

CORRIGENDUM

Chapter 4.1.2 BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Page: 27

The paragraph „Much of the reform ... a mandatory step in achieving the standards imposed by the BiH Euro-Atlantic objective“ is eliminated due to the fact that the data was relevant for 2008, not for 2009-2010 the period in which the information was collected.

4.1.4 CROATIA

Page 35-36

The second paragraph was updated in accordance with the developments at the level of 2010: “Following the Accession Conference with Croatia *until 25th May 2010*, the status in the accession negotiations is that there are *18 closed chapters* Enterprise and industrial policy, Science and research, Education and culture, and External Relations), negotiations remaining opened in *15 chapters*. ”

In the paragraph “The severe issue... role of the USKOK”, it should be noted that the coordination role for the implementation of the action plan for the revised anticorruption strategy is the responsibility of the Committee for the Monitoring of the Implementation of Anti-corruption Measures, not of the USKOK.

The fourth paragraph was updated in accordance with the developments at the level of 2010: “The reform of the judiciary in order to strengthen its independence and integrity focuses mainly on the State Judicial Council, responsible for disciplinary procedures, selection of judges, assessment of their performance etc., *while the State Prosecutorial Council (SPC) is responsible for state attorneys appointments*. In this regard, in June 2008, a new Action plan for the reform of the judiciary has issued along with a revised anti-corruption strategy and action plan, *which was further revised and adopted by the government on 18th March 2010*.”

4.1.7 MONTENEGRO

Page 49

The introduction was updated in accordance with the developments at the level of 2010: „Montenegro is a potential candidate for membership to the EU... The SAA *entered* into force *after* its ratification process was *completed on 1st May 2010*... As a new state, Montenegro *adopted the Constitution in 2007*. In 2008, a wide legislative process envisioned changes in the judicial framework in order to improve the independence and efficiency of the judiciary... as well as budgetary ones.”

4.1.8 ROMANIA

Page 53

The second paragraph was updated in accordance with the developments at the level of 2010: “The Government approved in 2009 four new codes (Civil code, Criminal code and the corresponding procedural codes), the civil and criminal codes being also adopted by the Parliament. It still needs to be proven.....”

Page 54

Instead of “...the extent to which the Bulgarian practitioners...”, it must be read “...the extent to which the Romanian practitioners...”. In the Country data analysis, in the fourth paragraph, the correct numbers are the one presented at page 166: “...92% of the judges consider that the Presidency holds a dominant position...”, and “...agreed that the legislative instability affects them ...(97% judges ...)”.

4.1.9 SERBIA

Page 56

The general data was corrected: Population: 7.4 million and GNI/capita: US\$9,830.