ICC Global Commission on Business Integrity

Official Side Event to the OECD

"Business and Government as Partners for Integrity"

Executive Summary

---

24 March 2025

Hybrid - Virtual/in-person at ICC Headquarters, Paris

1. Welcome Remarks

- **Viviane Schiavi**, ICC Business Integrity Global Policy Lead, welcomed participants to the ICC Business Integrity Conference, an official side event of the OECD Global Anti-Corruption and Integrity Forum. She noted the importance of bringing together experts from business, governments, and civil society to foster cross-sector learning and dialogue. Ms. Schiavi highlighted the global reach of the conference, with 130 registered participants from across the world. She extended her appreciation to ICC Secretary General **John Denton**, Deputy Secretary General – Policy **Andrew Wilson**, and ICC Global Business Integrity Commission Chair **Gonzalo Guzman** for their leadership, as well as to the Expert Speakers contributing to the ICC conference. She also acknowledged the participating Vice-Chairs, present in person:
    - **Sanket Dawda**, Commission Vice-Chair, Senior Vice-President and Chief Compliance Officer at Glenmark Pharmaceuticals, India.
    - **Hema Lehocky**, Commission Vice-Chair, Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer with AFRY, Sweden.

- **Commission Chair Gonzalo Guzman** also welcomed attendees and emphasized the importance of collaboration across sectors to address integrity challenges. He underscored the relevance of the conference discussions in today's uncertain geopolitical context. Mr. Guzman noted the growing cooperation between ICC mirror policy commissions, highlighting the establishment of mentorship programs between national committee commissions such as between those of ICC Mexico and ICC Indonesia. He thanked the OECD for its continued support of ICC's work, and opened the ICC conference, which aimed to explore key issues, including the role of business and governments in promoting integrity and the integration of ethics and compliance managing geopolitical risks.

2. Panel 1 – Business and Government Working Together for Integrity

- **Viviane Schiavi** moderated the Panel 1 of the conference, entitled *Business and Government Working Together for Integrity*. The panel explored how governments and businesses can align efforts to tackle corruption, strengthen transparency, and build integrity-based governance frameworks. Panel 1 featured insights from:

    - **Jasper Johnson**, Acting Head of Division, Anti-Corruption in Government, OECD
    - **Alice Navarro**, Deputy Director, Agence Française Anti-Corruption (AFA), France

- A key theme of this session was that integrity cannot be achieved in silos. Public and private actors need to exchange good practices and information to co-create systemic, scalable solutions. The panel embodied the theme of the day — collaboration — with both Ms. Navarro and Mr. Johnson contributing perspectives from their respective institutions.

- The discussion opened with reflections on the OECD's leadership role in anti-corruption efforts, beginning with the 2017 OECD Recommendation of the Council on Public Integrity and its importance for public-private cooperation. The 2017 Recommendation marked a transition from enforcement-heavy approaches to a more integrated, whole-of-society strategy. Public integrity was framed as a pillar of strong markets — helping foster level playing fields, boosting investor confidence, and reducing operational costs through regulatory predictability.

- The OECD Recommendation also provided guiding principles for data-informed policymaking, structured public-private collaboration, and effective integrity systems. A suite of Public Integrity Indicators supports implementation, feeding into the OECD Anti-Corruption and Integrity Outlook published in 2024. These indicators assess national progress across 13 different criteria and reveal where engagement gaps persist. Roughly one-third of OECD governments, for instance, still lack formal mechanisms to involve the private sector in national anti-corruption strategies — a major vulnerability.

- In response, the OECD launched the Galvanizing the Private Sector (GPS) initiative. This platform promotes business-government cooperation through tools such as the Anti-Corruption Leaders Hub, which convenes over 70 senior executives, and through joint training between corporate compliance teams and public integrity units. The initiative also fosters innovation partnerships, such as the collaboration between Oracle and Brazil's Office of the Controller General (CGU) to design a digital risk-assessment tool for procurement fraud detection.

- The French regulatory framework under the Sapin II Law (2016) was presented as a national-level example of an institutionalized anti-corruption policy. AFA, created under the French law, operates as both an advisory and enforcement authority. Companies with over 500 employees and €100 million in annual turnover are legally required to implement comprehensive compliance programs. These must include eight pillars:
    1. Risk mapping tailored to operational and geographical exposure;
    2. A formal Code of Conduct;
    3. Targeted training for at-risk staff;
    4. Due diligence on third parties;
    5. Internal and external accounting controls;
    6. A functioning whistleblower system;
    7. Disciplinary procedures;
    8. Evaluation and internal audit mechanisms.

- AFA audits are administrative in nature and do not require suspicion of criminal activity. Their purpose is to assess whether companies are meeting preventive obligations. The French agency also audits public entities including municipalities, hospitals, and universities. One example of concrete, on-the-ground action by AFA involved mapping corruption risks at French port authorities — zones considered vulnerable due to organized crime infiltration. AFA coordinated stakeholders across public and private sectors, including customs, logistics companies, and prosecutors. The resulting report provided cross-sector recommendations, training tools, and legislative proposals. The model has since informed similar exercises in Belgium and the Netherlands.

- Viviane Schiavi reflected on the high value of joint, on-the-ground engagement of this kind. ICC, she noted, has long developed private sector integrity tools by business, for business, underscoring the importance of ensuring that these build companies' capacity to align with public authorities' expectations. She also stressed the importance of ICC's continued engagement in policy fora like the B20 and OECD's Global Anti-Corruption & Integrity Forum to ensure that business engages actively in helping shape regulatory frameworks.

- A discussion with participants ensued, raising points on regulatory functions, coordination, and due diligence frameworks. On business involvement in shaping policy, it was observed that companies are increasingly expected to contribute to the development of norms, especially where governments face delays or capacity constraints.

- Panel 1 concluded with forward-looking reflections. The integrity landscape, it was noted, faces growing challenges — from organized crime and AI misuse to governance risks in the digital transition. A shared culture of integrity, supported by training at all institutional levels, remains critical. From frontline enforcement to executive strategy, both public and

private sectors must stay aligned with these fundamental aims. ICC reaffirmed its steadfast commitment to continuing to lead as a key partner facilitating that alignment through dialogue and action.

3. Panel 2 – Harnessing Trade Facilitation to Bolster Integrity at Border Crossings

- **Valerie Picard**, ICC Head of Trade, moderated the Panel 2 that explored how trade facilitation can serve as a powerful tool to reduce corruption risks at border crossings. The discussion showcased concrete business experiences, international instruments, and institutional collaborations that bridge the trade integrity and anti-corruption agendas. Panellists included:
    - **John Bescec**, Chair, ICC Global Customs and Trade Facilitation Commission; Director, Customs and Trade Affairs, Microsoft
    - **Andrea Hampton**, Integrity Lead and A-CIP Programme Manager, World Customs Organization (WCO)
    - **Rauno Hoffman**, Global Head of Corporate Compliance Management System – Ethics, Risk & Compliance, Novartis

- In her opening remarks, Ms. Picard recalled how the idea for a joint ICC-WCO paper originated from a meeting between ICC Secretary General **John Denton** and WCO Secretary General **Ian Saunders**. Their shared commitment to promoting both trade and integrity laid the groundwork for this paper. Trade facilitation - defined as the simplification, harmonization, and modernization of border procedures - is not only essential for efficient commerce but also a critical tool for promoting integrity at borders.

- The discussion began with a business perspective on why border integrity is a pressing issue. Border crossings are often where regulations are implemented and enforced, making them high-risk zones for fraud and discretionary abuse. Common issues identified include undervaluation of goods, fraudulent declarations, arbitrary “special service fees,” and coerced facilitation payments. Vivid on-the-ground examples were shared, such as customs officers confiscating goods for personal use or demanding unofficial “fees” to process invoices through intermediaries. These challenges are particularly acute for SMEs, that often lack the leverage or resources to push back.

- Proposed solutions included digitalization and automation, both of which reduce human discretion and enhance transparency. Emphasis was also placed on sustained public-private partnerships and the value of internal auditing systems that monitor not only tax

compliance but also informal charges. Internal compliance programs and zero-tolerance cultures were highlighted as tools for companies to build integrity within supply chains.

- The perspective of customs administrations was introduced with an emphasis on the WCO's broad mandate - representing 186 customs administrations responsible for over 98% of global trade. Customs authorities are tasked with balancing three roles: revenue collection, national security, and trade facilitation. These overlapping responsibilities place customs officers under pressure, exposing them to corruption risks.

- Among the WCO's core frameworks for integrity is the Revised Arusha Declaration, that outlines a holistic strategy including HR management, codes of conduct, and internal controls. Complementary tools such as the Revised Kyoto Convention, the SAFE Framework of Standards, and the WCO Performance Measurement Mechanism were also referred to as essential instruments that link integrity with trade facilitation.

- A flagship initiative discussed was the WCO's A-CIP Programme (Anti-Corruption and Integrity Promotion), which offers technical assistance to customs authorities to reduce corruption risks. Success stories were cited, including the implementation of Authorized Economic Operator (AEO) programs in Tanzania that reduce inspections for compliant companies, and digital customs reform in Guatemala supported by the Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation. Another innovative tool, the WCO Customs Integrity Perception Survey, was presented as a mechanism that gathers input from both customs officials and private sector stakeholders to uncover perception gaps and foster trust.

- While digitalization was acknowledged as a major step forward, it was noted that technology alone is not sufficient. Integrity must be embedded institutionally, with governance frameworks evolving alongside tech-driven reforms.

- A corporate case study was presented to show how large firms can embed trade integrity within global operations. **Novartis** was cited to as an example of a company that aligns its Ethics, Risk, and Compliance (ERC) function closely with operational departments, including customs and trade compliance. Though oversight of customs remains with the supply chain, the ERC function sets unified standards across risk areas. This "integrated assurance" approach was structured around four pillars:

    - Governance: Clear ownership of topics, policies, and systems
    - Risk Management: Enterprise-wide risk assessments using a shared standard

- Compliance: Application of consistent prevention, detection, and response frameworks
- Internal Controls: A unified taxonomy and centralized oversight tools

- Central governance bodies, such as the Novartis Global Trade Sanctions Board, ensure cross-functional collaboration among legal, compliance, public affairs, and trade departments. These platforms support cohesive decisions, training alignment, and investments in compliance infrastructure. Ethical leadership and corporate culture were described as fundamental enablers of this model, with internal surveys tracking trust, fairness, and employee confidence in speaking up.

- From a policy perspective, reflections emphasized how trade facilitation projects often deliver integrity outcomes, even when not originally framed that way. Over half of the Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation's projects, for example, include digitalization, which inherently reduces discretionary abuse. National Trade Facilitation Committees—structured forums that bring together border agencies and businesses—were suggested as promising platforms for integrity-building through training and awareness campaigns.

- The panel also highlighted the increasing commitment of public agencies to integrity. A recent surge in participation in the WCO Integrity Sub-Committee reveals a growing institutional focus on anti-corruption. The value of private sector engagement was emphasized, with recognition that companies can both support and pressure public institutions to evolve. Parallel challenges in embedding ethics across institutions—whether public or private—require similar solutions: clarity, coordination, and long-term cultural change.

- An integrated compliance strategy was deemed essential for lasting success. Compliance systems must not only exist on paper but deliver demonstrable value to internal stakeholders. Cross-functional coordination, visible ethical leadership, and meaningful trust between departments were cited as key success factors.

- The panel concluded with **Valerie Picard** and **Gonzalo Guzman** reinforcing the core message: trade facilitation is not just about reducing delays and paperwork — it is also a strategic tool to promote integrity, build trust, and improve governance at borders. The forthcoming ICC-WCO joint paper on the role of trade facilitation for enhancing integrity at borders is expected to provide structured recommendations and to further strengthen cooperation between customs authorities and the global business community.

4. ICC Global Business Integrity Commission - ICC Business Tools for Integrity and Responsible Business Conduct.

- Between Panel 2 and Panel 3, **Gonzalo Guzman** and **Viviane Schiavi** provided an update on the ongoing revision of the ICC Anti-Corruption Clause, part of ICC's suite of tools to support responsible business conduct. Originally issued over a decade ago to complement the ICC Rules on Combating Corruption, the clause is now under review to reflect updates to the Rules and current BUSINESS practices.

- **Viviane Schiavi** explained that the clause, designed to be included in private contracts to affirm parties' anti-corruption commitments, is currently being updated. Objectives of the refresh include improving accessibility, especially for SMEs, and reflecting that companies may increasingly integrate anti-corruption provisions within broader ESG or risk management clauses.

- It was noted that a value of the ICC Anti-corruption Clause is its clear procedural mechanisms - including notification, audit rights, and termination options—which offer practical tools for contract enforcement and compliance. Furthermore, beyond its legal function, the clause plays a strategic awareness-raising role, reminding companies and contract partners of the importance of integrity in commercial relationships. Mr. Guzman noted that even if not used word-for-word, the clause serves as a benchmark and advocacy tool for responsible contracting.

5. Panel 3 - ICC Guidance on Responsible Business in Challenging Contexts

- **Hema Lehocky**, Vice-Chair of the ICC Global Business Integrity Commission and Chief Ethics & Compliance Officer at AFRY, moderated Panel 3 that focused on implementation of the ICC 2024 Guidance on Responsible Business in Challenging Contexts. Ms. Lehocky in fact played a key role in developing the ICC Guidance, and was also one of its original interviewees, thus she was able to bring a unique dual perspective to Panel 2 as both practitioner and contributor to the ICC tool. The discussion addressed how companies can navigate integrity dilemmas in fragile or high-risk environments through structured, principle-based decision-making. It featured insights from:

    - **Théo Jaekel**, Founder of Jaekel Consulting and former Human Rights Lead at Ericsson,

- **Samantha Rowe**, Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton,
- **Louis Maréchal**, Senior Advisor, Minerals and Extractives, OECD Centre for Responsible Business Conduct.

- The session opened with an overview of the context that had led to the initiation of the Guidance. Following the outbreak of the war in Ukraine, companies faced mounting dilemmas over how to operate - or not operate - in politically unstable, high-risk, or sanctioned markets. The ICC Guidance provides a structured framework to assist business leaders on decision-making in contexts characterized by armed conflict, severe or systematic human rights violations, political unrest, and economic sanctions. It also recognizes that in some cases, misalignment with corporate values may trigger the need for action, even if no formal legal breach has occurred.

- The ICC Guidance on Responsible Business in Challenging Contexts is framed around the principle of preparedness and proactive scenario planning. It encourages senior executives to think beyond financial and reputational risk, factoring in societal impact, long-term consequences, and unintended harm. It also stresses the importance of due process, internal alignment, and documented decision-making, aiming to help companies avoid rushed or reactive exits while maintaining integrity and responsibility.

- The discussion then turned to stakeholder engagement and early warning signals. Trusted relationships with civil society actors, such as human rights defenders, journalists, and trade unions, were highlighted as essential for identifying shifts on the ground before crises erupt. Many of these stakeholders are often the first to experience repression or institutional erosion, making their input vital to real-time risk detection. Long-standing engagement with these actors also facilitates responsible exit strategies, as demonstrated in comparative business cases where established networks enabled companies to respond faster and more ethically to deteriorating conditions.

- The Panel emphasized that early warning signs are not always obvious or dramatic. From a legal and institutional lens, changes such as the selective application of disinformation laws, judicial rulings that increasingly favor executive overreach, or the weakening of regulatory institutions may indicate deeper shifts in democratic governance and rule of law. These developments, while less visible than violent conflict, require the same level of scrutiny. Tools such as stakeholder references and internal working groups can institutionalize this monitoring and ensure companies are not caught off guard.

- The importance of maintaining institutional memory through structured documentation was also underscored. Decisions to remain, adapt, or exit often evolve over time. Without a traceable record of risk assessments, red lines, and internal debates, organizations risk

inconsistent or poorly justified decisions. This not only exposes the company to legal and reputational challenges, but also undermines its broader commitment to integrity.

- The issue of corporate exits in response to geopolitical pressure was explored through the example of Russia. The panel noted that many companies left the Russian market only after public backlash or regulatory shifts, rather than on the basis of structured internal assessments conducted beforehand. In many cases, this resulted in rushed exits, disrupted supply chains, and reputational harm—outcomes the ICC Guidance aims to help companies avoid.

- For sectors such as mining and extractives, where operations are embedded in local communities over decades, rapid disengagement is often unfeasible. In these cases, corruption trends, regulatory changes, and signals of weakening rule of law can serve as early indicators of deeper systemic breakdowns. The discussion pointed to the need for companies in these sectors to build resilient monitoring systems that incorporate both internal and external intelligence, including embassies, peer networks, and third-party observers. Local engagement should also be cross-checked with insights from stakeholders based outside the country, who may have more objectivity or access to comparative analysis.

- The panel also discussed how heightened human rights due diligence in conflict zones involves businesses needing to evaluate if their operations are directly or indirectly contributing to the conflict.

- Issues in a discussion that followed included the problem of limited leverage, especially for SMEs or companies operating alone in challenging contexts. Participants acknowledged that multi-stakeholder platforms, industry associations, and joint advocacy initiatives can help fill this gap by pooling resources and influence. These structures also support information-sharing and reduce the isolation that often impairs effective due diligence in high-risk environments.

- The exchange closed with a reminder that disengagement should necessarily be the default response to controversy or risk. Unplanned exits can harm local populations, empower unethical competitors, and create operational and reputational spillover effects. The ICC Guidance gives advice to companies on how to remain engaged where possible, on responsible and transparent terms, while planning for transitions in a way that preserves trust and mitigates harm.

6. Panel 4: Leveraging the Function of Business Integrity to manage Geopolitical Risks

- Commission Chair **Gonzalo Guzman** moderated the final panel of the day, which explored how companies can integrate business integrity into their geopolitical risk management strategies. The session highlighted the role of ethics in navigating turbulent global dynamics, and featured insights from:
    - **Andrew Wilson**, Deputy Secretary-General for Policy, ICC
    - **Sanket Dawda**, Vice-Chair, ICC Global Commission on Business Integrity and Chief Compliance Officer, Glenmark Pharmaceuticals
    - **Thomas Gratowski**, Director, Center for Geopolitics, Boston Consulting Group

- Mr. Guzman opened the session by connecting it to prior discussions in Panel 3 on assessment, preparation, and scenario planning. He underscored that while geopolitical volatility is not new, its intersection with corporate integrity has taken on new significance. Business integrity is increasingly seen as a lever for navigating geopolitical risk - rather than merely a compliance obligation. Referencing recent discussions at the World Economic Forum (WEF) and a WEF white paper produced in collaboration with IMD Business School and Boston Consulting Group entitled Enhancing the Geopolitical Radar to Guide Global Business, Mr. Guzman introduced a conversation about how business functions such as compliance, ethics, and risk can play an active role in addressing global uncertainty.

- Mr. Gratowski presented findings from the paper, based on interviews with 25 executives from diverse sectors. One key insight was that most companies still lack an internal consensus on what geopolitical risk entails, or which functions should "own" it - risk, compliance, government affairs, or strategy teams. The result is fragmentation and slow responses. He outlined a three-pillar framework to improve organizational geopolitical radar systems:
    1. **Tracking** – this requires access to quality information beyond traditional news sources. It includes cultivating relationships with governments, international organizations, and think tanks that can offer early indicators of geopolitical shifts.
    2. **Assessing** – this involves using tools traditionally associated with military or intelligence communities, such as horizon scanning. These techniques help companies prepare for low-probability, high-impact events that can affect operations and supply chains.
    3. **Communicating** – this depends on clear internal responsibilities. Without clarity on who interprets geopolitical information and how it's shared, even the best intelligence may fail to reach decision-makers. Mr. Gratowski noted that many companies continue to manage geopolitics reactively, when it should be part of long-term strategic planning.

- ICC Deputy Secretary General – Policy Andrew Wilson then offered an institutional reflection, noting that ICC was itself created in a moment of geopolitical turmoil, with a mission to make commerce a force for peace. This ethos remains central as the organization continues to advocate for rule of law and open trade in a context of geopolitical tension. He encouraged greater public-private dialogue and stressed that multilateral institutions must evolve rather than be abandoned. Without strong international frameworks, there is a risk that business predictability and economic resilience could deteriorate.

- From a business perspective, the panel illustrated how compliance teams are increasingly being called upon to act as corporate "geopolitical radars." He emphasized that compliance now plays a strategic role, particularly in assessing whether to enter or exit politically sensitive markets. It identified five areas where compliance delivers value in geopolitically exposed environments:

    1. Identifying and flagging early-stage regulatory and ethical risks.
    2. Supporting boards in making informed decisions about operations in high-risk jurisdictions.
    3. Ensuring the organization aligns with different global legal frameworks to avoid reputational fallout.
    4. Facilitating ethical decision-making in volatile environments, such as around sanctions or public procurement.
    5. Contributing to robust governance and risk registers that include geopolitical exposure.

    - In terms of recommendations for compliance teams aiming to increase their geopolitical literacy, three areas of focus were identified: creating safe spaces for scenario-based thinking within organizations; recognizing that geopolitical disruption is no longer episodic but structural; and ensuring that compliance functions are embedded in strategic—not just regulatory—conversations. Compliance professionals are increasingly asked to show measurable value—especially in terms of resilience and foresight. He encouraged organizations to establish agile, cross-functional structures to reflect this change.

    - The session closed with further reflections on the vulnerability of SMEs. These firms constitute roughly one-third of global trade and are often the first entrants into high-risk markets, but also the most under-resourced. Panelists agreed that geopolitical complexity should not be seen only in terms of superpower rivalries. For many smaller companies operating near borders or in fragile states, even localized instability can present existential threats. Mr. Guzman concluded by reiterating the need for better

tools, stronger partnerships, and proactive engagement to navigate the evolving risk landscape.

7. Closing Plenary

- **Andrew Wilson** delivered the closing remarks, thanking participants, panellists, and the leadership of the ICC Global Commission on Business Integrity for their contributions throughout the day.
    - Mr. Wilson acknowledged the complex and uncertain global environment businesses face and reaffirmed ICC's driving commitment to supporting international trade, integrity, and the rule of law.
    - He encouraged participants to reach out to the ICC with insights or concerns, noting that the organization continues to remain both forward-looking and responsive. "We want to ensure the commission and our channels are used to their full potential to support business — and ultimately the global economy — in these challenging times," Mr. Wilson concluded.

* * *