic)

9. The Gender Equality Rapporteur and Liubov Samokhina from the Secretariat would happily provide additional information to any delegation interested in volunteering to participate in the *UNDP survey on men and women in civil service* that had been reported on by the President.

10. She had informed a meeting of the Council of Europe's Gender Equality Commission (GEC) of the preliminary results from answers provided by GRECO delegations to the questionnaire on gender dimensions of corruption. She would present a report to GRECO early 2015 on those results and her activities as Gender Equality Rapporteur. The GEC had applauded GRECO's approach to implementing the Organisation's Gender Equality Strategy. It had particularly noted the information gathered concerning national parliaments and had suggested that the collection of data be extended to include local government as well.

The Director, Information Society and and Action against Crime Directorate, Council of Europe

11. Mr Jan Kleijssen congratulated GRECO on the development of a policy for developing its rapid reaction capabilities in follow-up to the Secretary General's Report on the State of Democracy, Human Rights and the Rule of Law. It was acknowledged that the human rights emergencies that sister monitoring bodies might need to deal with will be somewhat different in nature to the issues that might be brought to GRECO's attention. Nevertheless the ad hoc focused dialogue envisaged by GRECO to address pressing issues outside its regular monitoring is a very important step that shows that it does not hesitate to take initiatives when current events require it. In May, the Secretary General will report to the Ministerial Session on the various proposals and steps taken by Council of Europe monitoring bodies.

12. GRECO was also congratulated on the way it is handling the gender aspects of corruption in response to the Organisation's gender equality strategy – the approach is now being used as a model by others. Those very interesting results were proof that there is some merit in looking into issues that might at first sight appear not to be of specific relevance in some fields of work. GRECO's experience is therefore being used to persuade other bodies that might still be reluctant, that there can be merit in looking at things from an original angle.

13. The Director stated that so far the thematic focus chosen by GRECO for its evaluation rounds addresses notable concerns in society and is highly politically relevant. The impact in member States of GRECO reports on political financing and the discussions during its current sessions demonstrated that. He was therefore confident that the choices to be made for the Fifth Round would be equally relevant

and would keep the results of GRECO's work very much in the forefront of political discussion in its member States.

14. Finally, reference was made to the Strategic Vision paper issued by the Secretary General when taking up office for a second term (made available to GRECO delegations at the previous plenary meeting) that again stresses the great importance he attaches to GRECO and, in particular, to the matter of EU accession to GRECO. On that issue, at a meeting earlier in the day with representatives of the Italian chairmanship and of the European Commission, the Council of Europe had been informed that the requisite consultations taking place within the EU institutions in that perspective would take a little longer than initially indicated.

The Executive Secretary

15. The Ministry of Finance of the Czech Republic plans to organise in cooperation with international partners, including the Council of Europe, an international anti-corruption conference in June 2015 – with financial support provided by the Norway Grants and European Economic Area (EEA) Grants programmes. The intention is to cover a broad range of subjects, from money laundering to public administration reform, specific anti-corruption policies and possibly also political funding, with links being made to the specific situation in the Czech Republic. GRECO's secretariat would certainly be called on to propose speakers but time constraints would make further involvement in the organisation of such a major event difficult.

16. Discussions in the plenary triggered by some draft compliance reports had led the Bureau to further clarify the conditions that draft legislation needs to meet for it to result in a recommendation being assessed as "partly implemented". GRECO (rapporteurs and plenary) needs always to be in a position to scrutinise draft legislation and to assess its overall credibility in the context of the legislative process of the country concerned. In addition to the pertinence of the draft legislation in terms of substance, it is essential to establish that it has emanated from and has the approval of a competent authority and that it is accessible to the public.

17. The Bureau had also discussed further cooperation with the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE). Two main avenues would be used. First, making better use of the PACE Anti-corruption Platform by participating more frequently and suggesting themes for future hearings. Secondly, providing information on GRECO's work in a particular country to the national delegation in PACE.

18. Regarding the feasibility of an additional protocol to the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption (ETS 173) to cover the non-profit sector, the CDPC (67th Plenary Session, 1-4 December 2014) had considered GRECO's view (Greco (2014) 11E) that "it would be highly desirable from GRECO's perspective if the CDPC would commission a feasibility study (or set up a working party) on the advisability of amending the Convention or complementing it with an Additional Protocol with a view to covering the non-profit sector which has up until now not received much attention in terms of corruption risks and the applicable legal framework (e.g. private associations - including those operating at international level, foundations, labour unions, charities, churches involved in service delivery to the community, etc.)" The CDPC had nevertheless decided to adhere to its previous conclusion that in the majority of countries corrupt practices in the non-profit sector are covered by existing legislation, while leaving the door open for GRECO to return, at any time, with a renewed and reasoned opinion as to the need for an additional protocol. GRECO might choose to do so in the future in light of the experience gained in connection with the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions (CETS 215).

19. Copies were made available of the Committee of Ministers Recommendation and explanatory memorandum on the Protection of Whistleblowers (CM/Rec(2014)7).

IV. Fourth Evaluation Round

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

Evaluation procedures

20. The procedure for the detailed examination by the plenary of draft evaluation reports consists in paragraphs previously flagged by the Evaluation Team, the authorities or the Secretariat being read in full by the President and discussed by the experts from the delegations of all GRECO member States that make up the plenary, with the participation of the Evaluation Team that carried out the on-site visit and contributed to the drawing up of the draft report. Delegations may also take the floor to open a discussion on any other section. A second reading of revisions made in light of the first is carried out by the plenary before formal adoption of the text.

21. GRECO adopted Fourth Round Evaluation Reports – including formal recommendations – on **Lithuania** (Greco Eval IV Rep (2014) 5E – publication pending) and **Malta** (Greco Eval IV Rep (2014) 4E – publication pending). The deadline of 30 June 2016 was set for the submission of Situation Reports on measures taken to implement the recommendations in both cases.

Compliance procedures

22. In the first set of compliance reports to be adopted in the Fourth Evaluation Round, 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.

23. The Fourth Round Compliance Report on **Poland** (Greco RC-IV (2014) 1E – publication pending) and the **United Kingdom** (Greco RC-IV (2014) 3E – published on 19 January 2015) were adopted and the deadline of 30 June 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

24. In the Fourth Round Compliance Report on **Slovenia** (Greco RC-IV (2014) 2E – publication pending) 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 Slovenia have been asked to provide a report on progress in implementing the recommendations by 30 June 2015.

Rapporteurs

25. The list of rapporteur countries for the Fourth Round compliance procedures regarding Albania, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, France, Norway, the Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (Greco Eval IV (2014) 13) was approved.

V. Third Evaluation Round

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

26. 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

27. Third Round compliance procedures were terminated with the adoption of the following reports: the 2nd Compliance Report on **Armenia** (Greco RC-III (2014) 26E – published on 16 December 2014), the 2nd Compliance Report on **Montenegro** (Greco RC-III (2014) 17E – published on 19 January 2015) and an Addendum to the 2nd Compliance Report on the **Netherlands** (Greco RC-III (2014) 27E – published on 15 December 2014). Furthermore, GRECO took note of the intention of the authorities of the Netherlands to report to a future Plenary meeting (under Item 4) on any further progress related to the implementation of on-going reforms in the field of political financing, including at local level.

Rule 32 procedures – non-compliance

28. In the 2nd Third Round Compliance Report on **Romania** (Greco (2014) 22E – publication pending) 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 has therefore been applied and, pursuant to paragraph 2(i) of that rule, the authorities of Romania have been asked to provide a report on progress in implementing the recommendations by 30 June 2015.

29. In its 2nd *Interim* Third Round Compliance Reports on the **Czech Republic** (Greco RC-III (2014) 28E – publication pending) and on **France** (Greco RC-III (2014) 29E – publication pending) and its *Interim* Third Round Compliance Report on **Turkey** (Greco RC-III (2014) 24E – publication pending) GRECO concluded that the level of compliance with its recommendations was still “globally unsatisfactory” in the meaning of Rule 31, paragraph 8.3 of the Rules of Procedure. The application of Rule 32 was therefore maintained and, pursuant to paragraph 2(i) of that rule, all three member States were requested to provide a report on progress in implementing the pending recommendations by 30 September 2015.

30. Moreover, it was decided, pursuant to paragraph 2 (ii) b) of Rule 32, that the President of the Statutory Committee would be invited to send letters to the Permanent Representatives to the Council of Europe of the Czech Republic and France underlining the need to take determined action in the country with a view to achieving tangible progress as soon as possible. In the case of Turkey, pursuant to paragraph 2 (ii) a) of Rule 32, GRECO decided that its President would send a letter – with a copy to the President of the Statutory Committee – to the Head of Delegation of Turkey similarly underlining the need for action.

31. With the adoption of the 4th *Interim* Third Round Compliance Report on **Sweden** (Greco RC-III (2014) 30E – published on 15 December 2014) GRECO discontinued the application of Rule 32 in respect of that member. In accordance with Rule 31, paragraph 8.2, the Head of Delegation was asked to submit additional information on the action taken to implement the recommendations by 30 September 2015.

Evaluators and Evaluation Teams

32. The composition of the evaluation teams responsible for the Third Round evaluations of GRECO’s most recent member States: Belarus, Liechtenstein and San Marino (Greco Eval III (2014) 1 Rev) was approved.

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

33. Following previous decisions aimed at greater visibility of GRECO's work, members were reminded of the action to be taken when publishing an adopted report.¹

34. The President noted that the lack of consistency in the composition of Belarus' delegation to GRECO plenary meetings makes communication difficult and stressed that it was very unsatisfactory that the country had not yet adhered to the policy of transparency by authorising the publication of the Joint First and Second Round Evaluation Report² (adopted in June 2012) and the subsequent Joint First and Second Round Compliance Report on Belarus (adopted in June 2014).

VII. Presentation by a Delegation from Norway – Political Parties' Portal (PPP)

35. A delegation from Norway presented to the plenary a new web tool – the PPP – developed for handling applications and disbursement of state grants and for the collection, management monitoring and publication of the financial accounts of the 20 national political parties and their 3 380 subordinated entities. In 2011, provision was made in the Political Parties Act (PPA) for establishing a separate accounting and bookkeeping system for parties and their entities which is based on the principles of the Accounting Act (AA) but provides a clear format and guidance for parties and entities allowing them to comply with their reporting and transparency obligations without the need for any specific competency in accounting. Those obligations have been expanded in response to GRECO recommendations from the Third Evaluation Round and apply to all parties and party entities. The PPP resulted from collaboration between the office of the County Governor of Sogn og Fjordane whose tool for managing state grants has been extended to cover the whole of Norway, and "Statistics Norway".

36. Incentives have been built into the PPP to encourage web-reporting rather than paper reporting, including for example forms that automatically filter out questions that are not applicable to a given entity and automatic mathematical calculations and verifications. In order to ensure that data on entities that choose to submit paper reports is publicly available, optically readable questionnaires are used and responses are scanned or manually input into the PPP. Failure to register on-line is an offence and the receipt of state grants is conditional on complying with the reporting obligations. The portal has been designed to significantly facilitate monitoring, for example of illegal donations, both by the authorities and by the parties themselves, the media and the general public. Information flow, decision-making and auditing is facilitated thanks to interactions with the portal by the relevant Ministry, the 19 County Governor offices, the PPAC (monitoring/controlling authority) and the Party Auditing Committee.

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)

VIII. Fifth Evaluation Round

37. A short outline of possible thematic options (Greco (2014) Misc 2E Revised) was provided by the Bureau as a basis for this first open discussion. In order not to steer the debate, the Bureau had not indicated any order of priority or an analysis of the provisions and standards that might be considered appropriate to each option. Work on the preparation of this new round would be pursued throughout 2015. The Secretariat was tasked with reflecting the various elements of the discussion and with responding to the specific requests made by delegations – notably referencing the related binding/non-binding Council of Europe anti-corruption standards and bearing in mind GRECO’s “functions” as spelled out in Article 2 of its Statute – in an up-date of the document “Fifth Evaluation Round Thematic Options” for consideration by the Bureau before submission to the next plenary meeting for further debate.

IX. Topical anti-corruption developments/events in member States

38. A summary of the information provided by delegations under this item (Item 4) can be found in the Addendum to this report (Greco (2014) 18 Addendum).

39. GRECO noted with concern the up-dated information provided by the Delegation of Latvia on the possible dismantling of the Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau (KNAB). At the time of the present plenary meeting, no response had yet been received from the government of Latvia to the letter regarding this matter addressed by the Secretary General to the Prime Minister on 3 November 2014. GRECO stressed in its decisions that in the Fourth Evaluation Round a specific recommendation has been addressed to Latvia to strengthen the independence of the KNAB in order to ensure that it can exercise its functions in an independent and impartial manner – compliance with that recommendation will be assessed by GRECO at its next plenary meeting (GRECO 67, March 2015).

X. Programme of Activities 2015

40. The Executive Secretary thanked those members due to receive an evaluation visit in 2015 for their highly constructive responses to the Secretariat’s carefully crafted proposals for setting those dates. Planning the sequence of GRECO’s work is a complicated exercise, dictated in many respects by constraints beyond the Secretariat’s control. GRECO adopted its Programme of Activities for 2015 (Greco (2014) 15E Final) in which it acknowledges that it is imperative that some degree of flexibility in its calendar be maintained in order to properly respond to scheduling requirements not anticipated at the time of adoption of this document. In particular, some of its reports may need to be prepared for adoption later than the statutory deadline and *interim* reports in cases of non-compliance will be given priority. Moreover, GRECO re-states its aim of enhanced cooperation with the European Union as it is felt that membership of the EU in GRECO would represent a unique opportunity to reinforce the coherence and hence, the efficiency, of action against corruption in Europe.

XI. Miscellaneous

International Anti-Corruption Day

41. The President published a statement to mark the occasion of International Anti-Corruption Day (9 December) that is reproduced in [Appendix III](#).

Corruption and Sport

42. Delegations had received the Report of the 13th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Sport (Magglingen, Switzerland, 18 September 2014) that states that the Committee of Ministers may already envisage “inviting GRECO and the European Committee on Crime Problems

(CDPC) to cooperate with [the Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport] EPAS on a possible review of anti-corruption standards pertaining to good governance in sport at regional and international levels, while looking at possible loopholes in existing laws, according to the terms outlined in Resolution no. 1 [on Corruption in Sport]”.

43. In Resolution no. 1 the ministers invite EPAS to draw the attention of GRECO and the CDPC to possible loopholes in the existing anti-corruption laws and mechanisms with a view to rendering the prevention and fight against corrupt practices in sport more effective, and to liaise with GRECO in connection with a possible review of the anti-corruption standards pertaining to good governance in sport at regional and international levels. GRECO took note of the resolution (cf. [Appendix IV](#)) transmitted by the Committee of Ministers (1213th meeting of the Ministers’ Deputies – 26 November 2014) for information and for GRECO (and other competent bodies) to take account of in their future work. No objections were raised to the Executive Secretary’s proposal that the implications for GRECO be discussed in the framework of direct consultations between GRECO and EPAS at an appropriate moment, given that GRECO had not been previously consulted on the resolution.

XII. Adoption of decisions

44. The decisions of the 66th Plenary Meeting were adopted as they appear in document Greco (2014) 17E.

XIII. Forthcoming meetings

45. At the invitation of the authorities of Slovenia, the Bureau would hold its 71st meeting in Ljubljana on 20 February 2015. GRECO’s 67th Plenary Meeting would be held in Strasbourg on 23-27 March 2015.

APPENDIX I
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

ALBANIA / ALBANIE

Ms Edlira NASI **Apologised / excusée**
Inspector/Coordinator, Unit for Internal Administrative Control and Anti-Corruption, General Directorate of Legal Issues, Monitoring of Programmes and Anti-corruption, Prime Minister's Office

ANDORRA / ANDORRE

Apologised / excusée

ARMENIA / ARMENIE

Mr Arthur OSIKYAN (Head of delegation)
Head of the Criminal-Executive Department, Ministry of Justice

Mr Karen GEVORGYAN
Deputy Dean of International Relations, Faculty of Law, 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

Ms Maryna ZHDANAVA
Chief Specialist of the International Legal Department, Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Belarus

BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

M. Frederik DECRUYENAERE (Chef de délégation)
Attaché au Service des Infractions et Procédures Particulières, Service Public Fédéral Justice (SPF Justice)

M Guido HOSTYN
Premier conseiller de direction, Secrétaire de la Commission de contrôle des dépenses électorales, Sénat

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

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

Ms Rena PAPAETI-HADJICOSTA **Apologised / excusée**
Senior Counsel of the Republic, Law Office of the Republic of Cyprus

CZECH REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

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

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

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

FINLAND / FINLANDE

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

Mr Aarne KINNUNEN
Deputy Head of Department, Ministry of Justice

FRANCE

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

GEORGIA / GEORGIE

Ms Irma GABRIADZE
Head of Research and Analysis 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 Frank RAUE
Deputy Head of Division, Division PM 1 - Remuneration of Members, German Bundestag

GREECE / GRECE

Mr Dimosthenis STINGAS
Chairman of the Court of First Instance of Serres, Presiding Judge of the District Court of Serres

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Apologised / excusée

ICELAND / ISLANDE

Mr Pall THORHALLSSON
Director, Department of Legislative Affairs, Prime Minister's Office

IRELAND / Irlande

Ms Aileen HARRINGTON
Assistant Principal Officer, Criminal Law Reform Division, Department of Justice and Equality

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

ITALY / ITALIE

Ms Valeria MONTARULI
Magistrate, Legislative office, Ministry of Justice

LATVIA / LETTONIE

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

LIECHTENSTEIN

Mr Patrick RITTER (Head of delegation)
Deputy Director, Office for Foreign Affairs

LITHUANIA / LITUANIE

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

Ms Elena KONCEVICIUTE
International Relations Officer, International Cooperation Division, Special Investigation Service

Mr Evaldas SINKEVIČIUS
Head of Legal and Political Information Unit, Office of Seimas, Parliamentary Research Department

LUXEMBOURG

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

MALTA / MALTE

Mr Peter GRECH
Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

Mr Anglu FARRUGIA
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Ms Donatella FRENO DIMECH
Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

Mr Ance! FARRUGIA MIGNECO
Personal Assistant to the Speaker

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA / REPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA

Mr Alexandru CLADCO
Prosecutor, Head of Unit for analysis and implementing of ECHR, General Prosecutor's Office

MONACO

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

MONTENEGRO

Ms Vesna RATKOVIC (Head of delegation)
Director, Directorate for Anti-Corruption Initiative

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

NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Mr Don O'FLOINN (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

Mr Johannes J.I. VERBURG (evaluator – Lithuania)
First Vice-President, Court of Appeal

NORWAY / NORVEGE

Mr Jens-Oscar NERGARD
Senior Adviser, Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation

Mr Anders Schiøtz WORREN
Adviser, Section for European and International Affairs, Ministry of Justice and Public Security

Mr Arne SANDNES
IT portal for political parties and public authorities, County Governor of Sogn og Fjordane (CGSF)

Mr Jørgen TISTEL
IT portal for political parties and public authorities, County Governor of Sogn og Fjordane (CGSF)

Mr Anders GRØNDAHL
Administration of the party population and electronic forms for the reporting of financial matters (Statistics Norway)

Mr Oskar Petter JENSRUD
Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation

Ms Kristina Nasset KJERSTAD
Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation

POLAND / POLOGNE

Ms Alicja KLAMCZYNSKA
Chief specialist, European Criminal Law Division, Criminal Law Department, Ministry of Justice

Mr Tomasz OSTROPOLSKI
Head of European Law Division, Ministry of Justice

PORTUGAL

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

ROMANIA / ROUMANIE

Mr Cornel Virgiliu CALINESCU (Head of delegation)
Head of the National Office for Crime Prevention and Asset Recovery, Ministry of Justice

Ms Anca JURMA
Chief Prosecutor, International Cooperation Service, National Anticorruption Directorate, Prosecutors' Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice

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

Mr Nicolae Octavian ONOGEA
Deputy Director, Permanent Electoral Authority

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 Dagmar FILLOVA
Criminal Law Legislation Division, Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic

SLOVENIA / SLOVENIE

Mr Matjaž MEŠNJAK
Adviser, Public Integrity and Prevention, Commission for the Prevention of Corruption

Mr Benjamin FLANDER (evaluator - Malta)
Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor

SPAIN / ESPAGNE

Mr Rafael VAILLO RAMOS
Technical Adviser, DG for International Cooperation, Ministry of Justice

Mr Manuel ALBA NAVARRO (evaluator – Lithuania)
Clerk of the Congress of Deputies

SWEDEN / SUEDE

Ms Elin CARBELL BRUNNER
Legal Adviser, Division for Criminal Law, Ministry of Justice

Mr Andreas KRANTZ
Deputy Director, Division for Constitutional Law, Ministry of Justice

Ms Sofia Rönnow RASMUSSEN PESSAH
Intern, Swedish Representation to the Council of Europe

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 Harun MERT (Head of delegation)
Judge, Deputy General Director, General Directorate of International Law and Foreign Relations, Ministry of Justice

Mr Mete DEMIRCI
Chief Inspector, Prime Ministry Inspection Board

Mr Ferhat KARAS
Chief Inspector, Deputy Head of the Prime Ministry Inspection Board

Ms Ayben İYİSOY
Judge, General Directorate of International Law and Foreign Relations

UKRAINE

Mr Robert SIVERS
Head of the Anticorruption Policy Department, Ministry of Justice

Mr Oleksiy SVIATUN
Senior expert, Administration of the President, International Legal Issues Sector, Department of Foreign Policy, Main Department of Foreign Policy and European Integration

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Mr David MEYER (Head of delegation)
Head of International Relations, Law Rights and International Division, Ministry of Justice

Ms Sheridan GREENLAND (evaluator - Malta)
Executive Director, Judicial College

Mr Nick BESLY
Clerk of the Sub-Committee on Lords' Conduct, House of Lords

Ms Eve SAMSON
Clerk of the Standards and Privileges Committee, House of Commons

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA / ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Mr Robert LEVENTHAL (Head of delegation)
Director, Anticrime Programs Division, Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs
U.S Department of State

Ms Jane LEY (Representative and evaluator - Malta)
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. 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

Mr Robert NEILL (United Kingdom)
Member of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights

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

Ms Katherine DELIKOURA
Chief Compliance Officer of the Council of Europe Development Bank

OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS

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

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

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

**Fourth Round Evaluation report on Malta /
Rapport d'Evaluation du Quatrième Cycle sur Malte**

Mr Benjamin FLANDER
Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor

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

Mr Kazimir ÅBERG
Judge, Svea Court of Appeal

Apologised / excusé

Ms Sheridan GREENLAND
Executive Director, Judicial College

**Fourth Round Evaluation report on Lithuania /
Rapport d'Evaluation du Quatrième Cycle sur la Lituanie**

Mr Manuel ALBA NAVARRO
Clerk of the Congress of Deputies

Ms Ülle MADISE
Legal adviser to the President, President's Office, Professor of Constitutional Law, Tartu University

Apologised / excusée

Mr Johannes J. I. VERBURG
First Vice-President, Court of Appeal

Mr Flemming DENKER
Former Deputy State Prosecutor

RAPPORTEURS

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

Poland / Pologne

Ms Helena LIŠUCHOVÁ – Czech Republic / République tchèque
Mr Daniel MARINHO PIRES – Portugal

Slovenia / Slovénie

Mr Frédéric DECRUYENAERE – Belgium / Belgique
Mr Dražen JELENIĆ – Croatia / Croatie

United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni

Ms Aileen HARRINGTON – Ireland / Irlande
Mr Matjaž MESNJAK – Slovenia / Slovénie

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

Armenia / Arménie

Mr Dimosthenis STINGAS – Greece / Grèce
Mr Cornel Virgiliu CALINESCU – Romania / Roumanie

Montenegro / Monténégro

Mr Vjekoslav VUKOVIC – Bosnia & Herzegovina / Bosnie-Herzégovine

Romania / Roumanie

Mr Vladimir LAFITSKIY – Russian Federation / Fédération de la Russie
Ms Ayben IYISOY – Turkey / Turquie

Apologised / excusé

Third Round - Interim Compliance Reports / Troisième Cycle - Rapports de conformité intérimaires

Czech Republic / République tchèque

Ms Nóra BAUS – Hungary / Hongrie
Ms Valeria MONTARULI – Italy / Italie

Apologised / excusée

France

M Guido HOSTYN – Belgium / Belgique
M Olivier GONIN – Switzerland / Suisse

Sweden / Suède

Mr Aarne KINNUNEN – Finland / Finlande

Turkey / Turquie

Mr Georgi RUPCHEV – Bulgaria / Bulgarie
Mr Jens-Oscar NERGARD – Norway / Norvège

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)

Apologised / excusée

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

Mr Jan KLEIJSEN, Director, Information Society and Action against Crime Directorate / Directeur, Direction de la Société de
l'Information et de la lutte contre la criminalité

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 / Adjoint au Secrétaire Exécutif

M. Christophe SPECKBACHER

Ms Laura SANZ-LEVIA

Ms Sophie MEUDAL-LEENDERS

Mr Michael JANSSEN

Ms Liubov SAMOKHINA

Mme Louise RIONDEL, Assistant Lawyer / Juriste-Assistante

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 Human Rights and Rule of Law / *Direction générale Droits de l'Homme et État de Droit*

Mme Marie-Rose PREVOST, GRECO

Interpreters / *Interprètes*

Mme Sally BAILEY-RAVET (8-9/12)

Mme Corinne McGEORGE

Mr Christopher TYCZKA (11-12/12)

Mme Isabelle MARCHINI

APPENDIX II
AGENDA

1.	Opening of the meeting	9.30 am	Ouverture de la réunion	09h30
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 Report - Fourth Round Lithuania Monday Malta Tuesday		Première lecture Rapport d'Evaluation - Quatrième Cycle Lituanie Lundi Malte Mardi	
6.	Adoption Compliance Reports - Fourth Round Poland Slovenia United Kingdom		Adoption Rapports de Conformité - Quatrième Cycle Pologne Slovénie Royaume-Uni	
7.	Adoption 2 nd Compliance Report – Third Round Armenia Montenegro Romania		Adoption 2 ^e Rapport de Conformité - Troisième Cycle Arménie Monténégro Roumanie	
8.	Adoption Addendum to the 2 nd Compliance Report - Third Round Netherlands		Adoption Addendum au 2 ^e Rapport de Conformité - Troisième Cycle Pays-Bas	
9.	Adoption <i>Interim</i> Compliance Report - Third Round Czech Republic France Sweden Turkey		Adoption Rapport de Conformité <i>interim</i> aire - Troisième Cycle République Tchèque France Suède Turquie	
10.	Fifth Evaluation Round Open discussion on: - proposals for the thematic scope - methodological and procedural issues Wednesday		Cinquième Cycle d'Evaluation Discussion ouverte sur : - propositions relatives à la portée thématique - questions de méthodologie et de procédure Mercredi	
11.	Composition of evaluation teams Third Round evaluations: Belarus, Liechtenstein, San Marino (Bureau 70 proposals for approval)		Composition d'équipes d'évaluation Evaluations du Troisième Cycle : Bélarus, Liechtenstein, Saint-Marin (propositions du Bureau 70 pour approbation)	
12.	Selection of rapporteur countries Fourth Round Compliance Procedures: Albania, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, France, Norway, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (Bureau 70 proposals for approval)		Sélection des pays rapporteurs Procédures de conformité du Quatrième Cycle : Albanie, Belgique, Croatie, Danemark, France, Norvège, République Slovaque, Espagne, Suède, « l'ex-République yougoslave de Macédoine » (propositions du Bureau 70 pour approbation)	

13.	Exchange of views Robert SATTLER, Director, General Secretariat of the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) Postponed	Echange de vues Robert SATTLER, Directeur, Secrétariat général de l'Organisation Internationale des Institutions Supérieures de Contrôle des Finances Publiques (INTOSAI) Reporté
14.	Presentation Jens-Oscar NERGÅRD and N.N. GRECO's recommendations on political party funding – the Norwegian experience Wednesday	Présentation Jens-Oscar NERGÅRD et N.N. Les recommandations du GRECO sur le financement des partis politiques – l'expérience norvégienne Mercredi
15.	Programme of Activities 2015 Adoption (draft approved by Bureau 70)	Programme d'activités 2015 Adoption (projet approuvé par le Bureau 70)
16.	Second reading and adoption Evaluation Reports - Fourth Round Lithuania Malta Friday	Deuxième lecture et adoption Rapports d'évaluation - Quatrième Cycle Lituanie Malte Vendredi
17.	Miscellaneous	Divers
18.	Adoption of decisions	Adoption des décisions
19.	Dates of next meetings	Dates des prochaines réunions
20.	Close of the meeting Friday, <u>1 pm</u>	Fin de la réunion Vendredi, <u>13h00</u>

APPENDIX III

Statement by Marin Mrčela, President of GRECO on the occasion of International Anti-corruption Day, 9 December 2014

Rarely a day goes by without a corruption scandal hitting the headlines in one of our 49 member states. Ordinary citizens of both our old and no longer so young democracies often face corruption in their daily lives, falling victim to graft and abuse of position in their contacts with public services, including health and education professionals and even judges and prosecutors.

At the same time, institutions set up to fight corruption frequently face a lack of resources, legal obstacles to doing their work properly, or even political interference when dealing with high-profile cases.

When the politicians we turn to for leadership pay only lip-service to fighting corruption, notably in their own ranks, democracy falters.

Some might think this is too sharp a claim, but it is not. The results of GRECO's evaluations show that we have good reason to ring the alarm bells. What our current country evaluations teach us is that boosting the integrity of MPs (and also of judges and prosecutors) is a must.

Of course, some of our member states don't have a problem in these sectors nor with overall governance, and I am happy to say that the work of the 49 countries in GRECO has more often than not had significant impact in these areas. That said, one cannot turn a blind eye to the fact that in several member states of GRECO, as well as in numerous other parts of the world, people have taken to the street to protest vehemently against corruption and bad governance. All too frequently, political parties score low on widely publicised measures of public trust and are considered "a rotten lot".

Citizens will certainly continue to denounce corruption, trading in influence and other deplorable practices of those who are meant to responsibly manage public and civil affairs and to promote and protect the common good.

The anti-corruption community must underscore more assertively the need for stronger political will to bring about lasting progress. Promises of morality and ethics are not enough. The 9th of December is a good opportunity to remind ourselves of this basic truth.

APPENDIX IV

Corruption in Sport – Resolution No. 1 adopted by the 13th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Sport (Magglingen, Switzerland, 18 September 2014)

The Ministers responsible for Sport, meeting in Macolin/Magglingen, Switzerland, for the 13th Council of Europe Conference on 18 September 2014:

- Considering that the aim of the Council of Europe is to achieve greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage, and of facilitating their economic and social progress;
- Recalling the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption (1999, ETS No. 173), the Civil Law Convention on Corruption (1999, ETS No 174) and the Additional Protocol to the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption (2003, CETS No 191);
- Having regard to its Recommendations Rec(92)13rev on the European Sports Charter; Rec(92)14rev on the Code of Sports Ethics and Rec(2005)8 on the Principles of Good Governance in Sport;
- Recalling the 11th Conference of Ministers responsible for Sport in Athens in 2008, which identified corruption as a new challenge to sport; the conference was followed by the decision made on match-fixing, the new convention, and the decision to handle other types of corruption following the work on the Convention;
- Having noted the work and conclusions of the 12th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Sport, held in Belgrade on 15 March 2012, in particular in the areas of match-fixing, corruption and illegal betting;
- Acknowledging that manipulation of sports competitions is a threat to sport which may involve corrupt practices;
- Acknowledging that, as addressed by the Convention, there are other areas of sport activities that may be endangered by corrupt practices;
- Considering the Recommendation CM/Rec(2005)8 of the Committee of Ministers to member States on the principles of good governance in sport, which stresses their belief that the consistent application of the principles of good governance in sport would be a significant factor in helping to eradicate corruption and other malpractices in sport;
- Considering the Resolution 1875 (2012) of the Parliamentary Assembly on good governance and ethics in sport;
- Acknowledging that, as a general rule, the sports movement is responsible for sport but that public authorities co-operate with the sports movement, in order to promote the values and benefits of sport;
- Convinced that the successful implementation by sports organisations of effective good governance policies, including codes of ethics and respect for international standards, would help to strengthen their self-regulation in matters relating to sport and would further consolidate their position with respect to public authorities on the basis of mutual respect and trust;
- Acknowledging that improvement in the democratic processes is important relating to the conditions for acquiring and keeping the autonomy of sport;
- Convinced that financial transparency and robust accounting is necessary within sports organisations, in order to comply with their democratic structures and the support they receive from tax-payers;
- Reaffirming that the nature of sport itself, based on fair-play and equal competition, requires that unethical practices and behaviours in sport be forcefully and effectively countered;
- Stressing their belief that the consistent application of the principles of good governance and ethics in sport would be a significant factor in helping to eradicate corruption, bribery, manipulation of sports results (match-fixing) and other malpractices in sport, and that such improvements would also make sports organisations more efficient in delivering their goals;
- Recalling the commitment by Ministers for Sport to comply with high ethical standards;

On the Convention on the manipulation of sports competitions

- Urge States all over the world to sign and ratify it;
- Recommend the Council of Europe to seek partnerships with international organisations and international NGOs to promote signing of the Convention against the manipulation of sports competitions by non-European States;
- Express appreciation for the strong involvement and support demonstrated by the sports movement and by the sports betting operators in the course of the preparation of this convention, and express the hope that the same level of support and involvement will be demonstrated for the setting-up and the implementation of the Convention;

On the issue of corruption in the governance of sport

- Express appreciation and support for the processes initiated by international sports organisations on the promotion of good governance in sport;
- Invite the governments of States Parties to the European Cultural Convention to check whether their national laws allow them to fight effectively corruption in sport, and to support the implementation of good governance principles in sport, such as those mentioned in Recommendation CM/Rec(2005)8 of the Committee of Ministers to member States, including through educational measures;
- Urge both public authorities and sports organisations to commit themselves and to execute a zero tolerance policy regarding corruption in sport;
- Commit themselves to dialogue and co-operation with their national sports movement to address these issues;
- Invite International sports organisations to include good governance frameworks and preventative measures against corruption as well as the requirement of complying with international standards in the terms of reference for host cities and countries bidding for or organising major sports events;
- Invite EPAS to:
 - Draw the attention of GRECO and CDPC, as well as member States, to possible loopholes in the existing anti-corruption laws and mechanisms with a view to rendering the prevention and fight against corrupt practices in sport more effective;
 - liaise with GRECO in connection with a possible review of the anti-corruption standards pertaining to good governance in sport at regional and international levels;
 - Seek co-operation with anti-corruption experts to support the implementation of the UNODC handbook through co-operation activities;
 - Offer its support to the possible organisation of an international conference on all forms of corruption in sport, involving governmental authorities and the sports movement;
 - Exchange good practices in how governments can audit subsidies without interfering unnecessarily with the autonomy of sport organisations;
 - Promote and support the development of guidelines on good governance at European level between the sports movement, the governments and specialists;
 - Collect and disseminate information on the measures taken by States at national level to promote good governance – and to fight corruption – in sport;
 - Set up a framework for discussion between governments and the sports movement on how to achieve more financially, socially and environmentally sustainable sporting events with a true legacy.