OECD 2016 Survey on Public Sector Integrity

Survey background and objectives:
The objective of the present **2016 OECD Public Sector Integrity Survey** is to collect data on member and partner countries' public sector integrity systems for the **2017 edition of Government at a Glance.** The focus has been set on selected principles embodied in the **Draft Recommendation on Public Integrity** which is planned to be approved before the end of 2016.

The questionnaire contains 4 sections:
1. **Coherent and comprehensive integrity systems:** a mapping of the main institutions responsible for designing and implementing various integrity policies as well as their mandates and functions.
2. **Monitoring and evaluation of integrity polices:** the extent to which countries have in place coherent evaluation frameworks to assess the effectiveness and impact of integrity policies, as well as mechanisms to monitor implementation.
3. **Risk mapping and control:** the extent to which countries assess integrity risks, as well as mitigate these risks through both internal and external controls.
4. **Future OECD work on integrity:** a short section asking delegates to indicate their degree of appetite for further OECD work on areas of the draft Recommendation. Prior to publication in Government at a Glance, **all data responses and methodologies will be reviewed and validated by delegates of the SPIO.**

Action:
The OECD recognizes that different units/entities within government may need to be consulted to complete the questionnaire. For instance, questionnaire responses concerning Section III- risk mapping and controls- may require inputs from other ministries and/or divisions responsible for internal control and audit functions. **However, it is kindly requested that SPIO delegates act as the central focal points, so that only one unified response from each country is submitted.** Via email, the Secretariat will provide delegates with a web link to the questionnaire, as well as the corresponding username and password needed to access it. The online questionnaire tool allows respondents to **start, save and stop the questionnaire at their convenience (answers will be saved), therefore allowing shared responsibility of responding with other officials/experts.** Further technical instructions will also be provided by email. Please note the deadline for responses is **October 7, 2016.** Furthermore, please note that the document attached to the e-mail invitation sent to the respondent is only intended for reference, to help planning your responses and coordinate with colleagues/other respondents. **Final responses must be submitted via the online**

questionnaire. The use of the online instrument will help improve data quality and comparability. **Help:** Please kindly refer to the glossary of key terms available here. For further assistance, information or advice in completing this questionnaire please contact Natalia Nolan Flecha (Natalia.NOLANFLECHA@oecd.org). If a respondent encounters questions which they find very difficult or resourceintensive to answer, they should not hesitate to contact the Secretariat for assistance.

Contact Details:
*Please provide name of focal point for questionnaire:
*Please state your job title:
*Please indicate the name of the organisation you work for:
*Please provide your email address:
*Please provide your work phone:
Other respondents/emails, if any:

Section I: Coherent and comprehensive integrity systems

The draft OECD Recommendation on Public Integrity, in its Principle 2, encourages countries to clarify the institutional responsibilities across their public sector in order to strengthen the effectiveness of the integrity system. In particular, the recommendation favours the establishing of clear responsibilities for designing, leading and implementing the elements of the integrity system for the public sector, and ensuring that all public officials, units or bodies with a central responsibility for the integrity system have the appropriate mandate and capacity to fulfil their responsibilities. Furthermore, countries are encouraged to implement mechanisms for horizontal and vertical collaboration between such public officials, units or bodies and where possible, with and between subnational levels of government, through formal or informal means to support coherence and avoid overlap and gaps, and to share and build on lessons learned from good practices. This section of the questionnaire therefore takes stock of how countries have set-up the institutional arrangement of their integrity system, including existing coordination mechanisms.

Institutional responsibilities within the Public Integrity System

2. Please indicate the institution or institutions responsible for the following activities. If responsibilities are shared, please select all applicable columns per row. Please specify the name(s) of the relevant institution(s)

	Center of Government	Ministry or Unit within Ministry	Autonomous body (such as Ombudsmen, Electoral body or Supreme Audit Institution)	Inter-institutional committee	Not Applicable (If not applicable, please provide additional explanations).	Other
i. Design of the national integrity and/or anticorruption strategy						
ii. Design of						

integrity policies related to:						
Code of Conduct/Ethics						
Conflict of Interest						
Ethics Training						
Human Resource Managment and Integrity						
Whistleblowing						
Lobbying						
Financing of Political Parties and Campaigns						
Internal Audit and Control						
Integrity and Corruption Risk management						
Public Procurement						
Disciplinary enforcement						
Awareness-raising on integrity						
Transparency and access to information						
Citizen participation in policy-making						

Coordination mechanisms at central and subnational level

***13. Integrity policies should be implemented effectively throughout the public administration. In your country, what kinds of
mechanisms are used to mainstream integrity policies across line ministries (e.g. health, education etc.)? Please select all that apply.**
Normative requirements (directives etc.)
Head of Central Government Body (or unit) participates in meetings of the Council of Minister (or similar)
Line ministries have dedicated integrity officials or units responsible for implementing integrity policies
Guidance by a Central Government Body (or unit) is provided to line ministries
Informal meetings
No such mechanisms exist, line ministries design their own integrity policies
Other (please specify):

***14. In your country, how is coordination between dedicated bodies at central and sub-national levels ensured? Please select all that
apply.**
Not applicable, there is no coordination between central and sub-national levels
Sub-national levels are autonomous and can decide over their integrity policies
Regular meetings between central government bodies and subnational bodies (or units) in specific integrity committee or commission
Integrity strategy and action plan (inter-institutional design of integrity policies)
Guidance by a Central Government Body (or unit) as in question 1 (e.g. through Help Desk/hotline or other kind of assistance to subnational governments)
Legal agreements /memorandums of understanding between levels of government
Other (please specify):

Section II. Evaluating the strength of public sector integrity systems
Performance measurement is not only an essential tool for facilitating implementation (by allowing policy makers to compare and identify potential bottlenecks), but also for improving the design of integrity policies themselves, since evaluations can provide invaluable evidence to inform reforms. When public, monitoring and evaluation initiatives also support continual improvement and inclusiveness by allowing citizens and other nongovernment stakeholders to examine policies more closely and participate in a more informed debate with government around integrity and anticorruption matters. This section of the questionnaire therefore takes stock of the extent to which governments monitor and evaluate policies; the depth, frequency and quality of those evaluations; and the ways by which they communicate and share this information with the public.The section aims at collecting evidence concerning Principle 3b of the draft OECD Recommendation on Public Integrity, which encourages countries to provide transparent

and timely data on the implementation and performance of public sector integrity systems.

*18. Pease indicate the specific elements generally covered by the evaluations. Select all that apply. Comment below if any other areas are evaluated:

	Always included as part of evaluation process (100% of the time)	Often included as part of evaluation process (50-90% of the time)	Sometimes included as part of evaluation process (1-49% of the time)	Unknown/varies widely across line ministries/organisations	Never included	Not applicable (i.e. policy or element does not exist)
a. Adoption of integrity values by public officials						
b. Extent of awareness of integrity policies by public officials						
c. Extent and quality of training conducted on integrity issues						
d. Extent to which trainings on integrity issues are attended and perceived (i.e. satisfaction with trainings)						
e. Existence and quality of codes of conduct						
f. Existence and quality of integrity/corruption/fraud risk mapping exercises						

g. Existence and strength of internal controls to mitigate corruption/fraud risks						
h. Existence and compliance with asset declaration policies						
i. Existence and compliance with conflict of interest policies						
j. Number of sanctions						
k. Types of sanctions (by offence, by sanction, by organisation, etc.)						
l. "Effectiveness" of disciplinary regime (i.e.						
appeals rates, cases overturned, recovery of fines if applicable)						

*19. What data and methods are commonly used to evaluate public sector integrity systems? Select all that apply.
Public opinion polls
Employee survey polls
Organizational administrative data
Interviews/focus groups
Case studies
Other (please specify):

Section III: Internal Control Systems and Risk Management Functions
Principle 10 of the draft OECD Recommendation on Public Integrity calls for countries to apply control and risk management frameworks to safeguard integrity in public sector organisations. Specifically, the draft Recommendation encourages countries to ensure a control environment with clear and fair objectives that demonstrate managers' commitment to integrity and public service values. In addition, the draft Recommendation

calls on countries to take a strategic approach to managing and assessing integrity risks (e.g. fraud and corruption) in order to address high-risk control weaknesses and identify warning signals. This also includes ensuring control mechanisms are coherent and clear procedures exist for responding to and reporting on credible suspicions of violations of laws and regulations, without fear of reprisals.

Internal control systems

*28a. Are line managers in the Executive branch (i.e. in line ministries/departments) responsible by law for monitoring and implementing internal control and risk management policies? Select all that apply.
Yes, for internal control policies
Yes, for risk management policies
Yes, specifically for integrity/corruption risk management
No, none

*34. Is there an internal audit function that exists centrally with a mandate to audit more than one government ministry? Select one.
Yes
No
No, but there are plans to develop a centralised internal audit function
*If yes, please note in which government entity the internal audit function resides. Comments

*35. Does the internal audit function generally include dedicated integrity (anti-fraud and anti-corruption) objectives in its mandate or strategy? Select one.
Yes
No
Not applicable