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Russian small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) have repeatedly cited corruption as the main factor hindering their growth. In the 1990s and early 2000s, Russian entrepreneurs paid bribes for certain extra-legal activities to secure an advantage over competitors, to induce bureaucrats to overlook infractions of the law, or to speed various regulatory or licensing processes. In the past several years, however, the dynamic has shifted radically, according to local experts who study the issue closely. Entrepreneurs are now forced to pay bribes by officials who demand payment to provide services – such as provision of licenses or permits – that are entirely legal, and that by law must be free of charge. In addition to this development, the business community has seen the growth of the phenomenon of “raiding,” whereby bureaucrats who are no longer content to extract individual payments from businesses use ostensibly legal means to orchestrate the illegal takeover of a firm.

However, the picture is not entirely bleak. Despite these difficulties, Russian entrepreneurs continue to open businesses and actively pursue ways to protect their livelihoods. Chambers of commerce and business associations are at the forefront of those efforts. They recognize that, in a highly corrupt environment, collective action can provide a necessary measure of protection for an individual businessperson looking to push back against the demands of a corrupt official.

Over the past 10 years, the Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE), with the support of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), has implemented a “SME Policy Advocacy” project in Russia, working with the business community and government officials to find ways to lower barriers to doing business and reduce opportunities for corruption. CIPE has helped to build coalitions of chambers and associations in 18 Russian regions and work with several key national-level groups that are advocating for important changes to create a more transparent business environment.

Having achieved important successes at the regional level and developed a range of innovative tools and approaches, CIPE’s SME Policy Advocacy project serves as an important guide to private sector-led, collective action anti-corruption programs. This handbook will present the strategies that CIPE’s partners have employed, and serve as a model for how such strategies can be replicated in other regions of the world.
History of the Program

The SME Policy Advocacy project was launched in 2002, when CIPE began working with chambers and associations in eight regions to form coalitions to strengthen the image of small business, lower the so-called “implementation gap” between laws on the books and in actual practice, and improve the business climate for SMEs through targeted advocacy campaigns. Over the following eight years, the program evolved to encompass 18 regional coalitions that comprise over 200 business associations, representing the interests of over 18,000 firms. CIPE’s partners and USAID increasingly recognized that corruption in Russia is the main barrier to business. Gradually, the SME Policy Advocacy program came to focus mainly on helping chambers and associations fight against corruption.

CIPE recognizes a variety of reasons explaining the success of its anti-corruption programs that operate worldwide through chambers and associations. First, in many countries of the world, including Russia, chambers and associations are comprised of voluntary, dues-paying members, including individual entrepreneurs, SMEs, large firms, cooperatives, and even other NGOs, such as other chambers and associations. The willingness of members to pay dues points to a level of commitment that gives extra weight to the activities of, and positions taken by, the association or chamber when dealing with government officials. While there are many types of civil society organizations that advocate for the interests of citizens, membership-based organizations have a clear mandate – in the form of membership dues – to speak on behalf of those whom they represent.

Second, an association or chamber can seem to be an anomaly in the world of private sector actors. Various firms, which might be competitors in the marketplace, come together through a chamber, association, or coalition to advocate for a particular policy position. When competitors agree that a particular change is needed to allow firms a chance to compete on fair and equal footing, their unified position has increased weight in swaying a government official. Finally, chambers and associations provide a collective voice for action by the business community by providing each other with a mutual defense. While an individual entrepreneur or firm may be afraid to protest alone, a chamber or association bears much less risk in vocally opposing corruption.

In each of the 18 Russian regions where CIPE implemented the project, one association or chamber was chosen to be the coordinator of the regional coalition. The coordinating organizations played a wide variety of roles in the program. They took the lead on gathering information from the regional business community, served as the main recipient of CIPE small grant funding, worked closely with the other coordinators to develop anti-corruption and advocacy tools, disseminated these approaches to other organizations in the coalition, provided opportunities for debate and discussion, and spearheaded advocacy activities.

As the coalitions identified local barriers to business, they developed regional business agendas to encourage regional governments to implement reforms. As a result, the coalitions scored many legislative victories at the regional and local levels, often on issues of taxation, administrative barriers, and corruption. As the coalitions turned their attention and advocacy efforts specifically towards corruption, they continued to focus on improving the business climate through better implementation of existing laws and legislative changes. Recognizing that corruption takes place in a particular enabling legislative environment, the coalitions settled on an anti-corruption campaign that fit in a more comprehensive framework of improving a broad range of issues in the business climate.

In one example, four regional business agendas included the creation of a “single window,” or “one-stop shop,” to expedite small business registration and other transactions. By limiting interactions with bureaucrats and streamlining procedures, single-window registration can theoretically help to limit opportunities for corruption. However, the coalitions understood that simply creating these single windows would not be enough in a Russia that struggles with implementation. The coalitions watched as corrupt practices took root early on, and were able to trace the problem back to loopholes or vague language in the laws creating the single windows. To a great extent, this observation informed one of the key anti-corruption tools later developed by the coalitions.

Developing a Unique Approach

In 2003, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation (RCCI) completed a survey to identify common problems in the Russian business climate at the local and federal levels. These issues included:

- **Administrative barriers.** Unwieldy registration and licensing requirements often pushed businesses into the informal sector. These codes exacerbated conflicts between business and bureaucracy.
- **Complex tax codes.** Tax policies tended to be excessively rigid, encouraging evasion. Additionally, tax revenues paid by businesses did not go towards helping municipalities develop small business.
- **Limited access to information.** Businesses lacked access to resources on business development, as well as a reliable process to review and comment on draft legislation.
- **Poor protection of property rights.** Access to non-residential property was extremely limited. When renting property, tenants faced sharply increased rent and unfair contract enforcement.
- **Widespread corruption.** Many businesspeople found it easier to “come to an understanding” with local bureaucrats.

To proactively address these issues, the regional coalitions developed a four-step mechanism for collective action:

1. Participating organizations begin first to share information openly and to reach a consensus, in order to ensure that business speaks with one voice to government officials.
2. The second step is to create a common, unified defense against corruption and other barriers to business.
3. The third step is to work on legislative analysis, from reviewing draft legislation to monitoring the implementation of existing laws and regulations.
4. The final step is to begin a dialogue between business and government to advocate for needed changes. Once changes are implemented, the coalition can return to step one, and continue evaluating whether the changes it advocated are functioning as intended.

Though tailored to Russia, this four-step process draws on CIPE’s experience in fighting corruption and reducing barriers to doing business in countries around the world. These steps can be adapted for use in other contexts, but the basic structure holds: a combination of analysis and exchanging information, collective action, and legislative change, employed by a broad-based coalition of like-minded associations and chambers with an effective coordinator, can help overcome seemingly intractable problems, create a more transparent and accountable business environment, and achieve workable partnerships with government.
A strong advocacy movement starts with information sharing among coalition members. A coalition can create a business community that supports its members in opposing corrupt practices only when it ensures that all business associations and enterprises have the same information regarding legislation, enforcement, and legal rights. A firmly united group of business leaders is stronger when it provides no opening for opponents seeking to sow division. Additionally, a coalition can react to specific instances of corruption more swiftly if the information is received, digested, and used to direct support through a single coordinating body. The coalition thus can provide a platform for information exchange within each business association and between associations in the coalition. Effective means of information sharing platforms include periodic newsletters, online forums, regular meetings, and telephone hotline systems.

Nearly all of the 18 coalitions in Russia distribute monthly or quarterly newsletters that outline problems, identify new approaches, and detail successes. By sharing information on a regular basis and in a standardized format, the coalition leaders link disparate groups together across large areas by making each group’s work part of a common cause. Another way to get information out to coalition members is through training sessions. This tactic is particularly important when specific skills or approaches have been built into successful practices and need to be shared with other coalition members. Trainers may focus directly on how to organize an effective advocacy campaign, or on areas that will make the business associations into better advocates by, for example, increasing membership.

Information sharing between businesses and government is also vital. During the advocacy process, roundtable discussions are a useful venue for convening authorities and businesses. For example, the Kirov coalition held an event in May 2010 in conjunction with the Kirov City Administration that brought officials from the federal, regional, and municipal levels together with members of the local business community. The goal of the forum was to help SMEs interact with government officials with the goal of ultimately changing problematic legislation. The forum was held in three stages. Prior to the event, any member of the public was free to visit the coalition’s website and submit a question to be addressed by officials and posted online. During the second stage, the coalition held various meetings on specific topics over a five-day period. The third stage brought the town meeting and online moderators together to discuss identified problems and possible solutions with a broad selection of administrators and businesspeople. Following the forum, participants recommended policy changes and sent the recommendations to the Small Business Development Coordinating Council in the provincial government. The relevant government entities addressed the recommendations in a timely manner and changes resulted.

Telephone hotlines are an effective tool for quickly sharing information among businesses. Hotlines that offer businesses relevant advice are especially useful in targeting specific and immediate needs in a local or regional
business community. The hotline is useful as a measure to gauge what issues are problematic and as a platform for offering legal advice or counsel on specific, urgent issues. Hotline data should be quickly shared with other members of the coalition, which builds confidence in the coalition’s efficacy among its members.

An effective national anti-corruption campaign must depend on an efficient system that relies on the regional coalitions. In Russia, the 18 individual regional coalitions submit information upward to the RCCI and Russian Non-governmental Organization of Small and Medium Business (OPORA) in Moscow. The RCCI and OPORA, in turn, share information on members’ reform and advocacy efforts to the full network. This approach provides the foundation for sharing experiences and innovative new approaches to fighting corruption that can then be duplicated elsewhere in the country.
Step Two: Coordinated Effort

During the early stages of coalition building and advocacy, associations are often faced with government officials who try to divide the business community through wedge issues. “Your colleagues in the other association disagree with your recommendations,” an official might say. “How can we decide what is best for improving the business environment if the business community itself cannot agree?” With corruption entrenched in local government structures, a divided group of businesses has little chance of fighting back. A unified group of businesses, an association, or a coalition of associations, however, can enjoy considerable collective power and effect real change.

The first step is to enter into direct talks with officials. The difficulty of this task often depends on determining the appropriate level of government (municipal versus ministry level, for example) and discovering who within the government branch has the power to bring about change. Advocacy and anti-corruption campaigns turn on trust. If there is no trust built between a coalition and relevant officials, it is unlikely that the coalition’s work will result in any policy changes. Perseverance and consistency through information sharing, roundtables, and reports are vital. Laying such groundwork often leads to a stronger and more open relationship in the future.

Ideally, trust-building dialogue with government officials will lead to business coalition representation on the advisory councils or equivalent structures of relevant government agencies. Such positions give coalitions official status with business and government alike, while building the associations’ ability to reach those in the government with the power to affect change. Representation is also an indicator of a strong coalition. The leadership body of the coalition is usually drawn from a full coalition that, out of necessity, includes many points of view. As a member of an advisory council, a coalition can therefore bring more than one perspective to the table, offering geographical and experiential diversity to the proceedings. Joining councils also allows coalitions to establish the broader recognition and influence necessary to make small changes quickly. For example, representatives of the Novorossiysk coalition are members of every public organization that engages in dialogue with the government. One such organization is the advisory council in the mayor’s office. This council provides a useful platform for dialog between the business community and the local government. At a meeting in June 2010 to discuss the results of the first stage of small-scale privatization (in which business owners could purchase the properties they lease), there was also a discussion of garbage removal in Novorossiysk. Four companies in the city provide garbage services; they have formed a cartel, which has increased the cost of waste removal by 64 percent. Despite the fact that the advisory council is not a government agency, it voted to participate in the development of a new policy to address the escalating costs of waste removal. Thus an issue of vital interest to local businesses became a priority for city hall, even though the local business coalition had no direct authority.
Another key element in a coordinated effort is ensuring that everyone has access to identical and accurate information sources. Sharing information is the first step; publicizing corrupt practices comes next, followed by drawing attention to campaigns against them. It is also helpful to communicate in an accessible and easily understood way. Some of the more effective anti-corruption communications methods used by CIPE’s coalitions include comics and cartoons, slogans that are easily remembered, and booklets written in clear and simple language rather than heavy legal jargon. Also, the local media can be an ally in identifying corrupt practices and attracting attention beyond the confines of the coalition.

Collective public action – in the form of protests and rallies – is another potentially effective means of publicizing corrupt practices. The Novorossiysk coalition used this tactic well when fighting a vaguely worded municipal ordinance that exposed business owners to fines from enforcement agencies, each of which interpreted the new law in a different way. One particularly contentious provision regarding various trash receptacles eventually sent business owners into the streets in protest. The coalition in Novorossiysk held a small public rally, alerted the local media to the problem, and hosted a roundtable with local business leaders and city officials. After a four-month battle, the law was changed to require enforcement agencies to issue business owners a warning before imposing fines.

Some of the most effective anti-corruption campaigns are rooted in the law. Therefore, a coalition’s legal resources are often vital to the individual or mutual defense of members. In Russia, much of the progress made in reducing the effect of corruption on businesses comes from courts setting legal precedents on how cases will be handled. Coalitions need to be able to judiciously identify cases that can act as legal turning points and back those suits in court to create judicial enforcement mechanisms for future cases. Communicating those successes to other coalitions allows the entire network to benefit.

In one telling example, in the Russian province of Perm, local officials cited a shop owner for her lack of a retail license. (A retail license is a method of taxation that is enforced by the tax authorities, not by the city.) The shop owner appealed to the Perm coalition of business associations for assistance. The lead association helped the shop owner bring her case challenging the city’s jurisdiction before a local court. The shop owner won her suit, thereby setting a legal precedent limiting the city’s jurisdiction. To ensure that other businesses provided a united front and knew of the ruling, the coalition printed small information cards and distributed them to businesses throughout the city. Business owners now show the cards to government inspectors, indicating a refusal to accept false jurisdiction. As a result, the Perm coalition witnessed a significant decline in these types of complaints.
Long-lasting change to the underlying causes of much business-related corruption is rooted in legal reform. In other words, while information sharing and a coordinated effort are keys to a successful coalition, legislative analysis and advocacy are crucial to having a long-lasting impact on the business environment and reducing corruption. Successful coalitions use a comprehensive approach to resisting corruption, but the core of this approach is prevention through legal reform, which eliminates poorly drafted legislation which gives officials immense powers to interpret ambiguous language. Coalitions that are successful in this area typically play a role in drafting the legislation itself; it is much simpler to eliminate problems at the draft stage than to battle for changes to existing legislation.

One of Russia’s most industrious and innovative business associations devised a methodology for identifying corruption-prone legislation. The Saratov Chamber of Commerce and Industry spent two years developing a methodology for analyzing legislation in an effort to reduce corruption. The methodology has three phases: first, monitoring the implementation of laws; second, analyzing the legal relationships between business and the state; and third, preparing recommendations for specific reforms. This methodology is cyclical. Once a new, vetted law is in place, the coalition returns to its initial step to ensure that the legislation is working as intended.

**Monitoring Phase**

Monitoring legal implementation is a necessary first step in any reform process. By surveying association and coalition members and legal experts, an association can gain specific information on the practical application of various laws and regulations as well as begin to pinpoint the loopholes and vague language that encourage corrupt practices. Key people to survey include lawyers, non-governmental organizations, regional and municipal government officials, and businesspeople. The coalition should draw information from all member associations and chambers of commerce in order to gather a broad sample of regional and inter-regional experiences. Armed with this data, the coalition leader can prepare analytical reports on regional findings and a general report summarizing overall results. Aside from summarizing the findings themselves, the report should include experts’ opinions on the effectiveness of legal regulations, the actual implementation of laws, and any anti-corruption measures that may be in place.

Using the report, the coalition should create a list of those government services that are at risk for corrupt activities. Such a list might focus on specific sectors – like water supply, electricity, or garbage collection – or it might target broader areas like tax rates or procurement guidelines. Once this step is taken, it is useful to focus on the actual implementation of the laws. Because this is a highly subjective task, this portion of the project may require additional expert opinions that can be gathered through focus groups, roundtables, issue-oriented interviews, and
an analysis of media reports. At the conclusion of this step, the coalition should have amassed enough data to make general conclusions and recommendations for specific steps in reducing corruption.

**Analysis Phase**

The analysis phase identifies the precise relationship between business owners, the law, and government officials. If in the previous phase we described the relevant legislation and regulation, at this stage we look at the reality on the ground – how those laws are implemented. This is vital knowledge, which makes possible specific interventions that can be targeted appropriately. Altering a law or regulation is often not enough. For example, a change in the tax rate might be one avenue of reform but not if a tax collector is negotiating payments with individual businesses.

In this phase, the associations begin an in-depth analysis of the regulations in question. It is important to establish the procedures for providing the service in question, the sequence of actions to be taken by the applicant, and the corresponding procedures to be carried out by the state agency. What are the applicable deadlines for submission? What are the services to be provided? What is actually being provided? This should include an analysis of the potential for corruption in the implementation process. Additionally, it is useful to determine whether the process is already adequately regulated. One factor that is often overlooked is the comparison between federal, regional, and municipal laws on a single topic. Inconsistencies between existing laws at any of these three levels lead to conflicts that must be resolved by an official, thus exacerbating a situation ripe for corruption.

One way to ensure that a corruption analysis is complete is by creating flow charts that detail all government entities and persons involved in the service, stages, deadlines, timelines, and expected results. This can help to pinpoint gaps in existing legislation. It works equally well for anti-corruption efforts and for broader business environment reforms. This method was used successfully by the Perm regional coalition during an examination of leasing practices for forest land. After analyzing the process, the Perm coalition identified three points at which corruption became a problem. The Perm coalition issued an opinion calling for several changes to the process in order to reduce opportunities for corruption. The changes included specifying the list of documents to be attached to a lease application, adding a step in the process that offers the applicant a chance to revise a proposal before a final decision is made, and specifying the plot size and location in the application process.

**Recommendations Phase**

After the first three phases have been thoroughly completed, it is time to prepare an opinion for strategic distribution to key stakeholders. The leading association, a group of coalition members, or an accredited expert may write the opinion but it should be approved by an accredited expert in the field. In Russia, there is a specific procedure under anti-corruption legislation on submitting such an opinion to the Ministry of Justice. That does not preclude publishing opinions in a variety of ways, including through newsletters, local newspaper ads, websites, blogs, online forums, pamphlets, or via local councils on which the coalition is represented. If the issue is already under consideration by officials and legislators, an accredited opinion paper often offers a concrete and well-researched basis for new legislation or amending existing regulations.
Step Four: Dialogue and Advocacy

Advocacy is the final and most important step in the reform process. Without effective advocacy, it is unlikely that corrupt practices can be curtailed. The three preceding steps ensure that a coalition is ready to work effectively with government officials and elected leaders. By gathering and sharing information, prioritizing the importance of reforms, and thoroughly analyzing the existing legislation’s implementation, associations arm themselves with the facts that underlie a persuasive case for change.

An association or coalition may take several approaches towards advocacy. The coalitions in Russia began with regional business agendas and narrowed down their priorities to focus on advocating for specific issues connected to corruption. Russian coalitions used a variety of approaches in their targeting of municipal, regional, and federal laws and regulations.

In Russia, coalitions had the most success in advocating change when they worked closely with pertinent officials at government agencies. By building on relationships formed early in the process, coalitions were quickly able to promote legislative and regulatory changes. With this cooperative approach, it is important to avoid directly criticizing authorities. Government officials should be respected as colleagues and treated as such. The coalitions found that delivering logical, persuasive arguments in a respectful manner was an effective tactic in swaying officials to embrace reform. Providing officials with solutions rather than problems also makes it easier for them to endorse new regulations and legislation. This approach has the added benefit of establishing the coalition’s credibility as an expert source of well-reasoned legislative alternatives. Building trust with government officials and elected leaders may take time. One effective way is to start by making small promises and following through on them promptly and effectively. From there, build to bigger and more contentious issues.

Another advocacy approach – to be used strategically and sparingly – is to appeal to the public through the media. Such a public approach need not be confrontational. In fact, it is better to begin by focusing on providing information about a specific issue. For example, an appearance at a public or government-hosted forum can be a useful way of proposing changes when personal relationships with decision-makers are lacking.

Advocacy campaigns sometimes have unintended consequences. For example, the coalition in Khabarovsk spent several years advocating for a “one window” system for expediting building and zoning permit applications. The system was ultimately established, but vague language and bureaucratization led to even greater levels of corruption. Officials had added extra fees to the standard rates. Khabarovsk coalition leaders communicated the business community’s concerns to the local legislature and the mayor’s office through existing personal contact. The coalition also held roundtables and publicized the issue through the media. As a result of these efforts, a decision was made in 2010 to revamp the “one window” system to protect the rights of businesspeople. The new system was set for implementation in 2011.
In light of its work with coalitions in Russia over the past eight years, CIPE had developed tips and recommendations for successful coalition work. CIPE formed 18 coalitions in Russia. Some have succeeded. Some have failed. Some have had a mixed impact depending on factors connected to leadership and funding. Here we examine some of the factors that played a significant role in success or failure.

First, hiring full time staff is a crucial step. Ideally, this would include staff members dedicated exclusively to the coalition's work. Retaining staff is also an important feature. The staff of an association accumulates experience over time, and this collective experience is crucial to building relationships with both business leaders and government officials. Aside from personnel, a coalition's organizational structure is a key factor in determining effectiveness. Establishing clear lines of authority and project priorities helps ensure efficient use of coalition staff, even when duties are divided between different organizations. Additionally, appropriate financing of staff time is a key factor in determining success.

An authoritative leader can also play a crucial role. Such a leader’s effectiveness depends as much on management style as on a level of trust between the leader and membership. With enough trust from members and the community, a strong leader can enhance an association’s power and represent members’ views without constant consultation. Constant changes in leadership or the loss of a charismatic leader reduce the effectiveness of the coalition and impede the cultivation of all-important personal relationships with officials.

Regardless of the size or funding of the leading association, the coalition must be able to mobilize quickly to act effectively. If the leading association is ponderous or unresponsive, opportunities will be lost. Effective advocacy requires nimble, established, and savvy leaders to be effective. The lead association needs to be able to build the coalition’s reputation as an expert representing small and medium business owners, with a footing equal to that of local civil society leaders and government. Too often, the business community is overlooked in the policy creation process. A coalition of business associations can change this perception. In Russia, CIPE observed that the business community in each region became more proactive about legislation after coalitions began having an impact on policymaking. When businesspeople noted the results of advocacy, they were motivated to participate.

Finally, when working to reduce corruption, it is vital that a coalition focus on the causes of corruption and not the practitioners. By targeting practitioners, the process becomes personal and it is easy to lose sight of problematic, systemic issues. The coalition becomes an avenger rather than a partner in the reform process. Drafting well-conceived legislation and enforcement mechanisms is the most effective means of eliminating corruption. This approach is also the least expensive, fastest, and most constructive approach to building bonds between business and government.
Conclusion

The process reviewed in this handbook may seem simple, but it takes time to implement. Creating a successful coalition is the first step. The advocacy component of legislative change is vital to making lasting alterations in a country’s business environment. The advocacy process described here combines all the essential elements in a single approach, but it is not the only way to instigate legislative change. There are many different ways to approach advocacy. The chosen approach, of course, should be guided by the conditions in the country.

It is important to keep in mind that changing a country’s business environment is an organic and evolutionary process, just as a democratic society is itself always in flux. As such, careful timing is important to success. Judging by the urgent emphasis at the highest levels of government on fighting corruption, now is an unprecedented time of opportunity in Russia. At the same time, each success seems to spawn new challenges. Those obstacles are usually surmountable, especially when existing partnerships, forged during the advocacy process, rally to the cause.
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