

Unclassified

DCD/DAC(2005)14



Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

24-Feb-2005

English - Or. English

**DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE**

**DCD/DAC(2005)14
Unclassified**

**FINAL REPORT OF THE OECD DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE DEVELOPMENT
PARTNERSHIP FORUM ON IMPROVING DONOR EFFECTIVENESS IN COMBATING
CORRUPTION, 9-10 DECEMBER 2004**

Contact:

Bathylle Missika: (tel) +33 (0)1 45 24 1979; (fax) +33 (0)1 44 30 61 47; bathylle.missika@oecd.org

JT00179232

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

English - Or. English

**FINAL REPORT ON THE OECD DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE
DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP FORUM ON
IMPROVING DONOR EFFECTIVENESS IN COMBATING CORRUPTION,
9-10 DECEMBER 2004**

1. Corruption is a major impediment to development and growth. It is a universal threat to social cohesion and political stability, undermining public confidence and good governance in all countries. It directly impedes progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and hampers long term growth and job creation. Increasingly, donor agencies, partner country governments and institutions, international and intergovernmental organisations, civil society and the private sector understand the serious negative impact of corruption on their programmes, projects and populations. In response, many have intensified their work to combat corruption.

2. Fighting corruption and strengthening the means by which donors can fight corruption are fundamental objectives for the international development community. In this context, the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), together with Transparency International (TI) organised this year's OECD DAC Development Partnership Forum, focusing on *Improving donor effectiveness in combating corruption*. This Forum, held in Paris from 9-10 December 2004, set out three specific objectives:

- to improve donor action in supporting anti-corruption programmes in partner countries;
- to assess donor practices and aid modalities in a corruption perspective; and
- to identify specific areas to take concerted action.

3. The Forum brought together political leaders and senior officials from governments, civil society and the private sector in OECD countries and non-OECD countries, bilateral donors, multilateral organisations, international NGOs, and national anti-corruption organisations. The Forum opened on International Anti-Corruption Day, marking the one year anniversary of the signature of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

4. The French Ministry of the Economy, Finance and Industry graciously hosted this event at the Centre des Conférences Pierre Mendès France. The Forum was made possible through the generous support of Canada, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States and the World Bank.

Forum discussions

5. There is broad consensus on the need for increased dialogue and co-operation between and among donors and aid recipients to improve donor effectiveness in combating corruption. The Forum offered participants the opportunity to share their views, experience and expertise in constructive discussions and debates about corruption and development aid. Throughout the discussions, it was noted that corruption should neither be perceived nor approached as a developing country issue and that it affects every sector,

every bureaucracy, in every country. The problems and the solutions lie within agencies and governments of both donor countries and partner countries.

6. Speakers asserted that the giving and receiving of aid, by their very nature, constitute a complex political process and that this process involves fundamental contradictions. Increased aid brings with it concerns about aid dependency, capacity for aid absorption and increased risk of corruption. The donor community must reconcile these contradictions to meet the objective of maintaining and increasing aid flow while ensuring high anti-corruption standards and sustainable, positive results.

7. Participants shared the view that the past decade has witnessed important advances in bringing the topic of corruption into an open forum for reflection and candid dialogue. They also agreed that further progress in the fight against corruption required strong political commitment at the highest levels of leadership. Progress also requires the foresight and persistence, as well as the capacity and resources to plan and implement action over the long term. The fight against corruption is long. In countries where progress has been made, efforts have spanned over decades.

8. A lively and fruitful exchange of ideas took place about how best to use and improve upon existing tools and institutions, as well as on innovative approaches to fight corruption. These discussions led to several ideas and recommendations on how to improve donor effectiveness in the fight against corruption in several areas.

Supporting anti-corruption efforts in partner countries

9. Donors must support effective capacity development to **improve government systems, institutions and processes in partner countries**: justice, procurement, accountability, monitoring. While long term investment of support is difficult to obtain, this is the most effective way to achieve meaningful, lasting change. One suggested approach was building “centres of excellence” - selecting one or two specific institutions among the many sectors that require attention, (e.g. tax and customs) where a long term commitment for support can be secured. Focused attention to a specific area over several years can prove to be effective in creating institutional change in the fight against corruption. These targeted successes in turn lead to virtuous circles, increasing confidence among donors and the general public, and generating momentum for further action in other sectors.

10. Progress in combating corruption depends on **strengthening the demand for accountability**. There is a need to deliver better services and to build confidence within communities that those services are being delivered. There is also a need for transparency about what services are *supposed* to be delivered. Donors can work towards these goals together with parliaments, civil society organisations, media and through intelligent use of information technology. **Parliaments** need better support from donors to ensure that audit systems and public accounts committees are in place. In addition to governmental “watchdogs”, **civil society** also has an important role in demanding accountability. Civil society organisations, including NGOs, faith-based organisations, trade unions and others, are key actors in the fight against corruption. NGOs can play a pivotal role in addressing corruption, acting as innovators, agenda setters, mobilisers and monitors. Transparency International, for example, has worked to raise the consciousness of both policymakers and the general public to recognize that corruption is one of the most important challenges facing the international development community. TI’s groundbreaking work attests to magnitude of the contribution that NGOs can make to the fight against corruption. Donors should identify ways to promote the development of NGO communities that flourish as rightful spokespersons for the public. The development community should also be responsive and proactive with respect to the **media**. Donors must understand how media works, the difficulties journalists face and how best to support media’s contribution to the fight against corruption. This includes understanding laws and practice involving freedom of the press and freedom of information, how journalists are remunerated, and how to protect investigative

journalism. Donors must also understand that the fight against corruption requires changes in attitude, behaviour and culture—all intimately linked to public information. Facilitating reliable access to sound information at all levels of society is crucial to building transparency.

11. The complex issues of **political corruption and the financing of political parties** must be addressed by the donor community. Political reforms aimed at building and strengthening democratic institutions achieve good governance by promoting transparency, accountability and openness. However, democracy itself can be costly and the risk of corruption is high in political party funding. Leaders in new democracies come under increasing pressure to leverage political influence or use political patronage to mobilise election funds, as elections become more and more expensive. Elections themselves provide many opportunities for corruption. These issues require further collective reflection; donors must identify innovative, opportunistic approaches in developing countries. This requires an in-depth understanding of the political economy and history of a country. Suggestions were put forward for more analytical work to study the links between democracy and corruption.

12. Several **regional anti-corruption initiatives** led by the OECD support anti-corruption reforms in participating countries on the basis of international legal instruments. These initiatives, active throughout the Asia-Pacific, Central Asia, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, and the Middle East-North Africa Region, have contributed extensively to raising worldwide awareness about corruption. They provide donors with opportunities for interaction and co-operation with participating countries within a clear anti-corruption framework.

Specific areas for focus

13. In the field of **procurement and public contracting**, emphasis is currently placed on improving efficacy of procurement systems within the broader framework of other government policies, such as transparency, accountability and support for the local business community, but does not aim specifically at fighting corruption. Striking the balance between improving efficacy and addressing corruption is a challenge. Accelerating procurement processes, for example may be considered an improvement, but can also result in less transparency and greater risk of corruption. Actors in the fight against corruption in public procurement cannot rely solely on government action, nor on the goodwill of private sector to lead progress. Effective action includes punitive measures (e.g. public sanctions and/or the exclusion of companies that have committed corrupt or fraudulent acts from future bidding opportunities) and preventive measures (e.g. strengthening the professional and ethical skills of personnel assigned within public institutions to carry out procurement so they can better redetect situations likely to involve corruption, using information technology to help secure procedures and reduce the risk of manipulating documents). Mainstreaming procurement into broader government functions, including the budget process, public financial management, and supply chain management is an important step in improving procurement processes and addressing corruption. Corruption in procurement is difficult to prove, and can even prove challenging to define (e.g. is failure to report corruption considered corruption?). More work is needed to develop means to recognise and prove corrupt behaviour. “Red flag” systems - where specific behaviour patterns and changes on the part of employees and civil servants, often linked to corrupt behaviour, are identified and routinely signalled - provide promising examples of methods to spot corruption.¹

¹ Extensive discussions focussing on procurement and public contracting took place at two recent events: the Global Forum on Governance, Fighting Corruption and Promoting Integrity in Public Procurement, held in Paris on 29-30 November 2004 and the OECD/World Bank Procurement Round Table, Johannesburg, South Africa, 30 November-2 December 2004.

14. Despite much discussion among the donor community, little progress has been made in **reducing tied aid**. Tied aid creates a non-competitive contracting environment by committing recipients of financial assistance to specific suppliers from donor countries, increasing the risk of corruption. It is less beneficial for the recipient, as the cost of goods and services financed by tied aid are consistently higher than market prices. Donors should also work to reduce excessively complex and burdensome requirements imposed on aid recipients and to speed the implementation of the good practices in the areas of **alignment and harmonisation**, as set out in the Rome Declaration. Poor practices and lack of transparency and coordination in these areas add unnecessarily to the cost of aid and may encourage corruption.

15. Donors should work together towards broad ratification, implementation and monitoring of the UN Convention against Corruption, the OECD Convention against Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions and other legal instruments. Donors have a role to advocate within governments, influencing them on the importance of ratifying the UN Convention. There is need for donor support for technical assistance, particularly to developing countries, for effective implementation and action in relation to the UN Convention. Ongoing work among TI, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and OECD aims to identify the best approach for a monitoring mechanism. Donors should also contribute to developing a monitoring system that is credible, sustainable, and cost effective. It should take full account of the multiple conventions that exist to avoid multiple, overlapping monitoring. A sound monitoring mechanism must take a realistic approach, not attempting to cover all aspects, in detail, at once.

16. Stronger reporting systems concerning **money laundering and the recovery of assets gained through corruption** are required. Ongoing evaluation work in the framework of the OECD Anti-Bribery instruments aims to assess the progress, practices and legislation of Parties to the Convention in the area of repatriation of proceeds of corruption. OECD countries should be more proactive in spotting the proceeds of corruption and taking action and the process of peer review should be encouraged, strengthened and more widely used to raise standards in all countries. Donors can support this process by providing technical assistance and training for officials in partner countries.

Information systems: assessment, measurement, review, monitoring

17. **Assessment and measurement tools** have proven useful in raising awareness and providing indicators for the fight against corruption in many cases. It is important, however, to recognize the challenges and limits of using these tools. Existing performance indicators lack dynamism. The lag to capture improvement translates into penalisation of governments that are making concrete progress. By the time progress is registered, and support is granted and delivered, important ground can be lost. The creation of new methods, appropriate use of existing tools and continued efforts to adapt them to serve the needs of partner countries and donors will benefit anti-corruption drives. For example, an innovative assessment framework developed by OECD, together with experts in OECD countries, provides governments and other public institutions with guidance on how to assess policies designed to prevent corruption and promote integrity.² Both the donor community and partner countries must explore alternative methods for assessment and measurement of corruption and progress in the fight against corruption.

18. **External review mechanisms**, such as peer review conducted by OECD, and other types of external evaluation are useful, provided they are imbedded within appropriate existing mechanisms. The review process of the OECD's Working Group on Bribery provides an example where extensive

² This assessment framework was discussed at length at the OECD Symposium on How to Assess Measures for Promoting Integrity and Preventing Corruption in the Public Service, in Paris, 9-10 September 2004.

examination of countries' performance in implementing the OECD convention and recommendations against bribery informs in-depth, straightforward, critical and constructive evaluation. Donor agencies should be subject to open review and evaluation to demonstrate that the standards of transparency and accountability promoted by the development aid community are being applied within their own operations. Scepticism about hypocrisy and corrupt behaviour in aid delivery and within donor agencies is very damaging to hard-won public confidence and to partner countries' anti-corruption programmes and undermines the fight against corruption.

Greater understanding and improved co-operation

19. There is an urgent need to **improve knowledge and information sharing among donors**. There is no universal anti-corruption strategy. A clear understanding of the political economy of corruption in general is necessary for taking effective action against corruption. Experience and specific knowledge of the countries and contexts where donors work are also essential. Clear communication and co-ordination among donors to share and increase this knowledge should be a priority in work in the fight against corruption, particularly at the field level. A set of principles for donor action in anti-corruption (currently under development by the DAC Network on Governance) could provide a broad platform for donors to work together more efficiently, harmonise their activities, align their programmes with developing countries' strategies and address corruption more systematically.

20. Increased **horizontal co-operation** among donors and other sectors of government and with the private sector is essential to improve efforts against corruption. For example, within their own governments, aid agencies can help ensure that the fight against corruption remains among the highest priorities where departments of trade and industry, foreign offices or export credit agencies might lend more attention to the priorities of strong business interests. This is often a challenging task for development co-operation agencies as they have only limited influence on the agendas of domestic ministries and agencies. Donors also have a role in influencing OECD countries' diplomatic representation in partner countries to combat corruption actively. In the context of the OECD Convention and other anti-bribery instruments, OECD countries' governments maintain regular contact with the private sector, trade unions and civil society organisations. Donor agencies can work with the private sector by being receptive to companies' warnings or concerns signalling corruption and by encouraging professional federations to mobilise their collective influence by forming coalitions against corruption.

21. **Open dialogue** between donors and other stakeholders is indispensable. Presentations from participants from developing countries at this forum gave a privileged perspective on the reality in partner countries. This type of exchange is fundamental to improving donor co-operation and coordination in support of authentic, effective, locally-owned anti-corruption activities. Progress has clearly been achieved. Open discussions among donors, partner countries, NGOs, international organisations and the private sector about these complex and sensitive issues would not have been likely in the past. Donors should ensure that the momentum to critically assess the problems and solutions of corruption be maintained and that the outcomes of these exchanges lead to lasting change.

22. Unchecked corruption is a toxic problem for the donor community. Donors will not be able to sustain momentum toward development goals if they cannot persuade the general public that aid money is going for good use. Discussions raised several areas where donors can take concerted action in combating corruption. The Development Assistance Committee, as a key forum where major bilateral donors work together to achieve greater progress towards their common goals, recognises important areas for ongoing work against corruption.

23. The rich exchange at this forum clearly illustrated the far-reaching nature of corruption: its complex causes, the many sectors it involves and affects, and the range of expertise needed to create and

implement lasting solutions. Similarly, the OECD takes a broad, multi-faceted approach to addressing corruption. Anti-corruption efforts are integrated into several areas of the OECD's work - development co-operation, trade, financial affairs, governance and ethics, among others. However, there are limits to what any one actor can achieve in isolation. Only a broad, coherent approach that reaches across areas of expertise can bring about sustainable change. Just as donors need to enhance horizontal co-operation with other government sectors and enrich exchange with actors outside government to address corruption effectively, the OECD must also co-ordinate efforts across directorates to formulate and implement a comprehensive, organisation-wide anti-corruption strategy. The DAC is firmly committed to playing an important role in OECD-wide coordinated action against corruption. This commitment underlies the following action points to be undertaken by the DAC.

- The work of the DAC Network on Governance (GOVNET) on principles for donor action in anti-corruption work, as well as the DAC's work in capacity development are pillars of DAC anti-corruption efforts; and would contribute greatly to an OECD-wide strategy. The GOVNET will take this work forward integrating the valuable outcomes of this forum.
- Development assistance agencies see the need to work more effectively within their own domestic environments, with Foreign Ministries, Export Credit Agencies and the private sector. As a result, the principle of mutual accountability is emerging as a powerful platform for DAC donors to form and strengthen genuine partnerships with developing countries to fight corruption.
- There is a need to integrate anti-corruption work more closely into work on aid effectiveness and harmonisation. Strengthening links between GOVNET and the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness will be strategically important, particularly concerning harmonisation.
- The DAC must address the challenges of taking its work to the local level, helping to ensure that DAC's Good Practices and lessons of experience are conveyed to field offices of DAC agencies and to partner country governments. The challenge applies to many areas of DAC work, not only corruption.
- At country level there is a need for a consistent approach over time. The DAC must be both timely and consistent in its support of long-running initiatives.
- Whereas the DAC works together to some extent on issues related to the media, political parties and parliaments, further efforts and increased collaboration with NGOs are needed. Attention will be given to how best to integrate this area of work.

For further information on the Forum, including background documents and presentations, please go to www.oecd.org/dac/governance/anticorruptionforum .

ANNEX 1

**FINAL AGENDA OF THE DAC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP FORUM,
"IMPROVING DONOR EFFECTIVENESS IN COMBATING CORRUPTION",
9-10 DECEMBER 2004**

THURSDAY, 9 DECEMBER 2004

13:00 Security clearance and registration

13:30 Buffet lunch for Participants of the Forum and the DAC Senior Level Meeting

Session One: Anti-corruption programmes in partner countries

Chair: Kiyoo Akasaka (Deputy Secretary-General, OECD)

14:30 Building public confidence in development effectiveness through anti-corruption programmes

Keynote speakers:

Minister Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, (Minister of Finance, Nigeria)

Alexandre Randrianasolo (Director General, Public Expenditure, Ministry of the Economy, Finance and Budget, Madagascar)

Kamal Hossain (Chairman, Transparency International Advisory Council)

15:30 Participants' comments and questions

16:00

UN Anti-Corruption Day

Richard Manning, Chair, OECD Development Assistance Committee

Bruce Jenks, Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Resources and Strategic Partnerships, United Nations Development Programme

Video link to UN Anti-Corruption Day events in New York and Vienna

16:30 Break

Session Two: Combating Corruption

17:00-18:30 Parallel breakout groups

Group 1: Better understanding the political economy of aid and corruption

Chair: Masood Ahmed (Director-General for Policy and International, DFID, UK)

Speakers:

Elodie Beth (Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate, OECD)

Robin Hodess (Director, Policy Research, Transparency International)

Londa Esadze (Chairwoman, Independent Board of Advisers, Parliament of Georgia)

Group 2: Enhancing the role of civil society in anti-corruption work

Chair: Miklos Marschall (Europe Regional Director, Transparency International)

Speakers:

Simeon Marcelo (Ombudsman, Philippines)

Simon Taylor (Director, Global Witness)

Group 3: Supporting legislation on money laundering and the recovery of stolen assets

Chair: Alan Perry (Kendall Freeman, UK)

Speakers:

Bernard Turner (Chairman of the Commonwealth Expert Group on Asset Recovery)

Akere Muna (Muna and Partner, Cameroon)

Munir Hafiez (Chairman, National Accountability Bureau, Pakistan)

Group 4: Building capacity to follow international conventions

Chair: David Nussbaum (Chief Executive, Transparency International)

Speakers:

Fritz Heimann (Corporate Consultant, US)

Nicola Bonucci (Deputy Director, Directorate for Legal Affairs, OECD)

Eduardo Vetere (Director, Division of Treaty Affairs, UN Office on Drugs and Crime)

Valeria Merino Dirani (Transparency International, Ecuador)

18:30 End of breakout groups

Forum Reception

Welcome address by Minister Xavier Darcos

Minister responsible for Co-operation, Development and the *Francophonie*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

FRIDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2004

Session Three: Assessing donor practices and aid modalities in a corruption perspective

09:00 Discussion: “Does the way donors deliver their aid and assistance promote rather than prevent corruption?”

Chair: Jean-Michel Severino (Director-General, French Development Agency)

Speakers:

Abdoulaye Bio Tchané (Director of Africa Department, IMF)

Brian Cooksey (Private consultant, Tanzania)

Philippe Montigny [Executive Director, International Development and Strategies, France and Chairman of Working Party on Preventing Corruption, French Council of Investors in Africa (CIAN)]

Luc Damiba (National Anti-Corruption Network, Burkina Faso)

Participants' comments and questions

10:30 Break

Session Four: Taking Concerted Action

Parallel breakout sessions

11:00-12:30 Emerging Lessons and Principles for Government Donors

Group 5: Facilitating Access to Information

Chair: Serge Chappatte (Deputy Director General, Swiss Development Co-operation)

Speakers:

Valeria Merino Dirani (Transparency International, Ecuador)

Peter John Aitsi (President, Media Council, Papua New Guinea)

Geir Sundet (Senior Researcher, Research on Poverty Alleviation, Tanzania)

Group 6: Supporting partner countries' programmes to fight corruption

Chair: Ruth Jacoby (Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden)

Speakers:

Sanjay Pradhan (Director, Public Sector Governance, World Bank)

Barbara Turner (Policy and Program Co-ordination, USAID)

Inge Amundsen (Utstein Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, Chr. Michelsen Institute)

Phil Mason (Department for International Development, UK, representing the DAC Governance Network [GOVNET])

Group 7: Improving Procurement and Public Contracting

Chair: Stefan Oswald (Deputy Head, Financial Affairs Department, BMZ, Germany)

Speakers:

Régis Pélissier (Chief, Office of International Monetary and Financial System, Ministry of the Economy, Finance and Industry, France)

Henry Malinga, (Director, Supply Chain Policy, National Treasury, South Africa)

Juanita Olaya (Manager, Integrity Pact and Public Contracting Programme, TI)

Peter Pease (Public Procurement Advisor, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD)

12:30 **Lunch**

Final Plenary

Chair: Michael Roeskau (Director, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD)

14:00 **Reports and conclusions from breakout sessions**

14:30 **Moving Ahead**

Speakers:

Mark Pieth (Chair, OECD Anti-Bribery Working Group)

Surya Nath Upadhyay (Chief Commissioner, Commission for Investigating Abuse of Authority, Nepal)

Peter Eigen (Chairman of the Board, Transparency International)

Participants' comments and questions

16.00 **Summary and concluding remarks**

Richard Manning, Chair, OECD Development Assistance Committee

Minister Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Minister of Finance, Nigeria

ANNEX 3

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT THE
OECD DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE PARTNERSHIP FORUM ON
IMPROVING DONOR EFFECTIVENESS IN COMBATING CORRUPTION
9-10 DECEMBER 2004**

The Anti-Corruption Drive in Nigeria

Minister Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Minister of Finance, Nigeria

Les programmes de lutte anti-corruption dans les pays partenaires, Le contexte de Madagascar

Alexandre Randrianasolo, Director General, Public Expenditure, Ministry of the Economy, Finance and Budget, Madagascar

Building Public Confidence in Development Effectiveness Through Anti-Corruption Programmes

Kamal Hossain, Chairman, Transparency International Advisory Council

Marking the 1st Anniversary of the UN Anti-Corruption Day

Bruce Jenks, Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Resources and Strategic Partnerships, United Nations Development Programme

Public Sector Integrity, a framework for assessment

Elodie Beth, Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate, OECD

Better Understanding Corruption: an Update on TI Measurement Tools

Robin Hodess, Director, Policy Research, Transparency International

Organized Nature of Corruption in Post-Soviet Space and Challenges of Donors: a Case Study of Georgia

Londa Esadze, Chairwoman, Independent Board of Advisers, Parliament of Georgia

Understanding the Political Economy of Corruption at Local Level: the Case of Indonesia

I Ketut Putra Erawan and Eiji Oyamada, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia

Enhancing the role of civil society in anti-corruption work

Simeon Marcelo, Ombudsman, Philippines

Supporting legislation and Action on Recovery of Stolen Assets and Money Laundering

Bernard Turner, Chairman, Commonwealth Expert Group on Asset Recovery

Difficulties Faced by Developing Countries in the Recovery of Proceeds of Corruption

Munir Hafiez, Chairman, National Accountability Bureau, Pakistan

Monitoring the OECD Convention: an Exportable Model?

Nicola Bonucci, Deputy Director, Directorate for Legal Affairs, OECD

United Nations Convention against Corruption

Eduardo Vetere, Director, Division of Treaty Affairs, UN Office on Drugs and Crime

Intervention sur la lutte contre la corruption

Xavier Darcos, Ministre délégué à la Coopération, au Développement et à la Francophonie, France

Elixir or poison chalice? The Relevance of Aid to East Africa

Brian Cooksey, Tanzania Development Research Group

Africa, Companies, International Aid and Corruption

Philippe Montigny, Executive Director, International Development and Strategies, France
Chairman of Working Party on Preventing Corruption, French Council of Investors in Africa (CIAN)

Les limites des mesures prises par les bailleurs de fonds au Burkina

Luc Damiba, National Anti-Corruption Network, Burkina Faso

Promoting access to information: the PNG experience

Peter John Aitsi, President, Media Council, Papua New Guinea

Fighting Corruption, Strategies that Work

Geir Sundet, Senior Researcher, Research on Poverty Alleviation, Tanzania

Our Challenging Climb on Anticorruption: World Bank Experience, Implications for OECD-DAC

Sanjay Pradhan, Director, Public Sector Governance, World Bank

Supporting Partner Countries' Programmes to Fight Corruption

Inge Amundsen, Director, U4, Utstein Anti-Corruption Resource Centre

How Can Donors Enhance Their Collective Action Against Corruption within Existing Mechanisms? Draft Principles for Donor Action In Anti-Corruption

Phil Mason, Department for International Development, UK

Improving Procurement and Public Contracting, Fighting Fraud and Corruption

Henry Malinga, Director, Supply Chain Policy, National Treasury, South Africa

Development Programmes and Corruption in Public Contracting

Juanita Olaya, Manager, Integrity Pact and Public Contracting Programme, TI

Improving Donor Effectiveness in Combatting Corruption, Sharing Nepal's Experience

Surya Nath Upadhyay, Chief Commissioner, Commission for Investigating Abuse of Authority, Nepal