



Australian Government
Australian Public Service Commission

Ms Sophie Dunstone
Committee Secretary
Select Committee on a National Integrity Commission
Department of the Senate
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

By email: integritycommission.sen@aph.gov.au

Dear Ms Dunstone

Further response to Question on Notice

I refer to an email of 1 August from your Ms Knackstredt about this matter.

The response to the additional question on notice that you identified is attached for the information of the Committee.

Yours sincerely

Paul Casimir
Director, Integrity
3 August 2017

Corruption questions used in the APS Employee Census in the years 2013-14 to 2016-17

The data collected from the APS Employee Census form the basis of the statistics in the annual State of the Service reports.

2014

The 2014 APS Employee Census was the first employee census to ask questions about perceived corruption in the APS. It asked two questions:

Question 1: In the last 12 months, did you witness another APS employee engaging in behaviour that you consider may be serious enough to be viewed as corruption?

Question 2: Which of the following best describes the corrupt behaviours you witnessed? [Please select all that apply]

- Bribery, domestic and foreign—obtaining, offering or soliciting secret commissions, kickbacks or gratuities
- Fraud, forgery, embezzlement
- Theft or misappropriation of official assets
- Nepotism and cronyism
- Acting (or failing to act) in the presence of an undisclosed conflict of interest
- Unlawful disclosure of government information
- Blackmail
- Perverting the course of justice
- Colluding, conspiring with or harbouring, criminals
- Other

2015

The 2015 APS Employee Census asked two questions again, amended slightly as shown. The material also included the following definition of corruption in the questionnaire and examples to support the definition:

The dishonest or biased exercise of a Commonwealth public official's functions. A distinguishing characteristic of corrupt behaviour is that it involves conduct that would usually justify serious penalties, such as termination of employment or criminal prosecution.

The following list provides examples of types of behaviour that, if serious enough, may amount to corruption:

- Bribery, domestic and foreign—obtaining, offering or soliciting secret commissions, kickbacks or gratuities
- Fraud, forgery, embezzlement
- Theft or misappropriation of official assets
- Nepotism—preferential treatment of family members
- Cronyism—preferential treatment of friends
- Acting (or failing to act) in the presence of a conflict of interest
- Unlawful disclosure of government information

-
- Blackmail
 - Perverting the course of justice
 - Colluding, conspiring with, or harbouring criminals

Question 1: Excluding behaviour reported to you as part of your duties, in the last 12 months have you witnessed another APS employee in your agency engaging in behaviour that you consider may be serious enough to be viewed as corruption?

Question 2: Which of the following best describes the corrupt behaviours you witnessed? [Please select all that apply]

- Bribery, domestic and foreign—obtaining, offering or soliciting secret commissions, kickbacks or gratuities
- Fraud, forgery, embezzlement
- Theft or misappropriation of official assets
- Nepotism—preferential treatment of family members
- Cronyism—preferential treatment of friends
- Acting (or failing to act) in the presence of an undisclosed conflict of interest
- Unlawful disclosure of government information
- Blackmail
- Perverting the course of justice
- Colluding, conspiring with, or harbouring criminals

2016

The 2016 APS Employee Census replicated the questions and format as in the 2015 APS Employee Census.

2017

The 2017 APS Employee Census kept the same definition of corruption as in 2015 and 2016, but added two further examples of what may viewed as corruption:

- Insider trading—misusing official information to gain an unfair private, commercial or market advantage for self or others
- Green-lighting—making official decisions that improperly favour a person or company, or disadvantage another