WORLD ETHICS FORUM

Leadership, Ethics, and Integrity in Public Life
at Oxford University, 9–12 April 2006

CONFERENCE REPORT

The first World Ethics Forum—held at Keble College in Oxford, UK, 9-12 April 2006—sought to facilitate a global dialogue on the role of public service values and leadership in creating and sustaining good governance. Drawing on the practical experiences of leaders from various levels of government, the private sector, and civil society, coupled with insights from noted academics, the conference also sought suggestions for the operational mechanisms necessary to empower, support, and connect ethical leaders into stronger alliances focused on sustainable change. The WEF brought together over 250 eminent leaders, activists, and professionals from the political sphere, government service, civil society, academia, and the private sector, and from both developed and developing countries.

The WEF was co-sponsored by the World Bank and the International Institute for Public Ethics (IIPE). Three agencies provided substantial funding: the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID), the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), and United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Other sponsors included the United Nations University (UNU), the Oxford Centre for Socio-Legal Studies, the Integrity Institute of Malaysia, and the International Association for Religious Freedom. The Conference Organizing Committee was chaired by Professor Sampford (IIPE President) and the Conference Secretary was Mrs Margaret Paton. This report outlines the background and key objectives of the conference, provides an overview of sessions and workshops, and highlights key messages emanating from deliberations.

ORIGINS OF THE WORLD ETHICS FORUM

The 2006 World Ethics Forum was derived from a series of conferences organized by the Ethics in the Public Service Network (EPSN) commencing in the late 1980s. In 1998, the final plenary session of the EPSN conference—held in Leiden—resolved to support the creation of an incorporated body, the International Institute for Public Ethics (IIPE), which, inter alia, undertook the organisational role required to facilitate biennial conferences on ethics and public service. The secretariat was supported by the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance (Key Centre) at Griffith University in Australia and then by the Institute for Ethics, Governance and Law (UNU-IEGL), the joint UNU/Griffith research facility and the Australian Research Council funded Australian Governance Research Network. In a parallel development, the World Bank Public Sector Governance group was interested in supporting the establishment of a 'Global Integrity Alliance' (GIA) of organizations and individuals that would promote ethics and integrity in public life. The Ethics Resource Centre (ERC) organized a forum at the 2004 IACC conference in Istanbul to discuss the proposed GIA

THE CONFERENCE THEME IN CONTEXT

Ethics and Leadership as the underemphasized elements of Governance Reform

Since the late 1990s, when good governance and anti-corruption efforts began to be recognized as central to the development challenge, support focused on reforming public sector institutions, enhancing transparency, creating checks and balances, and strengthening accountability mechanisms. However,

evidence of the checkered impact of these efforts has mounted, signifying the limitations of a purely institutional and technocratic approach, and raising the imperative of focusing on other elements and instruments to enhance governance and leadership capacity. In particular, both ongoing dialogues with developing economies and discussions on anti-corruption strategies within the international development community—such as at the Eleventh International Anticorruption Conference in Seoul in 2003 and the Istanbul Conference in 2004—highlighted the limited efficacy of institutional reform when underlying public service values are weak, leadership capacity and commitment are absent, and change agents and champions lack supportive networks and coalitions.

The goal of the Oxford Conference was to bring together these various strands of thinking, and provide a common platform to engage practitioners and other significant stakeholders focused on expanding governance and leadership capacity. Specifically, the conference aimed to:

- Initiate a global dialogue on the role of leadership and integrity as tools for better governance and accelerated development.
- Learn lessons from global experts on strategies and operational interventions that can support, empower, and connect leaders committed to integrity and good governance, with specific respect to alliance formation and coalition building.
- Serve as the launching pad for partnerships with civil society, the public and private sectors, academia, and donors who focus on building leadership capacity and combating corruption.

In order to highlight some underemphasized elements of good governance and governance reform, the agreed theme of the conference was 'Ethics, Integrity and Leadership in Public Life.'

SPEAKERS AND PARTICIPANTS

Over 250 participants from 70 countries attended the conference and several of the organizations and attendees of the Istanbul Conference were also present. Delegates and speakers included a wide range of academics, civil servants, policy advocates, and practitioners from every region in the world. Specific attention was given to include women and youth who have, despite mounting opposition in their home country or region, shown the type of integrity and leadership qualities that have or will truly bring about positive developments in leadership capacity or curbing corruption.

The Opening Keynote addresses were delivered by Mary Robinson, former President of Ireland and presently Chairwoman of the Ethical Globalization Initiative; and Huguette Labelle, Chairperson of Transparency International. Additional keynotes were delivered by Pulitzer Prize Nigerian journalist, Dele Olojede; Judge Emile Short, Director of the Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice of Ghana; and John Graham of the Giraffe Foundation. Other preeminent participants included: Eduardo Rodriguez, former Interim President of Bolivia; Digvijaya Singh, former Chief Minister of the state of Madhya Pradesh, India; Sir Mekere Morauta, former Prime Minister of Papua New Guinea; John Githongo, former Permanent Secretary for Governance and Ethics in Kenya; Dijana Plestina, former First Lady and Advisor to Minister for Anti-personnel Mines Action in Croatia; and Karina Constantino David, Chairperson of the Civil Service Commission in The Philippines.

STRUCTURE OF THE WORLD ETHICS FORUM

The first two days of the forum were devoted to a series of plenary and parallel sessions and workshops devoted to leadership ethics (see attached program). Topics included the implementation of ethics regimes, cultural considerations of leadership and ethics, how to generate demand for ethical leadership,

legal ethics, the role of faith and religion in determining a society's values, numerous country case studies, and a wide range of other issues. Additionally, 25 youth delegates were invited to discuss their experiences in leadership and anti-corruption, and attend team building and leadership development workshops delivered by John Graham of the Giraffe Project. The final day of the conference utilized focused break-out groups to explore two strategic questions: (1) How can the international community support the development and empowerment of a process that gives rise to and supports leadership, ethics and integrity in public life?; (2) What institutional forms are best suited to delivering that assistance and specifically, might they include a 'Global Integrity Alliance' as first suggested in Istanbul in 2004? Reports of the four Working Groups discussing these themes are at Annex I of this report.

KEY SESSIONS

Oxford Conference sessions addressed both conceptual questions related to the role of leadership, ethics, and integrity, as well as operational questions of engagement in these areas. The opening plenary set the tone for the conference, touching key themes including: the dimensions of effective leadership; the importance of a focus on 'good' leaders as opposed to rulers or power wielders; mechanisms to encourage the entry of good leaders into public life; empowering leaders through building capacity for ethical leadership; supporting change agents, who often work against tremendous odds, through networks and coalitions of support; creating mechanisms for the exit of leaders who have reached term limits; and operational mechanisms through which to implement this agenda, including utilization of global, regional, national, and sectoral alliances. Overall, deliberations focused on building broad based alliances for change, rather than concentrating all attention on individual leaders.

The second full plenary consisted of a high-powered panel of leaders who spoke about their 'Experience of Leadership,' highlighting their personal stories, mechanisms they employed to push through difficult agendas, and the characteristics and qualities they brought to their work. Follow-on parallel sessions on 'Who are Good Leaders and Where Do They Come From?', and 'Leadership for Transformation', featured prominent academics addressing what defines good leadership, how good leadership can be created, elements of transformational leadership, and highlighting the diversity of leadership models across cultures and contexts. Other parallel sessions emphasized the role of corporate leadership and social responsibility and the role of leaders of international institutions as well as lessons of ethics regimes and experiences in these organizations.

Many prominent sessions addressed topics less often discussed in the context of governance, such as 'Faith and Values in Public Leadership,' which addressed the role of faith in fostering a global dialogue on ethics and integrity, and 'Women and Leadership,' which addressed the particular challenges women leaders face and the specific qualities that women that contribute to leadership capacity. The role of civil society in creating demand side pressures for higher standards of public life, and raising public expectations of leaders and governments, was highlighted in a session on 'Generating Demand for Leadership and Ethical Governance'. Another set of sessions—on World Bank supported pilot projects in leadership and ethics, as well as lessons from 'Implementing Ethics Regimes'–examined the operational mechanisms through which governance environments can be transformed through ethics regimes and leadership capacity building. For instance, Ralph Heintzman, former Vice President for Ethics in the Canadian Civil Service, pointed to the complexity of implementing ethics institutions and codes of conduct, supported by an 'iceberg' like structure of management regimes (internal audit; pay structures; results based accountability); institutional approaches (ethos and values; public office appointment regimes) and governance arrangements more broadly (electoral regimes and electoral financing; freedom of the press; freedom and engagement of civil society organizations). The WEF also

included a number of sessions examining the specific, country experiences of implementing ethics regimes, with particular reference to the Philippines, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, and Australia.

The Youth Forum, an integral part of the WEF, brought together 25 youth leaders from various countries to provide a specific focus on the role of the global youth community in promoting ethical leadership, now and in the future. Youth Delegates shared stories and experiences in areas as diverse and specific as combating corruption at the local and national level to working with child soldiers in post-conflict societies, and proved an inspiration and catalyst for conference discussions and thinking on how to take forward the substance of GIA deliberations. Workshops facilitated by John Graham helped the youth focus on how to create and articulate a vision that inspires others to follow or otherwise create change.

The closing plenary, chaired by World Bank Institute Vice President, Frannie Leautier, brought together the main themes of the conference, especially the conclusions of the working group discussions on operationalizing assistance for leadership and ethics capacity, and discussed possible ways to move forward with creating an international alliance to promote integrity in public life.

KEY MESSAGES

The key messages that emerged from the conference amplified the need for global attention to these issues, but with strong country ownership and significant inputs from civil society partners. Key messages from the conference are listed below.

Leadership with integrity and a public service ethos are a crucial missing link in governance reform.

The conference underlined the rationale and timeliness of the WEF's theme with the general recognition that ethics, integrity and leadership had been under-emphasized in governance reform and capacity building. The majority of participants advocated political commitment and leadership with integrity (as Joanne Cuilla says: 'doing the right thing, the right way, for the right reason') as fundamental to achieving broad-based growth and improved development outcomes. In many instances, leaders have fallen far short of this vision, modeling unethical and corrupt behavior for broader society.

Many speakers brought out the various and crucial roles that leadership plays in successful governance reform:

- Providing a vision of an achievable and better future;
- Shaping and modeling informal norms and values;
- Promoting commitment to good governance;
- Implementing institutional reforms;
- Catalyzing change;
- Energizing a strong support base; and
- Forging coalitions to implement difficult reforms.

Other speakers emphasized some of the key attributes of ethical and effective leadership—in particular, moral courage and commitment—especially in situations where advocating important reforms or policies is likely to be particularly difficult and, potentially, personally risky. Fostering public service ethics and values, promoting commitment to good governance at the highest leadership levels, and supporting champions of good governance at all levels and in all sectors, are powerful antidotes to governance failures. Promoting public service values and ethics is also important in balancing more traditional approaches which seek to 'name and shame' after the fact.

In her paper and presentation at the WEF, Joanne Cuilla looked at the issues around ethics and effectiveness; arguing that while some leaders don't want to serve the public trust because they are focused on serving themselves, other leaders simply don't have the competence or experience to know how to serve their constituents, so they ultimately serve themselves.

A framework for engaging leaders needs to focus on entry of good leaders into public life, empowering ethical and effective leaders while they serve, and facilitating exit of leaders at the end of their terms and ensuring good succession mechanisms are institutionalized.

During the opening plenary session, Sanjay Pradhan, World Bank Director of Public Sector Governance, set the overall framework for the conference, and outlined key imperatives driving the World Bank's engagement in this area. He pointed to the importance of developing work in this area along a few key dimensions: understanding what constitutes good leadership; the factors that ensure the entry of effective and ethical leaders in public life; support for empowering leaders and forging strong sustainable alliances for change at the country, regional and global levels; and exploring mechanisms for smooth transfer of authority when leaders' term limits have expired.

Eduardo Rodriguez, former Interim President of Bolivia, pointed to the primacy of the rule of law in ensuring the effective exercise of leadership, but also the intrinsic and competing motivations of those who seek political office; whether it is the desire for social change, for genuine championship of causes and policies, or personal gain. Tim Besley, from the London School of Economics, outlined the incentive framework and broader institutional environment that determines the manner by which leaders are selected, and the necessity for engagement in these areas. Other scholars distinguished between transactional and transformational leadership and argued that transformational leadership is necessary in development contexts to raise the standards of public service, create a public service ethos, and build consensus in the process of reform. As Senator Jon Ungphakorn from Thailand, Winner of the 2005 Magsaysay Award pointed out, "moral leaders err on the side of inclusiveness".

Building sustainable alliances to promote the ethics and integrity agenda, and supporting leaders that champion change, are critical complements to institution capacity building for good governance.

Many speakers pointed out that reform champions often fail, or are forced to give up their crusades, because they lack the support base. A case in point is John Githongo, a prominent participant at the conference, who was then in exile in the UK after crusading against corruption as Kenya's permanent secretary for governance and ethics, is a case-in-point. Alliances of leaders, at the national, regional, and global levels—who seek to support reform champions like Githongo and to create the possibility of the emergence of other such change agents—are crucial for ensuring the success of anti-corruption measures, especially in situations where leaders attempt reforms against formidable odds and take on complex networks of patronage and corruption. Support networks and reform alliances are both a precondition to success and a complement to institutional reform in these instances. Recognizing that followers also have power and hence responsibility, support for reformers must be broader than a singular focus on the instrumentality of leadership to include an understanding of how followers, organizations, systems, and institutions that support good leadership (and do not tolerate bad leadership) might develop and be supported.

Coalitions for change have proved a powerful mechanism for mobilizing civil society to demand accountability, and influence the kind of leaders that run for public office and are elected to serve. In

fact many speakers and participants, notably Samuel Paul (recent recipient of the World Bank's Jit Gill Award for his work on Citizen Report Cards in Bangalore), stressed the necessity for shared accountability. Just as leaders must be accountable to their constituencies, so must those constituencies accept responsibility for holding leaders accountable. However, participants also emphasized that in order to be effective, good governance coalitions need to be built from within public institutions as well, with active participation of reform champions within the government who can provide advisory and support functions.

Sharing stories of courage and lessons from successes and failures can be an effective means of mobilizing change agents.

Sharing knowledge and best practices on global successes and failures is a crucial instrument for energizing change and informing strategies. A number of speakers commented that examples of good leaders and public recognition of their successes and effectiveness are almost totally absent from public discourse. While speakers focused on enhancing leadership capacity—through such instruments as training, peer support through global networking, and highlighting successes and positive stories of change—leaders from eminent positions in their countries shared personal stories on how they had overcome challenging odds and battled difficult situations to effect real change in their work. Speaking from personal experience former Irish President Mary Robinson identified courage and steadfastness as essential elements of leadership, and pointed to the importance of staying the course on difficult issues and causes, even when support is difficult to garner.

This idea was shared by many other speakers reflecting on their leadership experiences. For example, Digvijaya Singh, former Chief Minister of the state of Madhya Pradesh, India, discussed the difficulties of implementing reform in a difficult environment, and building consensus in order to gain support for reform. Karina David from the Philippines spoke about the specific challenges she faced as a woman official, the ways in which she overcame these challenges, and the specific attributes she brought to her work as a woman. These inspirational stories proved to be a powerful instrument for energizing participants, catalyzing commitment, and providing lessons and models for leadership across contexts.

We need to better understand how leadership varies across gender and culture

Issues of gender and culture played predominantly in questions about the nature of leadership. One of the most inspiring and insightful sessions of the Oxford Conference involved stories of women in leadership. The panel and the audience had strong but varying views of the correlation between leadership styles and gender. Two elements that received particular attention and discussion were whether a perceived 'female style' of leadership was more likely to be found in women because of the kinds of experience they had and whether such styles reflected the general lack of power that women have in most communities. However, it also may reflect the power and influence they may have in certain gendered roles. Some argued—and the panellists represented the belief that—women were more likely to 'fall into' leadership positions rather than plan for them from an early age. One clear conclusion was that the GIA should endeavour to support existing and potential female leaders because of the diversity their gender-specific experience brings to leadership roles. Another conclusion focused on the clear need for more research on women and leadership, and for incorporation in the broader research debate concerning gender in governance and development initiatives.

Role of education and research in the leadership agenda

Some discussions focused on the education of ethical leaders. Several papers and presentations examined the form, content, assessment, and timing of ethics education at the university level. Mary Jane Kuffner-Hirt argued that education needed to be interactive; Mark Thomas argued that ethics education should be directed to developing ethical decision making skills, and Sally Kift dealt with the difficulties of assessing current leadership and ethics programs.

Some argued for on-going education for leaders (not just entry and exit, but throughout) and Huguette Labelle argued for the inclusion of ethics teaching in different tiers of education. Charles Sampford argued that education on ethics and integrity should be seen as an element of life-long learning, particularly for those in positions of public trust.

Many researchers and academics provided vital inputs to the sessions and described valuable work currently being undertaken to help contextualize the importance of building leadership capacity. However, the WEF also highlighted many areas of research and a mechanism for identifying research priorities; the knowledge needs of past, present and future leaders.

Private sector leadership

While much of the WEF dealt with leadership and integrity in the public sector, some sessions emphasized the role of the corporate world in fostering a culture of ethics and accountability. This is only partly due to the increasing role of the private sector at the national and international levels in contributing to public policy, and the recognition that bribery needed 'bribe-givers' as well as 'bribe-takers.' The private sector and its governance mechanisms are also an essential part of any national integrity system and an important source of models of ethical institutions and good practices. Moreover, the corporate sector can be an important contributor to the demand-side of good governance, alongside civil society. Lessons learned in the governance and regulation of multi-national corporations can be of use to create effective governance and regulation of public agencies, and vice versa. Accordingly, corporate leaders who lead with integrity are critical to national and international governance reform and measures to educate and network leaders should include corporate leaders as well as those in public agencies and NGOs.

Integrity in institutions at an international level

Most work on ethics, integrity, and integrity systems is at a national level. Two sessions emphasized the applicability of and necessity for addressing integrity in institutions at an international level. Tunku Abdul Aziz emphasized that leadership is a fundamental requirement for all regimes. Other sessions focused on international instruments for promoting integrity and fighting corruption such as at the United Nations Anti-Corruption Convention (UNCAC).

NEXT STEPS: DEVELOPING INSTRUMENTS FOR CHANGE

A key objective of the Oxford Conference was to understand how the international community can support work on expanding leadership capacity and institutionalizing ethics. On the last day of the conference, break-out working groups discussed the way forward along four dimensions for effecting change:

- *Advocacy, Awards, and Networking*: examined the role of these instruments in ensuring that good leaders come into power, celebrating effective leaders as role models, and creating support networks for reform.

- *Supporting Entry and Exit of Leaders*: discussed processes—such as rule of law and representation systems—to support effective political selection, and exit mechanisms, such as term limits.
- *Capacity Building for Leadership*: focused on specific operational mechanisms that could help leaders increase their legitimacy, and ability to be effective and ethical.
- *The Global Integrity Alliance*: considered a potential alliance of leaders, public service officials and organizations, civil society institutions, and other stakeholders to play an advocacy, advisory, and assistance role in promoting effective leadership and integrity.

Each break-out session consisted of a Chair from the working group and a Framer to help contextualize the issues being discussed, with a member of the Youth Forum acting as Rapporteur to the closing plenary session. During the closing plenary, discussions on the reports generated general agreement on exploring further a way forward on the agenda of promoting effective leadership and integrity in public service.

This approach received much favourable comment from delegates who felt their views were taken seriously by the Forum organizers and sponsors. While the conference as a whole did not attempt to draft an agreed communiqué, the 25-strong Youth Forum did seek to find a common position. The Youth Forum participants proposed the establishment of a Global Integrity Alliance for Youth and set out their own declaration.

THE CONFERENCE SPONSORS

The International Institute for Public Ethics (IIPE) (www.iipe.org)
The World Bank Public Sector Governance Group (www.worldbank.org/publicsector)
The Institute for Ethics, Governance and Law (UNU-IEGL) (http://www.gu.edu.au/text/centre/iegl/)
Australian Governance Research Network (http://www.gu.edu.au/text/govnet)
United States Agency for International Development (www.usaid.gov)
United Kingdom's Department for International Development (www.dfid.gov.uk)
Australian Agency for International Development (www.ausaid.gov.au)
The University of Oxford Centre for Socio-Legal Studies (http://www.csls.ox.ac.uk/)
The Integrity Institute of Malaysia (IIM) (http://www.iim.com.my/)
International Association for Religious Freedom (IARF) (http://www.iarf.net/)

Annex I: Working Groups Reports

<u>Working Group 1: Advocacy and Awards</u>

Chair: Neil Levine, United States
Framer: Dijana Plestina, Croatia
Rapporteur: Akram Al-Akhail, Yemen

Prior to the Conference, organizers thought that leadership awards would figure prominently in the work of any proposals for a GIA that emerged. There was considerable discussion of awards during the conference with much said in favour and some caution expressed by others. Reports from the final sessions of the conference recognized the value of awards, but predominantly as a method by which to profile and advocate for ethical leadership.

The key questions identified by the working group included:

1. How to leverage change?
2. How to identify levers of change?
3. How to create space for dialogue within institutions and under-represented groups?
4. How to build momentum?
5. How to avoid the cynicism that so easily develops and the media preference for reporting bad news (e.g. corruption) rather than good news (e.g. ethical leaders and effective integrity systems)?

The following ideas were suggested:

1. Developing a new norm of ethical leadership.
2. Training for ethical leadership using existing institutions.
3. Media campaigns.
4. Using the UN's Anti-Corruption Day (December 9th) or World Day of Planetary Ethics (September 22nd) to raise awareness
5. Creative marketing.
6. Facilitated dialogues in safe environments.
7. Concrete action plans.
8. Developing ethical curriculum.
9. Connecting organizations supporting ethical leadership through electronic media and peer support.

Concerns raised included the means of identifying and dealing with 'spoilers' and 'pretenders' – those who talk like ethical leaders but who in reality fail to adhere to ethical principles in the course of holding a leadership position. During one session, Mary Robinson suggested that the Club of Madrid might be utilized to encourage high-level participation in subsequent leadership capacity building. If awards were offered as a component of the GIA initiative, the Club of Madrid could provide the panel that considered award recommendations. The Club of Madrid could also assist in advocacy for and profiling of the GIA. One suggested mechanism is to invite some of the members of the Club of Madrid to take part in the activities of GIA, particularly its formation. As former leaders and heads-of-state they may suggest, for the GIA, important inputs into the activities to be undertaken and assist more generally toward the achievement of goals.

Working Group 2: Capacity Building for Ethical Leadership: Leader-Led Life-Long Leadership Learning

Chair: Christoph Glaser, Germany
Framer: Charles Sampford, Australia
Rapporteur: Bojana Skrobic, Bosnia and Herzegovina

An analogy was drawn between judicial education and capacity building for ethical leadership. Like all professional education, legal education is now seen as a life-long learning process in which legal educators and senior members of the profession must be involved. It is generally recognized that judicial education must be 'judge-led' in the sense that they have the prime input into deciding when and what needs to be learned, and often take part in the delivery of courses.

This working group recognized that similar points could be made about leadership capacity building – hence the idea of 'leader-led life-long leadership learning'.

Leadership capacity building needs to ask leaders (former, future and current) what they would like to know and what experiences would help build their skills. This process should start with asking former leaders this series of questions:

- What competencies, in hindsight, would have been beneficial during your tenure?
- When did you wish that you had found it out?
- What form of educational or practical experiences do you think would have helped with your leadership capacity?

The working group initiated discussion regarding these general questions, with consultation of former leaders, and ultimately developed a series of more specific interrogatives:

1. What competencies are necessary to be an effective leader?
2. What experiences positively affected their ability to lead?
   For example – placements in line agencies and integrity agencies in established integrity systems and in emerging integrity systems.
3. At what point in their career did they feel they were ready to lead?
4. Where should this happen?
   a. In home country?
   b. In country with an effective integrity system?
   c. Web based?
5. What role can leaders play in facilitating this life-long learning process?
   a. Identifying the educational and practical experiences to help leaders develop.
   b. Adapting courses to suit regions and countries.
   c. Assisting in delivering courses.
   d. Mentoring of current and future leaders.

The working group also discussed what constitutes a good leader and the capacities that need to be developed.

1. Leadership was seen as making choices among alternatives.

2. Leaders had to recognize, distil and analyse problems, make choices, communicate the choices implemented, and take responsibility for their actions.
3. Leaders have to gain the trust of the community so that others will follow. Leaders are defined by the fact that the 'led' are prepared to follow.
4. Leaders have to resolve dilemmas and find ways to solve problems without breaking the rules.
5. Leaders have to realize that they can always learn and competency is ever-expanding.
6. Leaders needed institutions and systems to support their capacity to lead. If existing institutions and systems undermined ethical leadership and rewarded corrupt leadership, then ethical leaders are unlikely to succeed.

The working group suggested an approach which could assist leaders in developing the above mentioned capacities:

1. Education and training.
2. Internships/placements/secondments in different organisations – including corporations, NGOs, line agencies and integrity agencies in countries with developed and/or developing integrity systems.
3. Personal development:
   a. Partly from education, but more often from experience.
   b. A wide-range of experiences – structured (as in 2 above) and unstructured.
4. Mentoring.
5. Building regional and international coalitions to discuss experiences in leadership.
6. Advice:
   a. From short-term, in-house advisors 'sitting in the next office'.
   b. From outside experts in a GIA hub.
7. Institutional and policy alternatives provided from a World Wide Web 'warehouse' (see below) or from a group of experts.

Participants listed some of the kinds of training that is currently available including 'power-meals' to full-day programs, retreats and multi-day courses (especially for rising middle management – a particularly important group). It was agreed that the GIA should prepare an inventory of currently available training tools together with assessments of processes and tools that had worked for leaders of different types and different backgrounds. This discussion led to the suggestion that the GIA should be something of a 'warehouse' providing:

1. Lists and access to a range of courses.
2. A range of institutions and policies that could be used to deal with problems.
3. A set of case studies of ethical leadership – 'heroes'.
4. Case studies on the establishment of good governance through leadership coalitions.
5. A range of 'best practices'.

Members of the working group emphasized that there was no one solution that would suit all leaders and countries. This variety suggested that we needed to move from a 'warehouse' to a 'department store' format where potential leaders could pick and choose products as necessary.

A single international institute for training leaders was discussed. The dominant theme that emerged from this discussion was the decentralisation of training and ethical leadership institutions into a number of hubs is a more culturally and ethnically appropriate method of providing support. Participants in the working group also emphasized that not all learning is undertaken in institutions frequented by elites;

organizations that focus on grass-roots activities tend to have a more developed understanding of the practical versus the theoretical and can focus more on the follower (or citizen) rather than the leader.

One of the suggested criteria for success was an evaluation of the extent to which goods and services offered by the 'warehouse' or 'department store' were adopted and adapted by leaders.

Research Agenda

The working group recognized that asking leaders what they would like to know may require the creation of new knowledge. This new knowledge is instrumental in developing the research agenda in which leaders and researchers enter a dialogue. The process involves leaders posing questions that they would like answered and the researchers providing feedback on possible avenues of assistance and/or collaboration and how the leader's questions may be framed in a manner that maximizes a useful answer. Such leader-focused research agenda-setting is also an effective tool for assisting 'governance disciplines' (law, ethics, political science, economics, management and organisation theory) to move out of their 'disciplinary strait jackets'.

Working Group 3: Entry and Exit of Leaders

Chair: Gillian Dell, United Kingdom
Framer: Samuel Paul, India
Rapporteur: Solange Marquez Espinoza, Mexico

This working group dealt with questions associated with finding new leaders and assisting their entry into leadership positions. Such questions were analyzed together with questions related to the exit of leaders and assisting their exit in two contrasting cases – when it became, for security reasons, too difficult for those leading or championing governance reform and when successful leaders were tempted to cling to power, for example, by going for the 'unconstitutional third term'.

On entry issues, the group emphasized the importance of making leadership positions attractive to youth, women and marginalized stakeholders. Currently there are barriers to entry for some groups. In systems characterized by poor governance, corruption and self-serving elites, those with integrity may avoid politics. Building leadership capacity may help encourage individuals to participate in the political process that otherwise would have focused solely on personal pursuits.

The group suggested information sharing through electronic and physical networking as a means for aiding entry and exit. Participants of the working group also suggested strengthening the participation of civil society in the selection and assessment of leaders and promoting media awareness. The GIA was seen as having a role in training and accrediting leaders as well as supporting them. However, some suggested that membership of GIA might depend on leading with integrity and that leaders could lose membership of GIA. Mechanisms were not discussed but there are numerous professional models available.

It was suggested that the most effective way of assisting exit for leaders who found it too 'hot' was to provide them work within the GIA doing research, training, speaking at conferences etc. In much the same way that industrialized nations assist scholars, researchers, and scientists of failed states, lest they undertake questionable activities, leaders can be provided with the resources and opportunities to continue helping their society or nation develop in a positive direction. While fellowships at GIA associated institutes, participation in conferences and engaging in leadership research and training might offer little to the corrupt leader, they may be much more attractive to a successful governance reformer otherwise tempted to stay on or needing safe exit.

Working Group 4: Why, What, Who, How?

GIA Working Group 4: Vision, Mission, Governance of a Possible GIA
Chair: Tim Steel, United Kingdom
Framer: Karina Constantino David, Philippines
Rapporteur: Chadia El-Meouchi, Lebanon

There was a general consensus of the need for a GIA. However, it was agreed that it would need to have a distinctive character and add value to already available ethics and anti-corruption initiatives.

Why? Areas of distinction and value-adding:

1. Deal with building ethics and integrity rather than confining its focus to curbing corruption which is already well covered by TI with the IACC as the major biennial conference. As such the GIA would seek to highlight the positive by recognizing, developing, connecting and empowering ethical leadership.
2. Focus on ethics and integrity in leadership – especially the formation of coalitions of leaders and supporters across all sectors of society.
3. Most of those involved with ethics and integrity in leadership are working alone; the GIA would bring these efforts together.
4. Apply to leaders in all sectors and at all levels – including youth and middle management, not just the top leaders.
5. Connect researchers and practitioners from all countries, sectors and levels.
6. Gather knowledge and disseminate it to members and others.
7. Help identify standards for integrity, paying specific attention to cultural, ethnic, and regional attitudes.
8. Act internationally to encourage the establishment of national and sectoral integrity alliances providing support and bringing technical assistance to members in countries for their work on the ground.
9. Act as an advocacy/pressure group to spread awareness about issues of integrity and ethics in leadership and provide a vehicle for developing countries to express their concerns and experience of lack of integrity and ethics in leadership.

What does the GIA intend to achieve? Goals and Mission

1. Concentrate on a set of activities that are achievable with a clear initial agenda.
2. Connect leaders from all levels and sectors.
3. Consolidate the knowledge of all these leaders and individuals to serve as a learning platform. The work being done by individual countries on integrity and ethics in leadership must be consolidated so that it can become knowledge for all, at the service of all.
4. Establish mentoring from successful leaders to emerging leaders. The successful and established leaders can then provide guidance and support to the emerging leaders.
5. Instill optimism ands empower the youth.
6. The GIA should focus on the creation of a cadre of leaders across sectors that receive and provide critical support, rather than just supporting individual potential leaders.
7. Educate the public worldwide on integrity and ethics.
8. Develop a global dialogue of wide reach, including youth and women.
9. Use the media to disseminate positive messages of ethics and integrity in leadership.

10. Provide a flexible menu of support.
11. Beyond establishing regional, national, or local chapters, the GIA should employ modern communication technology, such as a website or other online portal, to establish a contemporary alliance with a global platform through which organization, individual leaders, and countries can contribute and exchange ideas and experience.

<u>Who? Composition and Membership</u>

1. Include leaders from all levels and sectors, (private, public, civil society, academics, practitioners, individuals, youth, and women) and achieve a balance between those various levels and sectors; the GIA should be an inclusive organization, open for all.
2. Should not be captured and/or controlled by <u>any one</u> association or organization. It should be clearly non-partisan.
3. Provision should be made for both individual and organizational membership.

<u>How? The Process</u>

The following process was suggested:

1. Establish a small working group, or Steering Committee, to establish the structure of the GIA.
2. The working group would act as a 'convenor' and facilitator' to produce two deliverables:
    a. A work plan program by the end of May based on all issues discussed throughout this conference and in the working groups of the Forum. The work plan program should be then circulated to all participants of the conference for their comments.
    b. A consultative report by September 1, 2006 including suggestions on how to set up the GIA. The report would again be circulated to all participants of the forum for their comments.
3. Composition: World Bank, IIPE, TI, ERC, other donors and leaders including youth leaders.
4. Temporarily housed by the ERC (Ethics Resource Center).
5. Longer term hosting to be agreed at a later date.
6. Funding: minimal for 1-4 above but GIA itself will require co-ordination of funders.