A coherent and comprehensive integrity SYSTEM

Commitment
Top-level management develop the necessary legal and institutional frameworks and display high standards of personal propriety

Responsibilities
Public sector organisations coordinate well with each other, with well-defined responsibilities. It is clear ‘who does what’

Strategy
Using data and indicators for evaluation and based on legitimate risks to integrity, a strategy is developed outlining objectives and priorities

Standards
Rules and public sector values are reflected in laws and organisational policies and are effectively communicated
A coherent and comprehensive integrity system across the whole of government (1)

Mechanisms for co-ordination between central and sub-national integrity bodies

- No coordination: 3
- Legal agreements /memorandums of understanding between levels of government: 4
- Inter-institutional design of integrity policies: 7
- Guidance by a central government body (or unit): 9
- Regular meetings in specific integrity committee or commission: 11

A coherent and comprehensive integrity system across the whole of government (2)

Mechanisms to mainstream integrity policies across line ministries

1. Head of central government body participates in meetings of the council of ministers
   - OECD Total: 7

2. Line ministries have dedicated integrity officials or units
   - OECD Total: 17

3. Guidance by a central government body (or unit)
   - OECD Total: 22

4. Normative requirements (i.e. policies and guidance)
   - OECD Total: 29

Evidence-based integrity policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods used for evaluations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion polls</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews/focus groups</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee survey polls</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational administrative data</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing results for Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Finland, France, German, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

Behavioural insights for integrity

4 Behavioural Insights for Public Integrity

Integrity depends on People’s choice

Integrity policies need to take behaviour into account.

It is not all about Control and enforcement

Over-strict control demotivates. Trust is more effective.

There are No ethical superhumans

There are hundreds of ways for morals to slip your mind when taking a decision.

Guilt is smaller with Diffused responsibility

Shared decisions and disclosed information do not guarantee ethical choices.
A CULTURE of public integrity

Business, Individuals and non-governmental actors uphold public integrity and do not tolerate corruption.

Managers lead with integrity in public sector organisations; they carve out the ‘integrity agenda’ and communicate it to the organisation.

The public sector strives to employ professional and qualified people that have a deep commitment to the public service integrity values.

Public officials are skilled and trained to apply integrity standards.

Integrity concerns are openly and freely discussed in the workplace and it is safe to report suspected violations of integrity.
Entry into force of dedicated whistleblower protection laws

http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264252639-en.
Whistleblower protection

Protection through dedicated law: 41%
Protection through provisions in other law(s): 47%
No protection: 13%

Effective ACCOUNTABILITY

Risk management
An effective integrity risk management and control system exists in public sector organisations

Enforcement
Corruption and other violations to integrity are detected, investigated and sanctioned

Oversight
Oversight bodies, regulatory enforcement agencies and administrative courts perform external control

Participation
A transparent and open government allows for the meaningful participation of all stakeholders in the development and implementation of public policies
Specific standards

Are there specific conflict-of-interest policies in place for specific types of public officials according to the nature of their work?

- Ministers: 60%
- Ministerial advisors: 30%
- Senior public officials: 60%
- Procurement officials: 33%
- Tax and customs officers: 43%
- Financial regulators: 40%
- Auditors: 43%
- Judges: 63%
- Public prosecutors: 57%
- Inspectors at central level of govt: 27%
Asset disclosure

Since 2010, the number of countries that have regulated lobbying practices have almost doubled.

THANK YOU

carissa.munro@oecd.org