



Kimberley Process

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

KPCS PEER REVIEW SYSTEM

The KPCS Peer Review system was agreed at the Sun City Plenary meeting in October 2003 and revised at the Gaborone Plenary meeting in November 2006, as a result of the 3-year Review of the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme (KPCS). The Peer Review system consists essentially of the following components: annual reporting, review visits and review missions, and is governed by the provisions of this Administrative Decision.

I. Annual reporting

(a) In accordance with Section VI, paragraph 11 of the KPCS document, Participants are to prepare, and make available to other Participants through the Chair of the Kimberley Process, information on an annual basis on the way in which they are implementing the requirements of the KPCS. The information submitted should make particular reference to Sections II, III, IV and V of the KPCS document. Participants are also encouraged to provide information on the extent to which they are making use of the Recommendations set out in Annex II of the KPCS document and the complementary guidance on internal controls set out in the Administrative Decision on Internal Controls adopted at the Gaborone Plenary in November 2006.

The information submitted should follow the format set out in Annex I of the present Decision. The information should be prepared and submitted each year by 31 March, and should cover implementation of the KPCS during the preceding calendar year.

(b) The Chair should make the reports available to the Chair of the Working Group on Monitoring and, pursuant to the Administrative Decision on Procedures for Respecting Confidentiality (2010), publish such reports on the KP website unless otherwise requested by the Participant. The Working Group on Monitoring should review the reports submitted in a timely fashion and prepare a summary of its main findings for each Participant, to be submitted to Plenary through the Chair. The Working Group on Monitoring shall also draw in its assessments on the statistical data made available by Participants in accordance with the provisions of the KPCS, and shall cooperate closely to this end with the Working Group on Statistics. The Working Group on Monitoring may also draw on the information provided by Participants to the Participation Committee.

(c) Any Participant or Observer may communicate additional information regarding implementation of the KPCS by any Participant to the Chair of the Working Group on Monitoring, who should make this information available to the Participant concerned and invite a reply.

(d) Participants are encouraged to share information on implementation of the KPCS on an *ad hoc* basis between Annual Report, through the Chair and the Working Group on Monitoring.



II. Review visits

(a) In order to enhance the credibility of the KPCS, Plenary decided that it would be desirable for the largest number of Participants possible to volunteer to receive a review visit by the date of implementation of the review mechanism as stated in Section VI, paragraph 20 of the KPCS document. Further to the 3-year Review of the KPCS, Plenary agreed that the Peer Review system should be retained and its main elements should be maintained, so that the largest number of Participants would invite and receive further review visits.

(b) To this end, and in order to encourage follow-up and verification of progress based on issues identified in a first or previous review visit, Participants should invite and receive a subsequent review visit at the latest three years thereafter, except for cases identified in Annex II paragraph 3.c. Where the issues identified in a first or previous review visit are of such nature that, pursuant to the specific recommendation of the review visit team, they require particular attention, Participants are encouraged to invite and receive a subsequent review visit within one year thereafter. The Working Group on Monitoring Chair and Vice-Chair should remain engaged with Participants directly to ensure that these timelines are implemented.

(c) The schedule of review visits to the Participants who have volunteered to receive a review visit should be decided by Plenary (including by written procedure) upon a Recommendation through the Chair from the Working Group on Monitoring. Efforts should be made to reflect adequate geographical balance and adequate balance between Participants that are primarily engaged in production and Participants that are primarily engaged in trading or processing in drawing up the recommended schedule. Efforts should also be made to improve efficiency and to reduce costs, inter alia, by conducting regional reviews or using representatives from local diplomatic missions, where feasible, and provided that the requirements in Annex II paragraph 3.b are met.

(d) All review visits should be based on the standard terms of reference attached in Annex II of this Decision. Where appropriate, these may be supplemented by specific regional questions. In case of further review visits to a Participant, particular attention could however be devoted to issues identified in the first review visit.

(e) The composition of teams conducting review visits should be based on the principle of broad, consistent, expert participation.

(f) Participants are requested to report to the Working Group on Monitoring on any subsequent follow-up steps undertaken in relation to the issues identified by the review visit. This may be done through Annual Reporting or in separate communications.

III. Review missions

(a) At any time between Plenary meetings, and without prejudice to the provisions of Section VI, paragraph 13 of the KPCS document, the sending of a review mission to a Participant where there are credible indications of significant non-compliance



with the Certification Scheme, as provided in the KPCS, may be recommended to Plenary by written procedure by the Chair of the Kimberley Process on a recommendation from the Working Group on Monitoring.

(b) Review missions should normally be based on the standard terms of reference attached in Annex II, without prejudice to the provisions of Section VI, paragraph 14 of the KPCS document.

IV Expert Missions

In co-operation with the Participation Committee, expert missions could be organized on an *ad-hoc* basis, including to applicant countries.



Annex I

Guidelines for the Annual Report on the implementation of KPCS in accordance with Section VI, paragraph 11 of the KPCS document

Participants submitting an annual report for the first time (for example, Participants that have only recently joined the KPCS) are requested to follow **in full** these Guidelines. In other cases, as indicated below, where there has been no change in the response, Participants may refer to previous annual reports.

A. Institutional Framework

In this section, up-to-date information on the designated authorities or bodies responsible for implementing the provisions of the KPCS should be provided, in particular on:

1. The Authority with responsibility for the implementation of the KPCS, including the full address and the names of contact persons (in accordance with Section V (a)).
2. The Import and Export Authority, including the full address and the names of contact persons (in accordance with Section IV (b)).
3. The address for the website established by the KP authorities to facilitate domestic implementation.

Based on a Recommendation – reply is optional:

In addition, information might be provided on whether an official coordinator to deal with the implementation of the KPCS has been appointed, as suggested by Recommendation No. 1.

B. Legal Framework

In this Section, a confirmation of the legislation in place for the implementation of the KPCS should be provided, with particular reference to:

1. The laws and regulations enacted or amended for the implementation of the Kimberley Process (Section IV (d)), in particular the specific legislative or administrative provisions for
 - export and import of rough diamonds
 - issuance of certificates
 - internal controls
 - penalties introduced for individuals and companies contravening diamond laws and regulations
 - collection and exchange of official production, import and export data
2. Information on changes of legislation that have occurred since the last annual report, including the text of any new legislation adopted (if any).

If there have been no changes in the legal framework since the previous report,



Participants may wish to refer to the reply given in the previous report, and indicate clearly that there have been no changes. If there have been changes or additions to the legal framework since the period covered in the previous report, Participants should provide full information on the nature of these changes or additions.

Where appropriate, Participants are encouraged to provide information under this heading on the measures they have taken to give effect to recent Decisions with respect to the implementation of the KPCS (such as the Decision by the 33rd HS Committee of the WCO with regard to the change of the Explanatory Notes to HS Codes 7102.10, 7102.21 and 7102.31, the Administrative Decision on the Validity Period of KP Certificates, and Technical Guideline No 15), even if such measures have not affected the legal framework as such.

C. Import and Export Regime

In this section, an overview should be given of how the undertakings in the KPCS on the international trade in rough diamonds (Sections II and III) are implemented. The overview may also refer to the Recommendations set out for the Export and Import Process. It should also refer to the issuance and receipt of Kimberley Process certificates by a Participant. In particular, the following questions might be addressed:

Outgoing shipments

- What is the procedure for issuing KP certificates?
(Section II (b))
- Does the KP certificate fulfill the security features and requirements set out in Annex I of the KPCS document and as per the attached checklist?
(Section II (c))?
- What evidence does an exporter have to provide in order to prove that the rough diamonds being exported have been handled in accordance with the KP and are not conflict diamonds?
(Section IV (a) and Recommendation 18)?
- How many Kimberley Process certificates were issued? To which Participants were the KP certificates issued actually sent?

Based on Recommendations – reply is optional:

- *Are rough diamonds sealed in a tamper proof container together with the Certificate or a duly authenticated copy?*
(Recommendation 19)
- *Is the exporting authority sending advance notice of shipments by e-mail to the relevant Importing Authority containing information on the carat weight, value, country of origin or provenance, importer and the serial number of the Certificate?*
(Recommendation 19)



- *Does the Exporting Authority record all details of rough diamond shipments on a computerized database?
(Recommendation 20)*

Incoming shipments

- Describe the sequence of events for an incoming shipment from the physical entering of the shipment in your territory to the validation of the Certificate, with particular emphasis on the following questions
 - Is confirmation of receipt sent to the relevant Exporting Authority (Section III (b))?
 - How do you ensure that only rough diamonds with a Certificate (Section III (b)) and placed in tamper resistant containers (Section IV (c)) are imported?
 - Where are the originals of the Certificates kept accessible? (Section III (b))
 - How many Certificates were received? From which Participants were Certificates received?
 - Have there been cases of shipments which were not in conformity with the provisions of the KPCS? If so, how were these followed up by your authorities?

Based on Recommendations – reply is optional:

- *Are prior notifications of rough diamond shipments received by e-mail (Recommendation 21)?*
- *Do you verify that the seals and the container have not been tampered with and that the export was performed in accordance with the Scheme (Recommendation 22)?*
- *Do you check that the content of an incoming shipment matches the information declared on the certificate (Recommendation 23), e.g. by the use of diamond valuers and other expertise?*
- *Is the return slip or import confirmation coupon sent back to the relevant Exporting Authority?
(Recommendation 24)*

If there have been no changes in the import and export regime or other points in this heading since the previous report, Participants may refer to the previous replies and indicate clearly that there have been no changes.

All Participants should provide information on the numbers of KP certificates issued



and received in the year (clearly indicating the number of certificates issued or received per Participant), and on shipments which were not in conformity with the KPCS (if any).

D. System of internal controls and Industry Self-Regulation

(Based on Recommendations – reply is optional:)

In this section, a description of the internal system of controls designed to eliminate the presence of conflict diamonds from shipments of rough diamonds, as stipulated by Section IV (a), may be given. In drawing up this information, reference could, among other things, be made to the options and recommendations for internal controls as elaborated in Section IV and Annex II of the KPCS document and the Administrative Decision on Internal Controls, and in particular:

- *The existence and functioning of a voluntary system of industry self-regulation
(Section IV)*
- *Have the names of individuals or companies convicted of activities relevant to the purposes of the Certification Scheme been made known to all other Participants through the Chair?
(Recommendation 6)*
- *Licensing of diamond mines, miners, buyers, sellers and agents
(Recommendations 9, 11, 12, 13, 14)*
- *The existence of a computerized database of licensed diamond mines, miners, buyers and sellers
(Recommendation 16)*
- *The keeping of records of buying, selling and/or exporting transactions, listing the names of buying and selling clients, license numbers, volume and value of transactions
(Recommendation 15)*

If there have been no changes under this heading, Participants may refer to previous replies, and indicate clearly that there have been no changes. If there have been changes in implementation of any elements of internal controls or industry self-regulation since the period covered in the previous report, Participants may wish to provide full information on the nature of these changes.

E. Statistics

In this section, information supplementing the data already submitted to the Chair of the Working Group on Statistics in accordance with the provisions specified by Annex III of the KPCS may be submitted. This information might also refer to procedural and methodological questions. The statistical data submitted in accordance with Annex III are considered to be part of the annual report.



The statistical data submitted by Participants under the reporting obligations set out in the KPCS document, although formally considered part of the annual report, should continue to be submitted by Participants directly to the Chair of the Working Group on Statistics in accordance with the methodology endorsed by Plenary. Participants are therefore not required to submit statistical data with their annual reports.

Participants are however encouraged to indicate which statistical reports they have provided in the year covered by the annual report.

E. Implementation of recommendations of Kimberley Process Review Visits and/or Review Missions

In this section, steps undertaken to implement the recommendations made in the report of review visits and/or review missions may be recorded. Requests for technical assistance following review visits and the progress made in this regard may also be recorded in this section. Participants are encouraged to provide detailed information in this section.

Reporting on steps which go beyond the KPCS minimum requirements is encouraged, albeit optional.

Participants for which the Consolidated Report on the previous year's annual reports noted outstanding "issues to be followed up" are encouraged to provide the requested information in this section.

G. Infringements and Cooperation with Respect to Enforcement

In this section, information on infringements of the KPCS may be submitted as well as information on measures undertaken in this regard, such as number of seizures of rough diamonds shipments with details, as well as information on prosecution and outcome of specific cases. Participants are also encouraged to report on what steps they have taken to implement the cooperation measures related to enforcement outlined in the Administrative Decision on Cooperation on KP Implementation and Enforcement (2009).

H. Miscellaneous

In this section, experiences, observations, problems (and solutions) or additional information related to the implementation of the KPCS can be noted with a view to improving the overall functioning of the Scheme and to establish a "best practice" policy. Information on irregularities encountered or non-compliance with the KPCS by other Participants may also be supplied in this section.

Participants may also set out here, or in separate correspondence with the Chair, the Coordinator for technical assistance or with other Participants, any requests for technical assistance that they feel will enhance their implementation of the KPCS.



ANNEX to the Guidelines

Checklist of Minimum requirements for Certificates according to ANNEX I of the KPCS Document

Each Certificate bears the title "Kimberley Process Certificate" and the following statement: "The rough diamonds in this shipment have been handled in accordance with the provisions of the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme for rough diamonds"	
Country of origin for shipment of parcels of unmixed (i.e. from the same) origin	
Certificates issued in English or English translation is incorporated	
Tamper and forgery resistant	
Date of issue and expiry	
Issuing authority	
Identification of exporter and importer	
Carat weight/mass	
Value in US\$	
Number of parcels in shipment	
Relevant Harmonised Commodity Description and Coding System	



Annex II

Standard Terms of Reference for review missions and review visits conducted as part of peer review in the KPCS

1. Mandate of review missions and review visits

Review missions and review visits will seek to assess on the ground and in an analytical, expert and impartial manner a Participant's implementation of the KPCS, in consultation with the competent authorities of the Participant concerned. Specifically, each review mission or review visit should seek to:

(a) Establish whether the Participant under review has in place relevant laws or regulations, procedures and practices to implement the minimum requirements set out in the KPCS document, with particular reference to sections II, III, IV and V of the KPCS document.

(b) Establish whether the Participant has designated authorities or bodies to implement these requirements.

(c) Establish whether the requirements of the scheme are being met overall through the specific and systematic application by the designated authorities or bodies of those laws or regulations and procedures.

(d) Where appropriate, and with the agreement of the Participant concerned, Review missions and review visits should also seek to establish whether and to what extent implementation of the KPCS by the Participant includes making use of any of the Recommendations set out in Annex II of the KPCS document and the complementary guidance on internal controls set out in the Administrative Decision on Internal Controls adopted at the Gaborone Plenary. At the request of Participants, review visit and review mission teams should enter in a dialogue on the implementation of measures recommended with a view to improve the effectiveness of internal controls with a view to supporting the Participant's efforts through appropriate follow-up.

e) Identify areas where the Participant could benefit from technical assistance and/or training for the implementation of the KPCS.

f) This mandate may be supplemented in individual cases by more detailed indicators, according to the specific circumstances of the Participant under review, with the consent of the Participant concerned and in consultation with all Participants.

2. Co-operation with authorities of the Participant under review

a) Each review mission or review visit would expect to receive the full co-operation of the authorities of the Participant under review, subject to applicable domestic laws, regulations and policies. At the same time, the members of the peer review mission or review visit would be expected to carry out their work in an analytical, expert and impartial manner with the consent of the Participant concerned.



The authorities of the Participant under review should facilitate access by the review mission or review visit to governmental institutions and governmental organisations relevant to the implementation of the KPCS, and should be willing to solicit the cooperation of relevant industry and other non-governmental entities, consistent with domestic law, regulations and policy, and consistent with organizational rules and regulations.

b) Review missions and review visits will respect local law, regulations and policy on confidentiality of private companies or businesspersons, the privacy of individuals, and the confidentiality of law enforcement or judicial investigation, and any other sensitive information. No Participant would be expected to provide information to a review mission or review visit that is precluded by domestic laws, regulations or policy.

c) Applicable law, regulations and policy pertaining to commercial confidentiality will be observed in all aspects of a review mission's or review visit's activities.

d) Missions and visits should provide a draft itinerary well in advance of the visit to the Participant so that the Participant may consider the persons or facilities to be reviewed during the mission or visit.

3. Composition of Review Missions and Review Visits

a) Within one month of taking office and following consultations with Participants and Observers, the Chair, based on a Recommendation from the Working Group on Monitoring, will designate a sufficient number of persons that it can call upon to join review missions and review visits during its term of office. The Chair will make its selection from candidates submitted to him by Participants or their representatives. Such submissions will be accompanied by a curriculum vitae. In selecting these persons the Chair will ensure that the individuals selected possess the appropriate expertise and level of professionalism.

b) In addition to experts identified by the Chair through the procedure specified in a), participation in a review mission or review visit team should be open to any Participant, in particular to members of the Working Group on Monitoring, the Working Group on Statistics and the Working Group of Diamond Experts. Any candidate that wishes to be included in a review mission team should be able to demonstrate to the team leader technical knowledge of the KPCS and in particular of the KPCS minimum requirements.

c) As set out in the KPCS document, the size, composition and timeframe of each mission or visit would be based on the circumstances and be established by the Chair with the consent of the Participant concerned and in consultation with all Participants. Based on experience to date, a useful guide could be that review missions and review visits should generally number five members in total. Each mission or visit could include representatives of three Participants, as well as a representative of an Observer from civil society and an Observer from the private sector. Each review mission or review visit would be led by the representative of a



Participant appointed by the Chair of the Kimberley Process. The Chair would seek to ensure geographical balance and adequate balance between Participants that are primarily engaged in (i) production, (ii) trading and (iii) processing of rough diamonds in the composition of a review mission or review visit. The participation of experts from artisanal-alluvial producer Participants should be encouraged. Team members should disclose to the team leader and the Chair any potential conflict of interest in advance of any review visit or review mission. A review mission or review visit should not include among its members a national of the Participant to be reviewed.

Bearing in mind the anticipated complexity of the proposed review visit, and whether Participants have previously received a review visit, the timing, composition and duration of review visits may be handled with greater flexibility, depending on the consideration of, *inter alia*, the size of the Participant's trade and industry, whether the preceding visit identified substantial issues and whether major issues have since developed.

d) After consulting with the hosting Participant regarding the composition of the review mission or review visit, the Chair will convey the names and functions of the members of a review mission or review visit to the other Participants and Observers at least two weeks before the mission or visit is to commence its work.

4. Practical arrangements for review missions and review visits

a) Based on experience to date, review missions and review visits would generally be expected to last between 2 and 5 working days, taking into account the specific circumstances of the Participant under review and whether a review visit previously took place. The dates for the review mission or review visit should be determined by mutual consent between the leader of the review mission or review visit and the Participant concerned. Review visit and review mission teams should allocate sufficient time in their planning for timely reporting, in line with sections 5 and 6 below.

b) Members of the review mission or review visit would be expected to be responsible for their own travel and accommodation expenses as well as any medical expenses incurred.

c) The authorities of the Participant under review should ensure freedom of movement for members of the review mission or review visit and should take appropriate steps to protect their person and freedom where necessary.

d) The Participant under review would be expected to assist if possible, and where appropriate, with domestic travel arrangements that are required to accomplish the mandate of the mission or visit.

e) Where this is deemed necessary by at least one member of the review mission or visit, the Participant under review or the leader of the review mission or visit shall make arrangements for interpretation to be provided during the visit of the review mission or visit.



5. Reporting

a) The leader of the review mission or visit, in agreement with the other Participants represented on the mission or visit, should draw up a written draft report. This draft report should give an account of the activities of the mission or visit and set out its findings. In particular, it should give an overview of the implementation of the KPCS as indicated in paragraph 1 of these standard terms of reference for review missions and review visits.

b) The draft report should be submitted simultaneously to the Chair of the Kimberley Process and to the Participant under review at the latest one month after the review mission or review visit has concluded its work in the territory of the Participant under review. The Participant may ask to receive the report in one of its official languages, where that language is one of the languages used in the Plenary of the Kimberley Process.

6. Right of reply and mediation by the Chair

a) The Participant under review may convey in writing to the Chair any observations on the draft report at the latest one month after receiving it. The Chair should send the members of the review mission or review visit a copy of these observations.

b) The Chair may invite the relevant authorities of the Participant and the members of the review mission or review visit to discuss and clarify their assessments in order to correct any mistakes or misunderstandings that may have occurred in the preparation of the draft report.

c) If an agreement can be reached on corrections or additions to the draft report, this corrected version will then be circulated to Participants and Observers. Either the entire report, or parts thereof, or a summary of the main findings (see Annex III) of the report should be made available in the public area of the KP website by the Chair of the Kimberley Process, in accordance with the Administrative Decision on Procedures for Respecting Confidentiality (2010), and provided that the Participant concerned consents, and with a view to ensuring public transparency in line with KPCS data publication standards.

d) If no agreement can be reached the Chair should circulate both the report of the review mission or review visit and the observations of the Participant reviewed to the other Participants and Observers.

e) The Chair should inform Participants and Observers of the completion of review visit or review mission reports, with a link to the KP website.

7. Use of data and information gathered by review missions and review visits



- a) The Chair and the members of the review mission or review visit should refrain from disclosing to any person not participating in the review mission or visit any material gathered during the mission or visit, as well as any draft report or responses from Participants under review, until the report has been circulated by the Chair to the other Participants.
- b) In accordance with section VI, paragraph 15 of the KPCS document, and the Administrative Decision on Procedures for Respecting Confidentiality (2010), Participants and Observers shall refrain from disclosing the “KP only” contents of the report of the review mission or visit to any party which is not a Participant or Observer. The non-“KP only” contents of final reports are to be published on the public area of the KP website.
- c) The members of the review mission or review visit should at all times respect the confidentiality of additional information acquired during review missions and review visits and not mentioned in the report, and should not release any such information without the consent of the Participant involved.

8. Follow-up action

- a) The Participant under review should report in writing to the Working Group on Monitoring on steps undertaken to implement the recommendations made in the report of the review visit, within six months after the date when the report had been circulated by the Chair to the other Participants. The Participant under review is encouraged to provide detailed information on each issue identified by the report. This follow-up report may include requests for technical assistance and the progress made on issues that could have relevance to the KPCS minimum requirements.
- b) Where a review mission or review visit considers that its findings merit more extensive discussion or follow-up on the part of the Chair and Participants, the leader of the review mission or review visit should so inform the Chair of the Kimberley Process and the members of the Working Group on Monitoring. The Chair may recommend taking further action in accordance with the relevant provisions of section VI, paragraph 16 of the KPCS document.
- c) Where the review mission deems this necessary and appropriate, the Chair may recommend to Plenary the sending of a follow-up mission or review visit, which should be subject to the same modalities as the initial review mission or review visit.
- d) Leaders or designated team members of review visits and review missions should be tasked by the Working Group on Monitoring to verify the state of implementation and follow-up to review visit and review mission recommendations. The Working Group on Monitoring should maintain a register of reports and related follow-up.



ANNEX III

Suggested guidelines for summaries of review visit reports

1. Background

The standard terms of reference for review visits and review missions contained in Annex II of the Administrative Decision on the Implementation of Peer Review in the KPCS provide that, in addition to the report of a review visit being made available to all Participants and Observers, “a summary of the main findings of the report may also be made available publicly by the Chair of the Kimberley Process, with the consent of the Participant concerned.”

In order to ensure that such summaries are as informative and as consistent as possible, the Working Group on Monitoring believes that it would be useful for summaries to contain a number of standard elements. The present document is thus intended to provide (non-binding) guidance to review visit teams on such standard elements and on a possible standard structure for summaries.

2. Length and level of detail

As a general guide, a summary should not exceed two to three pages in length, although the precise length will depend on the circumstances of the review visit (including the number of recommendations). In keeping with the spirit of the Administrative Decision on Peer Review, it is recommended that a summary should focus on structural issues (such as the institutional framework, the legal framework and standard implementing practice in the Participant under review, as well as any capacity issues where these are identified), rather than on individual cases. Similarly, as a general rule, given that summaries are public documents, references to specific companies or individuals (where these are considered necessary) should be limited to the review visit report as such.

3. Suggested structure

As a general guide, a summary could include brief comments under some or all of the following headings:

Context of the visit

Under this heading, summary information should be provided on the background to the visit (invitation from the host authorities; visit carried out as part of the peer review system of the KP), as well as on the team (composition). Basic information could be provided on the programme (e.g. towns/regions visited, official institutions met).

Summary of main findings

Under this heading, a summary indication should be provided as to whether the Participant was found to be compliant with the minimum requirements of the Scheme. Where necessary, additional summary information should be provided on specific issues that need to be addressed, or findings that merit



being highlighted, focussing in particular on the following categories of issues:

- *Legal Framework*
- *Institutional Framework*
- *Production*
- *Import and Export Regime*
- *Internal Controls*
- *Industry Self-Regulation (if appropriate)*
- *Statistics*
- *Other Issues (if appropriate)*

Recommendations

The main Recommendations made by a review visit should be listed under this heading. It should be indicated whether particular Recommendations refer to binding minimum requirements of the KPCS, or whether they refer to Recommendations in the sense of Annex II to the KPCS document.

Best practices (if appropriate)

Under this heading, specific cases of best practices identified by the review visit could be highlighted.

Capacity-building / Technical assistance issues (if appropriate)

Under this heading, the review visit team could list any requests for technical assistance conveyed by the host Participant during the review visit, as well as highlighting any areas in which the team believes the host Participant could benefit from capacity-building assistance.

**Washington,
November 2012**