Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

08-Apr-2016
_____
English - Or. English

Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate
Public Governance Committee

WORKING PARTY OF SENIOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY OFFICIALS

Draft Recommendation of the Council on Public Integrity

18 April 2016
OECD Conference Centre
Paris, France

This document presents the revised draft Recommendation of the Council on Public Integrity with revisions in track changes. The current revision reflects the results of the public consultation held in February and March 2016 and will be discussed at the upcoming meeting of the Working Party of Senior Public Integrity Officials on 18 April 2016. A consolidated revised draft Recommendation, integrating comments from the discussions, will be submitted to the SPIO and PGC for approval by written procedure and for transmission to Council.

Delegates will be invited to:

- DISCUSS and COMMENT the draft Recommendation of the Council on Public Integrity, aimed to replace and abrogate the 1998 Recommendation of the Council on Improving Ethical Conduct in the Public Service Including Principles for Managing Ethics in the Public Service.

For any questions please contact Ms. Terry Lamboo (Terry.Lamboo@oecd.org).

JT03393637

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION ON PUBLIC INTEGRITY

INTRODUCTION

Integrity is the backbone of political, economic and social structures. It underpins the governance process thereby contributing to prosperity and well-being. However, breaches of public integrity continue to plague us and have resulted in an increased interest in Member and non-Members in upgrading their integrity frameworks. As a result, the OECD Council invited the Public Governance Committee to update the first international instrument in the area of managing ethics and enhancing integrity: the 1998 OECD Recommendation on Improving Ethical Conduct in the Public Service (1998 Recommendation). The revisions to the 1998 Recommendation are extensive and incorporate new insights. For this reason, it is proposed to abrogate the 1998 Recommendation and replace it with the draft Recommendation of the Council on Public Integrity. The 1998 Recommendation is not legally binding but there is an expectation that Members and non-Members who have adhered to the Recommendation will do their utmost to implement it. The OECD stimulates learning through benchmarking and voluntary peer reviews to monitor progress in implementing the Recommendations in specific country contexts. Once adopted, the Recommendation would also be open for adherence by OECD non-Members.

The draft Recommendation specifically promotes a coherent and comprehensive integrity system that is applicable to all stages of the policy cycle. It is founded on the notion that an integrity system can only be effective if countries balance a values-based and compliance-based approach, and if the system is relevant given the actual risks of misconduct and corruption. A culture of integrity is based on values, clear standards and compliance supported by incentives and effective enforcement as teeth. Over-elaborate formal regulations and procedures however may be counter-effective, with the potential to raise unnecessary administrative costs, reduce privacy, institutionalise distrust, and reduce ethical reasoning to a culture of just following rules and procedures. This notion is therefore reflected within the draft Recommendation, which takes a principles-based approach. Practical guidance on how these principles could be implemented in a given context will be provided at the next stage in the form of a toolbox of good practices.

The draft Recommendation is also based upon the notion of integrity as a shared responsibility of individual organisations and of central public bodies (which may exist at the national level, but may also be available at subnational levels). Organisations are responsible for managing their integrity and facilitating open organisational cultures, and central public bodies (or units within bodies) for ensuring that the elements of the integrity system such as laws and regulations contribute to public integrity within their jurisdiction. Given the variety of multilevel governance arrangements in countries, integrity systems can be tailored to meet the needs of different government structures. Furthermore, given the variety of specific sectors, public officials or high-risk officials and tasks, the principle of a coherent and comprehensive integrity system does not imply one uniform system across the public sector; instead it allows for co-existing integrity sub-systems (at the central and subnational level) where relevant and effective.

The scope of the draft Recommendation explicitly includes a whole-of-government approach addressing all public officials, including public sector employees, as well as appointed or elected public officials. It also takes into account the insight that public trust in governments is based on the integrity of the public policy process and the delivery of public services. The draft Recommendation therefore includes a broad definition of 'public sector', including state owned enterprises or public-private partnerships,

whilst recognising that public services (e.g. health, education, and public transport) can be contracted out or privately funded in some countries. Public services are usually subject to stricter regulation as these are considered a 'public good', which are essential to the public well-being.

The draft Recommendation also takes into account the fact that integrity risks arise out of the various interactions between the public sector, the private sector, civil society and citizens at all stages of the political and policy process. This interconnectedness therefore is best addressed through a whole-of-society approach to enhancing integrity and reducing corruption. This is ultimately dependent upon efforts of public officials to refrain from misconduct, but a risk-based approach to integrity would also take into account the role of business and citizens in unethical interactions with public officials. Moreover, efforts to reduce corruption by public officials can only be effective within a broader culture of integrity where fraud and abuse of public resources by business and citizens alike is seen as unacceptable. This needs to be reinforced by regulations that create the "rules of the game" for citizens, business, government and civil society to protect the public interest. Such regulations underpin markets, protect the environment and the rights and safety of citizens and ensure the delivery of public goods and services. Establishing a culture of integrity within society would require a concerted action by public and private sectors, civil society and citizens alike.

Finally, in order to address the challenge of the actual implementation of measures promoting integrity, general management principles have been incorporated to ensure effective coordination of the system. Most importantly, the draft Recommendation aims to avoid a check-box approach based on a one-size-fits-all-solution, with the understanding that an effective integrity system must be founded on strategic goals and priorities that are informed by a risk-based approach.

Structure of the draft Recommendation

Central to the draft Recommendation is the shared aspiration and commitment by Member States and adherents to create a coherent and comprehensive integrity system, which builds a culture of integrity and provides accountability, and which contributes to effective governance, trust within society and inclusive growth. The public integrity system is thus organised around three pillars:

1. **Ensuring a coherent and comprehensive system** by taking political and management responsibilities for a strategic integrity system for all public officials, based on clear values and ethical standards.
2. **Building cultures of integrity** through a whole-of-society approach, and through investing in integrity leadership, a merit based public sector, and open organisational culture responsive to integrity concerns.
3. **Establishing accountability and transparency** through effective control, enforcement and oversight, and through an open government allowing for active participation by civil society, to safeguard the public interest.

The roadmap: Past steps

The Public Governance Committee, through its Working Party of Senior Public Integrity Officials (SPIO) began the updating process of the 1998 Recommendation in 2014. The SPIO first discussed challenges for an effective integrity system and identified key issues, then agreed on a Roadmap in March 2015 [GOV/PGC/ETH(2015)1]. At the SPIO meeting on 30 September-1 October 2015, and in the follow up written comments, the draft Recommendation [GOV/PGC/INT(2015)3] was well received, particularly in terms of its comprehensive approach, structure, and the relevance of the issues covered. Certain countries raised concerns in relation to the level of details and supported a less prescriptive and more principle-based text. Other countries on the contrary requested specific guidance to ensure clarity. The

inclusion of the sub-national level in the draft was also sensitive to federal countries as the national government cannot regulate or coordinate integrity policies at the subnational level. Several SPIO Delegates emphasised the need to strike the right balance between a values-based and a compliance-based system, and the need to connect the draft Recommendation with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that calls for a whole of society approach. Balancing transparency, privacy and administrative costs of integrity policies was also underlined. A number of SPIO Delegates also suggested including behavioural insights and "nudging" strategies for integrity in the draft Recommendation and in future OECD work. For more information see the summary of discussions at http://www.oecd.org/gov/ethics/Summary-Meeting-SPIO_Fall-2015.pdf.

A revised draft [GOV/PGC/INT(2015)3/REV1] was approved by SPIO for launching a public consultation through the Public Governance Committee. Several countries informed the OECD that the draft is useful for the further development of their policies. Given the more principle-based text of this revised draft, a toolbox with best practices and some explanatory notes will be added at a later stage. The revised draft [GOV/PGC/INT(2015)3/REV2] to the PGC reflected the feedback received from the SPIO and was approved by the PGC for public consultation with some suggestions for minor revisions.

Results of the public consultation

The open consultation [GOV/PGC/INT(2015)3/REV3] involved relevant OECD policy communities, stakeholders, international organisations and external experts, including public consultation through the OECD website. The open consultation took ~~take~~ place from 22 February - 23 March 2016, with extension until 31 March 2016. Over fifty responses were received from delegates representing the relevant Committees, Working Parties and Networks, accession countries and key partners, international organisations and academic institutions. The full responses and a concise summary will be published on the OECD website. Overall, the comments expressed approval or even compliments for the structure and scope of the draft Recommendation, making references to the three pillars and to the multilevel governance and the whole-of-society perspective to integrity. In addition, the need for an integrity system that balances a values-based and a compliance-based approach was recognised. Several suggestions for strengthening the draft Recommendation were also provided. The main issues included:

- A general need for practical guidance and further explanation of the draft Recommendation, such as the whole-of-society approach of the draft Recommendation;

- The need for more precise definitions and consistent use of terminology relating to integrity (including the terms misconduct, corruption, conflict of interest, wrongdoings, and irregularities). In general a concern was expressed that the definitions tended to a 'compliance-based' integrity system and neglected violations of ethical values.

- The need for more precise and consistent use of terminology relating to the object of the Recommendation (such as organisations, units, bodies or entities). According to some comments, the draft Recommendation tended to a focus on a centralised integrity system, neglecting the responsibilities of individual organisations and of the subnational levels of government.

Other comments included an invitation to strengthen some specific recommendations, such as: recognising transparency at the heart of any integrity system, revising the definition of conflict of interest to explicitly include asset declarations and post-public employment, clarifying the definition of whistleblowing policies and merit based civil service, and adding a more explicit reference to training on ethics for all public officials. Others commented that integrity not only concerns fighting corruption, but is also essential for the health and performance of public organisations and the personal health and

commitment of staff. In addition, it was suggested that a common language be adopted between the public and private sector in how to promote integrity and reduce misconduct in organisations. And while some comments indicated less preference for a strict review procedure for monitoring the implementation of the draft Recommendation, others expressed support for stricter and more elaborate reviews and benchmarking.

The revised draft Recommendation takes into account the comments and specific suggestions received in the consultations. Many comments also provided relevant input for developing a toolbox and practical guidance, as well as for future exchanges of experiences at the SPIO.

Next steps

The results of the consultations together with the revised draft Recommendation will be tabled for discussion at the next meeting of the SPIO on 18 April 2016 and the Symposium of the Public Governance Committee on 21 April 2016. The consolidated revised draft Recommendation will integrate the results of the debates during the Integrity Week as well as any additional comments from the PGC and SPIO. The consolidated, revised draft Recommendation will be submitted for Committee approval by written procedure and transmission to the Council for adoption, estimated in the Fall of 2016.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION OF THE COUNCIL ON PUBLIC INTEGRITY

HAVING REGARD to Article 5 b) of the Convention on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development of 14 December 1960;

HAVING REGARD to the Recommendation of the Council for Improving the Quality of Government Regulation [C(95)21/FINAL], the Recommendation of the Council on OECD Guidelines for Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Sector [C(2003)107], the Recommendation of the Council on Principles for Private Sector Participation in Infrastructure [C(2007)23/FINAL], the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions, the Recommendation of the Council for Further Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions [C(2009)159/REV1/FINAL], the Recommendation of the Council on Principles for Transparency and Integrity in Lobbying [C(2010)16], the Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises [C(76)99/FINAL as amended by C/MIN(2011)11/FINAL], the Recommendation of the Council on Regulatory Policy and Governance [C(2012)37], the Recommendation of the Council on Principles for Public Governance of Public-Private Partnerships [C(2012)86], the Recommendation of the Council on Effective Public Investment Across Levels of Government [C(2014)32], the Recommendation of the Council on Public Procurement [C(2015)2], the Recommendation of the Council on the Policy Framework for Investment [C(2015)56/REV1] and the Recommendation of the Council on Guidelines on Corporate Governance of State-Owned Enterprises [C(2015)85];

HAVING REGARD to the important work done on anti-corruption and good governance by the United Nations, embodied in particular in the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, and by other international as well as several regional organisations;

RECOGNISING that public integrity is the backbone of political, economic and social structures and thus essential to the economic and social well-being and prosperity of for individuals and societies as a whole;

RECOGNISING that public integrity is vital to public governance, safeguarding the public interest and reinforcing such fundamental values as the commitment to a pluralistic democracy based upon the rule of law and respect of human rights;

CONSIDERING that corruption and other integrity breaches, of which no country is immune, have become increasingly complex since the adoption of the 1998 Recommendation of the Council on Improving Ethical Conduct in the Public Service including Principles for Managing Ethics in the Public Service [C(98)70], which this Recommendation replaces;

RECOGNISING that integrity risks exist in the various interactions between the public sector, the private sector, civil society and citizens at all stages of the political and policy process, therefore this interconnectedness requires an integrative approach to enhancing integrity and reducing corruption;

RECOGNISING that integrity is a cornerstone of the overall system of good governance, and that updated guidance on integrity should accordingly promote coherence with other key elements of public governance;

RECOGNISING that national practices on promoting integrity vary widely across countries due to~~in light of~~ the specific nature of integrity risks and their distinct legal, institutional and cultural contexts, and understanding that while countries will determine and manage their national integrity system in accordance with ~~light of~~ these country-specific circumstances, they can benefit from the present Recommendation;

CONSIDERING that enhancing public integrity is a shared mission and responsibility for all levels of government, though different mandates and levels of autonomy apply in line with national legal and institutional frameworks; therefore, this Recommendation is relevant to all levels of government for fostering public trust;

On the proposal of the Public Governance Committee:

I. AGREES that, for the purpose of the present Recommendation, the following definitions are used:

- **Public integrity** refers to the consistent alignment of and adherence to shared values, principles and norms for upholding the public interest. As such it is not limited to public officials, but includes the public integrity of the private sector, civil society and citizens;

- ~~**Conflict of interest** involves a conflict between the public duty and private interests of a public official, in which the public official has private-capacity interests which could improperly influence the performance of their official duties and responsibilities.~~

- ~~**Corruption** refers to the abuse of a position or office for private interests;~~

- ~~**Integrity** refers to the consistent alignment of and adherence to sharedstated values, principles and norms for upholding the public interest. As such it is not limited to public officials, but includes the public integrity of the private sector, civil society and citizens; ;~~

- **Integrity system** includes the laws, regulations, policies, ~~organisations and~~ officials, bodies and units specifically contributing to public integrity and could be tailored to specific type of sectors and public officials, thereby creating co-existing **integrity sub-systems**;

- ~~**Misconduct** refers to behaviour breaching standards and rules that can be formally sanctioned, either through disciplinary, administrative, criminal or civil law;~~

- **Public official** refers to any person who performs a public function or provides a public service, i.e. someone who holds a legislative, executive, administrative, or judicial position of any kind, whether appointed or elected, paid or unpaid, in a permanent or temporary position;

- **Public sector** includes the legislative, executive, administrative, or judicial bodies at the central and subnational levels~~level~~, including public corporations, state owned enterprises and Public-Private Partnerships. It could also include entities that deliver **public**~~in kind~~ **services** (e.g. health, education, and public transport) although these can be contracted out or privately funded in some countries. It could also include non-governmental organisations performing governmental functions, generally in receipt of funding or other support from government.

II. RECOMMENDS that Members and non-Members having adhered to this Recommendation (hereafter the "Adherents") ensure a <u>coherent and comprehensive</u> ~~integrity~~ <u>system</u>.

To this end, Adherents should:

1. Demonstrate commitment at the highest political and management level to enhance integrity and reduce corruption, in particular through:

a) Establishing a coherent and comprehensive integrity system that takes into consideration a multilevel governance and whole-of-society perspective to integrity, that defines, supports, controls and enforces integrity and that is integrated into the wider <u>public</u> management and governance framework.

b) Ensuring that all public <u>sector</u> organisations have effective legislative and institutional frameworks, adequate resources and support to take responsibility for adequately <u>managing their</u>~~applying the~~ integrity ~~system~~.

c) Demonstrating <u>professional commitment and</u> exemplary personal behaviour, <u>and</u> maintaining a high standard of propriety in the discharge of official duties.

2. Promote institutional responsibilities across the public sector to strengthen the effectiveness of the integrity system, in particular through:

a) Establishing clear and effective responsibilities <u>at the relevant level (organisational, subnational, or national)</u> for <u>designing,</u> leading and implementing the<u></u>~~all~~ elements of the integrity system.

b) Ensuring that <u>all officials,</u>~~government~~ units or bodies (including autonomous or independent ones) responsible for the development, implementation, enforcement, and/or monitoring of elements of the integrity system <u>within their jurisdiction</u> have adequate mandate, capacity, expertise and resources to ~~effectively~~ fulfil their responsibilities.

c) Fostering ~~effective~~ mechanisms for horizontal and vertical collaboration between <u>such officials, units or</u>~~government~~ bodies<u>,</u> and where possible<u>,</u> with and between subnational levels of government<u>,</u> through formal or informal means to <u>avoid overlap and gaps and to</u> share lessons <u>learned</u> from good practices<u>,</u> ~~to avoid overlap and gaps~~.

3. Develop a strategic approach, outlining objectives and priorities that address risks and success factors, in particular through:

a) Setting strategic objectives and priorities for the integrity system based upon a clear risk-based approach to ~~irregularities,~~ misconduct<u>, corruption</u> and <u>wrongdoings of whatever kind</u>~~wrongful acts~~, and that takes into account relevant critical success factors.

b) Providing transparent and up-to-date measurement processes, including credible and relevant data, benchmarks and indicators that measure the level of implementation, performance and overall effectiveness of the integrity system.

4. Set standards that promote ethical conduct for public officials, in particular through:

   a) Setting integrity standards that not only focus on minimum standards, but that also encourage high standards of conduct, good governance, adherence to public service values and an open culture that facilitates and incentivises learning.

   b) Setting integrity standards in the legal system and organisational policies (such as codes of conduct or ethics) to provide a clear basis for —disciplinary, administrative, civil, and/or criminal —investigation and sanctions.

   c) Setting clear and proportionate standards and procedures for all public officialshigh risk positions and appointed or elected positions to prevent corruption and misconduct and corruption, including for the management of (latent) conflict of interests.

   d) Communicate public sector values and standards internally in public sector organisations, and externally to the private sector, civil society and citizens and askthe public with the expectation that these partners toalso respect those values and standards in their relationships with public officials.

III. RECOMMENDS that Adherents build a culture of integrity.

To this end, Adherents should:

5. Promote a whole-of-society culture of integrity, partnering with citizens and the private sector, civil society and citizens, in particular through:

   a) Including in the integrity system the role and responsibilities of citizens and the private sector, civil society and citizens for respecting public integrity values, in particular by providing incentives to uphold those values as a shared responsibility.

   b) Raising awareness in society of the benefits of integrity and ethical behaviour to reduce tolerance of corruption and misconduct, and carry out, where appropriate, campaigns to promote civic education, public values and ethics, among citizens.

   c)b) Engaging all relevant stakeholders in the development and regular update and implementation of the integrity system to ensure relevance and effective performance.

   c) Raising awareness in society of the benefits of integrity and reducing tolerance of misconduct, corruption and wrongdoings of whatever kind, and carry out, where appropriate, campaigns to promote civic education on public integrity, among citizens and especially at schools.

   d) Engaging with the private sector to uphold integrity in business operations and understandin the corresponding impact of business actions. on the public interest and share lessons learned from good practices.

6. Support open organisational cultures responsive to integrity concerns, in particular through:

   e) onEncouraging an open organisational culture where ethical dilemmas, integrity concerns, and errors can be discussed freely and where leadership is responsive to providing timely advice and resolving these issues.

f)d)~~Providing alternative channels for reporting irregularities and misconduct, including the possibility of reporting to a body with the~~ public interest,~~mandate~~ and ~~share lessons learned from good practices.~~capacity to conduct an independent investigation.

g) ~~6Providing clear rules and procedures for reporting irregularities, concerns about misconduct and wrongful acts that cover a wide scope of wrongdoings, and ensure in legislation and practice effective protection against all types of reprisals as a result of reporting, for all who carry out activities relevant to an organisation's mission.~~

~~7~~. Invest in integrity leadership to demonstrate an organisation's commitment to integrity, in particular through:

a) Including integrity leadership in the profile for managers at all levels of the organisation, and as a requirement for selection, appointment or promotion in a management position. In addition, assessing the performance of managers with respect to the integrity system at all levels of the organisation.

b) Supporting managers in their role as ethical leaders by establishing clear mandates, providing organisational support (internal control, human resources instruments, legal advice etc.) and periodic~~.),~~ training and guidance to increase awareness and skills for exercising appropriate judgement for integrity, in particular in cases~~case~~ of conflict of interest, whistleblowing, or disciplinary issues, as well as in relation to providing access to public information and transparency.

c) Fostering management frameworks that promote managerial responsibilities to identify and mitigate integrity risks.

7. Promote~~8. Create~~ a merit based professional public sector dedicated to public service values and good governance, in particular through:

a) Ensuring effective~~Effective, transparent and consistent~~ human resource management ~~policies~~ that consistently applies basic principles, such as merit and transparency, to support the professionalism of the ~~promote a~~ public service, prevents~~ethos, a merit based professional public sector, prevent~~ favouritism and nepotism, protects against undue political interference and mitigates~~address~~ risks for abuse of position and misconduct.

b) Ensuring a fair and open system for recruitment, selection and promotion, based on objective criteria and a formalised procedure; and an appraisal system that supports accountability and a public service ethos.

c) Addressing risks for abuse of position and misconduct through structural measures such as separating functions or rotating functions.

b) ~~8Ensuring that central units or bodies (including autonomous or independent ones) responsible for the development, implementation, enforcement, and/or monitoring of elements of the merit based system within their jurisdiction have the mandate, expertise and resources to effectively fulfil their responsibilities.~~

c) ~~Foster management frameworks that promote managerial responsibilities to identify and mitigate integrity risks.~~

9. Provide sufficient training, information, guidance and timely advice for public officials to apply ethical standards in the workplacesupport a culture of integrity, in particular through:

a) Providing public officials throughout their career with clear and up-to-date information about the organisation's policies, rules and administrative procedures relevant to maintaining high standards of integrity.

b) Offering induction and on-the-job integrity training to public officials throughout their career in order to raise awareness and develop essential skills for analysis of ethical dilemmas; and to make codes of conduct or ethics and other integrity standards practically applicable and meaningful in their own contexts.

c) Providing informal guidance and consultation mechanisms to help public officials apply integrity standards in their daily work, and to respond properly to conflict of interest situations. In addition, impartial advice and guidance (provided internallyinternal and/or externallyexternal to the organisation) should be made easy accessible to public officials, through proper formal channels.

9. Support open organisational cultures responsive to integrity concerns, in particular through:

a) Encouraging open organisational cultures where ethical dilemmas, integrity concerns, and errors can be discussed freely and where leadership is responsive in providing timely advice and resolving these issues.

b) Providing alternative channels for reporting misconduct, corruption and wrongdoings of whatever kind, including the possibility of confidentially reporting to a body with the mandate and capacity to conduct an independent investigation.

c) Providing clear rules and procedures for reporting misconduct, corruption and wrongdoings of whatever kind, and ensure in both legislation and practice effective protection against all types of reprisals as a result of reporting in good faith and on reasonable grounds, for all who carry out activities relevant to an organisation's mission (public officials and service providers to the organisation).

***IV. RECOMMENDS** that Adherents ensure accountability and transparency, and effective control and enforcement of public integrity.*

To this end, Adherents should:

10. Apply aan internal control and risk management framework to effectively safeguard integrity in public sector organisations, in particular through:

a) Ensuring aan effective control environment with clear and fair objectives that demonstrate managers' commitment to integrity and public service values, and that provides a reasonable level of assurance of an organisationsentity's efficiency, performance and compliance with laws, regulations, and standards. In particular, the internal control system should help to improve the performance – coherence, effectiveness and efficiency – of the integrity system.

b) Ensuring a strategic approach to risk management that includes assessing risks to integrity (e.g. fraud and corruption), risks and addressing control weaknesses. on a risk basis. This involvesincludes building in warning signals – such as red-flags – intowithin critical

processes, ~~as well as building~~and an effective monitoring and quality assurance mechanism ~~for~~of the risk management system~~, including fraud and corruption risks~~.

c) Ensuring control mechanisms are coherent ~~and include~~with effective and clear procedures for responding to credible suspicions of violations of laws and regulations, and facilitate reporting to the competent authorities without fear of reprisals.

11. Ensure that enforcement mechanisms provide appropriate responses to all credible suspicions of violations of integrity standards~~respond effectively to all cases of irregularities, misconduct or corruption~~, in particular through:

a) Applying fairness~~, and~~ objectivity and timeliness in the enforcement of integrity standards (including detecting, investigating, sanctioning, and appeal) through the disciplinary~~, or~~ administrative, civil, and/or criminal process, to reinforce cultures of integrity. ~~and through defining responsibilities and ensuring institutional capacity, at the organisational and central level where relevant to respond effectively and timely to reported cases.~~

b) Fostering ~~effective~~ mechanisms for collaboration and exchange of information between the relevant ~~internal~~ bodies, units and officials (at the organisational, subnational, or national level) to avoid overlap and gaps, and ~~to~~external public authorities where concurrent disciplinary and criminal cases would increase the timeliness and proportionality of enforcement mechanisms.

c) Providing transparency within public sector organisations~~the organisation~~ and to the public~~,~~ about the ~~outcomes of cases and the~~ effectiveness of the enforcement mechanisms and the outcomes of cases, in particular through developing relevant statistical data on cases, while respecting confidentiality and other relevant legal provisions.

12. Ensure that~~effective~~ external oversight and control promotes~~that promote~~ public accountability and integrity, in particular through:

a) Reinforcing the role of oversight within the integrity system by providing adequate responses (including redress where relevant) to the sanctions, rulings and formal advice by oversight bodies (such as a Supreme Audit Institution, Ombudsman, Information Commission), regulatory enforcement agencies (such as inspections and market regulators) and the administrative courts, thereby facilitating organisational learning and demonstrating accountability.

~~d) Ensuring that autonomous or independent regulatory and investigative entities defend the public interest through the impartial enforcement of laws and regulations applying to both public and private organisations, as well as citizens.~~

~~e) Ensuring that external oversight within the integrity system~~entities are autonomous or independent, with adequate authority, mandate, capacity, expertise and resources to fulfil their responsibilities, including the right to impose sanctions, as established in law.~~

~~Facilitating organisational learning and building public trust by providing adequate responses~~response (including redress where~~were relevant) to the sanctions, rulings and formal advice by oversight bodies (such as a Supreme Audit Institution, Ombudsman, Information Commission), regulatory enforcement agencies (such as inspections and market regulators) and the administrative courts, thereby facilitating organisational learning and demonstrating accountability~~and regulatory entities.~~

    b) Ensuring that these oversight bodies, regulatory enforcement agencies and administrative courts handle information received from third parties (complaints or allegations submitted by workers, citizens, other businesses etc.) in an effective way.

    c) Ensuring that regulatory enforcement agencies (such as inspections and market regulators), reinforce public integrity and defend the public interest through a risk-based, proportional and impartial enforcement of laws and regulations, as they may apply to both private and public entities (for example health, safety and environmental regulations), as well as to citizens (for example tax compliance).

13. Safeguard integrity and the public interest at all stages of the political and policyin the broader decision-making process, in particular through:

    a) Promoting transparency and an open government, including actively ensuring fullproviding access to information and open data, along withand active and timely responses to requestsrequest for information.

    b) GrantingEnsuring inclusion by granting all stakeholders - civil society organisations, businesses, the media and citizens the general public - equitable voice in the development and implementation of public policies, and averting. Including promoting integrity and avoidance of policy capture through management of conflict-of-interests, and transparency of lobbying activities and of financing of political parties and election campaigns.

    c) Enabling a civil society that includes 'watchdog' organisations, citizens groups and independent media, in order to ensure effective accountability.

V. INVITES the Secretary-General to disseminate this Recommendation.

VI. INVITES Adherents to disseminate this Recommendation within the public sector.

VII. INVITES non-Adherents to take due account of and adhere to this Recommendation.

VIII. INSTRUCTS the Public Governance Committee to monitor the implementation of this Recommendation and to report thereon to the Council no later than five years following its adoption and regularly thereafter.