

FOREIGN EXPERIENCE IN STAFFING INVESTIGATIVE UNITS

Azamat Azatovich Abdreimov,

Lecturer at the Department of Criminal Procedure Law of the
Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article presents a comparative legal and organizational-practical analysis of the theoretical-legal foundations of staffing investigative divisions under internal affairs bodies, drawing upon the foreign experience of leading democratic states. The article examines the mechanisms for selection, training, evaluation, and accreditation of investigative personnel in the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, Singapore, Canada, and other developed nations. The scientific substantiation emphasizes the significance of meritocratic principles, competency-based assessment methodologies, portfolio evaluation systems, workplace assessment procedures, leadership development programs, and integrity infrastructure frameworks. Furthermore, the article elucidates the impact of human resource management (HRM) systems, when integrated with internationally recognized human rights standards and principles of accountability, on the quality and effectiveness of investigative activities. Based on the research findings, science-based practical recommendations have been developed to enhance the system of staffing investigative divisions within the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Keywords: Investigative units, personnel provision, staffing policy, theoretical-legal foundations, civil service, meritocracy, procedural independence, human resource capacity, competency model, rational bureaucracy, staff stability, professionalism.

Introduction

The contemporary relevance and significance of this subject matter lies in the fact that investigative divisions operating under internal affairs bodies constitute the decisive structural component ensuring the quality of criminal prosecution and criminal procedure management. Although the criminal procedure legislation establishes the procedural framework and authority parameters, investigative quality in practice depends substantially upon proper personnel selection, training, mentorship, workload management, internal oversight mechanisms, and the effective functioning of integrity infrastructure systems.

In recent years, “target-oriented approaches”, preventive measures, and interagency cooperation in public administration and the maintenance of public safety have been significantly strengthened. In this regard, the Resolution No. 1 of January 5, 2026, emphasized the establishment of an integrated system and targeted measures to ensure a safe environment within local communities (mahallas), which, in turn, increases the informational-analytical and procedural workload placed upon investigative bodies. Consequently, this places the management of personnel quality within investigative divisions as a distinct institutional responsibility.

The President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev established the Law Enforcement Academy to address systematic cadre training for investigative work. While the Academy trains over 200 investigators annually, critical staffing challenges persist. In the capital city alone, more than 100 investigative positions within the Internal Affairs System have remained vacant for extended periods. Concurrently, vacancies in other positions have resulted in discernible quality deterioration. Statistical data from 2025 demonstrates that 422 individuals were acquitted in court, a finding attributable to judicial independence in decision-making – a positive development. However, this necessitates addressing a complementary concern: accountability for unlawful prosecutions. The investigative system requires quality, not merely numerical expansion.

Consequently, the imperative to enhance investigative operations based upon advanced foreign experience is evident. To prevent conflicts of interest, it is particularly significant that investigators exercise their official duties independently of territorial internal affairs leadership. To this end, government representatives have been instructed to reassess investigative division staffing plans proportionate to caseload and activity volume, and to incorporate legislative proposals and regulatory enhancements.

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Investigative activity demands sophisticated legal knowledge, analytical reasoning capacity, professional competence in evidence handling, strict adherence to procedural independence, and scrupulous compliance with professional ethics. Consequently, systems for personnel selection, training, and evaluation must be scientifically founded and institutionally sustainable. From this perspective, the experience of developed states demonstrates that investigative quality improvements are achieved through institutionalizing competency-based selection approaches, implementing graduated professional qualification standards, establishing professional accreditation mechanisms, and mandating continuous professional development programs.

In this article, the aforementioned experiences are analyzed through comparative legal and organizational-practical methodologies, utilizing normative-legal documentation and official procedural materials from international sources and administrative standards establishing educational regulations.

THE UNITED KINGDOM MODEL: THE PROFESSIONALISING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMME (PIP)

In the United Kingdom, the training and evaluation of investigative personnel is systematized through national standards via the "Professionalising Investigations Programme (PIP)", implemented since 2003. The program's foundational objective encompasses progressive development of investigative capacity through an integrated system of instruction, examination, field-based evaluation, and national accreditation standards.

The PIP represents a comprehensive system developed by the United Kingdom for professionalizing, standardizing, and enhancing the quality of investigative activities. Its legal and organizational significance lies in the fact that investigator preparation is not limited to

course attendance; rather, the required outcome mandates that investigators substantiate operational competency through a reliable "portfolio" reflecting practical achievement. A portfolio typically encompasses documentation of case materials, decisions grounded in evidence, evidence handling practices, interagency cooperation, victim and witness management, and adherence to ethical and legal safeguards.

PIP COMPETENCY LEVELS

The PIP framework systematizes investigative levels as follows:

PIP Level 1 constitutes the foundational tier, encompassing investigation of straightforward offenses including theft, trespass, minor fraud, traffic incidents, and less complex fraud cases. At this level, investigators develop foundational competency in evidence collection and documentation, appropriate victim and witness communication, proper procedural document management, and observance of investigative ethics and human rights standards. This foundational level serves as the prerequisite for the investigative profession, during which investigators establish baseline professional competencies while adhering to established standards.

PIP Level 2 represents specialized investigation of socially harmful and complex offenses, encompassing serious bodily injury, sexual offenses, substantial fraud, and multi-episode criminal matters. Investigators at this tier develop sophisticated competencies including investigation planning, development of investigative hypotheses, expert report analysis, victim-centered approaches, and complex evidence interpretation. Competency development at PIP Level 2 transforms the investigator into a subject matter specialist; errors at this level directly impact judicial determinations.

PIP Level 3 constitutes the advanced tier for investigating extremely serious offenses including homicide, terrorism, organized crime, and matters of significant public interest. Investigators at this level develop competency in managing large investigative teams, strategic decision-making, risk management, and high-level coordination with prosecutorial and judicial authorities. PIP Level 3 represents elite investigative status, where personal competency is complemented by critical leadership and strategic reasoning capabilities.

PIP Level 4 establishes the strategic leadership tier for systematic and strategic management of investigative activities, encompassing national-level complex matters, establishment of investigative policy and standards, and coordination of substantial resources. Investigators at this level develop competency in strategic management, institutional risk assessment, investigative quality oversight, and direction of personnel policy and training initiatives. PIP Level 4 practitioners function as architects of the investigative system rather than individual investigators, bearing responsibility for systemic effectiveness.

THE GERMANY MODEL

In Germany, the criminal investigative system is organized at federal and state (Länder) administrative levels. The Bundeskriminalamt (Federal Criminal Investigation Office) participates in training and professional development of investigative personnel. According to official documentation, the Federal Criminal Investigation Office operates the investigative

criminal investigation department (CID Criminal Investigation Department) and ensures that officer candidates undergo three-year specialized training at the Federal College.

The German model grounds investigator professional development in the integrated synthesis of "legal reasoning, forensic science, and management." Theoretical instruction is conducted concurrently with practical application, ensuring the reliability of evidence, standardization of documentation, and procedural decision-making stability. Comparatively, this model is explicated by increased probability of evidence admissibility in court and case resolution stability.

Federal-level institutions influence regional bodies through investigative methodology and specialized curricula, thereby establishing nationally uniform procedural standards encompassing evidence handling, forensic laboratory utilization, crime scene security preservation, and digital evidence retention and transmission protocols.

THE JAPAN MODEL

In Japan's police system, the National Police Agency (NPA) functions as the central coordinating authority, while the National Police Academy, subordinate to the NPA, fulfills a specialized role in training and developing investigative and administrative personnel. According to official information, the National Police Academy provides advanced-level educational and training programs for personnel anticipated to assume leadership positions, with objectives including development of management and leadership competencies and practical operational capabilities.

Japan's model is characterized by concentrating advanced-tier training (inspectors, division chiefs, administrative supervisors) at the apex of the personnel pyramid. This arrangement preserves institutional continuity, ensures interagency coordination, and maintains standards uniformity. Comparative research has examined personnel composition, educational objectives, and the police academy system within the Japanese framework.

The Japanese police system has institutionalized training on transnational cooperation in addressing transnational threats, thereby developing investigative competencies encompassing language proficiency, international legal assistance (Mutual Legal Assistance), extradition procedures, joint operations, and information sharing protocols.

THE SINGAPORE MODEL

Singapore's Police Force employs a residential training model for officer preparation. According to official documentation, the Direct Entry Inspector program commences with a nine-month residential training curriculum encompassing police protection tactics, physical conditioning, criminal law, leadership development, criminal investigation instruction, and supplementary leadership training modules including international components.

The Singapore model integrates officer operational capability encompassing "community management, operational decision-making, investigative standards." From an investigative divisions perspective, this is particularly significant regarding case distribution, investigative procedure management, results accountability, and personnel professional development.

Stated otherwise, cadre training concurrently develops "organizational management" competency.

THE CANADA MODEL

Within Canada, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) Academy (Depot Division), the national personnel training institution, organizes foundational training through the Cadet Training Program. According to official RCMP documentation, this program constitutes a comprehensive 26-week foundational curriculum offered in two official languages; successfully completing cadets may be offered service within Canada's federal police system and assume peace officer status. According to the Government of Canada Management Advisory Board report, the 26-week training program constitutes the fundamental curriculum for the National Personnel Training Academy, with recommendations regarding enhancement in alignment with forward-looking, inclusive, and healthy organizational objectives. An important contemporary tendency includes linkage of cadre training not merely to professional competencies, but to organizational culture, stress management, psychological resilience, and ethics. Within investigative divisions, these factors (burnout, emotional stress) may influence erroneous decision-making risks.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND THEORETICAL SUBSTANTIATION

Comparative analysis demonstrates that investigative cadre policy in developed states extends beyond instruction alone; it encompasses merit-based human resource management (HRM) – a system for selection, development, and effective management of organizational personnel – integrated with integrity infrastructure and internationally recognized human rights standards. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) practical guidance emphasizes that merit-based civil service systems achieve heightened public integrity through transparency and objectivity.

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) practical guidance establishes that police accountability encompasses internal and external oversight systems, balance and constraint mechanisms, and evaluation of police discipline and anti-corruption frameworks. The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) practical guidance establishes rule of law, police ethics, human rights, and public accountability as democratic policing objectives.

The United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) training manuals for law enforcement personnel recommend methodologically structured training incorporating model objectives for trainers, session plans, question-answer frameworks, and case-based instruction.

SYNTHESIS OF COMPARATIVE EXPERIENCE

Upon synthesizing foreign state experience through comparative analysis, the following conclusions emerge:

First, transparent and rigorous selection mechanisms (competency requirements, assessment instruments, security investigations, competency evaluation) assume paramount significance in personnel selection.

Second, training programs necessitate integration of theoretical knowledge and practical instruction, encompassing simulation, scenario-based case studies, evidence collection and documentation, and questioning competencies.

Third, workplace evaluation and accreditation constitute fundamental instruments for verifying actual personnel competency.

Fourth, leadership development, particularly for senior officials, assumes decisive significance in effective complex case management.

Fifth, principled commitment and human rights standards constitute integral components of training frameworks.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

Synthesizing the aforementioned experiences, the following science-based practical recommendations are considered appropriate for investigative divisions under internal affairs bodies:

- 1) Implementation of national competency frameworks encompassing levels I–IV for investigators;
- 2) Institutionalization of merit-based and integrity criteria in personnel selection, whereby organizational positions reflect demonstrated knowledge, professional capacity, and achievement rather than nepotism or personal connection;
- 3) Implementation of portfolio evaluation systems and workplace assessment procedures reflecting individuals' knowledge, professional capacity, achievements, and experience;
- 4) Organization of specialized leadership and major case management curricula for senior officials addressing serious and extremely serious offenses (homicide, terrorism, human trafficking, organized crime);
- 5) Transition to systems of continuous professional development (CPD) for systematic renewal and enhancement of practitioner competencies linked to performance outcomes;
- 6) Standardization of digital forensics competencies encompassing proper digital evidence handling methodologies.

PROCEDURAL COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK

A competency classification analogous to the British PIP investigative levels should establish that national investigative matters be stratified from simple to complex, with precisely defined knowledge and competency requirements for each tier.

Within these competency frameworks, the following substantive areas should be addressed as coherent, legally grounded curricular modules: Procedural decision-making; Evidence chain documentation (chain of custody) from initial evidence discovery through court presentation; Investigative procedures; Forensic science and expert report analysis; Digital evidence; Procedural protective measures and human rights compliance; Case preparation for judicial proceeding; Interagency cooperation protocols.

Accreditation shall be effected through evaluation of individual work experience and workplace assessment, constituting a principal criterion for advancement and assignment to senior positions.

In accordance with OECD recommendations, civil service merit-based systems enhance public integrity through transparency and objectivity while strengthening integrity culture. Within investigative divisions, this is achieved through: Transparency of appointment and promotion criteria; Standardization of examination and interview procedures; Identification and documentation of conflicts of interest; Cooperation with internal oversight organs; Verification of prescribed legal standard observance; Ongoing ethics training during service. The UNODC practical guidance establishes that anti-corruption internal and external oversight, complaint mechanisms, and disciplinary procedures are significant. The OSCE practical guidance emphasizes that investigative process training serves to: Prevent coercion and unlawful pressure; Protect victims and witnesses; Ensure understanding and realization of procedural rights; Maintain proportionality in investigative constraints and procedural compulsory measures; Preserve evidence admissibility standards affecting judicial determinations.

CONCLUSION

Research findings establish that personnel provision for investigative divisions constitutes not merely an organizational-staffing matter, but rather a strategic institutional factor determining the effectiveness of legal governance and fair adjudication systems. Comparative analysis demonstrates that investigative cadre policy in developed states is executed through integrated mechanisms of competency-based selection, staged professional development, accreditation procedures, and workplace assessment systems.

Foreign experience confirms that human resource management systems grounded in meritocratic and integrity principles constitute prerequisite conditions for ensuring procedural independence, accountability, and quality standards within investigative activities. Training investigators through integrated approaches combining theoretical knowledge, practical competency, analytical reasoning, and professional ethics ensures evidence admissibility and decision-making stability in judicial proceedings. Simultaneously, leadership training and strategic management competencies demonstrate critical significance for senior personnel.

Research findings indicate that enhancing investigative division staffing within Uzbekistan's context requires institutionalization of national competency models, graduated qualification levels, transparent examination and accreditation systems, continuous professional development frameworks, and human rights standards-compliant training.

In conclusion, establishing the principle of "quality, not quantity" in investigative activity is achievable through implementing scientifically grounded, transparent, and sustainable mechanisms for personnel selection, training, and evaluation. Such mechanisms serve to strengthen legality in criminal procedure, ensure reliable protection of citizen rights and freedoms, and enhance public confidence in justice system institutions.

References:

1. Video conference held by the President regarding measures for establishing a safe environment and ensuring effective public security on January 27, 2026.
2. OECD. OECD Public Integrity Handbook. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2020.
3. Simon H. A. Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization. New York: Free Press, 1997.
4. College of Policing. PIP: Programme policy 2023. London, 2023.
5. Drucker P. Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
6. Bayley, D.H. Democratizing the Police Abroad. National Institute of Justice, 2006.
7. National Police Agency (Japan). Education and Training Courses | National Police Academy, 2024.
8. Ueno, H. Japanese Police - Education and Training. Police Studies, 1979.
9. Van den Haag E. Punishing Criminals: Concerning a Very Old and Painful Question. New York: Basic Books, 1975.
10. Singapore Police Force. Direct Entry Inspector (9-month residential training). Singapore, 2023.
11. RCMP. Cadet Training Program (26 weeks). Canada, 2024.
12. Government of Canada. Report on the Cadet Training Program (RCMP Management Advisory Board). Ottawa, 2023.
13. Saidov A.H. State Service and the Rule of Law. Tashkent: Juridical Literature Publishers, 2015.
14. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. OECD Public Integrity Handbook. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2020.
15. UNODC. Handbook on Police Accountability, Oversight and Integrity. Vienna: United Nations, 2023.
16. OSCE. Guidebook on Democratic Policing. Warsaw: OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2021.
17. OHCHR. Training Guide on Human Rights for Law Enforcement Officials. Geneva: United Nations, 2022.
18. Kushbokov S.R. Issues in Improving Investigative Activities in Criminal Procedure. Tashkent: National University of Uzbekistan Publishers, 2018.
19. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. OECD Public Integrity Handbook. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2020.
20. OHCHR. Training Guide on Human Rights for Law Enforcement Officials. Geneva: United Nations, 2022.