

COUNTRY SUMMARY - SWEDEN

POLITICAL - 77%	Defence & Security Policy	Legislative Scrutiny	4	
		Defence Committee	4	
		Defence Policy Debated	3	
		CSO Engagement	3	
		International AC Instruments	4	
		Public Debate	4	
		AC Policy	2	
		AC Institutions	2	
		Public Trust	2	
		Risk Assessments	0	
	Defence budgets	Acquisition Planning	3	
		Budget Transparency & Detail	4	
		Budget Scrutiny	3	
		Budget Publicly Available	4	
		Defence Income	2	
Other Political Areas	Internal Audit	4		
	External Audit	3		
	Natural Resources	4		
	Organised Crime Links	3		
	Organised Crime Policing	2		
FINANCE - 67%	Asset Disposals	Intelligence Services Oversight	4	
		Intelligence Services Recruitment	4	
		Export Controls	3	
	Secret Budgets	Asset Disposal Controls	3	
		Asset Disposal Scrutiny	0	
		Percentage Secret Spending	0	
		Legislative Access to Information	2	
		Secret Program Auditing	4	
	Links to Business	Off-budget Spending in Law	4	
		Off-budget Spending in Practice	-	
		Information Classification	4	
	PERSONNEL - 83%	Leadership	Mil. Owned Businesses Exist	4
			Mil. Owned Business Scrutiny	-
			Unauthorised Private Enterprise	3
		Payroll and Recruitment	Public Commitment	3
Measures for Corrupt Personnel			4	
Whistleblowing			2	
Special Attention to Sensitive Personnel			2	
Numbers of Personnel Known			4	
Conscription		Pay Rates Openly Published	4	
		Well-established Payment System	2	
Salary Chain		Objective Appointments	4	
		Objective Promotions	4	
OPS - 70%		Values, Standards, Other	Bribery to Avoid Compulsory Conscription	-
			Bribery for Preferred Postings	-
			Ghost Soldiers	4
	Controls in the Field	Chains of Command and Payment	4	
		Code of Conduct Coverage	2	
		Code of Conduct Breaches Addressed	4	
	Government Policy	AC Training	2	
		Prosecution Outcomes Transparent	4	
		Facilitation Payments	4	
		Military Doctrine	2	
		Operational Training	4	
	Capability Gap	AC Monitoring	4	
		Controls on Contracting	1	
		Private Military Contractors	3	
		Legislation	4	
Transparent Procurement Cycle		3		
Tendering	Oversight Mechanisms	3		
	Purchases Disclosed	3		
	Standards Expected of Companies	2		
	Strategy Drives Requirements	3		
	Requirements Quantified	4		
Contract Delivery / Support	Open Competition v. Single-Sourcing	1		
	Tender Board Controls	3		
	Anti-Collusion Controls	4		
	Procurement Staff Training	4		
	Complaint Mechanisms for Firms	4		
Offsets	Sanctions for Corruption	4		
	Due Diligence	4		
	Transparency	3		
Other	Competition Regulation	0		
	Controls of Agents	2		
	Transparency of Financing Packages	3		
	Subsidiaries / Sub-Contractors	1		
	Political Influence	3		

Sweden is placed in Band B. In terms of **political corruption risk**, there is evidence of robust and independent legislative scrutiny of defence and security policy. Sweden has signed and ratified relevant international anti-corruption instruments. The defence budget is transparent and reviewed by the Auditor General. There is no evidence of the armed forces having business interests related to natural resource exploitation. There is evidence of a low level of engagement between national defence and security establishments and civil society organisations. Public confidence in the Armed Forces' ability to combat corruption, influenced presumably by scandals in the recent past, is also indicated to be low.

With regard to **finance risk**, the National Audit Office does not scrutinise asset disposal sales carried out by the defence establishment; it focuses instead on the materiel supply process which has been greatly criticised. The percentage of defence and security expenditure dedicated to secret items and the intelligence services is not publicly available. Nevertheless, there is no evidence of off-budget military expenditure or military-owned businesses.

In the field of **personnel**, effective measures having taken part in corruption or bribery are in place, and there is evidence of their enforcement. The appointment and promotion system is understood to be robust. While chains of command and of payment are separate, the current payment system has occasionally delivered delayed and incorrect payments. There is no evidence of effective whistle-blowing legislation in place, although there is on-going lobbying activity in this regard.

In **operations**, while corruption is not explicitly referred to as a strategic issue in operations in Sweden's military doctrine, there is comprehensive anti-corruption training for commanders, and legal advisors qualified to report back on corruption risks are deployed in missions. There is, however, a lack of transparency with relation to the activities of Private Military Contractors (PMCs) operating in Sweden, although laws in place are capable of punishing them for wrongdoing.

Regarding **procurement**, there are legislation and effective oversight mechanisms in place. Defence and security purchases are based on carefully identified and quantified requirements, tender boards are audited and collusion is strongly regulated. Companies violating procurement laws are given sanctions and risk being banned. Companies can complain to the Parliamentary Ombudsman regarding perceived malpractice and they are recognised to be well protected against discrimination in future procurements. However, the Swedish Defence Materiel Administration (FMV) reports that a majority of defence contracts are purchased by single-sourcing. Sweden subscribes to the European Defence Agency (EDA) Code of Conduct on offsets, though no transparency in relation to offset contracts is observed.

Research finalised: April 2012