

Improvement of Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector Project

ICOISS Phase II



TR 2011/0324.02

LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS IN PARIS AS BEST PRACTICES

12.04.2013

International Short Term Expert: FRANÇOIS-YVES BOSCHER

Reference to the Description of the Action	
Component	C. Civil Society and Media
Activity	C.3 Facilitate setting up of local security commissions at 8 pilots sites in 5 provinces and arranged a minimum of 20 meetings of Local Security Commissions involving civil society representatives and joint conclusions reached (output: Reports of the meetings with local security commissions).
Output	C.3. Reports of the meetings with local security commissions
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presenting a description of the French local security commissions in Paris and pointing out their best practices.



“Improvement of Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector Project Phase II (ICOISS II) is funded by the European Union. The beneficiary of the Project is the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior. Technical assistance for the implementation of the Project is provided by the United Nations Development Programme.”

Introduction

The beginning of the second phase of UNDP Project to enforce civilian oversight on police enforcement forces in Turkey opened with a seminary on lessons learnt which was organized on 26-27 March 2013 in Istanbul for more than 150 people from governorates, police and gendarmerie, municipalities and non governmental associations.

The seminary was held and organized by Rahmi DOGAN, head of department at the Turkish Ministry of Interior and Professor Sébastien ROCHE, chief technical adviser of the project.

In this context, it was thought to be useful to present a description of the French local security commissions in Paris and to point out their best practices.

As the international expert in charge of the project, I produced this presentation as well as the present report which aims at relating how best practices have been found and presented (part one) and how they have been commented and what interest they show for the project (part two).

Part 1: Best Practices in PARIS Local Security Commissions

In order to present the best practices in the context of the Parisian local security commissions to the Turkish participants, a preparatory work of consulting and documenting has been necessary in France to identify them. They have been exposed in Turkey through a power-point that is available on the website of the Project.

1. The preparative works

Documenting

Documenting work was long but rather easy. It was long because, between 2008 and 2009, each of the twenty local security commissions wrote a long and technical document of around one hundred and fifty pages to describe their own local security plan.

For itself, the top-level local security commission called “Parisian Security Council” wrote a plan of more than two hundred pages.

Access to all these documents was easy, which is important for civilian oversight, because most of them may be consulted on the district municipalities web-sites. The transparency is very well ensured and every one can take note of specific items like dangerous areas, events in streets. It must also be noted that the reason of the availability of the plans on municipality web-sites lies in the fact that the municipality services are the secretary of the commissions.

For the presentation, I investigated all these plans identifying best practices. This long work was complicated by one important fact: while the first annual local security plan in Paris was created in 1998, all annual local security plans in Paris refer to the previous annual one and assess the situation and the results on this basis. It was necessary therefore to analyze each of them backwards.

Consulting

To reach the expertise level, consulting was therefore necessary. Contacting some people in charge was made easy for a notable fact: I found several retired policemen in the municipal bureau working for the district local security commissions.

At the top-level of the Parisian Prevention Security Council, the chief of the bureau is a police-chief, former police-chief of a Parisian district, detached from the Ministry of Interior to the Paris municipality. I took benefice from this specificity.

Identifying the best practices

Because inventing and leading security preventive strategies or actions is a rather complicated task to be carried out by the prevention security commissions, I tried to classify the fields or items where I identified their best practices. But, before of this, I must insist on the “concepts good integration”:

Like it is said before, the Parisian experiment of the central and district local prevention security commissions is long and the local security plans have existed since more than fifteen years. Parisians are therefore used to working with concepts that are new for others. These new concepts have to be understood by all those who want to appreciate the best practices.

The most important new concept is “**the partnership for prevention**” with the double part of its novelty. The first is in this notion, “prevention”. It is different of the “administrative police” and includes all the modern types of prevention (the social, the situational and the behavioral ones). The second “partnership” means equality, and complementary and interactive action. These principles are valuable in the commission debates and in the concrete actions. So, Local Prevention Security Plans can be implemented in a single partner prevention program (neighbor watch program for the police, information on the law for a lawyers NGO) as well as in a preventive strategy with a mix of partners programs, or in a collective brand new program.

Another concept is to distinguish what can be called a preventive action, a preventive program or a preventive strategy following their different extents.

2. The presentation of best practices

In Istanbul, a power point with 23 slides was used to present the Paris local preventive security best practices. The description was parted in six points that can be read elsewhere:

EXPERIENCE and CHANGE HAVE GIVEN SIX TYPES OF BEST PRATICES

- 1. Best practice to cover all the fields of prevention**
- 2. Best practice to choose the main security topics**
- 3. Best practice to improve the organisation of the Prevention security Comissions**
- 4. Best practice for the security diagnosis**
- 5. Best practice in the action plan**
- 6. Best practice to invent new jobs to make LPSP**

Part 2: Comments of the audience and interest for the project

The audience was composed of two parts, the one made with district governors and members of commissions who experimented the project in phase one and the other not. This difference did not create any problem except for the people coming only at the second day of the seminary.

There was another distinction within the people attending the presentation of the Paris Best Practice in Local Prevention Security Plans. There was a distinction between Istanbul participants and those from other provinces. This did not make any difference in terms of interest or relevance of the project though.

The presentation was wider and more technical than the one about the public survey on security that was given in the same morning of the seminary. Despite of that, interest was present but it was seen more like a piece of information rather like a concrete element and analysis, especially for those who have not experimented the project in phase one. A deeper and more critical exam allows to see the weak and the strong point of my presentation.

1. The brittle point of the presentation

The leader of the project, Professor S. Roché, wished that more emphasis would be made on the **“two-level” organization of the security commissions in Paris**, for the governorate as well as for the municipalities. Indeed, in the big modern cities, it is necessary to distinguish what is for the city as a whole and what is for the districts. Because Turkey has many big cities, at first rank the very big Istanbul, this point seemed worthy to be debated.

In fact, there was no question on that point because considering the “two-level organization” from a Turkish point of view is rather difficult: the governorate and the districts have a very strong hierarchic link but a feeble operational one.

Some experts say things are changing but texts are still the same for the moment.

In that context, district governors must lead with their own means. But in the public administration of governorates, modern rules of management are opposed to formalism and legalism. Transversal or horizontal functions are prohibited for the organization and detachment or disposal prohibited for the servants. So, the district governors cannot mobilize strength in their administrative organization and they risk to appeal to N.G.O. resources.

In that occurrence, it was difficult to discuss about the three shapes of the “two-level organization”:

- The separate one (top-level takes this, districts takes that),
- The integrate one (top-level integrates or sustains districts important needs and opposite)
- Or the unequal one (generally top-level orders and sustains in the districts the important needs it decides). Paris chose this last form described.

So, instead of a dispute on the “two-level organization”, participants preferred focusing on the district governor’s role. The way he will lead the local prevention and security commission was a case of dispute for very few participants. The very big majority agrees with his leadership.

My opinion is also this one, though the reality of it is difficult to implement. Positively, district governors have authority - even a very big large one compared with the elected mayor’s one -, but their administrative expedients are low compared to the municipalities ones.

With the territorial state administrations, district governors and deputy governors consider that some of them and even the police tends to the upper level of the governorate. In that context, district governors and deputy governors need to be lend a hand and be comforted in the beginning of the project.

From my point of view, I think it is a paradox, the Ministry of Interior repeats its confidence to the four district governors in Istanbul and the deputy governors in the elected provinces to lead the project for the district security commissions without expressing **its own proper needs that will create the first level** we actually miss.

Effectively, to my knowledge, for the moment and in the time of this seminary, it does not make announce to the participants it will take its part in the project by saying the governors its own priorities for security prevention in an experimental partnership. Actually, I do not know if it will express transverse priorities for the four districts of Istanbul and the others in Turkey.

If the project is to define an institutional set up to install local security commissions in Turkish provinces with district governors and deputy governors like the master pieces, the state will for prevention must appear and made concrete in expressing priorities. It is not necessary these national priorities are numerous but some must exist to be reached for the period of the first security plans.

Those national priorities are not to be considered as absolute orders because the goal to enforce civilian oversight will be lost. The national priorities for prevention measures are only orientations, axis (domestic violence, violence at school...) given by the central government to the governors for the district governors in charge for them to decline, fully or not, following local needs and interests.

They are the state opinion in the local security partnership. They prove the state interest in the project but they let local security partnership work its own way. Maybe in the future, state would give funds to sustain and help to realize these priorities in the provinces.

2. The strong point of the presentation

If actual situation of the “two-level” organization is the weak point my presentation has met, the Turkish national culture of solidarity make **security partnership** the strong point of the project I discovered through the seminary.

In Turkey, security partnership is a very easy understandable concept for people in charge, whoever they can be: public servants, municipality servants, N.G.O. members and so on. This may be accounted by the result of the national culture.

After the presentation of “Best Practice in District Prevention Security Commissions in Paris”, a workshop was set up about “How to Organize Security Partnership?”. Our colleague Sevcan AKINCI KILIC enlivened the talks and allowed to confirm what the first phase proved: security partnership is a very easy concept to carry out in Turkey.

The participants of the workshop used a frame I made for them and accepted without any difficulties to speak from a district governor’s point of view about the five items written below:

How to organize prevention security partnership by Deputy governors : (results of 28th march 2013 seminary)

- 1. He must know what prevention partnership is**
- 2. He must know what it is concretely made of**
- 3. He must know what partners may give**
- 4. He needs a political decision and a legal frame to enforce prevention partnership**
- 5. He must have an administrative training to make partners share competencies**

Members of the workshop dealt easily with the first three items but they were in a waiting position to speak about the last two ones.

The needs of a political decision and a legal framework like means to enforce prevention partnership were said. Opinions were expressed on these points but they were not absolute and all the partakers repeated their interest for the project to make security partnership inside of Local Security Commissions.

The workshop discussed a part of all these elements I prepared before on an other power-point :

4. The need of a political decision and a legal frame to enforce preventive security partnership is expressed

- **Take a political decision to share preventive security treatment at local level with national coordination**
- **Invent a legal frame to allow participation and transparency**
- **Keep the state harmony by defining a national way of local security partnership**

The workshop of the seminary ended with a talk about the district governors' tasks for the local security commissions. They are summarized below and can be considered to decide for a training.

There is also need of a good administrative training to organize security partnership

to mobilize the state agencies

- **To define a territory and its inhabitants for partnership**
- **To convince them about security prevention**
- **To find good willing local responsables**
- **To give goals, methodology, experts to every state partner**

to mobilize the L.S.Commission

- **To identify main local security issues and consider national ones**
- **To define preventive strategies and objectives in a local S.Plqn**
- **To negociate and decide agreements and engage for them**

to install bureau or operative secretariat

- **To write the Prevention security local Plan**
- **To present the actions cards**

- :- :- :- :-

Conclusion of my presentation of the "best practice in Paris local security commissions" is hard to draw because the difference between partakers' attendance to the first phase of the project. In that difficulty, information about a fifteen years institution can give optimism but also eagerness or fear. In all the case, it seemed it gave elements to contribute to make a Turkish model of local prevention security commissions.