



Group of States against Corruption
Groupe d'États contre la corruption

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Adoption: 1 December 2023

Publication: 12 March 2024

Public

GrecoRC4(2023)21

FOURTH EVALUATION ROUND

Corruption prevention in respect of members of
parliament, judges and prosecutors

SECOND ADDENDUM TO THE SECOND COMPLIANCE REPORT NORTH MACEDONIA

Adopted by GRECO at its 95th Plenary Meeting
(Strasbourg, 27 November – 1 December 2023)

F
O
U
R
T
H

E
V
A
L
U
A
T
I
O
N

R
O
U
N
D

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Second Addendum to the Second Compliance Report assesses the measures taken by the authorities of North Macedonia to implement the recommendations issued in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report on that country (see paragraph 2) dealing with "Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors".
2. [The Fourth Round Evaluation Report on North Macedonia](#) was adopted at GRECO's 62nd Plenary Meeting (6 December 2013) and made public on 17 March 2014, following authorisation by North Macedonia. The corresponding first [Compliance Report](#) was adopted at GRECO's 72nd Plenary Meeting (1 July 2016) and made public on 12 October 2016.
3. In the [Second Compliance Report](#) adopted by GRECO at its 80th Plenary Meeting (22 June 2018) and made public on 9 August 2018, following authorisation by North Macedonia, it was concluded that North Macedonia had implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner six of the 19 recommendations contained in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report. GRECO considered the compliance level as "globally unsatisfactory" and decided to apply its "non-compliance" procedure.
4. The [Interim Compliance Report](#) was adopted by GRECO at its 85th Plenary Meeting (25 September 2020) and made public on 2 October 2020, following authorisation by North Macedonia. It was concluded that North Macedonia had implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner, nine of the 19 recommendations contained in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report. Consequently, the level of compliance was no longer considered "globally unsatisfactory" in the meaning of Rule 31 revised, paragraph 8.3 of the Rules of Procedure and GRECO discontinued its "non-compliance procedure under Rule 32.
5. In the [Addendum to the Second Compliance Report](#), adopted by GRECO at its 90th Plenary Meeting (25 March 2022) and made public on 4 July 2022 following the authorisation of North Macedonia, only modest progress was noted. Nine of the 19 recommendations had been implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner, nine recommendations had been partly implemented and one recommendation had not been implemented.
6. As required by GRECO's Rules of Procedure, the authorities of North Macedonia submitted a Situation Report with additional information regarding measures taken to implement the ten pending recommendations which, according to the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report, had been partly or not implemented. The Situation Report was received on 5 April 2023 and served as a basis for this Second Addendum to the Second Compliance Report.
7. GRECO selected Armenia (in respect of parliamentary assemblies) and Denmark (in respect of judicial institutions) to appoint Rapporteurs for the compliance procedure. The Rapporteurs appointed were Ms Tatevik KHACHATRYAN, on behalf of Armenia, and Mr Jonathan GASSEHOLM, on behalf of Denmark. They were assisted by GRECO's Secretariat in drawing up this [Second Addendum to the Second Compliance Report](#).

II. ANALYSIS

8. In its Evaluation Report, GRECO addressed 19 recommendations to North Macedonia. In the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report, GRECO concluded that recommendations vi-xi, xiii, xvii and xix had been implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner, recommendations i-iv, xii, xiv-xvi and xviii had been

partly implemented and recommendation v had not been implemented. Compliance with the 10 outstanding recommendations is dealt with below.

Corruption prevention in respect of Members of Parliament

Recommendation i

9. *GRECO recommended (i) swiftly proceeding with the development of a code of conduct for members of the Assembly and ensuring that the future code is made easily accessible to the public; (ii) establishing a suitable mechanism within the Assembly, both to promote the code and raise awareness among its members on the standards expected of them, but also to enforce such standards where necessary.*
10. GRECO assessed this recommendation as partly implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO had taken note of the draft Code of Ethics for MPs and its implementing Guidelines. Although the draft Code and the Guidelines represented a suitable framework for promoting integrity and guiding the ethical behaviour of MPs, GRECO considered that they would benefit from further refinement and streamlining to render them more user-friendly, eliminate redundant content and ensure clarity and coherence of corresponding provisions. GRECO welcomed the awareness-raising activities for MPs for promoting integrity and guiding ethical behaviour but noted that these needed to be adjusted to the new Code and Guidelines, once in place.
11. The authorities now indicate that the Assembly has further improved the Code and the Guidelines for MPs, notably by revising and streamlining the entire text of the Code. As regards the establishment of a suitable mechanism to promote the Code and raise awareness among MPs, the Parliamentary Support Programme has prepared a curriculum for the training of MPs on its implementation. This curriculum was adopted on 20 March 2023 at the 14th session of the Assembly's Committee on Procedure and Mandate-Immunity Issues. The curriculum provides for the continuity of MPs' training activities and has led to an increase in awareness of ethics and integrity standards. The Parliamentary Support Programme has also assisted in the training of trainers, which was conducted in the Parliamentary Institute for 12 of its employees, who in turn will be conducting the training of MPs in the future.
12. GRECO takes note and welcomes the progress made in streamlining the Code of Ethics for MPs, which is now coherent and no longer contains redundancies. It also welcomes the development of the training for MPs on the implementation of the Code and the training of trainers to ensure future awareness of ethics and integrity standards, which is now adjusted to the new Code and Guidelines.
13. GRECO, for this reason, concludes that recommendation i has been implemented satisfactorily.

Recommendation ii

14. *GRECO recommended that internal mechanisms and guidance be further developed within the Assembly on the prevention of conflicts of interest and the acceptance of gifts, hospitality and other advantages and that compliance by parliamentarians with these rules be properly monitored.*
15. GRECO assessed this recommendation as partly implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO noted that the draft Code of Ethics for MPs and the accompanying new Guidelines contained elaborate provisions on conflicts of interest, gifts, hospitality, and other advantages, as required by the recommendation. However, a clear separation needed to be made between the Code

(which should bring together all applicable rules) and the Guidelines (which should only present related explanations and examples), which was not the case and created confusion. In addition, the principle of accountability was not included amongst key ethical principles/values, and compliance mechanisms were not designated. GRECO also noted that although confidential counselling and mentoring were foreseen, to which parliamentary bodies these functions are assigned was not specified. Also, as concerns the functioning of the Assembly's Committee on Procedure and Mandate-Immunity Issues, and its role in the new framework to be created by the new Code and the Guidelines required clarification.

16. The authorities now indicate that the Assembly's Committee on Procedure and Mandate-Immunity Issues recalled, during its 14th session on 20 March 2023, that the Code of Ethics for MPs was drafted on the basis of the [Seven Principles of Public Life](#) used in the UK, adapted to the national context of North Macedonia. This includes: commitment to the public interest and democratic values, objectivity and fairness, equality, openness, accountability and transparency, mutual respect, integrity, efficiency and economy and leadership. With respect to the principle of accountability, the Assembly's Committee on Procedure and Mandate-Immunity Issues indicates that it has been included in the Code and that MPs are under the obligation to regularly inform citizens in their electoral unit and the broader public about their work, their reasoning in the decision-making process, their initiatives and they have an obligation to be open to cooperate with the media. As regards which parliamentary bodies carry out the function of confidential counselling and mentoring, the authorities point out that this function needs to first be defined in the Assembly's new Rules of Procedure, which are currently under preparation. As for the functioning of the Assembly's Committee on Procedure and Mandate-Immunity Issues, the authorities explain that its action under the current Code are exclusively based on a written report.
17. GRECO takes note of this information. A clear separation has now been made between the Code and the Guidelines and the principle of accountability is now included in the Code. GRECO also takes note that the function of confidential counselling and mentoring will be addressed in the upcoming Assembly's new Rules of Procedure, but points out that the issue of the designation of a compliance mechanism, mentioned in the Code, has not yet been addressed.
18. GRECO therefore concludes that recommendation ii remains partly implemented.

Recommendation iii

19. *GRECO recommended to introduce rules on how Members of Parliament engage with lobbyists and other third parties who seek to influence the legislative process.*
20. GRECO assessed this recommendation as partly implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO welcomed the inclusion in the draft Code of Ethics and Guidelines of the rules, explanations, and examples on MPs' interaction with lobbyists and was generally satisfied with the new regulatory framework in the making, except for the introductory part of the Guidelines, which appeared to present lobbyists as only foreign persons – a shortcoming that needed to be addressed. GRECO also noted that the Law on Lobbying provided for an obligation for the legislative branch to establish internal rules and procedures for managing contacts with lobbyists, but this had not been done.
21. The authorities now indicate that the Assembly's Committee on Procedure and Mandate-Immunity Issues has initiated the preparation of these internal rules and procedures for managing contacts with lobbyists with the competent services of the Assembly.

22. GRECO takes note that the task of establishing internal rules and procedures for managing contacts with lobbyists has been given to the competent services of the Assembly. No clarification has been provided regarding the notion of lobbyists in the Guidelines on the implementation of the Code (to assure that is broader than foreign persons).

23. GRECO therefore concludes that recommendation iii remains partly implemented.

Recommendation iv

24. *GRECO recommended to ensure (i) that sanctions are provided in the relevant laws for all infringements they contain and (ii) that appropriate enforcement action is taken in all cases of misconduct by Members of Parliament.*

25. GRECO assessed this recommendation as partly implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO had noted the intention, with respect to part (i) of this recommendation, to enhance the dissuasiveness of sanctions provided for under the new Law on Prevention of Corruption and Conflicts of Interest (LPCCI) - as part of future amendments to the LPCCI. With respect to part (ii), more detail was needed regarding enforcement data to assure that not only violations on procedural grounds, but also on substance, were being punished (cf. also recommendation xviii).

26. The authorities now indicate that for part (i), the process for the preparation of the Proposal for Amendments to the Law on Prevention of Corruption (LPCCI) and Conflict of Interest is ongoing and so far, there are no provisions developed relating to sanctions.

27. As regards part (ii), the authorities indicate that the SCPC carries out two types of inspections on the MPs regarding the fulfilment of their legal obligation to submit a declaration of assets and interests: (1) refers to an MP's obligation to submit a declaration of assets and interests on time (i.e. 30 days from appointment or after termination of the office); (2) refers to an in-depth inspection carried out on the basis of Article 92 of the LPCCI (i.e. on the basis of the annual inspection plan adopted by the SCPC, or on the basis of a report or, in other cases, on SCPC's own initiative, if there are grounds for it). This inspection consists of a comparison and analysis of whether the data on the property and interests declared by the MP for himself/herself and his/her family members, living in a family community, match the data that other competent institutions have for these persons (i.e. the Real Estate Cadastre Agency, Ministry of Interior (for vehicles), Central Register (ownership/management of commercial companies), Central Securities Depository (ownership of stocks/shares), and Public Revenue Office (earned income/reported taxes). When there is no discrepancy between what is reported by the MP (published on SCPC's website) and the data in the databases and registers of the listed competent institutions, as well as in cases where the reported property obtained during the term of office of the MP is not disproportionate to his/her regular income or the income of his/her family members, then the procedure before the SCPC is stopped.

28. So far, in all cases of this type of in-depth inspection, no discrepancies were found in the properties declared by MPs with the actual situation based on data received from other competent institutions. The SCPC has therefore not initiated any procedure for the examination of such a situation under Article 93 of the LPCCI. In 2022, while carrying out a regular inspection of submitted declarations of assets by MPs, public prosecutors and judges, the SCPC has only found one violation by an MP (Article 45 paragraph 1, LPCCI), for which misdemeanour proceedings have been initiated.

29. GRECO takes note of this information. With respect to part (i) of this recommendation, it notes that the preparation of the Proposal for Amendments to the LPCCI and Conflict of Interest is ongoing and regrets that there are no provisions being developed relating to sanctions. Thus, this part of the recommendation remains partly implemented.
30. With respect to part (ii), GRECO takes account of the inspections carried out by the SCPC regarding declaration of assets, which look into both procedural and material breaches in order to ensure appropriate enforcement action. Consequently, this part of the recommendation has been met.
31. GRECO concludes that recommendation iv remains partly implemented.

Corruption prevention in respect of Judges

Recommendation v

32. *GRECO recommended that, in order to strengthen the independence of the judiciary from undue political influence, the ex officio membership of the Minister of Justice in the Judicial Council be abolished.*
33. GRECO assessed this recommendation as not implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO regretted the persisting lack of progress under this recommendation.
34. The authorities now indicate that in the period of 2019 to March 2023, the Minister of Justice did not attend any of the sessions of the Judicial Council. Article 11 paragraph 4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Council (Official Gazette of the Republic of North Macedonia No. 274/2019 and 186/2020) provides that certain members of the Judicial Council, i.e. the Minister of Justice and the President of the Supreme Court, do not receive the work material for procedures in which they do not participate. According to this provision, the Minister of Justice has received no information about cases in which the responsibility of a judge and/or president of a court is examined, or on the election of a judge and/or president of a court. This means that the minister cannot exercise any influence over these proceedings. Furthermore, this practice of "non-participation" by the Minister of Justice in the sessions of the Judicial Council serves as a protection against any possible political influence the Minister could have on the work of this body. This *modus vivendi* will remain in practice until adoption of an amendment to the Constitution, which would provide provisions for excluding the Minister of Justice of the membership in the Judicial Council.
35. GRECO takes note of this information. GRECO is aware that this recommendation requires a constitutional amendment and that although a proposal had been made in this respect, it did not succeed in Parliament. The explanations provided by the authorities are the same as in previous reports: the Minister of Justice does not participate in the sessions of the Judicial Council and hence cannot exercise any pressure on the Judicial Council.
36. GRECO reiterates that a risk of political influence always exists without formal voting rights or even formal attendance of the Minister of Justice in person at meetings and therefore regrets the persistent lack of progress for this recommendation.
37. GRECO concludes that recommendation v remains not implemented.

Recommendation xii

38. GRECO recommended (i) that disciplinary infringements applicable to judges be clearly defined and that the range of sanctions be extended to ensure better proportionality and (ii) that dismissal of a judge only be possible for the most serious cases of misconduct, ensuring, in particular, that the possibility to dismiss a judge solely in case one of his/her decisions is found to be in violation of the right to a trial within a reasonable time be abolished.
39. GRECO assessed this recommendation as partly implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO noted that part (i) of this recommendation had been complied with. As for part (ii), GRECO had previously commended efforts to reform the disciplinary mechanisms as provided for in the Law on Courts and the Law on the Judicial Council as amended in 2019 and found the system, as conceived by these laws, to be satisfactory overall. The only pending element was its practical implementation to dispel any possible doubt regarding the proportionality of the system.
40. The authorities now indicate that GRECO's concern for a lack of proportionality in the role of the Judicial Council in disciplinary procedures against judges, is addressed by Article 60 of the Law on the Judicial Council (Official Gazette of the Republic of North Macedonia, No. 102/2019). It allows the Judicial Council to stop proceedings if it finds no ground for a judge's liability. However, if it finds that a judge (or a court president) has committed a serious disciplinary violation or gross misconduct, it can then decide on the dismissal of the judge (or the court president). Alternatively, should the Judicial Council neither stop proceedings nor decide on dismissal, it will then conduct a vote on applying disciplinary measures, which range from the least to the most severe measures.
41. In 2022, the Judicial Council imposed four disciplinary measures, one in the form of salary reductions applied in two cases and one in the form of written warnings in the two other cases.¹ The Judicial Council also rendered five decisions in 2022, which resulted in the dismissal of five judges.²

¹ Two Decisions of 15 March 2022, imposing disciplinary measures on two judges in the form of a salary reduction in the amount of 15 % and 30% respectively of their monthly salary for a period of six months (Article 78, paragraph, 1 item 3 of the Law on Courts). Decision of 8 June 2022, imposing a disciplinary measure on a judge in the form of a written warning (Article 78, paragraph 1, item 1 and Article 74, paragraph 4 of the Law on Courts). Decision of 27 September 2022, also imposing a disciplinary measure on a judge in the form of a written warning (Article 75, paragraph 1, item 4 and Article 78, paragraph 1, item 1 of the Law on Courts).

² Four decisions of 7 April 2022: (1) dismissal of a judge for violations committed in his role as acting president of a basic court (unprofessional and negligent behaviour). The Judicial Council found that there was abuse of position and acting *ultra vires* official powers in the distribution of court cases ([link](#)); (2) dismissal of a judge for a more serious disciplinary violation that made him unfit to carry out his judicial function. The Judicial Council found that the judge, despite the obvious conflict of interest in a specific procedure (blood relations with the attorney of one of the parties), did not recuse himself from the case, nor did he request an exemption from the case, thus committing a more serious disciplinary violation that made him unworthy of performing his judicial function. The decision was published on the website of the Judicial Council ([link](#)); (3) dismissal of a judge as acting president of a court of appeal. The judicial Council found that the judge acted negligently and unprofessionally by deciding to reject a request for recusal by a judge, even though there was an indisputable conflict of interest, and he was informed and notified of the circumstances that clearly indicated the existence of legal grounds for recusal. The decision is published on the website of the Judicial Council ([link](#)); (4) dismissal of a judge for unprofessionalism and negligence. The Judicial Council found that the judge deliberately and unjustifiably committed a major professional mistake by rendering two different decisions and applying different legal provisions to the same request, within the same procedure, for the same specific case, thus causing legal uncertainty among the parties. The decision was published on the website of the Judicial Council ([link](#)). Another decision, on 12 December 2022 also concerned the dismissal of a judge as a result of unprofessionalism and negligence. The Judicial Council found that the judge intentionally and unjustifiably committed a serious professional mistake by authorising certificates of legal validity and enforceability in one case, without taking into account a modification made by another judgment and, in another case, drawing up two decisions under the same date and case number, one for an adoption and the other for the withdrawal of a temporary measure.

42. The authorities also indicate that the Judicial Council's decisions are well-reasoned and follow the subjective element of Article 74 of the Law on Courts. According to this Article, a judge is dismissed from judicial office in accordance with the grounds provided by the Law if the violation was committed with intent or obvious negligence, as a result of a fault by the judge, without justifiable reasons and if the violation caused serious consequences.
43. Decisions of the Judicial Council on the selection, promotion and dismissal of a judge/president of a court are available on the judicial website www.sud.mk
44. GRECO takes note of the information provided regarding the application of legal provisions on discipline substantiating their proportionality in practice and concludes that recommendation xii has been implemented satisfactorily.

Corruption prevention in respect of prosecutors

Recommendation xiv

45. *GRECO recommended that a set of clear standards/code of professional conduct, accompanied by explanatory comments and/or practical examples, be established which will apply to all prosecutors.*
46. GRECO assessed this recommendation as partly implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO welcomed the adoption of a Code of Ethics establishing principles and rules of conduct for all prosecutors in North Macedonia. The Ethics Council remained responsible for supervising the application of the Code. Advisory opinions regarding ethical dilemmas not covered by the Code could be requested from "integrity officers" specifically appointed within the prosecution service. However, explanatory comments/guidelines for the Code were not yet ready.
47. The authorities now indicate that in the proceedings conducted so far before the Ethics Council, no problems have been observed in the application of the provisions of the Code of Ethics. The existing Guidelines for practical implementation of the Code are an appropriate tool for the members of the Ethics Council to make decisions without difficulty, as well as for consistent implementation of the Code by the public prosecutors.
48. GRECO takes note of this information and recognises that if the existing Guidelines on the implementation of the Code have proved to be sufficiently clear, there seems to be no need for further explanatory comments.
49. GRECO concludes that recommendation xiv has been implemented satisfactorily.

Recommendation xv

50. *GRECO recommended that rules and guidance be developed for prosecutors on the acceptance of gifts, hospitality and other advantages and that compliance with these rules be properly monitored.*
51. GRECO assessed this recommendation as partly implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO acknowledged the improvements made regarding the regulation of gifts, but noted that the notion of "hospitality" was not explicitly covered by the Code. In addition, the different rules relating to gifts, other than those provided by the Code of Ethics for prosecutors, needed to be harmonised (for example, in relation to the applicable thresholds for acceptable protocol gifts).

52. The authorities now indicate that Article 7 of the Code of Ethics of Public Prosecutors defines the term "intangible benefit", which includes the term "hospitality" - in the sense required by GRECO: "Intangible benefit means any benefit to the public prosecutor or a person close to him/her, which is not provided by payment, in order to act or refrain from acting in accordance with his/her obligations or to perform his/her competencies contrary to his/her official duties and the provisions of this Code. Intangible benefits also include discounts on prices and services due to the position of public prosecutor, as well as free professional advice of the public prosecutor". Nevertheless, in order to ensure clarity on this issue, the Council of Public Prosecutors, adopted amendments to the Code of Ethics of Public Prosecutors on 8 November 2023 to specifically mention the term "hospitality" in Article 7. With respect to the harmonisation of the different rules relating to gifts, the authorities refer to the new "Rulebook for acceptance, disposal and recording of received gifts by the public prosecutors at protocolary events", which was adopted on 5 September 2023, and aligns the different rules on gifts for prosecutors.
53. GRECO takes note of the clarification provided by the authorities that the notion of gifts also encompasses hospitality. Also, the different rules on gifts for prosecutors, as contained in various texts, have now been fully aligned in the new "Rulebook for acceptance, disposal and recording of received gifts by the public prosecutors at protocolary events".
54. GRECO concludes that recommendation xv has been implemented satisfactorily.

Recommendation xvi

55. *GRECO recommended that the disciplinary regime applicable to prosecutors be reviewed so that (i) infringements are clearly defined and that (ii) the range of available sanctions be extended to ensure better proportionality ensuring, in particular, that dismissal of a prosecutor is only possible for the most serious cases of misconduct.*
56. GRECO assessed this recommendation as partly implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO noted that the Law on Public Prosecution provided for a reduction, not an extension of the range of sanctions available for disciplinary violations by prosecutors. However, further legislative reforms in this respect were expected.
57. The authorities now indicate that this recommendation will be taken into account when the Law on Public Prosecution will be amended.
58. GRECO takes note of this information and encourages the authorities of North Macedonia to amend the Law on Public Prosecution as soon as possible to take into account this recommendation.
59. GRECO concludes that recommendation xvi remains partly implemented.

Corruption prevention in respect of all categories

Recommendation xviii

60. *GRECO recommended that appropriate legal, institutional and operational measures be put in place to ensure a more in-depth scrutiny of statements of interest and asset declarations submitted by Members of Parliament, judges and prosecutors, in particular by streamlining the verification process under the aegis of the State Commission for the Prevention of Corruption.*

61. GRECO assessed this recommendation as partly implemented in the Addendum to the Second Compliance Report. GRECO had taken note of the data provided on the supervision exercised by the State Commission for Prevention of Corruption (SCPC) over the content of asset declarations submitted by MPs, judges and prosecutors, which appeared to point to a greater compliance with the reporting obligation by all three professional groups, thanks to the administrative checks performed by the SCPC. However, in-depth scrutiny by the SCPC had only been foreseen for asset declarations of a limited number of judges and prosecutors. Most violations had only been established based on purely procedural grounds rather than in-depth checks. Information regarding a more in-depth scrutiny of declarations of interests had been provided only in respect of some MPs.
62. The authorities now indicate that the SCPC performs two types of checks on MPs, judges and public prosecutors to see if they fulfil the legal obligation to submit a statement on their assets and interests: (1) refers to the obligation of for these officials to submit their declarations of assets and interests in time (within 30 days from the appointment/after the termination of office); (2) is an in-depth inspection and is carried out on the basis of Article 92 of the LPCCI (i.e. on the basis of the annual inspection plan adopted by the SCPC or on the basis of a report or, in other cases, on SCPC's own initiative, if there are grounds for it) – see recommendation iv above for further details.
63. The authorities pointed out that the SCPC turned to the Financial Police Administration to carry out financial checks under their jurisdiction (financial transactions, bank accounts, etc.) for five judges. The SCPC was informed that for three out of those five judges no disproportionately increased assets were found and thus the procedure was stopped and for two cases the procedure is still ongoing.
64. GRECO takes note of this information, notably of the second type of check on MPs, judges and public prosecutors, which is an in-depth type of review. This review is made on the basis of the annual inspection plan adopted by the SCPC, or on the basis of a report or, in other cases, on SCPC's own initiative, if there are grounds for it. It also notes that such an inspection was carried out with respect to five judges, not just MPs.
65. GRECO concludes that recommendation xviii has been implemented satisfactorily.

III. CONCLUSIONS

66. **In view of the foregoing, progress can be noted in the implementation of the recommendations addressed to North Macedonia in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report.** Fourteen of the nineteen recommendations have been implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner, four recommendations have been partly implemented and one recommendation has not been implemented.
67. More specifically, recommendations i, vi, vii, viii, ix, x, xi, xii, xiii, xiv, xv, xvii, xviii and xix have been implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner, recommendations ii, iii, iv and xvi have been partly implemented and recommendation v has not been implemented.
68. Regarding MPs, the authorities have referred to progress made in streamlining the Code of Ethics for MPs, as well as in developing a training programme for MPs on the implementation of the Code and the training of trainers to ensure future awareness of ethics and integrity standards. Other developments are still in the making, notably the function of confidential counselling and mentoring will be addressed in the

upcoming Assembly's new Rules of Procedure and internal rules for the Law on Lobbying are in preparation with the Assembly's Committee on Procedure and Mandate-Immunity Issues. GRECO regrets that there has been no improvement regarding the sanctioning system provided in in the LPCCI.

69. With respect to the judiciary, GRECO reiterates its concerns regarding *ex officio* membership of the Minister of Justice in the Judicial Council.
70. As for prosecutors, the only outstanding recommendation concerns extending the range of sanctions available for disciplinary violations by prosecutors. The authorities indicated that this recommendation will be addressed when the Law on Public Prosecution will be amended. To this end, GRECO would like to encourage the authorities to do so as soon as possible.
71. The adoption of this Second Addendum to the Second Compliance Report terminates the Fourth-Round compliance procedure in respect of North Macedonia. The authorities of North Macedonia may, however, wish to inform GRECO of further developments with regard to the implementation of the outstanding recommendation ii, iii, iv, v and xvi.
72. Finally, GRECO invites the authorities of North Macedonia to authorise, as soon as possible, the publication of the report, to translate it into the national language and to make the translation public.