



2b rue Jules Ferry, 93100 Montreuil, France  
Tel. +33 1 48 51 18 90, Fax +33 1 48 51 95 12  
Email: [facilitator@eca-watch.org](mailto:facilitator@eca-watch.org)

Paris, 18 June 2007

Ms. Nicole Bollen  
Chair  
Export Credit Working Group  
c/o OECD  
2, rue André Pascal  
75775 Paris Cedex 16  
Fax: 01 44 30 61 58  
Email: [Xcred.Secretariat@oecd.org](mailto:Xcred.Secretariat@oecd.org)

Dear Ms. Bollen,

The 2006 OECD Recommendation to deter bribery in officially supported export credits provides for a form of peer review process to determine how the Anti-Bribery Convention and 1997 Recommendation are being taken into account in national official export credit systems and to consider further steps to combat bribery in respect of officially supported export credits.

Under OECD peer review processes, Member countries “review each other’s policies and performance and monitor implementation of and compliance with agreed measures. Where countries fall short, they come under pressure from their peers to take action to meet requirements.”<sup>1</sup>

In this context, we would appreciate being advised of actions taken or being contemplated by the ECG to review the performance of the Export Credit Guarantee Department of the UK. Recent press reports and the OECD Working Group on Bribery have expressed considerable concern over ECGD supported transactions which may not be consistent with the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention.

In accordance with article 4.2 of the 2003 Action Statement on Bribery and Official Export Credits, article 1(b) of the 2006 Recommendation, Question 2 of the September 2005 OECD Survey on Measures taken to combat bribery in officially supported export credits, and Question 3 of the May 2007 version of the questionnaire, did the ECGD notify the OECD, or can the ECGD provide evidence, that in granting guarantees to BAE Systems post-2003, it invited the applicant to provide an undertaking/declaration that neither they, nor anyone acting on their behalf, have been engaged or will engage in bribery in any transaction?

In accordance with article 4.6 of the 2003 Action Statement on Bribery and Official Export Credits and articles 1(i) AND 1(j) of the 2006 Recommendation, has the ECGD referred any evidence of suspected bribery by BAE Systems to the appropriate national authorities since

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.oecd.org/site/0,3407,en\\_21571361\\_37949547\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/site/0,3407,en_21571361_37949547_1_1_1_1_1,00.html)

2003, and if so, has it informed the OECD?

In accordance with article 1(f) of the 2006 Recommendation, has the ECGD notified the OECD that it is undertaking enhanced due diligence, since, on the basis of extensive, credible press reports, the Member should now have reason to believe that bribery may be involved in an ECGD transaction?

If these questions have not yet been asked of the ECGD by the ECG, at what point in the peer review process will these and/or other questions be raised so as to ensure the credibility of the ECG peer review process with respect to the OECD Recommendation on Bribery and Officially Supported Export Credits?

Yours sincerely,

*Bob Thomson*

for ECA Watch

cc: Ms. Janet West, ECG  
Dr. Mark Pieth, OECD Working Group on Bribery  
c/o [nicola.ehlermann-cache@oecd.org](mailto:nicola.ehlermann-cache@oecd.org)