

ACLEI INTEGRITY MATURITY AXIS



Australian Government

Australian Commission for
Law Enforcement Integrity

Ad hoc

- Some integrity practices exist
- Focus on compliance and control
- Risks to organisational and individual integrity have not been clearly identified or articulated
- Risk management measures are likely to have been implemented ineffectively
- Risk management structures may be lacking
- Responses to issues, if identified, are uncoordinated, reactionary and ad hoc
- Inadequate control creates vulnerability in a high risk environment

High Risk

Aligned to risk

- Integrity is inherent to behaviour at all organisational levels
- Ethical standards have been codified and internalised to create a holistic integrity system
- Organisation is active and responsive to a changing risk environment
- Risk management roles and responsibilities are embedded to support organisational authority and accountability
- Organisational structures are sensibly aligned to ensure meaningful relationships support productivity and integrity
- Well-developed capacity for organisational reflection and self-criticism
- Ethical standards and integrity are embodied by all employees

Simple

Appropriate to risk

- Nominal risk management structures are appropriate for the relatively low risk environment
- Focus on compliance and control
- Risk management measures are simplistic or 'off the shelf'
- Problems may be addressed in ways which are quantifiable (such as training, restructures, or check-list approaches)
- Measures may be undertaken in an isolated manner
- Measures may not form part of a coordinated integrity management strategy

Complex

Over-engineered governance

- Comprehensive risk management structures and activities
- Risk management not proportionate to the risk environment
- Heavy reliance on rules, processes and procedures
- Hierarchical system with positions aligned to tasks
- Integrity messaging relies on top down communication
- Ethical standards are codified, with rigorous performance and compliance reporting
- Employees tend to work around policies and procedures for efficiency
- 'Getting the job done' ultimately takes precedence over integrity framework compliance
- Excessive control creates vulnerability in a low risk environment

Low Risk



ACLEI INTEGRITY MATURITY AXIS



Australian Government

Australian Commission for
Law Enforcement Integrity

This axis is designed as a tool to inform thinking about corruption risk, and to set expectations about the necessary complexity of an agency's integrity framework.

The horizontal axis of the Integrity Maturity Axis represents a spectrum (simple to complex) for considering integrity arrangements, while the vertical axis represents inherent risk in the operational environment prior to treatment (low risk to high risk).

The Integrity Maturity Axis is designed to be considered prior to undertaking the internal corruption controls self-assessment (R.E.D assessment) as it assists in considering measures as aligned to risk. For example—if an agency assesses their environment to be low risk, then the resource commitment needed to implement high risk treatments may not be justifiable. Likewise, if the environment is deemed high risk, and treatments are identified as simple, an agency may be exposed to increased corruption vulnerability.

To use the axis:

1. Considering the vertical axis (low risk to high risk), identify an agency's inherent environmental risk and plot this on the axis.
2. Considering the horizontal axis (simple to complex), assess the complexity of an agency's current integrity arrangements by identifying statements in each quadrant which best reflect the current status of integrity or risk management activities. Use this to select a position on the axis.
3. The intersection of (1) and (2) on the axis should be representative of the agency's current state.
4. Identify an agency's desired state by repeating (1) and (2), but considering which statements reflect an optimum, but also achievable outcome, and use this to select a position on the axis.
5. These indicators can then be used to qualify scope when considering internal corruption control activities in the ACLEI R.E.D assessment.

1. Bititci, U., Garengo, P., Ates, A. & Nudurupati, S. (2014). Value of maturity models in performance measurement. *International Journal of Production Research*, 53(10), 3062-3085
2. Bonham, S. (2008). *Actionable strategies through integrated performance, process, project, and risk management*. Artech House: Boston
3. Demidenko, E. & McNutt, P. (2008). *Framework for an ethical maturity index*
4. Evans, M. (2012). Beyond the integrity paradox - towards 'good enough' governance? *Policy Studies*, 33(1), 97-113
5. Thynne, I. (2012). Institutional maturity and challenges for integrity bodies. *Policy Studies*, 33(1), 37-47
6. Trapnell, S. (2015). *User's guide to measuring corruption and anti-corruption*. United Nations Development Programme: New York