



**DEFENCE
COMPANIES
ANTI-
CORRUPTION
INDEX 2015**

AUTHORS: Katie Fish, Michelle Man, Michael Petkov, Mark Pyman

CONTRIBUTORS: Moira Andrews, Louise Fluker, Dessi Hristova, Gareth Somerset, Leah Wawro

EXTERNAL PEER REVIEWERS: John Bray, Charles Chadwick, John Howe, Rajesh Kapoor

DESIGN: Rational International, Ivo Jongejan

© 2015 Transparency International UK. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in parts is permitted, providing that full credit is given to Transparency International UK (TI-UK) and provided that any such reproduction, in whole or in parts, is not sold or incorporated in works that are sold. Written permission must be sought from Transparency International UK if any such reproduction would adapt or modify the original content.

Published April 2015

ISBN: 978-1-910778-01-2

Printed on 100% recycled paper.

Every effort has been made to verify the accuracy of the information contained in this report. All information was believed to be correct as of April 2015. Nevertheless, Transparency International UK cannot accept responsibility for the consequences of its use for other purposes or in other contexts.

Transparency International UK's registered UK charity number is 1112842.

THANKS

TI-UK would like to thank all the companies and individuals who have encouraged us to do this study and those who engaged with us throughout the process.

We would particularly like to thank those companies that participated in providing internal information. We appreciate that it has involved not only a significant commitment but also a degree of trust on their part and we hope that the result will be a significant improvement across the whole defence industry.

TI-UK would like to thank the UK Department for International Development (DFID) for their generous support. This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government. The views expressed do not reflect the UK government's official policies.

DISCLOSURE OF POSSIBLE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

General Electric Company is a corporate supporter of the Transparency International Secretariat and member of the TI-Secretariat's Business Principles Steering Committee. The Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Fluor Corporation, Mr Alan Boekmann, sits on the TI-Secretariat's Business Principles for Countering Bribery: Business Advisory Board. General Electric Company, Bechtel Corporation, Fluor Foundation, Fluor Corporation, Lockheed Martin Corporation, and Raytheon Company are corporate supporters of Transparency International USA. Transparency International UK has worked with Meggitt plc. Other companies covered in this report may also provide support to Transparency International Chapters worldwide. TI-UK and external peer reviewers have recused themselves from reviewing companies to which they have a connection.

companies.defenceindex.org

CONTENTS

The index at a glance.....	3
The results at a glance.....	4
A shared interest.....	5
Recommendations.....	6
Results.....	7
Regional results.....	9
Results based on internal information.....	11
How did companies in the 2012 index score in 2015?.....	13
Analysis.....	15
• Leadership, governance & organisation	
• Risk management	
• Company policies & codes	
• Training	
• Personnel & helplines	
• Offsets	
Methodology.....	21
Annex 1: Question set 2015.....	24
Annex 2: Detailed company results.....	27

THE INDEX AT A GLANCE

THIS INDEX ASSESSES THE ETHICS AND ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRAMMES OF **163** DEFENCE COMPANIES FROM **47** COUNTRIES USING PUBLICLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION

COMPANY SELECTION

Companies were selected based on one of three criteria:

- they were included in the 2012 index;
- they lie within the top one hundred global defence companies as measured by defence revenue in 2012;
- they are a significant defence company from a country that would otherwise be unrepresented.

SCORING

Based on the extent of public evidence on their ethics and anti-corruption programmes, companies were placed in one of six bands.

BAND	EVIDENCE LEVEL
A	Extensive evidence
B	Good evidence
C	Moderate evidence
D	Limited evidence
E	Very limited evidence
F	Almost no evidence

COMPANY ENGAGEMENT

Companies were asked to nominate a point of contact; one hundred companies did so. All companies in the index were sent a draft assessment for comment and review.

We also reviewed information that is internal or confidential to companies. Sixty-three companies provided detailed internal information in 2015, almost double the number that did so in 2012.

THE RESULTS AT A GLANCE

MOST LARGE DEFENCE COMPANIES STILL SHOW LITTLE EVIDENCE OF ETHICS AND ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRAMMES

Two-thirds (107 companies) perform in the bottom half of the index (bands D to F), with limited to no evidence of such programmes.

23% (37 companies) provide no evidence at all.

HOWEVER, MANY DEFENCE COMPANIES ARE INCREASINGLY ADDRESSING CORRUPTION RISKS

42 companies out of 127 (33%) have improved significantly since 2012, by one or more bands. In total, 76 companies (60%) have improved compared with 2012.

17% of companies are now in bands A and B, compared with only 8% in 2012.

Improvement was evident in companies from every region of the world.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE IS ACHIEVABLE AND INCREASING

Of the 85 companies that scored in bands D to F in the 2012 index, 29 have substantially improved their public disclosure.

KEY AREAS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT ARE AGENTS, WHISTLEBLOWING AND OFFSETS

Only 13 companies provide evidence of regular due diligence on agents. Only 8 companies have whistleblowing mechanisms that encourage reporting. Only 3 companies demonstrate good anti-corruption procedures in offset contracts.

A SHARED INTEREST

Corruption in defence affects us all. It is not just about commissions on sales: corruption can also mean soldiers operating with equipment that doesn't work, or with no equipment at all. Well intentioned 'defence assistance' can be subverted by corruption in the destination country. We all – citizens, defence companies, governments, and international organisations – have a shared interest in reducing this risk worldwide.

Societal norms and the attitude of markets to corruption have changed for the better over the last thirty years. Practices such as facilitation payments and uncontrolled use of intermediaries, once common, are increasingly recognised as poor practice. Anti-bribery laws have been passed and compliance has become part of the lexicon of today's businesses.

These changes of attitude are happening in defence too, but with greater difficulty. The sale and purchase of weapons usually has a political element, and many defence transactions are protected by secrecy, a practice that can also shield companies from sensible scrutiny in some parts of the world. Major corruption scandals continue to occur.

Nevertheless, it is clear from this analysis that many companies in the industry are paying closer attention to corruption risks. Despite increasing the rigour of the questionnaire, there has been significant net improvement in the results of the second Defence Companies Anti-Corruption Index: this improvement is both

among the companies that already had substantive anti-corruption programmes in place in 2012, and those that showed almost no evidence of anti-corruption programmes.

We welcome these improvements in individual companies. Not only do they raise the standard of the whole global industry, they show other companies that have not yet improved how it can be done.

Defence companies have also started to collaborate on industry-wide initiatives. One example is the International Forum on Business Ethical Conduct for the Aerospace and Defence Industry (IFBEC), a global forum for raising defence industry standards. IFBEC is currently working on an initiative to reduce the corruption risks relating to offsets – side contracts in which companies reinvest a significant proportion of the deal with the purchasing country.

Governments have a vital role to play in improving integrity in this sector: many defence ministries still need to improve their own anti-corruption programmes. Transparency International's Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index provides a tool for defence ministries to analyse and improve their anti-corruption programmes.

On the next page we propose ten steps through which this shared interest can be brought closer to reality, through actions by company CEOs, government officials, investors and civil society. This will have a positive impact on citizens, soldiers and budgets.

RECOMMENDATIONS

CEOs AND BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

1. Ensure that you have a robust ethics and anti-corruption programme. Encourage periodic independent review.
2. Disclose the programme fully on your company's website.
3. Speak up strongly against corruption inside your company and in public fora.

INVESTOR ENGAGEMENT TEAMS, PORTFOLIO MANAGERS, AND ANALYSTS

4. Ask the CEO and the Chair of the Board to explain their ethics and anti-corruption programme.
5. Ask them to show you the results of any independent review of their programme.

PROCUREMENT CHIEFS IN ARMS IMPORTING COUNTRIES

6. Require that all bidding companies have effective ethics and anti-corruption programmes in place, and that they are made public.
7. Where regulations permit, place a requirement in Ministry of Defence (MoD) regulations that all bidding companies must possess an ethics and anti-corruption programme.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS RESPONSIBLE FOR OFFSETS

8. Require all bidding companies to publish their detailed offset obligations.
9. Require that they publish annual performance assessments of their offset obligations.

ARMS EXPORTING GOVERNMENTS

10. Require robust ethics and anti-corruption programmes in your national defence companies.

CIVIL SOCIETY

Request that companies are required to have ethics and anti-corruption programmes in place as a condition of bidding for MoD contracts. Discuss the results of this index with national defence companies. Carry out a national defence companies index in your country.

RESULTS

BASED ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

<p>BECHTEL LOCKHEED MARTIN</p>	<p>A (4)</p>	<p>FLUOR CORPORATION RAYTHEON</p>
<p>ACCENTURE BABCOCK COBHAM EXELIS INC. FUJITSU HEWLETT-PACKARD MEGGITT QINETIQ ROCKWELL COLLINS SERCO GROUP THYSSENKRUPP AG UNITED TECHNOLOGIES</p>	<p>B (23)</p>	<p>AIRBUS GROUP BAE SYSTEMS CSC FINMECCANICA GENCORP KBR NORTHROP GRUMMAN RAFAEL ADVANCED DEFENSE SYSTEMS ROLLS-ROYCE THALES ULTRA ELECTRONICS</p>
<p>ATK BOOZ ALLEN HAMILTON DAEWOO SHIPBUILDING & MARINE ENGINEERING ELBIT SYSTEMS FINCANTIERI GENERAL DYNAMICS HARRIS CORPORATION ISRAEL AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES KONGSBERG LEIDOS NAMMO OSHKOSH SAAB TEXTRON</p>	<p>C (29)</p>	<p>BOEING CHEMRING DAY & ZIMMERMANN DYNCORP INTERNATIONAL EMBRAER GE AVIATION GKN HONEYWELL JACOBS ENGINEERING L-3 COMMUNICATIONS MISSION ESSENTIAL NEC CORPORATION PATRIA SAIC URS</p>
<p>ALION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AVIO CACI CUBIC DCNS DIEHL STIFTUNG FLIR SYSTEMS HUNTINGTON INGALLS INDUSTRIES MANTECH MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC MTU AERO ENGINES OTOKAR RHEINMETALL SAMSUNG TECHWIN TOSHIBA VSE</p>	<p>D (31)</p>	<p>AVIBRAS INDÚSTRIA AEROESPACIAL BALL AEROSPACE & TECHNOLOGIES CORP. CAE CURTISS-WRIGHT CORPORATION DENEL ESTERLINE TECHNOLOGIES HINDUSTAN AERONAUTICS INDRA MBDA MISSILE SYSTEMS MITSUBISHI HEAVY INDUSTRIES NAVISTAR PRECISION CASTPARTS CORP. SAFRAN TELEDYNE TECHNOLOGIES TRIUMPH GROUP</p>

EVIDENCE OF ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRAMMES

A

F

EXTENSIVE

ALMOST NONE

	E (19)	
<p>AAR AIDC ASELSAN BHARAT ELECTRONICS LIMITED GORKY AUTOMOBILE PLANT ITOCHU LIG NEX1 NAVANTIA RUAG ZODIAC AEROSPACE</p> <p>AAL ADVANCED ELECTRONICS COMPANY ANTONOV ARSENAL ASC BATTELLE BELTECHEXPORT COMPANY CEA TECHNOLOGIES DAMEN SCHELDE NAVAL SHIPBUILDING FADEA HEAVY INDUSTRIES TAXILA HIRTENBERGER GROUP INDIAN ORDNANCE FACTORIES IRKUT CORPORATION KBP INSTRUMENT DESIGN BUREAU KING ABDULLAH II DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT BUREAU KRAUSS-MAFFEI WEGMANN THE MITRE CORPORATION NORINCO POLISH DEFENCE HOLDING PT DIRGANTARA INDONESIA RUSSIAN HELICOPTERS SATUMA SRA INTERNATIONAL ST ENGINEERING TATRA TRUCKS TOPAZ TURKISH AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES URALVAGONZAVOD ZASTAVA ARMS</p>	<p>F (57)</p>	<p>THE AEROSPACE CORPORATION AM GENERAL BHARAT EARTH MOVERS LIMITED DOOSAN DST ISRAEL MILITARY INDUSTRIES KAWASAKI HEAVY INDUSTRIES MOOG RTI SYSTEMS SUMITOMO CORPORATION</p> <p>ABU DHABI SHIP BUILDING ALMAZ-ANTEY ARAB ORGANIZATION FOR INDUSTRIALIZATION AVIATION INDUSTRY CORPORATION OF CHINA BOUSTEAD NAVAL SHIPYARD CHINA SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY CORPORATION DASSAULT AVIATION GENERAL ATOMICS HERSTAL GROUP IGMAN D.D. KONJIC IRAN ELECTRONICS INDUSTRIES JAPAN MARINE UNITED KHARKOV STATE AIRCRAFT MANUFACTURING COMPANY KOREA AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES M.C. DEAN NEXTER GROUP PAKISTAN ORDNANCE FACTORIES POONGSAN CORPORATION RSK MIG SAPURA SECURED TECHNOLOGIES SC UZINA MECANICA CUGIR SA SRC, INC SUKHOI TERMA TACTICAL MISSILES CORPORATION UNITED ENGINE CORPORATION WYLE</p>

REGIONAL RESULTS

BASED ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA

NORTH AMERICA

A
(4)

BECHTEL
FLUOR CORPORATION
LOCKHEED MARTIN
RAYTHEON

B
(8)

CSC
EXELIS INC.
GENCORP
HEWLETT-PACKARD
KBR
NORTHROP GRUMMAN
ROCKWELL COLLINS
UNITED TECHNOLOGIES

C
(17)

ATK
BOEING
BOOZ ALLEN HAMILTON
DAY & ZIMMERMANN
DYNACORP INTERNATIONAL
GE AVIATION
GENERAL DYNAMICS
HARRIS CORPORATION
HONEYWELL
JACOBS ENGINEERING
L-3 COMMUNICATIONS
LEIDOS
MISSION ESSENTIAL
OSHKOSH
SAIC
TEXTRON
URS

D
(15)

ALION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
BALL AEROSPACE
& TECHNOLOGIES CORP.
CACI
CAE
CUBIC
CURTISS-WRIGHT CORPORATION
ESTERLINE TECHNOLOGIES
FLIR SYSTEMS
HUNTINGTON INGALLS INDUSTRIES
MANTECH
NAVISTAR
PRECISION CASTPARTS CORP.
TELEDYNE TECHNOLOGIES
TRIUMPH GROUP
VSE

E
(4)

AAR
THE AEROSPACE CORPORATION
AM GENERAL
MOOG

F
(7)

BATTELLE
GENERAL ATOMICS
M.C. DEAN
THE MITRE CORPORATION
SRA INTERNATIONAL
SRC, INC
WYLE

B
(13)

AIRBUS GROUP
ACCENTURE
BABCOCK
BAE SYSTEMS
COBHAM
FINMECCANICA
MEGGITT
QINETIQ
ROLLS-ROYCE
SERCO GROUP
THALES
THYSSENKRUPP AG
ULTRA ELECTRONICS

C
(7)

CHEMRING
FINCANTIERI
GKN
KONGSBERG
NAMMO
PATRIA
SAAB

D
(9)

AVIO
DCNS
DIEHL STIFTUNG
INDRA
MBDA MISSILE SYSTEMS
MTU AERO ENGINES
OTOKAR
RHEINMETALL
SAFRAN

E
(6)

ASELSAN
GORKY AUTOMOBILE PLANT
NAVANTIA
RTI SYSTEMS
RUAG
ZODIAC AEROSPACE

F
(27)

ALMAZ-ANTEY
ANTONOV
ARSENAL
BELTECHEXPORT COMPANY
DAMEN SCHELDE NAVAL SHIPBUILDING
DASSAULT AVIATION
HERSTAL GROUP
HIRTENBERGER GROUP
IGMAN D.D. KONJIC
IRKUT CORPORATION
KBP INSTRUMENT DESIGN BUREAU
KHARKOV STATE AIRCRAFT
MANUFACTURING COMPANY
KRAUSS-MAFFEI WEGMANN
NEXTER GROUP
POLISH DEFENCE HOLDING
RSK MIG
RUSSIAN HELICOPTERS
SC UZINA MECANICA CUGIR SA
SUKHOI
TATRA TRUCKS
TERMA
TOPAZ
TACTICAL MISSILES CORPORATION
TURKISH AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES
UNITED ENGINE CORPORATION
URALVAGONZAVOD
ZASTAVA ARMS

EVIDENCE OF ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRAMMES



EXTENSIVE

ALMOST NONE

ASIA PACIFIC

B (1)	FUJITSU
C (2)	DAEWOO SHIPBUILDING & MARINE ENGINEERING NEC CORPORATION
D (5)	HINDUSTAN AERONAUTICS MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI HEAVY INDUSTRIES SAMSUNG TECHWIN TOSHIBA
E (8)	AIDC BHARAT EARTH MOVERS LIMITED BHARAT ELECTRONICS LIMITED DOOSAN DST ITOCHU KAWASAKI HEAVY INDUSTRIES LIG NEX1 SUMITOMO CORPORATION
F (17)	AAL ASC AVIATION INDUSTRY CORPORATION OF CHINA BOUSTEAD NAVAL SHIPYARD CEA TECHNOLOGIES CHINA SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY CORPORATION HEAVY INDUSTRIES TAXILA INDIAN ORDNANCE FACTORIES JAPAN MARINE UNITED KOREA AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES NORINCO PAKISTAN ORDNANCE FACTORIES POONGSAN CORPORATION PT DIRGANTARA INDONESIA SAPURA SECURED TECHNOLOGIES SATUMA ST ENGINEERING

LATIN AMERICA

C (1)	EMBRAER
D (1)	AVIBRAS INDÚSTRIA AEROESPACIAL
F (1)	FADEA

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

D (1)	DENEL
--------------	-------

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

B (1)	RAFAEL ADVANCED DEFENSE SYSTEMS
C (2)	ELBIT SYSTEMS ISRAEL AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES
E (1)	ISRAEL MILITARY INDUSTRIES
F (5)	ARAB ORGANIZATION FOR INDUSTRIALIZATION ABU DHABI SHIP BUILDING ADVANCED ELECTRONICS COMPANY IRAN ELECTRONICS INDUSTRIES KING ABDULLAH II DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT BUREAU

RESULTS BASED ON INTERNAL INFORMATION

Along with public information, we also review in detail information that is internal or confidential to companies. This gives us a better understanding of companies' ethics and anti-corruption programmes, facilitates a deeper understanding of how anti-corruption processes can be embedded inside a company, and encourages increased transparency.

Reviewing information that is internal to companies has the major limitation that it is not available for public scrutiny. We believe that transparency is central to public accountability and it is for this reason that the main index produced from this analysis is based on public information only. We strongly encourage all companies to put information on their ethics and anti-corruption programmes into the public domain.

A (17)	ACCENTURE	(B)	B (25)	BABCOCK	(B)	C (9)	AIDC	(E)
	AIRBUS GROUP	(B)		CSC	(B)		CAE	(D)
	BAE SYSTEMS	(B)		DCNS	(D)		DAEWOO SHIPBUILDING & MARINE ENGINEERING	(C)
	BECHTEL	(A)		ELBIT SYSTEMS	(C)		FINCANTIERI	(C)
	BOEING	(C)		EMBRAER	(C)		ISRAEL MILITARY INDUSTRIES	(E)
	COBHAM	(B)		FINMECCANICA	(B)		MISSION ESSENTIAL	(C)
	DAY & ZIMMERMANN	(C)		FUJITSU	(B)		NAMMO	(C)
	EXELIS INC.	(B)		GE AVIATION	(C)		OSHKOSH	(C)
	FLUOR CORPORATION	(A)		GENCORP	(B)		SAFRAN	(D)
	HEWLETT-PACKARD	(B)		GKN	(C)			
	L-3 COMMUNICATIONS	(C)		HARRIS CORPORATION	(C)			
	LOCKHEED MARTIN	(A)		ISRAEL AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES	(C)			
	QINETIQ	(B)		JACOBS ENGINEERING	(C)			
	RAYTHEON	(A)		KONGSBERG	(C)			
	SERCO GROUP	(B)		MEGGITT	(B)			
	THYSSENKRUPP AG UNITED TECHNOLOGIES	(B)		MTU AERO ENGINES	(D)			
				NEC CORPORATION	(C)			
		PATRIA		(C)				
		RAFAEL ADVANCED DEFENSE SYSTEMS		(B)				
		RHEINMETALL		(D)				
		ROCKWELL COLLINS		(B)				
		ROLLS-ROYCE		(B)				
		SAAB		(C)				
		TELEDYNE TECHNOLOGIES		(D)				
		THALES		(B)				

Sixty-three companies provided additional internal information about their ethics and anti-corruption programmes, an 85% increase on the 2012 analysis.

Including internal information, companies improved their results by an average of one band, with 18 companies moving up to band A or B from bands C to F.


The improvement is mostly due to additional information disclosure in two specific areas:

- how the companies assess corruption risk; and
- how staff members are trained on ethics and anti-corruption measures.

THIS TABLE SHOWS THE BAND FOR EACH COMPANY IF INTERNAL INFORMATION WERE MADE PUBLIC. THE LETTER IN PARENTHESIS REPRESENTS THE COMPANY'S BAND BASED ON PUBLIC INFORMATION ONLY.

D (8)	AM GENERAL	(E)		
	DIEHL STIFTUNG	(D)		
	INDRA	(D)		
	KAWASAKI HEAVY INDUSTRIES	(E)		
	KRAUSS-MAFFEI WEGMANN	(F)		
	MBDA MISSILE SYSTEMS	(D)		
	SAPURA SECURED TECHNOLOGIES	(F)		
	ST ENGINEERING	(F)		
	E (3)	DOOSAN DST	(E)	
		LIG NEX1	(E)	
		ZODIAC AEROSPACE	(E)	
				F(1) TATRA TRUCKS (F)

HOW DID COMPANIES IN THE 2012 INDEX SCORE IN 2015?



Of the 163 companies in this index, 127 were assessed in 2012. The results show significant improvement overall. At the upper end, 26 of the 127 companies are now in bands A and B compared with only 10 in 2012. Only 35 companies are in band F, compared with 46 in 2012.

This net improvement has taken place despite the 2015 index being more demanding. Five of the questions are more rigorous, and the scoring criteria for 14 questions are more nuanced. We have added questions on offsets, anti-corruption agenda review, risk assessment, charitable contributions and whistleblowing. Detailed modelling indicates that the 2015 index is up to 7% more demanding than the 2012 index.

TI-UK assessed 129 companies in 2012 index but ARINC, Goodrich Corporation and Tognum have since been acquired. SAIC has been restructured and now appears in the index as both Leidos and SAIC. In 2015, ATK merged with Orbital Sciences Corp. to form Orbital ATK Inc. ATK has been included in this analysis as the merger was completed after the index research period.

42 COMPANIES HAVE IMPROVED SIGNIFICANTLY SINCE 2012

+3 BANDS

ISRAEL AEROSPACE
INDUSTRIES
PATRIA
ULTRA ELECTRONICS

+2 BANDS

AVIBRAS INDÚSTRIA
AEROESPACIAL
BABCOCK
BECHTEL
DENEL
FINCANTIERI
LOCKHEED MARTIN
OTOKAR
RAFAEL ADVANCED
DEFENSE SYSTEMS
RAYTHEON

+1 BAND

AIRBUS GROUP
ATK
BHARAT EARTH MOVERS
LIMITED
BHARAT ELECTRONICS
LIMITED
BOOZ ALLEN HAMILTON
COBHAM
CSC
DAEWOO SHIPBUILDING &
MARINE ENGINEERING
DCNS
DOOSAN DST
ELBIT SYSTEMS
EMBRAER
EXELIS INC.
FINMECCANICA
ISRAEL MILITARY
INDUSTRIES
KAWASAKI HEAVY
INDUSTRIES
KBR
LIG NEX1
MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC
MITSUBISHI HEAVY
INDUSTRIES
NAMMO
NAVANTIA
NEC CORPORATION
QINETIQ
RHEINMETALL
ROCKWELL COLLINS
ROLLS-ROYCE
SAMSUNG TECHWIN
THYSSENKRUPP AG
ZODIAC AEROSPACE

-1 BAND

AAR
DASSAULT AVIATION
INDRA
JAPAN MARINE UNITED
TELEDYNE
TECHNOLOGIES
VSE

We have added 36 new companies to the 2015 analysis. Almost two-thirds of these score in the lowest band, providing almost no or no evidence of ethics and anti-corruption programmes.

36 COMPANIES ADDED TO THE INDEX IN 2015



ANALYSIS

LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE & ORGANISATION

Leaders set a company's stance on ethics and good business conduct, demonstrate that anti-corruption is a priority, and ensure that weaknesses are identified and improvements made.

Sixty-six per cent of the 56 companies in bands A-C show evidence of leadership, regularly speaking out in support of a strong anti-corruption stance. However, only 7 per cent of the 107 companies in bands D-F show similar evidence.

The table below shows the companies achieving the highest scores for Leadership, Governance & Organisation, both on the basis of public information and internal information.

The regional split shows good practice ranging from France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and the UK, to Israel, India, Japan, and the US.

FORMAL BOARD REVIEW

A key high-level governance function is formal board review of a company's ethics and anti-corruption programme. We have seen a significant improvement in the 2015 index compared with 2012. In bands A-C, 37 out of 56 companies score well in 2015, compared with only 13 out of 44 companies in 2012.

Refer to Annex 2 for the detailed scores per company per pillar.

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON PUBLIC INFORMATION					
NORTH AMERICA		EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA		REST OF THE WORLD	
BECHTEL		ACCENTURE		HINDUSTAN AERONAUTICS	
FLUOR CORPORATION		AIRBUS GROUP		ISRAEL AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES	
HARRIS		BABCOCK		MITSUBISHI HEAVY INDUSTRIES	
HEWLETT-PACKARD		FINMECCANICA		NEC CORPORATION	
L-3 COMMUNICATIONS		MEGGITT		RAFAEL ADVANCED DEFENSE SYSTEMS	
LOCKHEED MARTIN		SAAB			
RAYTHEON		SERCO GROUP			
		THALES			
TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON INTERNAL INFORMATION					
AIRBUS GROUP	BECHTEL	FLUOR CORPORATION	HARRIS	QINETIQ	THYSSENKRUPP AG
UNITED TECHNOLOGIES					

RISK MANAGEMENT

A number of companies have substantially improved public disclosure of their risk management processes over the past three years.

Nonetheless, companies overall score lowest in this pillar. Only 22 companies provide good public evidence of enterprise-wide anti-corruption risk assessment processes with detailed mitigation plans. Only nine companies score well on having an anti-corruption risk assessment procedure for assessing proposed business decisions.

Companies achieving the highest scores on risk management are shown below. Outside of North America and Europe, companies from India, Israel and Japan demonstrate the geographic spread of good practice.

THIRD PARTIES

Fifty-four per cent of companies state that they make suppliers aware of their stance on bribery and corruption. This includes all but three of the companies in bands A-C and one third of the companies in bands D-F. However, only 29 per cent of companies provide public evidence of contractual terms for agents and monitoring mechanisms for ensuring that agents abide by these terms.

Many companies are aware of the need to conduct due diligence on agents: 53 companies provide some public evidence of such procedures. However, only 13 companies provide additional evidence that due diligence is refreshed at regular intervals.

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

NORTH AMERICA	EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA	REST OF THE WORLD
BECHTEL	AIRBUS GROUP	FUJITSU
FLUOR CORPORATION	BABCOCK	HINDUSTAN AERONAUTICS
LOCKHEED MARTIN	FINMECCANICA	ISRAEL AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES
MISSION ESSENTIAL	ROLLS-ROYCE	RAFAEL ADVANCED DEFENSE SYSTEMS
RAYTHEON	SERCO GROUP	
	THALES	

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON INTERNAL INFORMATION

ACCENTURE	AIRBUS GROUP	BAE SYSTEMS	JACOBS ENGINEERING	QINETIQ	RAYTHEON
-----------	--------------	-------------	--------------------	---------	----------

COMPANY POLICIES & CODES

Company policies and codes are traditionally the foundation of an ethics and anti-corruption programme and are most commonly presented as evidence of a company's commitment to ethics and anti-corruption. This is evident from the fact that, on average, companies score highest in this pillar.

The average score for this pillar has risen substantially from 2012.

- Fifty-six companies have increased their scores by at least 10 per cent.
- Of the companies that have increased their scores from zero in the 2012 index, the majority of them achieved the highest number of points in this pillar.

Companies score the most points in this pillar by ensuring that their anti-corruption policies are easily accessible. This was true across all companies: of the 110 companies that score on this question, 51 per cent rank in bands A-C and 49 per cent in bands D-F.

Among the top scoring companies below, the European list is dominated by British companies – perhaps due to the UK Bribery Act, which came into force in 2011. There has since been significant strengthening of policies and codes among UK companies generally.

FACILITATION PAYMENTS

Facilitation payments are small bribes sometimes made to expedite an administrative process. In many jurisdictions national legislation, some with extraterritorial effect, outlaws such payments. The index results were disappointing:

- Seventy-six per cent of companies in the index do not provide evidence that they explicitly prohibit facilitation payments.
- Only 19 companies are explicit in prohibiting facilitation payments and providing guidance on how to respond to requests for such payments.

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

NORTH AMERICA

CSC
HEWLETT-PACKARD
LOCKHEED MARTIN
NORTHROP GRUMMAN
RAYTHEON
ROCKWELL COLLINS
UNITED TECHNOLOGIES

EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA

BABCOCK
BAE SYSTEMS
COBHAM
ROLLS-ROYCE
SERCO GROUP

REST OF THE WORLD

DAEWOO SHIPBUILDING
& MARINE ENGINEERING
ELBIT SYSTEMS
EMBRAER
FUJITSU
ISRAEL AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES
RAFAEL ADVANCED DEFENSE SYSTEMS

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON INTERNAL INFORMATION

BAE SYSTEMS	COBHAM	CSC	EXELIS INC.	HEWLETT-PACKARD	LOCKHEED MARTIN
RAYTHEON	ROCKWELL COLLINS	SERCO GROUP			

TRAINING

Training is a key component of mitigating a company's exposure to corruption risk and publicises a company's commitment to anti-corruption. During the research period for the 2012 index, many companies informed us that they had not considered public disclosure of their anti-corruption training programmes. In 2015, companies are disclosing significantly more about their training programmes.

Fifty-three companies now provide evidence of an explicit anti-corruption training module, compared with only 20 companies in 2012.

Sixty-seven per cent of the companies that provided internal information relating to training scored above 70 per cent. Seven companies achieved 100 per cent in this

pillar based on internal information. This suggests that many companies have good practice but are not publishing the details.

The results also show that smaller companies can perform as well as larger companies. For example, QinetiQ (UK) and Kongsberg (Norway) have much smaller defence revenues than BAE Systems (UK), Thales (France) and ThyssenKrupp AG (Germany), but nonetheless achieve some of the highest scores on training.

TRAINING FOR BOARD MEMBERS

Very few companies provide evidence of delivering targeted and regular anti-corruption training to board members: only four companies provide good evidence of this.

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

NORTH AMERICA	EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA	REST OF THE WORLD
BECHTEL	BABCOCK	AVIBRAS INDÚSTRIA AEROESPACIAL
FLUOR CORPORATION	BAE SYSTEMS	DAEWOO SHIPBUILDING & MARINE ENGINEERING
GENCORP	KONGSBERG	ELBIT SYSTEMS
HEWLETT-PACKARD	QINETIQ	EMBRAER
LOCKHEED MARTIN	SAAB	FUJITSU
	THALES	ISRAEL AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES
	THYSSENKRUPP AG	NEC CORPORATION
		RAFAEL ADVANCED DEFENSE SYSTEMS
		TOSHIBA

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON INTERNAL INFORMATION

ACCENTURE	BAE SYSTEMS	BECHTEL	GENCORP	HEWLETT-PACKARD	LOCKHEED MARTIN
THYSSENKRUPP AG					

PERSONNEL & HELPLINES

The questions in this pillar were made more demanding following feedback from the industry that the 2012 questions on whistleblowing were too generic.

Nevertheless, companies still score relatively well on Personnel & Helplines in comparison with the other pillars.

As shown in the table below, the fact that privately owned companies, in this case Bechtel and Avibras, are among the top scoring companies in this pillar indicates that private ownership need not prevent the publication of personnel and helpline processes.

Again, companies across the globe, from Brazil to South Africa, show evidence of good practice.

WHISTLEBLOWING

For 67 per cent of companies there is public evidence of at least one whistleblowing channel. This includes all the companies in bands A-C and half of the companies in bands D-F.

Two questions on whistleblowing were added to the 2015 index to identify which companies actively encourage whistleblowing, rather than just having a formal mechanism.

- Whilst most companies have whistleblowing mechanisms, only eight actively support and follow-up on their use.
- Even based on internal information, only 19 companies achieved a high score, suggesting that this is not simply an issue of public disclosure.

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

NORTH AMERICA

BECHTEL
BOOZ ALLEN HAMILTON
DAY & ZIMMERMANN
GENCORP
L-3 COMMUNICATIONS
LOCKHEED MARTIN
NORTHROP GRUMMAN
UNITED TECHNOLOGIES

EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA

BAE SYSTEMS
COBHAM
GKN
QINETIQ
SERCO GROUP

REST OF THE WORLD

AVIBRAS INDUSTRIA AEROESPACIAL
DENEL
ELBIT SYSTEMS
EMBRAER
FUJITSU
NEC CORPORATION
RAFAEL ADVANCED DEFENSE SYSTEMS

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON INTERNAL INFORMATION

ACCENTURE AIRBUS GROUP BECHTEL BOEING COBHAM DAY & ZIMMERMANN EXELIS INC.
GE AVIATION GENCORP L-3 COMMUNICATIONS QINETIQ

OFFSETS

An offset requires supplying companies to reinvest a percentage of the main contract back into the purchasing country in order to “offset” the expenditure. Offsets are big business and yet they are opaque and complex mechanisms, which receive much less attention than the main defence deal and are particularly susceptible to high corruption risk.

Across the industry there is little public information on company involvement in offset contracting. This makes it difficult to assess how companies address the associated corruption risks. Companies involved in offsets should provide public evidence that corruption risks are explicitly addressed through policies, procedures and contractual terms that increase transparency and accountability in their offset programmes. This could include providing tailored training for employees involved in offset contracts and conducting due diligence on all brokers and providers during appointment and re-appointment.

Eighty-two out of 163 companies either confirmed or were found to enter into offset contracts. If no evidence was found to suggest that a company enters into offset contracts, or if the company specifically informed TI-UK that it does not

enter such contracts, this question was scored as non-applicable.

- Only three companies publish evidence of detailed procedures to mitigate offset contracting corruption risk.
- Thirteen companies provide public evidence that offset contracting corruption risk is either addressed in policies and procedures, or that offset brokers and offset partners undergo due diligence
- One company explicitly states that it does not engage in offset contracts due to the corruption risks.

Forty-seven of the 63 companies that provided internal information engage in offset contracting. Only 24 companies submitted evidence of policies or procedures to address offset contracting corruption risk.

Improving transparency in offsets requires a joint industry and government effort. There needs to be greater transparency on the government side in relation to offsets packages proposed by the contractors, offsets contracts, and the performance of those contracts.

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

BABCOCK MISSION ESSENTIAL LOCKHEED MARTIN RAFAEL ADVANCED DEFENSE SYSTEMS RAYTHEON
ROLLS-ROYCE THALES

TOP SCORING COMPANIES BASED ON INTERNAL INFORMATION

AIRBUS GROUP BABCOCK BAE SYSTEMS MISSION ESSENTIAL RAYTHEON SAAB
TELEDYNE TECHNOLOGIES

METHODOLOGY

This index assesses 163 defence companies on the ethics and anti-corruption programmes they have in place to prevent corruption. We use the phrase “ethics and anti-corruption programmes” to describe a company’s approach to promoting its ethical culture and reducing corruption risk.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire contains 41 questions organised into five pillars:

- 1) Leadership, governance & organisation;
- 2) Risk management;
- 3) Company policies & codes;
- 4) Training; and
- 5) Personnel & helplines.

The questions cover what TI-UK regards as the basic capabilities that a global defence company should have in place.

TI-UK used readily available public information to assess companies against the questions. The information to answer these questions should be, in TI-UK’s view, available on companies’ websites as a matter of good practice and public accountability.

The full question set is reproduced in Annex 1. The full question set with model answers can be found at <http://companies.defenceindex.org>

1. LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE & ORGANISATION	2. RISK MANAGEMENT	3. COMPANY POLICIES & CODES
LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE & ORGANISATION	RISK ASSESSMENT	POLICIES
EXTERNAL ENGAGEMENT	PARTNERS & AGENTS	GIFTS & HOSPITALITY
STRUCTURE & ORGANISATION	OFFSETS	FACILITATION PAYMENTS
MONITORING & EVALUATION	5. PERSONNEL & HELPLINES	POLITICAL & CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS
4. TRAINING	PERSONNEL & DISCIPLINE	
GENERAL TRAINING	HELPLINES & WHISTLEBLOWERS	
SPECIALIST TRAINING		

MODEL ANSWERS

For every question, we provide guidance notes and detailed scoring criteria on what is considered good practice. An example is provided below:

QUESTION:

- A1** Does the company publish a statement from the Chief Executive Officer or the Chair of the Board supporting the ethics and anti-corruption agenda of the company?

GUIDANCE NOTES:

The assessor is looking for evidence of the strength of the company's external commitment to its ethics and anti-corruption agenda through public statements from its leadership as opposed to, for example, internally published, non-public statements.

SCORING CRITERIA:

- 2** The CEO / Chairperson has issued at least one statement supporting its strong stance against corruption specifically in the last two years. Alternatively the CEO / Chairperson has made several strong statements that promote the company's anti-corruption and ethics agenda, under which it is clear that anti-corruption is a significant component (as judged by review of the company's ethics and anti-corruption policies).
- 1** The CEO / Chairperson has issued at least one strong statement that promotes the company's whole anti-corruption and ethics agenda in the last two years, under which it is clear that anti-corruption is a significant component (as judged by review of the company's ethics and anti-corruption policies).
- 0** There is no apparent support or only minor statements have been made by the CEO / Chairperson.

SCORING

The companies were placed into one of six bands based on overall score.

BAND	LOWER %	UPPER %	EVIDENCE LEVEL
A	83.3	100	Extensive evidence
B	66.7	83.2	Good evidence
C	50.0	66.6	Moderate evidence
D	33.3	49.9	Limited evidence
E	16.7	33.2	Very limited evidence
F	0	16.6	Almost no evidence

THE ASSESSMENT

TI-UK wrote to the CEOs of all companies in November 2013 informing them of the index, inviting them to appoint a point of contact (100 did so) and to indicate whether they wished to submit internal information. Sixty-three provided internal information.

TI-UK completed all desk research on publicly available information between April and December 2014. Sources included company websites and relevant links and documents directly accessible through them. Where possible, local language documents were assessed in addition to information available in English. Research was conducted independently of evidence provided for the 2012 index. Companies were given the opportunity to comment on the draft analysis, guide TI-UK towards additional publicly available information, and/or provide internal information. For companies providing internal information, TI-UK reviewed and discussed the documents bilaterally and each company then received a second assessment based on the additional information provided. To be included in the internal information assessment, TI-UK had to be able to review original documentation or excerpts of original documentation.

Completed assessments underwent consistency checks and peer review within TI-UK. An external peer review group of four experts reviewed a sample of assessments and draft analyses. Each company received a copy of the finalised assessment and an opportunity to submit further statements. Those companies that did not respond were contacted multiple times, by letter, email and telephone.

THE COMPANIES

The majority of companies included in this study lie within the group of top one hundred global defence companies, as measured by published defence revenue in 2012. To ensure a global range of countries, a selection of companies involved in arms exporting that were not within this group were also included.

Companies from the following countries were added in 2015: Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Denmark, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Moldova, New Zealand, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Taiwan.

2015 ANALYSIS

The 2015 questionnaire features more nuanced scoring criteria for fourteen questions, and five questions have been refined; for example, by adding a timing element. In addition, we added questions on offsets, anti-corruption agenda review, risk assessment, charitable contributions, and whistleblowing.

These changes make the 2015 Index more rigorous. We estimate the new questionnaire to be up to 7 per cent more demanding than in 2012.

The detailed assessment for each company is available at:

COMPANIES.DEFENCEINDEX.ORG

QUESTION SET 2015

- A1:** Does the company publish a statement from the Chief Executive Officer or the Chair of the Board supporting the ethics and anti-corruption agenda of the company?
- A2:** Does the company's Chief Executive Officer or the Chair of the Board demonstrate a strong personal, external facing commitment to the ethics and anti-corruption agenda of the company?
- A3:** Does the company's Chief Executive Officer demonstrate a strong personal, internal-facing commitment to the ethics and anti-corruption agenda of the company, actively promoting the ethics and anti-corruption agenda at all levels of the company structure?
- A4:** Does the company publish a statement of values or principles representing high standards of business conduct, including honesty, trust, transparency, openness, integrity and accountability?
- A5:** Does the company belong to one or more national or international initiatives that promote anti-corruption or business ethics with a significant focus on anti-corruption?
- A6:** Has the company appointed a Board committee or individual Board member with overall corporate responsibility for its ethics and anti-corruption agenda?
- A7:** Has the company appointed a person at a senior level within the company to have responsibility for implementing the company's ethics and anti-corruption agenda, and who has a direct reporting line to the Board?
- A8:** Is there regular Board level monitoring and review of the performance of the company's ethics and anti-corruption agenda?
- A8a:** Is there a formal, clear, written plan in place on which the review of the ethics and anti-corruption agenda by the Board or senior management is based, and evidence of improvement plans being implemented when issues are identified?
- A9:** Does the company have a formal process for review and where appropriate update its policies and practices in response to actual or alleged instances of corruption?
- A9a:** Does the company have a formal anti-corruption risk assessment procedure implemented enterprise-wide?
- A10:** Does the company have a formal anti-corruption risk assessment procedure for assessing proposed business decisions, with clear requirements on the circumstances under which such a procedure should be applied?
- A11:** Does the company conduct due diligence that minimises corruption risk when selecting or reappointing its agents?
- A12:** Does the company have contractual rights and processes for the behaviour, monitoring, control, and audit of agents with respect to countering corruption?

A13: Does the company make clear to contractors, sub-contractors, and suppliers, through policy and contractual terms, its stance on bribery and corruption and the consequences of breaches to this stance?

A13a: Does the company explicitly address the corruption risks associated with offset contracting?

A13b: Does the company conduct due diligence that minimises corruption risk when selecting its offset partners and offset brokers?

A14: *Removed from the index*

A15: Does the company have an anti-corruption policy that prohibits corruption in its various forms?

A16: Is the anti-corruption policy explicitly one of zero tolerance?

A17: Is the company's anti-corruption policy easily accessible to Board members, employees, contracted staff and any other organisations acting with or on behalf of the company?

A17a: Is the company's anti-corruption policy easily understandable and clear to Board members, employees and third parties?

A18: Does the anti-corruption policy explicitly apply to all employees and members of the Board?

A19: *Removed from the index*

A20: Does the company have a policy on potential conflicts of interest, and does it apply to both employees and board members?

A21: Does the company have a policy for the giving and receipt of gifts to ensure that such transactions are bona fide and not a subterfuge for bribery?

A22: Does the company's anti-corruption policy include a statement on the giving and receipt of hospitality that ensures that such transactions are bona fide and not a subterfuge for bribery?

A23: Does the company have a policy that explicitly prohibits facilitation payments?

A24: Does the company prohibit political contributions, or regulate such contributions in order to prevent undue influence or other corrupt intent? Does the company record and publicly disclose all political contributions?

A25: Does the company have a clear policy on engagement in lobbying activities, in order to prevent undue influence or other corrupt intent, and discloses the issues on which the company lobbies?

A25a: Does the company prohibit charitable contributions, or regulate such contributions in order to prevent undue influence or other corrupt intent?

A26: Does the company provide written guidance to help Board members and employees understand and implement the firm's ethics and anti-corruption agenda?

A27: Does the company have a training programme that explicitly covers anti-corruption?

A28: Is anti-corruption training provided in all countries where the company operates or has company sites?

A29: Does the company provide targeted anti-corruption training to members of the Board?

A30: Does the company provide tailored ethics and anti-corruption training for employees in sensitive positions?

A31: Does the company have a clear and formal process by which employees declare conflicts of interest?

A32: Is the company explicit in its commitment to apply disciplinary procedures to employees, Directors and Board members found to have engaged in corrupt activities?

A33: Does the company have multiple, well-publicised channels that are easily accessible and secure, to guarantee confidentiality or anonymity where requested by the employee (e.g. web, phone, in person), to report concerns or instances of suspected corrupt activity?

A33a: Are the whistleblowing channels available to all employees in all geographies?

A33b: Does the company have formal and comprehensive mechanisms to assure itself that whistleblowing by employees is not deterred, and that whistleblowers are treated supportively?

A34: Does the company have well-publicised resources available to all employees where help and advice can be sought on corruption-related issues?

A35: Is there a commitment to non-retaliation for bona fide reporting of corruption?

NOTE

The question numbering maintains consistency with the 2012 question set. The addition of a letter (a or b) after a question number denotes it is new to the 2015 index.

Annex 2

DETAILED COMPANY RESULTS

COMPANY	COUNTRY	2012	2015	LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE & ORGANISATION	RISK MANAGEMENT	COMPANY POLICIES & CODES	TRAINING	PERSONNEL & HELPLINES
AAR Corp	USA (North America)	D	E	5%	0%	54%	0%	64%
Abu Dhabi Ship Building	UAE (Middle East & North Africa)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Accenture Plc	Ireland (Europe & Central Asia)	B	B	75%	40%	75%	60%	71%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	85%	100%	79%	100%	93%
Advanced Electronics Company Limited	Saudi Arabia (Middle East & North Africa)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
The Aerospace Corporation	USA (North America)	-	E	5%	0%	50%	10%	29%
Aerospace Industrial Development Corporation (AIDC)	Taiwan (Asia Pacific)	-	E	15%	0%	38%	0%	14%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	C	65%	30%	75%	60%	71%
Air Affairs Limited (AAL)	New Zealand (Asia Pacific)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Airbus Group	Netherlands (Europe & Central Asia)	C	B	75%	71%	67%	60%	57%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	100%	100%	88%	90%	93%
Alion Science and Technology Corporation	USA (North America)	D	D	15%	10%	67%	30%	57%
Alliant Techsystems Inc. (ATK)	USA (North America)	D	C	40%	30%	75%	60%	71%
In 2015, ATK merged with Orbital Sciences Corp. to form Orbital ATK Inc. ATK has been included in this analysis as the merger was completed after the index research period.								
Joint-stock Company Concern "Almaz-Antey"	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
AM General LLC	USA (North America)	-	E	20%	14%	42%	0%	57%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	D	35%	36%	54%	40%	64%
Antonov	Ukraine (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Arab Organization for Industrialization (AOI)	Egypt (Middle East & North Africa)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Arsenal JSC	Bulgaria (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	5%	10%	13%	0%	14%
ASC Pty Ltd	Australia (Asia Pacific)	-	F	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%
ASELSAN A.Ş.	Turkey (Europe & Central Asia)	E	E	20%	7%	50%	40%	36%
Aviation Industry Corporation of China (AVIC)	China (Asia Pacific)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Avibras Indústria Aeroespacial S.A.	Brazil (Latin America)	F	D	30%	14%	58%	60%	64%
Avio S.p.A.	Italy (Europe & Central Asia)	D	D	35%	29%	54%	30%	50%
Babcock International Group PLC	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	D	B	80%	93%	88%	80%	71%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	80%	93%	88%	80%	71%
BAE Systems Plc	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	B	B	70%	64%	92%	90%	86%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	85%	100%	96%	100%	86%
Ball Aerospace & Technologies Corp.	USA (North America)	-	D	30%	20%	63%	0%	50%
Battelle Memorial Institute	USA (North America)	F	F	5%	0%	0%	0%	14%
Bechtel Corporation	USA (North America)	C	A	90%	80%	88%	100%	93%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	95%	80%	92%	100%	93%
BelTechExport JSC	Belarus (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

COMPANY	COUNTRY	2012	2015	LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE & ORGANISATION	RISK MANAGEMENT	COMPANY POLICIES & CODES	TRAINING	PERSONNEL & HELPLINES
Bharat Earth Movers Limited	India (Asia Pacific)	F	E	25%	14%	17%	10%	36%
Bharat Electronics Limited	India (Asia Pacific)	F	E	35%	14%	25%	30%	29%
The Boeing Company	USA (North America)	C	C	60%	14%	58%	40%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	90%	93%	79%	90%	93%
Booz Allen Hamilton Inc	USA (North America)	D	C	50%	30%	75%	20%	86%
Boustead Naval Shipyard Sdn. Bhd.	Malaysia (Asia Pacific)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
CACI International Inc	USA (North America)	D	D	50%	0%	79%	10%	50%
CAE Inc.	Canada (North America)	D	D	30%	36%	79%	0%	64%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	C	45%	36%	79%	70%	64%
CEA Technologies Pty Limited	Australia (Asia Pacific)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Chemring Group Plc	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	C	C	35%	50%	79%	60%	57%
China North Industries Group Corporation (NORINCO Group)	China (Asia Pacific)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
China Shipbuilding Industry Corporation		F	F	5%	10%	0%	30%	7%
Cobham Plc	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	C	B	50%	29%	88%	70%	93%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	75%	93%	96%	70%	100%
Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC)	USA (North America)	C	B	55%	20%	92%	60%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	60%	50%	96%	70%	86%
Cubic	USA (North America)	D	D	15%	30%	54%	0%	64%
Curtiss-Wright Corporation	USA (North America)	D	D	20%	7%	71%	20%	50%
Daewoo Shipbuilding & Marine Engineering Co. Ltd	South Korea (Asia Pacific)	D	C	50%	14%	71%	60%	50%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	C	75%	29%	75%	80%	64%
Damen Schelde Naval Shipbuilding	Netherlands (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Dassault Aviation	France (Europe & Central Asia)	E	F	20%	0%	33%	0%	0%
Day & Zimmermann	USA (North America)	C	C	65%	10%	50%	50%	86%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	85%	70%	83%	90%	93%
DCNS	France (Europe & Central Asia)	E	D	60%	43%	58%	30%	36%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	85%	79%	71%	40%	50%
Denel SOC Ltd	South Africa (Sub-Saharan Africa)	F	D	35%	14%	58%	40%	64%
Diehl Stiftung & Co. KG	Germany (Europe & Central Asia)	D	D	35%	0%	54%	60%	50%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	D	35%	29%	58%	60%	50%
Doosan DST Co., Ltd	South Korea (Asia Pacific)	F	E	15%	0%	38%	30%	0%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	E	20%	0%	38%	40%	14%
DynCorp International Inc	USA (North America)	C	C	75%	40%	67%	60%	64%
Elbit Systems Ltd	Israel (Middle East & North Africa)	D	C	40%	29%	71%	60%	64%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	45%	71%	75%	80%	71%

COMPANY	COUNTRY	2012	2015	LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE & ORGANISATION	RISK MANAGEMENT	COMPANY POLICIES & CODES	TRAINING	PERSONNEL & HELPLINES
Embraer S.A.	Brazil (Latin America)	D	C	50%	36%	75%	70%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	75%	64%	79%	70%	86%
Esterline Technologies Corporation	USA (North America)	-	D	5%	0%	71%	40%	50%
Exelis Inc.	USA (North America)	C	B	75%	36%	79%	50%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	90%	86%	96%	90%	100%
Fabrica Argentina de aviones "Brig. San Martín" S.A. (FAdeA)	Argentina (Latin America)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fincantieri S.p.A.	Italy (Europe & Central Asia)	E	C	50%	36%	75%	60%	57%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	C	50%	43%	83%	60%	57%
Finmeccanica S.p.A	Italy (Europe & Central Asia)	C	B	75%	71%	71%	50%	64%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	80%	86%	75%	80%	64%
FLIR Systems, Inc.	USA (North America)	D	D	25%	21%	58%	10%	71%
Fluor Corporation	USA (North America)	A	A	90%	70%	83%	90%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	100%	70%	83%	90%	86%
Fujitsu Limited	Japan (Asia Pacific)	B	B	50%	60%	75%	90%	64%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	75%	90%	75%	90%	79%
GE Aviation	USA (North America)	C	C	60%	43%	79%	40%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	65%	64%	79%	70%	93%
GenCorp Inc.	US (North America)	-	B	75%	30%	75%	100%	100%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	80%	30%	83%	100%	100%
<small>On 27 April 2015, GenCorp Inc. became Aerojet Rocketdyne Holdings, Inc.</small>								
General Atomics	USA (North America)	F	F	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%
General Dynamics Corporation	USA (North America)	C	C	70%	7%	67%	40%	71%
GKN plc	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	C	C	40%	43%	67%	50%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	65%	57%	79%	70%	79%
Gorky Automobile Plant (GAZ Plant)	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	E	E	5%	0%	33%	30%	43%
Harris Corporation	USA (North America)	C	C	85%	7%	58%	50%	71%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	95%	29%	79%	80%	79%
Heavy Industries Taxila	Pakistan (Asia Pacific)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Herstal Group	Belgium (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hewlett-Packard Company	USA (North America)	B	B	80%	57%	96%	90%	57%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	90%	71%	96%	100%	79%
Hindustan Aeronautics Limited	India (Asia Pacific)	D	D	55%	50%	46%	30%	57%
Hirtenberger Group	Austria (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Honeywell International Inc.	USA (North America)	C	C	40%	0%	71%	30%	79%
Huntington Ingalls Industries Inc.	USA (North America)	-	D	65%	20%	46%	10%	79%
Igman d.d. Konjic	BiH (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Indian Ordnance Factories	India (Asia Pacific)	-	F	10%	14%	0%	0%	36%
Indra Sistemas, S.A	Spain (Europe & Central Asia)	C	D	50%	21%	54%	20%	43%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	D	55%	21%	54%	20%	43%
Iran Electronics Industries	Iran (Middle East & North Africa)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Irkut Corporation	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Israel Aerospace Industries Ltd	Israel (Middle East & North Africa)	F	C	55%	57%	71%	80%	50%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	75%	79%	79%	80%	64%

COMPANY	COUNTRY	2012	2015	LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE & ORGANISATION	RISK MANAGEMENT	COMPANY POLICIES & CODES	TRAINING	PERSONNEL & HELPLINES
Israel Military Industries Ltd <i>incl. internal information</i>	Israel (Middle East & North Africa)	F	E	25%	0%	29%	20%	57%
		-	C	60%	57%	54%	50%	57%
Itochu Corporation	Japan (Asia Pacific)	-	E	40%	20%	29%	20%	21%
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc. <i>incl. internal information</i>	USA (North America)	C	C	30%	60%	75%	60%	64%
		-	B	70%	100%	88%	80%	79%
Japan Marine United Corporation	Japan (Asia Pacific)	E	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
KBP Instrument Design Bureau JSC	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kawasaki Heavy Industries, Ltd. <i>incl. internal information</i>	Japan (Asia Pacific)	F	E	10%	20%	21%	40%	29%
		-	D	20%	50%	29%	50%	36%
KBR, Inc	USA (North America)	C	B	70%	60%	67%	50%	79%
Kharkov State Aircraft Manufacturing Company	Ukraine (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
King Abdullah II Design and Development Bureau	Jordan (Middle East & North Africa)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kongsberg Gruppen <i>incl. internal information</i>	Norway (Europe & Central Asia)	C	C	70%	50%	71%	80%	50%
		-	B	85%	79%	75%	90%	57%
Korea Aerospace Industries, Ltd.	South Korea (Asia Pacific)	-	F	0%	0%	38%	10%	21%
Krauss-Maffei Wegmann GmbH & Co. KG <i>incl. internal information</i>	Germany (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	10%	0%	4%	30%	14%
		-	D	30%	21%	38%	60%	36%
L-3 Communications Holdings Inc. <i>incl. internal information</i>	USA (North America)	C	C	80%	21%	75%	40%	86%
		-	A	85%	93%	79%	80%	93%
Leidos, Inc (<i>previously SAIC</i>)	USA (North America)	C	C	65%	10%	67%	50%	57%
LIG Nex1 Co., Ltd <i>incl. internal information</i>	South Korea (Asia Pacific)	F	E	5%	0%	33%	20%	21%
		-	E	5%	0%	33%	30%	21%
Lockheed Martin Corporation <i>incl. internal information</i>	USA (North America)	C	A	85%	79%	100%	100%	86%
		-	A	90%	86%	100%	100%	86%
ManTech International Corporation	USA (North America)	D	D	45%	0%	67%	20%	79%
MBDA Missile Systems <i>incl. internal information</i>	France (Europe & Central Asia)	D	D	45%	14%	58%	30%	43%
		-	D	50%	14%	58%	30%	43%
M.C. Dean, Inc	USA (North America)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	21%
Meggitt Plc <i>incl. internal information</i>	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	B	B	75%	60%	75%	60%	71%
		-	B	75%	90%	75%	70%	79%
Mission Essential Personnel, LLC <i>incl. internal information</i>	USA (North America)	-	C	60%	64%	71%	40%	71%
		-	C	60%	79%	71%	40%	71%
The MITRE Corporation	USA (North America)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	36%
Mitsubishi Electric Corporation	Japan (Asia Pacific)	E	D	20%	10%	54%	50%	43%
Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd.	Japan (Asia Pacific)	E	D	60%	30%	17%	50%	57%
Moog Inc.	USA (North America)	-	E	10%	10%	42%	0%	50%
MTU Aero Engines AG <i>incl. internal information</i>	Germany (Europe & Central Asia)	D	D	45%	50%	54%	50%	29%
		-	B	70%	90%	67%	70%	50%
Nammo AS <i>incl. internal information</i>	Norway (Europe & Central Asia)	D	C	55%	29%	71%	40%	50%
		-	C	75%	29%	71%	50%	57%

COMPANY	COUNTRY	2012	2015	LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE & ORGANISATION	RISK MANAGEMENT	COMPANY POLICIES & CODES	TRAINING	PERSONNEL & HELPLINES
Navantia, S.A.	Spain (Europe & Central Asia)	F	E	0%	0%	58%	0%	36%
Navistar International Corporation	USA (North America)	D	D	30%	10%	63%	0%	50%
NEC Corporation	Japan (Asia Pacific)	D	C	60%	40%	42%	60%	64%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	65%	90%	79%	70%	86%
Nexter Group	France (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Northrop Grumman Corporation	USA (North America)	B	B	75%	43%	92%	80%	86%
Oshkosh Corporation	USA (North America)	C	C	35%	29%	63%	40%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	C	40%	50%	75%	80%	79%
Otokar Otomotiv ve Savunma Sanayi A.Ş.	Turkey (Europe & Central Asia)	F	D	30%	10%	54%	0%	50%
Pakistan Ordnance Factories	Pakistan (Asia Pacific)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Patria Oyj	Finland (Europe & Central Asia)	F	C	50%	14%	63%	60%	57%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	65%	79%	79%	70%	71%
Polish Defence Holding	Poland (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poongsan Corporation	South Korea (Asia Pacific)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Precision Castparts Corp.	USA (North America)	-	D	25%	10%	63%	10%	79%
PT Dirgantara Indonesia (Indonesian Aerospace)	Indonesia (Asia Pacific)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
QinetiQ Group Plc	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	C	B	60%	60%	63%	90%	93%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	95%	100%	83%	90%	93%
Rafael Advanced Defense Systems Ltd	Israel (Middle East & North Africa)	D	B	75%	64%	79%	60%	71%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	85%	93%	83%	70%	79%
Raytheon Company	USA (North America)	C	A	80%	86%	96%	80%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	85%	100%	96%	90%	79%
Rheinmetall AG	Germany (Europe & Central Asia)	E	D	55%	21%	42%	50%	50%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	85%	71%	58%	70%	64%
Rockwell Collins, Inc.	USA (North America)	C	B	70%	29%	96%	70%	71%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	70%	64%	96%	70%	79%
Rolls-Royce Plc	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	C	B	70%	71%	88%	60%	71%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	80%	71%	92%	60%	86%
RTI Systems	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	E	E	5%	0%	29%	0%	50%
RUAG Holding Ltd	Switzerland (Europe & Central Asia)	E	E	15%	0%	50%	20%	14%
Russian Aircraft Corporation MiG (RSK MiG)	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Russian Helicopters JSC	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	4%	0%	14%
Saab AB	Sweden (Europe & Central Asia)	C	C	75%	57%	58%	80%	36%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	90%	86%	71%	90%	64%
Safran SA	France (Europe & Central Asia)	D	D	35%	43%	63%	50%	7%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	C	50%	79%	71%	60%	36%
Samsung Techwin (Co., Ltd.)	South Korea (Asia Pacific)	E	D	40%	14%	63%	40%	57%
Sapura Secured Technologies Group	Malaysia (Asia Pacific)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	D	20%	14%	46%	60%	57%
SATUMA	Pakistan (Asia Pacific)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

COMPANY	COUNTRY	2012	2015	LEADERSHIP GOVERNANCE & ORGANISATION	RISK MANAGEMENT	COMPANY POLICIES & CODES	TRAINING	PERSONNEL & HELPLINES
Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)	USA (North America)	C	C	70%	10%	58%	40%	64%
Serco Group Plc	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	B	B	80%	80%	88%	70%	79%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	90%	90%	96%	90%	86%
Singapore Technologies Engineering Ltd	Singapore (Asia Pacific)	F	F	10%	14%	17%	0%	21%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	D	20%	21%	67%	50%	43%
Societatea Uzina Mecanica Cugir S.A	Romania (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SRA International, Inc	USA (North America)	F	F	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SRC, Inc	USA (North America)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sukhoi Company (JSC)	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sumitomo Corporation	Japan (Asia Pacific)	-	E	35%	14%	17%	50%	14%
Tactical Missiles Corporation JSC	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TAI -Turkish Aerospace Industries, Inc	Turkey (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tatra Trucks A.S.	Czech Republic (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	F	5%	0%	8%	0%	0%
Teledyne Technologies Incorporated	USA (North America)	C	D	40%	29%	58%	20%	71%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	55%	86%	92%	60%	86%
Terma A/S	Denmark (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	20%	7%	29%	0%	0%
Textron, Inc.	USA (North America)	C	C	70%	21%	67%	50%	71%
Thales Group	France (Europe & Central Asia)	B	B	85%	86%	67%	80%	57%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	B	85%	93%	79%	80%	64%
ThyssenKrupp AG	Germany (Europe & Central Asia)	C	B	65%	43%	79%	80%	71%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	95%	79%	88%	100%	86%
TOPAZ JVS	Moldova (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Toshiba Corporation	Japan (Asia Pacific)	-	D	35%	7%	42%	60%	43%
Triumph Group, Inc.	USA (North America)	-	D	25%	0%	42%	0%	79%
Ultra Electronics Holdings plc	UK (Europe & Central Asia)	E	B	55%	70%	79%	70%	64%
JSC United Engine Corporation	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	F	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
United Technologies Corporation (UTC)	USA (North America)	B	B	70%	43%	92%	60%	86%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	A	100%	64%	92%	80%	86%
Research and Production Corporation "UralVagonZavod" JSC	Russia (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	5%	0%	13%	0%	0%
URS Corporation	USA (North America)	C	C	60%	50%	75%	40%	71%
VSE Corporation	USA (North America)	C	D	35%	10%	50%	10%	64%
Wyle	USA (North America)	F	F	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Zastava Arms	Serbia (Europe & Central Asia)	-	F	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Zodiac Aerospace	France (Europe & Central Asia)	F	E	30%	10%	42%	40%	14%
<i>incl. internal information</i>		-	E	30%	10%	42%	50%	14%

ADDITIONAL PUBLICATIONS

- Corruption: Lessons from the international mission in Afghanistan (2015)
- Corruption Threats and International Missions: Practical guidance for leaders (2014)
- Single Sourcing: A multi-country analysis of non-competitive defence procurement (2014)
- Classified Information: A review of current legislation across 15 countries & the EU (2014)
- Étude sur les aspects de l'intégrité de la Force de Défense Nationale du Burundi (2014)
- Étude sur les aspects de l'intégrité de la Police Nationale du Burundi (2014)
- Building Integrity in UK Defence: Practical recommendations to reduce corruption risks (2014)
- Corruption as a threat to stability and peace (2014)
- Corruption and peacekeeping: Strengthening peacekeeping and the UN (2013)
- Watchdogs? The quality of legislative oversight of defence in 82 countries (2013)
- Raising the Bar: Good Anti-Corruption Practices in Defence Companies (2013)
- Training the military and defence and security officials in understanding and preventing corruption (2013)
- Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index (2013)
- Arresting corruption in the police: The global experience of police corruption reform efforts (2012)
- Defence Companies Anti-Corruption Index (2012)
- The 3rd Line of Defence: How Audits Can Help Address Defence Corruption (2012)
- Due Diligence and Corruption Risk in Defence Industry Offsets Programmes (2012)
- Military-Owned Businesses: Corruption and Risk Reform (2012)
- Counter Corruption Reforms in Post-Conflict Countries (2011)
- The Transparency of National Defence Budgets (2011)
- Organised crime, corruption and the vulnerability of defence and security forces (2011)
- A review of anti-corruption reform measures in the defence sector in Colombia (2011)
- Codes of conduct in defence ministries and armed forces:
What makes a good code of conduct? A multi-country study (2011)
- Building integrity and reducing corruption in defence & security: 20 practical reforms (2011)
- Defence offsets: Addressing the risks of corruption & raising transparency (2010)

**TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL
UK'S DEFENCE AND SECURITY
PROGRAMME WORKS TO REDUCE
CORRUPTION IN DEFENCE AND
SECURITY WORLDWIDE**

**COMPANIES.DEFENCEINDEX.ORG
TI-DEFENCE.ORG**