I. United States Developments

Many of the cases in 2014 involving violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA) related to follow-on aspects of cases previously charged. But of particular significance in the public pronouncements by the U.S. Department of Justice (“DOJ”) and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) were myriad cases where a more favorable resolution was attributed to the level of cooperation, including self-disclosure, extensive remediation, and enhancement of compliance programs and internal controls.

A. Major Enforcement Actions

A sampling of the more significant enforcement actions includes the following cases:

1. Alcoa

Stemming from a complex series of transactions involving an alumina supply contract for Bahrain, Alcoa World Alumina LLC, a majority-owned and controlled sales company of Alcoa Inc. (“Alcoa”), pleaded guilty to a violation of the FCPA’s anti-bribery provisions. In that case, a London-based middleman with ties to certain royal family members was inserted “as a sham sales agent,” at the request of members of Bahrain’s royal family who...
controlled the tender process, and was paid “a corrupt commission intended to conceal bribe payments.” Alcoa entered into a settlement with the SEC for violations of the FCPA’s accounting and record-keeping provisions based on these facts and the SEC’s reference to the lack of due diligence as to the business purpose of the middleman.5

2. Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.

A United States-based issuer and medical manufacturer, Bio-Rad Laboratories Inc. (Bio-Rad), agreed to pay a fine and entered into a non-prosecution agreement (“NPA”) with the DOJ to resolve allegations that it violated the FCPA by falsifying its books and records and failing to implement adequate internal controls in connection with sales in Russia.6 Of particular note was the use of intermediaries who lacked the capacity to carry out the services to be performed. Bio-Rad also agreed to a settlement with the SEC for similar violations in Russia, Thailand, and Vietnam relative to the sales practices of its subsidiaries.7

3. Hewlett-Packard Company

The DOJ resolved its investigation into violations of the FCPA by Hewlett-Packard Company (HP) in the form of a plea with its Russian subsidiary, a deferred prosecution agreement (“DPA”) with its Polish subsidiary, and an NPA with its Mexican subsidiary.8 Record-keeping and internal controls violations were alleged to have facilitated the improper payments to foreign officials. The SEC’s settlement with HP was premised upon similar violations.9 The DOJ only charged the Russian subsidiary with a violation of the anti-bribery provisions.10

4. PetroTiger Ltd.

Arising out of a voluntary disclosure by PetroTiger Ltd. (“PetroTiger”), a British Virgin Islands oil and gas company with operations in Colombia and offices in New Jersey, its two former co-CEOs and general counsel were charged with violating the FCPA’s anti-
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bribery provisions, defrauding PetroTiger, and laundering the proceeds of crime.\textsuperscript{11} Payments were made from PetroTiger’s U.S. bank account to the official’s bank account in Colombia to secure approval from Colombia’s state-owned and state-controlled oil company for an oil services contract. All three individuals were also charged with attempting to secure kickbacks at the expense of PetroTiger in connection with PetroTiger’s acquisition of another company.

5. \textit{Alstom}

Alstom S.A. (Alstom), a French power and transportation company, pleaded guilty and agreed to pay a $772,290,000 fine to resolve charges related to violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA). The plea agreement cites many factors considered by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in reaching the appropriate resolution, including: Alstom’s failure to voluntarily disclose the misconduct even though it was aware of related misconduct at a U.S. subsidiary that previously resolved corruption charges with the DOJ in connection with a power project in Italy; Alstom’s refusal to fully cooperate with the Department’s investigation for several years; the breadth of the companies’ misconduct, which spanned many years, occurred in countries around the globe and in several business lines, and involved sophisticated schemes to bribe high-level government officials; Alstom’s lack of an effective compliance and ethics program at the time of the conduct; and Alstom’s prior criminal misconduct, including conduct that led to resolutions with various other governments and the World Bank.\textsuperscript{12}

6. \textit{Avon}

Avon Products (China) Co. Ltd. (Avon China), the wholly owned subsidiary of New York-based Avon Products Inc. (Avon), pleaded guilty to accounting provisions of the FCPA. Avon entered into a deferred prosecution agreement with the DOJ, admitting its role in a conspiracy to conceal in excess of $8 million in bribes paid to Chinese government officials. Cumulatively, the Avon entities will pay over $67 million in criminal penalties and retain a monitor for 18 months.\textsuperscript{13} Avon also settled a related FCPA matter with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and will pay an additional $67,365,013 in disgorgement and prejudgment interest, bringing the total amount of U.S. criminal and regulatory penalties paid by Avon and Avon China to $135,013,013.

B. \textsc{Significant Rulings}

In upholding a broad interpretation of what constituted an “instrumentality” under the FCPA’s anti-bribery provisions, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit held
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that the FCPA intended to “reach the type of officials the United States agreed to stop domestic interests from bribing when it ratified the OECD Convention.”14 As part of its analysis, it looked to the OECD Convention and its commentaries in identifying the factors that would determine whether an entity was an instrumentality of government.

C. NONPROFITS

Employees of International Adoption Guides Inc. (“IAG”), an adoption services provider, were indicted for conspiring to defraud the United States in connection with its adoption services in Ethiopia.15 The scheme involved submitting fraudulent contracts of adoption to Ethiopian courts, submitting fraudulently procured adoption decrees to U.S. officials, creating counterfeit U.S. immigration forms, and paying bribes to Ethiopian officials. No substantive violations of the FCPA or any other law were charged.

D. TRAVEL ACT

Emanating from actions taken by a complex series of transactions by a number of entities associated with an international conglomerate, six foreign nationals were charged with participating in an international racketeering conspiracy involving bribes of government officials in India to allow the mining of titanium minerals.16 The separate charges included conspiracy to violate the Travel Act,17 the FCPA, and U.S. money laundering laws and two substantive Travel Act violations.

E. OPINION PROCEDURE RELEASES

In a late 2013 opinion procedure release involving a partner of a U.S. law firm handling arbitrations for a foreign country, his payment for the medical expenses for the daughter of an official of the foreign agency that retained the law firm was permitted.18 The recusal practices involving the official and the law firm and the express permission of the official’s agency were critical to the DOJ’s analysis. Similarly, in the first opinion procedure release for 2014,19 an extensive recusal regime and an independent mechanism for establishing the value of the buyout were critical to a U.S. issuer being permitted to acquire the minority interest of its majority-owned foreign company from a businessman who was to be appointed to a senior government position in that country.

In the other 2014 opinion procedure release, a foreign acquisition by a United States issuer did not lead to successor liability, despite evidence of questionable payments and

inadequate controls disclosed in pre-acquisition due diligence.\textsuperscript{20} The critical factor was the absence of a jurisdictional basis for a violation at the time the questionable payments were made.

F. Pursuing the Proceeds of Corruption

As part of the largest forfeiture action ever brought under the Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative, the DOJ froze corruption proceeds hidden in bank accounts around the world by former Nigerian dictator Sani Abacha and his cohorts.\textsuperscript{21} The civil forfeiture complaint seeks more than $550 million, including from bank accounts and investment portfolios in the Bailiwick of Jersey, France, and the United Kingdom. In another matter stemming from the Initiative, formal action was also taken to forfeit the assets traceable to Chun Doo Hwan, the former president of the Republic of Korea.\textsuperscript{22}

As part of an unrelated initiative, Alfonso Portillo, the former President of Guatemala was fined and sentenced to over five years of imprisonment for taking bribes from Taiwan in exchange for promising that Guatemala would continue to recognize Taiwan diplomatically.\textsuperscript{23} Though the offense took place between 2000 and 2004, Portillo was extradited to the United States in 2013 and pleaded guilty to attempting to launder the illegal money through U.S. banks.

II. Enforcement Actions Abroad

A. Cases

1. Austria

On October 3, 2014, the regional criminal court for Vienna found two executives of Oesterreiche Banknoten und Sicherheitsdruck GmbH ("OeBS"), the Austrian central bank's banknote-printing arm, guilty of having bribed Syrian and Azeri officials to obtain contracts for OeBS.\textsuperscript{24} Johannes Miller and Michael Wolf each received a two-year suspended sentence for funneling bribes totaling approximately $14 million to the officials.


2. **Canada**

On May 23, 2014, an Ottawa court sentenced Nazir Karigar to three years in prison for his role in a corruption case involving Canadian company CryptoMetrics. Karigar was the first individual to be convicted under Canada’s recently amended Foreign Public Officials Act (“CFPOA”).

3. **China**

China’s Central Commission for Discipline Inspection of the Communist Party of China announced in November 2014 that it had concluded an investigation of two FAW-Volkswagen Automotive Co Ltd executives for corruption. Subsequently FAW-Volkswagen severed business ties with more than a dozen vendors, all of whom were involved in advertising and public relations for the company.

On August 8, 2014, a court in Shanghai found two former investigators guilty of stealing and selling personal information. The investigators, Briton Peter Humphrey and his American-national wife, Yu Yingzeng, worked as vendors to multinational pharmaceutical company GlaxoSmithKline (“GSK”) in China and were caught up in a larger corruption investigation launched by Chinese authorities against GSK. Humphrey was sentenced to two and a half years in prison. His wife was sentenced to two years, and both were fined. The same court found GSK guilty of bribing hundreds of doctors and state hospital personnel over a period of years. GSK was fined $490 million and its former chief executive of the China division, Mark Reilly (another British national), was given a suspended three-year prison sentence.

4. **Cuba**

Canadian businessman Cy Tokmakjian was sentenced in October 2014 by a Cuban court to fifteen years in prison for bribing Cuban officials. The Cuban government seized US $100 million dollars in assets belonging to his sugar industry company, Tokmakjian Group. Tokmakjian was found guilty of bribery as well as trafficking in Cuban currency, tax evasion, and fraud.
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5. Germany

On May 9, 2014, the German Bundesgerichtshof ruled that, in instances where a payment of bribes has influenced a purchase agreement between two commercial entities, the purchase agreement can be invalidated. It further reasoned that claims for compensation were valid under the increased liability for unjust enrichment.

In August 2014, a German court halted the trial of Formula 1 executive Bernie Ecclestone. German state prosecutors dropped criminal charges pending against Ecclestone in return for a payment of a $100 million fine. Ecclestone had been accused of bribing a former German banker related to the sale of a majority interest in Formula 1 nearly a decade ago. The payment represents the largest sum ever paid in Germany for a criminal trial of this nature.

6. Greece

Rheinmetall Defence Electronics GmbH (RDE), a Bremen-based subsidiary of Rheinmetall AG, a German defense conglomerate, agreed to pay a $37 million fine to end a criminal investigation of suspected bribery payments by a company representative in connection with arms deals in Greece.

7. Hong Kong

On August 5, 2014, Luk Kin Peter Joseph, chief executive of Brockman Mining, a listed company in Australia, was convicted of bribery by the District Court of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. The conviction resulted in Mr. Luk’s immediate resignation from the company.

8. Italy

On October 9, 2014, an Italian court cleared two former executives of Finmeccanica of corruption but found them guilty of lesser charges for falsifying invoices. The two were given suspended sentences of two years’ jail time. The case arose out of charges of bribes
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paid to Indian defense officials relating to the sale of helicopters. India’s investigation continues. 40

In March, 2014, the Treasury department of the Italian government issued a letter to numerous state-owned companies (SOEs) instructing them to remove from their boards any director charged of financial crimes, including bribery. 41 It also stated that managers who have been indicted for crimes against the public administration or financial crimes should be barred from sitting on the board of state-owned companies even before a first guilty verdict. 42

9. Japan

On July 15, 2014, a Tokyo district court imposed a suspended sentence on former Deutsche Bank AG ("DBK") salesman Shigeru Echigo as punishment for bribing former Japanese pension-fund executive Yutaka Tsurisawa, who, under Japanese law, was considered a civil servant. 43 Tsurisawa was convicted of accepting bribes from Echigo in June 2014 and was given an eighteen-month suspended prison sentence and ordered to make restitution. 44 Echigo was given a three-year suspended ten-month prison sentence. 45 During the trial, Echigo protested that he was only following orders and that the bank’s culture promoted bribery. Following on the conviction of Tsurisawa, Japan’s Financial Services Agency ordered compliance improvements at Deutsche Bank’s Japanese securities unit.

10. Multilateral Investment Banks

In total, the World Bank debarred and cross-debarred 101 individuals and firms in 2014. 46 On March 21, 2014, the African Development Bank ("AFDB") stated that it had reached Negotiated Resolution Agreements with Kellogg Brown & Root LLC, Technip S.A., and JGC Corp. following the companies’ admission of corrupt practices by affiliated companies in bank-financed projects in Nigeria. The companies will pay fines of US $6.5 million, US $5.3 million and US $5.2 million, respectively. 47
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On May 28, 2014, the AFDB reached a Negotiated Resolution Agreement with Snamprogetti Netherlands B.V. (“Snamprogetti”) related to the company’s corrupt acts in Nigeria between 1995-2004 with respect to AFDB-funded projects. Snamprogetti agreed to pay US $5.7 million to the AFDB.48

11. Netherlands

On November 12, 2014, it was announced that Dutch-domiciled SBM Offshore NV (SBM) would pay $193 million in fines to the Dutch prosecutor’s office to settle a bribery investigation.49 The investigation focused on allegations that sales agents for SBM had made improper payments to government officials in Angola, Brazil, and Equatorial Guinea between 2007 and 2011. The U.S. DOJ agreed to close its parallel investigation although authorities in Brazil indicated that they would continue their inquiries into the company’s activities in that country.50

12. Norway

The National Authority for Investigation and Prosecution of Economic and Environmental Crime announced on January 15, 2014, that it had found global fertilizer firm Yara International ASA (“Yara”) guilty of bribery and fined the company 295 million kroner ($48 million) for corruption involving deals the company made in Libya, Russia, and India.51 Yara admitted that between 2004 and 2009, it had paid bribes totaling more than 70 million kroner ($12 million). Three former senior executives of Yara were also indicted.52

13. Oman

On February 27, 2014, the Oman Court of First Instance in Muscat sentenced Ahmad al-Wahaibi, the CEO of state-owned Oman Oil Company, to a prison term of twenty-three years. His former aide, Adel al-Raisi, was sentenced to ten years. Both were convicted of accepting bribes, money laundering, and abuse of office. Korean national MyungJao Yoo, CEO of Korea-based company LGI, paid US $8 million in bribes to Wahaibi and al-Raisi.53 Yoo was sentenced to ten years in prison.54
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On March 3, 2014, the Court of First Instance in Muscat sentenced Egyptian nationals Fatihi Alaadeen and Rizq Mustafa, executives with Consolidated Contractors Company (“Consolidated”) to three years in jail and imposed fines of OMR500,000 and OMR300,000 respectively. Convicted alongside them were two Omani government officials who were sentenced to three years in prison, fined, and banned from holding government office for thirty years.

On March 9, 2014, an Omani court sentenced Indian national Mohammed Ali, the former managing director of Galfar Engineering and Contracting, with respect to five counts of bribery in exchange for contracts from state-owned enterprise Petroleum Development Oman (“PDO”). Only two months prior, Ali had been sentenced to three years in prison over different bribes made to PDO. Ali was also fined 1.774 million rials ($4.61 million).

More than twenty civil servants and businessmen have gone on trial in Oman since last year; several of these individuals have been foreign nationals.

14. **Poland**

On October 10, 2014, the Polish Centralne Biuro Antykorupcyjne convicted a Poland-based executive of Swiss pharmaceutical company Novartis of bribery.

15. **Switzerland**

On October 1, 2014, the Swiss Federal Crime Court accepted a negotiated plea deal between Riadh Ben Aissa, a former Canada-based SNC-Lavalin executive, and the Swiss Attorney General’s office. Aissa was accused of fraud, corruption, and money laundering. He pleaded guilty in exchange for a reduced sentence and will serve twenty-nine months in jail. He has been ordered to pay millions in restitution to SNC-Lavalin. Aissa is likely to be extradited to Canada to stand trial for fraud now that the Swiss plea deal has been concluded.

16. **United Kingdom**

On July 22, 2014, Australian Bruce Hall, former CEO of state-owned Bahraini company, Aluminum Bahrain B.S.C. (“Alba”) was sentenced to sixteen months in prison for conspir-
acy to corrupt. Hall was ordered to pay a confiscation order of £3,070,106.03 in seven days or face serving an additional term of imprisonment of ten years.

On August 4, 2014, the Serious Fraud Office announced the sentencing of three British nationals and one Greek national (Dennis Kerrison, Paul Jennings, David Turner and Miltiades Papachristos) for their roles in bribing state officials in Indonesia and Iraq on behalf of Innospec. Kerrison, Jennings, and Papachristos all received prison terms; Turner received a suspended sentence. Innospec itself pleaded guilty in March 2010 to bribing state officials in Indonesia and was fined $12.7 million. In February 2014, the SFO was granted the power to enter into deferred prosecution agreements with companies charged with bribery.

On December 22, 2014, Smith and Ouzman Ltd and two employees were convicted of bribery of foreign officials, the first trial convictions for the SFO. Christopher J. Smith, chairman of the company, and Nicholas C. Smith, its sales and marketing director, were convicted of “corruptly agreeing to make payments.” The two had made over £395,000 in corrupt payments to win contracts in Kenya and Mauritania.

Scotland based International Tubular Services Limited (ITS), which supports activities for petroleum and natural gas extraction disgorged £172,200, the total of profit it earned under a contract secured via bribery. ITS self-reported and agreed to the disgorgement not under the UKBA but under the UK’s Proceeds of Crime Act.

B. Anti-Corruption Legislation and Initiatives

1. Australia

On February 18, 2014, the Australian Securities & Investments Commission issued guidance on its approach to dealing with whistleblowers and whistleblower reports. Only
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officers and employees of the company about whom the disclosure is made, and the com-
pany’s current contractors (including employees thereof) qualify as whistleblowers. The
person making the report to ASIC must have reasonable grounds to suspect that the com-
pany in question or one of its officers has breached the Corporations Act.73

2. Canada

In March 2014, the Canadian federal government promulgated new rules under the ex-
isting “integrity framework.”74 The expanded rules now require companies seeking to do
business with the federal government to disclose if they have been found to have violated
anti-corruption laws as well as those involving fraud. Companies debarred in other juris-
dictions would also be precluded from bidding on Canadian government tenders for a
period of ten years.75

3. China

On November 3, 2014, China’s legislature issued draft amendments76 to China’s Crimi-
nal Code, strengthening penalties for corruption and bribery. The amendments include
lowering the exemptions from prosecution; making the offering of bribes to relatives of
government officials a crime; adding a provision for monetary fines for corruption-related
crimes; broadening sentencing criteria standards and imposing employment bans on those
convicted of corruption crimes.77 In March of 2015, China’s legislature announced that
improvements and advances to national anti-corruption law would be developed “as
quickly as possible.”78

4. European Union

On April 15, 2014, the European Parliament passed a new law making it mandatory for
companies with more than 500 employees to disclose, in annual-report form, information
on their compliance with anti-corruption laws, human rights, and certain other social re-
sponsibility issues.79

5. India

Effective January 1, landmark Indian legislation aimed at combating corruption by creat-
ing an anti-graft ombudsman with broad powers to prosecute all offending politicians,
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ministers, and senior civil servants, came into effect. The new laws amend the Prevention of Corruption Act.

6. Ireland

On July 8, 2014, a comprehensive whistleblower protection law went into effect in Ireland. The Protected Disclosures Act 2014 provides legal protections for all employees, contractors, agency workers, and members of the police and the military who report concerns about fraud or corruption in private, public, or non-profit entities.

7. Multilateral Investment Banks

In May 12, 2014, Ukraine signed an anti-corruption pact with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The pact will establish an independent and independently-funded Business Ombudsman Institution. The Institution will be the first point of contact for companies seeking redress against corrupt practices in the country.

8. United Kingdom

In order to comply with certain European Union accounting rules, the UK government published draft legislation requiring all extraction-related and logging companies to disclose any payments made to governments in countries where they operate. UK-registered companies will have up to eleven months after the end of their financial year to report payments under the new rule.

In February 2014, the SFO was granted the power to enter into deferred prosecution agreements with companies charged with bribery.
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III. Treaties and International Organizations

A. International Conventions

The eleven-year-old United Nations Convention Against Corruption ("UNCAC")\(^{90}\) added four new members in 2014—Germany, Oman, State of Palestine, and Sudan—and now has 173 state parties.\(^{91}\) Germany’s ratification came eleven years after its signature of the Convention, delayed by the lack of legislation punishing members of parliament for bribery, which is a requirement for ratification.\(^{92}\) There are only twenty-one countries remaining that have not ratified UNCAC, including Japan and New Zealand.

In 2014, the UNCAC Implementation Review Group adopted country reviews for Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Canada, El Salvador, Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Latvia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Serbia, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Tanzania, Trinidad & Tobago, and Vanuatu (in June)\(^{93}\) and Colombia, Dominica, Malta, Netherlands, Paraguay, Poland, Sweden, and Uruguay (in October).\(^{94}\) A total of sixty-eight country reviews have been completed to date. Key findings from those reviews were used to prepare thematic and regional overviews of the implementation of Chapters III (Criminalization and Law Enforcement) and IV (International Cooperation) of the Convention.\(^{95}\)

Efforts under the Inter-American Convention against Corruption\(^{96}\) also concentrated on reviewing member countries’ implementation of the Convention. At its Twenty-Third and Twenty-Fourth meetings, held in March and September 2014 respectively, the Committee of Experts of the Follow-up Mechanism for the Implementation of the Inter-American Convention against Corruption ("MESICIC") adopted its first report on Haiti as well as reports on Belize, Canada, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guyana, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname.\(^{97}\) The MESICIC continues its project, the Responsibility of the Private Sector in Preventing and Combating Corruption, and plans to adopt a set of guidelines on the basic principles or fundamental rules that could be incorporated in domestic legislation in order to promote, strengthen and ensure accountability of this sector in the fight against corruption.\(^{98}\)
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The Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions ("OECD" Convention)99 added its 41st member, Latvia, in May 2014.100 The OECD Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions conducted peer reviews and adopted Phase 3 reports on Brazil, Chile, Estonia, Slovenia, South Africa, and Turkey.101 It has also updated its Compilation of Recommendations Made in the Phase 3 Reports.102

The Council of Europe’s Group of States against Corruption ("GRECO"), the group that monitors implementation of the Council of Europe’s Criminal Law Convention on Corruption, published fourth evaluation round reports, which focus on prevention of corruption by members of parliament, judges, and prosecutors, for Albania, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Ireland, Norway, and the Slovak Republic.103 Third Evaluation Round Compliance Reports, concentrating on transparency in the funding of political parties and electoral campaigns were completed for Italy, Monaco, and the Russian Federation.104 Bulgaria, Macedonia, Serbia, and Turkey were evaluated in the second round,105 and Belarus received the Joint First and Second Evaluation Rounds Report.106

In its 2014 annual report,107 GRECO expressed concern about the little progress made by a significant number of European countries in implementing its recommendations on transparency of political funding, due in part to the political sensitivity of party and campaign funding, and to the fact that, by evaluating states in this field, GRECO’s monitoring has extended to areas beyond direct governmental control and under the influence of political parties and parliaments themselves.108
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B. International Organizations

At the 2014 G20 Summit in November 2014, the leaders of the world’s largest economies endorsed the 2015-16 G20 Anti-Corruption Action Plan.109 G20 efforts will concentrate on building cooperation and networks, including enhancing mutual legal assistance, recovery of the proceeds of corruption, and denial of safe haven to corrupt officials.110 The G20 also reiterated its commitment to improving public and private sector transparency, and the transparency of beneficial ownership by implementing the G20 High-Level Principles on Beneficial Ownership Transparency.111

The G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group (“ACWG”) held three meetings in 2014. Among ACWG’s achievements are the development of the G20 High-Level Principles on Beneficial Ownership Transparency (2014),112 High-Level Principles on Corruption and Growth,113 and the Compendium of Good Practices for Integrity in Public Procurement.114 ACWG has also secured a commitment by all G20 countries to complete a self-assessment of their domestic foreign bribery frameworks and to provide annual updates to the ACWG on their progress as part of the annual ACWG Accountability Report questionnaire.115

The Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (“AFAR”) convened its third meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, in November 2014. Over two hundred fifty delegates from forty governments and jurisdictions and six regional and international organizations agreed on the need to pursue and strengthen international cooperation to support Arab countries in transition with their respective processes of recovering illicit assets. As part of the forum, Austria, British Virgin Islands, Bailiwick of Jersey, Lebanon, and Hong Kong announced the publication of comprehensive asset recovery guides.116

Following the ouster of former Ukrainian President Victor Yanukovich in February 2014, the new government of Ukraine began efforts to recover assets stolen by Yanukovich and his cronies. The Ukraine Forum on Asset Recovery (“UFAR”), with partners from over thirty countries and territories as well several international organizations, was held in London in April 2014. UFAR participants pledged to ensure that technical assistance is on-going and continues to be available to assist Ukraine in its efforts to recover the proceeds of corruption.

In December 2014, the World Bank Group’s International Corruption Hunters Alliance (“ICHA”) held its Third Biennial Meeting in Washington, D.C. The meeting
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brought together senior officials of corruption-investigating bodies and prosecuting authorities from over one hundred thirty countries. The meeting focused on fighting corruption—and the vast illicit outflows generated by corruption—by sharing know-how and experiences in the use of both traditional and alternative corruption-fighting approaches.

The 5th Global Focal Point Conference on Asset Recovery was held in Vienna, Austria, in September 2014. The event, organized by INTERPOL’s Anti-Corruption and Financial Crimes unit and the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (“StAR”), brought together more than 170 anti-corruption investigators and prosecutors from seventy-nine countries to discuss operational issues related to asset recovery using examples of recent international cases to highlight challenges and possible solutions.117

StAR also published two new reports in 2014. Public Wrongs, Private Actions discusses how civil lawsuits can provide an effective complement to more commonly-used criminal approaches.118 Few and Far: The Hard Facts on Stolen Asset Recovery reports on how OECD countries are performing on asset recovery, provides recommendations and best practices, and suggests specific actions for development agencies.119

In June 2014, the World Bank Office of Suspension and Debarment (“OSD”) released its first public report.120 The report provides case processing and other performance metrics related to two hundred twenty-four sanctions imposed by the Bank on firms and individuals from 2007 through June 30, 2013.121

IV. Civil Society Efforts

A. Transparency International

In 2014, Transparency International (TI) released its tenth annual report on OECD Convention enforcement.122 Exporting Corruption: Progress Report 2014 uses statistics from 2010-2013 to rank forty countries according to enforcement activity: active, moderate, limited, and little or no enforcement.123 Latvia was not included because it had not joined the OECD until 2014,124 and countries that joined the Convention after 2010 had their
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requirements reduced proportionately.\textsuperscript{125} Again this year, only the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Switzerland were listed as active enforcers.\textsuperscript{126} Canada joined last year’s group of Italy, Australia, Austria, and Finland in the moderate enforcement group.\textsuperscript{127} The other twenty-nine member countries rank in the bottom two categories.\textsuperscript{128}

In December, TI issued its 2014 Corruption Perceptions Index,\textsuperscript{129} ranking one hundred seventy-five countries and territories using expert opinions of public corruption.\textsuperscript{130} Denmark ranked at the top of the Index followed by New Zealand and Finland. At the bottom, Sudan ranked 173d while North Korea and Somalia tied for last.\textsuperscript{131} Among its new tools, TI released the EU Integrity Watch database of European parliament members (“MEPs”) financial interest declarations.\textsuperscript{132} As of July of 2014, all MEPs were required to submit financial interest declarations, including information on outside revenue, board memberships, and financial holdings.\textsuperscript{133} The database provides a method of identifying MEPs with potential conflicts of interest.\textsuperscript{134}

TI’s U.S. chapter released \textit{Verification of Anti-Corruption Compliance Programs}, which covers research relating to compliance verification and consultations.\textsuperscript{135} The report included five methods of verification: public reporting by companies, verification work carried out by accountants, lawyers, and consulting firms, certification of compliance programs, compliance reviews performed by government-mandated monitors, and certification efforts in the social and environmental areas.\textsuperscript{136} Organizations completing an internal review were encouraged to use a risk-based approach with a focus on the company’s geographic locations, business sectors, business partners, nature of transactions, and the degree to which company agents interact with public officials.\textsuperscript{137}

\textbf{B. Extrative Industries Transparency Initiative}

As of this year, forty-eight countries have implemented the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (“EITI”) standards to ensure disclosure of taxes and other payments.
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made by oil, gas, and mining companies to governments. Among the group, thirty-one are compliant with EITI requirements having disclosed $1.3 trillion in extractive revenues this year. Chad, Guatemala, Sierra Leone, Indonesia, Guinea and the Democratic Republic of Congo all became compliant in 2014.

As of 2014, EITI countries are required to produce an annual activity report as part of compliance with the EITI requirements. Each report should describe objectives achieved in the countries’ work plan from the prior year.

EITI also started a pilot program on beneficial ownership, which requires disclosure of ownership of oil, gas, and mining companies in EITI implementing countries. The pilot program now includes eleven countries.

C. World Justice Project

The World Justice Project ("WJP") released its fourth annual Rule of Law Index ranking ninety-nine countries and jurisdictions based on over 100,000 household and expert surveys. The index ranks countries using forty-seven sub-factors organized into nine aggregate categories: 1) constraint on government powers; 2) absence of corruption; 3) open government; 4) fundamental rights; 5) regulatory enforcement; 7) civil justice; 8) criminal justice; and 9) informal justice. The “absence of corruption” category considers bribery, improper influence by public or private interests, and misappropriation of public funds. Within the category, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden took the top three spots, while Nigeria, Cameroon, and Afghanistan occupied the bottom of the rankings.

---
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143. Those countries are: Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Honduras, Kyrgyz Republic, Liberia, Niger, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Togo, and Zambia. Other countries are working to accomplish similar goals outside the pilot program: Myanmar, Norway, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, and the United Kingdom. Iraq, Nigeria and Trinidad and Tobago originally signed up for the pilot, but have put it on hold.
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