The external consultation confirmed strong support for a practical, plain-language corruption risk identification tool, while highlighting the need to refine the tool so it is neutral, evidence-informed, and easy for agencies to apply.

The main areas for improvement were clearer instructions, better definitions, stronger preventative indicators, careful handling of intent and culture, visible scoring logic, and clearer scope boundaries for the tool with suggestions for any potential future versions.

Overall, external stakeholders viewed the tool as well designed and valuable, but sought stronger guidance, clearer definitions, greater attention to culture and emerging risks, and broader recognition of how corruption manifests across different organisational contexts.

The feedback identified several practical improvements to strengthen the tool before release:

- **Clearer instructions:** agencies need to understand how to complete the assessment, who should complete each domain, how to use the results, and how responses translate into priority ratings. This has been addressed in the revised Instructions sheet and Guidance document.
- **Better definitions:** the guidance should clearly distinguish corruption from fraud, misconduct, poor practice, and broader integrity concerns, using plain language and examples. This has been addressed in the Guidance document, which now includes plain language definitions distinguishing corruption from fraud, misconduct and broader integrity concerns.
- **Stronger preventative indicators:** stakeholders encouraged a better balance between preventative controls and detective red flags, so the tool does not only identify warning signs after risk has emerged. This has been addressed through review of the diagnostic statement set, which has been updated to improve the balance between preventative controls and detective indicators.
- **Practical and observable indicators**: Stakeholders preferred indicators focused on observable behaviours and conditions, rather than assumptions about intent or motivation. This has been addressed in the revised diagnostic statements, which now focus on observable vulnerabilities and conditions rather than assumptions about intent or motivation.
- **Careful handling of intent and culture:** diagnostic statements should focus on observable vulnerabilities and behaviours, rather than implying corrupt intent. Culture, reporting confidence, and leadership response were also identified as important factors affecting whether controls work in practice. This has been

addressed in the revised diagnostic statements, which focus on observable vulnerabilities and behaviours rather than implying corrupt intent. Culture, reporting confidence, and leadership response are reflected in the relevant domain statements.

- **Visible scoring logic:** agencies need to understand how ratings are converted into risk priorities, and how “don’t know” responses are treated as awareness gaps rather than neutral answers. This has been addressed in the Instructions sheet, which explains how responses are converted into priority ratings and how 'don't know' responses are treated as awareness gaps rather than neutral answers.
- **Clearer scope boundaries:** the tool should explain what is included in this version , what is out of scope, and what may be considered for future versions, including local government risks, AI and automated decision-making, and cross-agency intelligence sharing. This has been addressed in the Instructions sheet, which sets out what is included in this version, what is out of scope, and what may be considered for any potential future versions including local government risks, AI and automated decision-making, and cross-agency intelligence sharing.