



The Guide to Corporate Compliance

Editors

Andrew M Levine

Reynaldo Manzanarez Radilla

Valeria Plastino

Fabio Selhorst

Published in association with



The Guide to Corporate Compliance

Editors
Andrew M Levine
Reynaldo Manzanarez Radilla
Valeria Plastino
Fabio Selhorst

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd
This article was first published in June 2020
For further information please contact Natalie.Clarke@lbresearch.com

LATIN LAWYER

Published in association with
LACCA

Publisher
Clare Bolton

Deputy Publisher
Rosie Creswell

Senior Account Manager
Monica Fuertes

Senior Content Coordinator
Hannah Higgins

Head of Production
Adam Myers

Production Editor
Caroline Fewkes

Subeditor
Martin Roach

Chief Executive Officer
Nick Brailey

Published in the United Kingdom
by Law Business Research Ltd, London
Meridian House, 34-35 Farringdon Street, London, EC4A 4HL, UK
© 2020 Law Business Research Ltd
www.latinlawyer.com

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients.

Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of March 2020, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – clare.bolton@lbresearch.com

ISBN 978-1-83862-428-6

Printed in Great Britain by
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire
Tel: 0844 2480 112

Acknowledgements

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

Alvarez & Marsal, LLP

Andrew Jánosky

Anheuser-Busch InBev

Barbosa Müssnich Aragão

Beccar Varela

Buckley LLP

Camargo Corrêa Infra

Carey y Cía

Debevoise & Plimpton LLP

FeldensMadruga

Hogan Lovells

Kestener, Granja & Vieira Advogados

Maeda, Ayres & Sarubbi Advogados

Philippi Prietocarrizosa Ferrero DU & Uría

QIL+4 Abogados

Quinn Emanuel LLP

Reynaldo Manzanarez Radilla

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

Sullivan & Cromwell LLP

TozziniFreire Advogados

Villarreal-VGF

Von Wobeser y Sierra, SC

Whirlpool Corporation

Publisher's Note

Latin Lawyer and LACCA are delighted to publish *The Guide to Corporate Compliance*.

Edited by Andrew M Levine, a litigation partner at Debevoise & Plimpton LLP, Reynaldo Manzanarez Radilla, a corporate attorney and compliance professional, Valeria Plastino, vice president, general counsel and regional ethics and compliance officer at CenturyLink, and Fabio Selhorst, general counsel, chief integrity officer and chief communications officer at Camargo Corrêa Infra, this new guide brings together the knowledge and experience of leading practitioners from a variety of disciplines and provides guidance that will benefit all practitioners.

We are delighted to have worked with so many leading individuals to produce *The Guide to Corporate Compliance*. If you find it useful, you may also like the other books in the Latin Lawyer series, including *The Guide to Infrastructure and Energy Investment* and *The Guide to Corporate Crisis Management*, as well as our jurisdictional references and our new tool providing overviews of regulators in Latin America.

My thanks to the editors for their vision and energy in pursuing this project and to my colleagues in production for achieving such a polished work.

Contents

Introduction	1
<i>Andrew M Levine</i>	

Part 1: Setting the Scene

1 The Evolution of Compliance: How Did We Get Here?	11
<i>Peter Spivack and Isabel Costa Carvalho</i>	
2 Latin America's Compliance Climate Today	26
<i>Jocelyn E Strauber, Julie Bédard, Lauren A Eisenberg and Mayra Suárez</i>	

Part 2: Building an Effective Compliance Programme

3 The Profile of a Successful Compliance Department.....	51
<i>Reynaldo Manzanarez Radilla</i>	
4 Developing a Robust Compliance Programme in Latin America.....	59
<i>Brendan P Cullen and Anthony J Lewis</i>	
5 The Board, Compliance and Rising Expectations	76
<i>Andrew Jánosky</i>	
6 Building Effective Internal Communication Channels.....	89
<i>Daniel R Alonso, Andrew P Pennacchia, Benjamin W Hutten and Norma Ramirez-Marin</i>	
7 Employee Compliance Training: Adapting Programmes to Local Laws and Customs	102
<i>Luis A García Campuzano</i>	
8 How to Conduct Internal Investigations of Alleged Wrongdoing.....	115
<i>Adrián Magallanes Pérez and Diego Sierra Laris</i>	
9 Embracing Technology	127
<i>Matt Galvin and Vincent M Walden</i>	

Part 3: Compliance as a Business Advantage

10 Selling Integrity	141
<i>Carolina Goldenberg and Jussara Rocha Tibério</i>	

11	Assessing and Mitigating Compliance Risks in the Transactional Context	148
	<i>Andrew M Levine and Erich O Grosz</i>	
12	The Advantages of a Robust Compliance Programme in the Event of an External Investigation.....	159
	<i>Shin Jae Kim, Renata Muzzi Gomes de Almeida, Giovanni Paolo Falcetta, Karla Lini Maeji, Fabio Rawet Heilberg and Laís Neme Cury Augusto Rezende</i>	
13	Certifications of Ethics: Are They Worth It?	174
	<i>José Quiñones, Evelyn Rebuli, Ignacio Grazioso, Javier Castellan and Luis Pedro Martínez</i>	
Part 4: Legislative and Regulatory Pressure Points		
14	Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorist Financing Law	193
	<i>Ana Maria Belotto, Antenor Madruga and Mariana Tumbiolo</i>	
15	Environmental and Health and Safety Compliance: Avoiding Costly Penalties	204
	<i>Luis Fernando Macías Gómez, Alexander Acosta Jurado, María Paula González Espinel, Carolina Porras and Irene Salazar</i>	
16	Navigating Competition Rules From a Chile Perspective.....	214
	<i>Lorena Pavic, José Pardo and Benjamín Torres</i>	
17	Compliance Checks for Avoiding Tax Evasion Fines	229
	<i>Carolina Rozo Gutiérrez and Pamela Alarcón Arias</i>	
Part 5: Staying Compliant in Higher-Risk Industries		
18	Working with the Public Sector: How to Say ‘No’ to Bribery in the Oil and Gas and Infrastructure Industries in Brazil.....	245
	<i>Anna Carolina Malta Spilborghs and José Guilherme Berman</i>	
19	Risk Management in the Financial Services Industry in Argentina and the Changes Being Adopted.....	253
	<i>Maximiliano D’Auro and Gustavo Papeschi</i>	
20	Data Privacy and Protection Relating to Healthcare in Europe, the United States and Brazil	265
	<i>Fabio Alonso Vieira and Carolina Barbosa Cunha Costa</i>	
Part 6: Trends to Watch		
21	The Creep of Legislation Targeting Private Corruption	281
	<i>Ben O’Neil and Francesca Wool</i>	
22	External Compliance Monitorships	294
	<i>Erica Sellin Sarubbi and Tomás Fezas Vital Mesquita</i>	
	About the Authors.....	305
	Contributors’ Contact Details.....	327

Part 1

Setting the Scene

2

Latin America's Compliance Climate Today

Jocelyn E Strauber, Julie Bédard, Lauren A Eisenberg and Mayra Suárez¹

Introduction

Since 2014, Brazil's *Operation Car Wash* investigation into widespread bribery and corruption involving politicians and state-owned enterprises has dominated headlines and captured public attention across Latin America and around the world. Among other things, the investigation led to the conviction of one former Brazilian president² and the impeachment of another,³ the guilty pleas of a number of Brazilian and foreign companies, payments of millions of dollars in penalties and more than 200 individual convictions in Brazil.⁴ In the wake of that unprecedented enforcement activity, legislators, enforcement agencies and judiciaries within and outside Latin America have made substantial efforts to combat corruption in their respective regions. The US Department of Justice (US DOJ) and US Securities and Exchange Commission (US SEC), for example, have brought corruption-related charges against more than 50 individuals and corporations in respect of conduct in or related to Latin America since 2015, often in collaboration with enforcement counterparts in other countries.⁵

The international interest in combating corruption in the region shows no sign of abating. In March 2019, the US Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) announced the Miami

-
- 1 Jocelyn E Strauber and Julie Bédard are partners and Lauren A Eisenberg and Mayra Suárez are associates at Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP.
 - 2 Associated Press, 'Former Brazilian President Lula convicted in second corruption case', *Los Angeles Times* (6 February 2019) <<https://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-brazil-lula-conviction-20190206-story.html>>.
 - 3 Romero, Simon, 'Dilma Rousseff Is Ousted as Brazil's President in Impeachment Vote', *The New York Times* (31 August 2016) <<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/americas/brazil-dilma-rousseff-impeached-removed-president.html>>.
 - 4 Brazil's Federal Public Ministry, 'Caso Lava Jato – Resultados' (12 February 2020) <www.mpf.mp.br/grandes-casos/lava-jato/resultados>.
 - 5 See section below titled 'Recent enforcement trends'.

International Corruption Squad (a task force intended to work alongside the FBI's other international corruption squads, the US SEC and the US DOJ's Fraud and Money Laundering Asset Forfeiture sections) signalling the continuing focus of US authorities on corruption in Latin America. The squad 'was created to combat international corruption by addressing foreign bribery, kleptocracy, and international antitrust matters . . . occurring outside US borders but having a nexus to the US'.⁶

In this context, companies operating in Latin America should be mindful of recent legislative, judicial and enforcement trends, and of global regulators' focus on fighting corruption in the region. This chapter reviews:

- recent trends in legislative and constitutional anti-corruption enforcement regimes in Latin America;
- changes in data protection regimes within and outside Latin America that may affect corporate investigations in the region; and
- global enforcement of corruption-related conduct in Latin America, including cooperation amongst US, Latin American and other regulators.

Key legislative changes in Latin America and elsewhere

Development and strengthening of anti-corruption regimes

Corporate criminal liability

In the past five years, many Latin American countries, by legislation or constitutional amendment, have established corporate criminal liability for bribery and corruption offences, with respect to conduct by agents of or for the benefit of corporations or similar legal entities. For example, Argentina (March 2018),⁷ Mexico (May 2015)⁸ and Peru (April 2016, amended 2017)⁹ now provide for corporate criminal liability for bribery of domestic public officials; in some countries corporations can be liable for related conduct such as money laundering, commercial bribery and bribery of foreign officials.

6 Press release, Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI], 'FBI Announces New International Corruption Squad in Miami Field Office' (5 March 2019) <<https://www.fbi.gov/news/pressrel/press-releases/fbi-announces-new-international-corruption-squad-in-miami-field-office>>.

7 See Law No. 27401 of 1 December 2017 [CXXV-33.763] B.O. 3 (Arg.) <<https://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/docs/electronic/106245/130242/f-2006629615/ley%2027401%20argentina.pdf>>. The law provides for criminal liability for offences, including foreign bribery and false books and records, committed with the company's intervention or in the company's name, interest or benefit. Penalties include fines, suspension of commercial activities, disqualification from public tenders, cancellation of corporate registration, loss of government benefits and publication of the conviction. There is no retroactive liability.

8 See 'Decreto por el que se reforman, adicionan y derogan diversas disposiciones de la Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos, en materia de combate a la corrupción', *Official Federal Gazette* (Mexico) (DOF 27-5-2015) <www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/proceso/docleg/62/223_DOF_27may15.pdf> (providing for criminal liability for (1) offences (including public bribery) committed in the entity's name, on its behalf, for its benefit or using means provided by the entity (2) where the entity did not have proper controls in place). See also General Law of the National Anti-Corruption System, *Official Federal Gazette* (Mexico) (DOF 18-07-2016) <www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/LGSNA.pdf>.

9 See Law No. 30424 of 21 April 2016, *El Peruano* (Peru) <www.leyes.congreso.gob.pe/Documentos/Leyes/30424.pdf> (providing for criminal liability for offences, including public bribery and money laundering, committed in the name or on behalf of the legal entity for its direct or indirect benefit).

Additionally, in some Latin American countries – such as Brazil, Colombia and Ecuador – only individuals, not corporations, can be held criminally liable for anti-corruption violations, though companies in Colombia may be held jointly and severally liable with employees and executives who engage in corrupt conduct.¹⁰ In Brazil, corporations can only be held criminally liable for environmental violations.¹¹ In practice, however, corporations will retain criminal counsel and closely monitor any proceedings against current and former executives and other employees, particularly given the other forms of liability that corporations face.

Mandated or recommended compliance programmes and other factors in leniency determinations

A number of countries have passed laws relating to corporate compliance programmes that are (1) required, (2) recommended or (3) if implemented, can entitle a company in violation of anti-corruption laws to leniency.¹²

- In Brazil, although compliance programmes are not currently required under federal law, companies with effective compliance programmes may be entitled to a fine reduction of up to 4 per cent in civil and administrative proceedings.¹³
- Chile provides companies that have effective 'prevention models' with complete immunity from corporate liability for corrupt conduct.¹⁴

10 See Law 599 of 24 July 2000, *Official Gazette* (Colombia), 22 <https://www.unodc.org/res/cld/legislation/can/codigo-penal_html/Codigo_Penal.pdf>; see Law No. 9605 of 12 February 1998, *Official Gazette* (Brazil) (13 February 1998) <www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l9605.htm>.

11 Law No. 9605 (footnote 10, above).

12 Federal and certain state laws in Brazil require companies that contract with state entities to have compliance programmes. See, e.g., Decree No. 6112 of 2 February 2018, *Official Gazette* (Brazil) (6 February 2018); Decree No. 7,753 of 17 October 2017, *Official Gazette* (Brazil) (18 October 2017); Decree No. 15228 of 25 September 2018, *Official Gazette* (Brazil) (26 September 2018); Decree No. 4370 of 27 December 2018, *Amazon Official Gazette* (Brazil) (27 December 2018); Decree No. 20489 of 6 June 2019, *States Official Gazette* (Brazil) (10 June 2019).

13 Decree No. 12846 of 1 August 2013, *Official Gazette* (Brazil) (2 August 2013) <www.in.gov.br/materia/-/asset_publisher/KujrwoTZC2Mb/content/id/30042702/do1-2013-08-02-lei-n-12-846-de-1-de-agosto-de-2013-30042696> [LAC] (no requirement for corporate compliance programmes); Decree No. 8420 of 18 March 2015, *Official Gazette* (Brazil) (19 March 2015) <www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2015-2018/2015/Decreto/D8420.htm> (providing credit for effective compliance programmes, defining parameters for evaluating compliance programmes (e.g., customised to each legal entity and its activities, commitment by senior management, training) and providing for the administrative liability of legal persons for the commission of acts against public, national or foreign administrations); Instruction No. 607 of 17 June 2019, *Official Gazette* (Brazil) (18 June 2019) <www.in.gov.br/web/dou/-/instrucao-n-607-de-17-de-junho-de-2019-164059674>. Securities and Exchange Commission of Brazil, Rule No. 607 establishes that any publicly held company with an effective compliance programme may have their fines reduced by up to 25 per cent.

14 See Law No. 20393 (establishing the criminal responsibility of legal persons in the crimes of laundering of assets, financing of terrorism and bribery), 11 November 2009, *Official Gazette* (Chile) <www.oas.org/juridico/spanish/mesicic3_chl_ley20393.pdf> (stating that an effective prevention model includes: (1) systems to identify risks, establish specific protocols, rules and procedures to prevent the commission of said offences, and identify procedures for administrating and auditing the entity's financial resources; (2) internal administrative sanctions; (3) procedures for reporting wrongdoing; and (4) procedures to detect and correct systemic failures in the prevention model).

- In Argentina, Law 27401 sets forth mandatory and recommended components of a corporate compliance programme:¹⁵

Mandatory	Recommended
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Code of ethics or Code of conduct · Specific policies or procedures to prevent criminal offences in public tenders, administrative agreements or in any other dealings with public administration · Periodic compliance training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Periodic risk analyses and review of the compliance programme · Clear anti-corruption tone from the top · Whistle-blower reporting channels · Whistle-blower protection policy · Internal investigation protocols to protect the rights of employees under investigation and to impose effective sanctions for misconduct · Third-party due diligence policies · Due diligence policies relating to mergers and acquisitions · Appointment of a compliance officer

Some countries provide incentives in the form of credit or leniency for disclosure of misconduct to government authorities and cooperation with investigations. For example, in Peru, the Public Prosecutor's Office can enter into leniency agreements – subject to judicial approval – with individuals and companies who are involved in the commission of certain crimes, including bribery of public officials, when the company or individual (1) voluntarily abandons the criminal activities, (2) admits freely, or does not contradict, the facts concerning the criminal conduct and (3) presents himself or herself to the Public Prosecutor's Office, demonstrating a willingness to provide useful information.¹⁶

Similarly, under Ecuador's Criminal Code, individuals who engage in corrupt conduct can obtain a reduction in their sentence if they provide accurate and verifiable information that (1) clarifies facts under investigation, (2) results in the identification of culpable persons or (3) helps to prevent, neutralise or impede the commission of a crime of equal or greater significance.¹⁷ For an individual to receive cooperation credit, the prosecutor must confirm in the charging document presented to the court that the cooperation was effective.¹⁸

Expansion of prohibited and regulated conduct

At the same time that some countries in Latin America are offering leniency to those companies that cooperate or maintain an effective compliance programme, a number of Latin American countries have expanded the reach of their anti-bribery statutes. In Peru and Chile, for instance, the prohibited conduct extends beyond the bribery of public officials and includes commercial bribery, that is to say bribery of individuals acting in a private

¹⁵ See Law No. 27401 (footnote 7, above).

¹⁶ See Legislative Decree No. 957, Criminal Procedure Code (Peru), 29 July 2004 <http://spij.minjus.gob.pe/content/publicaciones_oficiales/img/CODIGOPROCESALPENAL.pdf>.

¹⁷ See Organic Integral Criminal Code, Official Registry (Ecuador), 3 February 2014 <https://www.aduana.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/CODIGO_ORGANICO_INTEGRAL_PENAL.pdf>.

¹⁸ *id.*, at Articles 492 and 493.

capacity.¹⁹ Others, such as Venezuela, have also criminalised bribery of foreign, not just domestic, government officials.²⁰

Some countries also have placed restrictions on corporate political contributions as a means to combat corruption. For example, in Chile, companies are prohibited from making political contributions; these may be made by individuals only.²¹ In Colombia, any company that makes a contribution greater than 2.5 per cent of the total contribution permitted under law to any president, governor or mayor may not enter into public contracts with entities administered by the candidate while the candidate is in office.²²

Data privacy and implications for corporate investigations

There have been significant changes in data privacy and data protection regimes across the world during the past five years. In particular, on 25 May 2018, the European Union implemented a comprehensive data protection framework, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). This new framework may govern the collection of data of Latin American companies in certain circumstances. It also has prompted several Latin American countries to re-examine their data protection regimes.²³

To date, Brazil has enacted the most comprehensive reform in the region – the General Data Protection Law (LGPD) – which was approved, as amended, in July 2019 and comes into full effect in August 2020.²⁴ Similar to the GDPR, the LGPD establishes a comprehensive data protection system in Brazil and imposes rules for the collection, processing, storage, use and transfer of personal data. The LGPD applies broadly, and extraterritorially, to (1) the processing or collection of personal data in Brazil, (2) the processing of data anywhere in the world related to natural persons located in Brazil or (3) the processing of personal data for the purpose of offering goods or services in Brazil.²⁵ The National Data Protection Authority enforces the LGPD. Non-compliance can result in sanctions, including warnings with a time limit for taking corrective action, suspensions of processing activities that violate the law

19 See Law No. 21121 (amending the Criminal Code and other legal rules for the prevention, detection and prosecution of corruption), 20 November 2018, *Official Gazette* (Chile); Legislative Decree No. 1385, Criminal Code (Peru), 4 September 2018 <https://cdn.www.gob.pe/uploads/document/file/192144/DL_1385.pdf>.

20 *Official Gazette* No. 6155 (Venezuela), 19 November 2014 <www.mindefensa.gob.ve/COMISION/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/leycontracorruption.pdf>.

21 See Law No. 20900 (for the strengthening and transparency of democracy), *Official Gazette* (Chile), 14 April 2016 <<https://www.diariooficial.interior.gob.cl/media/2016/04/14/do-20160414.pdf>>.

22 See Law 1474 of 12 July 2011, *Official Gazette* (Colombia) <<http://wp.presidencia.gov.co/sitios/normativa/leyes/Documents/Juridica/Ley%201474%20de%202012%20de%20Julio%20de%202011.pdf>>; see also Law No. 28094 of 30 November 2017 (Peru) (prohibiting political parties from receiving contributions from companies) <https://portal.jne.gob.pe/portal_documentos/files/fd6aadd2-0361-433b-8cab-ae2a0c568b7.pdf>.

23 See Bojalil, Paulina; et al., 'Data privacy reform gains momentum in Latin America', *Inter-American Development Bank Blog* (12 February 2019) <<https://blogs.iadb.org/conocimiento-abierto/en/data-privacy-reform-gains-momentum-in-latin-america/>>.

24 See Decree No. 13853 of 8 July 2019 (amending Law No. 13,709), *Official Gazette* (Brazil) (9 July 2019) <www.in.gov.br/web/dou/-/lei-n-13853-de-8-de-julho-de-2019-190107897>.

25 See Decree No. 13709 of 14 August 2018, *Official Gazette* (Brazil) (15 August 2018) <www.in.gov.br/materia/-/asset_publisher/KujrwoTZC2Mb/content/id/36849373/do1-2018-08-15-lei-no-13-709-de-14-de-agosto-de-2018-36849337>.

and public disclosure of the infraction.²⁶ It can also include fines of up to 2 per cent of annual revenues generated in Brazil during the prior year, excluding taxes, up to a maximum of 50 million reais per infraction.²⁷

Other countries in the region have taken steps to increase privacy and security protection for personal data. For example, on 18 September 2018, former Argentine President Mauricio Macri submitted a bill to the National Congress to replace Argentina's Personal Data Protection Law 25326, which has been in place since 2000.²⁸ If passed, the new law would comprehensively reform Argentina's data protection laws, making them more consistent with international standards and the GDPR. Similarly, the National Congress of Chile is currently considering a new data protection bill that would enhance Chile's existing data protection regulation, Law No. 19628/1999 on the Protection of Private Life.

Legislation in the United States enables US authorities to obtain data stored overseas. A law enacted in 2018 is notable in that it could enable US law enforcement to compel the production of data residing in Latin America. On 23 March 2018, President Donald Trump signed the Clarifying Lawful Overseas Use of Data Act (the CLOUD Act), which allows US law enforcement agents to compel US electronic communication service providers to produce data stored outside the United States in certain circumstances.²⁹ The CLOUD Act amended the Stored Communications Act³⁰ to clarify that a US electronic communication service provider must 'disclose the contents of a wire or electronic communication, and any record or other information pertaining to a customer or subscriber' within its possession, custody or control, regardless of where the data is located.³¹ Service providers can challenge warrants seeking data if they reasonably believe that the customer or subscriber that is the subject of the warrant 'is not a United States person and does not reside in the United States' or if the disclosure would 'create a material risk that the provider would violate the laws of a qualifying foreign government'.³² The CLOUD Act also allows certain foreign governments to enter into bilateral agreements with the United States and request data directly from US electronic communication service providers, instead of through a mutual legal assistance treaty.³³

26 *id.*, at Article 52.

27 *id.*

28 See Message No. MEN-2018-147-APN-PTE (Argentina), 19 September 2018 <https://www.argentina.gob.ar/sites/default/files/mensaje_ndeg_147-2018_datos_personales.pdf>.

29 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Pub. L. No. 115-141, §§ 101–106, 132 Stat 348, 1213–25 (23 March 2018).

30 18 U.S.C. 121 § 2701, *et seq.*

31 Consolidated Appropriations Act, § 103(a)(1).

32 *id.*, at § 103(b).

33 *id.*, at §§ 104 and 105. As at 20 February 2020, only the United Kingdom had entered into a bilateral agreement with the United States.

Recent enforcement trends

State-owned entities

Operation Car Wash: Petrobras and beyond

Although *Operation Car Wash* began with *Petróleo Brasileiro SA* (Petrobras), Brazil's state-owned and state-controlled energy company, many other state-owned or state-controlled enterprises have been implicated across Latin America. Companies interacting with state-owned or state-controlled enterprises in Latin America should scrutinise these interactions.

Between December 2016 and December 2017, at least four companies reached resolutions with the US DOJ or the US SEC (or both), acknowledging bribe payments made to or through Petrobras, as well as, in some instances, additional improper payments to other government or state-owned entities (SOEs) or officials.³⁴ The alleged misconduct of these companies spanned Latin America – including alleged payments in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Venezuela. In connection with the US resolutions, the Brazilian authorities were also able to secure independent settlements with all four companies.³⁵

Following Odebrecht's December 2016 resolution with US, Brazilian and Swiss authorities, prosecutors from 10 Latin American countries formed a task force to investigate potential bribes paid by the company, emphasising information sharing and cooperation in the region.³⁶ As a result of its efforts to cooperate, the company has reached agreements with prosecutors in at least six countries in Latin America.

On 27 September 2018, Petrobras agreed to pay US\$1.78 billion – at the time, the largest single US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA) resolution – to resolve investigations by the US DOJ, the US SEC and Brazilian authorities.³⁷ Petrobras acknowledged that it received

34 See, e.g., Letter from Sandra Moser, Acting Chief, Fraud Section, US Dep't Justice [US DOJ], to F Joseph Warin, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP (26 September 2018) [hereinafter US DOJ Press release, 26 September 2018] <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/press-release/file/1096706/download>>; Press release, US DOJ, 'SBM Offshore N.V. & U.S.-based Subsidiary Resolve Foreign Corrupt Practices Act Case Involving Bribes in Five Countries' (29 November 2017) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/sbm-offshore-nv-and-united-states-based-subsidiary-resolve-foreign-corrupt-practices-act-case>>.

35 See, e.g., 'Keppel Offshore & Marine Reaches Global Resolution with Authorities in the U.S., Brazil and Singapore', Keppel Offshore & Marine (23 December 2017) <www.keppelom.com/en/news-item.aspx?sid=2605&aid=5875&title=keppel-offshore-marine-reaches-global-resolution-with-authorities-in-the-us-brazil-and-singapore>; Press release, SBM Offshore, 'SBM Offshore achieves settlement with Dutch Public Prosecutor's Office over alleged improper payments. United States Department of Justice closes out the matter' (12 November 2014) <<https://www.sbmoffshore.com/?press-release=sbm-offshore-achieves-settlement-dutch-public-prosecutors-office-alleged-impropet-payments-united-states-department-justice-closes-matter>>.

36 See Boadle, Anthony, 'Latin American prosecutors join forces on Odebrecht bribes', *Reuters* (17 February 2017) <<https://fr.reuters.com/article/idUSKBN15W2H7>>.

37 Press release, US DOJ, 'Petróleo Brasileiro S.A. – Petrobras Agrees to Pay More Than \$850 Million for FCPA Violations' (27 September 2018) [hereinafter US DOJ Press release, 27 September 2019] <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/petr-leo-brasileiro-sa-petrobras-agrees-pay-more-850-million-fcpa-violations>>; US DOJ Press release, 26 September 2018 (footnote 34, above); Press release, US Securities and Exchange Commission [US SEC], 'Petrobras Reaches Settlement With SEC for Misleading Investors' (27 September 2018) <https://www.sec.gov/news/press-release/2018-215?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery>.

bribe payments from companies in exchange for contracts, which Petrobras executives retained or passed to Brazilian politicians and others with influence over public projects.³⁸

As part of its resolution, Petrobras agreed to cooperate with other current investigations into related conduct. Both US and Latin American authorities have been active in prosecuting companies that paid bribes to and through Petrobras. Since the resolution of the Petrobras investigation in September 2018, the US DOJ and the US SEC have, individually or jointly, reached resolutions with at least three additional companies for Petrobras-related misconduct.

Other SOEs

Operation Car Wash led investigators far beyond Petrobras. In April 2015, 'Brazilian prosecutors said they had also found evidence of fraud at the country's health ministry and at state-owned bank Caixa Econômica Federal'.³⁹

Brazil's state-owned electric utility, Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras SA (Eletrobras), has also been the focus of anti-corruption investigations by both Brazilian and US authorities. In July 2015, Brazilian authorities arrested the chief executive of Eletrobras and executed nearly two dozen related search warrants.⁴⁰ In October 2016, Eletrobras filed a delayed annual report for 2015 'because we required additional time to conduct an investigation into certain allegations relating to "Operação Lava Jato"' and disclosed that it was cooperating with the US DOJ, the US SEC, Brazilian authorities and others.⁴¹ In August 2018, Eletrobras disclosed that the US DOJ declined to prosecute the company for FCPA violations but, in December 2018, Eletrobras paid US\$2.5 million to settle US SEC charges that it violated the books and records and internal controls provisions of the FCPA.⁴²

Operation Car Wash has also brought investigators to SOEs in other countries. For example, in December 2016, after the investigation unearthed allegations that bribes were paid to an executive of a Mexican state-owned and state-controlled company, *Petróleos Mexicanos* (PEMEX) began investigating whether any of its executives received illicit payments in connection with the scheme.⁴³ In July 2019, 'the Federal Attorney General's Office [in Mexico] announced that it had obtained several arrest warrants against a former executive officer of PEMEX and other members of his family in connection with alleged crimes' identified by *Operation Car Wash*.⁴⁴ As of September 2019, PEMEX announced that it

38 US DOJ Press release, 27 September 2019 (footnote 37, above).

39 Jelmsayer, Rogerio; Magalhaes, Luciana, 'CEO of Brazil's Eletronuclear Arrested in Wide Corruption Probe', *The Wall Street Journal* (28 July 2015) <https://www.wsj.com/articles/brazil-car-wash-corruption-probe-spreads-to-eletronuclear-1438091569?mod=article_inline>.

40 id.

41 *Eletrobras*, Annual Report (Form 20-F) (11 October 2016).

42 Press release, US SEC, 'SEC Charges Eletrobras with Violating Books and Records and Internal Accounting Controls Provisions of the FCPA' (26 December 2018) <<https://www.sec.gov/enforce/34-84973-s>>.

43 *Petróleos Mexicanos* (Form 6-K) (20 September 2017).

44 *Petróleos Mexicanos* (Form 6-K) (11 September 2019).

was cooperating with Mexican authorities.⁴⁵ PEMEX is also allegedly under investigation by the US SEC and the US DOJ.⁴⁶

During the past few years, US authorities have also undertaken sweeping investigations of alleged corruption at state-owned and state-controlled entities in Venezuela and Ecuador, though these have largely resulted in individual enforcement actions. In at least one instance, the US DOJ declined to prosecute an entity, citing its full cooperation in connection with the bribes it paid to induce the purchase of its products, although the US DOJ did require disgorgement of profits.⁴⁷

In June 2019, Citgo Petroleum Corp (Citgo) confirmed that it received a subpoena requesting information relating to bribery in Venezuela. Citgo has been implicated in certain individuals' guilty pleas but has not been publicly charged nor has it reached a public corporate resolution.⁴⁸ In July 2018, the US DOJ subpoenaed documents from a company relating to potential violations of the FCPA and money-laundering statutes in Venezuela and elsewhere. In April and December 2019, the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the UK's Serious Fraud Office (SFO), respectively, notified the company of investigations into potential corruption. In March 2019, a US federal judge dismissed for lack of standing a suit brought by a *Petróleos de Venezuela, SA (PdVSA)* litigation trust alleging that the company and other corporate and individual defendants paid bribes to corrupt PdVSA employees.

For example, while the US DOJ's investigation for the most part has not (yet) resulted in the prosecution of *Empresa Pública de Hidrocarburos del Ecuador (PetroEcuador)*, the US DOJ has actively prosecuted individuals who paid or received bribes related to PetroEcuador. These prosecutions include Frank Roberto Chatburn Ripalda, a dual US/Ecuador citizen who allegedly conspired with an oil services contractor to pay nearly US\$3 million in bribes to PetroEcuador officials through offshore shell companies.⁴⁹ On 13 December 2019, PetroEcuador filed a motion seeking to establish its victim status and its entitlement to restitution in the US DOJ's case against Chatburn. In its motion, PetroEcuador argued that it is the principal corporate victim of Chatburn's criminal acts and that PetroEcuador has suffered financial losses as a direct result of Chatburn's and his co-conspirators' criminal acts.

45 *id.*

46 See Tourliere, Mathieu, 'EU investiga ilegalidades e irregularidades en Pemex de 2012 a 2018', *Proceso* (14 September 2019) <<https://www.proceso.com.mx/599784/eu-investiga-ilegalidades-e-irregularidades-en-pemex-de-2012-a-2018>>.

47 Letter from Lorinda Laryea, Trial Attorney, and Daniel Kahn, Deputy Chief, US DOJ, Criminal Division, to Steven A Tyrell, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP (29 September 2016) <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/file/899116/download>>.

48 See Wethe, David; Kassai, Lucia, 'Citgo Gets U.S. Subpoena Related to Venezuela Bribery Probe', *Bloomberg* (3 June 2019) <<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-06-03/citgo-gets-u-s-subpoena-related-to-venezuela-bribery-probe>>.

49 See, e.g., Plea Agreement, *United States v. Jose Raul de la Torre Prado*, No. 19-20580-CR-Williams (S.D. Fla. filed 15 November 2019) <https://globalinvestigationsreview.com/digital_assets/087e7a85-4175-4fe4-9b28-313015a36079/DeLaTorre_pleaagreement.pdf>; Press release, US DOJ, 'Miami-Based Businessman Pleads Guilty to FCPA and Money Laundering Violations in Scheme Involving PetroEcuador Officials' (23 January 2020) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/miami-based-businessman-pleads-guilty-fcpa-and-money-laundering-violations-scheme-involving>>.

PetroEcuador argued that it was not aware of the illegal bribery scheme until the publication of the Panama Papers in May 2016 and that PetroEcuador contacted the Ecuadorian prosecutors and supported the investigations and prosecutions relating to the bribery scheme.

The US government opposed PetroEcuador's motion on 26 December 2019, arguing that PetroEcuador (1) does not qualify as a victim under the Crime Victim's Restitution Act because it is an SOE, (2) was complicit in the bribery and money-laundering schemes and is therefore precluded from qualifying as a victim and (3) is not entitled to restitution under the Mandatory Victim Restitution Act (MVRA) 'for any alleged harm resulting from conduct that was not charged or for alleged harms not directly and proximately caused by the Defendant's criminal conduct and it is unable to show a direct and proximate causal link between this Defendant's conduct and any harm it allegedly suffered'.⁵⁰ As at 11 March 2020, the judge had not issued a ruling.

Previous requests for victim status by SOEs – including PetroEcuador – have been unsuccessful in US courts.⁵¹ In a September 2019 ruling rejecting PetroEcuador's motion for victim status, the court noted that 'the level of pervasive, constant, and consistent illegal conduct among EP PetroEcuador's principals was sufficient to preclude EP PetroEcuador from being recognized as a victim under the MVRA'.⁵² Similar motions by Instituto Costarricense de Electricidad of Costa Rica and Bariven SA, a subsidiary of PdVSA, were rejected.⁵³

Coordination amongst regulators

Recent actions reflect continuing coordination with respect to civil and criminal enforcement actions, both within the various federal, state and local law enforcement and regulatory agencies in the United States and among US law enforcement and regulatory agencies and their non-US counterparts.

In May 2018, the US DOJ formalised its position on coordination in a policy requiring US DOJ attorneys to coordinate internally, with other law enforcement partners in the

50 Petitioner Victim PetroEcuador's Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Recognition of its Rights as a Victim and Entitlement to Restitution, *United States v. Chatburn*, No. 1:18-cr-20312-CR-Cooke (S.D. Fla. filed 13 December 2019).

51 See Hudson, Clara, 'PetroEcuador is not a victim, Miami judge says', *Global Investigations Review* (23 September 2019) <<https://globalinvestigationsreview.com/article/jac/1197882/petroecuador-is-not-a-victim-miami-judge-says>>; Godoy, Jody, 'Lawyered-Up Suspect Says Taped Calls Violated Ethics Rule', *Law360* (22 May 2019) <<https://www.law360.com/articles/1162008/lawyered-up-suspect-says-taped-calls-violated-ethics-rule>>.

52 Omnibus Report and Recommendation, *United States v. Baquerizo*, No. 1:18-cr-20596-DPG (S.D. Fla. filed 20 September 2019).

53 See 'ICE Again Gets A Chilly Response From The 11th Circuit', *FCPA Professor* (6 August 2012) <<http://fcpaprofessor.com/ice-again-gets-a-chilly-response-from-the-11th-circuit/>> (summarizing Instituto Costarricense de Electricidad of Costa Rica's [ICE] failed attempt at petitioning for victim status in the *Alcatel-Lucent* bribery case at trial level and in its efforts to appeal before the 11th circuit); 'PdVSA "Victim" Petition Denied', *FCPA Professor* (28 February 2017) <<http://fcpaprofessor.com/pdvsa-victim-petition-denied/>> (summarising the unsuccessful attempt of Bariven SA, a subsidiary of Petróleos de Venezuela, SA [PdVSA], to get victim status and restitution; the US DOJ argued that Bariven was merely trying to gain access to sensitive and confidential information about its investigation into bribery and corruption at Bariven and its parent, PdVSA).

United States and counterparts abroad (the Anti-Piling On Policy).⁵⁴ The Anti-Piling On Policy recognises that '[w]hen multiple law enforcement and regulatory agencies pursue a single defendant for the same or substantially similar conduct', the result may be 'unwarranted and disproportionate penalties for that conduct'.⁵⁵ Coordination among regulators avoids 'unfair duplicative penalties' and 'depriv[ing] a company of the benefits of certainty and finality ordinarily available through a full and final settlement'.⁵⁶ As the then Attorney General Rod Rosenstein explained: 'We need to consider the impact on innocent employees, customers, and investors who seek to resolve problems and move on. We need to think about whether devoting resources to additional enforcement against an old scheme is more valuable than fighting a new one.'⁵⁷

The Anti-Piling on Policy consists of four principles, which apply to the US DOJ's cooperation with other US regulators and with foreign authorities:

- The US DOJ should 'not use criminal enforcement authority unfairly to extract, or to attempt to extract, additional civil or administrative monetary payments'. For example, the US DOJ 'should not employ the threat of criminal prosecution solely to persuade a company to pay a larger settlement in a civil case'.⁵⁸
- US DOJ attorneys in different departments should coordinate with each other – be it through 'crediting and apportionment of financial penalties, fines, and forfeitures, [or] other means of avoiding disproportionate punishment' – to 'achieve an overall equitable result'.⁵⁹
- The US DOJ should 'endeavor, as appropriate, to coordinate with and consider the amount of fines, penalties, and/or forfeiture paid to other federal, state, local, or foreign enforcement authorities that are seeking to resolve a case with a company for the same misconduct'.⁶⁰

54 US DOJ, Justice Manual § 1-12.100 – Coordination of Corporate Resolution Penalties in Parallel and/or Joint Investigations and Proceedings Arising from the Same Misconduct (May 2018) [hereinafter Justice Manual 1-12.100] <<https://www.justice.gov/jm/jm-1-12000-coordination-parallel-criminal-civil-regulatory-and-administrative-proceedings#1-12.100>>.

55 Deputy Associate Attorney General Stephen Cox, Remarks as Prepared for the Cleveland, Tennessee, Rotary Club (12 March 2019) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/deputy-associate-attorney-general-stephen-cox-gives-remarks-cleveland-tennessee-rotary>>.

56 Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, Remarks as Prepared for the New York City Bar White Collar Crime Institute, New York (9 May 2018) [hereinafter Rosentein Remarks, 9 May 2018] <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/deputy-attorney-general-rod-rosenstein-delivers-remarks-new-york-city-bar-white-collar>>.

57 *id.*

58 *id.*

59 *id.*

60 Justice Manual 1-12.100 (footnote 54, above).

- The US DOJ should consider whether multiple resolutions with different regulators are necessary for the 'interests of justice to be fully vindicated'. Some of the relevant factors include 'the egregiousness of a company's misconduct; statutory mandates regarding penalties, fines, and/or forfeitures; the risk of unwarranted delay in achieving a final resolution; and the adequacy and timeliness of a company's disclosures and its cooperation with the [DOJ], separate from any such disclosures and cooperation with other relevant enforcement authorities'.⁶¹

It is important to note that this policy does not require the US DOJ to refrain from imposing its own penalties for conduct also investigated and penalised by other US and non-US enforcement agencies. The policy merely requires US DOJ prosecutors to consider whether multiple resolutions are necessary – the US DOJ is free to conclude that, for example, conduct that it perceives to be egregious warrants multiple penalties imposed by different authorities. Furthermore, the policy further incentivises cooperation with the US DOJ, as that is a factor to be considered by the US DOJ in evaluating whether multiple penalties are necessary.

Coordination between the US DOJ and other US regulatory agencies

Because Latin American companies whose shares or American Depositary Receipts (ADRs) are publicly traded in the United States are subject to US SEC regulation, the Anti-Piling On Policy may be useful to companies facing US DOJ and US SEC investigations, in that the policy provides a basis to contend that the imposition of substantial penalties by both agencies would be unnecessary and unwarranted. Indeed, the Anti-Piling On Policy encourages US DOJ attorneys to coordinate with other agencies where possible – including the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Office of the Foreign Assets Control, in addition to the US SEC – to better 'detect sophisticated financial fraud schemes and deploy adequate penalties and remedies to ensure market integrity'.⁶²

In the anti-corruption space in particular, a company that is headquartered or conducts business in Latin America and is publicly traded in the United States (including through ADRs) may be subject to investigations and penalties by both the US DOJ and the US SEC for the same alleged violations of the FCPA.⁶³ In a speech on 3 October 2019, US Attorney General William Barr reiterated the US DOJ's commitment to coordination, particularly with the US SEC: 'Critically . . . if a company meets the benchmarks of good corporate behavior, the DOJ can use its discretion to act in deference to an US SEC parallel resolution.' Barr cited

⁶¹ *id.*

⁶² Rosenstein Remarks, 9 May 2018 (footnote 56, above).

⁶³ Moreover, in March 2019, the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission's [CFTC] Division of Enforcement published an advisory signalling its intention to investigate and charge Commodity Exchange Act [CEA] violations related to foreign corrupt practices. See Press release, CFTC, 'Enforcement Advisory: Advisory on Self Reporting and Cooperation for CEA Violations Involving Foreign Corrupt Practices' (6 March 2019) <<https://www.cftc.gov/sites/default/files/2019-03/enfadvisoryselfreporting030619.pdf>>.

two companies that the US DOJ declined to prosecute in the past in light of a simultaneous US SEC resolution.⁶⁴

Indeed, recent enforcement actions do suggest that the US DOJ may be willing to decline to prosecute where the US SEC is investigating and reaches a resolution. For example, of the six companies to which the US DOJ has issued formal declinations since 2018:

- four involved US-based companies publicly traded on a US stock exchange that reached resolutions with the US SEC;⁶⁵ and
- one involved a UK-based company that was not publicly traded in the United States and the US DOJ explicitly tied the declination to the UK authorities' ongoing investigation of the same conduct.⁶⁶

This signals that when a company fully resolves corruption-related violations with another enforcement agency – whether in the United States or elsewhere – the US DOJ may be less inclined to bring its own charges, particularly if the company has taken certain investigative, cooperative or remedial measures. Even when the US DOJ provides a formal declination, however, it may still require a company to disgorge ill-gotten profits.⁶⁷

If the US DOJ does not issue a formal declination, it may still decline to bring charges if a company reaches a resolution with the US SEC concerning the same conduct.

Notwithstanding the Anti-Piling On Policy, the US DOJ and the US SEC are not prohibited from simultaneously investigating and penalising the same conduct. Indeed, the US DOJ and the US SEC may be inclined to insist on multiple resolutions if companies do not voluntarily self-disclose or fully cooperate with the government's investigation.

Finally, despite the Anti-Piling On Policy, *Operation Car Wash* has resulted in substantial and at times overlapping corporate fines and penalties imposed by US, Latin American

64 Barr, William P, US Attorney General, Remarks As Prepared for Delivery at the US SEC's Criminal Coordination Conference (3 October 2019) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/us-attorney-general-william-p-barr-delivers-remarks-us-securities-and-exchange-commission>>.

65 See, e.g., Letter from Matthew Kruger, US Attorney, E.D. Wis. and Robert Zink, Chief, Fraud Section, US DOJ, to David W Simon et al., Foley & Lardner LLP (19 September 2019) <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/file/1205341/download>>; Letter from Sandra Moser, Acting Chief, Fraud Section, US DOJ, to Caz Hashemi, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, and Rohan Virginkar, Foley & Lardner LLP (20 December 2018) [hereinafter Letter from Sandra Moser to Caz Hashemi] <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/file/1122966/download>>; Letter from Craig Carpentine, US Attorney, Dist. of N.J., and Sandra Moser, Acting Chief, Fraud Section, Criminal Division, US DOJ, to Peter Spivack, Hogan Lovells (23 April 2018) <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/file/1055401/download>>.

66 Letter from Daniel S Kahn, Deputy Chief, US DOJ, to Matthew Reinhard, Miller & Chevalier Chartered (20 August 2018) <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/page/file/1088621/download>> (noting that one reason for declination was 'the fact that [Guralp Systems Limited], a U.K. company with its principal place of business in the U.K., is the subject of an ongoing parallel investigation by the U.K.'s Serious Fraud Office for violations of law relating to the same conduct and has committed to accepting responsibility for that conduct with the SFO.'). The final declination involved a Barbados-based company that earned less than US\$100,000 in illicit profits from the bribery scheme and voluntarily self-disclosed the conduct. Following the declination, US DOJ charged the company's former Chief Executive Officer and Senior Vice President.

67 See Letter from Craig Carpenito, US Attorney, District of N.J., and Robert Zink, Acting Chief, Fraud Section, Criminal Division, US DOJ, to Karl H Buch and Grayson D Stratton, DLA Piper LLP, and Kathryn H Ruemmler and Douglas N Greenburg, Latham & Watkins LLP (13 February 2019) <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/file/1132666/download>>; Letter from Sandra Moser to Caz Hashemi (footnote 65, above).

and other law enforcement and regulatory entities, raising questions about the benefits of the policy when applied in practice. And because Latin American authorities do not have a similar policy, companies that resolve their US exposure without resolving their exposure throughout Latin America may find themselves subject to crippling additional fines and penalties for largely similar or related conduct. Latin American authorities would do well to consider a similar policy, to encourage cooperation and to ensure that companies that cooperate and resolve their exposure with multiple law enforcement and regulatory authorities can continue to operate post-resolution.

Global coordination

During the past five years, there has also been an increase in global anti-corruption enforcement and coordination, particularly with respect to investigations involving Latin America.⁶⁸ In 2017 alone, the US DOJ reportedly received cooperation from approximately 20 countries in cases brought under the FCPA.⁶⁹ Similarly, the US SEC acknowledged that, in 2017 and 2018, it had received assistance from more than 25 jurisdictions in FCPA cases.⁷⁰ Since 2014, Brazil has assisted in at least nine investigations that resulted in corporate resolutions, Mexico in at least three and the Dominican Republic in at least one. As the then Assistant Attorney General for the US DOJ's Criminal Division, Leslie Caldwell, stated: 'We increasingly find ourselves shoulder-to-shoulder with law enforcement and regulatory authorities in other countries. Every day, more countries join in the battle against trans-national bribery.'⁷¹ In some instances, the US DOJ has deferred to foreign authorities' investigations and prosecutions, or credited companies the fines paid to foreign authorities for related conduct.⁷²

Recent resolutions of corruption investigations involving conduct in Latin America reflect this increased cooperation. Most recently, on 28 January 2020, Airbus SE agreed to pay combined penalties of more than US\$3.9 billion – to date, the largest single FCPA resolution – to resolve charges with the United States, France and the United Kingdom arising out of a scheme to use third-party business partners to bribe government officials and

68 Allen II, Warren T; Bosworth, B Michelle, 'Multi-Jurisdictional Anti-Corruption Investigation and Enforcement Trends and Developments' in *The Review of Securities & Commodities Regulation*, Vol. 51, No. 17 (2018).

69 Kahn, Daniel, 'Responding to the Upward Trend of Multijurisdictional Cases: Problems and Solutions', 66 *DOJ J. Fed. Law & Prac.* 125, 126 (2018).

70 Peikin, Steven, Remarks at the IOSCO/PIFS-Harvard Law School Global Certificate Program for Regulators of Securities Markets, 'The Salutary Effects of International Cooperation on SEC Enforcement' (3 December 2018) <<https://www.sec.gov/news/speech/speech-peikin-120318>>.

71 Caldwell, Leslie R, Assistant Attorney General, at the American Conference Institute's 31st International Conference on the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (19 November 2014) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/assistant-attorney-general-leslie-r-caldwell-speaks-american-conference-institute-s-31st>>.

72 See, e.g., Press release, US DOJ, 'Rolls-Royce plc Agrees to Pay \$170 Million Criminal Penalty to Resolve Foreign Corrupt Practices Act Case' (17 January 2017) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/rolls-royce-plc-agrees-pay-170-million-criminal-penalty-resolve-foreign-corrupt-practices-act>>; US DOJ Press release, 26 September 2018 (footnote 34, above); Press release, US DOJ, 'Keppel Offshore & Marine Ltd & U.S. Based Subsidiary Agree to Pay \$422 Million in Global Penalties to Resolve Foreign Bribery Case' (22 December 2017) [hereinafter US DOJ Press release, 22 December 2017] <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/keppel-offshore-marine-ltd-and-us-based-subsiary-agree-pay-422-million-global-penalties>>.

non-government airline executives.⁷³ The investigations spanned more than a dozen countries in which Airbus does business, including Brazil, Colombia and Mexico. Notably, the SFO and the French National Financial Prosecutor's Office (PNF) entered into a joint investigation team agreement to facilitate their investigations. This resulted in the SFO and the PNF each focusing on conduct in different countries.⁷⁴ Given that Airbus is not a US issuer or domestic concern and that there was only limited territorial contact over the corrupt conduct, the US authorities gave Airbus credit for any payments to the SFO and the PNF.⁷⁵ To date, Latin American authorities have not publicly announced investigations or charges against Airbus.

Misconduct initially identified during *Operation Car Wash* in particular has led to coordination between US and Latin American regulators in a number of large corporate settlements. As previously mentioned (see footnote 72), in December 2017, Keppel Offshore & Marine Ltd (Keppel), a shipyard operator in Singapore, and its US-based subsidiary reached a global settlement with authorities in the United States, Brazil and Singapore in connection with payments to public officials in Brazil.⁷⁶

Similarly, in February 2018, the Brazilian Federal Police began investigating allegations that TechnipFMC plc (Technip) paid bribes to win contracts with Petrobras.⁷⁷ In related proceedings in June 2019, US and Brazilian authorities reached corporate resolutions with Technip, wherein Technip agreed to pay a combined criminal fine of more than US\$296 million, with the United States receiving US\$81 million and Brazil US\$214 million.⁷⁸

73 Press release, US DOJ, 'Airbus Agrees to Pay over \$3.9 Billion in Global Penalties to Resolve Foreign Bribery and ITAR Case' (31 January 2020) [hereinafter US DOJ Press release, 31 January 2020] <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/airbus-agrees-pay-over-39-billion-global-penalties-resolve-foreign-bribery-and-itar-case>>.

74 Statement of Facts Prepared Pursuant to Paragraph 5(1) of Schedule 17 to the Crime and Courts Act 2013, *Regina v. Airbus SE* (filed 31 January 2020) <www.tisrilanka.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/R-v-Airbus-Statement-of-Facts.pdf> ('The PNF focused its investigations more particularly on Airbus and its divisions' conduct in the following countries: United Arab Emirates, China, South Korea, Nepal, India, Taiwan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Vietnam, Japan, Turkey, Mexico, Thailand, Brazil, and Kuwait. The SFO focused its investigations on Airbus and its divisions' conduct in the following countries: South Korea, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Taiwan, Ghana, Colombia and Mexico. Within this scope, the PNF and SFO selected a representative sample of the markets and concerns involved.')

75 Deferred Prosecution Agreement ¶ 4, *United States v. Airbus SE*, No. 1:20-cr-00021-TFH (D.D.C., 28 January 2020) <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/file/1242051/download>> (noting that Airbus 'is neither a U.S. issuer nor a domestic concern, and the territorial jurisdiction over the corrupt conduct is limited; in addition . . . France's and the United Kingdom's interests over the Company's corruption-related conduct, and jurisdictional bases for a resolution, are significantly stronger, and thus the [DOJ has] deferred to France and the United Kingdom to vindicate their respective interests as those countries deem appropriate, and the [DOJ has] taken into account these countries' determination of the appropriate resolution into all aspects of the U.S. resolution[.]').

76 US DOJ Press release, 22 December 2017 (footnote 72, above).

77 See 'A Polícia Federal abriu um inquérito, no âmbito da Operação Lava-Jato, para investigar suposta propina em contratos da Petrobras envolvendo cinco plataformas', *Jornal O Sul* (19 February 2018) <<https://www.osul.com.br/policia-federal-abriu-um-inquerito-no-ambito-da-operacao-lava-jato-para-investigar-suposta-propina-em-contratos-da-petrobras-envolvendo-cinco-plataformas/>>.

78 Deferred Prosecution Agreement ¶ 7, *United States v. TechnipFMC plc*, No. 19-CR-278 (E.D.N.Y. 25 June 2019) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/press-release/file/1177316/download>>; Press release, 'Controladoria-Geral da União, CGU, AGU, MPF e DOJ firmam primeiro acordo de leniência global no âmbito da Lava Jato' (25 June 2019) <<https://www.gov.br/cgu/pt-br/assuntos/noticias/2019/06/cgu-agu-mpf-e-doj-firmam-primeiro-acordo-de-leniencia-global-no-ambito-da-lava-jato>>; Leniency Agreement, Acordo de Leniência Firmado Entre a Controladoria Geral da União (CGU), a Advocacia-Geral da União (AGU) e Technip Brasil - Engenharia, Instalações

In addition to companies already discussed, two companies recently resolved FCPA cases with the US DOJ or the US SEC (or both) involving conduct in Latin America, in which the US authorities received assistance from, or reached simultaneous resolutions with, authorities in Latin America.⁷⁹ For example, in January 2017, Rolls-Royce reached a related leniency agreement with Brazil's Attorney General's Office (MPF), under which it would pay a US\$25.5 million penalty for corrupt payments made to secure Petrobras contracts.⁸⁰ In reaching the agreement, the MPF emphasised the quick response by Rolls-Royce and the importance of the company's continuous cooperation with Brazilian regulators; Rolls-Royce made itself available to the regulators throughout the investigative process and, in early 2015, provided Brazilian authorities with the results of its internal investigation into the alleged payments.⁸¹

Coordination between countries may be moving beyond coordinated enforcement and into legislative alignment. If ratified, Chapter 27 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) would require not only cross-border cooperation between the countries' respective enforcement authorities but for each country to 'adopt or maintain legislative and other measures' that criminalise bribery, solicitation or acceptance of a bribe and embezzlement or misappropriation of public funds, among other measures.⁸² Each country will retain discretion with respect to the enforcement of its anti-corruption laws and parties do not have a real recourse if they believe another party has failed to enforce its anti-corruption laws in compliance with the USMCA.⁸³ The USMCA has been ratified by the United States and Mexico but was still under review in Canada as at 11 March 2020.⁸⁴

Individuals

US enforcement

The US DOJ and the US SEC continue to prioritise individual accountability in enforcing the FCPA for conduct in Latin America and elsewhere. US DOJ policy emphasises the importance of pursuing individual criminal liability as the strongest deterrent against future

e Apoio Marítimo Ltda. e Flexibrás Tubos Flexíveis Ltda. (25 June 2019) <www.mpf.mp.br/atuacao-tematica/ccr5/coordenacao/colaboracoes-premiadas-e-acordos-de-leniencia/doc_acordos_votos/Acordo_TECNHIP_1.25.000.001452-2018-11.pdf/@download/file/Acordo_TECNHIP_1.25.000.001452-2018-11.pdf>.

79 See Nunes, Samuel; et al., 'Rolls-Royce pagou US\$ 9,32 milhões em propina para fechar contrato', *G1 Globo* (17 January 2017) [hereinafter Rolls-Royce pagou] <<http://g1.globo.com/pr/parana/noticia/2017/01/mpf-confirma-acordo-de-leniencia-com-rolls-royce-na-lava-jato.html>>; Epstein, Evan, 'Top 10 FCPA-Related Cases in Latin America', *Medium* (29 May 2018) <<https://medium.com/@evan.epstein/top-10-fcpa-related-cases-in-latin-america-ef0129747cf1>>.

80 See Rolls-Royce pagou (footnote 79, above).

81 *id.*

82 Office of the US Trade Representative, U.S. Mex. Can. Agreement, Chapter 27, Article 27.3-1: Measures to Combat Corruption <https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/files/agreements/FTA/USMCA/Text/27_Anticorruption.pdf>.

83 *id.*, at Articles 27.6.1-2 and 27.8.1-3.

84 Johnson, Kelsey, 'Canada kicks off USMCA ratification process, urges bi-partisan co-operation', *Reuters* (27 January 2020) <<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trade-canada/canada-kicks-off-usmca-ratification-process-urges-bi-partisan-co-operation-idUSKBN1ZQ26L>>.

corporate wrongdoing and requires companies to identify individuals who were 'substantially involved in or responsible for the criminal conduct' to earn cooperation credit.⁸⁵

This prioritisation has led to an increase in FCPA charges against individuals. In December 2019, Assistant Attorney General Brian Benczkowski announced: 'So far in 2019, the Criminal Division's FCPA Unit has publicly announced more charges against individuals [34] than in any other year in history. It has also publicly announced more guilty pleas by individuals [30] than ever before.'⁸⁶ Some, however, have taken issue with the US DOJ's counting.⁸⁷

The US DOJ and the US SEC also continue to rely on cooperating companies to assist in individual prosecutions. Companies' assistance in identifying individuals and supporting the US DOJ's prosecution of these individuals is a factor that the US DOJ has cited in declining to bring corporate criminal charges and is key for companies obtaining cooperation credit.⁸⁸ In November 2018, the US DOJ revised its policies to provide cooperation credit to qualifying companies that identify individuals that were 'substantially involved in or responsible for' potential criminal misconduct – a change from earlier policy that required companies to identify all individuals involved in the misconduct to receive any credit.

The US DOJ has made additional efforts to provide greater clarity into how it assesses companies' compliance programmes and remediation efforts, once becoming aware of wrongdoing. In September 2019, Deputy Assistant Attorney General Matthew S Miner noted that the US DOJ is 'focused on investigating and prosecuting the individuals responsible for fraudulent behavior and corporate crime'.⁸⁹ However, he explained 'deterrence alone is not enough', outlining how the US DOJ has tried to make cooperation and voluntary self-disclosure easier for companies by providing more transparency through 'greater clarity regarding how voluntary self-disclosures will be treated and what will be expected from companies that seek self-disclosure credit'.⁹⁰ These policy changes and remarks

85 Rosenstein, Rod J, Deputy Attorney General, Remarks as Prepared for the American Conference Institute's 35th International Conference on the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (29 November 2018) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/deputy-attorney-general-rod-j-rosenstein-delivers-remarks-american-conference-institute-0>>; see Justice Manual, 9-28.210 – Focus on Individual Wrongdoers <<https://www.justice.gov/jm/jm-9-28000-principles-federal-prosecution-business-organizations#9-28.210>>.

86 Benczkowski, Brian A, Assistant Attorney General, Remarks as Prepared for the American Conference Institute's 36th International Conference on the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (4 December 2019) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/assistant-attorney-general-brian-benczkowski-delivers-remarks-american-conference>>.

87 Cassin, Richard L, 'Why FCPA scoreboards can be so different', *FCPA Blog* (13 December 2019) <<https://fcpublog.com/2019/12/31/why-fcpa-scoreboards-can-be-so-different/>> (noting that Benczkowski's numbers include all defendants in cases where any defendant is charged with an FCPA violation and defendants who were 're-indicted' following initial indictments in prior years).

88 See, e.g., Letter from Richard P Donoghue, US Attorney, E.D.N.Y. and Sandra L Moser, Acting Chief, Fraud Section, Criminal Division, US DOJ, to Adam B Siegel, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer US LLP (23 August 2018) <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/page/file/1089626/download>> ('[T]he Department has decided to close its investigation of this matter based on a number of factors, including . . . the fact that the Department has been able to identify and charge the culpable individuals.').

89 Miner, Matthew S, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Remarks as Prepared for the 6th Annual Government Enforcement Institute (12 September 2019) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/deputy-assistant-attorney-general-matthew-s-miner-delivers-remarks-6th-annual-government>>.

90 id.

reflect not only the government's focus on prosecuting key individual actors in misconduct but, equally important, incentivising corporate cooperation.

Of 55 companies that reached large⁹¹ FCPA-related resolutions with the US SEC or the US DOJ (or both) between 2015 and January 2020, the US government pursued at least 31 individuals related to the conduct of at least 18 companies. The vast majority of the individuals were employed by the settling company or its subsidiaries, held senior positions or were directly involved in authorising, causing or concealing bribe payments. Those individuals prosecuted by the US DOJ who were not directly employed by the settling company were generally third-party consultants who paid bribes on behalf of the settling company.⁹²

In a notable departure from the typical situation in which a corporate entity cooperates, achieving a more favourable resolution for the entity and facilitating US DOJ enforcement actions against culpable individuals, the US DOJ has brought more than 30 individual prosecutions in connection with two Latin American SOEs in the energy sector, notwithstanding that neither entity nor any other company has reached a resolution relating to those schemes. For example, the US DOJ has aggressively prosecuted individuals related to PetroEcuador. As at 23 January 2020, the US DOJ had announced 13 public charges and guilty pleas against individuals in the US DOJ's investigation into bribery and money laundering involving PetroEcuador.

*The individuals who have been charged to date for their roles in the bribery and money laundering schemes include former PetroEcuador officials who received and concealed the bribe payments, businessmen and contractors who paid the bribes to obtain lucrative oil services contracts from PetroEcuador, and financial advisors and other intermediaries who enabled and facilitated the bribery through the use of U.S. and offshore companies and bank accounts.*⁹³

Local enforcement in Latin America

While US agencies have pursued bribe payers and facilitators, as well as employees of SOEs, Latin American authorities have aggressively prosecuted politicians and high-level government officials, many of whom received bribe payments uncovered in *Operation Car Wash*. In efforts to ensure accountability of government officials, prosecutors have sought to hold former senior politicians in pretrial detention, try them *in absentia* or imprison them after their conviction is upheld by an appellate court. The latter practice, however, was recently rejected in Brazil – where it will have wide implications for the many politicians under investigation – when former president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva was released from prison on the basis of a Brazilian Supreme Court decision that defendants cannot be imprisoned

91 Combined monetary payments of US\$9,875,000 or greater.

92 See, e.g., *Rolls-Royce PLC* (Petros Contoguris, Andreas Kohler).

93 Press release, US DOJ, 'Miami-Based Businessman Pleads Guilty to FCPA and Money Laundering Violations in Scheme Involving PetroEcuador Officials' (23 January 2020) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/miami-based-businessman-pleads-guilty-fcpa-and-money-laundering-violations-scheme-involving>>.

until they fully exhaust their appeals, including beyond the appellate court level, which can take years.⁹⁴

Still, aggressive prosecution of high-level officials continues across Latin America. In Peru, for example, all former living presidents were either imprisoned or under investigation as at January 2020.⁹⁵ On 16 July 2019, former president Alejandro Toledo was arrested in California, a year after a formal extradition request was made by Peru, where he faces corruption charges.⁹⁶ During his arrest, Toledo was found to be in possession of a suitcase that contained US\$40,000 in cash; he was deemed a flight risk by US courts and ultimately denied bail.⁹⁷ Toledo was said to have taken a US\$20 million bribe during his term as president and has a hearing scheduled in April 2020 before a US magistrate judge in connection with his legal challenge to extradition.⁹⁸ Former president Pedro Pablo Kuczynski is in pretrial detention and is facing corruption charges relating to allegations uncovered by *Operation Car Wash*.⁹⁹ Former president Alberto Fujimori is serving a 25-year sentence for human rights violations and corruption.¹⁰⁰ Fujimori's daughter, who narrowly lost the presidential election to Kuczynski and leads the Peruvian opposition, was recently released from pretrial detention before being imprisoned again in connection with allegations that she received illegal campaign contributions.¹⁰¹ In April 2019, former president Alan García committed suicide when police arrived at his home to place him in pretrial detention for alleged corruption.¹⁰²

-
- 94 See Federal Court of Justice, Brazil (7 November 2019) <<http://portal.stf.jus.br/processos/detalhe.asp?incidente=4986065>>.
- 95 Jenner, Frances, 'Peruvians demand dissolution of Congress', *Latin America Reports* (9 September 2019) <<https://latinamericareports.com/peruvians-demand-dissolution-congress/3069/>>.
- 96 See Burnson, Robert, 'Ex-Peru President Charged With Corruption Wins Bail in U.S.', *Bloomberg* (updated 11 October 2019, 01:50 BST) [hereinafter Burnson] <<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-10-10/ex-peru-president-held-in-u-s-custody-to-be-released-on-bail>>; see also Sage, Alexandria, 'Peru ex-president denied bail in U.S., wife dragged from court after outburst', *Reuters* (12 September 2019) <<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-peru-corruption-toledo/peru-ex-president-denied-bail-in-us-wife-dragged-from-court-after-outburst-idUSKCN1VX2P4>>.
- 97 See Viguria, Carlos, 'Justicia de EE.UU. determina que Alejandro Toledo continúe en prisión', *Perú21* (14 November 2019) <<https://peru21.pe/politica/justicia-de-eeuu-determina-que-alejandro-toledo-continue-en-prision-noticia/>>; Burnson (footnote 96, above).
- 98 See Michelena, Liliana, 'Alejandro Toledo: juez programó para el 9 de abril nueva audiencia sobre la extradición', *El Comercio* (6 February 2020) <<https://elcomercio.pe/politica/justicia/alejandro-toledo-juez-programo-para-el-9-de-abril-nueva-audiencia-en-la-que-evaluara-pedido-de-la-defensa-para-entregar-documentos-sobre-proceso-de-extradicion-estados-unidos-noticia>>.
- 99 'Aprueban 36 meses de prisión preventiva para Pedro Pablo Kuczynski', *CNN Español* (19 April 2019) <<https://cnnespanol.cnn.com/2019/04/19/aprueban-36-meses-de-prision-preventiva-para-pedro-pablo-kuczynski/>>.
- 100 'Keiko Fujimori: Peru opposition leader walks free from jail', *The Guardian* (29 November 2019) <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/nov/30/keiko-fujimori-peru-opposition-leader-walks-free-from-jail>>.
- 101 Rochabrun, Marcelo; Aquino, Marco, 'Peru's Keiko Fujimori vows to "end her silence" as she is jailed again', *Reuters* (28 January 2020) <<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-peru-corruption/perus-keiko-fujimori-vows-to-end-her-silence-as-she-is-jailed-again-idUSKBN1ZR2WA>>.
- 102 'Making sense of the suicide of Alan García, a former president of Peru', *The Economist* (27 April 2019) <<https://www.economist.com/the-americas/2019/04/27/making-sense-of-the-suicide-of-alan-garcia-a-former-president-of-peru>>.

In Argentina, Cristina Fernández de Kirchner (former President and Senator and current Vice President) has 11 court cases pending against her, including in connection with allegations of corruption.¹⁰³ Some of the charges stemmed from *Los Cuadernos* (known as the *Notebooks scandal*), an investigation made public in August 2018 that was triggered by the publication of several notebooks written by the driver of a high-ranking public official in Argentina. The notebooks detailed bribes paid to public officials in connection with contracts for public works.¹⁰⁴ The scandal has implicated dozens of public officials and business owners.

In Bolivia, prosecutors issued an arrest warrant for former president Evo Morales, who resigned in October 2019 following a disputed election.¹⁰⁵ In January 2020, the interim government opened a corruption investigation into 600 former Morales officials, including the former president.¹⁰⁶

In Mexico, the very first Chief Anti-Corruption Prosecutor to be appointed is overseeing more than 680 investigations.¹⁰⁷

The former Vice President of Ecuador, Jorge Glas, was sentenced to six years in prison in December 2017 for corruption unearthed by *Operation Car Wash*.¹⁰⁸ In October 2019, former president Rafael Correa and 22 of his former officials were accused of being part of a network of bribery and the Attorney General issued a petition for pretrial detention.¹⁰⁹

Industry-specific focuses

Healthcare

In the past five years, the US DOJ and the US SEC have brought a number of enforcement actions in the healthcare space, including with respect to corrupt payments made to Latin American officials. For example, in January 2017, Zimmer Biomet Holdings, Inc (Zimmer Biomet) and its indirect subsidiary, JERDS Luxembourg Holding Sàrl, resolved investigations by the US DOJ and the US SEC concerning its dealings with a corrupt third-party

103 Mur, Robert, “‘La condena ya está escrita’, afirma Kirchner en su juicio por corrupción”, *La Vanguardia* (12 March 2019, last updated at 09:43) <<https://www.lavanguardia.com/internacional/20191202/472029885966/cristina-kirchner-juicio-corrupcion-argentina.htm>>; Alcoba, Natalie, ‘Argentina’s ex-President Kirchner faces first corruption trial’, *Al Jazeera* (21 May 2019) <<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/05/argentina-president-christina-kirchner-faces-corrupcion-trial-190521131408914.html>>.

104 Do Rosario, Jorgelina; Gillespie, Patrick, ‘Why Kirchner’s Comeback Goes Through Argentine Court’, *Bloomberg* (last updated 12 August 2019, 11:00) <<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-05-30/why-kirchner-s-comeback-goes-through-argentine-court-quicktake>>.

105 ‘Bolivia issues arrest warrant for Evo Morales’, *Financial Times* (8 December 2019) <<https://www.ft.com/content/aa5ace2e-21e6-11ea-b8a1-584213ee7b2b>>.

106 ‘Bolivia opens probe into 600 former Morales officials’, *France24* (8 January 2020) <<https://www.france24.com/en/20200108-bolivia-opens-probe-into-600-former-morales-officials>>.

107 Corres, Luis Dantón Martínez, ‘New corruption prosecutor opens 680 investigations’, *FCPA Blog* (18 December 2019) <<https://fcpublog.com/2019/12/18/new-corrupcion-prosecutor-opens-680-investigations/>>.

108 ‘Ecuador’s Vice President Sentenced to 6 Years in Corruption Case’ (*Reuters*), *The New York Times* (13 December 2017) <<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/13/world/americas/ecuadors-vice-president-sentenced-to-6-years-in-corrupcion-case.html>>.

109 id.

distributor in Brazil.¹¹⁰ The company agreed to pay a US\$17.4 million criminal penalty, a civil penalty of US\$6.5 million and approximately US\$6.5 million in disgorgement and prejudgment interest to US authorities, in connection with its admission that it failed to follow the conditions of a 2012 deferred prosecution agreement (DPA) with the US DOJ by continuing to use a third-party distributor in Brazil known to have paid bribes to government officials on the company's behalf. Zimmer Biomet also failed to implement an adequate system of internal controls in Mexico, which resulted in the payment of bribes to Mexican customs officials.¹¹¹

Other companies in the medical sector that have settled FCPA investigations with the US DOJ or the US SEC (or both) in the past five years in connection with conduct in Latin America include, for example, Olympus Latin America, Inc (Olympus),¹¹² Orthofix International NV¹¹³ and Alere Inc.¹¹⁴ In nearly all these investigations, the US DOJ or the US SEC considered the companies' voluntary cooperation, implementation of compliance programmes or remediation when determining the penalty. For example, the US DOJ gave Olympus a 20 per cent penalty reduction because of its cooperation in undertaking an extensive internal investigation, translating a number of foreign language documents and gathering and analysing voluminous evidence.¹¹⁵

The government's focus on companies in the life sciences sector continues, including with respect to their Latin American operations. On 22 July 2019, Koninklijke Philips NV (Philips), headquartered in the Netherlands, disclosed that the public prosecution service in Rio de Janeiro and the Brazilian antitrust authority are conducting an investigation into tender irregularities in the medical device industry in Brazil and that Philips is one of the companies involved in the investigation. Philips is also conducting an internal investigation and cooperating with requests from the Brazilian authorities, the US DOJ and the US SEC.¹¹⁶

Similarly, on 4 February 2020, Alexion Pharmaceuticals, a company headquartered in Massachusetts, announced in a securities filing that it had begun preliminary discussions with the US SEC to resolve a foreign bribery investigation across several countries, including

110 See Deferred Prosecution Agreement, *United States v. Zimmer Biomet Holdings, Inc.*, No. 12-CR-00080 RBW (D.D.C., 12 January 2017) <https://www.millerchevalier.com/sites/default/files/resources/FCPARReview/FCPARReviewSpring2017_Zimmer_DPA.pdf>; Order Instituting Cease and Desist Proceedings, *In re Biomet, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 79780 (12 January 2017) <<https://www.sec.gov/litigation/admin/2017/34-79780.pdf>>.

111 Press release, US DOJ, 'Zimmer Biomet Holdings Inc. Agrees to Pay \$17.4 Million to Resolve Foreign Corrupt Practices Act Charges' (12 January 2017) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/zimmer-biomet-holdings-inc-agrees-pay-174-million-resolve-foreign-corrupt-practices-act>>.

112 See generally Deferred Prosecution Agreement, *United States v. Olympus Latin America, Inc.*, No. 16-3525 (MF) (D.N.J., 2016) <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/file/831256/download>>.

113 See Press release, US SEC, 'Medical Device Company Charged With Accounting Failures and FCPA Violations' (18 January 2017) <<https://www.sec.gov/news/pressrelease/2017-18.html>>.

114 See Order Instituting Cease and Desist Proceedings, *In re Alere Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 81,742 (28 September 2017) <<https://www.sec.gov/litigation/admin/2017/33-10417.pdf>>.

115 See Press release, US DOJ, 'Medical Equipment Company Will Pay \$646 Million for Making Illegal Payments to Doctors and Hospitals in United States and Latin America' (1 March 2016) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/medical-equipment-company-will-pay-646-million-making-illegal-payments-doctors-and-hospitals>>.

116 *Koninklijke Philips N.V.*, Report of Foreign Private Issuer Pursuant to Rules 13a-16 and 15d-16 (Form 6-K) (22 July 2019) <<https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/313216/000031321619000014/phg-20190722.htm>>.

Brazil and Colombia. This was in connection with a subpoena that the company received from the US SEC in 2015 and a request for information from the US DOJ.¹¹⁷

Aviation

Companies in the aviation industry that do business in Latin America have also been recent targets of anti-corruption enforcement actions, including with respect to corrupt payments made to officials in the region. Airbus's January 2020 settlement with authorities in the United States, France and the United Kingdom is only the most recent example.¹¹⁸

On 25 July 2016, LATAM Airlines Group SA (LATAM) settled charges relating to a scheme orchestrated by its predecessor, LAN Airlines SA, to pay bribes to Argentine union officials via a false consulting contract with a third-party intermediary. LATAM entered into a three-year DPA with the US DOJ, under which it agreed to pay a US\$12.75 million criminal penalty, enhance its compliance programme and retain an independent monitor.¹¹⁹ The US DOJ considered the company's cooperation in the investigation but also took into account that the company did not voluntarily disclose the violations or remediate adequately. As a result, the US DOJ imposed a penalty within the US Sentencing Guidelines range rather than providing a discount off the bottom of the range.¹²⁰ LATAM also agreed to pay approximately US\$9.4 million to the US SEC in disgorgement and prejudgment interest.¹²¹ The US SEC considered remedial acts by LATAM and its predecessor LAN, including the implementation of a basic compliance programme, the adoption of a new code of conduct, the hiring of a compliance manager and annual training of employees on anti-corruption.¹²²

Three other companies in the aviation industry have resolved FCPA cases with the US DOJ or the US SEC (or both) in the past five years in connection with conduct in Latin America.¹²³

There are also continuing investigations regarding several airlines in the region. For example, in May 2017, Brazil's Gol Linhas Aereas Inteligentes SA disclosed that it had concluded an internal investigation that revealed that irregular payments had been made to public officials and that the company planned to report the conclusions of its investigation

117 Alexion Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (Form 10-K), at 54 and 55 (4 February 2020) <<https://ir.alexion.com/static-files/c1e8aa68-bbb7-4745-9a73-6efce71e29be>>.

118 See US DOJ Press release, 31 January 2020 (footnote 73, above).

119 See Press release, US DOJ, 'LATAM Airlines Group Resolves Foreign Corrupt Practices Act Investigation and Agrees to Pay \$12.75 Million Criminal Penalty' (25 July 2016) <<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/latam-airlines-group-resolves-foreign-corrupt-practices-act-investigation-and-agrees-pay-1275>>.

120 id.

121 Press release, US SEC, 'LAN Airlines Settles FCPA Charges' (25 July 2016) <<https://www.sec.gov/news/pressrelease/2016-151.html>>.

122 See Order Instituting Cease and Desist Proceedings, *In re LAN Airlines S.A.* (25 July 2016) <<https://www.sec.gov/litigation/admin/2016/34-78402.pdf>>.

123 See, e.g., Deferred Prosecution Agreement, *United States v. Dallas Airmotive, Inc.*, No. 14-CR-483 (N.D. Tex., 10 December 2014) <<https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/criminal-fraud/legacy/2014/12/30/dai-dpa-final.pdf>>; Deferred Prosecution Agreement, *United States v. Rolls Royce PLC*, No. 2:16-cr-347 (S.D. Ohio, 20 December 2016) <<https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/file/929126/download>>.

to relevant authorities in due course.¹²⁴ It is as yet unclear whether the US DOJ or the US SEC opened an investigation into the company.

Conclusion

As recent events make clear, regulators throughout Latin America are aggressively investigating allegations of corruption and prosecuting wrongdoers. Further, regulators in the United States and Europe have been working together and with Latin American regulators to enforce their own anti-corruption laws in connection with allegations of legal violations in the region. Companies doing business in Latin America should ensure that they have robust anti-corruption policies and safeguards in place, and be prepared to coordinate with multiple regulators from various jurisdictions should they be the subject of an investigation, and consider carefully the costs and benefits of proactive voluntary cooperation.

124. See *Gol Intelligent Airlines, Inc.*, Annual Report Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) (Form 20-F), at 82 (1 May 2017) <http://ri.voegol.com.br/conteudo_en.asp?idioma=1&conta=44&tipo=53780&id=0&submenu=0&img=0&ano=2016>.

Appendix 1

About the Authors

Jocelyn E Strauber

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

Jocelyn Strauber is a partner in the government enforcement and white-collar crime group at the firm. She represents companies and individuals in a wide array of criminal and civil enforcement matters. Prior to joining Skadden in 2013, she held numerous roles at the US Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, including, most recently, co-chief of the Criminal Division's Terrorism & International Narcotics Unit.

Julie Bédard

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

Julie Bédard is head of Skadden's international litigation and arbitration group for the Americas. Fluent in French, Spanish and Portuguese, she practises in four languages in complex international litigation and arbitration matters. Ms Bédard regularly counsels management and supervisory boards in corporate governance, internal investigations and US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act matters. She frequently assists with internal investigations and related corporate governance advice, including remedial measures and the implementation of corporate compliance programmes. She also is experienced in conflict of laws and has represented clients in connection with litigation and arbitration proceedings throughout the world.

Ms Bédard has been listed repeatedly in *Chambers USA*, *Chambers Global*, Law Business Research's *Who's Who Legal: Arbitration*, *Chambers Latin America* and *The Best Lawyers in America*. Additionally, Ms Bédard has been named repeatedly by *Latinvex* magazine as one of Latin America's Top 100 Lawyers for Arbitration and Litigation, and as one of its Top Female Lawyers in Latin America. She also was named as one of *Benchmark Litigation's* 2019 Top 250 Women in Litigation and was cited as a leading lawyer by *The Legal 500 US* in 2019.

Lauren A Eisenberg

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

Lauren Eisenberg is an associate in the litigation group at the firm. She has represented corporations and individuals in investigations by the Department of Justice, Securities and Exchange Commission and other regulators related to the US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, federal securities laws, and other criminal and civil regulations. Ms Eisenberg has also conducted internal investigations on behalf of companies in the United States, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East.

Mayra C Suárez

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

Mayra Suárez is an associate in the firm's litigation and government enforcement and white-collar crime groups. She has conducted internal investigations on behalf of US and foreign corporations, audit committees and individuals in the United States, Europe and Latin America. She also has defended clients in connection with allegations of unlawful antitrust practices and in investigations by the US Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to the US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

One Manhattan West

New York, NY 10001-8602

United States

Tel: +1 212 735 3000

jocelyn.strauber@skadden.com

julie.bedard@skadden.com

1440 New York Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20005

United States

Tel: +1 202 371 7000

lauren.eisenberg@skadden.com

mayra.suarez@skadden.com

www.skadden.com

Published by Latin Lawyer and LACCA, edited by Andrew M Levine, a litigation partner at Debevoise & Plimpton LLP, Reynaldo Manzanarez Radilla, a corporate attorney and compliance professional, Valeria Plastino, vice president, general counsel and regional ethics and compliance officer at CenturyLink, and Fabio Selhorst, general counsel, chief integrity officer and chief communications officer at Camargo Corrêa Infra, *The Guide to Corporate Compliance* is designed to assist key corporate decision makers and their advisers in the effective handling of their compliance obligations in Latin America.

The guide delivers specialist insight to our readers – general counsel, compliance officers, government agencies and private practitioners – who must navigate the region’s complex, fast-changing framework of rules and regulations.

In preparing this guide, we have been working with practitioners from a variety of disciplines and geographies, who have contributed a wealth of knowledge and experience. We are grateful for their cooperation and insight.

Visit latinlawyer.com
Follow @Latin_Lawyer on Twitter
Find us on LinkedIn

an LBR business

ISBN 978-1-83862-428-6