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1 Introduction

The Basel Institute on Governance and its International Centre for Collective Action (ICCA) hosted for the second time an international conference on anti-corruption Collective Action, entitled Collective Action: Evidence, Experience and Impact on October 20-21 2016 in Basel. The conference was part of the G20/B20 anti-corruption agenda aimed at identifying mechanisms that may effectively prevent bribery of public officials and support companies’ efforts to resist bribery and extortion. The event followed up on the learnings and experiences shared in the first Collective Action conference¹ held in Basel in June 2014.

Nearly 200 participants and distinguished speakers from the private sector, government, international organisations, academia and civil society from all over the globe took part in the event. This stakeholder and geographical diversity greatly enriched the discussions, offering different perspectives and examples of what constitutes successful Collective Action and the challenges to its implementation. Practical insights and exchange of experience were further complemented by a set of papers that were written in advance of the event, among which several were presented at the conference by the authors. These were submitted as the result of a call for papers issued by the ICCA to anti-corruption and compliance practitioners and academics, requesting works that would assess and provide further insights into the conference’s main objectives, namely to understand what the evidence is for Collective Action effectiveness; what has worked and why; and in which ways examples of best practice can be replicated in order to maximize the impact of Collective Action.

Frequently described as a young and promising method to combat corruption, Collective Action is slowly reaching the stage where it must more explicitly deliver on the promise, making the establishment of the evidence base and exchange of best practice critical for the credibility and future of this approach. The ambitious program and engaged audience participation over the course of one and half days of discussion in Basel helped to further the case for Collective Action as an anti-corruption tool, while acknowledging that there remains work to be done. This Conference Report summarizes the main proceedings and outcomes from the event.

2 Thursday October 20 2016, morning

2.1 Welcoming remarks

Speaker: Mark Pieth, Professor of Criminal Law and Criminology at the University of Basel and Chairman of the Board of the Basel Institute on Governance

In a look back at the history of Collective Action since 1990, Mark Pieth noted that during this period, Collective Action emerged as one of the most promising approaches to tackling corruption, by moving beyond a reactive approach and based on the idea of turning compliance into a competitive advantage. In setting out the conference goals, he noted the need for the practitioners’ community to communicate on both successes and challenges surrounding Collective Action, as well as the need to document evidence for impact on corruption through Collective Action, lessons learned on what has worked and why, and to discuss among concerned stakeholders where this takes us in future.

2.2 Panel discussion - Best frenemies? Views from law enforcement and the private sector on constructive engagement to counter corruption

Moderator: Gemma Aiolfi, Head of Collective Action, Basel Institute on Governance

Panellists: Andreas Hoffmann, General Counsel and Head of Legal and Compliance of Siemens AG; David Green, Director, Serious Fraud Office, United Kingdom; Karen A. Greenaway, Supervisory Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, International Corruption Unit, United States of America; Walter Mäder, Federal Attorney, (International Corruption), Office of the Attorney General, Switzerland; Stefan Heissner, Managing Partner, Fraud Investigation & Dispute Services, EY GmbH (Germany)

The high-level opening panel brought together representatives of law enforcement and the private sector to explore the common and complementary elements of their respective roles in relation to anti-corruption efforts, identify shared interests and assess the feasibility of possibly joint or collective approaches that companies and law enforcement may take in relation to transnational bribery.

A common method by which law enforcement and the private sector work together to tackle corruption is through self-disclosure and other forms of cooperation when a suspected corruption case arises, making this the dominant theme addressed in the panel discussion. Companies that cooperate with law enforcement may stand to benefit from a range of incentives such as, speedier resolution of an investigation, reduced penalties, no imposition of a monitor and no blacklisting by national authorities, international organizations or multilateral development banks.

The development of a common set of globally applicable rules for voluntary self-disclosure was recognized during the discussion as an important topic for the private sector. Law enforcement representatives on the panel acknowledged the importance of cooperation and coordination between
jurisdictions. At the same time, the panel recognised that implementing common rules across multiple jurisdictions would be difficult to implement in practice.

For anti-corruption laws to have the desired deterrent effect, the panel also recognised that enforcement is critical, while stressing that if sanctions are such that they put a company out of business, this was not usually in the interests of the company nor of society at large (unless the company is a criminal undertaking). Of course this requires that the concerned company cooperates sincerely with law enforcement and from an early point in time, and is making best-efforts to remediate any weaknesses in internal controls to reduce the risk of criminal or noncompliant behaviour recurring. In this context Collective Action was recognised as a useful complement to company compliance programs as well as the ever critical tone from the top.

2.3 Beyond the lawyers: Financial markets, corruption and Collective Action

Keynote Speaker: Karina Litvack, Non-Executive Director of Eni S.p.A. (nominated to the board by the minority institutional investors and speaking in a strictly personal capacity)

Interviewer: Gemma Aiolfi, Basel Institute on Governance

In this session, Karina Litvack introduced the ‘Tainted Assets Initiative’, a new idea for a multistakeholder collective action. It centres on situations where companies, for example as a result of an M&A transaction, find themselves in possession of assets that may for historical reasons have been associated with bribery. While typically this is looked at from the perspective of successor liability, this is not the prime focus of this initiative. Rather, it looks at and tries to address the bigger picture of the origin of the conditions that tainted the asset in the first place. The Tainted Assets project proposes a multi-stakeholder approach towards tackling the problem of assets that include risk as part of their M&A and joint venture transactions.

2.4 Panel Discussion - Anti-Corruption Collective Action: Impact stories

Moderator: Greta Fenner, Managing Director, Basel Institute on Governance

Panellists: Tracy Paradise, Executive Secretary, the Wolfsberg Group; Noor Naqshbandi, Director, Alliance for Integrity; Gabriella Nagy, Head of Public Funds Programs, Transparency International Hungary; Dániel Lopert, Communication Director, NIF National Infrastructure Development Plc, Hungary; Qusay Salama, Project Director, Integrity Network Initiative, Egyptian Junior Business Association; Sheneine Fawzy, Business Administration Manager, Ship & C.R.E.W., Egypt

Collective Action leaders from civil society were joined in this session by their initiatives’ private sector counterparts in a discussion on the effect Collective Action has had on their respective business environments and practices. The session underscored the broad diversity in which Collective Action is practiced and generates impact, attesting to the flexibility of the concept while showing that there is no one-size-fits-all method for engagement.
This was demonstrated by presentations of initiatives practiced at global, regional and local levels, as well as initiatives that target a single sector and others that take a multi-sector approaches. The Wolfsberg Group, an association of 13 global banks addressing financial crime related risks, provides an example of a comparatively homogenous, smaller group of financial institutions operating in a sector-specific initiative at the global level. Given the size of the institutions involved, however, the small size of the group does not prevent the initiative from having significant impact globally and far beyond the directly involved banks. Contrasting this example with initiatives at the national level, Gabriella Nagy of Transparency International Hungary discussed the country’s use of Integrity Pacts, with Daniel Loppert of the contracting authority implementing the project attesting to the reputational benefits gained through participation. Initiatives can also vary in the types of markets in which they are practiced and size of companies involved. Qusay Salama’s presentation on Collective Action experiences in Egypt with the Integrity Network Initiative provided the example of how to apply Collective Action in markets that are characterized by higher levels of informality, and where compliance itself can be seen more often as a competitive disadvantage. The initiative concentrates its efforts on supporting SMEs, with Sherine Fawzy from Ship & C.R.E.W., a member company of the initiative, providing a presentation on how the company is meeting the challenges of corruption through raising awareness, monitoring and whistleblowing. Noor Naqshbandi of the Alliance for Integrity provided an example of an initiative based in Germany and with regional offices in various countries. Among its activities the Initiative conducts training programmes that have reached over 600 companies, with particular focus on grey areas such as facilitation payments and conflicts of interest.

The diversity of initiatives presented also contributed to a similar diversity of factors identified by the speakers as key to success. The smaller, more homogenous makeup of companies and single-industry focus was recognized as a decisive element in the Wolfsberg Group’s success, contributing to very industry-specific solutions and slow but continual building of trust among the participants. The broader mandate and organizational set-up of the Alliance for Integrity however convinced the discussant that having as many companies on board as possible is an important factor in its success in training and sensitizing a number of businesses in diverse regions. Clearly defined scope and areas of focus is a common success factor across all of the initiatives.

3 Thursday 20 October 2016, afternoon

3.1 Research Panels – Evidence of effectiveness, results and advocacy: selected research

This session featured selected research papers and analysis on Collective Action effectiveness and impact submitted in response to the ICCA’s call for papers, through a series of themed panel discussions. Each panel included at least two authors and a moderator, as well as a private sector representative to provide comment on the papers.
3.1.1 Empirical evidence and conceptual clarification

**Keynote Speaker:** Nikos Passas, Distinguished Inaugural Professor of Collective Action, Business Ethics and Compliance, International Anti-Corruption Academy

Nikos Passas's thought-provoking presentation on the effectiveness of Collective Action initiatives identified a number of issues that so far make it hard to guarantee a meaningful impact of Collective Action. Amongst these are, in his opinion, a degree of conceptual confusion surrounding the topic, the formulation of sometimes unclear or all too generic objectives of Collective Action initiatives, and shaky assumptions as to its ability to address the problem. It was argued that in order to maximize the effectiveness of Collective Action initiatives must respect the context in which an initiative operates, with local initiatives potentially having a greater chance – though no guarantee – for success. He also recommended to carefully select clear and specific goals at the beginning of an initiative, and to monitor and assess the initiative and to adjust where necessary in order to maximize chances for success.

3.1.2 Evidence and effectiveness

**Moderator:** Nikos Passas, International Anti-Corruption Academy

**Panellists:** Elizabeth David-Barrett Senior Lecturer in Politics, University of Sussex: "Overcoming the Collective Action Problem: The Role of Sectoral Initiatives in Tackling Corruption"; Berta van Schoor, PhD Candidate, Technical University of Munich: "Can Cooperation Prevent Corruption? Effects of Collective Commitment in Sector-Specific Coordinated Governance Initiatives on Anti-Corruption Strategies"; Robin Hodess, Group Director for Advocacy and Research, Transparency International

This first research panel featured two papers that applied varying methodological approaches and concrete examples on Collective Action evidence and effectiveness from an academic perspective, sharing between them two well-known Collective Action initiatives as case studies. Both papers highlight the importance of keeping stakeholders in a Collective Action initiative motivated, as well as draw attention to the need for monitoring within an initiative to ensure compliance, coupled with consequences for noncompliance. The measurement of impact of Collective Action however remains challenging and an item for further research.

**Dr Elizabeth David-Barrett** presented a paper that seeks to explain the proliferation of Collective Action initiatives by taking three theoretical steps relating to clubs, norms, and the international dimension to augment and rehabilitate collective action theory. Empirically, the paper reflects on the emergence and evolution of two initiatives – the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) and the Maritime Anti-Corruption Network (MACN) – in view of this theoretical framework, out of which emerge four characteristics for analysis when determining sustainable Collective Action initiatives: cost of membership, selective benefits, third-party monitoring/audit, and sanctions for violation. It identifies further sub-questions for research, e.g., the extent to which the ‘success’ of an initiative depends on
the size and concentration of a sector, the character of the selective benefits, and the diversity of stakeholder involvement.

The paper presented by Berta van Schoor, written together with Prof. Christoph Luetge of the Technical University of Munich, identified potential success factors of Collective Action initiatives, or Coordinated Governance Initiatives as they are called in the paper, by means of a qualitative multiple-case study. Three different anti-corruption initiatives were selected for analysis: the Ethics Management of the Bavarian Construction Industry (EMB), along with the EITI and MACN. Six success factors for sector-specific initiatives were highlighted: the initiatives’ company composition, the situation of crisis as initiating factor, the existence of a supportive institutional framework, the continuing commitment of participants, the complexity-dependent governance structures and procedures, and effective enforcement mechanisms for reputation protection.

### 3.1.3 Case studies specific to national contexts in Asia and opportunities for lessons learned

**Moderator:** Claudia Baez-Camargo, Head, Governance and Research, Basel Institute on Governance


This panel featured research papers written by Collective Action practitioners, documenting experiences from a trio of Asian countries. Together they underscore the importance of ensuring that Collective Action initiatives take into account the local conditions in which an initiative operates, as the socio-cultural, economic and legal environment can greatly affect the manner in which an initiative is designed and its potential outcomes.

**Angela Joo-Hyun Kang** provided a field case study based on her own direct and indirect experiences in South Korea. Using two analytic methodologies – SLEPT (Social, Legal, Economic, Political, and Technological) and SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, and Threat), the paper identified trends in the South Korean business market as well as key actors as change agents, proposing four Collective Action strategies – focusing (SO strategy), sampling (WO strategy), grouping (ST strategy) and bridging (WT strategy). Two South Korean Collective Action initiatives under the Siemens Integrity Initiative – Northeast Asia Business Integrity School (NABIS) and Fair Player Club - feature as examples in the paper. New technologies, incentives, a new workforce (through education) and new regulations are all suggested as areas for change agents to develop strategies and pilot projects to further mainstream anti-corruption in South Korea.

**Phisanu Phromchanya** presented a paper on Collective Action in Thailand, written together with Dr Bandid Nijathaworn. Thailand’s private sector Collective Action Coalition against Corruption (CAC)
The initiative was founded in 2010 by the country’s leading business organizations to implement effective anti-corruption policies and take an advocacy role in graft-fighting on behalf of the business sector. The study looks at the evolution and role of the CAC, including its certification program which helps companies put in place strong anti-corruption compliance standards. The paper reviews key factors that have encouraged over 700 Thai companies to join and commit to establishing internal anti-graft policies and compliance processes, and discusses future challenges for the initiative. Some of these tipping points that lead to its growth included taking a sectoral approach to recruitment and industry-wide enrolment by companies from the financial sector, support from groups such as the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Thai Investors Association, and the change agent role undertaken by CAC members to persuade suppliers and trading counterparts to adopt anti-corruption practices.

Ashutosh Mishra examined the use of Integrity Pact (IP) in India, first introduced in 2006 and currently applied by over 100 organizations (primarily state owned enterprises / SOEs) in the procurement of goods and services. The study places this pioneering Collective Action initiative in the context of anti-corruption and public procurement in India. He argues that the IP can bring the supply side under the ambit of an anti-corruption mechanism, and suggests training and capacity building workshops for all stakeholders involved in the IP as one way to strengthen its effectiveness.

3.1.4 The role of trust in anti-corruption Collective Action

**Moderator:** Claudia Baez-Camargo, Basel Institute on Governance

**Panellists:** Katalin Pallai, Associate Professor, Director of the Post-graduate Program for Integrity Advisers, National University for Public Service, Hungary: "The Need for a New Expertise Profile in Anticorruption"; Philip Nichols, Associate Professor of Legal Studies and Business Ethics, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania: "Maximizing Stakeholder Trust as a Tool for Controlling Corruption"; Michael Faske, Partner, Fraud Investigation & Dispute Services, EY (Switzerland)

The research presented in this panel brought forward the need for moving beyond standard technical mechanisms for controlling corruption and promoting anti-corruption. This may be achieved through increased attention on the quality of the process by which stakeholders achieve results, as presented in a concrete example from the Hungarian public sector in one paper, or promotion of a strong ethical culture, as addressed in the second.

In her paper and presentation, Katalin Pallai argues for the importance of a processual dialogic approach in anticorruption Collective Action processes, the training of hybrid anticorruption professionals and new teaching methods for their training. The research posits that the quality of the process, requiring skilled facilitators to promote an environment of collective inquiry, is a key determinant as to whether or not committed leaders or coalitions can achieve results. Philip Nichols contends in his research that the creation of strong ethical cultures within business firms will reduce corruption. While an ethical culture is difficult to measure, the trust engendered among stakeholders by an ethical culture can be measured, and thus used as a proxy measurement for a strong ethical culture, making the measurement of stakeholder trust a useful tool in controlling
corruption. Michael Faske provided a business perspective on the research papers, including the challenge of interconnecting credible key performance indicators (KPIs) with concepts like stakeholder trust and ethical culture.

3.1.5 Anti-corruption Collective Action in conflict zones

Moderator: Stefan Schembera, Senior Researcher, Department of Business Administration, University of Zurich

Panellists: Mark Pyman, Committee Member, Afghanistan Anti-Corruption Monitoring and Evaluation Committee; "Afghanistan’s Independent Anti-Corruption Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (MEC). Evidence of Impact: Evidence for a Collective Action Effect"; Manuel de Vera, Executive Director, Asian Institute of Management TeaM Energy Center for Bridging Leadership (AIMTEC): "Collective Action for Political Stability and Business Confidence: The Case of Marawi City, Philippines"; Soji Apampa, Co-Founder, Executive Vice Chairman and CEO, Convention on Business Integrity, Nigeria

The panel featured two papers that address how Collective Action approaches can function in areas affected by conflict, focusing on experiences in Afghanistan and the Philippines. Both papers explore Collective Action as applied outside of a business-driven perspective, a contrast to most of the papers and discussions at the conference. The papers provide examples of how a committed individual or group of individuals can bring stakeholders together to foster effective change. Although private sector actors do not figure prominently, by promoting anti-corruption in zones of weak governance, the benefits can spill over and have an impact on the business sector.

Mark Pyman discussed in his paper (written together with Mostafa Mohammadi and Cheirollah Sarag) the work of the Independent Joint Anti-Corruption Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (MEC) in Afghanistan that analyses and reports on the progress of the Afghan government on anti-corruption reforms. The paper examines the evidence for what the MEC has achieved so far and the extent to which this reflects a Collective Action effect. Detailed review of the recommendations made for Afghan government ministries and oversight institutions; using its voice to intervene in situations where corruption is occurring; effectuating change though legal reforms, policies and mechanisms; and gathering stakeholder opinions are all mechanisms presented in the paper that demonstrate where and how the MEC has made an impact against corruption.

Manuel J. De Vera’s paper, written with Karmela Faustine C. Indoyon and Eloisa A. Barbin, presents a case focused on Marawi City, Lanao del Sur in the Philippines, in the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM). Brigadier General Daniel Lucero, Commander of the 103rd Infantry Brigade of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP), led a cross-sectoral election reform project to end corrupt electoral and political practices in Marawi City. Through new local governance arrangements, military-led cultural immersions in Maranao villages, and the use of the media, the city’s voter’s list was put to order which as a consequence, engendered political stability in the locality. The research conducts a narrative inquiry on the locals of Marawi City, non-government workers, local government officials, and
members of the military that were part of or involved in the reforms efforts of Lucero in challenging the corrupt local electoral practices of the city.

Soji Apampa provided commentary on the two papers, highlighting the importance of empowering reformists in these and in similar environments, while ensuring that a thorough analysis of the political economy at both the macro and micro levels is undertaken in order to design and implement Collective Action interventions.

4 Friday 21 October 2016, morning

4.1 Tackling bribery from the “demand” side: The High Level Reporting Mechanism

Keynote speaker: Nicola Bonucci, Director for Legal Affairs, OECD

Nicola Bonucci presented the High Level Reporting Mechanism (HLRM), an anti-corruption mechanism originally developed by the Basel Institute, OECD and Transparency International together with several international companies, which seeks to provide companies with a constructive means to tackle solicitation and extortion. In practice this involves a process that allows companies to report bribery solicitation to a dedicated and high-level institution that is tasked with responding swiftly and in a non-bureaucratic manner. These reporting mechanisms are not meant to replace existing structures and processes offering legal redress, or investigative bodies that have to examine allegations of illegal conduct. These processes inevitably take longer however, and do not necessarily offer swift responses to business critical issues.

The process has been tested thus far in Colombia and Ukraine. In Colombia, the costs of the HLRM were covered by the National Agency of Infrastructure. The Secretario de Transparencia, reporting directly to the President, was created to focus on the infrastructure process. In practice, the HLRM works as follows: a company with a concern addresses it to the Secretario which makes a prima facie determination on its merits, and when more clarification is needed, the matter is referred to a group of experts – public prosecutor specialist, criminal lawyer, an engineer and business law specialist – which makes a recommendation to the Secretario.

In Ukraine a different model was employed as there were no existing structures of integrity. With the help of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) a Business Ombudsman was created in 2014, based on the HLRM model. It was designed to serve as a business office with a complaint mechanism to improve and foster business. It is open also to local business, thus has a broader scope and backed by international organizations, together with business and government. Since its creation the Business Ombudsman has received over 1100 referrals.
Among lessons learned from HLROMs so far include the following: 1) Strong will; in Colombia there was strong backing from the President, while in the case of Ukraine this was provided by the EBRD and with the government slowly catching on; 2) the HLROM must be tailored to the needs of the country, legal framework and business structure. Discussions with this in mind are currently underway with Peru or Panama; 3) the process must have some degree of medium term sustainability. The current hope is that Colombia will engage in the second phase of the project, while in Ukraine discussions are underway to integrate the Business Ombudsman into official legal structures; 4) business participation is essential.

4.2 Q&A with a Collective Action practitioner

**Keynote Speaker:** Timothy F. Schultz, Chair, International Forum on Business Ethical Conduct (IFBEC)

**Interviewer:** Mark Pieth, Basel Institute on Governance

This session provided the example of how companies within a large, highly competitive industry can, over time, develop a Collective Action initiative that addresses very concrete topics of interest to its membership and stakeholders at large.

The International Forum on Business Ethical Conduct (IFBEC) works to promote ethical conduct within the Defence and AeroSpace sector. Currently made up of 35 companies and seeking to expand, its members have all signed on to a set of Global Principles that represent concrete expression of their business ethics commitments. In 2015 IFBEC published a report on offsets together with the Basel Institute and its B20 Collective Action Hub. Other Collective Action projects of IFBEC include the creation of a Model Code of Conduct for Suppliers and the NATO Building Integrity Partnership, an opportunity to further raise standards.

Among lessons learned in the development process of IFBEC, Mr Schultz noted that industry stakeholders were in agreement on the need for common industry standards; however, it takes time to build trust and relationships with colleagues. Participants in Collective Action must recognize that they have to be in it for the long haul. Top level support and the attendance of UK Government officials at some of the earlier meetings and IFBEC knew that some of the customers were interested. Transparency International was also a group that encouraged IFBEC’s progress.

On the topic of offsets, overcoming trust issues required several meetings in order to achieve consensus on the [report](#) and its outcomes, with the topic remaining a problematic area do to differing views within the industry, among customers and in certain regions of the world.

4.3 Collaboratories

These three parallel sessions provided participants the opportunity to deep-dive into how Collective Action is being applied or can be further enhanced in selected regions, challenges to its effectiveness, regional constraints and corruption dynamics, and markers for success. The sessions were led by groups of speakers however the settings were geared towards interaction and debate.
4.3.1 Extending Collective Action in challenging markets

Panellists: Tayfun Zaman, Secretary General, Ethics and Reputation Society of Turkey; Angie Farrag-Thibault, Director, Transport & Logistics and Collaborative Initiatives, BSR; Philip Nichols, Associate Professor of Legal Studies and Business Ethics, The Wharton School, The University of Pennsylvania

When looking at Collective Action in challenging markets, the discussants highlighted the importance of communication, bringing together a wide set of stakeholders – particularly local champions – and recognizing that the process takes time and patience. Angie Farrag-Thibault provided examples of the Maritime Anti-Corruption Network (MACN), which aims to eliminate corruption from the maritime industry and has practical experience in many countries. In Nigeria for example, a key takeaway from a project there was that progress takes significantly more time in certain markets, particularly in relation to internalizing local ownership for any recommended actions. Tayfun Zaman highlighted the challenge of maintaining interest among stakeholders that initially sign on to a Collective Action initiative, citing his experience from working with customs brokers in Turkey. Ensuring the involvement of industry champions is an important element in sustaining Collective Action, along with communication.

Drawing comparisons between Turkey, Nigeria or any of the countries discussed during the session under the label of ‘challenging’ – a concept that was itself challenged – is however difficult, in part due to different economic conditions and relationships. Collective Action in these countries must also tackle the issue of differences in perceptions, expectations and interests between companies and stakeholders entering the market compared to those held by local actors. The session once again underscored Collective Action’s flexibility for application in diverse environments, complemented however by the need for thorough analysis of the socioeconomic and political situation in which the initiative takes place.

4.3.2 Collective Action beyond corruption: inspiration from other disciplines

Panellists: Ursula Wynhoven, Chief, Social Sustainability, Governance and Legal, UN Global Compact; Nick Hepworth, Director, Water Witness International; Adriana Lagrotta Leles, Adviser of the CEO/Sustainability, SANASA (Brazil)

This session addressed the use of Collective Action to manage integrity in water stewardship, diverging from the anti-corruption and compliance focus of the conference yet remaining topical and providing transferable lessons learned for application in anti-corruption Collective Action.

One initiative discussed by Nick Hepworth and Adriana Leles included the CEO Water Mandate whereby businesses promote water management, sanitation and support of the Sustainable Development Goals, through a process that involves many aspects of Collective Action, such as fostering multi-stakeholder partnerships. Lessons learned included fostering closer collaboration, having a good conceptual understanding of the problem one wants to tackle, civil society on board, and having credible partners. Keeping the dialogue going and promoting transparency were also highlighted, making these experiences relevant takeaways for anti-corruption Collective Action initiatives.
4.3.3 Collective Action, open data and public procurement: trends, evidence and effectiveness

Panellists: Gavin Hayman, Executive Director, Open Contracting Partnership; Christiaan Poortman, Chair of the Board, Construction Sector Transparency Initiative; Shabnam Siddiqui, Director, UN Global Compact Network India

This session highlighted the importance of taking a systemic approach towards engagement in anti-corruption interventions such as Collective Action, by focusing on the operating environment and tools to support effectiveness and measurement of impact, through initiatives such as the Open Contracting Partnership and the Construction Sector Transparency Initiative (CoST) that prioritize data collection and analysis. Quantitative data collection and analysis can play an important part in supporting evidence of impact, despite the challenges of this approach (data collection itself and establishing firm evidence of cause-effect), and merits consideration for other Collective Action initiatives.

Gavin Hayman described the benefits of open contracting and the Open Contracting Data Standard as a way to improve value for money, public delivery and contribute to a level playing field, serving as a catalyst towards measuring effectiveness. Christiaan Poortman discussed CoST and how its multi-stakeholder and data-driven approach to infrastructure projects has contributed to greater efficiency in public spending, reduced conflict, and enhanced accountability through the independent review of disclosed data. Shabnam Siddiqui provided further concrete examples from the UN Global Compact Network India in the area of public procurement, another process that can be supported by open data and Collective Action. The presentations and discussions that followed also stressed the importance of local actor involvement and civil society participation.

4.4 Concluding Panel – Committing to action

Moderators: Greta Fenner, Managing Director, Basel Institute on Governance and Pedro Rodrigues de Almeida, Head of Basic Industries, Member of the Executive Committee, World Economic Forum

Panellists: Klaus Moosmayer, Chief Compliance Officer of Siemens and Anti-Bribery Chair of BIAC and B20; Viviane Schiavi, Senior Policy Manager, Corporate Responsibility & Anti-corruption, International Chamber of Commerce (ICC); Ursula Wynhoven, Chief, Social Sustainability, Governance and Legal, UN Global Compact; Robin Hodess, Group Director for Advocacy and Research, Transparency International

The panel brought together the key representatives from the private sector anti-corruption and Collective Action space for a frank discussion on the main themes of the conference, while also positioning Collective Action towards the future and within the wider construct of international anti-corruption organizations and initiatives. Taking into consideration the organizations represented and the issues discussed, the session underscored the need for strengthening both the level of coordination among actors at the international level, as well as the dialogue, support and learning between actors at the international and local levels.

The conference’s connection to the B20/G20 anti-corruption agenda and B20 Germany 2017 Anti-Corruption and Responsible Business Conduct Working Group meeting that also took place in Basel
provided the panellists the opportunity to address anti-corruption and Collective Action’s place in the context of current international initiatives against corruption, and in particular how these can complement local initiatives. Both Transparency International and the UN Global Compact, through their organizational structures, provide examples of how this global-local nexus can play out and bring anti-corruption and Collective Action to the level of the citizenry and civil society players on the ground, sharing experiences and building capacity. By maintaining anti-corruption on the international agenda, this slowly but steadily translates into national legislation against corruption, which can support actors at the local level.

The panel held a positive view on the potential for Collective Action going forward within the digital age. Technology offers opportunities for making connections locally and spreading one’s message. It was also noted however that internet-based leaks and social media also can bring their own set of challenges, necessitating careful and effective management of information.

4.5 Closing remarks

The conference marked another step in the process of moving Collective Action from the aspirational to the concrete, Mark Pieth stated in his closing remarks. What was readily apparent from the conference is that no single concept or model of Collective Action can be prescribed. Initiatives require thorough understanding of the political economy in which they operate, and academic research can provide insights into how to maximize chances for success of an initiative. Monitoring, enforcement and the measurement of impact are difficult yet important elements of Collective Action and merit further research and discussion.

On the question of local as opposed to international initiatives, both approaches can be successful, though it can be more effective and exhibit greater impact when beginning an initiative’s efforts at the local level before then moving to the international level. From the analytical perspective – what is collective action? Who is carrying the brunt of the work in promoting and engaging it? – one finds that it is frequently through public-private partnership and multi-stakeholder efforts that it is being practiced today, in an interplay of international organizations and smaller local NGOs that are crucial to the process.

Moving forward, events such as this conference will remain important due to their providing the opportunity for exchange of ideas and peer learning. Digitalization, social media and other technologies will also play an important role in Collective Action initiatives.