

Anti-corruption Collective Action in the G20/B20 process

Charting progress 2020–2024

Scarlet Wannenwetsch | August 2025

Table of contents

Executive Summary	3
1 Introduction	5
1.1 Tracking recommendations across G20/B20 cycles	5
1.2 Collective Action as a recurring recommendation	6
2 Representation of anti-corruption and Collective Action over the past five B20 cycles	7
3 How have the different B20 working modes affected outputs and impact?	8
4 The impact on the B20's engagement with the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group	10
4.1 A missing puzzle piece: the G20–B20 dialogue	11
4.2 The role of international organisations in bridging the gap between the B20 and G20	12
5 Turning high-level recommendations into measurable key performance indicators	13
5.1 A dedicated Collective Action KPI	13
5.2 The importance of continuity	14
6 Recommendations to strengthen the B20 Integrity and Compliance Agenda	15

About this report

This report analyses the approaches of the previous five B20 presidencies to addressing anti-corruption Collective Action. It captures lessons learned and provides recommendations for future B20/G20 cycles. It is primarily intended for upcoming B20/G20 presidencies, B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force members and organisations engaging with the B20/G20.

You may share or republish this report under a Creative Commons [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) licence.

Suggested citation: Scarlet Wannenwetsch. 2025. 'Anti-corruption Collective Action in the G20/B20 process: Charting progress 2020–2024.' Basel Institute on Governance. Available at: <https://baselgovernance.org/publications/anti-corruption-collective-action-g20b20-process-charting-progress-2020-2024>.

The report was funded by the [Siemens Integrity Initiative](#), which supports organisations in the fight against corruption and fraud through Collective Action, education and training. The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and do not reflect the position of Siemens or the Siemens Integrity Initiative.

About the author



Scarlet Wannenwetsch

Senior Specialist, Collective Action

As Senior Specialist, Collective Action with the Basel Institute on Governance, Scarlet Wannenwetsch leads the Collective Action Mentoring Programme and Collective Action activities with a particular focus on the Southern African region. She also heads the Institute's engagement with the Business 20 (B20) on corruption as Deputy Co-Chair of the Integrity & Compliance Task Force in 2021/22 and as a network and knowledge partner in the previous years. Since 2021 she has lectured at the International Anti-Corruption Academy's Master in Anti-Corruption Compliance and Collective Action programme.

Scarlet holds a Law degree (LLB) from Kings College London as well as a Master's (LLM) from the Free University of Berlin focusing on Public International Law and Alternative Dispute Resolution.

Email: scarlet.wannenwetsch@baselgovernance.org

Basel Institute on Governance and the B20

The Basel Institute on Governance has a long-standing working relationship with the B20 Integrity and Compliance Task Force. In 2013, the Basel Institute on Governance was mandated to establish the [B20 Collective Action Hub](#) to disseminate knowledge of existing private sector-driven anti-corruption multi-stakeholder initiatives to tackle corruption. The B20 Collective Action Hub also functions as the go-to support and facilitation centre for companies and other stakeholders interested in engaging in Collective Action. The Basel Institute is currently supporting the 2025 [South African B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force](#) as a network partner.

Acronyms and abbreviations

ACWG	G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group
B20	Business 20
ESG	Environmental, social and governance
G20	Group of Twenty
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SME	small and medium-sized enterprise

Executive Summary

In 2026, the G20/B20 cycle will return to the United States, where the first G20 Leaders' Summit was held in 2008. This marks a symbolic full circle moment for global cooperation on financial stability, integrity and anti-corruption. This report draws on lessons from the past five B20 cycles, from 2020 to 2024. It reflects on how one long-established recommendation, anti-corruption Collective Action¹, has evolved, been prioritised and implemented across different presidencies.

The report builds on the findings of the [G20's responsiveness to B20 anti-corruption recommendations 2010–2017](#) baseline report, published by the Basel Institute in 2020.²

B20 timeline 2020–2024



Despite varied national contexts and structures of the respective Integrity & Compliance Task Forces, Collective Action has consistently remained a strategic focus of the B20 Integrity and Compliance agenda. It offers a lens through which to assess continuity, stakeholder engagement and institutional resilience in the B20 process. The report shows how long-standing and dedicated task force members are the institutional backbone of the B20. They help preserve institutional memory, advocate for strategic continuity and drive forward core recommendations beyond shifting political and procedural priorities.

¹ Collective Action is a sustained, collaborative engagement between stakeholders, bringing individual players into a coalition of like-minded actors with shared goals to address common corruption issues and levelling the playing field between competitors.

² The baseline report also provides a comprehensive overview of the step-up of the B20/G20 process.

The absence of a dedicated Integrity & Compliance Task Force under the Indian presidency in 2023/24 demonstrated how easily strategic engagement and public-private dialogue can be disrupted. Conversely, its reinstatement under the Brazilian presidency the following year – prompted by the proactive engagement of long-standing task force members – reaffirmed the importance of continuity for achieving long-term impact.

Another significant development for Collective Action under the B20 over the past five years was the introduction of the first-ever B20 Collective Action Key Performance Indicator (KPI) under the Brazilian presidency. This marked a step change towards greater measurability, accountability and policy alignment. This innovation underscores how recurring recommendations can evolve into more impactful, data-driven contributions to the G20 process when supported by sustained institutional engagement and knowledge partners.

The breakdown of the B20–G20 dialogue on integrity and compliance/anti-corruption during the Indian presidency – previously a key engagement platform to allow for a structured exchange between the B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force and the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group (ACWG) – is a learning opportunity. It enables the re-establishment of a more sustainable and forward-looking dialogue format that allows for ongoing coordination throughout each cycle.

This report focuses on Collective Action as a representative example. However, the recommendations derived from these five cycles – namely, reinforcing continuity, re-establishing a structured B20–G20 dialogue and institutionalising KPI development – have broader applications and can strengthen the B20 process as a whole.

1 Introduction

The return of the G20/B20 cycle to the United States in 2026, where the first G20 Leaders' Summit was held in 2008, marks a symbolic full-circle moment. Since that first Summit in Washington, the G20 has grown into a pivotal platform not only for financial stability but also for advancing integrity and anti-corruption agendas.

A major turning point came in 2010, under Korea's G20 presidency, with the establishment of the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group (ACWG). This body has since guided the development of biannual Anti-Corruption Action Plans that G20 countries commit to implementing, providing continuity and direction across rotating presidencies.

In parallel, the B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force, which brings together businesses operating across the G20, has steadily contributed to shaping a global culture of Collective Action against corruption through its policy papers and recommendations. Since the 2011 French presidency, this public-private interface offers policy recommendations, promotes best practices and encourages companies to embed fair and transparent practices into their operations.

From high-level political commitments to practical tools and measurable performance indicators, the G20/B20 architecture has created a growing ecosystem that supports integrity, transparency and collaboration. It promotes continuity across presidencies, reinforces operational momentum and increasingly relies on sustained measurement to ensure accountability and impact of its policy recommendations and commitments made.

1.1 Tracking recommendations across G20/B20 cycles

It is difficult to draw overarching conclusions about the lessons learned, trends and impact of the G20/B20 process given its breadth and complexity and the flexibility granted to each rotating presidency. More meaningful insights can be gained by zooming in at the micro level.

This is particularly true for G20/B20 recommendations that appear more consistently across cycles. These recurring recommendations offer a unique opportunity to assess continuity, evolution and impact of recommendations over time. By tracking the approach of each G20 presidency and B20 task force constellation to these well-established topics, we can better understand how the process influences the visibility, prioritization and ultimately uptake of these topics. It also allows for the establishment of a baseline to better understand how institutional memory, leadership styles and stakeholder engagement shape the outcomes of the G20/B20 anti-corruption agenda.

Anti-corruption Collective Action is one such long-standing core B20 topic. This report aims to tease out lessons learned to help steer the future. It reviews the last five B20/G20 cycles from

2020–2024, spanning the presidencies of Saudi Arabia, Italy, Indonesia, India and Brazil. It builds on the G20 baseline report that captured the visibility of corruption for the ten B20 cycles from 2010–2019.

1.2 Collective Action as a recurring recommendation

The World Bank defined Collective Action in 2008 as follows:

“Collective Action is a collaborative and sustained process of cooperation between stakeholders. It increases the impact and credibility of individual action, brings vulnerable individual players into an alliance of like-minded organizations and levels the playing field between competitors. Collective Action can complement or temporarily substitute for and strengthen weak local laws and anti-corruption practices.”

Collective Action has been a recurring recommendation by the B20 since the inception of the G20 dialogue forum with the global business community in 2010/11 under the French presidency. The collaborative approach to tackling shared corruption risks has become firmly established over the past five cycles in particular. Collective Action is carried forward by the majority of the B20 cycles within the Integrity & Compliance Task Force and beyond.

During the 2013 cycle, the B20 mandated the Basel Institute on Governance to establish the [B20 Collective Action Hub](#), which captures Collective Action initiatives in a global database and provides additional resources and support to the Collective Action community. The B20 Collective Action Hub is one of the longest-standing B20 legacy initiatives and continues to input and contribute data and expertise to the B20 anti-corruption work streams. The B20 Collective Action Hub also functions as the go-to support and facilitation centre for companies and other stakeholders interested in engaging in Collective Action.

2 Representation of anti-corruption and Collective Action over the past five B20 cycles



Figure 1: Timeline of the B20 presidencies 2020–2024 highlighting focus topics relating to Collective Action.

The first G20/B20 presidencies under review in this report is [Saudi Arabia's](#) in 2020/21. It was marked by the COVID pandemic. As a result, the presidency emphasised **integrity in crisis response and public procurement**. Collective Action appeared primarily as a mechanism to **build trust and resilience** in a time of global uncertainty. The B20 called for scaling up **multi-stakeholder dialogue** and **sectoral partnerships** to ensure transparency during COVID-19 responses.

Under the [Italian presidency](#) in 2021/22, Italy's B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force **explicitly endorsed Collective Action** as a core recommendation. It also introduced references to the **High Level Reporting Mechanisms** – a procurement focused accountability tool – and promoted **business-led multi-stakeholder initiatives**. Italy's strong alignment with EU anti-corruption frameworks gave momentum to cross-border initiatives. Italy's B20 process also prioritised developing measurable key performance indicators to support continuity and impact measurement of its recommendations.

The [Indonesian presidency](#) 2022/23 reinforced the link between **anti-corruption, sustainability and inclusive development**, and called for the empowerment of SMEs and

local actors through Collective Action platforms. This cycle put a particularly strong emphasis on **digital tools** and **transparency in the green transition**. Indonesia also celebrated and highlighted national public-private Collective Action initiatives as well as international and global approaches. The Indonesian presidency aimed to build on the KPI framework developed under the Italian presidency to ensure alignment and development of performance indicators.

The [Indian presidency](#) in 2023/24 is the only cycle over the past five years that did not establish an Integrity & Compliance Task Force but rather integrated the topic into a newly established ESG Action Council. Within the ESG Action Council, the Indian presidency spotlighted **the potential of technology for integrity**, including blockchain and AI in public service delivery. The B20 also encouraged **private-sector engagement in Collective Action** as part of a values-based approach to ESG. While the framing leaned more towards corporate governance and compliance, **Collective Action remained present** as a practical pathway to implementation.

[Brazil](#) in 2024/25 brought back the B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force and included Collective Action as one of its three key recommendations. The Brazilian presidency marked a **key milestone** by developing and embedding the first-ever **Collective Action KPI** into the official B20 communiqué (more on this in section 5 of this report). In addition to the KPI, the B20 presidency also promoted the **B20 Collective Action Hub** as one of three overarching B20 Brazil legacy projects.

As we can see above, anti-corruption Collective Action was included and referenced in all B20 cycles over the past five years. This provides a good foundation to dig further into the commonalities and differences of the respective approaches and how these affect visibility, uptake and consideration of Collective Action.

3 How have the different B20 working modes affected outputs and impact?

What jumps out when comparing the last five cycles is the Indian B20 process as the only one that did not establish a stand-alone Integrity & Compliance Task Force. This “anomaly” allows us to assess how this interruption has impacted the visibility of Collective Action between cycles.

It is important to note here that there are no fixed and prescribed governance structures for the B20. Rather, they remain flexible for each presidency to shape according to its priorities. That being said, soft governance structures have gradually developed over time, supported by their effectiveness and the commitment of long-standing B20 partners and task force members. This has provided a degree of continuity across the various B20 cycles without the need to

install overly bureaucratic systems and structures. This combination of adaptability and continuity constitutes a unique strength of the B20, enabling it to remain both dynamic and responsive, while at the same time ensuring institutional memory and sustained impact.

The Indian B20 process decided to integrate the topic of anti-corruption into their ESG Action Council. This led to:

- **Reduction of the visibility of the topic of anti-corruption and Collective Action** as a recurring B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force recommendation: ESG encompasses a number of topics ranging from environment and sustainability to governance considerations. As a result, corruption was only relevant for a subsidiary discussion under the governance section of the ESG Action Council B20 India Policy Recommendations to the G20, with Collective Action featuring as a subset of this to provide examples and best practices.
- **Reduction in the ability for long-standing task force members to engage:** The limited number of members that were able to join the ESG Action Council, in combination with the broader ESG audience, meant that not all long-standing Integrity & Compliance Task Force members were able to engage and contribute.
- **No engagement between the B20 and the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group:** As corruption only featured as a subtopic, there was no dialogue between the ESG Action Council and the G20 ACWG during the B20 India cycle.

India was not the only cycle that integrated the topic of anti-corruption into other task forces; Australia (2015) also chose to take an integrated approach. Australia integrated corruption as a core topic into its B20 Infrastructure Task Force and featured it in a number of other task forces and, ultimately, in their recommendations. Unlike in 2023/24, this led to more anti-corruption recommendations reaching the G20 from a number of B20 workstreams, which increased visibility of the topic overall. It also reflected the reality that corruption is not a stand-alone issue, but one that touches all sectors and business practices.

Perhaps the biggest impact of the Indian presidency's decision not to establish a dedicated Integrity & Compliance Task Force became clear when India handed over the B20 presidency to Brazil. Integrating anti-corruption under the broader ESG umbrella set a new precedent for the B20. As new presidencies tend to ensure continuity, there was initially no plan to set up an Integrity & Compliance Task Force under Brazil's leadership in the early stages of preparing the process and setting priorities.

This is where another important B20 pillar comes into play: **the B20 member community**. The long-standing Integrity & Compliance Task Force members have themselves become a community of practitioners that engage on a regular basis both during and outside of the B20 cycles. In 2024, they came together to call for the re-establishment of the Integrity & Compliance Task Force in an open letter to the Brazilian B20 presidency. They highlighted the importance of the corruption topic and all the work that has been built over the past fourteen

B20 cycles in this regard. In particular, they emphasised the value of a dedicated task force focusing on integrity and compliance. The fact that the Integrity and Compliance Task Force has a direct G20 counterpart (G20 ACWG) allows for substantive engagement at the policy level beyond just handing over recommendations to the G20 leaders at the annual Summit.

This proactive engagement by the long-standing task force members prompted the B20 presidency to reconsider its approach. Ultimately, the Brazilian B20 process was highly impactful, both in terms of anti-corruption and, more specifically, Collective Action.

There is an interesting takeaway from examining the transition between the Indian and Brazilian B20 cycles: Continuity is usually assessed by looking at process. However, given the unique way in which the B20 works highlights the importance of people, i.e. the task force members. They are not just participants in individual B20 cycles. Rather, the long-standing task force members and network partners form the backbone of the B20, ensuring substantive continuity beyond formal processes. They often guide new presidencies even before task forces are established and provide the historical knowledge of previous cycles that goes beyond policy papers and procedures.

4 The impact on the B20's engagement with the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group

The pause for the Integrity & Compliance Task Force during the Indian B20/G20 cycle had a long-term effect that still persists today: the breakdown of the public engagement platform between the B20 and the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group, which had been slowly established and institutionalised over the past decade.

In other words, without a dedicated Integrity & Compliance Task Force, there was no public B20–G20 dialogue on integrity and anti-corruption. Up until now, this engagement platform has not been reinstated since communication broke down in 2023. Even though there is some interaction between the B20 presidency and the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group, there is currently no public exchange forum in which the B20 can reinforce its position as a key stakeholder group giving input into the G20 process.

The B20–G20 dialogue on anti-corruption has been a platform for engagement that predates the formal establishment of the [G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group in 2010](#). It has been the main channel through which companies connect with the G20 on integrity and compliance issues.

Since 2010, the B20–G20 anti-corruption dialogue has taken on many different formats. In 2013, for example, a G20–B20 Dialogue Efficiency Task Force was set up to assess and rate

the efficiency of previous B20 cycles and to make recommendations on how the B20 can increase its impact at the G20 level. This setup led to active and consistent engagement between the B20 and G20 on anti-corruption throughout this cycle. However, this format has not since been replicated.

In the years leading up to its break in 2023 the B20–G20 dialogue on anti-corruption had evolved into an annual platform for the B20 and G20 workstreams to present and inform each other on focus topics and the outcome of their respective policy discussions. Typically, this public-private exchange happened after the Integrity and Compliance Task Force's policy papers and the work plans of the G20 ACWG had been finalised, a month or two before the G20 Summits.

In the context of the overall B20/G20 process, all B20 recommendations are ultimately presented to the G20 Heads of State at the G20 Summit. The Integrity & Compliance recommendations in particular, however, are addressed not only to the Heads of State but also to the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group (ACWG), which brings together high-ranking government officials from national anti-corruption agencies and related bodies. This dual pathway ensures access of the business community both to the highest level of political leadership and to the working-level forum within the G20 that is dedicated to advancing the anti-corruption agenda.

4.1 A missing puzzle piece: the G20–B20 dialogue

It's an important achievement that this type of exchange between the B20 and G20 anti-corruption workstreams has become institutionalised over the years. The current halt to this format gives us the opportunity to pause and reflect on whether the previous setup best serves the process, or if there is a better way to re-establish and structure the engagement between the B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force and the G20 ACWG:

Up until 2023 the engagement had been limited to one dialogue per cycle. This setup, however, doesn't allow for constructive exchange over time, or the identification of common areas of interest and collaboration opportunities through each G20/B20 cycle. Under this *modus operandi*, each B20–G20 dialogue was a one-off event for each presidency. The next cycle will bring together a different B20 Secretariat, a new G20 ACWG Chairperson, and new focus topics and recommendations to present and discuss.

This format makes it difficult to build strong working relationships and facilitate ongoing exchange and alignment between the B20 and G20 anti-corruption workstreams.

Setting up a two-part B20–G20 integrity and compliance dialogue for each cycle could be an easy way to strengthen and reinvigorate the exchange between the global business community and the G20 leaders. It would make the engagement more constructive and impactful without adding new bureaucratic structures.

Considering the timing of the dialogues can also be an effective tool to increase their potential impact. For example, a first dialogue could take place between the first and second iterations of the draft policy papers and work plans. This would give both the B20 and G20 workstreams enough time to internally build consensus, while ensuring there is sufficient flexibility to include outcomes of the dialogue. It allows for a productive discussion between the workstreams in the early stages of the process, where alignment is still possible.

The second dialogue could remain in the same format and timing as previously established. It would continue to be an important platform for discussing the core policy recommendations and work plans developed each year. But it would have the added benefit of building and reflecting on the outcomes of the first dialogue.

This approach would allow both the B20 and G20 processes to identify areas for collaboration and to assess engagement and alignment of the integrity and anti-corruption agendas throughout each cycle.

4.2 The role of international organisations in bridging the gap between the B20 and G20

International organisations engaged in both the B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force and the G20 ACWG are ideally placed to help rebuild a stronger, more impactful B20–G20 anti-corruption dialogue. The OECD, for example, has played a particularly important role in supporting the G20/B20 process since its inception. It has even been described as taking on some unofficial Secretariat duties.

This report suggests that international organisations supporting both the G20 and B20 should take on a more active role. They could help identify areas for collaboration and facilitate those discussions on an ongoing basis to help break down silos and bridge communication gaps.

5 Turning high-level recommendations into measurable key performance indicators

Over the past five years, substantive progress was made to move the needle from high-level B20 Integrity & Compliance recommendations to more specific recommendations that are combined with key performance indicators.

The Italian B20 cycle (2021/22) did a lot of the heavy lifting to establish a comprehensive foundational approach to developing tailored KPIs that connect the B20 recommendations with existing anti-corruption and governance data. The Indonesian process continued to build on and expand the KPI framework developed under the Italian presidency.

Following the pause of the Integrity & Compliance Task Force during the Indian presidency, Brazil adopted a fresh approach to reconnect with the KPI outcomes of the Indonesian/Italian cycles. The Brazilian leadership placed a particular focus on developing and applying KPIs across the entire B20 process as part of a comprehensive strategy, and also, for the first time, on embedding sustainability considerations into the KPIs developed.

5.1 A dedicated Collective Action KPI

Let's take a look at how these approaches to developing measurable key performance indicators have affected and impacted Collective Action. While Collective Action was included and referenced in all of the past five B20 cycles, this long-standing recommendation had not been translated into a data-driven KPI before 2024.

This changed during the Brazilian cycle, when the B20 decided that all key recommendations should be backed up by a KPI. And Collective Action was one of the three key recommendations of the Integrity & Compliance policy paper. Consequently, the first ever B20 Collective Action KPI was developed in 2024/25 ringing in a new era for anti-corruption multi-stakeholder approaches within the B20 process.

The newly developed 2024 Collective Action KPI measures the number of G20 governments that are engaged in or provide support to at least one Collective Action initiative. The scope of "G20 countries" is wide, comprising core members and associated members, including all countries in the African Union and the European Union.

The measurement is based on data from the [B20 Collective Action Hub](#), which includes a global [database](#) of over 300 Collective Action initiatives. It is hosted and maintained by the Basel Institute on Governance, a long-standing B20 network partner and global thought leader on anti-corruption Collective Action.



Figure 2: Collective Action Key Performance Indicator developed under the Brazilian presidency.

Currently, 43 of the 96 G20 governments – or 45 percent – support or are engaged in at least one Collective Action Initiative. This result demonstrates the success of two decades of effort by the Basel Institute and others who champion multi-stakeholder approaches to business integrity. But it also highlights room for improvement. The aim is to reach 100 percent by 2030.

This new KPI allows the B20 and the Collective Action community to track something many companies and practitioners identify as crucial for the success of Collective Action: government support. Government support for Collective Action strengthens incentives for companies to engage and invest in corruption prevention.

5.2 The importance of continuity

Further institutionalising the KPIs, including the one on Collective Action, could provide actionable, data-driven insights that can support the G20 ACWG and G20 member countries in strategically shaping commitments and closing the persistent implementation and accountability gaps.

This is only possible, however, if a certain level of continuity is achieved within the KPIs themselves and the relevant data they rely on. Continuity has always been an issue given the flexibility in the B20 process with a rotating secretariat. The Brazilian cycle identified this problem and took an innovative approach to ensure more sustainability in the KPIs related to recurring B20 recommendations.

Which brings us back to an important pillar already highlighted in this report: the long-standing task force members and knowledge and network partners. The Brazilian presidency ensured that the data for each KPI for recurring recommendations is provided by a knowledge/network partner or engaged task force members who commit to providing this data on an annual basis.

For Collective Action, this has meant that the B20 reaffirmed the B20 Collective Action Hub as a B20 legacy project. This includes the continued tracking of the B20 Collective Action KPI, which will be made public annually by the Basel Institute.

This approach empowers the institutions engaging with the B20, while ensuring a certain level of consistency and sustainability for recurring recommendations. This could mitigate the negative impact of intermittent pauses of the Integrity & Compliance Task Force in future as committed network partners continue to capture and communicate on developed KPIs.

6 Recommendations to strengthen the B20 Integrity and Compliance Agenda

As the global community navigates a period of heightened uncertainty and complex challenges, the lessons learned from past B20 cycles, the processes established and, most importantly, the trust built between Business 20 and G20 counterparts represent invaluable assets. They provide credibility and continuity of the process and also offer a resilient foundation on which the B20 can continue to influence global governance in terms of integrity and compliance. Leveraging these achievements is essential to ensure that the B20 remains a trusted voice and effective partner in advancing anti-corruption and Collective Action priorities within the G20 context.

Against this backdrop, the following recommendations aim to further strengthen and institutionalise the B20 Integrity and Compliance agenda:

1. **Reinforce continuity through a dedicated Integrity & Compliance Task Force**
A dedicated Integrity & Compliance Task Force is essential to preserving institutional memory and ensuring the continuity of substance beyond rotating presidencies. Long-standing task force members represent a core pillar of the B20 process, providing historical knowledge, subject-matter expertise and sustained engagement that are vital for lasting impact. Their proactive role helps maintain momentum and coherence in advancing anti-corruption and Collective Action efforts across B20 cycles.
2. **Re-establish a structured B20–G20 dialogue platform on anti-corruption**
The dialogue between the B20 Integrity & Compliance Task Force and the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group should be revitalised to support sustained, substantive engagement on the topic. This could take the form of a two-part exchange in each cycle: an early-stage dialogue to enable alignment and a dialogue following policy and work plan finalisation to share insights and reinforce shared priorities. International organisations involved in both the B20 and the G20 processes, such as the OECD and UNODC, are well placed to facilitate this dialogue and strengthen institutional bridges between the public and private sectors.

3. Continue advancing KPI development for recurring recommendations

Building on the progress made under the Italian, Indonesian and Brazilian presidencies, the development of measurable Key Performance Indicators should continue, with a focus on recurring recommendations such as anti-corruption Collective Action. The introduction of the first B20 Collective Action KPI under the Brazilian presidency sets a strong precedent. Future efforts should prioritise refining and institutionalising this and other KPIs with support from knowledge partners like the Basel Institute on Governance, to ensure sustainability and comparability across cycles.