

Summary

Our remit

The remit of the Police Organisation Committee is to analyse whether the current organisation of the police constitutes an obstacle to the Government's requirements for higher quality, increased cost-effectiveness, increased flexibility and a substantial improvement in police performance. If the Committee considers that the organisation constitutes an obstacle in these respects a new organisation is to be proposed.

The remit can be seen in the light of the considerable additional resources the police service has received. During the period 2000–2010 the police service appropriation increased by more than 40 per cent to SEK 19 billion for 2010. At the same time the number of police service employees increased by 26 per cent to 28 000, of whom 20 300 were police officers, making the Police Service the largest state-controlled activity in Sweden. The Government's assessment is that the increased resources are not reflected in police performance.

Organisation of the Swedish Police Service

The Swedish Police Service is a state service consisting of 21 police authorities with geographical areas of responsibility that follow the county boundaries, the National Police Board and the National Laboratory of Forensic Science. The National Police Board is the superordinate authority for the National Laboratory of Forensic Science. The National Criminal Police and the Swedish Security Service are constituent parts of the National Police Board, although the Swedish Security Service in practice functions as an independent authority.

The National Police Board is the central administrative agency for police services and has a supervisory function. The National Police Board is led by the National Police Commissioner, who is employed by the Government. The governing board of the National Police Board is a board with limited liability whose members are appointed by the Government.

The police authorities are responsible for leading and implementing police activities in their respective police districts. The police authorities are directed by a chief commissioner and a local police board. Both the chief commissioner and members of the local police boards are appointed by the Government.

Management structure of the police

Operational police activities are mainly conducted by the police authorities. The National Police Board, as central administrative agency for police services, has certain powers over the police authorities. The National Police Board is responsible for developing and specifying the targets and guidelines that the Riksdag (the Swedish Parliament) and the Government decide for police activities and communicating them to the entire police organisation. The National Police Board is also tasked with distributing the funds allocated to the police by the Government. The tasks of the National Police Board also include supervision of police services. The National Police Board is to promote method, coordination and rationalisation in the police, which means that technology and methods development as well as follow-up are important parts of its activities.

The National Police Board has limited powers to take measures to change the direction of activities or to correct deficient performance at a police authority. If a police activity does not live up to the requirements made of it, the National Police Board, in its role as supervisory authority, must work to bring about improvement by means of remarks and recommendations, or in some other way. Where necessary the National Police Board must also report such circumstances to the Government. The governing board of the National Police Board is responsible for the annual report, interim report and budget documentation. The governing board also decides on guidelines, etcetera for internal audit and regulations directed at individuals, municipalities and county councils.

Within the police authorities each local police board decides on the operational plan, budget, internal organisation and rules of procedure for the authority, while the chief commissioner has responsibility for the day-to-day operations and finances. The chief commissioner must ensure that operations are conducted effectively and in compliance with current law and that they are reported reliably and fairly. The local police board is to assist the chief commissioner and propose measures it finds reasonable.

Police performance

Police activities are extensive and varied. Apart from preventing and investigating crime, the police must also provide protection, information and other assistance. Police objectives include reducing the risk of crimes being committed, endeavouring to ensure that more crimes lead to prosecution and increasing public safety. The exercise of public authority by the police must be predictable and consistent and be conducted effectively and be of high quality.

Performance and the degree to which objectives have been achieved are difficult to assess for many police duties. This applies not least to large sections of crime prevention work. The number of crimes reported has increased in the past ten years, partly due to increased police operations regarding traffic offences and drug offences, and a greater percentage of crime is cleared up now than before. On the other hand the percentage of crime that leads to prosecution remained unchanged in the period 2000–2010. The quality measurements carried out in recent years show, however, that the work of the police on the whole effectively satisfies the needs and expectations of the public and that most of the population have great confidence in the police.

The difficulties of assessing other aspects of police performance in terms of quality and cost-efficiency are associated with the in some respects incomplete reporting of police performance and the impact of police activities in relation to the targets set for them. Another reason for the difficulties of assessing efficiency in law enforcement is that the emphasis of police work during the period has gradually shifted in favour of more prevention measures, with increased police visibility and more traffic controls, collaboration with municipalities and other local actors, etc. In addition, the structure of crime has changed, with an increasing proportion of

violent crime, fraud and other economic crime, as well as IT-related crime.

Swedish membership of the EU and participation in the Schengen cooperation have gradually led to both new conditions and new obligations for the police. Demographic and other changes in society have also had an effect on police activities. For example, the population increased by six per cent between 2000 and 2010, with a population concentration in the metropolitan regions.

The disparity in performance between different police authorities as regards investigation activities, for example, indicate that there is potential to improve the quality and efficiency of police activities. In the view of the Committee, these differences can be ascribed either to the underlying documentation for performance reporting or differences in priorities and working methods. The existence of such differences is, in the opinion of the Committee, closely linked to the limited remit of the National Police Board to make decisions in these matters that are binding on police authorities.

Confidence in the design and reliability of the performance reporting system is weak within the police organisation and there is no common view as to what constitutes good performance in police activities. These factors in turn impact the possibility of implementing effective strategic management and control of activities.

Obstacles in the current leadership structure and organisation

Insufficient national decision-making powers and unclear division of responsibilities

The Committee can note that the National Police Board has limited powers to act in the areas that fall under its responsibility. For example, the National Police Board has limited possibilities of making the decisions required to ensure that activities comply with the objectives and guidelines decided by the Riksdag and the Government. Despite the fact that ensuring this is one of its main tasks, the National Police Board has to resort to using a combination of policy instruments and informal processes to try to induce the police authorities to act in accordance with the will of

the Government. This means that the expectations and demands placed on the National Police Board do not go hand in hand with what it is in reality able to deliver under its instructions and regulatory framework.

The National Police Board's mandate to issue regulations on matters primarily of an organisational nature is not clear in relation to the powers and responsibility of the police authorities and local police boards. This undoubtedly constitutes an obstacle to efficient management of police activities. A large number of actors are now involved and, proceeding from different points of view, assert their claim to manage operations. The current chain of command is very difficult to comprehend. Powers overlap in several areas, including between the local police boards and the National Police Board, as well as between the local police board and the chief commissioner. From this follow problems of interpretation and application.

In the areas in which the National Police Board has the authority to act, such as specifying and communicating objectives and guidelines and promoting method, coordination and rationalisation in the police service, the police authorities are obliged to follow the Board's directions. At the same time it follows from the provisions of the Police Ordinance that the local police board and chief commissioner are responsible for police activities in the county and that the local police boards have their own powers of decision-making on certain matters, including the organisation of the police authority. These conflicting circumstances contribute to the lack of clarity within the police organisation about the extent to which the National Police Board directions in these respects are binding on the police authorities. To the extent there is such a lack of clarity, the consequence is that it is difficult for the National Police Board to effectively and firmly ensure that national, consistent working methods are implemented.

The National Police Board conducts its supervisory activities through special inspections, for example. Reports containing criticism and remarks on the basis of these inspections are published and communicated to the police authorities. However, within the police organisation the status of the reports is perceived as unclear and the recommendations made, as far as the Committee can tell, have far too limited an impact on the activities of the police authorities. The National Police Board does not have a mandate to order the police authorities to rectify the deficiencies discovered.

Through its right to issue regulations, and by other means, the National Police Board has some authority to ensure satisfactory internal management and governance, but the Committee notes that it is questionable whether the powers held by the National Police Commissioner match up to the responsibilities that formally rests with that position. A consistent problem in supervision, internal audit and internal management and control within the police is that the National Police Board is not in a position to order the police authorities to rectify identified deficiencies. This means that there are no formal requirements for the police authorities to carry out proposed measures. In practice the chief commissioner concerned decides if and when a measure will be taken. In this respect the current form of organisation of the police is a clear obstacle.

In the assessment of the Committee, the police organisation is thus characterised by a chain of command that prevents the National Police Board's supervisory and monitoring function from having the impact on management and governance required to ensure that operations are efficient and effective. The Committee has also noted that at regional level opinions are divided as to the division of responsibility between the chief commissioner and the local police board at the different authorities.

Many police authorities of differing sizes

The police authorities are separate profit centres and thus expected by and large to maintain the competence and functions required for their task. The police authorities in the counties of Stockholm, Västra Götaland and Skåne, due to their size, are largely equipped to cope with these demands. However, the smaller police authorities have some difficulty in maintaining specialised skills in all their different areas of activity. For high-quality crime prevention and crime investigation activities, there is a constantly growing need for specialists and leading-edge skills. Demands are also increasing for certification of some functions, such as operators in communication centres.

The Committee notes that the police authorities in many cases are too small to be able to achieve efficiency and quality in all functions. Even if they could manage to maintain skills in all func-

tions, this would not be reasonable, since the volume involved in some duties is too limited and thus not cost-effective.

In the opinion of the Committee, analysis and follow-up of the authorities' performance is a further area in which the present organisational structure leads to quality shortfalls. There is a need to strengthen the ability to analyse results achieved so as to improve the management of activities and deepen the performance culture in the organisation. Performance monitoring should support the work of development and improvement in the police service. The task of analysing overall performance is a national responsibility, but achieving that requires high-quality documentation from all police authorities. The current organisational structure with 21 county police authorities and one central administrative agency makes this work harder.

Another problem with today's organisational structure is that confidentiality rules and separate systems of storing and processing information prevent rapid and seamless exchange of information between police authorities. However, the new Police Data Act offers increased opportunities for some types of information exchange between authorities concerned, provided the technology is adapted to the new legislative provisions.¹

Another obstacle is terms of employment which are applied differently between police authorities. This is a limitation to staff mobility within the police organisation.

The current division of responsibilities in the police service involves major shortcomings in overall responsibility for police activities in the country and restricts the chances of collaboration between police authorities. This is partly because such collaboration must be based on voluntary participation on the part of the police authorities. Another effect of the lack of comprehensive responsibility is that it is difficult for best practices to spread.

The current system also involves some difficulties regarding strategic collaboration with the Swedish Prosecution Authority at national level and impedes contacts with other agencies of importance to activities, since the decision-making functions are on different levels. The current organisation also hinders coordinated action in international contexts and the diffusion of international experience within the organisation.

¹ The Police Data Act applies from 1 March 2012 (SFS 2010:361).

The Committee's proposed new organisation

A unified Swedish police service

The Committee has analysed the possibility of improving police activities and performance, in accordance with the requirements set by the Government, through changes in the existing organisational structure. The Committee has also looked into the possibility of improvements by extending the National Police Board's mandate or, alternatively, reducing the number of police authorities. The Committee concludes that neither of these alternatives is sufficient to achieve the desired effects.

Many government agencies, such as the Swedish Prison and Probation Service, the Swedish Prosecution Authority and the Swedish Tax Agency, have been reorganised in recent years as mono-agencies.² The reasons for these reorganisations were to achieve clearer leadership and management, increased flexibility of operations, more effective use of resources, increased legal security and consistency.

In order for the police to be able to reach their full development potential and for the police organisation structure to provide the conditions for meeting the Government's requirements for higher quality, increased cost-effectiveness, increased flexibility and substantially improved police performance, the Committee assesses that an equivalent reorganisation should also be implemented for the police. Consequently, the Committee proposes that the National Police Board and the 21 police authorities, together with the National Laboratory of Forensic Science, be reorganised as a unified agency. At the same time the Committee proposes that the Swedish Security Service be merged into a separate agency.³

A starting point for the Committee's proposal regarding the new organisation of the police has been the Government's state-

² The 'mono-agency' form of organisation means that regardless of geographical location and internal organisation, the operations are led by a director-general or board that is (nationally) accountable to the Government for all operations. (This is not the same thing as an 'agency group' in which there is a central agency that is usually the superordinate agency for the other agencies in the group. These other agencies have often been regional, but sometimes local or with operations throughout the country. The subordinate agencies in a group have powers to take independent decisions on certain matters, decisions that the central agency has no formal right to govern.)

³ The question of the organisation and management structure of the Swedish Security Service will be further analysed and the more detailed considerations necessary will take place in the course of the Committee's continuing work (ToR 2012:13).

ments in the Administrative Policy Bill⁴ and what is stated in the Government Agencies Ordinance (2007:515).

In the opinion of the Committee the new Police Authority should be a director-general-governed agency⁵ headed by a director-general appointed by the Government. The Committee proposes that the name of the new agency should be the Police Authority.

By reorganising the Swedish police as a unified agency it will be possible for the agency leadership to take comprehensive responsibility for police activities throughout the country. The responsibility for police activities can then be delegated via a straight and clear chain to the leadership at regional and local levels and on out to the local operational units of the organisation. Compared with the present overlapping areas of responsibility and unclear chains of responsibility, the division of responsibilities in such an organisational structure can be made clear and the chain of governance can be rationalised. This sets the conditions for more effective management, governance and review of activities.

With a unified Swedish police service there is a good framework for achieving greater uniformity where needed to ensure the activities are legally consistent, of high quality and cost-effective. The proposed agency form creates the conditions for both following up activities more consistently and achieving a better and more stable performance within the agency. In the new organisational structure, it will be easier to disseminate best practices.

Hence from both the citizen and operational perspective, and from the perspective of the law enforcement chain, a unified agency is deemed to give the best prospects of conducting efficient and high quality police activities.

It is proposed that the new Police Authority assume the tasks that are today performed by the police authorities, the National Laboratory of Forensic Science and the National Police Board, with the exception of the duties dealt with by the Swedish Security Service. The Swedish Security Service will retain its duties. The Police Authority will thus be responsible for all police activities in

⁴ Govt. Bill 2009/10:175.

⁵ A director-general-governed agency is led by a Director-General who is alone accountable to the Government for all the agency's activities.

the country except for police activities that the Swedish Security Service is responsible for.

Organisation of the Police Authority

To enable full use to be made of the development potential offered by the mono-agency model and make it possible to demand accountability from the agency leadership, the Committee considers that the Police Authority should be able to make its own decisions about its own organisation to a greater extent than is the case today. The fact that the internal organisation of the agency is not fixed in law or ordinance – with some exceptions – will create conditions for a service that is more flexible and adaptable to different types of external change. For example, the Committee does not take a position on the number of police regions, nor on the location of the management of police activities in the regions. In the view of the Committee, these questions should be determined in the framework of the implementing organisation that should precede the establishment of the Police Authority. However, the Committee does make some proposals concerning the organisation of the Police Authority.

The Police Authority is to have a national headquarters and otherwise be geographically divided into police regions. There will be a national operations department at the Police Authority. The main focus of the national operations department should be to command and coordinate certain operational activities and in some areas to maintain specialist skills both for its own activities and to be able to assist the police regions.

Special investigations under the Ordinance on processing of cases of crimes by police employees, etcetera (2010:1031) will be conducted by a separate department of the Police Authority. However, it is proposed that this department be given an autonomous standing, for example by the Government employing its head and by giving it a separate appropriation.

The National Laboratory of Forensic Science will be a part of the Police Authority. The arrangement with the National Police Board as the superordinate agency for the National Laboratory of Forensic Science will thereby be abolished.

Appointment of managers

Apart from the Director-General the Government is also to employ the head of department for special investigations. In other respects the agency will itself appoint its managers and staff. The National Police Commissioner will determine his or her own deputy.

The Police Authority will have an appointments committee that will be responsible for preparing proposals and advising the National Police Commissioner on the appointment of regional chief commissioners, the head of the national Operations Division and the head of the National Laboratory of Forensic Science. At the request of the National Police Commissioner, the committee will also advise on other appointments. The members of the committee will be appointed by the Government. This will ensure public transparency and a measure of public influence on the recruitment process.

Local and regional levels

The Police Authority will be divided into police regions. These should be viable and have a certain volume of activities. The police regions will be under the leadership of a regional chief commissioner. In each police region there will be a regional police council responsible for monitoring the activities of the police region and providing advice to the regional chief commissioner. The regional chief commissioner will chair the council and keep it informed of activities.

The strategic direction of activities in the police region should mainly be decided at regional level on the basis of the national directions decided by the National Police Commissioner. The police regions should have the main responsibility for operational police activities. Decentralised decision-making processes are required in the police region to ensure and develop local activities. Operational and tactical leadership and management of activities should be conducted further out in the organisation of the police region. Operational planning based on local problems, criminal intelligence and follow-up of previous actions etc. should be conducted at local level. The Police Authority will be empowered to make its own decisions on the local organisation. To ensure that

the decision-making structure in the Police Authority guarantees that police activities throughout the country have local relevance and support, the Committee considers that geographical subdivision of the police regions is necessary. The assessment of the Committee is that far-reaching delegation is required in operational police work.

No matter where they live, citizens must be able to feel confident that police activities promote their security and that police priorities include the volume crime problems that occur in the local community. The Committee's proposal is that the Police Authority be given explicit responsibility for collaboration with primary municipalities to reduce crime and increase people's sense of security in their local communities. This will ensure that the municipalities have the opportunity to be involved in the activities.

Relations between the Police Authority and the general public

The Committee regards it as important to strengthen the requirements on the Police Authority to have close and constructive relations with the general public. Under our proposal, in its work the Police Authority will pay attention to and take account of the demands and wishes of people living and working in the local area. The Police Authority will be given a duty to develop and choose modes of working that foster a close and constructive relationship between it and the general public. In addition, the Police Authority will be required to give victims of crime the information they need in view of the crime. The Police Authority will also be required to ensure that it is available to the public and that police activities are visible.

Contact point for the general public

The way in which police employees act and behave in their contacts with people in various situations has a great impact on how the public perceives the Police Authority as an organisation, its ability to perform its duties and to act professionally. The views of the public on police activities are therefore an important knowledge base for developing the Police Authority. The Police Authority should have a contact point that is well-known to the public and to

which individual people can easily address both positive and negative comments. The Police Authority should develop national routines and methods for managing the views of the public and providing feedback in individual matters. The Police Authority should then use the experience gained from the contact point to make ongoing improvements in its services based on citizens' needs.

Democratic transparency

There are areas in police activities that are specially sensitive in terms of privacy and where transparency to the public is therefore of particular importance. This applies above all to activities concerning reports of crimes involving police employees. The Committee proposes that the governing board of the National Police Board and the local police boards at the police authorities be replaced by the Police Authority's advisory council and a regional police council in each police region. The members of the advisory council and the regional police councils will be appointed by the Government for a fixed period.

In addition to the usual duties of an advisory council, the Police Authority's advisory council and the regional police councils will have the task of particularly monitoring special investigative activities conducted pursuant to the Ordinance on processing of cases of crimes by police employees etc. (2010:1031). The advisory council will also be responsible for particularly monitoring the activities of the regional police councils.

The Committee proposes that a function for coordination of the work of the advisory council and the regional police councils should be set up at the headquarters.

An independent review body for police activities

The Committee considers that an independent review body should be set up to supervise the activities of the Police Authority and the Swedish Security Service. The Committee will deliver a full proposal on the design of the organisation and its activities in a subsequent report (ToR 2012:13).

Legislative amendments

The Committee's proposals on a new organisation for police activities entail a number of legislative amendments. In this report the Committee presents proposals for amendments in the Police Act (1984:387), the Police Ordinance (1998:1558), the Ordinance on processing of cases of crimes by police employees etc. (2010:1031) and in the Preliminary Investigations Ordinance (1947:948). The Committee also proposes two new ordinances: an ordinance with instructions for the Police Authority and an ordinance on forensic activities at the Police Authority. Under the proposal, the Ordinance with instructions for the National Police Board (1989:773) and the Ordinance with instructions for the National Laboratory of Forensic Science (1978:677) would be repealed. The Committee's proposals on a new organisation for police activities will necessitate amendments in a large number of other statutes as well. Moreover, certain additional amendments will probably be needed in the statutes mentioned above. Proposals for such amendments will be developed within the framework of the Committee's ongoing work (ToR 2012:13).

More in-depth preparation required

An organisational change on the scale involved here requires major efforts to identify, prepare and implement the measures that are needed before a new organisation for the police can enter into effect. The Committee considers it essential that the changes are carried out on the basis of good planning and cooperation between several parties at strategic and operational level. Moreover, this must be done in the shortest time possible so as to limit productivity losses and poorer services to the public.

The scale of the work involved in implementation and the need for extensive and thorough preparation, combined with the time factor, strongly indicate that a special implementing organisation should be created. The Committee therefore proposes that the Government give an inquiry the task of preparing and implementing the creation of the Police Authority.

In line with the position adopted by the Riksdag and the Government, a government agency should as far as possible take its own decisions on its own organisational design. However, given

experience from previous reorganisations creating 'mono-agencies', it is important that before reorganising the police, the Government sets clear points of departure for the design of the organisation. By means of well-considered terms of reference for the inquiry, the Government can exercise real influence on the details of the reform. The Committee therefore presents proposals on a number of key points from which the inquiry should proceed.

A successful implementation depends on close cooperation with the police organisation. Close dialogue with organisations representing the staff during the process of change will also contribute to a good outcome.

The main task of the inquiry should be to identify, prepare and implement the measures and decisions that are necessary for the new authority to be able to function from the date that has been set. Some of the measures and decisions required are to work out the new internal organisation of the Police Authority, the basic organisation and activities of the headquarters, the structure of the regional organisation, including geographical boundaries and regional centres, the structure of the other departments and functions that should be included in the Police Authority, and a new operational plan and budget. In addition, the division of duties and responsibilities between the police regions and the national level should be clarified in new rules of procedure for the Police Authority and new delegation procedures. Moreover, the inquiry should prepare and implement the work on employment of public officials that is needed before the Police Authority is converted into the new organisation.

The Committee would like to emphasise that the work conducted by the Police Authority at local level will continue to be the basis of police services. The police regions must be viable and this requires a certain volume of activities. By 'viability' the Committee means that the police regions, based on the duties assigned to them and the financial resources allocated to them, must have the ability and capacity to conduct both basic police activities and activities that require specialist skills. The population base is an important factor that affects the possibility of the police regions to achieve a sufficiently large volume of activities. The police regions must be sub-divided geographically and far-reaching delegation is necessary, particularly with regard to operational police activities. Decision-making powers and duties should be located at the lowest suitable level. Accordingly, the implementing organisation should first take

a position on which activities should be conducted locally and then on which activities, considering quality, cost-efficiency and other factors, should be placed at regional or national level. One consequence of this approach may be that certain activities that are currently conducted by the National Police Board should be moved out to the police regions.

The implementing organisation should identify the capabilities the Police Authority needs to develop in order to strengthen the strategic management. The reorganisation of the National Police Board, the police authorities and the National Laboratory of Forensic Science into a single authority opens up quite new opportunities for managing and coordinating certain operational activities in a national perspective, compared with the current organisation and division of responsibilities. As a result of the police regions achieving a greater ability to conduct activities that require specialist skills, the present role and duties of the National Criminal Police will need to change.

The implementing organisation should be instructed to devise a clear and effective decision-making structure to lead the operational activities, building on the police intelligence model. Particular attention should be given to which specific areas are to be managed and coordinated nationally, and in which areas the national Operations Division should maintain specialist skills either with its own operational responsibility or in order to assist the police regions.

The primary role of the National Laboratory of Forensic Science will be to take responsibility for forensic activities and quality assurance, as well as methods development in the area at various levels of the Police Authority. For continued confidence in the quality of these activities, the independence of the laboratory in assessing the results of analyses must be protected and the laboratory must be guaranteed the freedom and resources to conduct forensic research and development. The conditions required for an efficient forensic process from the scene of the crime to the laboratory should be formulated in the course of the implementation process.

Some consequences of the proposals

Points of departure

The Committee's proposal for a new Police Authority is framed in relatively general terms, in line with the positions adopted by the Riksdag and the Government to the effect that a government agency, as far as possible, should take its own decisions on the design of its own organisation. An organisational change and increased clarity regarding responsibility in accordance with the proposals and the detailed plans that the implementing organisation may decide on will not eliminate all obstacles to high-quality, cost-effective and flexible police activities, but will create considerably better conditions for this than the current organisation.

Even when the new organisation is in place, a continued process of change will be required in the organisation before the positive effects can be fully achieved. In addition to the Committee's organisational proposals, continued development of methods and procedures will be needed to obtain the best possible results given available financial and human resources. Other issues that have a far-reaching influence on the efficiency of the police include the development of a modern management style and skills development adapted to ongoing improvement and development processes.

Consequences

Experience of previous reorganisations in which several organisations have been merged into a single government agency show that during a transitional period, much energy goes into the actual process of change and that this is at the expense of the efficiency and quality of activities. The possibility cannot be ruled out that the organisational change of the police will similarly lead to efficiency losses and other negative consequences during a transitional period.

Experience from earlier reorganisations to create mono-agencies, and from other major reorganisations, shows also that in certain cases there is insufficient force in the process of change for the planned reorganisation to be implemented in full. A protracted process of change can lead to old structures being kept. Purposeful work is therefore essential, aimed at ensuring that the introduction of the new organisation is implemented in its entirety at the time

decided. For this to be possible, the implementing organisation must have sufficient financial and human resources to solve all necessary questions.

It is also essential that managers at all levels have the power to enforce the decisions taken. Inadequate involvement in the process of change can mean that the changes are never implemented or that, in time, activities revert to their previous pattern. Consequently, it is necessary to involve not just managers but all those concerned in the process of change, at an early stage.

The changes that the Committee proposes primarily target the management structure of police services and aim to rationalise the division of responsibilities at national and regional level. The greatest changes will therefore primarily concern the reorganisation of the National Police Board as central administrative authority into a head office, and activities in the localities where the county chief commissioners and the inter-authority specialist functions are now placed. The localities that become centres in the new regional division of the police can be expected to have wider responsibilities, while activities will be reduced elsewhere. Police activities conducted close to the citizens, for example, at municipal level, will not be affected as much by the restructuring in an initial phase.

One important task for the management of the police will be to ensure that the effects the Government expects of the organisational change can be achieved. To manage this, police performance reporting needs further development. The results of the authority's internal governance and control as well as monitoring and evaluation of activities need to be analysed and if necessary followed by measures. For the further development of police activities, systematic monitoring of both national and international developments is required. This monitoring also includes studying and applying the findings of criminological research and other research of relevance to police services.

With regard to the activities of the National Laboratory of Forensic Science, with wider responsibility for the forensic process, it is expected that this will contribute to better results, particularly with regard to investigative activities. However, in the Committee's opinion, there is a risk that it will not be possible to guarantee the laboratory's impartiality in a way fully matching the current situation. In order to ensure the impartiality and continued high quality of forensic activities, the new management of the police must ensure that the National Laboratory of Forensic Science

continues to be guaranteed resources for conducting both forensic research and development work.

The transition to a single Police Authority will facilitate information exchange in the police organisation, as current boundaries between authorities will disappear. Rules on secrecy and authorisation restrict the possibilities of individual officials accessing information other than as required in their work. In a mono-agency organisation, it is even more important that access to police systems is limited to certain functions and authorisation levels. The current plethora of local computer systems and registers of various types will be reduced by the new agency construction, which will gradually lead to greater consistency, higher quality and lower administrative costs for IT activities within the authority.

Extensive work will be needed in the area of staff policy before the new authority can be established. Initially, the transition to a single employer and the corresponding adaptation of the four staff organisations will require both efforts within each organisation and joint measures involving the different parties. Systematic work environment efforts must be treated consistently on the basis of the new organisation.

With regard to the transfer of police employees' employment contracts to the new Police Authority, it should be possible to reason in much the same way as when the Swedish Tax Agency was established. For example, a mono-agency organisation does not have the geographical limitation that follows from the current division into police authorities. This will probably affect where employees are obliged to work geographically. However, the issue of the working obligations of employees requires further consideration, which should be addressed within the framework of the implementing organisation.

The changes in the organisational structure will require skills development, adaptation and, if necessary, new recruitment. The scale and direction of these measures depends on the decisions taken by the inquiry in the course of the continued work on implementation.

On the Committee's assessment, the proposals presented will have financial consequences only for central government. It will mainly be a matter of consequences for police activities.

The cost of the implementing organisation can be estimated at around SEK 30 million. Adjustment costs, which are a one-off cost, may be estimated at around SEK 200 million.

The Committee notes that these implementation and adjustment costs cannot be accommodated in the current budget allocated to the police without adverse consequences for both the implementation of the proposal and police activities in general. To avoid this, another means of financing the implementation and adjustment costs is required.

The Committee's overall assessment is that in the long term, given no change in the level of ambition regarding duties and capacity, activities can continue to be financed within the existing budget allocation when the police service has a unified organisation.

Our proposals do not imply a general centralisation of police activities, duties or management functions. On the contrary, the Committee has had a clear focus on creating conditions for developing and strengthening police activities at local and regional level. The proposals presented by the Committee create conditions for efficiency gains that can be used, among other purposes, for purposeful work to strengthen the local police presence both in rural areas and in areas in urban municipalities with high crime rates.

A major purpose of the proposals is for police activities to achieve higher quality and greater efficiency, in accordance with Government ambitions. This implies that the change should have an impact on crime, both in the form of reduced crime and in that more reported crimes will be investigated and prosecuted. This applies both to crime investigations in general and to investigations of volume crimes in particular, while at the same time the police will continue to strengthen their ability to combat serious and organised crime. The extent to which the Committee's proposals provide sufficient scope for achieving, in the longer term, the goals set and levels of ambition envisioned, is an issue that the Police Authority may have reason to revisit.

A natural consequence of increased efficiency in the police organisation is that the burden on other authorities in the law enforcement chain – the Swedish Prosecution Authority, the courts and the Swedish Prison and Probation Service – will increase, which will lead to a need for efficiency measures or increased resources at these authorities. More effective police activities, and a more effective justice system, should in turn lead to reduced criminality, a reduction in people's fear of being exposed to crime and an increase in security in the community, which is one of the objectives of police activities.

The Committee recommends a systematic evaluation of the reform. Such a review should involve a citizens' perspective, an operational perspective and a law enforcement chain perspective.

Timing

The implementing organisation faces a substantial task. We estimate that two or three years may be needed to solve all the questions that need to be tackled. It will also take time to implement the necessary changes in primary and secondary legislation, and changes in administrative and operational support systems. The current appointments of local police board members expire at the end of 2014. Our assessment is that an appropriate date on which to introduce the new organisation and thus establish the new Police Authority is 1 January 2015.