



Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

Distr.: General
2 October 2023

Original: English

Report on the meeting of the Working Group on International Cooperation held in Vienna on 11 and 12 September 2023

I. Introduction

1. In its decision 2/2, the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime decided to establish an open-ended working group to hold substantive discussions on practical issues pertaining to extradition, mutual legal assistance and international cooperation for the purpose of confiscation. In its decision 3/2, the Conference decided that an open-ended working group on international cooperation would be a constant element of the Conference.

2. Since its first meeting, convened during the third session of the Conference of the Parties, which was held in Vienna from 9 to 18 October 2006, the Working Group on International Cooperation has been the subsidiary body of the Conference used as a forum for holding substantive discussions on practical issues pertaining to the effective implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime on international cooperation in criminal matters, including extradition, mutual legal assistance and international cooperation for the purpose of confiscation.

3. The procedures and rules for the functioning of the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto, which are annexed to resolution 9/1 establishing the Mechanism, envisage a significant role for the working groups of the Conference, including the Working Group on International Cooperation, in the Mechanism. According to paragraph 12 of the procedures and rules, the Conference and its working groups are to add matters pertaining to the review process to their agendas as an item consistent with their areas of expertise and without prejudice to their respective existing mandates. In addition, in order to ensure that the working groups are able to contribute to the Mechanism while also carrying out their respective existing mandates, each working group should dedicate no more than one agenda item per session to matters pertaining to the functioning of the review process. In May 2022, at its thirteenth meeting, the Working Group on International Cooperation included, for the first time, an agenda item on the Mechanism. During that meeting, the secretariat briefed the participants on the status and progress of the reviews, and States parties had the opportunity to deliberate on their participation in the Mechanism and on general developments in that regard.



II. Recommendations

4. The Working Group on International Cooperation adopted the following recommendations for endorsement by the Conference:

Practical implementation of article 27 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (law enforcement cooperation)

(a) States parties are urged to make use of the Organized Crime Convention, as well as applicable bilateral and multilateral agreements or arrangements, as a basis for law enforcement cooperation in relation to offences covered by the Convention and the Protocols thereto;

(b) States parties are encouraged to foster law enforcement cooperation, consistent with their respective domestic laws, regulations, administrative systems and applicable international instruments, by making effective and appropriate use of tools such as information-sharing, the establishment of joint investigative bodies and the use of special investigative techniques, including controlled deliveries, in the investigation of offences covered by the Organized Crime Convention and the Protocols thereto, and to further strengthen mechanisms for information exchange among their bodies for financial monitoring, follow-up and investigation, such as financial intelligence units;

(c) States parties are strongly encouraged to build their required capacity, including by training their law enforcement officers and other practitioners engaged in law enforcement cooperation, especially with regard to cooperation relating to proceeds of crime, and to invite UNODC, subject to the availability of resources, to develop and implement technical assistance and capacity-building activities in this area. States parties are also invited to make voluntary contributions to support developing countries in this regard;

(d) States parties are encouraged to build mutual trust, understanding and confidence by utilizing international forums, practitioners' meetings and relevant conferences to exchange experiences, expertise, best practices and lessons learned in the area of law enforcement cooperation, in particular those relating to the implementation of article 27 of the Organized Crime Convention;

(e) States parties are encouraged, subject to the availability of resources, to support the acquisition and safe and appropriate use of modern equipment to enhance the efficiency of law enforcement cooperation to combat organized crime and provide, upon request, technical assistance and capacity-building in those areas to requesting States;

(f) States parties are encouraged to examine their domestic legislation to determine whether improvements can be made in terms of taking any necessary steps to provide the widest measure of effective international cooperation between law enforcement authorities and strengthen the fight against transnational organized crime, in accordance with the Organized Crime Convention and the Protocols thereto;

(g) States parties are encouraged to consider, consistent with their respective domestic legal and administrative systems, identifying and supporting practical ways to facilitate international cooperation, including, subject to bilateral agreements or arrangements between States parties concerned, by posting liaison officers, such as police officers, prosecutors or magistrates, who could assist in fostering mutual trust and confidence between the States concerned for the purpose of law enforcement cooperation and mutual legal assistance;

(h) States parties are encouraged to work with regional mechanisms to build on good practices on data exchange for the purpose of international cooperation and to expeditiously apply integrated systems in regions to promote more efficient international cooperation;

(i) States parties are encouraged to strengthen and participate in regional and subregional structures and networks to promote law enforcement cooperation;

(j) States parties are encouraged to consider using the I-24/7 global police secure communications system of the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) to exchange criminal data and intelligence in a timely and secure manner, to further their use of INTERPOL databases, notices and diffusions with a view to fostering information exchange among law enforcement authorities globally, and to extend, where applicable, real-time access to I-24/7 from the National Central Bureaux to relevant national authorities;

(k) States parties are encouraged to support, in accordance with domestic laws, the work of cooperation networks as a means of promoting the exchange of information for intelligence purposes prior to the use of formal cooperation;

Lessons learned from the implementation of the international cooperation provisions of the Organized Crime Convention 20 years after its entry into force and in light of anticipated work under the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto: the indicative example of establishing dual criminality for extradition and mutual legal assistance purposes

(l) States parties that have not yet done so are called upon to nominate national focal points for the purposes of the Implementation Review Mechanism in a timely manner and to consider the best ways to maintain and improve efficient and sustained dialogue among focal points engaged in a specific review;

(m) The secretariat is requested to support focal points from States parties to the Organized Crime Convention in consulting on their responses to the provisions reviewed under the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption that are relevant or similar to those provisions reviewed under the Implementation Review Mechanism for the Organized Crime Convention;

(n) States parties are encouraged to make voluntary contributions to UNODC in order to ensure that the secretariat has resources to effectively support the functioning of the Mechanism;

(o) States parties are encouraged to share their technical assistance needs related to the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention and also share the progress made in their country reviews. In this regard, the secretariat was requested to collect and share information on such technical assistance needs and to inform the subsidiary bodies of the Conference of the Parties to the Organized Crime Convention;

(p) In matters of international cooperation, whenever dual criminality is considered a requirement, States parties are encouraged to take measures domestically to ensure compliance with that requirement as it is understood in the Convention, namely, with the focus on the underlying conduct and not the legal denomination or terminology of the offence in question;

(q) States parties are encouraged to ensure that information obtained through the use of informal international cooperation channels is subject to applicable procedural safeguards, including, as appropriate, the transmission of evidence through international mutual legal assistance requests in criminal matters before being admitted in judicial proceedings as evidence.

III. Summary of deliberations

5. The following summary of deliberations was prepared by the secretariat after the meeting, in close coordination with the Chair. The following is a summary by the

Chair of the deliberations of the meeting and was not subject to negotiation or adoption during the meeting.

A. Practical implementation of article 27 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (law enforcement cooperation)

6. At its 1st and 2nd meetings, on 11 September 2023, the Working Group on International Cooperation considered agenda item 2, entitled “Practical implementation of article 27 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (law enforcement cooperation)”.

7. With the Chair presiding, the discussion under agenda item 2 was facilitated by the following panellists: Elisante Gadiel Masaki, Senior State Attorney (United Republic of Tanzania); Udo Stattmann, Criminal Intelligence Service and Fugitive Active Search Team, Federal Ministry of the Interior (Austria); and Walter Augusto Vega, Deputy Commissioner, Federal Investigation Division of Fugitives and Extraditions, National Central Bureau of INTERPOL (Argentina).

8. The panellist from the United Republic of Tanzania elaborated on his country’s implementation of article 27 of the Organized Crime Convention. In that regard, he underlined the establishment of channels of communication with other States parties through INTERPOL and the African Police Cooperation Organization (AFRIPOL) for the purposes of exchanging intelligence and the exchange of information on transnational organized crime. The panellist underlined that these mechanisms allowed for timely information-sharing and an increased number of joint interventions to combat transnational organized crime. The panellist referred to the recent amendments to the domestic legal framework in the areas of both extradition and mutual legal assistance. In that connection, he underlined a recent amendment allowing direct communication between central authorities, obviating the need to resort to diplomatic channels. The panellist also noted that information-sharing had been extended to include information obtained through cooperation between law enforcement authorities on the location of suspects, *modi operandi* used to commit criminal activities, as well as joint operations, thus facilitating the identification of offences covered by the Organized Crime Convention and the collection of evidence or the surrender of fugitives through the respective forms of international cooperation. In addition, the panellist reported on the establishment of mechanisms to allow for law enforcement cooperation in identifying, tracing, managing and confiscating proceeds of crime, as well as the development of national inter-agency guidelines for coordination, cooperation and collaboration on the investigation and prosecution of offences related to money-laundering. The panellist concluded with a reflection on how those guidelines had served to facilitate effective cooperation between law enforcement authorities and other competent authorities involved in the exchange of information.

9. The panellist from Austria reported on the role of the Fugitive Active Search Team within the Federal Ministry of the Interior as the single point of contact for various networks, including INTERPOL and the European Network of Fugitive Active Search Teams (ENFAST). He also elaborated on the channels used for cooperation, such as ENFAST, and referred to the preconditions for arrest and the importance of ensuring timely operational cooperation amid the risk of fugitives escaping. The panellist shed light on the main tasks of the Fugitive Active Search Team, including the identification and arrest of suspects and convicted perpetrators who are on the run and whose place of residence is unknown to authorities. In that regard, the panellist mentioned the diversity of entities that may become engaged in an active search, including police liaison offices, law enforcement agencies, ministries of foreign affairs, ministries of justice, and inter-governmental organizations such as the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation (Eurojust), the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (Europol)

and INTERPOL. The panellist elaborated on the preconditions for international active searches. In that regard, he underlined the need, as appropriate in each specific case, for either an international arrest warrant (i.e. a European arrest warrant, INTERPOL Red Notice or INTERPOL diffusion request), an extradition or mutual legal assistance request, a European Investigation Order or a deportation order with a guarantee that the human rights of the person concerned would be fully protected. He also referred to the importance of direct police cooperation on information exchange, immediate action in high-profile fugitive searches, rapid cooperation between competent judicial authorities and the swift implementation of arrest warrants.

10. The panellist from Argentina shared the experience of his country in the exchange of information at the regional level in Latin America through INTERPOL channels and noted that the practice had had a positive impact on cooperation among law enforcement authorities, which had also, in the case of Argentina, extended to other countries in Africa, Europe and the Middle East. The panellist also referred to the use of INTERPOL Red Notices to facilitate the provisional arrest of fugitives in advance of extradition proceedings. The panellist reported on successful cases of extradition, as well as joint operations with law enforcement authorities in other countries leading to the arrest of members of an organized criminal group. In addition, the panellist underscored that on more than one occasion, his country had worked collaboratively with other countries with which it had no bilateral treaties on extradition, on the basis of the provisions of the Organized Crime Convention and the principle of reciprocity.

11. In the ensuing dialogue, several speakers reported on cases of law enforcement cooperation between their countries and other States, including cases in which use had been made of special investigative techniques such as electronic surveillance and controlled deliveries, as well as joint investigations.

12. Reference was made to police-to-police cooperation as a non-mandatory and voluntary form of cooperation, as opposed to formal forms of cooperation such as mutual legal assistance and extradition. In that regard, several speakers underlined the importance of fostering mutual trust and confidence among States, including by participating in international forums such as the Working Group on International Cooperation, as well as by relying on existing INTERPOL channels such as the national central bureaux, which had proved successful in enabling cooperation between countries that, for example, lacked or did not maintain diplomatic representations in each other's country.

13. Some speakers highlighted the interplay between formal and informal cooperation in criminal matters to identify the structure of organized criminal groups, carry out mapping and predict criminal trends. They emphasized that informal cooperation focusing on the sharing of information should be engaged in with mutual trust and reciprocity, taking into account the need to ensure the confidentiality of the information shared.

14. Some speakers pointed out opportunities arising from the use of informal cooperation. For instance, reference was made to the importance of using informal channels of communication in urgent cases and prior to the submission of formal requests for mutual legal assistance; the electronic transmission of requests for international cooperation; the use of joint investigation teams bringing together law enforcement officers from different countries; and the added value of the Organized Crime Convention as a legal basis for cooperation, as well as the conclusion of more bilateral agreements for the same purpose. The importance of cooperation and communication through INTERPOL and the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units, among others, was stressed. Speakers concluded that informal cooperation should not be seen as a replacement for formal cooperation, but rather as a complement to it.

15. Some speakers referred to the important role of INTERPOL, especially when it came to the investigation of highly volatile crime types, such as cybercrime. They also referred to the challenges involved in accessing and preserving electronic

evidence for law enforcement purposes. Reference was made to the use of I-24/7 to facilitate the exchange of criminal data and intelligence between member countries of INTERPOL in a timely and secure manner.

16. Challenges and opportunities arising from the use of informal communication channels were discussed, such as how information communicated on an informal basis, including electronic evidence obtained primarily from informal channels, could be further used and become admissible as evidence in subsequent criminal proceedings.

17. Several speakers referred to systemic challenges or legislative differences that might represent obstacles to police-to-police cooperation and to the implementation of article 27 of the Organized Crime Convention. They highlighted the importance of identifying the right person or authority for cooperation, as well as the need to rely on police-to-police cooperation as much as possible, and in combination with formal channels of cooperation where necessary.

18. Several speakers elaborated on the necessity of cooperation mechanisms between law enforcement agencies and communications service providers. In that regard, they underlined the need for those mechanisms to be fully effective across different legal systems and to operate in a manner that did not contravene national laws. Examples were provided of difficulties encountered in obtaining cooperation from communications service providers and reference was made to informal channels that might facilitate such cooperation.

19. Some speakers mentioned the key role of technology and the necessity of gaining a better understanding of the fundamental dualism that is inherent in the impact and role of technology in finding solutions to policing, prosecutions and successful criminal justice outcomes on the one hand, and in enhancing the modus operandi of criminals and organized criminal groups on the other. The misuse of technology by criminals and the need to counter this at the national and international levels by harmonizing legislation and establishing mechanisms for agile cooperation were emphasized. The importance of building the capacity of law enforcement authorities to address the criminal misuse of technologies, in particular in their fight against cybercrime, was also highlighted. In that connection, several speakers suggested ways to enhance the efficiency of law enforcement cooperation to combat organized crime, ranging from the transfer of relevant technology from the private sector to the acquisition and safe and appropriate use of modern equipment, with one speaker arguing in favour of the safe and appropriate acquisition of such equipment already at the procurement stage. Specific reference was also made by many speakers to the need to enhance technical assistance and capacity-building for law enforcement officers, judges and prosecutors.

20. A number of speakers underlined the importance of establishing subregional structures and centres to promote law enforcement cooperation and the exchange of information.

21. One speaker reported on the work of the International Cooperation Network in Criminal Matters (REDCOOP) of the Ibero-American Association of Public Prosecutors, which functioned as a forum in which experts in international cooperation in criminal matters from public prosecutor's offices of countries in Latin America and Europe (Andorra, Portugal and Spain) could discuss and analyse the various practices, tools and legal instruments used, as well as problems and challenges encountered, when requesting or receiving requests for international cooperation. Since its establishment in 2016, the Network – which was recently transformed into a specialized network – had been coordinated by the Public Prosecution Service of Chile through its Specialized Unit on International Cooperation and Extradition.

22. The same speaker referred to a guide on extradition prepared by the above-mentioned Network to support prosecutors and officials in the region involved in extradition proceedings. He also referred to the progress made in the region in the area of joint investigations, which was also thanks to the work and initiatives of the

Network (e.g. the development of an explanatory guide on steps or stages that should be followed in the creation of joint investigative teams; the development of a model operating agreement that had been used in several cases in recent years; and the creation of a committee of experts on joint investigative teams to advise and support prosecutor's offices in the region and other networks in the use of such teams as a tool of international cooperation).

23. The speaker also highlighted the work of the above-mentioned Network on inter-institutional cooperation among prosecutors from different countries in the Ibero-American region that did not hold the status of central authorities. In that regard, reference was made to an inter-institutional cooperation agreement that was opened for signature in 2018 and had been signed by 19 public prosecutor's offices to date. The agreement is complemented by a user guide and is not intended to replace formal cooperation between central authorities, but rather to prepare for and complement it.

24. The same speaker referred to training programmes for prosecutors and officials involved in international cooperation in Latin America on issues such as inter-institutional cooperation, asset recovery, obtaining electronic evidence from abroad and the spontaneous transmission of information. The links and cooperation of the aforementioned Network with other organizations and networks were highlighted, together with its position that the role of central authority responsible for mutual legal assistance should be exercised by public prosecutor's offices rather than other State agencies.

25. A number of speakers underlined that States parties should have the discretion to decide where and, more specifically, within which agency to place the central authority designated to deal with mutual legal assistance requests. One speaker also highlighted the need to respect the organization and structure of national criminal justice systems.

26. One speaker noted that the recommendations of the Working Group on International Cooperation need not include so many caveats such as "in accordance with domestic law", because police-to-police information-sharing was always voluntary and must always be done in accordance with domestic laws and procedures.

27. One speaker encouraged States parties that had not yet done so, including States that were not members of the Ibero-American community, to ratify the Treaty on the Electronic Transmission of Requests for International Legal and Judicial Cooperation between Central Authorities, also known as the Treaty of Medellín, of the Conference of Ministers of Justice of Ibero-American Countries, with a view to speeding up legal cooperation and avoiding impunity.

28. The Working Group on International Cooperation noted the work of the Ibero-American Network for International Legal Cooperation, which would celebrate its twentieth anniversary in 2024 and which brought together members of ministries of justice, public prosecutors and representatives of the judiciary from 22 countries in the Ibero-American community. The Working Group was also informed about the signing of an agreement between the Ibero-American Network and Eurojust that constituted an implementing arrangement for the memorandum of understanding between the two parties and would improve the exchange of information and communication between judicial authorities in Latin America and Eurojust through broader access to the Iber@ Secure Communication System.

B. Lessons learned from the implementation of the international cooperation provisions of the Organized Crime Convention 20 years after its entry into force and in light of anticipated work under the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto: the indicative example of establishing dual criminality for extradition and mutual legal assistance purposes

29. At its 2nd meeting, on 11 September 2023, the Working Group on International Cooperation considered agenda item 3, entitled “Lessons learned from the implementation of the international cooperation provisions of the Organized Crime Convention 20 years after its entry into force and in light of anticipated work under the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto: the indicative example of establishing dual criminality for extradition and mutual legal assistance purposes”.

30. Under the agenda item, the secretariat made a presentation on the progress and status of the Implementation Review Mechanism and on some of the challenges identified during the review process.

31. In response to the presentation, which highlighted the delays in completing country reviews under cluster 1 and the requirement to complete 70 per cent of the reviews to advance to the review of the provisions under the next cluster, in line with paragraph 10 of the procedures and rules for the functioning of the Implementation Review Mechanism, the secretariat was invited to continue monitoring the issue and report on it at the next meeting of the Working Group on International Cooperation.

32. One speaker expressed concern about the delays in the advancement of country reviews and suggested exploring solutions for enhanced communication between the nominated focal points, including through in-person meetings, as a way to further proceed with the reviews.

33. A number of speakers highlighted the necessity of addressing the technical assistance needs expressed by some parties, in particular in relation to the completion of the self-assessment questionnaire and the overview of procedures for reviewing the implementation of the Convention. In that regard, the secretariat reminded States parties to use the current technical assistance needs survey available on the online platform “RevMod”.

34. One speaker invited the secretariat to support parties with their cross-referencing of the relevant sections of the self-assessment checklist on the implementation of the Convention against Corruption.

35. To foster the exchange of good practices and information, several speakers expressed support for the implementation of paragraph 40 of the procedures and rules for the functioning of the Implementation Review Mechanism regarding the sharing of responses to the self-assessment questionnaire on the “RevMod” platform. One speaker also suggested renewing the invitation for Governments to make public their submitted questionnaires in line with paragraph 41 of the procedures and rules.

36. A number of speakers underscored the need to support the Implementation Review Mechanism with adequate resources through extrabudgetary and voluntary contributions to ensure its efficient operation and the effective participation of all States parties. In that regard, the Secretariat provided a brief overview of the voluntary contributions received by the Global Programme to Support the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto.

37. One speaker shared his country's experience in setting up an agency with subcommittees to examine and oversee the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention and the Protocols thereto.

38. With the Chair presiding, the discussion under agenda item 3 was further facilitated by the following two panellists: Nicolás Murgueitio Sicard, Director of International Affairs, Ministry of Justice and Law (Colombia); and Mariela Bondar, Coordinator of International Cooperation in Criminal Matters, Directorate of International Legal Assistance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship (Argentina).

39. The panellist from Colombia explained the different stages and institutions (whether judicial or administrative) involved in domestic extradition proceedings, both in relation to incoming and outgoing extradition requests. He also referred to the use of the Organized Crime Convention and the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988 as legal bases in extradition cases. He noted the increased number of extradition cases, mainly in connection with drug trafficking and money-laundering, and referred to the importance of bilateral treaties in the area of judicial cooperation in criminal matters.

40. The panellist from Argentina delivered a presentation on how Argentina had implemented the provisions of the Organized Crime Convention on mutual legal assistance and extradition, describing the applicable national legal framework in the areas of extradition and mutual legal assistance and the institutional role of the authorities involved. She emphasized the need to build commitment and relations of confidence and trust among practitioners to ensure efficiency in international cooperation. She also devoted particular attention to the application of the dual criminality requirement in cases of extradition and mutual legal assistance involving coercive measures, including the interpretation of the requirement, which focuses on the underlying conduct and not the legal denomination or terminology of the offence in question. The panellist also reported on a recent case of trafficking in persons where no bilateral treaty existed and the Organized Crime Convention, in conjunction with its supplementary Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, were used as legal bases for an extradition request. In addition, she referred to a recently established subregional network of central authorities in Latin America.

41. In the ensuing dialogue, a number of speakers referred to the challenges arising from the application of the dual criminality requirement in both extradition and mutual legal assistance cases. One speaker mentioned the frequent failures to establish dual criminality when dealing with different legal systems and languages, while other speakers stressed the need to harmonize criminalization provisions. One speaker referred to the lack of information on how to identify the criminal conduct as a potential reason for the existence of problems relating to the fulfilment of the dual criminality requirement. It was mentioned, in that regard, that article 16, paragraph 16, of the Organized Crime Convention allowed for consultations before refusing extradition, which could offer an opportunity for the provision of the necessary clarifications. Numerous speakers stated that analysis of the existence of dual criminality should be based on the conduct of the criminal suspect, rather than on the name or categorization of the criminal activity, as is required under article 43, paragraph 2, of the Convention against Corruption. One speaker noted that it would make no sense to have one type of analysis under the Convention against Corruption and a different one under the Organized Crime Convention.

42. One speaker referred to common challenges relating to mutual legal assistance, including the confidentiality of the information to be transmitted. Another speaker referred to the ongoing reform of her country's extradition legislation.

43. One speaker urged the secretariat to consider inviting Financial Action Task Force-style regional bodies to participate in future meetings of the Working Group on International Cooperation with a view to further promoting the discussion on the implementation of pertinent provisions of the Organized Crime Convention. The

speaker also noted that States parties should be encouraged to bring to the attention of the Working Group the outcomes of mutual evaluation reports on the implementation of Financial Action Task Force recommendations 36–40.

C. Other matters

44. At its 3rd meeting, on 12 September 2023, under the agenda item “Other matters”, the Chair invited delegations to suggest topics for possible inclusion in the agendas of future meetings of the Working Group on International Cooperation, subject to further consultation between States parties and consideration and decision by the extended Bureau of the Conference of the Parties. The following topics were suggested:

- (a) The handling of multiple extradition requests for the same person;
- (b) The development of curricula for training practitioners on extradition and mutual legal assistance;
- (c) The electronic transmission of international cooperation requests;
- (d) The use of videoconferences, especially with regard to extradition;
- (e) The implementation of article 27, paragraph 1 (b), of the Organized Crime Convention, especially with regard to law enforcement cooperation concerning the movement of property or proceeds of crime derived from the commission of offences established in accordance with the Convention.

IV. Organization of the meeting

A. Duration of the meeting

45. The Working Group on International Cooperation met on 11 and 12 September 2023, holding a total of four meetings. As agreed by the extended Bureau by means of a silence procedure on 17 May 2023, the meetings were held in a hybrid format.

46. The meetings were chaired by Thomas Burrows (United States of America).

B. Statements

47. Under agenda item 2, statements were made by representatives of the following States parties to the Convention: Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, State of Palestine, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania and United States.

48. The observers for INTERPOL and the Ibero-American Association of Public Prosecutors also delivered statements.

49. A representative of the secretariat delivered a presentation under agenda item 2.

50. Under agenda item 3, statements were made by representatives of the following parties to the Convention: Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, State of Palestine, Trinidad and Tobago and United States.

51. A representative of the European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, and a representative of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), also made statements under agenda item 3.

52. A representative of the secretariat delivered a presentation under agenda item 3.

53. Under agenda item 4, statements were made by representatives of the following States parties: Argentina, Colombia, Egypt and United States.

54. Representatives of the secretariat delivered presentations under agenda item 4.

55. Under agenda item 5, statements were made by representatives of the following States parties: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, State of Palestine, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

56. A representative of the European Union and a representative of ECOWAS each made a statement under agenda item 5.

57. The observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran also made a statement under agenda item 5.

C. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

58. At its 1st meeting, on 11 September 2023, the Chair informed the Working Group on International Cooperation about the proposed organization of work for its meeting. In that context, it was noted that on 21 April 2023, the extended Bureau had approved by means of a silence procedure the conduct of business of future meetings of working groups of the Conference, including the fourteenth meeting of the Working Group on International Cooperation.

59. At its 1st meeting, the Working Group adopted by consensus the following agenda:

1. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Opening of the meeting;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
2. Practical implementation of article 27 of the United Nations Convention on Transnational Organized Crime (law enforcement cooperation).
3. Lessons learned from the implementation of the international cooperation provisions of the Organized Crime Convention 20 years after its entry into force and in light of anticipated work under the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto: the indicative example of establishing dual criminality for extradition and mutual legal assistance purposes.
4. Other matters.
5. Adoption of the report.

D. Attendance

60. The following States parties to the Convention were represented at the meeting, including online: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa,

Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

61. The European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, was represented at the meeting.

62. The Islamic Republic of Iran, a signatory State to the Convention, was represented by observers.

63. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers, including online: Ibero-American Association of Public Prosecutors, Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization, Conference of Ministers of Justice of Ibero-American Countries, East African Community, ECOWAS Secretariat, Egmont Group, Eurojust, Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, International Development Law Organization, Integrative Internal Security Governance Secretariat, INTERPOL and Organization of American States Meeting of National Authorities on Transnational Organized Crime.

64. A list of participants is contained in document [CTOC/COP/WG.3/2023/INF/1/Rev.1](#).

E. Documentation

65. The Working Group on International Cooperation had before it the following:

(a) Provisional agenda and annotations ([CTOC/COP/WG.3/2023/1](#));

(b) Background paper prepared by the Secretariat on the practical implementation of article 27 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (law enforcement cooperation) ([CTOC/COP/WG.3/2023/2](#));

(c) Background paper prepared by the Secretariat on the status of the functioning of the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto ([CTOC/COP/WG.3/2023/3](#)).

V. Adoption of the report

66. At its fourth meeting, on 12 September 2023, the Working Group on International Cooperation adopted chapters I, II, IV and V of the present report, on the understanding that the summary of deliberations was a summary by the Chair, to be prepared by the secretariat after the meeting in close coordination with the Chair, in accordance with the organization of work for the fourteenth meeting of the Working Group and as approved by the extended Bureau by means of a silence procedure on 21 April 2023.
