

Title Whistleblower Guideline Inrego AB			Inrego AB Kemistvägen 3 183 79 Täby, Sweden
Established by Henrik Långmark	Established (date) 2023-01-31	Latest update by Henrik Långmark	Update (date) 2023-01-31
Approved by Henrik Nilsson	Valid from 2023-03-02		

Whistleblower Guideline Inrego AB

Introduction

With this whistleblowing guideline, Inrego AB specifies how employees and others should act when reporting misconduct—so-called whistleblowing.

This guideline should be helpful to anyone who has reason to **report information about misconduct in which there is a public interest in finding out**, to feel safe to do so without being hindered, risking reprisals or being held liable for, for example, breaching professional secrecy.

Purpose

The purpose of this guideline is to provide clear guidance on when and how misconduct can be reported in situations where it is not relevant to use the usual means of reporting. All revelations of misconduct, as there is a public interest in them coming to light, should be handled fairly and properly.

Overarching guidelines

The guideline is based on the Act on the Protection of Persons Reporting Misconduct (Whistleblower Act). The protection that our employees receive through this guideline is the same as that provided by the Whistleblower Act. The guideline does not provide for any restriction or extension of the protection of the law.

We strive for a culture where all employees dare and want to express their opinions and that there is a dialogue in the company about any problems that arise in the business. Although there is no such misconduct that leads to reporting in accordance with this guideline, we encourage all employees to raise any issues they experience within the organization. As a first action, one should bring it up with his or her manager.

Although this guideline is primarily aimed at employees, the Act on the Protection of Persons Reporting on Misconduct (Whistleblower Act) can also be applied outside the employer-employee relationship. This means that people other than employees are also protected under the Whistleblower Act as long as reporting takes place in a work-related context and the law's criteria for protection are met.

A work-related context means that the reporting person can or has been able to obtain information about misconduct in his or her current or previous work (in private or public activities). The law thus does not apply to reporting outside a work-related context such as reporting information that someone has received in the capacity of customer, client, patient or student.

Whistleblowing

In this guideline, whistleblowing means that any employee reports information about misconduct within our business where there is a public interest in them coming forward.

The whistleblowing can also refer to misconduct in other activities that the employee through his work with us has become aware of, for example, serious misconduct on the part of a customer or a supplier and where there is a public interest that it is made visible.

No false information or unfounded rumors

A prerequisite for being protected against labor law measures, etc., is that the person reporting at the time of reporting the misconduct had reasonable grounds to believe that the information about the misconduct was true.

Thus, an employee who knowingly reports or publishes false information is not entitled to any protection. Protection also does not apply if the employee reports unfounded rumors or hearsay. However, it is not required that the employee can provide actual evidence of the misconduct, but there must be something that makes it reasonable to believe that the information is correct. There is no requirement that the employee must carry out surveys and checks to be sure that the data is indeed correct unless it is possible to examine or verify the accuracy of the data without difficulty.

No right to disclose documents

There is no right to disclose documents belonging to Inrego AB even if the document contains information about misconduct that has a public interest in their appearance.

However, there is no impediment to the employee orally or otherwise reporting information from a document without disclosing the document.

Discharge for breaching professional secrecy in the employment

An employee who reports does not normally become liable for breaching his or her duty of confidentiality in his or her employment contract. The discharge applies if the employee at the time of reporting had reasonable grounds to believe that the reporting of the information was necessary to reveal the reported misconduct. This is not the case if, for example, the reporting could have been done with sufficient clarity without the obligation of confidentiality and the reporting person had no reasonable grounds for reporting the information anyway.

Discharge for reporting misconduct does not apply to employees who are subject to a so-called qualified duty of confidentiality in the Public Access to Information and Secrecy Act or the Act on Defense Inventions. The so-called lawyer's confidentiality must not be overridden either.

Not allowed to commit crimes

If an employee is guilty of a crime through the collection of information, there is no discharge even if there is misconduct. Crimes that can typically be committed upon collection are theft, unlawful intrusion, data breach, espionage, or unauthorized employment with secret information.

When are employees who report misconduct protected?

As can be seen above, this guideline is based on the Act on the Protection of Persons Reporting on Misconduct (Whistleblower Act). The protection that employees receive from us through this guideline is the same as that provided by the Whistleblower Act. The guideline does not provide for any restriction or extension of the protection of the law.

In summary, this means the following prerequisites for protection when reporting:

1. Misconduct

Firstly, it should be a question of reporting information on misconduct.

The abuses covered are those consisting of acts and omissions, whether intentionally or negligently. It may also be that the misconduct is due to circumstances for which no person can be blamed, i.e. accidents. An attempt to conceal wrongdoing may constitute an act of cover.

2. Public interest

Secondly, it must be a matter of reporting information on misconduct that there is a public interest in their being made visible.

For there to be a public interest, the misconduct must concern the public. Protection under the law and this guideline is that it is normally not a question of reporting things that only concern the employee's own working or employment conditions.

In addition to the fact that the misconduct should concern the public, the public must have a legitimate interest in the misconduct coming to light. Public curiosity is not such an interest. On the other hand, as a rule, there is a legitimate interest in ensuring that abuses that adversely affect the public come to light and can thus be remedied. The public may also have a legitimate interest in being informed of the misconduct to take measures to protect themselves. The more frequent and systematic the abuses, the greater the public interest in remedying or interrupting the abuses.

The public interest in the disclosure of violations of internal rules can in many cases be relatively weak. At the same time, there may be a broader interest in also revealing violations of internal rules. Based on the circumstances, there may therefore be a public interest in the emergence of violations of internal rules and principles.

One starting point is that there is normally no public interest in misconduct coming to light, but that the conditions are serious.

3. Reporting internally or to external authorities

Thirdly, reporting must be done internally within the organization as below or to an authority via its external reporting channels.

There is no requirement for an external reporting to have been preceded by internal reporting. The employee can thus choose whether he or she wants to report internally or externally to an authority via its external reporting channels.

Protection also applies if the employee reports externally to an authority other than through its external reporting channels if one of the following three conditions is met:

I. The employee has first reported internally without

- the recipient has taken reasonable follow-up action in response to the reporting, or
- the recipient has provided feedback on the follow-up to a reasonable extent.

II. The employee has reason to believe that the misconduct constitutes an imminent or obvious danger to life, health, safety, or the risk of extensive damage to the environment or for any other reason has justifiable reason to report to the authority.

III. The employee has reason to believe that internal reporting would entail a risk of retaliation or lead to the misconduct being unlikely to be effectively remedied.

Employees are not allowed to publish information

As a general rule, an employee must not ignore internal or external reporting and instead publish information about misconduct.

Publication means that information about misconduct is made available to the public. This can be done in several different ways, for example by providing information to someone else for publication, such as a journalist. Information may also be made available to the public by providing information to actors who can contribute to the dissemination of the information such as environmental organizations, elected representatives and other non-profit associations, etc. Disclosure also includes the employee self-publishing the data in any medium that is accessible to the public, such as social media.

Publication may take place only if the following conditions are met:

1. The employee has reported externally without
 - the recipient has taken reasonable follow-up action in response to the reporting, or
 - the recipient has provided reasonable feedback on the follow-up within three months of receipt of the report or, where there are special reasons, six months and the reporting person has been informed of the reasons for extending the deadline.
2. The employee has reasonable grounds to believe that the misconduct constitutes an imminent or obvious danger to life, health, safety, or the risk of extensive damage to the environment or otherwise has justifiable reason to make the information public.
3. The employee has reasonable grounds to believe that an external report would entail a risk of retaliation or lead to the misconduct being unlikely to be remedied effectively.