

Fulfilling the FORM OR SUBSTANCE?

- Content Analysis of the Annual Performance Reports of the State Prosecutor's Office and the Police Administration –

Podgorica, March 2014

Introduction

Regular performance report is one of the important tools for carrying out oversight of the State Prosecutor's Office and of the Police Administration and for assessing their work. In order for this mechanism to be operational, reports must be timely, precise, and accurate and their contents must answer the following question: what results have been achieved in the reporting period and what are the problems and obstacles in work. Adequate reporting on the work of these two bodies is additionally significant in light of the opening of accession negotiations with the European Union in Chapter 23 – Judiciary and fundamental rights – and of the need to monitor progress in achieving the goals. Opening of this chapter meant setting a condition for Montenegro's progress in the accession process, reflected in the building a track-record in the fight against high-level corruption and organised crime. An especially important role in this task is played precisely by the State Prosecutor's Office and the Police Administration.

This research report analyses performance reports of the State Prosecutor's Office (hereafter: SPO) and parts of the report of the Ministry of Interior relating to the work of the Police Administration (hereafter: PA) in the context of international standards on openness and transparency. We analysed types/categories of data, statistical and narrative, available in the reports, with regard to the competences, work and activities of these bodies. We also monitored the extent to which the contents of these reports inform the citizens and the Parliament of Montenegro, which carries out oversight of these bodies, about the achieved results, especially in the fight against corruption and organised crime.

Author:
Dina Bajramspahić

Editor:
Stevo Muk

Reports' Content Analysis

Regular reporting of the SPO and PA to the Parliament of Montenegro takes place once a year. Reports are discussed at the level of working bodies (two competent committees) and in the plenary. The importance of deliberation on these reports is reflected in the fact that this is the only regular control mechanism of the Parliament vis-à-vis these bodies, bearing in mind that all others are ad hoc mechanisms (control/consultative hearing, MPs' questions, visits, interpellation, etc.).

a) Analysis of the Report of the State Prosecutor's Office

The Law on State Prosecutor's Office¹ prescribes the obligation of the Supreme State Prosecutor to submit an annual performance report of the State Prosecutor's Office

¹ 'Official gazette of the RoM' No. 69/03 of 25 December 2003, 40/08 of 27 June 2008, 278/10 of 10 December 2010, 39/11, of 04 August 3022, 46/13 of 02 October 2013)



This analysis was made possible by the generous support of the American People through the U.S. State Department's Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) within the U.S. Embassy in Podgorica, under the Criminal Justice Civil Society Program.

It is created as part of the project of Institute Alternative dedicated to strengthening inter-institutional cooperation in the criminal justice system of Montenegro.

which contains 'description and analysis of conditions in the prosecution, detailed data for every prosecutor's office relating to the number of received and solved cases during the reporting year², as well as the problems and shortcomings in their work.³ In addition, this report, as stipulated in the Law, must contain data on state of play and trends in criminal activities in the previous year, as well as a proposal of measures to enhance the work of the State Prosecutor's Office.⁴

Although they are becoming longer every year, (63 pages in 2011, 207 pages in 2012) reports are predominantly narrative and include a table-type enumeration of statistical data, i.e. they rarely contain data on specific cases, analytical explanation of concrete problems at work, or proposals for overcoming them. Conclusions and recommendations, e.g. of the 2012 SPO Report boil down to positive comments and praise for successful work, and to stating the need for more advisors, for improving interagency cooperation between the Police and the prosecution, and for adapting the premises for the work of the Kotor Basic Prosecutor's Office. Furthermore, the same or similar conclusions and recommendations are repeated year after year. There is no information on concrete problems in different cases. However, these can be occasionally found in the analyses prepared by the relevant experts:

Example 1: *'However, in organised crime cases, there is large percentage of annulled decisions, mostly due to significant breach of criminal procedure provisions from article 386, paragraph 1, item 8 of the CPC (...). It is noted that this significant breach of the criminal procedure provisions, in a large number of significant cases – by this I refer to cases which are under the special scrutiny by the public, both because of the number of perpetrators and because of the type of the criminal offence – is reflected in incomprehensible verdict, which represents a literal copy of the incomprehensible indictment.'*⁵

Another example which points to the gap between the performance and the performance report, i.e. insufficient attention paid to the problems in reports, is the establishment of the Special Prosecutor's Office for the fight against organised crime and corruption, although there is no single report which pointed to such a need nor to the necessary steps to reform the existing Special Prosecutor's Office.

Besides, these reports contain only sporadic comparative data with regard to the previous year. Hence, it is technically impossible to monitor differences vis-à-vis the data from previous years. There is no explanation on reasons behind changes, regardless of whether the change brought positive or negative results. It is possible to spot such differences only by comparing several reports in detail.

2 In line with the internal rulebook of the State Prosecutor's Office, monthly performance reports contain data on completed procedures, ongoing procedures, procedural activities undertaken, as well as data on unsolved cases with a rationale. Besides numerical data, reports contain an overview of activities in significant cases, reasons for significant shortcomings in activities or a large number of negative decisions, as well as the prosecution's activities outside procedures (meetings, seminars, etc.). Annual performance report contains a table overview of activities and an accompanying text. The table overview is prepared according to the special guidelines of the Supreme State Prosecutor. The text component of the report contains data on the work of the Basic State Prosecutor's offices, legal issues in certain areas, overview of the organisation and personnel, problems and shortcomings as well as proposals for enhancing the work of the prosecution.

3 Article 103, paragraph 1 of the Law on State Prosecutor's Office.

4 Article 103, paragraph 2 of the Law on State Prosecutor's Office.

5 Svetlana Vujanović, President of the Court of Appeal, analysis: 'New CPC and amendments to the Criminal Code – challenges and problems in practice with an emphasis on corruption and organised crime criminal offences.'

Example: Table 2 – Differences in the duration of prosecutor-led investigation in 2011 and 2012

Department for the suppression of organised crime, corruption, terrorism and war crimes	
2011 Report	2012 Report
'In the area of organised crime, prosecutor-led investigation lasted – on average – a bit over 4 months .'	'In cases of organised crime, prosecutor-led investigation lasted – on average – 5.5 months .'
'Average duration of the prosecutor-led investigation for criminal offences with elements of corruption is a bit more than 2 months .'	'In corruption cases, investigation lasted on average 6 months .'

In contrast to such practice in Montenegro, the report of the State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Croatia provides comparative graph data in some of the categories for the past 10 years, and minimum for five years, while statistical data are accompanied by analytical comments and explanation of trends.⁶

Performance Report of the SPO is submitted to the Parliament of Montenegro at latest by 31 March of the current year for the previous year and is discussed at the Committee for political system, judiciary and administration. In 2012, it was the first time that the annual report of the SPO failed to obtain the necessary majority for endorsement, since the majority of MPs considered the results of SPO's work as unsatisfactory. This, however, had no direct implications for the work of the SPO. Yet, in terms of its structure, it was precisely this report that was marked by an improved quality. Namely, for the first time, upon request from the Parliament,⁷ the report provided an overview of activities of the prosecution in cases which were particularly under public scrutiny – cases: 'Škerović', 'Bukovica', 'Šarić', 'Snimak'. However, this practice must not remain an isolated case. The overall practice of reporting should include detailed explanations of all activities in cases of special interest and which are under public scrutiny. A very good example of such reporting is the Report of the Serbian Prosecutor's Office for the fight against organised crime – which provides detailed information on 35 most significant cases (information on the case 'Balkan Warrior' and the criminal group led by Darko Šarić was presented in detail on 7 pages, including the dynamics and activities of the prosecution undertaken to collect evidence for indictments).

A particular shortcoming is the lack of analysis of the structure of criminal charges per state bodies (Police Administration, Customs Administration, Tax Administration, Directorate for Anti-Corruption Initiative, Anti-Money Laundering Administration, State Audit Institution, etc.) as well as concrete data on decisions and actions taken by the prosecution on the basis of charges submitted by these bodies. Performance reports do not contain data on joint work with the police and other state bodies (positive and negative examples in practice).

Annual performance report of the SPO further lacks a serious presentation of its budget in the narrative, description of the financial conditions and key budgetary items, impact assessment of the approved funding with regard to the efficiency,

6 State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Croatia regularly publishes its performance reports, monthly and annually, in line with the Law on State Prosecutor's Office. The SPO is obliged to publish a report on state of play and trends in crime rates in the previous year, on the work of state prosecutor's office in the area of criminal, civil and administrative law, on cases related to protection of property rights of the Republic of Croatia, and about the legal issues in specific cases. In its annual report, Croatian SPO may warn about the state of play in the legal system, shortcomings in legislation and internal activities of the SPO and provide proposals for enhancing its work. As regards monthly reports, they contain data on completed proceedings, and if there is a need, it may contain data on specific types of cases. In line with the Law, reports are submitted to the Croatian Parliament and to the Government or the Republic of Croatia.

7 Data from the research interview with representatives of the SPO: 'addendum to the report was prepared upon the initiative from the Parliament.'

or the implications of new legal solutions on the work and the budget of the SPO. Furthermore, the reports lack a detailed analysis of administrative capacity, need for special education, conditions in the IT system, spatial capacity, official vehicles, which would have provided a comprehensive and realistic overview of the capacities of the SPO. Although some of the information may be sporadically found in hitherto reports, they are only numerical and incomplete – they do not answer the question of needs of the prosecution vis-à-vis the existing conditions, which changes would enhance efficiency and effectiveness (e.g. need for a financial expert), or the analysis of how possible changes influenced the work of the prosecution (e.g. increased number of civil servants and public employees – additional 17 – in 2012).

The report contains a list prosecutors' participation in international committees and bodies, but not the list of participation in national interagency working groups of ministries and other state bodies, nor on the work on preparation of draft laws, bylaws, analyses, reports, provision of legal opinion, etc. Overview of the implementation of new and amended laws which touch upon the competences of the prosecution is also missing.

Finally, the report lacks an explanation of the most important legal terms used in the report and the explanation of the reporting methodology of the SPO, which would make the report more accessible and clearer for citizens.

b) Analysis of the Report of the Police Administration

As an integral part of the annual performance report of the Ministry of Interior, the annual performance report of the Police Administration is submitted to the competent working body of the Parliament, Security and Defence Committee, which carries out oversight of the work of this body in line with the special Law on parliamentary oversight in security and defence sector.⁸

Although the performance report of the Police Administration is physically integrated in the report of Mol, there are four parts which specifically deal with work, results and activities of the Police:

- State of play in the area of safety in the previous year and most significant activities of the Police Administration, including the assessment;
- Detailed report on state of play in the area of safety and achieved results in different crime fields, overview of some technical issues (special checks, criminal investigation techniques, witness protection, undercover investigators, forensic centre), state of public peace and order, traffic safety, border security, human resources, legal matters and telecommunications system, special anti-terrorist unit, international police cooperation, operational-communication centre and responsibility of officials;
- Priorities for the next year,
- Concluding remarks.

However, even other parts of the Mol report, which are not strictly thematically related to the PA, contain significant data indicating the quality of the work of the PA, such as the work of the internal control, information on the use of means of coercion, border and border-crossing point management, competences of the Ministry with regard to the Department for the fight against trafficking in human beings, etc.

Bearing in mind that the report lacks a serious analysis of problems in the work of the PA, the segment entitled 'work priorities' for the next year relates only to the implementation of measures stemming from strategic documents and action plans, strengthening of capacity, signing of agreements, etc. This part does not contain anything qualitatively new, as a contribution of the annual report.

⁸ Official gazette of Montenegro, No.80/10 of 31 December 2010

It would be a good practice to provide an overview of independent reports of independent organisations, international and national, along with a set of measures for solving the identified problems – which is not the case at the moment. This would mean avoiding that the reports of international and national organisations point out to the same problems year after year. An example could be the report of Maurizio Varranese for the European Commission.⁹

Timely information on national statistics on crime is of key importance in order to monitor and react to trends and sub-trends, as well as to compare criminal patterns and patterns of rise in special types of criminal groups among different countries. The report lacks an overview of trends of phenomena and events per months – in contrast to the report compiled by the Ministry of Interior of Croatia, especially for crimes prosecuted ex officio, misdemeanours related to public order, traffic accidents, traffic infractions, fires and explosions, and other similar offences, with a view to identifying the regularity of such events and finding an adequate response to risks posed to citizens' security.

Criminal legal system includes several actors and components. Problems often appear in the coordination of different procedural steps. Information on the 'destiny' of every criminal charge and case has to be transparent through the entire system, in order to detect and act upon possible abuse and corruption, as well as to develop more functional and just policies and to pave an easier way to justice. In that regard, the connection between the performance reports of the SPO, PA and courts has to be clear and evident, and should follow all phases of the procedure, which is not the case right now. This is all the more important bearing in mind that these bodies act in the capacity of mutual 'quality controllers', i.e. there is interaction and direct link between the identified criminal offences and the collection of evidence, the quality of the indictment and the decision of the court.

Example: Table 3 – Lack of clarity between the work on cases between the Special Prosecutor's Office and the Police in 2012¹⁰¹¹¹²

2012 SPO Performance Report:	2012 PA Performance Report:
<p><i>Financial investigation</i></p> <p>'In 2012, this Department¹⁰ conducted financial investigations in cases 'Zavala' and 'Auto-Moto Drustvo Budva', which have not been finalised by the end of the reporting period.¹¹</p> <p>'The Special Prosecutor worked intensively on collecting evidence against Duško Šarić and Jovica Lončar for the criminal offence of money laundering, in parallel running a financial investigation for the extended confiscation of assets.'¹²</p>	<p>4 Financial Investigations have been initiated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial investigation against 17 members of a criminal group 'Green Mile' conducted and delivered to the Special Prosecutor with a proposal for seizure of assets. - Financial investigation with regard to 'Trio' case is underway. - Financial investigation against K.D. for reasonable suspicion of a criminal offence of abuse of power in economic activities is underway. - Financial investigation against K.V., German national, and the business entity 'Operation Trading Montenegro Ltd.' Budva for reasonable suspicion of a criminal offence of abuse of power in economic activities is underway.

Some of the procedural steps are neglected in performance reports. In the PA performance report, there is no detailed statistics with regard to detention and persons deprived of liberty (legal grounds for detention and duration of custody, including geographical and demographic data on detained persons, with separate information on minors and women), statistics on bail, statistics on searches, notifications in line

9 Report 'Assessment of Organised Crime in Montenegro'
 10 Department for the suppression of organised crime, corruption, terrorism and war crimes.
 11 Performance Report, p.52
 12 Performance Report, p.72

with the court decision, and statistics on the use of means of coercion against the abovementioned persons.

One of the standards to be met by open governments is to provide detailed information on the application of secret surveillance measures and special measures for the fight against organised crime and terrorism – concretely about the number of applied measures, duration of measures, implications of their application for the budget, results (information on the number of launched/not launched procedures), as well as the overview of criminal offences for which these measures were applied. The performance report of the Police does not contain single information on secret surveillance measures applied in criminal proceedings upon obtaining warrant from the investigative judge, i.e. state prosecutor. Such information is missing in the report of the SPO, as well as the information on measures initiated toward the court and about the decisions adopted.

Reports further lack detailed information on cooperation with other state bodies (National Security Agency, Tax Administration, Customs Administration, Administration for Inspection Affairs – e.g. data on assistance with the enforcement of decisions, or checks on data about the person subject to surveillance, checks on documents related to surveillance, etc.). There are no data on interconnection between the database of the Police with the database of other state bodies, or about the problems in this area or steps to be taken to enhance the situation.

Nevertheless, the performance report of the Police provides a more advanced overview of data compared to the Prosecution, since it contains many data classified in numerous categories. The part entitled 'Traffic Safety' needs to be enhanced by including data on structure of victims and wounded (categories: drivers, passengers, pedestrians, children). There should be a special part dedicated to investigations of attacks on police officers and attacks on other officials. Also, it is necessary to provide data on the number of citizens' calls for emergency reaction, structure of responses given (police patrol sent on the spot, verbal notification, etc.) and the average reaction time.

Furthermore, the report lacks demographic data on police forces and data on administrative staff in the police, including information on women's representation, age structure, ethnic/minority groups, pay grades, education level, trends in these areas, etc.

Without the narrative overview of the financial situation in the Police, without an explanation of key budgetary items and implications of strategic police development decisions on the budget, data on financial management and human resources management, it is impossible to give an objective assessment on the work of the police. An important piece of information is the assessment of the Police itself on the impact of the approved budget on the efficiency of their work as well as the projection of needs (capital investments, expert support, spatial capacity, vehicles, special clothing, etc.).

Generating problems – measuring the citizens' satisfaction with the work of the Police

Report on the work of over 5 000 Montenegrin police officers lacks information on the extent to which citizens are satisfied with their work. Citizens expect from the Police to reduce crime rates, to be fair and to respond to the needs of people, especially in direct interaction. Regular surveys on citizens' satisfaction with the work of the police would be a means of assessing the quality of such interaction, and would allow citizens to make their voice heard with regard to the work of the Police, while simultaneously generating feedback and pointing out to the problems

which is crucial for enhancing the work and accountability of the Police. Creating a visible mechanism for community input may help in building trust, responsibility, transparency and legitimacy, while citizens' surveys may provide data on number of criminal offences not reported to the Police, experience with and opinion of crime and criminal offences in Montenegro.

Reports of the Tripartite Commission

Although it may, in no way, replace regular reporting via the annual reports, the mission of the Tripartite Commission was a step in the right direction. However, the work of this Commission is hampered by the lack of information.

Tripartite Commission was established by the Decision of the Deputy Prime Minister of the Government of Montenegro for European integration¹³, in order to allow for an analysis of cases in the area of organised crime and corruption, as well as reporting,¹⁴ and the preparation of a single methodology for statistical indicators in the area of organised crime and corruption. The task of the Tripartite Commission is to statistically analyse the data, using a single methodology, needed for assessing the diffusion of corruption-related and organised crime offences, bearing in mind different criteria used by the Police, the prosecution and the courts as the basis for monitoring and carrying out their activities. However, these reports remained outside the competence of the Parliament and are not discussed at the working bodies which, by nature of their work, have an interest in having information on the results of these state bodies at their disposal. Although there is room for significant improvement of reporting in this case, especially in terms of greater discipline and timely delivery of information, reports provide some data which are not provided to the Parliament, e.g. on the number of applied SSM in criminal proceedings.¹⁵

Conclusions and recommendations

There are two basic tendencies to enhance the work of the State Prosecutor's Office and the Police Administration whose goal is to enhance the rule of law: equality of all before the law and improving 'good management'. For years now, there has been an attempt to provide greater security for citizens in their relations with the

13 Decision of 10 October 2007

14 Reports available at the website of the Directorate for the Anti-Corruption Initiative, for the period 2012-2013: http://www.antikorupcija.me/index.php?option=com_phocadownload&view=category&id=24&Itemid=285

15 Between 1 January and 31 December 2012, SSM were applied against 124 persons of whom 93 persons are still under SSM, while SSM were terminated in 31 cases. **The Commission has no data on the number of orders issued for conducting investigations in cases where secret surveillance measures were applied, since the Prosecution did not deliver these data to the member of the Commission from the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office.** Orders were issued to apply SSM against 124 persons, which corresponds with the number of proposals issued by the competent state prosecutor's office. **The Commission has no data on whether the State Prosecutor's Office issued orders for the application of secret surveillance measures upon proposal of the Police Administration, since such data has not been delivered to the member of this Commission from the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office.** Not a single person subject to secret surveillance measures applied upon order of the investigative judge has been informed about the application of SSM, nor have these persons been notified of the material collected in this manner.' – Report of the Tripartite Commission for the period 1 January 2013 – 30 June 2013.

state and greater legal protection through the establishment of additional rules and principles of behaviour of state bodies vis-à-vis citizens. The principle of good management should be understood as a collection of ethical standards which, along with legal mechanisms, should remove various irregularities in the work of state bodies, such as the lack of accountability and objectivity, unequal treatment, untimely reaction, slow reaction, non-undertaking of measures, biased approach in decision-making, etc. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to continuously enhance mechanisms which ensure accountability and transparency so that the good and bad examples of work are made visible, i.e. to ensure greater efficiency. To achieve this, the following is necessary:

▪ **Annual Performance Report of the State Prosecutor's Office should be enhanced in the following manner:**

- By including a detailed overview of SPO cases, measures undertaken and results achieved, especially those cases which are of special interest for the public;
- By including an analysis and overview of problems in the work of SPO, with a proposal of measures to overcome such problems;
- By providing comparative graphs for different categories of information for at least five, and for the most important ones for the past 10 years, with accompanying analytical comments and explanation of trends;
- By providing findings from reports of independent organisation, international and national, with a proposal of measures for solving the identified problems;
- By providing information on cooperation with other state bodies (in numerical form if possible: e.g. number of cases where cooperation was established, number of exchanged data, number of actions of state bodies upon request from SPO, etc., as well as qualitatively explained positive and negative examples in practice);
- By providing information on the budget with an impact assessment of approved funds on the efficiency of work;
- By providing an analysis of administrative capacity, educational needs, state of play in the IT system, etc.
- By providing a list of participation of prosecutors in national interagency working groups, their work on drafting laws, bylaws, analyses, reports and provision of legal opinions;
- By providing information on the application of new and amended laws which are related to the prosecutorial competences;
- By explaining the most important legal terms used in the report and explaining the methodology of reporting of the SPO, which would make the report more citizen-friendly.

▪ **Performance Report of the Ministry of Interior in part relating to the work of the Police Administration should be enhanced in the following manner:**

- By providing analysis and overview of problems in the work of the Police, with a set of measures to overcome them;
- By including information from reports of independent organisations, in-

ternational and national, with a set of measures for solving the identified problems;

- By providing information on phenomena and events per months, especially for crime prosecuted ex officio, public order misdemeanours, traffic accidents, fires and explosions;
 - By providing statistics with regard to detention and persons deprived of liberty (according to the legal grounds for detention, length of custody, including geographical and demographic data on detained persons, separating data on minors and women);
 - By providing overview of statistics on bail, statistics on searches and notifications in line with the courts' warrants, statistics on the use of means of coercion, especially in cases mentioned above;
 - By providing detailed overview on applied measures of secret surveillance and other special measures for the fight against corruption and organised crime (number and type of measures applied, number of persons, duration of measures, implications of their application for the budget, achieved results (information on number of initiated/non-initiated proceedings and consequent court decisions), as well as an overview of criminal offences for which measures have been applied).
 - By providing information on cooperation with other state bodies (in numerical form where possible (e.g. number of cases where cooperation was established, number of exchanged data and number of actions taken by state bodies upon request of the Police Administration, etc.)
 - Part entitled 'traffic safety' should be enhanced through the inclusion of data on structure of victims/wounded (categories: drivers, passengers, pedestrians).
 - Information on investigations with regard to attacks on police officials and other official persons should be included.
 - By providing information on number of emergency calls by citizens and structure of answers (whether the police patrol was sent, verbal notification, etc.) and average time for reaction,
 - By providing demographic data on police forces, including number on women's representation, age structure, ethnic/minority groups, pay grades, educational level, etc.
 - By providing narrative overview of financial parts, with an impact assessment of the approved budget on the efficiency;
 - By providing data on citizens' satisfaction and presentation of problems identified by citizens with regard to the work of the Police.
- **Reporting to the Parliament should be enhanced with regard to achieved results in the fight against corruption and organised crime, through the delivery of regular quarterly reports on achieved results to the Security and Defence Committee and to the Anti-Corruption Committee. Reports should include data prepared by the Tripartite Commission.**

Annex 1:

The Police Administration is a state body within the Ministry of Interior. The Police Administration carries out tasks related to:

- Protection of citizens' safety and their constitutionally guaranteed freedoms and rights;
- Protection of property;
- Prevention and identification of criminal offences and misdemeanours;
- Locating and arresting perpetrators of criminal offences and misdemeanours and bringing them before the competent authorities;
- Maintaining public peace and order;
- Providing security at public and other citizens' gatherings;
- Providing security for certain persons and objects;
- Surveillance and control of traffic safety;
- Surveillance and security of state border and carrying out border control;
- Control of movement and stay of foreigners;
- Ensuring conditions for smooth functioning of courts, maintaining order, protection of persons and property;
- Criminal expertise and research, criminal and other records;
- International police cooperation;
- Preparing analyses, studies and monitoring of certain security issues;
- Other tasks that fall under its competence.

Sources and literature:

- 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 Performance Reports of the State Prosecutor's Office
- 2010, 2011 and 2012 Performance Reports of the Police Administration and of the Ministry of Interior
- Reports of the Tripartite Commission
- Law on State Prosecutor's Office
- Law on parliamentary oversight in the security and defence sector
- Rulebook on internal organisation of the State Prosecutor's Office
- Svetlana Vujanović, President of the Court of Appeal, Analysis 'New CPC and amendments to the Criminal Code – challenges and problems in practice with an emphasis on corruption and organised crime cases'
- Maurizio Varranese, Report for the European Commission 'Assessment of Organised Crime in Montenegro'
- Law on State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Croatia
- Performance reports of the Croatian State Prosecutor's Office and Ministry of Interior
- Performance report of the Serbian Prosecutor's Office for the fight against organised crime
- Manual for the assessment of criminal justice, UNODC, 2006
- Open Government Guide, segment: Police and public security, <http://www.opengov-guide.com/topics/police-and-public-security/>

Research interviews:

- Raško Konjević, Minister of Interior,
- Radovan Ljumović, Head of the Department for analytics, enhancing the work and development of the Police, Police Administration ,
- Petar Krstajić, Chief Police Inspector, Head of the Cabinet of the Police Administration Director
- Sead Frljučkić, president of the Police Board of Ethics
- Stojanka Radović, state prosecutor with advisors

About Institute Alternative

Institute Alternative (IA) is a non-governmental organization, established in September 2007 by a group of citizens with experience in civil society, public administration and business sector.

*Our **mission** is to contribute to strengthening of democracy and good governance through research and policy analysis as well as monitoring of public institutions performance.*

*Our **objectives** are to increase the quality of work, accountability and transparency, efficiency of public institutions and public officials; to encourage open, public, constructive and well-argument discussions on important policy issues; raising public awareness about important policy issues, strengthening the capacity of all sectors in the state and society for the development of public policies.*

*The **values** we follow in our work are dedication to our mission, independence, constant learning, networking, cooperation and teamwork.*

We function as a **think tank** or a research centre, focusing on the overarching areas of good governance, transparency and accountability. Our research and advocacy activities are structured within five main programme strands: **i) public administration, ii) accountable public finance, iii) security and defense, iv) parliamentary programme** and **v) social policy**.

On the basis of our five programmes, we monitor the process of accession negotiations with the EU, actively participating in working groups for certain chapters. Our flagship project is the Public Policy School, which is organized since 2012.

In our hitherto work, we had joint projects with Center for monitoring and research (CEMI), Centre for Civic Education (CGO) and European Movement in Montenegro. When it comes to international partners, we have cooperated with Centre for Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) from Geneva, **Support for Improvement in Governance and Management (SIGMA), a joint initiative of the OECD and the European Union**, European Policy Center from Brussels, Center for International Studies (CESPI) from Rome, Center for Study of Democracy – Sofia, etc.

Managing of the organization is divided between the Assembly and the Managing Board. President of the Managing Board is **Stevo Muk**. Research Coordinator is **Jovana Marović, PhD**.

For more information on our work, please visit:

www.institut-alternativa.org

