



G20
SOUTH AFRICA 2025



Solidarity

Equality

Sustainability

SHERPA TRACK

G20 ACWG 2025

Compendium of Good Practices on the role of Multi-Stakeholders in Preventing and Combating Corruption

Place: Mpumalanga
Date: 30 October 2025

#G20SouthAfrica | www.g20.org

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Executive Summary	5
Part I: Frameworks and foundations	7
Chapter 1: Regulatory frameworks and national strategies for multistakeholder engagement 7	
1.1 Overview of regulatory approaches to multistakeholder participation	7
1.2 National anti-corruption strategies and multistakeholder involvement.....	12
1.3 International legal frameworks and commitments	13
Chapter 2: Engaging specific non-state stakeholders in anti-corruption efforts.....	15
2.1 Private sector engagement	15
2.2 Civil society participation.....	17
2.3 Media engagement	20
2.4 Academic institutions and universities	22
2.5 Gender and youth initiatives.....	24
Part II: Platforms and coordination.....	27
Chapter 3: Multistakeholder platforms and collective action	27
3.1 Domestic multistakeholder partnerships	27
3.2 Sector-specific initiatives and networks	29
3.3 International and regional platforms.....	33
Chapter 4: Government coordination mechanisms	38
4.1 Inter-agency coordination mechanisms.....	38
4.2 National integrity boards and coordination bodies	40
4.3 Federal, state and local government collaboration.....	41
4.4 Role of specialised anti-corruption agencies	42
4.5 Integrating judiciary, legislative and executive branches.....	43
Part III: Findings and Conclusions.....	44
Technology – an amplifier, not a panacea.....	44
Trust: a fundamental challenge	44
Resources: the sustainability imperative	44
Measurement: The prevention paradox.....	45
Conclusions – the journey continues	45
Appendix 1: acronyms and abbreviations	47

Introduction

Background

Under South Africa's G20 Presidency theme of "Solidarity, Equality and Sustainability," the Anti-Corruption Working Group (ACWG) identified as its third priority the need to "Enhance and Mobilise the Inclusive Participation of the Public Sector, Private Sector, Civil Society and Academia to Prevent and Combat Corruption." Recognising that corruption affects all members of society and that no single actor can address this challenge alone, the ACWG commissioned this Compendium to document how G20 members and guest countries engage multiple stakeholders in their anti-corruption efforts.

This Compendium serves as a practical resource for public sector officials designing and implementing multistakeholder initiatives seeking to strengthen anti-corruption frameworks, and for the private sector and civil society organisations engaging in good governance initiatives. It provides concrete examples of how different countries structure stakeholder engagement, overcome common challenges, and measure impact.

Methodology

The questionnaire forming the basis for this Compendium was distributed to G20 members and guest countries on 17 June 2025, with responses received through July and August 2025 from twenty-four governments. Of these, eighteen were G20 members, and six had observer status, but were invited to participate in the same way as G20 members. The G20 members which took part were Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Korea, United Kingdom and the European Union. The six participating observers were the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Singapore, Nigeria, and Spain.

The multistakeholder topic was further developed during a side event during the second G20 ACWG meeting in Brazil in June 2025. In August, the African Development Bank commissioned a consultant to compile and analyse the questionnaire responses, synthesising them into this comprehensive resource.

While previous G20 work has examined specific aspects of stakeholder engagement—including the 2022 G20 Compendium of Good Practices on Public Participation and Anti-Corruption Education and the 2024 G20 High-Level Principles on Incentives for the Private Sector—this represents the first comprehensive examination of multistakeholder approaches by the G20 ACWG. The Compendium breaks new ground in documenting how countries coordinate action across government, business, civil society, academia, and media to enhance the impact of anti-corruption efforts.

The Compendium draws entirely from materials submitted in response to the questionnaire, except for a limited number of international examples of collective action initiatives that are drawn from external sources and appropriately cited. This approach ensures the document reflects actual country experiences as reported by governments themselves.

The Compendium is structured in three main parts: Part I examines the frameworks and foundations for multistakeholder engagement, including regulatory approaches, national strategies, and the engagement of specific non-state stakeholders (private sector, civil society, media, academia, and youth). Part II explores platforms and coordination mechanisms, covering

both multistakeholder platforms for collective action and government coordination mechanisms across agencies and levels of government. Part III presents key findings and conclusions, synthesising the challenges, lessons learned, and emerging patterns from the country experiences documented throughout the Compendium.

Multistakeholder approaches and collaboration

When governments open themselves up to engagement with multiple stakeholders, this can potentially impact corruption. In reality, most of the initiatives reported by the respondents are examples of consultation or coordination rather than advanced forms of collective action, where stakeholders share decision-making power and accountability. Such cases remain rare.

Nevertheless, the efforts described here provide valuable lessons for countries seeking to strengthen their anti-corruption systems through broader participation. The diversity of approaches shows that there is no single model for multistakeholder engagement (see Box 1). Success requires adapting approaches to local contexts while maintaining commitment to fundamental principles of transparency, inclusion, and accountability.

Box 1: Understanding Key Terminology

Multistakeholder initiatives: Any arrangement bringing together actors from two or more sectors (government, business, civil society, academia) to address corruption challenges. This is the broadest term, encompassing everything from consultation processes to joint operations.

Public-private partnerships: Formal collaborations between government and business sectors, typically focused on specific services or functions (e.g., procurement platforms, compliance programmes).

Public-private-civil society partnerships: Tri-sector collaborations that include government, business AND civil society as active participants with defined roles in governance, implementation, or oversight.

Collective action: Coordinated efforts where multiple stakeholders commit to joint standards, shared monitoring, and mutual accountability. Goes beyond dialogue to include binding commitments and synchronized implementation

We hope this Compendium contributes to strengthening collaboration across all sectors of society in the fight against corruption. By sharing experiences, learning from both successes and failures, and continuously adapting approaches, the international community can build more meaningful, resilient and effective anti-corruption systems. This Compendium offers practical guidance for that journey.

This report was developed under the leadership of the South African G20 Presidency with the support of the African Development Bank and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

Executive Summary

This Compendium documents how G20 members and guest countries engage multiple stakeholders in anti-corruption efforts. Based on responses from 19 countries and the European Union to a questionnaire distributed under South Africa's G20 Presidency. It constitutes the first comprehensive assessment of multistakeholder approaches by the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group.

Findings

The global shift from government-led to more collaborative anti-corruption efforts reflects growing recognition that corruption's systemic nature requires equally systemic responses. Countries demonstrate this evolution through constitutional frameworks mandating participation, permanent multistakeholder bodies with decision-making powers, and digital platforms enabling mass engagement.

Effective initiatives share common characteristics: high-level political commitment, legal mandates ensuring sustainability beyond political cycles, transparent processes demonstrating how input influences decisions, and financial incentives linking integrity to market access. Technology serves as a critical enabler, with consultation platforms reaching hundreds of thousands of citizens.

Challenges

Despite progress, significant barriers remain. Trust deficits between sectors hinder collaboration even in established democracies. Fear of retaliation limits participation, particularly where powerful interests are involved. Resource asymmetries prevent smaller organisations from engaging meaningfully alongside well-resourced entities.

Measuring effectiveness proves particularly challenging because preventive anti-corruption work involves assessing the absence of wrongdoing rather than observable outcomes. Unlike reactive measures that respond to specific incidents, prevention aims to reduce opportunities and incentives for corruption before it occurs, making its impact inherently difficult to quantify. Attribution issues limit the ability to link specific initiatives with a reduction in corruption, while the hidden nature of corruption complicates impact assessment. Furthermore, many countries acknowledge not systematically collecting data on multistakeholder effectiveness, highlighting a significant gap in evidence-based policymaking.

Sustainability across political cycles remains problematic. The periodic rotation of authorities can disrupt initiatives. Stable and consistent funding is needed for effective civil society engagement. Beyond that, declining participation can occur when citizens repeatedly engage in consultations without seeing concrete outcomes from their input.

Innovations

Countries are developing innovative responses to these challenges. Sector-specific forums addressing unique corruption risks in health, infrastructure, and extractives enable targeted solutions. Gender-responsive programming and meaningful youth engagement initiatives facilitate differential impacts. International collective action platforms demonstrate potential for cross-sector learning and cooperation.

Looking forward

The evidence demonstrates that multistakeholder engagement faces significant implementation challenges. While the trajectory toward more inclusive approaches is clear, countries struggle with trust deficits, resource constraints, sustaining the effort, and measuring impact. Progress requires accepting these limitations while working persistently toward more effective coordination, and in time, engaging all sectors of society in collective action against corruption.

Part I: Frameworks and foundations

The global fight against corruption has evolved from isolated government enforcement to recognition that corruption's systemic nature requires equally systemic responses. This evolution demands both robust institutional architecture and meaningful engagement with all sectors of society. Part I examines how countries create the foundational structures for multistakeholder anti-corruption efforts.

Chapter 1: Regulatory frameworks and national strategies for multistakeholder engagement

Effective multistakeholder engagement focused on prevention and combating corruption requires more than good intentions - it needs robust legal foundations, institutionalised mechanisms, and alignment with international standards. In this chapter, we can see that many governments successfully combine mandatory requirements for public participation with the provision of genuine opportunities for citizens to influence public policy. International frameworks like the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) and, where applicable, the Open Government Partnership (OGP) provide both normative pressure and practical models for implementation in member states. Regional initiatives such as the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) enable peer learning and harmonisation of standards. As corruption challenges become increasingly transnational, these international multistakeholder initiatives are likely to play an increasingly influential role in making national anti-corruption policies and implementation more effective.

1.1 Overview of regulatory approaches to multistakeholder participation

Given the character of the challenges posed by corruption, it is broadly recognised that government action alone is insufficient to address this complex challenge. Countries across the G20 have implemented diverse regulatory frameworks that mandate, incentivise, or facilitate the participation of non-state actors in anti-corruption efforts. These approaches range from constitutional provisions to specialised legislation, reflecting different legal traditions and governance contexts.

1.1.1 Constitutional and legislative foundations

Several countries have embedded multistakeholder participation directly into their constitutional or fundamental legal frameworks.

India's Pre-Legislative Consultation Policy (PCLP) mandates formulating feasible legislative proposals in consultation with interested persons and authorities concerned, including a discussion on the necessity of the proposed legislation and all matters of substance to be embodied therein. MyGov Platform of India is a participatory governance platform where citizens submit ideas, respond to legislative and policy consultations, and contribute to decision-making.

Indonesia demonstrates comprehensive constitutional grounding for stakeholder participation, establishing both substantive rights and procedural mechanisms for citizen engagement in anti-corruption efforts (see Box 2).

Box 2: Indonesia's Constitutional Court Decision on Meaningful Participation

Indonesia grounds citizen participation in Article 27 of its Constitution, which establishes equality before the law and government for all citizens. This constitutional foundation is operationalised through Law No. 12 of 2011, which grants citizens the right to provide input on draft laws and regulations at every stage of development.

Indonesia's Constitutional Court Decision 91/PUU-XVIII/2020 represents a landmark interpretation of participatory rights in anti-corruption governance. The Court established that meaningful participation requires three elements:

- **Right to be heard:** Citizens must have genuine opportunities to express views
- **Right to be considered:** Authorities must demonstrably consider public input
- **Right to be explained:** Decision-makers must explain how public input influenced final decisions

This framework has been implemented across Indonesia's anti-corruption architecture, including in the development of the National Strategy for Corruption Prevention, regulated by Presidential Regulation Number 54/2018. The National Secretariat is mandated to accommodate public participation in formulating and monitoring progress, with stakeholders actively participating from programme planning through to evaluation.

1.1.2 Mandatory participation and consultation requirements

Some jurisdictions have created legally binding requirements for stakeholder consultation in anti-corruption policy development.

Spain's Law 40/2015 on the Legal Regime of the Public Sector mandates two distinct consultation phases: an initial public consultation before drafting legislation, and a subsequent hearing process when draft texts are available. These consultations must run for minimum periods (15 calendar days for initial consultations, 15 working days for hearings) and explicitly include private sector actors, civil society organisations, academics, and citizens. Importantly, this law also requires consultation for all legislation, thereby ensuring continuity regardless of political changes. Spain further embeds accountability through its requirement for Regulatory Impact Assessment Reports to include summaries of consultation inputs. Officials must explain not just what input was received but how it influenced final decisions. This creates an audit trail of participation influence, moving beyond procedural compliance to substantive engagement.

Germany's Joint Rules of Procedure requiring ministries to share drafts with affected stakeholders and publish them online ensures broad participation opportunity. This applies to anti-corruption legislation like all other policy areas.

Transparency and access to information laws provide the foundation for meaningful stakeholder participation.

Argentina's Law 27.275 on Access to Public Information extends beyond government entities to include state-owned companies, private companies providing public services, and any private entity receiving public funds. This broad scope ensures civil society can monitor both public and private sector integrity. Furthermore, Argentina has developed innovative transparency monitoring through its Active Transparency Index, created in 2020 with civil society. The Index uses eight indicators covering information requests, authorities, salaries, asset declarations, procurement, budget, audits, and transfers.

Portugal's Law 26/2016 on access to administrative and environmental information applies the principle of transparency to every entity exercising administrative powers.

In Italy, considering the characteristics and close relationships between corruption and money laundering, some preventive measures require integrating rules and practices in both the AC and the AML systems, to increase the capacity of a very comprehensive range of subjects in identifying and mitigating corruption-related risks. The Italian AML system also includes some Public Administration Offices (handling administrative procedures in specific sectors, such as public tenders and contracts, public funding, real estate and trade) within the entities obliged to communicate to the national FIU data and information concerning suspicious transactions of which they become aware in exercising their institutional activity. An effective contribution from these types of public administrations can bring to the FIU's attention operational contexts, often linked to corruption cases, that cannot be fully detected by other reporting categories.

The Netherlands' Open Government Act (Wet open overheid), implemented in May 2022, represents an evolution in transparency law. Building on the 1991 Act, it shortens response times, emphasises proactive disclosure, and, since September 2022, requires all policy memos underlying parliamentary documents to be disclosed automatically.

India's Right to Information Act (2005), India's RTI Act, 2005, gives every citizen a legal right to access government-held information. The government promotes RTI through awareness campaigns, handbooks, and digital platforms such as RTIOnline.gov.in, strengthening transparency and accountability across public schemes.

1.1.3 Private sector compliance frameworks

Most G20 countries have established corporate liability frameworks requiring or incentivising anti-corruption compliance programmes. While comprehensive coverage exceeds this compendium's scope, the following examples illustrate different regulatory approaches countries employ. These range from prescriptive requirements mandating specific measures to incentive-based approaches that reward integrity through commercial advantages or penalty mitigation.

Prescriptive requirements

Some jurisdictions mandate specific anti-corruption measures that companies must implement based on objective criteria such as size, revenue, or government contract value. These approaches provide detailed compliance roadmaps, specifying exact procedures and systems that must be in place regardless of whether corruption has occurred, creating standardised prevention infrastructure across affected companies.

France's Sapin II Law takes a prescriptive approach by establishing size-based thresholds: companies with over 500 employees and revenue exceeding €100 million must implement eight specific anti-corruption measures, including risk mapping, internal alert systems, and third-party

due diligence procedures. The French Anticorruption Agency (AFA) carried out 84 audits in the public sector between 2018 and 2023 and provided extensive support through 35 awareness-raising actions for the private sector in 2024 alone.

Liability-based approaches

Several countries establish corporate criminal or administrative liability for corruption offences while allowing compliance programmes to serve as a complete or partial defence. This approach shifts the burden to companies to demonstrate they took adequate preventive measures, creating powerful incentives for proactive compliance investment rather than reactive responses after violations occur.

Argentina's Law 27.401 on Criminal Liability of Legal Entities (2017) exemplifies this approach. It establishes mandatory criminal liability for legal entities involved in corruption, while allowing mitigation through adequate integrity programmes (Article 8) and potential exemption through self-reporting and restitution (Article 9). This creates a powerful incentive for companies to invest in genuine compliance rather than paper programmes.

Spain's Criminal Code establishes that legal persons can be held criminally liable for corruption and related offences. However, if a company has adopted an effective compliance programme, this may exempt it from liability, making only the individual directly responsible liable. This legal provision is a key incentive for companies to embed anti-corruption measures into their internal governance systems.

Adequate compliance measures can also be an exempting or mitigating circumstance under Germany's corporate liability regime.

South Africa has recently strengthened its approach through amendments to the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act. The new Section 34A creates a specific offence for failure to prevent corrupt activities by private sector entities and state-owned enterprises. Crucially, entities can defend themselves by demonstrating that they took "reasonable internal precautions" to prevent corruption. This shifts the burden to companies to proactively implement integrity measures, similar to the UK Bribery Act model.

Commercial incentives

Rather than relying solely on enforcement, some jurisdictions link integrity directly to business opportunities through procurement preferences, market access requirements, or eligibility for government support programmes. These approaches recognise that making compliance a prerequisite for commercial success can be more effective than punishment in driving sustained behavioural change across the private sector.

Brazil demonstrates how procurement systems can incentivise integrity. Law 14133/2021 establishes integrity programme implementation as a tie-breaking criterion in public tenders and as a condition for the rehabilitation of companies previously barred from public contracting. This creates direct commercial advantages for companies investing in compliance.

India links integrity requirements directly to market opportunities. The mandatory Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting for the top 1,000 listed companies requires detailed anti-corruption disclosures. Companies seeking Production-Linked Incentive schemes must demonstrate ESG compliance. The GeM platform prioritises vendors with clean compliance records, creating commercial advantages for integrity.

Spain's 2025 National Anti-Corruption Plan foresees the introduction of mandatory anti-corruption compliance systems for companies engaging with the public sector, accessing subsidies, or applying for EU funds. The Spanish Public Sector Contracts Law already establishes disqualification from contracting for companies convicted of certain offences, including corruption. This creates a clear business case: without adequate compliance systems, companies cannot access significant economic opportunities.

Canada's Trade Commissioner Service demonstrates how governments can link service provision to integrity standards. Organisations must sign an Integrity Declaration affirming they have not been charged or convicted of corruption or bribery before receiving trade advocacy services from Canada's offices abroad. Companies that decline to sign receive no trade advocacy support. This approach creates immediate commercial consequences for integrity failures while requiring minimal administrative burden - a simple declaration rather than complex compliance programmes.

Leniency programmes

Some jurisdictions provide substantial benefits for companies that self-disclose violations and cooperate with authorities in investigations. These leniency programmes recognise that encouraging companies to come forward with misconduct they discover internally can be more effective than relying solely on external detection, while also providing valuable intelligence about systemic corruption patterns that might otherwise remain hidden.

Brazil's leniency agreement system under the Anti-Corruption Law allows companies that self-disclose misconduct and cooperate with authorities to benefit from significant sanction reductions. The CGU's Secretariat of Private Integrity (SIPRI), created in 2023, manages these agreements alongside broader private sector integrity promotion efforts.

Argentina's Law 27.401 on Criminal Liability of Legal Entities (2017) creates incentives for corporate self-organisation by allowing companies with adequate integrity programmes to mitigate criminal penalties (Article 8) or achieve exemption from liability through self-reporting and restitution (Article 9).

In the United Kingdom a Deferred Prosecution Agreement (DPA) is an agreement reached between a prosecutor and an organisation which could be prosecuted, under the supervision of a judge. The agreement allows a prosecution to be suspended for a defined period, provided the organisation meets certain specified conditions. The Serious Fraud Office and Crown Prosecution Service publish a Code of Practice for DPAs, includes factors for consideration in deciding whether to continue bring criminal charges or enter into a DPA with a company. In April 2025 the SFO issued revised guidance to corporates encouraging companies to report suspected wrongdoing by setting out factors the SFO will consider in offering a Deferred Prosecution Agreement (DPA), reduced penalties, or making a decision not to prosecute. It also sets out the potential benefits of self-reporting, and its expectations in relation to the self-reporting process and cooperation.

1.2 National anti-corruption strategies and multistakeholder involvement

The development and implementation of national anti-corruption strategies provide a critical entry point for multistakeholder engagement.¹ G20 countries demonstrate varying approaches to incorporating non-state actors into these strategic frameworks, from consultation-based models to full co-creation partnerships.

1.2.1 Co-creation and participatory development models

Brazil's Integrity and Anti-Corruption Plan 2025-2027 exemplifies a comprehensive participatory approach. In its governmental development phase, the plan involved 53 federal public administration bodies, including 35 ministries and 11 regulatory agencies. Civil society engagement occurred through the Council for Transparency, Integrity and Combating Corruption (CTICC), which comprises 30 civil society members out of 41 total members (73%). The Plan incorporated over 40 proposals from civil society consultations, demonstrating genuine integration of external input.

China's model demonstrates systematic public consultation through its five-year planning process. For the 20th CPC National Congress, 8.54 million pieces of advice were received from various sectors of society, with an additional 820,000 pieces from professionals participating in dedicated discussion seminars. Draft administrative decisions must be published for public comment for no less than 30 days under the Interim Regulation on the Procedure for Major Administrative Decisions.

Italy's "ParteciPA" is the official online platform of the Italian government dedicated to public participation in policymaking. It provides a digital space where administrations can present draft regulations, action plans, or policy initiatives and collect feedback, proposals, and comments from citizens, civil society organisations, and other stakeholders. Furthermore, the Participation Hub is Italy's national platform for public participation, created under the 5th Open Government Action Plan. It promotes participatory policies by sharing practices and tools, and serves as a catalyst for democratic innovation at national and international levels.

1.2.2 Institutionalised monitoring and oversight

South Africa's National Anti-Corruption Strategy (2020-2030) embraces a "whole society approach". The sixth pillar of the strategy is focused on the protection of sectors that are vulnerable or prone to corruption, and this is operationalised through Sector Anti-Corruption Forums. These forums demonstrate effective inclusion of state and non-state actors such as government, civil society, business, labour, regulators, and other stakeholders in the fight against corruption (see box 6).

Argentina's multistakeholder approach includes the Integrity Policy Observatory (IPO) for intersectoral coordination. Created through Resolution 13/2024, the IPO exemplifies institutionalised multistakeholder monitoring. The Observatory brings together civil society organisations, universities, chambers of commerce, professional councils, and private sector representatives to contribute to the design, evaluation, and improvement of integrity policies. Working across four strategic axes—public sector integrity, private sector integrity, training and dissemination, and federal coordination—the OPI has already developed two key initiatives: Guidelines for Developing Integrity Programs and a Comprehensive Training Program in Public

¹ The development and implementation of national anti-corruption strategies reflect states' obligations under UNCAC Article 5.

Ethics. This permanent platform ensures continuous multistakeholder input into policy development rather than ad-hoc consultations.

India's Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) is the apex integrity institution responsible for policy oversight, preventive vigilance, and supervising vigilance functions across all Central Government Ministries, Public Sector Units, and autonomous bodies. It also issues guidelines, conducts system studies, and hosts the annual Vigilance Awareness Week.

1.2.3 Integration with broader governance frameworks

Many countries are aligning their anti-corruption strategies with wider governance reforms.

Italy's 6th National Action Plan for Open Government (2024-2026) includes specific anti-corruption actions involving collaboration between public actors and organised civil society. This ensures that anti-corruption efforts benefit from broader transparency and participation.

While the Netherlands does not have a unified national anti-corruption strategy, it announced in June 2025 its intention to strengthen government-wide anti-corruption efforts through a risk-based approach informed by a national risk assessment on corruption. Policy development occurs through close coordination with diverse stakeholders who discuss priorities and key issues.

Mexico's National Anti-Corruption Policy (PNA), approved in January 2020, defines strategic direction through its Implementation Programme (PI-PNA), which contains strategies, lines of action, and performance indicators. The Financial Intelligence Unit developed 64 strategic indicators, updated in 2024, as monitoring tools that will form part of the Anti-Corruption and Integrity Evaluation Model (MESAI).

1.3 International legal frameworks and commitments

G20 countries' approaches to multistakeholder engagement are significantly shaped by international frameworks and commitments, particularly UNCAC article 13, and, in certain cases, the Open Government Partnership (OGP), and the African Regional mechanisms like the African Peer Review Mechanism.

1.3.1 UNCAC article 13 implementation

UNCAC Article 13 requires States Parties to promote the active participation of individuals and groups outside the public sector in preventing and fighting corruption. The article specifies four components: (a) Enhancing the transparency of and promoting the contribution of the public to decision-making processes; (b) Ensuring that the public has effective access to information; (c) Undertaking public information activities that contribute to non-tolerance of corruption, as well as public education programmes; (d) Respecting, promoting and protecting the freedom to seek, receive, publish and disseminate information concerning corruption.²

² For more examples and guidance, UNODC, together with the OECD and the UN Global Compact, has published "A Resource Guide on State Measures for Strengthening Business Integrity" in 2024. The guide is designed to provide States with a framework for encouraging business integrity by identifying and implementing an appropriate mix of sanctions for misconduct, and by outlining good practices for incentives. It is available in English, French, Spanish and Arabic <https://businessintegrity.unodc.org/bip/en/new-publication-a-resource-guide-on-state-measures-for-strengthening-business-integrity.html>

Most countries have operationalised UNCAC Article 13's requirement for societal participation through diverse mechanisms.

Indonesia operationalises UNCAC Article 13 through comprehensive legal mechanisms for public participation in corruption cases (see Box 2 above for framework details), including Government Regulation No. 43 of 2018 on participation procedures and awards.

Several G20 countries have signed the Transparency Pledge of the UNCAC Coalition, a global network of over 350 civil society organisations promoting UNCAC implementation and publicly supporting participation of civil society observers in UNCAC subsidiary bodies.

1.3.2 Open Government Partnership as a catalyst

The OGP has emerged as a powerful framework for structuring multistakeholder engagement. It occupies a unique position in the international anti-corruption architecture, straddling the boundary between voluntary cooperation and binding commitment. While countries voluntarily choose to join OGP, once they become members, they undertake formal government commitments that are subject to independent monitoring and public accountability. These National Action Plans, co-created with civil society, often translate into domestic legislation, regulations, or institutional reforms that become legally binding within the national context. This hybrid nature—voluntary at the international level but generating accountability mechanisms and often legal obligations domestically—makes OGP particularly effective at driving concrete governance reforms while respecting national sovereignty.

Spain's Open Government Forum, comprising representatives from public administration and 32 civil society organisations, oversees the country's OGP commitments. The Forum is now setting the groundwork for the V Plan (2025-2029) through inclusive online consultations and co-creation workshops.

Argentina is promoting co-creation of the Sixth National Open Government Action Plan (2025-2027) through a participatory and federal process. Issues being addressed include bringing crime statistics to the public, evaluating open data, strengthening access to information, and capacity building for an Open State.

Norway's OGP Action Plan includes a specific commitment to "a More Strategic Approach to Anti-Corruption Work," developed through its Stakeholders' Forum that brings together civil society organisations, media organisations, and public and private bodies.

In Italy, the OGP Community adopted a multistakeholder approach resulting, i.e., in a range of initiatives in the field of anti-corruption and anti-money laundering. Such initiatives are based on the collaboration between the Department of Public Function, the National School of Administration and the FIU, and aim at promoting a greater awareness and participation of public administrations in the anti-money laundering system.

In the United Kingdom, civil society and government work together to co-create UK National Action Plans for Open Government. This process leads to the creation of a set of commitments across a range of thematic interests. Action plans are independently assessed to whether they meet minimum participation requirements agreed with OGP. The development of UK NAPs and the general promotion of open government is overseen by a joint government-civil society body called the UK Multi-Stakeholder Forum for Open Government (MSF). This includes representatives from Cabinet Office, FCDO, the Devolved Administrations, local government,

the UK Open Government Network Steering Committee, and government and civil society representatives involved in developing and/or implementing NAP commitments.

1.3.3 Regional legal instruments and specialised standard-setting bodies

Beyond global instruments like UNCAC, regional conventions, and international standards-setting bodies create additional binding or quasi-binding obligations that shape domestic regulatory frameworks.

The Financial Action Task Force occupies a unique position—while technically voluntary, FATF membership creates such strong compliance pressure through its grey-listing mechanism that its 40 Recommendations effectively function as binding standards, with countries like Mexico incorporating FATF requirements on corruption as a predicate offence for money laundering directly into domestic law. These regional and specialised instruments prove particularly effective because they address context-specific challenges—illicit financial flows in Africa, public procurement in the EU, or money laundering globally—while creating peer pressure mechanisms among countries with similar legal traditions and development levels.

The African Union's anti-corruption architecture operates through multiple instruments: the binding AU Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption creates legal obligations for state parties, while the voluntary African Peer Review Mechanism generates peer pressure for governance reforms. South Africa's National Anti-Corruption Strategy demonstrates how both mechanisms work in tandem—the Convention providing legal requirements while APRM principles shape the 'all of society approach'.

The layered approach of global conventions reinforced by regional instruments and specialized standards creates multiple accountability mechanisms. Countries like South Africa explicitly acknowledge how UNCAC, AU frameworks, and FATF standards collectively shape their national strategies.

Chapter 2: Engaging specific non-state stakeholders in anti-corruption efforts

While Chapter 1 examined the regulatory frameworks and strategic foundations for multistakeholder engagement, this chapter explores how countries operationalise these frameworks through concrete programmes and initiatives. The experiences of G20 countries demonstrate that successful engagement of non-state stakeholders requires tailored approaches that recognise the distinct capabilities, motivations, and constraints of different sectors. From mandatory compliance requirements to voluntary integrity networks, from investigative journalism to citizen monitoring, these diverse approaches reflect the multifaceted nature of corruption challenges and the need for equally diverse responses.

2.1 Private sector engagement

The private sector plays a dual role in anti-corruption efforts: as both a potential source of corruption risk and a critical partner in building integrity systems. G20 countries have developed sophisticated approaches that complement the mandatory frameworks outlined in Chapter 1. The evolution from punitive to preventive approaches marks a significant shift in how countries engage the private sector. While traditional enforcement remains important, many G20 countries

now emphasise building corporate cultures of integrity through structured programmes that combine legal requirements with voluntary initiatives.

2.1.1 Voluntary integrity programmes and recognition systems

Several countries have developed voluntary programmes that provide public recognition and support for corporate integrity efforts, creating reputational incentives beyond regulatory compliance. These initiatives recognise that a sustainable anti-corruption culture requires companies to embrace integrity as a value proposition rather than merely a legal obligation

Brazil's Pro-Ethics (Pró-Ética) programme, administered by the Secretariat of Private Integrity within the CGU, offers companies validation through a "Pro-Ethics Business" seal. In the 2022-2023 edition, nearly 300 companies participated, with 84 receiving the seal, demonstrating significant private sector appetite for public integrity recognition.

South Africa's approach through Business Unity South Africa (BUSA) and the Joint Initiative to Fight Crime and Corruption (JICC) shows how business associations can drive voluntary compliance. The JICC involves CEOs from major companies pledging resources and expertise to support government anti-corruption efforts, including the planned establishment of a forensics analysis centre. This CEO-level commitment ensures anti-corruption efforts receive board-level attention rather than being relegated to compliance departments.

Indonesia's PANCEK (Anticorruption Guideline for the Business Sector) offers a particularly accessible model. As a self-assessment tool that is non-certifiable and free of charge, it lowers barriers to participation for smaller companies. Over 1,000 companies have adopted these measures, demonstrating that voluntary programmes can achieve significant scale when designed with accessibility in mind. Indonesia's Regional Advisory Committee (Komite Advokasi Daerah - KAD) takes a geographic approach, facilitating public-private dialogue between business associations and local governments in all 34 provinces. These committees discuss sector-specific corruption issues and develop recommendations for improving public services through regulatory reform and digitalisation of licensing processes. This provincial-level engagement ensures anti-corruption efforts address local contexts and challenges.

Argentina's Integrity and Transparency Registry for Companies and Entities (RITE) demonstrate how governments can support voluntary compliance through accessible platforms. This free online registry, administered by the Anti-Corruption Office, allows companies to register their integrity programmes and access self-assessment tools covering integrity programmes, due diligence, and personal data protection. With 461 entities registered as of June 2025, RITE facilitates programme development, particularly for SMEs that lack resources for expensive compliance consultants.

2.1.2 Capacity building and training initiatives

Given that compliance programmes require technical knowledge and skills, some countries have developed diverse training and capacity-building initiatives to support private sector integrity efforts.

South Korea's dual-track e-learning approach through the Government e-Learning Platform and the specialised 'Integrity Learning Centre' demonstrates targeted capacity building for different audiences. While the government platform serves general public sector training, the Integrity Learning Centre specifically targets employees of public sector-related organisations, private school faculty, and journalists with five specialised courses on anti-corruption laws, fair recruitment procedures, and ethical management. Offered 11 times annually from February to

December, this sustained programming ensures continuous learning opportunities. The ACRC's Anti-Corruption Training Institute has expanded to include quarterly seminars for private companies and on-site corporate training, with new courses on integrity and ethical management for executives introduced in 2022, showing evolution from compliance training to leadership development.

France's AFA conducted 36 training activities in universities and business schools in 2024, designed for master's students and professionals in specialised programmes. This dual approach ensures both future professionals and current practitioners receive anti-corruption education.

Indonesia's approach shows how to reach businesses at scale. The KPK has conducted training for over 1,000 companies through PANCEK implementation support, while specialised programmes target SMEs, recognising their different capacity needs compared to large corporations.

The Netherlands has developed targeted approaches for specific business sectors. Following corruption cases in healthcare, the FIOD/ACC provided awareness sessions for medical professionals. Collaboration with medical magazines and professional associations raised awareness about corruption risks specific to healthcare, including pharmaceutical influence and procurement fraud.

Australia's Bribery Prevention Network (BPN) operates as a public-private partnership bringing together business, civil society, academia, and government. The BPN offers a free online portal of resources curated by Australia's leading anti-bribery experts, providing access to compliance expertise traditionally available only to large corporations.

China's Ministry of Public Security's "Sunshine Police Platform" creates a feedback loop between enforcement and prevention. The platform receives corruption reports from private entities and informs enterprises of compliance loopholes revealed during investigations, enabling real-time learning from enforcement actions.

India has adopted a holistic approach rooted in capacity-building, policy standardisation, and digital integration. The Mission Karmayogi initiative, implemented through the iGOT digital platform, offers continuous training on ethics and governance for public officials at all levels. Further, the Indian Institute of Corporate Affairs (IICA) established under the Ministry of Corporate Affairs—serves as the principal national body for promoting corporate integrity.

2.2 Civil society participation

Civil society encompasses far more than traditional NGOs, including community-based organisations, faith-based groups, professional associations, trade unions, academic institutions, and social movements. These diverse actors bring crucial expertise from outside the public sector and provide independent perspectives on corruption challenges that government insiders might overlook or be unable to voice. Their varied forms—from grassroots community groups to international watchdogs—ensure multiple viewpoints and approaches in anti-corruption efforts. They play indispensable roles in anti-corruption efforts, operating across three distinct but complementary functions: implementing programmes as service providers, monitoring government and private sector as watchdogs, and influencing policy as advocates.

Their independence from both state and market actors positions them uniquely to bridge government-citizen gaps while maintaining critical oversight.

2.2.1 Civil society as service providers

Germany's approach through BMZ-commissioned projects demonstrates how international cooperation can strengthen local civil society capacity. The project "Prevention and fight against corruption" in Moldova supported the establishment and capacity building of local transparency councils. The "Participation, accountability and integrity for a resilient democracy" project in Ghana strengthens civil society's role in demanding accountability.

Indonesia's engagement with faith-based and cultural groups recognises that effective civil society engagement must work with existing social structures. Programmes like the Religious Anti-Corruption Safari and CSO Anti-Corruption Seminars adapt anti-corruption messages to different cultural contexts, increasing their resonance and effectiveness. Indonesia's PAKSI (Anti-Corruption Instructor Certification) programme takes a different approach by training community members as anti-corruption educators. This creates a network of community-based integrity champions who can identify and address corruption risks in their contexts.

Portugal's MENAC has signed collaboration protocols with entities like All4Integrity, a civic association focused on transparency and good governance. These partnerships support implementation of the General Regime for the Prevention of Corruption through training and awareness activities, showing how government agencies can leverage civil society expertise.

2.2.2 Civil society as watchdogs

Citizen monitoring initiatives represent one of the most direct forms of civil society participation in anti-corruption efforts. These approaches leverage citizen proximity to public services and their lived experience of corruption to create bottom-up accountability mechanisms that complement top-down enforcement.

Brazil's extensive system of Ombudsperson offices (ouvidorias) demonstrates how citizen monitoring can be institutionalised at scale. Since 2018, the CGU has integrated all 300 ouvidorias units under the Ombudsman System of the Federal Executive Branch. The centralised Fala.BR platform enables both public servants and citizens to report wrongdoing in federal administration, creating a systematic channel for citizen input into integrity oversight.

China's specialised reporting website (<http://www.12388.gov.cn/>), operated by the National Commission for Supervision, accepts public reports, including anonymous ones. In 2024, prosecution bodies received 142,800 appeals from citizens through the Unified Portal of the Prosecutor's Office, up from 114,000 in 2023, showing growing citizen confidence in reporting mechanisms.

South Africa's ward committee system, while facing challenges, provides a model for structured community participation in local governance oversight. These committees, established under the Municipal Structures Act, create formal channels for communities to monitor service delivery and flag corruption risks at the most local level. South Africa's Public Protector, established under the Public Protector Act 1994, investigates conduct in state affairs alleged to be improper. Citizens can lay complaints directly, with the Public Protector having significant investigative powers and moral authority even without binding enforcement power.

India's MGNREGA social audits represent the world's largest community-based accountability mechanism. Mandated since 2011, these audits empower village assemblies to review all local

works and expenditures, supported by independent Social Audit Units in 28 states. The 2024 integration of AI-powered translation through Bhashini enables participation in 22 languages, overcoming linguistic barriers. Data from 2018 highlights that over 73,655 such meetings were convened during Vigilance Awareness Week alone. This demonstrates how social accountability can scale across a population of 1.4 billion people.

South Korea's innovative Anonymous Reporting through a Lawyer system demonstrates how legal professionals can facilitate corruption reporting while protecting whistleblower identity. Established through an August 2024 amendment to the Act on the Protection of Public Interest Whistleblowers, the system allows lawyers to file reports on behalf of whistleblowers without disclosing their identity. The Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC) maintains a panel of 100 advisory lawyers who provide comprehensive legal assistance beyond filing reports.

Russia's Federal Law No. 172-FZ of 2009 "On the Anti-Corruption Expert Review of Normative Legal Acts and Drafts of Normative Legal Acts" provides for the possibility for civil society institutions and individual citizens to undertake anti-corruption expert reviews of normative legal acts and their drafts that are published on the website <https://regulation.gov.ru/> created for disclosing information on draft normative legal acts and the outcomes of their public discussion.

2.2.3 Civil society as advocates

Argentina, civil society organisations play a crucial role in shaping anti-corruption policies through structured advocacy and participation in governance mechanisms. This advocacy function transforms civil society from external observers to active participants in policy formulation, bringing grassroots perspectives and independent expertise into government decision-making processes.

Countries that create formal channels for this advocacy often find their anti-corruption strategies strengthened by civil society's unique insights into how corruption affects communities and their innovative proposals for systemic reform. Examples include: The Netherlands inclusion of Transparency International Netherlands as a recurring observing member of Dutch delegations to UNCAC Conference of States Parties and Implementation Review Group sessions; Brazil's incorporation of over 40 civil society proposals into the 2025-2027 Integrity Plan; Indonesia's involvement of civil society in monitoring specific issues like beneficial ownership transparency and legal case data integration through its National Strategy for Corruption Prevention framework.

The United Kingdom worked with civil society, think tanks, the business sector and academia in the development of a new Anti-Corruption Strategy. through a mix of set quarterly meetings with the Joint Anti-Corruption Unit (JACU) in the Home Office, and dedicated engagement on Strategy development. Officials have engaged with civil society organisations through every stage of the development of the new Anti-Corruption Strategy, including:

- Engaging in workshops to discuss the lessons learned from the previous Anti-Corruption Strategy
- Discussions of what civil society organisations would want to see included in the Strategy
- Theory of Change workshops to identify gaps and potential solutions in the previous approaches to anti-corruption measures
- Progress updates throughout the development of the Strategy

Civil society organisations have also been commissioned for research papers on topics of their expertise in order to gain a better understanding of the corruption issue and potential solutions, including on public integrity, and have attended roundtables with Ministers on the topic of anti-corruption and Strategy development.

South Africa's approach through Corruption Watch provides a civil society-led model. As an independent organisation, Corruption Watch operates multiple reporting channels and has developed specific tools like the "Youth and Corruption Toolkit" to empower young people to identify and combat corruption in their communities. Their "Strengthening Action Against Corruption (SAAC) Project," funded by the EU and implemented with partners including Transparency International, specifically targets community advice offices and CSOs in the Eastern Cape province, building local capacity for corruption monitoring.

Through Resolution 13/2024, the Anti-Corruption Office (OA) created the Integrity Policy Observatory (OPI), a space for intersectoral and interinstitutional participation aimed at contributing to the design, evaluation, and improvement of public policies on integrity and transparency, as well as strengthening the articulation and synergy between the different national State agencies, civil society, and other relevant institutions in this area.

The OPI is made up of civil society organisations whose mission is related to anti-corruption policies, as well as universities, representatives of chambers of commerce, professional councils, or other private sector organisations that—in the context of their activities—interact or are linked to the national government. This is without prejudice to the possibility of convening, for specific topics, representatives of public bodies, as well as other institutions or experts in the field of preventing and combating corruption.

2.3 Media engagement

The media serves as a crucial bridge between anti-corruption institutions and the public, translating complex corruption cases into understandable narratives and maintaining public pressure for accountability. G20 countries demonstrate diverse approaches to media engagement, from protecting investigative journalism to leveraging digital platforms for anti-corruption messaging.

2.3.1 Investigative journalism and public awareness

South Africa's experience with investigative journalism units like amaBhungane demonstrates the media's critical role in exposing grand corruption. Their work on state capture, revealing how billions were diverted from state enterprises, influenced the establishment of the Zondo Commission of Inquiry.

France demonstrates a strong commitment to investigative journalism through direct financial support. The French MFA subsidised the Organised Crime and Corruption Reporting Project (OCCRP) in 2023 and 2024 and will support Plateforme de Protection des Lanceurs d'Alerte en Afrique (PPLAAF) in 2025. PPLAAF specifically focuses on protecting individuals who expose corruption, recognising that effective social control requires both safe reporting channels and protection for those who use them.

Germany supports capacity building for journalists investigating corruption cases, in collaboration with Journalists for Transparency. BMZ-commissioned projects in Moldova and Ghana specifically include strengthening journalistic work on integrity and anti-corruption, recognising that investigative skills require dedicated development.

Saudi Arabia's approach through NAZAHA demonstrates systematic media engagement. NAZAHA regularly publishes monthly arrest and investigation statistics on social media and its website, "enhancing transparency and engaging with the media to convey this information to the public." The authority also monitors media coverage on integrity and corruption topics, including complaints that fall under its jurisdiction.

The Netherlands developed targeted media strategies following large corruption cases. In 2022, law enforcement agencies published press releases about corruption investigations in the medical sector and gave interviews to both daily newspapers and medical magazines. This sector-specific media engagement helped raise awareness among professionals most at risk of encountering corruption.

Singapore's collaboration with media extends beyond traditional news. CPIB works with the media to create deterrent messages through regular press releases on enforcement actions, media features on CPIB cases and capabilities, and even a documentary series, "Corruption Crackdown Inside the CPIB" and "Abyss of Greed." This multi-format approach recognises that different audiences consume media differently.

The United Kingdom funds **Transparency International (TI)** and the **Organized Crime and Corruption Reporting Project (OCCRP)** under a joint grant which combines the unique strengths of investigative journalism and civil society advocacy in a consortium that exposes corruption and facilitates action by government, law enforcement, and international organisations.

2.3.2 Media partnerships and communication strategies

Indonesia's comprehensive media engagement through KPK includes multiple programmes: Media Discussions that explore media narratives on corruption, Anti-Corruption Journalist Training across regions to strengthen investigative skills, Press Releases and Progress Updates on selected topics providing in-depth context, and annual Media Gathering Forums fostering transparency between KPK leadership and national/regional media.

Indonesia's media strategy makes sophisticated use of digital platforms. While traditional media monitoring continues through KPK's internal Media Monitoring Unit, which produces quarterly analysis reports, the country also recognises challenges in the digital space: "Ensuring message clarity and consistency is challenging due to the diverse range of platforms in social media/digital space."

Portugal's MENAC regularly promotes media initiatives through social media, webinars, television, and radio campaigns. Their December 2022 campaign "Against corruption, we must all say no!" used examples of corruption behaviours to alert the public to the impacts on democratic institutions and economic development.

India's CPGRAMS enables citizens to lodge complaints on corruption and service delivery, with grievances tracked through an escalation matrix. The MyGov platform supports participatory governance through polls, discussions and integrity campaigns, while the UMANG app integrates thousands of government services with feedback options. These platforms provide real-time channels for citizen reporting, reinforcing transparency and accountability in governance.

2.3.3 Challenges in media engagement

Countries acknowledge significant challenges in media engagement. Italy's latest Rule of Law report stressed needs to "reinforce media pluralism, protect journalistic freedom, and address systemic issues that hinder transparency." Indonesia seeks good practices in "addressing

disinformation surrounding corruption cases" and "strengthening media accountability and ethical standards in high-risk environments."

Several countries note the difficulty of maintaining media independence while engaging in anti-corruption efforts. The balance between providing information and avoiding political influence remains delicate, particularly in contexts where media ownership concentration or political pressure constrains journalistic freedom.

2.4 Academic institutions and universities

Academic institutions contribute to anti-corruption efforts through research, education, and capacity building. Their intellectual independence and analytical capabilities make them valuable partners in developing evidence-based anti-corruption strategies and nurturing future integrity leaders.

2.4.1 Research partnerships and education

Italy's tight collaboration between ANAC and universities demonstrates how academic research can inform policy. Universities support corruption prevention through specialised training for public officials, civic education programmes, and research on transparency, procurement, and whistleblower protection. The LUISS University-ANAC "Legality and Merit Project," now in its seventh edition, involves university and secondary school students, Juvenile Penal Institutes, and Ministerial Communities.

Russia's institutional approach includes the Interdisciplinary Council for Coordination of Scientific and Methodological Support for Combating Corruption at the Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law, the Anti-Corruption Centre and Laboratory for Anti-Corruption Policy at the Higher School of Economics, and the Research and Educational Centre for Combating Corruption at the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration.

South Africa's universities demonstrate how academic institutions can contribute beyond traditional teaching and research to become active partners in national anti-corruption efforts. (see Box 3)

Box 3: South Africa's Academic Contributions to Anti-Corruption

South Africa's universities demonstrate comprehensive engagement in anti-corruption efforts:

Specialised Centres:

- Stellenbosch University's ACCERUS offers training and education for public organisations
- SIU's Brigitte Mabandla Justice College provides specialised law enforcement training
- Rhodes University signed Corruption Watch pledges promoting transparency

Research and Advocacy:

- Documentation of best practices in open governance and ethical leadership
- Research on corruption's impact informing policy and public discourse
- Participation in Water Sector and Local Government Anti-Corruption Forums

Civic Education:

- Promotion of whistleblowing and access to information
- Youth engagement through social advertising contests
- Integration of anti-corruption themes in various academic disciplines

Argentina's Federal Network of Multidisciplinary Studies on Integrity and Corruption (EMIC), established through an agreement between the Anti-Corruption Office and CONICET, bridges public and academic sectors. The network has published seven investigations examining corruption's intersections with environment, human rights, and tax havens, demonstrating how academic research can reconceptualise corruption as a complex phenomenon requiring multidisciplinary approaches.

China has established corruption studies as an academic discipline, with some universities offering master's programmes in discipline inspection and supervision. The Academy of Discipline Inspection and Supervision (CADIS) serve as a specialised academy for training Chinese and foreign anticorruption practitioners, showing how countries can develop dedicated academic institutions for integrity education.

2.4.2 Anti-corruption curriculum development

Saudi Arabia demonstrates comprehensive curriculum integration, with NAZAHA cooperating with the Ministry of Education to include integrity values in curricula for all general education stages. Universities are encouraged to include dedicated or integrated courses on integrity protection and anti-corruption, while 53 "Integrity Clubs" across universities have conducted over 2,858 awareness activities.

Türkiye's 'Education Model of the Century of Türkiye' demonstrates systematic integration of integrity across the curriculum through its Virtue-Value-Action Framework. This model directly incorporates 'integrity' as one of 20 core values. The approach moves beyond standalone ethics courses to embed integrity concepts throughout the educational experience.

Portugal has developed a "Referencial de Educação para a Ética e Integridade" (Ethics and Integrity Education Framework) applicable from pre-school through secondary education. MENAC and All4Integrity collaborate to develop training programmes for teachers in anti-corruption literacy, ensuring educators can effectively deliver integrity education.

Japan's National Public Service Ethics Board conducts public relations activities for businesses having contact with national public employees in the civil service. Furthermore, Japan has established United Nations Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFEI) based on an agreement between the UN, and has been conducting international training programmes for criminal justice practitioners from emerging markets and developing economies. As part of such capacity-building initiatives, UNAFEI conducted the 26th UNCAC Training Programme on "Strengthening Prevention, Detection and Prosecution of Corruption, and Public-Private Partnership" in October 2024.

France's National School of Magistrates (ENM) integrates anti-corruption throughout magistrates' training. Initial training includes corruption topics in economic/financial courses and ethics workshops with concrete case studies. The ENM offers annual continuing education on "corruption: detection, prevention, repression" plus eight related training sessions and immersion internships. The French Anticorruption Agency (AFA) conducted 36 training activities in universities and business schools in 2024 for both students and professionals, while the High Authority for Transparency conducted 57 external interventions in 2024 and 35 in 2023, working with institutions like the Institute for Advanced Studies in National Defence and the National Institute of Public Service.

The Netherlands regularly consults academic researchers on legislative issues, and the Scientific Research and Data Centre is conducting studies, including a national risk assessment on corruption in the European part of the Netherlands and research on corruption in Dutch Caribbean municipalities.

2.5 Gender and youth initiatives

Recognition in certain domestic contexts that corruption may affect different demographic groups differently and that sustainable change requires engaging all segments of society has led countries to develop targeted approaches for gender-approaches and youth.

2.5.1 Gender-responsive or gender-responsive approaches

Several countries have developed targeted approaches for engaging gender-approaches's organisations. This has also been reflected in the UNCAC COSP resolution 10/10, which specifically encourages States to "promote the meaningful participation and engagement of, and cooperation with, gender-approaches and community-based organisations..."³. These initiatives address both the gendered impacts of corruption and the unique role gender-approaches can play in promoting integrity through their positions in families and communities.

Indonesia's SPAK movement demonstrates how gender-focused anti-corruption programmes can achieve scale and sustainability through community ownership (see Box 4).

Other countries demonstrate diverse approaches to gender-approaches' anti-corruption leadership. Brazil's CTICC achieved 55% gender-approaches membership while deliberately including feminist, Black, and grassroots organisations. India mandates that there is 50% reservation for gender-approaches' seats in 21 states, combined with self-help groups that have mobilised over 100 million gender-approaches. South Africa recognises gender-approaches as primary whistleblowers motivated by securing better futures for their children, leading to targeted support programmes, including addressing sextortion through the TIP programme. These approaches demonstrate evolution to gender-responsive anti-corruption programming,

³ <https://www.unodc.org/corruption/en/cosp/conference/session10-resolutions.html#Res.10-10>

with several countries explicitly addressing forms of corruption that disproportionately affect gender-approaches while leveraging gender-approaches's influential roles in communities.

Box 4: Indonesia's SPAK Movement - From Government Initiative to Independent Organisation

The evolution of Indonesia's SPAK (Saya Perempuan Anti Korupsi/I am a Woman Against Corruption) movement demonstrates how government-initiated programs can evolve into independent civil society organisations:

Origins and Evolution:

- Initiated in 2014 as collaboration between KPK Indonesia and Australia Indonesia Partnership for Justice
- Launched as independent SPAK Indonesia organisation in April 2018
- Transition from government programme to civil society organisation

Scale and Diversity:

- 2,080 agents across 34 provinces (as of 2019)
- Diverse membership: stay-at-home spouses, lecturers, teachers, civil servants, students, activists, gender-approaches with disabilities
- Works from individual level through family units to community environment

Activities and Impact:

- Educational campaigns through "knowledge stalls" at car-free day events
- Reading Corner Initiatives combining education and games
- Family-focused programs recognising gender-approaches' role in instilling integrity values
- Collaboration with Indonesian Gender-approaches' Coalition and other gender-approaches' organisations

This model shows how governments can incubate civil society initiatives that eventually

2.5.2 Youth engagement

Countries face significant challenges in sustaining youth engagement beyond initial enthusiasm. Cultural barriers, infrastructure limitations, and the need to move beyond traditional didactic approaches all constrain effectiveness. Despite these challenges, countries recognize youth engagement as critical for sustainable anti-corruption progress.

G20 countries employ diverse approaches spanning different age groups and engagement methods. These range from formal education integration to digital campaigns, creative arts initiatives, and structured participation programmes. The IAACA/UNODC/IACA Policy Guide provides comprehensive examples of successful youth engagement strategies across multiple countries (see Box 5).⁴ The evidence demonstrates that effective youth engagement requires multiple channels adapted to local contexts and youth preferences, with emphasis on

⁴ [Policy Guide for National Anti-Corruption Authorities on Meaningful Youth Engagement in Anti-Corruption Work](#)

participatory rather than didactic methods. The shift from treating youth as passive beneficiaries to active change agents has produced innovative approaches that leverage young people's energy, digital fluency, and fresh perspectives on corruption challenges.

Box 5: A Framework for Meaningful Youth Engagement

The Policy Guide for National Anti-Corruption Authorities on Meaningful Youth Engagement, developed through collaboration between International Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities, UNODC, the Independent Commission Against Corruption, Hong Kong, China (ICAC), and youth representatives, provides a comprehensive framework that G20 countries are beginning to implement:

Five Principles for Meaningful Engagement:

- **Rights-based and inclusive:** Ensuring diverse youth participation including marginalised groups
- **Equity-focused:** Addressing barriers that prevent equal participation
- **Transparent and accountable:** Clear communication about how youth input influences decisions
- **Safe and enabling:** Creating environments where youth can participate without fear
- **Youth-led and collaborative:** Moving from consultation to co-creation

Practical Implementation Strategies:

- **Formal mechanisms:** Youth advisory boards, quotas in anti-corruption bodies, youth ombudspersons
- **Capacity building:** Training programs, mentorship schemes, peer-to-peer learning networks
- **Resource allocation:** Dedicated budgets for youth programs, small grants for youth-led initiatives
- **Digital innovation:** Online platforms for engagement, social media campaigns, gamification

This framework moves beyond tokenistic youth consultation toward genuine partnership, recognising young people not as future anti-corruption leaders but as current agents of change with unique perspectives on integrity challenges.

Russia's Prosecutor-General's Office organises the International Youth Social Advertising Competition "Together against Corruption!" under the auspices of the Interstate Anti-Corruption Council of the Commonwealth of Independent States on an annual basis. In 2024, the official website of the competition (www.anticorruption.life) received over 41 thousand anti-corruption posters, drawings, and videos from young participants from Russia and other countries across the world. As per the established tradition, the best entries are displayed at side events of the Conference of the States Parties to the UN Convention against Corruption (in 2017, 2019 and 2023).

Part II: Platforms and coordination

While Part I examined the frameworks and bilateral engagements that enable anti-corruption efforts, Part II explores how countries operationalise these foundations through platforms that bring stakeholders together and coordination mechanisms that ensure coherent action across institutions. Chapter 3 investigates multistakeholder platforms ranging from domestic partnerships to international networks. Chapter 4 examines coordination within government itself, recognising that even the most sophisticated external engagement cannot succeed if the public sector operates in silos.

Chapter 3: Multistakeholder platforms and collective action

This chapter explores platforms that bring multiple stakeholders together for coordinated action against corruption. These platforms range from domestic partnerships within national contexts to sector-specific initiatives addressing industry challenges to international networks enabling cross-border collaboration.

Amongst these platforms, collective action initiatives represent a fundamental evolution beyond traditional stakeholder engagement (see Box 1). While conventional multistakeholder approaches often involve parallel efforts—where government, business, and civil society work on similar goals but separately—genuine collective action requires binding commitments, shared accountability, and mutual enforcement mechanisms. In stakeholder consultation, the government retains decision-making power while others provide input; in coordination, actors align their separate efforts; in collaboration, they work together on shared activities. But in true collective action, participants jointly define problems, co-create solutions, and share responsibility for outcomes.

This progression from consultation through coordination and collaboration to collective action occurs at all levels. Municipal integrity pacts, national sector forums, and global initiatives all attempt to achieve this highest form of engagement.

3.1 Domestic multistakeholder partnerships

Most domestic initiatives described in this section represent points along a continuum from consultation through collaboration toward collective action. Some provide structured dialogue without shared decision-making (consultation), others enable joint activities without binding commitments (collaboration). This reality reflects the inherent challenges of aligning diverse institutional cultures, incentives, and capabilities within national contexts, where power imbalances and historical mistrust between sectors often run deep.

Despite these limitations, these platforms serve important functions: building trust across sectors that traditionally view each other with suspicion, creating habits of dialogue that can evolve into deeper cooperation, and establishing institutional foundations that future initiatives can build upon. The experiences below demonstrate both the promise and the challenges of domestic multistakeholder engagement, offering lessons for countries seeking to move beyond parallel efforts toward genuine collective action.

The fundamental challenge in multistakeholder partnerships is overcoming historical mistrust between sectors.

South Africa's National Anti-Corruption Advisory Council (NACAC) drives the National Anti-Corruption Dialogue, including all role players in the fight against corruption. This dialogue includes civil society, non-governmental organisations, community-based organisations, the private sector, media, and academia, creating a comprehensive platform for multistakeholder engagement. An example of this is South Africa's Joint Initiative to Fight Crime and Corruption (JICC), which promotes trust through high-level commitment. By involving CEOs from major companies pledging resources directly to government efforts, including possibly establishing a forensics analysis centre, the initiative ensures accountability at the highest levels. This CEO-level engagement moves beyond compliance departments to embed anti-corruption in core business strategy.

Brazil's Council for Transparency, Integrity and Combating Corruption (CTICC) sets a high standard for NGO participation in anti-corruption governance. The incorporation of over 40 civil society proposals into the 2025-2027 Integrity Plan demonstrates meaningful influence over policy outcomes. Brazil's National Network for the Promotion of Private Integrity (REDE) demonstrates how federal systems can coordinate multi-level engagement. The network aims to standardise Anti-Corruption Law application across federal, state, and municipal levels through knowledge dissemination, best practice sharing, and integrated strategies. This addresses the challenge of uneven implementation capacity across Brazil's vast territory.

Spain's Open Government Forum exemplifies institutionalised multistakeholder dialogue. With 32 civil society members working alongside public administration, the Forum achieved over 90% implementation of its 2020-2024 plan through 111 initiatives and 537 activities. The Forum's success stems from clear governance structures, regular meetings, and transparent reporting on progress.

Singapore's Anti-Corruption Partnership Network (ACPN), established by CPIB in 2018, brings together private sector companies, professional bodies, and business associations to strengthen private sector resilience. The network provides multiple engagement channels, including industry dialogues with corporate leaders, development of practical guides like "PACT - A Practical Anti-Corruption Guide for Businesses in Singapore," and support for the Singapore Standard ISO 37001 on Anti-Bribery Management Systems.

In Italy, the institution of the Multistakeholder Forum for Open Government in 2022, now in its second mandate, represents a permanent platform for dialogue and collaboration between public administrations and civil society. The Forum is composed of 11 representatives from civil society and 11 from public administrations, and together they engage in consensus-building and develop a shared language that bridges different positions, with the aim of promoting collaborative governance and constructive synergy. The Forum is entrusted with the co-design and monitoring of National Action Plans, thus ensuring that Italy's open government policies are shaped through an inclusive and participatory process.

Several countries utilise conferences and structured workshops as mechanisms for multistakeholder dialogue, though these typically provide forums for exchange rather than sustained partnership. Norway's Oslo Anti-Corruption Conference, established in 2014 as an independent foundation, brings together practitioners from government, private companies, development organisations, and civil society annually, with its non-profit model ensuring accessibility while maintaining quality through international speakers. Russia's annual St. Petersburg International Legal Forum attracted over 5,600 participants from 80 countries in 2025, including dedicated sessions on public-private cooperation against corruption, while the

Eurasian Anti-Corruption Forum provides a platform for regional experience sharing. Saudi Arabia's "Our Homeland is a Trust" initiative conducts workshops bringing together public and private sector entities to enhance beneficiary trust through promoting integrity, transparency, and accountability. While these events facilitate valuable networking and knowledge exchange, they represent periodic engagement rather than the continuous collaboration required for collective action.

MyGov platform of India facilitates continuous dialogues between the government and other stakeholders and enables the multi-stakeholders to contribute towards policy suggestions, digital campaigns and feedback on government reforms. It offers features such as polls, thematic discussions, tasks, blogs, and the "Idea Box" through which citizens contribute suggestions, report issues, and participate in nationwide campaigns

3.2 Sector-specific initiatives and networks

Many countries have developed specialised domestic platforms addressing unique sectoral challenges within their national contexts. These initiatives bring together stakeholders with deep sector knowledge to develop targeted solutions that more generic anti-corruption approaches might miss. By focusing on specific industries or service areas, these platforms can address particular vulnerabilities, regulatory requirements, and operational realities that shape corruption risks in each sector. A good example of this is South Africa's Sector Anti-Corruption Forums (see Box 6)

Many sector-specific initiatives represent domestic implementation of international standards or frameworks. The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), for example, sets global standards that countries adapt to their national contexts through domestic multistakeholder groups. Similarly, Financial Action Task Force recommendations shape national financial sector partnerships. These examples demonstrate how international frameworks provide structure and legitimacy for domestic sector initiatives while allowing adaptation to local contexts

Box 6: South Africa's Sector Anti-Corruption Forums - A Comprehensive Approach

South Africa's Sector Anti-Corruption Forums represent a sector-specific approach:

Structure and Coverage:

- Health Sector Forum (launched October 2019 by the President)
- Infrastructure Build Anti-Corruption Forum (launched May 2021)
- Local Government Anti-Corruption Forum (launched September 2022)
- Border Management and Immigration Anti-Corruption Forum (launched March 2025)
- Water and Sanitation Anti-Corruption Forum (inaugural meeting May 2025)

Multistakeholder Composition:

- Law enforcement agencies
- Chapter 9 institutions (constitutional bodies)
- Civil society organisations
- Private sector companies
- Public sector entities
- Professional regulators
- Traditional and religious sectors
- Municipalities and organised labour

Implementation Approach:

- Corruption Vulnerable Sector Risk Assessments (CVSRA) conducted by the Special Investigating Unit
- Identification of sector-specific vulnerabilities
- Development of targeted risk management strategies

Foster collaboration among sector stakeholders

This model demonstrates how countries can move beyond generic anti-corruption approaches to address the specific risks and dynamics of different economic sectors.

3.2.1 Financial sector

The financial sector's dual role as both potential enabler and detector of corruption requires specialised partnerships. Given the financial sector's critical role in detecting corruption, several countries have developed specialised partnerships with banks and financial institutions.

The Netherlands' Financial Expertise Centre (FEC) brings together the Dutch Central Bank, Public Prosecution Service, Tax Administration, financial regulators, and four major Dutch banks. This collaboration has produced specific guidance on identifying corruption risks in transactions,

regularly updated based on emerging typologies. The partnership recognises that banks often see corruption indicators before law enforcement, making their participation essential.

Mexico's engagement through FATF's Private Sector Consultative Forum addresses corruption as a predicate offence for money laundering. Mexico's participation in developing guidance on Citizenship and Residency by Investment Programmes shows how countries can leverage international platforms for domestic benefit while contributing to global standards. Mexico's implementation of FATF standards includes vulnerable activity reports that enable citizens and businesses to flag suspicious transactions potentially linked to corruption. This demonstrates how international anti-money laundering frameworks create domestic mechanisms for citizen participation in financial integrity monitoring.

Norway's evolution from OPS AT (Anti-Money Laundering and Terror Financing) to OPS ØK (Economic Crime) demonstrates adaptive platform development. Originally focused on money laundering, the platform expanded in response to emerging needs, with a working group established to investigate formalisation needs, reporting by December 2025.

In Italy, in the context of the AML/CFT system, authorities have also begun to utilise strategic Public Private Partnerships (PPP) to enhance operational cooperation. The FIU and the Bank of Italy (as banking and financial supervisor) have a PPP with the Italian Banking Association (ABI), and most relevant banks' experiences and emerging trends and risks are shared with the private sector. The PPP is also aimed at updating risk indicators and improving the capacity of obliged entities to detect and report STRs.

3.2.3 Extractive industries

The extractive sector's combination of high-value contracts, natural resource rents, and complex supply chains creates particular corruption vulnerabilities.

Argentina's participation in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) since 2019 through a Multistakeholder Group comprising public sector, extractive companies, and civil society organisations demonstrates how international standards can structure domestic platforms.

The international dimension strengthens these domestic initiatives. France supports EITI implementation in Senegal and the Republic of Congo, while Germany strengthens the standard in 6 bilateral partner countries and mainstreams anti-corruption standards through development cooperation, including a grant agreement with the Natural Resource Governance Institute (NRGI). This international cooperation helps establish common standards while respecting national sovereignty in implementation. The focus on extractives recognises that resource corruption often involves cross-border flows requiring coordinated responses.

3.2.3 Infrastructure and construction

Infrastructure projects, with their large budgets, complex contracts, and multiple subcontractors, present distinct corruption risks from extractive industries. The infrastructure sector's corruption risks span from project conception through maintenance: inflated cost estimates, bid rigging, variation orders, substandard materials, and ghost projects.

South Africa's Infrastructure Built Anti-Corruption Forum, launched in May 2021, addresses these issues. The Forum brings together construction companies, professional councils (engineers, quantity surveyors, architects), labour unions, and community organisations to address procurement fraud, collusion, and substandard construction that endangers public

safety. The Forum's multistakeholder approach recognises that effective oversight requires technical expertise from professional bodies, monitoring from civil society, and cooperation from legitimate businesses crowded out by corrupt competitors. Given the infrastructure's role in economic development and service delivery, corruption in this sector has multiplier effects on society.

3.2.4 Port and maritime security

The Netherlands has developed multiple initiatives addressing port sector corruption vulnerabilities. Veilige Zeehavens Zeeland/West-Brabant brings together municipalities, police, customs, tax administration, and port companies to ensure resilient port operations. This collaboration recognises ports as critical infrastructure requiring special protection from criminal infiltration, including corruption. The Platform for Safe Entrepreneurship (Platform Veilig Ondernemen) provides sector-specific advice for maritime operations, industrial areas, and logistics. By developing crime scripting to identify corruption risks at different operational points, the platform helps businesses understand where they are vulnerable and implement targeted controls.

3.3.5 Healthcare sector

The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted healthcare corruption risks globally, from procurement fraud to vaccine queue-jumping, demonstrating the need for sustained sector-specific attention even after crisis periods.

Following corruption cases in the healthcare sector, the Netherlands developed targeted initiatives for medical professionals. The FIOD/ACC provided awareness sessions addressing specific risks like pharmaceutical company influence, procurement fraud, and patient referral schemes. Articles were published in collaboration with medical magazines, and professional associations raised awareness about healthcare-specific corruption risks. This targeted approach recognises that healthcare professionals may not see certain practices as corrupt if they are industry norms.

South Africa's Health Sector Anti-Corruption Forum, the first launched in 2019, brings together public hospitals, private medical schemes, pharmaceutical companies, professional councils, and patient advocacy groups. The Forum has achieved measurable results, including reduced procurement fraud and improved medicine availability through supply chain monitoring.

India also encourages private sector collaboration through the Global Compact Network India (GCNI), a local branch of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC). Through its Anti-Corruption Collective Action Project, backed by the Siemens Integrity Initiative, GCNI has brought together public institutions, civil society, and businesses, especially small and medium enterprises (SMEs), to tackle corruption in urban governance and healthcare procurement. The initiative has created a Business Integrity Toolkit, held discussions with multiple stakeholders in five cities, and trained over 100 Indian companies on ISO 37001 anti-bribery compliance frameworks.

3.2.c Technology and professional services

High-trust professions and emerging technology sectors require specialised integrity approaches. Singapore's collaboration with professional bodies demonstrates how sector initiatives can leverage existing organisations.

Singapore's approach through professional bodies demonstrates how sector initiatives can leverage existing organisations. Collaborations with the Institute of Singapore Chartered Accountants (ISCA), Institute of Banking and Finance, Singapore Contractors Association Ltd (SCAL), and Association of Strata Managers, among others, include publishing awareness messages through official channels, incorporating integrity values into professional classification exams. This approach embeds anti-corruption into professional identity rather than treating it as external compliance.

The Netherlands' Resilient Notary initiative (OWN) shows how high-trust professions require specialised approaches. Bringing together the notarial association, financial supervision office, and law enforcement, the initiative addresses the unique corruption risks notaries face as gatekeepers for property transactions and corporate formations.

3.3 International and regional platforms

The transnational nature of modern corruption requires platforms that transcend national boundaries. G20 countries participate in various international platforms that facilitate learning, coordinate responses to cross-border corruption, and harmonise standards across jurisdictions.⁵

3.3.1 Multilateral inter-governmental networks

Intergovernmental cooperation forms the foundation of international anti-corruption efforts. There are too many examples of multilateral coordination, joint investigations, and stolen asset recovery to cover adequately here, so here are a few examples that were mentioned by the questionnaire respondents.

The Global Operational Network of Anti-Corruption Law Enforcement Authorities (GlobE Network), established in 2021, includes 243 authorities from 131 Member States. Saudi Arabia and Brazil serve as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee for 2025-2028. Through the GlobE Secure Communications Platform, members exchange information swiftly and securely, supported by specialised resources like the Directory of Open-Source Registries.

The International Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities (IAACA) provides a platform for specialised agencies to share experiences. China's Academy of Discipline Inspection and Supervision (CADIS) serve as a training hub for both Chinese and foreign practitioners through IAACA networks.

The G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group coordinates policy among the world's largest economies, with countries reporting their implementation of G20 High-Level Principles and commitments. The G20's engagement with B20 and C20 attempts to ensure that business and civil society perspectives inform intergovernmental discussions. The quality of the G20-B20 engagement is illustrated in the B20's recommendations to the G20 in 2025 (see Box 7).⁶

⁵ [Working Paper 57: Mapping and strengthening the evidence base for anti-corruption Collective Action | Basel Institute on Governance](#)

⁶ [B20 Integrity and Compliance Task Force Recommendations 2025](#)

Box 7: From Parallel Tracks to Partnership - G20 ACWG and B20 Task Force

The B20's 2025 Integrity and Compliance Task Force recommendations demonstrate direct alignment with G20 ACWG priorities, particularly the South African Presidency's focus on enhancing multistakeholder participation.

- Recommendation 1: Encourage the responsible use of technology in integrity and anti-corruption measures
- Recommendation 2: Strengthen integrity embedment in climate and sustainability finance systems
- Recommendation 3: Amplify Collective Action and integrity standards for inclusive growth

The B20's three priority areas advance specific ACWG objectives: First, promoting responsible technology use in anti-corruption directly supports the ACWG's digital transformation agenda, with concrete proposals for digital whistleblowing platforms and Legal Entity Identifiers enhancing transparency. Second, strengthening integrity in climate finance systems addresses the ACWG's recognition that massive climate-related resource flows require robust corruption safeguards - a critical intersection as countries mobilize unprecedented funds for green transitions. Third, the emphasis on collective action and public-private partnerships operationalizes the ACWG's multistakeholder priority, moving beyond parallel efforts to genuine collaboration.

The full recommendations of the B20 are available on the B20 South Africa website: [B20 South Africa 2025](#)

The BRICS Anti-Corruption Working Group serves as a platform for coordinating the BRICS countries' approaches to the most acute issues on the international anti-corruption agenda, providing mutual support to the partners' initiatives, implementing joint projects and promoting direct contacts between national competent authorities. BRICS standing anti-corruption priorities include asset recovery, denial of safe haven to the corrupt and proceeds of crime, the fight against corruption as an enabler of sustainable development, and anti-corruption awareness-raising, education and training.

The Interstate Anti-Corruption Council (Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan) of the Commonwealth of Independent States, is a sectoral body of the Commonwealth of Independent States responsible for promoting anti-corruption cooperation among its members, *inter alia*, by defining common anti-corruption priorities, undertaking practical joint measures, promoting harmonization of relevant domestic laws, formulating suggestions on how to improve the legal framework for cooperation, coordinating anti-corruption technical assistance programmes and interaction among competent authorities and other relevant bodies of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

The Coordination Council of Prosecutors-General (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan) of the Member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States has a status of an interstate body of the Commonwealth of Independent States. It is responsible, in particular, for promoting cooperation among the

prosecution bodies of the Commonwealth of Independent States against crime, including corruption, serving as platform for information exchange, ensuring the creation of a common legal space, implementing joint capacity-building initiatives and interstate anti-crime programmes, elaborating suggestions on how to improve the functioning of the prosecution service, closely interacting with other bodies of the Commonwealth of Independent States, such as the Interstate Anti-Corruption Council, on the matters of common interest.

The International Anti-Corruption Coordination Centre (IACCC), is an international, multiagency team of investigators and intelligence analysts that provides dedicated operational support to grand corruption investigations. The IACCC provides a unique law enforcement capability to improve international cooperation on the most serious corruption cases. Active law enforcement officers collate intelligence and evidence to directly support corruption investigations, whilst providing case specific mentoring and case coordination for asset recovery. The nine law enforcement agency members are represented from Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Singapore, the United Kingdom and the USA. Any law enforcement agency or prosecuting authority in the world can refer a case to the IACCC for operational assistance, while still maintaining control of its own investigation.

Since inception to May 2025, the IACCC has obtained the following results:

- £1.8 billion – total value of suspected stolen assets identified by the IACCC
- £641 million – total value of assets frozen on IACCC supported cases
- £70 million - total value of assets confiscated/forfeited on IACCC supported cases
- 380 cases – the number of referrals received by the IACCC
- 197 intelligence reports – the number of composite intelligence reports shared by the IACCC
- 114 ILORs – the number of MLA requests generated by affected states with IACCC assistance

International organisations employ peer review mechanisms to drive implementation. UNODC conducts Implementation Review Mechanism cycles for the UN Convention Against Corruption, while the OECD Working Group on Bribery reviews implementation of the Anti-Bribery Convention. These review processes create peer pressure and technical assistance opportunities, with countries undergoing scrutiny from their peers and receiving recommendations for improvement. Several countries note how this review mechanisms shape their domestic anti-corruption approaches.

3.3.2 Regional platforms

There are many regional platforms that adapt global frameworks to specific contexts—too many to list in full here. A selection of some of them is included here.

The EU Network Against Corruption, launched in 2023, creates an umbrella forum for national authorities, civil society, international organisations, and EU agencies (see Box 8).

Box 8: The EU Network Against Corruption - A Regional Model

Launched in 2023, the EU Network Against Corruption demonstrates how regional frameworks can enhance multistakeholder engagement:

Structure and Participation:

- Brings together national authorities, civil society, international organisations, EU agencies
- Inclusive design based on belief that sharing different perspectives improves policy effectiveness
- Can meet in smaller groups where it is beneficial for specific topics

Activities and Methods:

- Experience-sharing workshops for anti-corruption practitioners
- National workshops following Rule of Law reports (40 participants under the Chatham House rule)
- World Café method for small group discussions with rotating topics
- Mapping of high-risk areas for corruption through participant contributions

Funding and Support:

- Internal Security Fund (2021-2027) funds anti-corruption projects
- Technical Support Instrument provides tailor-made assistance to Member States
- Calls for research open to private entities and NGOs

The African Union's anti-corruption architecture influences national approaches across the continent. South Africa's National Anti-Corruption Strategy explicitly embraces an "all of society approach" influenced by AU frameworks, while the African Peer Review Mechanism creates both pressure and support for strengthening multistakeholder engagement.

The OECD-IOB Public Integrity Network for Latin America and the Caribbean, in which Argentina and Brazil actively participate, promotes cooperation and information exchange among regional anti-corruption authorities. This OECD regional network demonstrates how international organisations can facilitate South-South cooperation.

UNODC's regional platforms fast-track UNCAC implementation. France supports platforms in the Western Balkans and West Africa/Sahel, including 1 million euros for the West Africa launch. These platforms help countries develop comprehensive policies while facilitating peer learning.

3.3.3 Multistakeholder global sectoral approaches

Several sector-specific initiatives move a long way towards achieving collective action impact at the international level:

Maritime Anti-Corruption Network (MACN): Over 180 shipping companies collaborate to eliminate facilitation payments. In Nigerian ports, collective action reduced demands by 90% through standardised procedures and grievance mechanisms.⁷

Infrastructure Transparency Initiative (CoST): Operating in 20 countries including Indonesia, CoST's multistakeholder teams jointly review projects from planning through completion.⁸

Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI): As discussed in section 3.2.3, EITI sets global standards implemented through national multistakeholder groups, with countries facing suspension for non-compliance. The implementation of EITI standards creates a common framework for transparency while allowing country-specific adaptations to address local challenges such as provincial resource management.⁹

3.3.4 Global multistakeholder initiatives

While sector-specific initiatives often achieve collective action within defined industries or geographic regions, global multistakeholder initiatives attempt the ambitious goal of establishing collective action principles and practices across diverse contexts and cultures. These platforms face the additional challenge of harmonising different legal systems, business practices, and cultural norms while maintaining sufficient coherence for genuine collective accountability. The initiatives below demonstrate varying approaches to this challenge—some focusing on methodology transfer and capacity building, others on creating binding standards with enforcement mechanisms, and still others on building communities of practice that gradually shift global norms.

Germany's Alliance for Integrity demonstrates how small initiatives can evolve into global collective action platforms (see Box 9).

Transparency International's Integrity Pacts - Civil Society Monitoring in the EU, implemented with EU support across 11 European countries, embed civil society monitors in major public contracts.¹⁰ These pacts demonstrate how civil society can move from external advocacy to embedded oversight, with government and contractors accepting monitoring as risk mitigation rather than opposition.

UNODC has implemented collective action projects in 18 countries over the past 15 years, linking public and private sector actors as well as civil society.¹¹ Other active proponents of collective action at a global level include the Basel Institute for Governance, whose B20 Collective Action Hub¹² (itself a product of G20 and B20 collaboration) tracks collective action projects around the world. The Basel Institute also monitors the G20 and B20 ACWG annual declarations and commitments¹³; the UN Global Compact, while voluntary, influences business norms through its 15,000+ participants¹⁴. The Anti-Corruption Collective Action Impact Centre

⁷ [MACN - Maritime Anti-Corruption Network](#)

⁸ [CoST – Infrastructure Transparency Initiative](#)

⁹ [EITI - Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative](#)

¹⁰ [Integrity Pacts - Transparency.org](#)

¹¹ <https://businessintegrity.unodc.org/bip/en/index.html>

¹² [Basel Institute B20 Collective Action Hub](#)

¹³ [Basel Institute B20 and Anti-corruption](#)

¹⁴ [Anti-Corruption UN Global Compact](#)

(ACCA) within the International Anti-Corruption Academy (IACA) teaches courses on collective action¹⁵.

Box G: Alliance for Integrity – towards collective action at scale

The Alliance for Integrity, initiated by Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development in 2015, operates in 16 countries across Latin America, Africa, Asia, and Europe.

This international multistakeholder initiative has achieved significant scale through strategic capacity building, having trained over 5,000 SMEs and corporate representatives globally and establishing a network of over 300 voluntary trainers. The Alliance developed The Integrity App, a self-assessment tool for compliance programmes, and contributes to policy development on national and international anti-corruption regulation.

The Alliance for Integrity, initiated by Germany but with significant presence in Africa, operates programmes in South Africa, Ghana, and other African countries. In South Africa, the Alliance for Integrity cooperates with the Transparency, Integrity and Accountability Programme (TIP), commissioned by BMZ, which works specifically with community-based organisations on gendered forms of corruption, including sextortion. This recognises that corruption affects different groups differently and requires targeted responses.

Chapter 4: Government coordination mechanisms

Effective anti-corruption requires more than a single dedicated agency; it demands coordinated action across all public institutions. This chapter examines how countries move beyond traditional silos to create integrated public sector responses, from inter-agency coordination mechanisms to federal-local collaboration, recognising that corruption often exploits jurisdictional boundaries and institutional gaps.

4.1 Inter-agency coordination mechanisms

The complexity of modern governance creates numerous interfaces where corruption can occur, requiring sophisticated coordination mechanisms to ensure coherent responses across government agencies. Countries have developed various models, from informal networks to legally mandated structures, each reflecting different administrative traditions and corruption challenges.

4.1.1 Formal coordination structures

Argentina's National Integrity and Transparency Board, created by Administrative Decision 592/2021, brings together the country's key oversight authorities: the Anti-Corruption Office, Office of the Comptroller General, Agency for Access to Public Information, and Secretariat of State Transformation and Public Service. This coordination space enables the development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of public integrity policies across the national public sector.

¹⁵ [Anti-Corruption Collective Action Impact Centre \(ACAC\)](#)

South Africa's Anti-Corruption Task Team (ACTT), now called the National Priority Crime Operational Committee (NPCOC), demonstrates a comprehensive coordination architecture. Composed of law enforcement agencies and government departments, NPCOC operates through four programmes: crime operations and resolutions, intelligence and policy support, public sector policy and regulations, and vulnerable sector management.

Norway's central cooperation forum (DSSF) includes directors of police, tax administration, labour inspection, customs, welfare administration, plus the Attorney General and head of Økokrim (economic crime authority). This high-level composition ensures decisions can be implemented across agencies, strengthening cooperation to prevent and combat economic crime, including workplace-related corruption.

4.1.2 Operational coordination models

Indonesia's Monitoring Centre for Prevention (MCP) provides a digital coordination platform. By making performance visible, MCP creates peer pressure for improvement while facilitating learning from high performers.

South Africa established the Fusion Centre to provide a framework for law enforcement collaboration (See Box 10).

Box 10: South Africa's Fusion Centre

South Africa established the Fusion Centre to provide a framework for law-enforcement to collaborate in prevention, detection and responding to allegations of corruption or related activities in response to the detrimental economic and social impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. This model is still post-Covid 19.

The establishment of the Fusion Centre is underpinned by the following principles:

- Multi-agency approach to ensure collective effort and proper integration.
- Effective coordination and collaboration of the efforts.
- Co-location of the human resources.
- Flexibility, agility and operational adaptability.
- Transparency in the sharing and exchange of information
- Accurate and shared identification/targeting of entities for investigation.
- Safeguarding the confidentiality and security of sensitive information.
- Intelligence and prosecution-driven investigations
- It was established in order to provide an immediate response by law enforcement and corruption-fighting agencies to incidents of alleged corruption, fraud, abuse, or maladministration.

In line with the , which consists of prevention, detection, investigation, and resolution.

Canada demonstrates how policy-based frameworks can achieve government-wide coordination without legislation. The Ineligibility and Suspension Policy, managed centrally by Public Services and Procurement Canada, operates through memoranda of understanding with individual departments. Currently, 89 federal institutions have signed MOUs to apply the policy, creating consistent standards across government despite the decentralised procurement

system. This MOU approach allows flexibility while ensuring coherence - departments voluntarily adopt the framework but then must apply it consistently. The challenge, as Canada acknowledges, is that policy-based frameworks require continuous outreach and engagement to maintain consistency, unlike legislative mandates that apply automatically

India's Public Financial Management and procurement portals publish real-time data on budgetary allocations, expenditure, and tendering, enabling public scrutiny of government spending. Direct Benefit Transfer (DBT) scheme transfers subsidies, pensions, and welfare payments directly into Aadhaar-linked bank accounts, reducing leakages and fraud.

4.1.3 Information sharing mechanisms

Brazil's integration of 300 ouvidorias units under the Ombudsman System of the Federal Executive Branch demonstrates how coordination can improve citizen interface. The centralised Fala.BR platform enables consistent handling of reports across federal administration, avoiding duplication while ensuring no complaint falls through institutional cracks.

Russia's approach through the Unified Portal of the Prosecutor's Office, which received 142,800 citizen appeals in 2024, shows how centralised platforms can coordinate responses across the prosecution system. The portal's special anti-corruption section ensures consistent handling of corruption reports regardless of entry point.

Mexico's Financial Intelligence Unit demonstrates specialised coordination for financial crimes. Though acknowledging it "does not have powers to combat corruption" directly, the UIF analyses reports from financial institutions and vulnerable activities to identify corruption patterns, coordinating with the Attorney General's Office when corruption indicators emerge.

4.2 National integrity boards and coordination bodies

Beyond operational coordination, many countries have established high-level bodies to provide strategic direction and ensure policy coherence across government anti-corruption efforts. These bodies often combine oversight, advisory, and coordination functions.

4.2.1 Strategic oversight bodies

Saudi Arabia's Oversight and Anti-Corruption Authority (NAZAHA) exemplify a powerful coordination body with a broad mandate. Under Article 4 of its establishing law, NAZAHA monitors the implementation of anti-corruption regulations across all government entities, reviews work procedures to identify corruption vulnerabilities and requires entities to develop internal action plans aligned with the national strategy. Each entity's performance is tracked through indicators on transparency, integrity, and corruption prevention.

Brazil's System of Integrity, Transparency and Access to Information (SITAI), coordinated by CGU, ensures federal bodies develop tailored integrity programmes addressing their specific risks and responsibilities. This system-wide approach maintains consistency while allowing institutional flexibility.

France's interministerial dialogue to develop the upcoming National Anticorruption Strategy 2025-2029 ensured that measures are relevant, feasible, and will effectively be carried out by relevant authorities. This coordination during strategy development is also meant to ensure policy coherence in the activities carried out by different authorities with mandates relevant to preventing and fighting corruption.

The *Lokpal of India along with CVC*, provides independent high-level oversight of corruption complaints against public functionaries. Both institutions coordinate with investigative agencies like the Central Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement Directorate while also driving preventive vigilance and systemic reforms.

4.2.2 Multi-level governance structures

South Africa's National Priority Crime Operational Committee (NPCOC) coordinates anti-corruption across government levels. NPCOC's agreement with businesses through the Joint Initiative to Fight Crime and Corruption shows how coordination bodies can bridge the public and private sectors at a strategic level.

Argentina's Network of Integrity Liaisons, created by Decree 650/2019, demonstrates embedding coordination in institutional structures. With 117 integrity liaisons designated across public administration departments, the network has created permanent coordination points rather than relying on ad-hoc collaboration.

4.2.3 Professional and technical networks

Argentina's Permanent Forum of Administrative Investigation Prosecutors' Offices and Anti-Corruption Offices bring together equivalent bodies from across the country. This horizontal network enables experience exchange and joint initiatives without requiring hierarchical coordination.

Italy's Community of Practice for Anti-Corruption and Transparency Officers (RPCT), established by the National School of Administration, provides peer exchange and knowledge dissemination. This professional network strengthens technical capacity while building informal coordination channels. The involvement of public officials in charge of fulfilling specific AML requirements within the communities created by the National School of Administration resulted in exchanges of experiences among different public bodies concerning the need to adopt an integrated approach in performing AML and anti-corruption activities.

Russia's engagement of academic institutions shows how technical expertise can support coordination. The Interdisciplinary Council for Coordination of Scientific and Methodological Support at the Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law provides analytical capacity supporting evidence-based coordination.

4.3 Federal, state and local government collaboration

Federal systems face particular challenges in anti-corruption coordination, with corruption often exploiting jurisdictional boundaries and capacity differences between government levels. Successful approaches balance autonomy with coherence.

4.3.1 Vertical integration mechanisms

Brazil's National Network for the Promotion of Private Integrity (REDE) addresses federal coordination challenges by fostering standardised application of anti-corruption law across federal, state, and municipal levels. This recognises that Brazil's "vast and decentralised federal structure" with "hundreds of federal entities and thousands of subnational government entities" requires special coordination mechanisms.

Indonesia's approach through 34 provincial Regional Advisory Committees (KAD) ensures national anti-corruption strategies adapt to local contexts. These committees facilitate dialogue

between business associations and local governments, developing recommendations for improving public services through regulatory reform and licensing digitalisation.

South Africa's Local Government Anti-Corruption Forum, launched in September 2022, addresses the vulnerability of local government to corruption (see Box 6).

4.3.2 Capacity building across levels

Germany's Federal Government Directive on Corruption Prevention (2004) provides uniform standards while allowing agency adaptation. The annual "Report on Integrity in the Federal Administration," covering over 500,000 employees from 900 agencies, demonstrates how monitoring can support coordination without undermining autonomy.

Australia's Commonwealth Fraud Prevention Centre supports the Australian public sector through leading practice guides, tools, and resources. While primarily targeted at federal agencies, most resources are publicly available, enabling subnational governments to adopt federal standards voluntarily.

Portugal's approach through the General Regime for the Prevention of Corruption (RGPC) requires all entities exercising public power, whether national, regional, or local, to implement regulatory compliance programmes including prevention plans, codes of conduct, training programmes, and whistleblowing channels. This creates consistency while respecting institutional diversity.

4.4 Role of specialised anti-corruption agencies

Specialised anti-corruption agencies serve as coordination hubs, technical resources, and sometimes enforcement bodies. Their effectiveness often depends more on their convening power than on formal authority.

4.4.1 Models of specialised agencies

Singapore's Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (CPIB) demonstrates the focused agency model, with a clear mandate for both investigation and prevention. CPIB's establishment of the Anti-Corruption Partnership Network in 2018 shows how specialised agencies can catalyse broader coordination.

Indonesia's Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) combines enforcement with extensive coordination functions. KPK's role in developing PANCEK guidelines for business, conducting the National Integrity Survey across 641 public agencies, and managing the MCP monitoring platform demonstrates how specialised agencies can drive system-wide improvements.

France's Anticorruption Agency (AFA) focuses on prevention and compliance, conducting audits, and providing guidance. During 2024, AFA conducted 35 awareness-raising actions for the private sector and 36 training activities in universities, showing how specialised agencies can build capacity across sectors.

4.4.2 Coordination versus enforcement

The tension between coordination and enforcement roles affects many specialised agencies. Mexico's acknowledgement that its Financial Intelligence Unit "does not have powers to combat corruption" but contributes through financial analysis shows how agencies can support anti-corruption without a direct enforcement mandate.

The Netherlands' approach of not having a single specialised agency but rather multiple coordinated bodies demonstrate an alternative model. Law enforcement agencies such as the Fiscal Intelligence and Investigation Service/Anti-Corruption Centre share their expertise and insights in corrupt practices with government bodies as guiding principles for policy development. This coordination shows functional specialisation can substitute for institutional consolidation.

South Africa's multiple specialised bodies—the Special Investigating Unit, Hawks, and the National Prosecuting Authority—each with specific mandates but coordinating through NPCOC, demonstrate how specialised agencies can maintain focus while achieving coordination through overarching structures.

4.5 Integrating judiciary, legislative and executive branches

Effective anti-corruption requires coordination across all branches of government, each playing distinct but complementary roles. This separation of powers creates both checks and balances and coordination challenges.

4.5.1 Executive-legislative coordination

Portugal's parliamentary committee for oversight of Anti-Corruption Agenda implementation demonstrates structured legislative engagement. The committee's mandate includes hearing from different stakeholders and monitoring executive branch progress, ensuring democratic accountability for anti-corruption efforts.

Spain's requirement for a legislative footprint in all regulatory processes, part of the draft Law on Transparency and Integrity of Interest Groups, will document how different stakeholders, including legislators, influence policy development. This transparency mechanism can reveal corruption risks in legislative processes.

Indonesia's Constitutional Court Decision 91/PUU-XVIII/2020, establishing requirements for meaningful public participation in legislation, affects all branches.

4.5.2 Judicial independence and coordination

The challenge of maintaining judicial independence while ensuring coordination appears across countries. The EU Justice Scoreboard 2025 shows that over half of EU citizens and businesses positively view judicial independence, but coordination with anti-corruption efforts remains sensitive.

South Africa's inclusion of “Chapter 9” institutions¹⁶ Sector Anti-Corruption Forums demonstrate how independent institutions can participate in coordination while maintaining autonomy. Their participation focuses on technical expertise rather than compromising independence.

Italy's collaboration between ANAC and judicial authorities on corruption prevention maintains clear boundaries. ANAC focuses on administrative prevention while courts handle criminal prosecution, with information sharing protocols preserving judicial independence.

¹⁶ Chapter 9 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, deals with State Institutions supporting constitutional democracy, such as the South African Human Rights Commission and the Public Protector.

4.5.3 Parliamentary oversight mechanisms

Brazil's legislative oversight of CGU and anti-corruption programmes ensures democratic control while respecting operational autonomy. Congressional committees can investigate corruption cases while the executive implements prevention programmes.

Part III: Findings and Conclusions

The experiences documented in this Compendium reveal patterns that transcend institutional design or national context. Despite diverse approaches to frameworks, engagement mechanisms, and coordination structures, countries face remarkably similar challenges in translating anti-corruption aspirations into sustained impact.

Technology – an amplifier, not a panacea

Digital transformation has fundamentally altered multistakeholder engagement, though government experiences reveal both impressive reach and persistent limitations. The evidence suggests technology amplifies existing dynamics rather than fundamentally transforming them.

Yet countries themselves acknowledge significant limitations. One country explicitly states that "geographic isolation and inadequate infrastructure hinder youth participation in remote areas" and that "ensuring message clarity and consistency is challenging due to the diverse range of platforms in social media/digital space." Others acknowledge struggling to demonstrate how digital input translates into actual policy influence.

Digital divides compound these challenges. Reaching all segments of society through digital means remains aspirational rather than achieved. Technology has expanded participation possibilities dramatically, but converting possibilities into meaningful engagement remains an ongoing challenge across all jurisdictions.

Trust: a fundamental challenge

Trust between sectors that historically view each other with suspicion remains the fundamental challenge. Even in established democracies, according to one respondent, stakeholders "may be hesitant to speak freely." Even in open dialogue forums, there may be a residual "fear of victimisation when speaking out."

Trust develops through demonstrated impact, not declared intentions. When Brazil incorporated 40+ civil society proposals into its Integrity Plan, when Spain required officials to explain how input influenced decisions, and when Saudi Arabia's platform tracked comment influence on legislation, these actions built confidence that participation matters.

Resources: the sustainability imperative

Sustainable multistakeholder engagement faces four interconnected resource challenges that compound each other's effects: financial, human, impact, and leadership.

Civil society organisations consistently report needing more stable and predictable funding, particularly for watchdog functions outside election cycles. But the challenge extends beyond civil society —governments struggle to fund coordination mechanisms, and businesses question return on investment in prevention. Some countries create self-sustaining mechanisms: the EU's multi-year funding instruments (Internal Security Fund 2021-2027, Technical Support

Instrument) enable long-term planning. Brazil links integrity scores to fiscal transfers, creating self-reinforcing incentives.

The "periodic rotation of authorities" disrupts institutional memory. New administrations abandon predecessors' programmes regardless of effectiveness. Experienced officials move to new positions just as they develop expertise. Multiple countries report "capacity asymmetries"—smaller organisations cannot engage meaningfully alongside well-resourced entities, creating participation gaps that undermine legitimacy.

Initial enthusiasm wanes as "consultation fatigue" sets in when stakeholders repeatedly engage without seeing concrete outcomes from their input. Trust erodes rather than builds if interactions with government are perceived to be window-dressing without tangible impact.

Leadership attention shifts to crises, leaving anti-corruption initiatives orphaned. Even within stable governments, anti-corruption competes with immediate priorities for ministerial attention. The observation that initiatives require "sustained investment in people, platforms and processes" understates the challenge—they require sustained high-level championship that rarely survives political transitions.

Measurement: The prevention paradox

Measuring the effectiveness of multistakeholder anti-corruption initiatives remains one of the field's greatest challenges. The hidden nature of corruption, attribution difficulties, and the prevention paradox—measuring corruption that did not occur—create fundamental measurement challenges that no country has fully resolved.

When corruption decreases, determining whether multistakeholder platforms, economic improvement, political change, or other factors caused it proves nearly impossible. Several countries explicitly acknowledge this limitation, with Norway noting it "does not systematically collect data" on multistakeholder effectiveness.

Conclusions – the journey continues

The fight against corruption increasingly depends on creating resilient ecosystems where multiple stakeholders reinforces each other's efforts. Governments provide frameworks and enforcement, businesses implement integrity systems and collective action, civil society maintains vigilance and advocacy, citizens exercise oversight and demand accountability, and international partners provide support and pressure for reform.

Success requires recognising that no single actor can combat corruption alone. The most effective approaches create virtuous cycles where transparency enables accountability, accountability builds trust, trust facilitates cooperation, and cooperation strengthens transparency. These cycles must be deliberately constructed and continuously maintained.

The experiences documented in this compendium demonstrate both the challenges and potential of multistakeholder approaches. While perfect solutions remain elusive, the trajectory is clear: from isolated government action to collaborative governance, from token consultation to genuine partnership, from fighting corruption to building integrity. This evolution requires sustained commitment, continuous learning, and recognition that the perfect should not be the enemy of the good.

As corruption evolves, so must responses. Digitalisation creates new corruption risks while enabling unprecedented transparency. Globalisation facilitates cross-border corruption while

enabling international cooperation. Climate change and pandemic recovery create massive resource flows requiring robust oversight. These challenges demand ever-more sophisticated multistakeholder approaches. The challenge is not only releasing data but making it meaningful. Citizens need context, interpretation, and evidence of impact. When transparency becomes mere compliance—data dumps without explanation—it fails to enable accountability.

The path forward requires humility about what works, honesty about what does not, and commitment to continuous improvement. Countries must learn from each other's successes and failures, adapt promising approaches to local contexts, and remain vigilant against corruption's constant evolution. Most importantly, they must recognise that building integrity is not a destination but a journey requiring sustained effort from all sectors of society.

The evidence is clear: when governments, businesses, civil society, and citizens work together with genuine commitment, transparent processes, and shared accountability, corruption can be reduced and integrity strengthened. The challenge now is to scale these successes, address persistent gaps, and build anti-corruption approaches resilient enough to meet emerging challenges while inclusive enough to engage all stakeholders in the common cause of building more just and equitable societies.

International cooperation accelerates the development of effective voluntary programmes. Many of the multistakeholder approaches that have been examined in this Compendium demonstrate how countries can avoid reinventing solutions, instead building on tested approaches while adapting them to local contexts. Such international learning reduces implementation time and costs while increasing the likelihood of success.

The evidence points to an uncomfortable truth: while multistakeholder approaches are necessary for addressing corruption's complexity, genuine collective action remains exceptional rather than normal. The challenge is not creating more platforms or frameworks but aligning incentives, building trust, and maintaining momentum across political cycles and institutional boundaries. Success requires accepting this reality while working persistently toward the aspiration of coordinated, sustained, and effective anti-corruption efforts.

India's Open Government Data Platform is a structured multistakeholder initiative involving government ministries, technology firms, academic institutions, and civil society organisations. By making datasets on public finance, service delivery, and regulatory compliance widely accessible, the platform enables collaborative innovation.

Appendix 1: acronyms and abbreviations

- **ACCERUS** - Anti-Corruption Centre for Education and Research (Stellenbosch University, South Africa)
- **ACFFEST** - Anti-Corruption Film Festival (Indonesia)
- **ACPN** - Anti-Corruption Partnership Network (Singapore)
- **ACTT** - Anti-Corruption Task Team (South Africa)
- **ACWG** - Anti-Corruption Working Group (G20)
- **AFA** - Agence Française Anticorruption (French Anticorruption Agency)
- **AfDB** - African Development Bank
- **ANAC** - Autorità Nazionale Anticorruzione (National Anti-Corruption Authority, Italy)
- **APRM** - African Peer Review Mechanism
- **AU** - African Union
- **BMZ** - Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany)
- **BPN** - Bribery Prevention Network (Australia)
- **BRICS** – a group formed by eleven countries: Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, United Arab Emirates, Ethiopia, Indonesia, and Iran
- **BUSA** - Business Unity South Africa
- **CADIS** - China Academy of Discipline Inspection and Supervision
- **CEO** - Chief Executive Officer
- **CGU** - Controladoria-Geral da União (Office of the Comptroller General, Brazil)
- **CPC** - Communist Party of China
- **CPGRAMS** - Centralised Public Grievance Redress and Monitoring System
- **CPIB** - Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (Singapore)
- **CSO** - Civil Society Organisation
- **CTICC** - Council for Transparency, Integrity and Combating Corruption (Brazil)
- **DSSF** - Central cooperation forum (Norway)
- **EITI** - Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
- **ENPE** - European Network for Public Ethics
- **ESG** - Environmental, Social, and Governance
- **FATF** - Financial Action Task Force
- **FEC** - Financial Expertise Centre (Netherlands)
- **FIOD/ACC** - Fiscal Intelligence and Investigation Service/Anti-Corruption Centre (Netherlands)
- **GACIF** - Global Anti-Corruption and Integrity Forum
- **GeM** - Government e-Marketplace (India)
- **Globe Network** - Global Operational Network of Anti-Corruption Law Enforcement Authorities
- **GRECO** - Group of States against Corruption (Council of Europe)
- **IAACA** - International Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities
- **IACCC** - International Anti-Corruption Coordination Centre
- **IDB** - Inter-American Development Bank
- **JICC** - Joint Initiative to Fight Crime and Corruption (South Africa)
- **KAD** - Komite Advokasi Daerah (Regional Advisory Committee, Indonesia)
- **KPK** - Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (Corruption Eradication Commission, Indonesia)
- **LAC/LEN** - Latin America C Caribbean Anti-Corruption Law Enforcement Network
- **LHKPN** - Laporan Harta Kekayaan Penyelenggara Negara (Asset Declaration, Indonesia)

- **LUISS** - Libera Università Internazionale degli Studi Sociali (Free International University of Social Studies, Italy)
- **MCP** - Monitoring Center for Prevention (Indonesia)
- **MENAC** - Mecanismo Nacional Anticorrupção (National Anti-Corruption Mechanism, Portugal)
- **MESAI** - Anti-Corruption and Integrity Evaluation Model (Mexico)
- **MFA** - Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- **MGNREGA** - Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (India)
- **NACAC** - National Anti-Corruption Advisory Council (South Africa)
- **NACS** - National Anti-Corruption Strategy (South Africa)
- **NAZAHA** - Oversight and Anti-Corruption Authority (Saudi Arabia)
- **NGO** - Non-Governmental Organisation
- **NPCOC** - National Priority Crime Operational Committee (South Africa)
- **OCCRP** - Organised Crime and Corruption Reporting Project
- **OECD** - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
- **OGP** - Open Government Partnership
- **OPI** - Observatorio de Políticas de Integridad (Integrity Policy Observatory, Argentina)
- **OPS AT** - Anti-Money Laundering and Terror Financing (Norway)
- **OPS ØK** - Economic Crime (Norway)
- **Outa** - Organisation Undoing Tax Abuse (South Africa)
- **OWN** - Overleg Weerbaar Notariaat (Resilient Notary initiative, Netherlands)
- **PAKSI** - Anti-Corruption Instructor Certification (Indonesia)
- **PANCEK** - Anticorruption Guideline for the Business Sector (Indonesia)
- **PI-PNA** - Implementation Programme for National Anti-Corruption Policy (Mexico)
- **PNA** - National Anti-Corruption Policy (Mexico)
- **PPLAAF** - Plateforme de Protection des Lanceurs d'Alerte en Afrique (Platform for the Protection of Whistleblowers in Africa)
- **REDE** - National Network for the Promotion of Private Integrity (Brazil)
- **RGPC** - General Regime for the Prevention of Corruption (Portugal)
- **RITE** - Registry of Integrity and Transparency for Companies and Entities (Argentina)
- **RPCT** - Anti-Corruption and Transparency Officers (Italy)
- **SAAC** - Strengthening Action Against Corruption (South Africa)
- **SAR** - Saudi Riyal
- **SCAT** - Social Change Assistance Trust (South Africa)
- **SINTESIS** - Sinergi Integritas Muda Indonesia (Indonesian Youth Integrity Synergy)
- **SIPRI** - Secretariat of Private Integrity (Brazil)
- **SITAI** - System of Integrity, Transparency and Access to Information (Brazil)
- **SIU** - Special Investigating Unit (South Africa)
- **SME** - Small and Medium Enterprises
- **SPAK** - Saya Perempuan Anti Korupsi (I am a Woman Against Corruption, Indonesia)
- **SPI** - Survei Penilaian Integritas (National Integrity Survey, Indonesia)
- **TIP** - Transparency, Integrity and Accountability Programme (South Africa)
- **UIF** - Unidad de Inteligencia Financiera (Financial Intelligence Unit, Mexico)
- **UMANG** : Unified Mobile Application for New-age Governance
- **UNAFEI** - United Nations Asia and Far East Institute
- **UNCAC** - United Nations Convention against Corruption
- **UNGASS** - United Nations General Assembly Special Session
- **UNODC** - United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime