



OECD GLOBAL FORUM ON INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT

NEW HORIZONS AND POLICY CHALLENGES FOR FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Mexico City, 26-27 November 2001

FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

*OECD Paper**

I. Introduction

The notion of sustainable development presents a challenge for policy makers and goes beyond the traditional concerns for economic growth. It argues that present growth should not be at the expense of future generations or of social equity both within and across countries worldwide. It raises environmental concerns about renewable resources and degradation of the ecosystem, as well as social ones regarding the marginalisation of the poorest countries and of unskilled workers, a respect for core labour standards, and of increasing income inequality.

The concerns raised by the concept of sustainable development become even more pronounced in the light of globalisation processes. Globalisation, in economic terms, can be thought of as a process in which business decisions, production processes and markets gradually come to exhibit more “global” characteristics and less “national” ones. Globalisation is characterised by structural reforms – especially trade and investment liberalisation – and increased trade and international investment flows. International trade and investment promote growth, alter the composition and geographical distribution of economic activities, stimulate competition and facilitate the international diffusion of technologies. Depending on the circumstances, trade and investment can have significant effects, both positive and negative, for sustainable development.

In general, trade and investment are not the root causes of environmental and social problems, which rather reflect market and intervention failures. However, the ongoing process of liberalising trade and investment regimes offers both challenges and opportunities in implementing sustainable development policies. For example, issues may arise at the interface of policies or rules designed to encourage trade and inward investment and those designed to further environmental or social objectives. Because of the long-term focus inherent to the notion of sustainability, the most

*. This paper was prepared by Fabienne Fortanier, Erasmus University, and Maria Maher, Senior Economist, OECD.

important influence of investment may well be its indirect influence on environmental and social performance, both nationally and globally.

The growth in international investment also means that a country's sustainable development outlook is increasingly influenced by multinational enterprises (MNEs). This increased internationalisation of firm activities raises concerns regarding the reach of regulatory control in environmental areas such as resource management and pollution control, and social issues like income distribution and labour standards. On the other hand, increasingly more MNEs are responding to public concerns regarding environmental and social issues, as can be seen in the recent rise in corporate voluntary initiatives. This rise in corporate responsibility (CR) also impacts on sustainable development.

In section II the paper discusses recent trends in foreign direct investment (FDI) in the 1980s and 1990s and policy developments that have accompanied and contributed to these trends. The impact of FDI on the three pillars of sustainable development – economic growth, environmental protection and social development – is discussed in section III. The response of firms to increased public concerns regarding sustainability and how these responses can contribute to sustainable development is discussed in section IV. Section V discusses what role governments can play in promoting this trend in increased corporate responsibility and section VI concludes.

II. Impact of FDI on Sustainable Development

This section analyses the main mechanisms by which international investment impacts upon the three constituent parts of sustainable development: the economy, the environment, and the social framework. It distinguishes between direct effects (for example economic growth, worldwide shifts in production and consumption patterns, and technology transfers) and the influence on, and the relevance of, the evolution of policies for sustainable development. In some cases, economic, environmental and social concerns are affected in the same way, in others there are significant differences. For this reason, these issues are discussed separately below. This approach should not obscure the fact that economic, environmental and social concerns are not separate and opposing aims of sustainable development. In some areas, progress on one front will have positive spillovers on the other two.

a) Economic growth

Whether international investment stems from foreign or national sources, it has been shown that market openness – to both trade and investment – increases economic growth. Open markets allow resources to be used more efficiently and productively, may provide countries with technology not locally available, and by helping firms to tap into world markets, increases their sales potential and realises economies of scale. Efficiency, in turn, contributes to economic growth and rising incomes. Liberalisation can also benefit citizens in tangible ways, through lower prices and greater product diversity, and an increase in the purchasing power of their wages.

There is an increasing body of empirical-econometric evidence that countries with more open trade and investment regimes have had higher rates of growth. In the last decade countries that have had more open trade and investment regimes have achieved double the annual average growth rates of others, and have attracted more FDI (OECD, 1998). The observed average increase in trade exposure in OECD countries over the 1980s-90s period has been estimated to have resulted in about a 4% increase in output per capita (Bassanini *et al*, 2001). For developing countries, a study by Sachs and Warner (1995) finds that those countries with open economies grew by 4.5% a year in the 1970s and 1980's, while those with closed economies grew by 0.7% a year. And a recent study by Ben-David, Nordstrom and Winters (1999) finds that major trade liberalisation events have coincided with movements to higher – and in the majority of cases, steeper – growth paths that lie above the lower,

and flatter, pre-liberalisation paths. These results concur with a World Bank study by Dollar and Kraay (2000) which confirms that openness boosts economic growth, and that the incomes of the poor rise one-for-one with overall growth.

Benefits associated with the inflow of FDI include an increase in the production base, the introduction of new skills and technologies and the creation of employment. MNEs are a powerful and effective means to disseminate technology from developed to developing countries, and are often the only source of new and innovative technologies that are usually not available through the market. Technology disseminated through FDI generally includes the 'entire package' including experts, skills and the financial resources to exploit the technology appropriately.

Looking at the impact of FDI on capital accumulation and productivity growth, de Mello (1999) finds that foreign investors increase productivity in host countries and that FDI is often a catalyst for domestic investment and technological progress. Markusen and Venables (1999) find that FDI has a positive effect on domestic firms' productivity. They claim that increased competition associated with the entry of an MNE upgrades the efficiency and product quality in national firms, and opens up possibilities for export. Empirical evidence on OECD countries also shows that foreign affiliates of MNEs have a higher labour productivity compared to local firms.¹ Foreign investment plays an important role in the dissemination of gains from innovations, especially for developing countries (Ahn and Hemmings, 2000). And studies by Borensztein *et al.* (1999) and OECD (1998) find that not only does foreign direct investment stimulate growth but that it has a larger impact than investment by domestic firms. Recent literature, however, shows that developing countries need to have reached a certain threshold of development (e.g. education or infrastructure) before being able to capture the benefits associated with FDI (Saggi, 2000).

FDI also brings other tangible and intangible assets that have large impacts on development. For example, the inflow of FDI through mergers and acquisitions can bring improved corporate governance, including better organisational and managerial skills. The degree to which corporations observe basic principles of good corporate governance is an increasingly important factor for international investment decisions. Corporate governance programmes – which establish rules to protect shareholders and encourage clarity and transparency in financial reporting – play an important role in economic growth, and the development of equity markets, which enable companies to access financing from a larger pool of investors (Maher and Andersson, 2001). Corporate governance mechanisms facilitate the efficient functioning of capital markets (including the market for corporate control) and promote the efficient allocation of resources. This is particularly relevant for international investment given the increase in FDI via mergers and acquisitions. A good corporate governance regime helps to maintain the confidence of investors – both foreign and domestic – and to attract patient longer-term capital, which is particularly important for developing countries. Bribery and corruption are also critical impediments to economic growth. Corruption is not only a serious obstacle to investment, but also acts as a brake on social improvement (e.g. education or health) since it diverts funds away from development (Box 1).

Available evidence suggests that many of the poorest developing countries have not been able to integrate successfully into global markets and to participate in the growth-inducing benefits of openness to trade and investment. The failure of the majority of the least developed countries (LDCs) to grow and to integrate into the global economy as rapidly as other developing countries has occurred despite multiple efforts at reform. Market openness clearly is not a sufficient condition for economic growth, but sound macro-economic policies and institutional stability are also necessary, as is social stability (Rodrik, 1999). With weak institutions, poor governance (both public and private) and unsound policies, market reforms can fail with great costs, especially to vulnerable groups in society.

1 . The wages paid in the manufacturing industry by foreign affiliates of MNEs reflect the higher labour productivity and are higher than those paid by national firms (OECD, 1998).

Box 1 Bribery, Corruption and Sustainable Development

Bribery and corruption – stemming from lax economic, political and institutional systems – have a strong impact on sustainable development. For example, the report on Transparency International's (2000) *Corruption Perception Index* (CPI) shows a striking correlation between the CPI and national environmental performance. In contrast to the idea that corruption and bribery can “grease the machinery of commerce”, empirical evidence has shown that countries with high levels of corruption have poor economic performance and lower rates of investment, both domestic and foreign (Mauro, 1995; World Bank 1997; and Wei, 1998).

The mechanisms through which corruption hinders economic growth are straightforward. First of all, bribery and corruption distort economic decision-making, and increase transaction costs and uncertainty in the economy. Once corruption has spread, a vicious circle is established whereby economic actors continue to operate illegally without trying to revert to the rule of law. Moreover, corruption inflates government expenditure and distorts the composition of this expenditure away from investment in sectors such as health and education towards large public infrastructure projects. Hence, development is slowed as crony capitalism is promoted at the expense of economic efficiency. Similarly, corruption misallocates talents to rent-seeking activities and distorts sectoral priorities and technology choices. Last, but not least, corruption undermines the state's legitimacy and its ability to raise revenues, reducing the provision of public goods.

Enterprises have responded to these concerns by adapting management techniques commonly used in many other areas such as quality and environment. OECD research on corporate codes of conduct shows bribery and corruption are amongst the most commonly cited issues in codes, but that definitions used, and the scope of commitments, vary widely. This suggests that the international business community still struggles to come to grips with the complex ethical questions that arise in defining appropriate business conduct in this area.

Indeed, during the 1990s, output growth in low-income countries was less than the developing country average, largely as a result of conflict and macroeconomic instability.² Since 1980 more than half of all low-income countries, including 15 of the world's 20 poorest countries, have been involved in external or civil wars. However, low-income countries that had both macroeconomic stability and avoided conflict achieved annual per capita growth rates of 2.9 percent and real export growth rates of 11.6 percent. Though hardly conclusive, the performance of these countries during the 1990s suggests they can achieve rapid growth while increasing their integration with the global economy (despite limited capacity and weak institutions) provided they exhibit minimal social and macroeconomic stability. Good regulatory reforms to encourage competition and foster consumer protection are also elements crucial for ensuring the rewards from liberalisation are realised.

b) Environmental protection

In general, while foreign investment is not the cause of environmental problems, it can have significant effects, both positive and negative, on the environment. The consequences of investment liberalisation on the environment are likely to be the result of an expansion of world economic output (scale effects), a reallocation of production and consumption worldwide and between sectors (structural effects), and the stimulation of technological development and diffusion (technology effects).

On the one hand, investment liberalisation may lead to increased production and consumption of polluting goods or to an expansion in industrial activity. This can lead to growing pressures on the environment such as increased pollution and use of resources, rapid urbanisation, or damage to protected areas, etc. – posing problems for pollution control, ecological protection and public health issues. On the other hand, investment liberalisation – when paired with the implementation of strong regulatory frameworks to protect the environment – can have a beneficial impact on the environment. For example, FDI can improve structural efficiencies and make new investments in environmental protection possible. Furthermore, by contributing to an economy's economic growth, investment also increase society's demand for a healthier environment, since

2. See World Bank (2000). Low-income countries are defined as those countries with a GDP per capita in 1999 of less than US \$755.

wealthier societies are more willing – and able – to pay for protection of the environment. Some evidence supporting this relationship has been found – the amount of environmental regulation, as well as many indicators of environmental quality, increase steadily with the growth in per capita income (Furtado *et al.*, 2000).

However, there are several reasons for not relying exclusively on this “market solution” to protect the environment. Not all measures of environmental quality fit this pattern e.g. growth contributes monotonically to global emissions of carbon dioxide, levels of waste disposal and urban congestion. Also, it might take years of growth before environmental quality begins to improve, at the risk of possibly irreversible environmental damage in the short term. While income growth may well be necessary it may not be sufficient for environmental improvements. Instead of relying solely on economic growth and market mechanisms, policy coherence and the implementation and enforcement of adequate environmental regulations will become increasingly important in limiting damages to the environment caused by FDI.

Foreign direct investment flows can also assist in abating pollution, or have other positive environmental impacts, through the worldwide dissemination of technologies. With tighter regulations at home, MNEs have a strong incentive to innovate in areas that improve resource efficiency or reduce industrial waste. Once developed, new technologies can be applied on a worldwide basis by the firm, in order to benefit from economies of scale. FDI by MNEs can also have positive spill-over effects on the technological characteristics of national firms since local firms may imitate multinationals’ technological practices in order to improve their own production practices. However, even if industrial production plants use advanced technologies, FDI can increase the total environmental burden on a country if before that investment no such plants existed.

While FDI is an important vehicle for both technological change and diffusion, international capital flows are also an important determinant of the technologies of production. The internationalisation of capital markets, by giving firms access to foreign sources of savings, can ease financial constraints that prevent firms from investing in potentially more efficient and environmentally friendly technology. Financial constraints are often among the most important barriers to investment in environmentally preferable technologies. In some cases, these constraints have arisen from national policies towards foreign capital, such as foreign exchange restrictions, international credit controls, and ownership restrictions.

Long term environmental impacts of international investment will depend in large part on how government environmental policies respond to their pressures and opportunities. For example, the so-called “*pollution haven*” hypothesis implies that competitive forces would move foreign direct investment away from countries with high environmental standards, or attract it towards those with low environmental standards. Closely related to this hypothesis is that of the “*regulatory chill*”, which would reflect resistance to enacting or upgrading home country environmental standards on competitiveness grounds.

It is possible that some countries could be attracted by the idea of relaxing environmental standards or refraining from upgrading low standards in order to attract certain types of investments, and individual firms may be sensitive to the costs of complying with more stringent environmental standards. FDI flows to a wide range of industries and companies – some of which are careful environmental stewards, some of which are not. However, empirical research shows that the risk of redeployment of productive resources towards low standard countries is rather small. Environmental costs are only one of a broad number of factors, including quality of infrastructure, access to inputs, wage costs, labour productivity, political risk, the size and growth potential of markets, that investors take into account in location decisions. The costs of adhering to environmental regulations are also typically a small part (on average 2-3%) of total production costs for most firms (OECD, 1998; Adams, 1997; UNEP, 2000). Instead, multinational enterprises generally seek *consistent* environmental enforcement, rather than *lax* environmental enforcement (OECD, 1997). In spite of the strength of empirical findings concerning the relative unimportance of pollution havens there is some

evidence that competitiveness concerns have dampened governments' enthusiasm to raise environmental standards.³

c) *Social development*

The social effects associated with investment, and its liberalisation, are examined in two areas. First, FDI can impact upon the labour market. Though foreign firms have been shown to create employment, the quality of that employment is sometimes questioned. Especially where governments compete to attract FDI, some may be tempted to be less vigilant in enforcing their national laws that promote core labour standards. Secondly, investment and its liberalisation can exacerbate differences in income distribution and inequality that in general result from inadequate national policies regarding wealth distribution (e.g. tax policies). The benefits of the changes in global production and trade patterns, therefore, will be distributed differently amongst nations and amongst different groups within nations.

With respect to the definition and recognition of *core* labour standards, the international community has made significant progress in developing consensus. According to the ILO *Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work*, adopted in 1998, these principles and rights include freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour; the effective abolition of child labour; and the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

The interplay between investment, and employment and core labour standards is complex. Countries that strengthen their core labour standards can increase economic efficiency by raising skill levels in the work force and by creating an environment which encourages innovation and higher productivity. In general, the absence of core labour standards does not change the location decisions of OECD investors in favour of less strictly regulated countries. In the majority of cases, core labour standards are not important determinants for investment location decisions, thereby making policy competition between governments in core labour standards unnecessary and even harmful for society (OECD, 1998).

Besides its impact on labour markets, international investment can also impact upon the distribution of wealth within and across nations and contribute to poverty alleviation. Economic growth, driven by investment, helps to alleviate poverty and the social and environmental damage which poverty engenders, but may not by itself be sufficient for poverty reduction. Poverty can also foster political and social instability, as well as encourage practices that result in environmental degradation (e.g. deforestation to increase farmland or provide firewood, and soil erosion from over-intensive farming).

In the last fifty years, investment led integration has been accompanied with a rise in prosperity and living standards, and a substantial reduction in poverty in many parts of the world. The share of the world's population living in extreme economic poverty – defined as living on less than \$1 per day – has fallen from 29 percent in 1990 to 24 percent in 1998 (World Bank, 2000). That still leaves a total of more than one billion people in poverty. In Asia, where most of the world's poor live, poverty has declined significantly over the past two decades, although the recent crisis has slowed progress. In contrast, the incidence of poverty is rising rapidly in countries with economies in transition in Europe and Central Asia, and continuing to rise in Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Though people are poor for a variety of reasons, empirical studies show a growing consensus that market openness has a positive impact on per capita incomes.⁴ However, while liberalisation

3 . For example, see Mabey and McNally (1999), Oman (1999) and Nordstrom and Vaughan (1999).

policies are likely to be beneficial in most circumstances, for the less developed countries enhancing their integration into the global economy involves more than the opening of markets and a welcoming environment for international investment. Policies concerning macroeconomic stability, good governance and capacity building are also of crucial significance. So too are the right environmental and social policies to ensure that development is sustainable, and that the benefits of openness are widely shared.

Even though experience shows that properly sequenced market-friendly reforms do produce economic growth and increased welfare, these effects might not be distributed equally among different groups in society. Liberalisation can lead to transitional disturbances in the markets on which the poor operate. Extreme adverse poverty shocks are often associated with the disappearance of a market, while strong poverty alleviation arises when markets are introduced for previously non-traded goods. Where markets do exist, liberalisation is likely to have major effects on the price of factors of production – of which wages are the most important for poverty purposes. If the reform boosts the demand for labour-intensive products, it will increase the demand for labour and then either wages or employment, or both, will increase. Whether this will reduce poverty depends on whether the poor are strongly represented in the type of labour for which demand has risen (Ben-David *et al.*, 1999). Policymakers, therefore, need to complement policies stimulating economic growth with policies intended to broaden access to income opportunities, and which are needed in order to stimulate welfare gains overall.

III. Firm Level Responses

As the above overview has shown, much of the overall impact of FDI on sustainable development depends on government policies in the host and the home country, and on the behaviour of the multinational enterprise itself. With respect to the latter, a particular interesting feature of the last decade has been the focus on responsible corporate behaviour. Companies – especially large, visible firms – have increasingly undertaken voluntary initiatives to advance the sustainable development agenda. These initiatives include the issuance of codes of conduct, the implementation of associated management systems and, more recently, public reporting on the non-financial performance of companies. Firms have undertaken these initiatives for a variety of reasons – to improve compliance with law and regulation, to manage litigation and reputation risks, to improve relations with customers and business partners, and to improve relationships with the societies in which they operate.

a) Corporate codes of conduct

Codes of conduct are voluntary expressions of commitment that set forth standards and principles for business conduct (Kolk *et al.*, 1999). They cover a broad range of issues and address each of the economic, social and environmental “pillars” of the sustainable development agenda. Examples of those issues are environmental management, human rights, labour standards, the fight against corruption, consumer protection, information disclosure, competition, and science and technology. ‘Compliance with law’ is the most common commitment made in the codes, and environment and labour relations are the most common issue areas. However, significant divergences exist among companies in the nature of commitments they make, even in narrowly defined business ethics contexts (e.g. commitments on core labour standards in the branded apparel industry -- OECD, 2001).

Voluntary commitments issued in the form of codes of conduct have an advantage in that they can be tailored to firm-specific requirements. On the other hand, they can suffer from credibility problems, especially by people who suspect that companies cannot be trusted to monitor their own behaviour. Firms are aware of this problem and they are attempting to communicate the steps that they

4. See Sachs and Warner (1995). A critical review of this study is provided in Rodriguez and Rodrik (1999).

take to make good on their commitments in day-to-day operations. Examination of public statements on their implementation efforts suggests that firms try to tailor implementation to the issue at hand – that is, they use different management tools for anti-bribery commitments than they do when trying to implement core labour standards (OECD, 2001). Various private consulting firms and auditing services have emerged to assist firms in developing appropriate management and communication strategies. However, in many of these areas there are still significant differences of opinion on what should be done and how it should be reported.

b) *Management systems*

Management systems have been developed by firms to implement the strategies and commitments found in corporate codes of conduct. In particular, many firms are introducing *environmental management systems* (EMSs). An effective EMS identifies and controls risks related to the environment, and increases cost-savings through more efficient use of resources and energy. Firms often seek to increase the credibility of their environmental commitments by publishing the details of their EMS. Since the implementation of an EMS requires considerable know-how, international standards have been developed to formalise this procedure. The most common standardised EMSs are the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS); the EU supported management system and certification scheme introduced in 1993; and ISO 14001, an international environmental management standard published in 1996. As regards labour relations, standardised management systems have also become available, of which Social Accountability 8000 (SA8000) – focusing *inter alia* on child labour, forced labour, health and safety, and free association and collective bargaining – is a well-known example.

The past few years have seen a rapid growth in the number of certified firms. Some tension, however, may exist between tailor-made management systems and standardised systems. Standardised systems provide quick and relatively inexpensive access to advanced management techniques – and avoid “re-invention of the wheel”. On the other hand, standardised systems may not be tailored to individual company needs.

c) *Environmental reporting practices*

Environmental performance reporting is used by an increasing number of firms to report the results of their efforts to the public. Companies are facing ever-greater pressure to publish a thorough report on their environmental performance, including quantitative information going back several years and references to negative experiences. In economies where environmental management practices have been widespread, the demand for high quality environmental reports is mounting as the next step in advanced environmental corporate practice. Still, environmental performance reporting is relatively uncommon and high environmental impact firms differ markedly in how they publish their information and the data they include (OECD, 2001). Unlike other areas of business reporting, there are few widely accepted standards to help firms decide what information should be included in their environmental performance report. The Global Reporting Initiative, supported by major businesses, NGOs and the United Nations, has developed standards for business reporting in the area of sustainable development.

IV. Promotion of responsible Corporate Behaviour

The private sector plays a vital role in generating economic growth and in ensuring the sustainability of that growth. Therefore, the way private enterprises are governed and their behaviour, both domestically and internationally, is important for sustainable development. The private initiatives discussed above often complement government-orchestrated initiatives, and recent trends of regulatory or public enforcement strategy have tended to integrate these private initiatives. OECD countries have

launched several initiatives to promote responsible corporate behaviour more in line with the sustainable development agenda. Among these instruments are the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, and the OECD Bribery Convention. This may eventually lead to the accumulation of greater consensus among businesses and other parts of civil society about the appropriate scope and nature of commitments in the various areas of business conduct, and about the management and reporting practices that are needed to support these commitments. Although none of these initiatives represents the last word on the issues they address, they do represent important steps in the ongoing process of developing a meaningful framework for promoting appropriate conduct in international business.

The OECD Principles of Corporate Governance include the core elements of a good corporate governance regime. For example, they advocate *inter alia* that the rights of shareholders, including minority and foreign shareholders, be protected, and that the markets for corporate control be allowed to function in an efficient and transparent manner. They recognise the role that stakeholders play in contributing to the sustainability of financially sound enterprises, and that factors such as business ethics and corporate awareness of environmental and societal concerns impact on the reputation and long-term success of a company. A good corporate governance regime helps to assure that corporations use their capital efficiently, while at the same time that they operate for the benefit of society as a whole. The Principles can be used both by national governments as a benchmark against which they can evaluate and improve their laws and regulations, and by private sector parties that have a role in developing corporate governance systems and best practices.

The OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises provide a set of recommendations for worldwide responsible corporate behaviour consistent with existing legislation and both complement and reinforce efforts by the private sector to define and implement responsible business conduct. These voluntary Guidelines – specifically aimed at the behaviour of Multinational Enterprises – provide a government-backed set of principals and standards of good corporate behaviour and help to level the playing field between competitors in the international market place. Issues dealt with in the recently revised Guidelines include: disclosure and transparency (updated to encourage social and environmental accountability); employment (now covering all internationally recognised core labour standards), and; environment (encouraging MNEs to raise their environmental performance through improved internal environmental management and better contingency planning for environmental impacts). Also a new recommendation on human rights and new chapters on combating corruption and on consumer protection have been added.

Though the role of firms is vital in the fight against bribery, governments also have an important role to play. *The OECD Convention on Combating Bribery* addresses combating bribery of foreign public officials in international business transactions. The Convention *inter alia* requires countries to establish the criminal offence of bribing a foreign public official, and to have in place adequate sanctions and reliable means for detecting and enforcing the offence. The aim is to eliminate the ‘supply’ of bribes to foreign officials, with each country taking responsibility for the activities of its own companies. The new chapter on combating corruption in the OECD Guidelines for MNEs, and the disclosure and transparency chapter in the OECD Corporate Governance Principles, provide a framework that discourages firms engaging in acts of bribery.

V. Conclusion

Driven by increases in international investment flows and by changes in government policies – liberalisation, regulatory reform and privatisation – national economies have become increasingly integrated into one global one, with the exception of a number of least developed countries. For both developed and developing countries the internationalisation of economic activities poses opportunities and challenges for sustainable development. Though investment is not the root cause of environmental and social problems – which in general result from market failures and inadequate policy frameworks – it does amplify and accelerate these difficulties.

International investment can stimulate competition, improve resource allocation, and facilitate the international distribution of technology. Indeed, countries with open investment regimes have generally shown higher growth rates than those countries that did not. However, while economic growth has increased overall world prosperity, inequality between and within both developed and developing countries has increased. With the large majority of the world's people living in developing countries, it is important to take into account their perspective on the issues of sustainable development as well. High international standards in employment and environment are clearly desirable in terms of sustainability, but these may be relatively and absolutely more difficult for developing countries to reach. OECD countries have a role to play in assisting developing countries in attaining the presently set goals of sustainable development.

Some have feared that recognition of the benefits of FDI might lead to a race to the bottom in environmental and social standards in order to attract more FDI. These concerns have in general proven to be unfounded – though on the other hand, there are no signs of a ‘race to the top’ either. At the same time, economic growth has increased pressure on the environment through scale effects, which can only partly be offset through more efficient use of resources, for example, due to better technology. MNEs however have generally preferred to reap the scale benefits of standardisation in environmental, health and safety management systems in their foreign affiliates rather than exploiting weaknesses in local legislation.

MNEs are the main vehicles of FDI, and their behaviour and strategies are crucial in attaining sustainable development. Within the OECD, several instruments – among which the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises – provide a benchmark to stimulate corporate behaviour more in line with the goals of sustainability. Firms are also responding to pressure from the public-at-large and civil society. The largest MNEs are increasingly committing themselves to voluntary principles and standards of corporate social responsibility, thereby, contributing to sustainable development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS, J. (1997), "Globalisation, Trade and the Environment", in *Globalisation and the Environment*, Paris: OECD.
- AHN, S. and HEMMINGS, P. (2000), "Policy Influence on Economic Growth in OECD Countries: An Evaluation of the Evidence", OECD Economics Department Working Paper, no. 246, Paris: OECD.
- BASSANINI, A., S. SCARPETTA, AND P. HEMMINGS (2001), "Economic Growth : The Role of Policies and Institutions – Panel data evidence from OECD countries", OECD Economics Department Working Paper, no. 283, Paris: OECD.
- BEN-DAVID, D., NORDSTROM, H. and WINTERS, A. (1999), "Trade, income disparity and poverty", WTO special studies 5, Washington: WTO.
- BORENSZTEIN, E., DE GREGORIO, J. and LEE, L-W (1998), "How does foreign investment affect economic growth", *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 45: 115-135.
- DE MELLO, L.R. (1999), "Foreign Direct Investment-led growth: evidence from time series and panel data", *Oxford Economic Papers* 51, 133-151.
- DOLLAR, D. and KRAAY A. (2000), "Growth is good for the poor", World Bank Development Research Group Working Papers, forthcoming.
- EARLE, Ralph (1998), "Environmental performance and equity value, the link gets stronger", paper presented at the CERES annual conference, April 15.
- FURTADO, J.I. dos R. and BELT, T., with JAMMI, R (eds.) (2000), *Economic Development and Environmental Sustainability: Policies and Principles for a Durable Equilibrium*, Washington DC: World Bank Institute.
- GONENC, R., MAHER, M. and NICOLETTI, G. (2001), "The implementation and the effects of regulatory reform: Past experiences and current issues", *OECD Economic Studies*, No. 32(I), p. 11-98, Paris: OECD.
- KOLK, A., VAN TULDER, R. and WELTERS, C. (1999), "International Codes of Conduct and Corporate Social Responsibility: Can Transnational Corporations Regulate Themselves?", *Transnational Corporations*, Vol. 8(1): 143-80.
- MABAY and McNALLY (1999), "Foreign direct investment and the environment: From pollution havens to sustainable development", Gland (Switzerland): WWF.
- MAHER, M. and T. ANDERSSON (2001), "Corporate Governance: Effects on Firm Performance and Economic Growth", in Renneboog, L., J. McCahery, P. Moerland and T. Raaijmakers (eds.), *Convergence and diversity of corporate governance regimes and capital markets*, Forthcoming, Oxford University Press.
- MARKUSEN, J.R. and VENABLES, A.J. (1999), "Foreign direct investment as a catalyst for industrial development", *European Economic Review*, Vol. 43: 335-356.
- MAURO, P. (1995) "Corruption and Growth", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 110(3).

- NORDSTROM, H. and VAUGHAN, S. (1999), "Trade and Environment", WTO Special Studies 4, Washington: WTO.
- OECD (2001), *Corporate Responsibility: Private initiatives and public goals*, Paris: OECD.
- OECD (1998), *Open Markets Matter: The benefits of trade and investment liberalisation*, Paris: OECD.
- OECD (1997), *Globalisation and environment: preliminary perspectives*, Paris: OECD.
- OMAN, C. (1999), *Policy competition for FDI: A study of competition among governments to attract FDI*, Paris: OECD.
- RODRIGUEZ, F. and RODRIK, D. (1999), "Trade Policy and Economic Growth: A Skeptic's Guide to Cross-National Evidence", NBER, working paper no. 7081.
- RODRIK, D. (1999), "The new global economy and developing countries. Making openness work", ODC Policy essay no. 24, Washington: ODC.
- SACHS, J. and WARNER, A. (1995), "Economic Reform and the Process of Global Integration", *Brookings Papers on Global Activity*, Vol. 1: 1-118.
- SAGGI, K. (2000), "Trade, foreign direct investment and international technology transfer: a survey", World Bank, Washington DC.
- SOCIAL INVESTMENT FORUM (1999), Report on socially responsible investing trends in the United States, Washington D.C.: SIF.
- TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL (2000), *Corruption perceptions index*, Berlin: TI.
- UNCTAD (2000), *World investment report: Cross-border Mergers and Acquisitions and Development*, Geneva: UNCTAD.
- UNCTAD (1999), *World investment report: Foreign direct investment and the challenge of development*, Geneva: UNCTAD.
- UNEP (2000), *Environment and Trade: A handbook*, Nairobi: UNEP.
- WEI, S. (1998), "Corruption in economic development: beneficial grease, minor annoyance, or major obstacle", World Bank, Development Research Group, paper presented at the Workshop on Integrity in Asia, Bangkok, June 29-July 1.
- WORLD BANK (1997), *World Development report 1997: The state in a changing world*. Washington, D.C.
- WORLD BANK (2000), *Global Economic Prospects and the Developing Countries*, Washington, D.C.