

REPORT



This project is funded by the European Union.
Bu proje Avrupa Birliği tarafından
finanse edilmektedir.

March 2021

STRENGTHENING
CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT OF
INTERNAL SECURITY FORCES
PROJECT PHASE III

France Study Visit Report

Prepared by Mathieu Zagrodzki



/sivilgozetim
www.sivilgozetim.org.tr

- Transparent
- Participatory
- Citizen Focused
- Internal Security





This project is funded by the European Union.
Bu proje Avrupa Birliđi tarafından
finanse edilmektedir.

Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of ISFs- Phase III Project (CO-III) is funded by the European Union under Pre-Accession Financial Assistance. The beneficiary of the Project is the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior. The Delegation of the European Union to Turkey (EUD) is the contracting authority of the Project. Technical assistance for the implementation of the Project is provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The content of this report does not reflect the official opinion of the EU and UNDP. Responsibility for the information and views expressed in the report lies entirely with the authors.





This project is funded by the European Union.
Bu proje Avrupa Birliği tarafından
finanse edilmektedir.

Reference to the Description of the Action	
Component	Component C: Scaling Up Pilot Security Governance Structures
Activity	C.2.4.4. Conduct a technical visit to a selected EU member state, with the aim of reflecting international experience in the functioning of civilian/democratic oversight at local administrative level
Output	Study Visit Report
Description	Report on the Study Visit, occurred in France (via Zoom due to current Covid-19 pandemic) with general overview of Local Prevention and Security Boards (LPSB) and their functioning.



This project is funded by the European Union.
Bu proje Avrupa Birliği tarafından
finanse edilmektedir.

Table of Content

Abstract	5
Executive Summary	6
List of Abbreviation/Acronyms.....	7
I. Introduction.....	8
II. Methodology	8
III. Opening Speeches.....	8
IV. Presentations.....	8
I. Presentation 1: Mathieu Zagrodzki, political scientist and UNDP STE	8
II. Introduction to presentation 2: Sebastian Roché, Chief Technical Advisor	9
III.Presentation 2: Eric Piolle, Mayor of Grenoble.....	10
IV.Presentation 3: Gilles Clavreul, Préfet and former Head of the Interministerial Delegation against Racism	11
V. Presentation 4: Christine-Louise Sadowski, Head of Prevention in the département of Essonne	11
VI.Presentation 5: Elizabeth Johnston, Director of the French Forum for Urban Security	12
VII.Presentation 6: Michel Felkay, Direction of Security and Prevention of the City of Paris	13
VIII.Presentation 7: Thomas Lavielle, Deputy Governor and Chief of Staff of the Governor of Yvelines.....	13
V. Conclusion: Lessons Learned	14
VI. Annexes	15



This project is funded by the European Union.
Bu proje Avrupa Birliđi tarafından
finanse edilmektedir.

Abstract

The study tour in France was designed to have an overview of Local Prevention and Security Boards (LPSB) and their functioning. A major aspect of the program revolved around the need to coordinate various administrative and organizational levels: local and national, public and private, law enforcement and civilian. France's institutional framework is quite similar to Turkey, which made the examples developed in the presentations by speakers from various French institutions relevant for the project. Issues such as the coordination between local and national prevention plans, the "Préfet" (Governor)/Mayor cooperation and partnerships at provincial and municipal levels were discussed, showing the variety of situations in different parts of France and the flexibility required to properly develop local security and prevention plans.



Executive Summary

The study tour in France was designed to have an overview of Local Prevention and Security Boards (LPSB) and their functioning. A major aspect of the program revolved around the need to coordinate various administrative and organizational levels: local and national, public and private, law enforcement and civilian. Representatives from various bodies were invited: two Governors, one working at the central level, the other one holding a position in a French province, two representatives of municipalities (Paris and Grenoble), one representative of a province, one representative of a civil society organization. They presented their perspectives and experiences in local prevention policies. France's institutional framework is quite similar to Turkey, which made the examples developed in the presentations relevant for the project.

The main lessons learned were the following:

- 1- The Governor/Mayor relationship is extremely important in the coordination between the national and the local level. They both work in order to adapt national priorities and strategies to the local environment and needs;
- 2- It is important that the Mayor takes initiatives and involves other stakeholders, including the Préfet, as the Mayor has political and local legitimacy;
- 3- Flexibility is the key: there are formal mechanisms, but they need to be adapted if necessary. Two examples were given. Eric Piolle created neighborhood prevention boards, as he considered the municipal LPSB too formal. Elizabeth Johnston suggested that new technologies are used for meetings with citizens, as some of them cannot attend physically due to their schedule or family life;
- 4- National and Local Funding Mechanisms for prevention: There is a national interministerial committee and fund for crime prevention. The money from the fund is distributed by "Préfets" (Governors) to prevention projects developed mostly by municipalities, so that the decision making is delivered at local level and to the most relevant projects.
- 5- Money is not the only factor of success. The national prevention fund has an important role in developing local initiatives, but what matters the most is the will of stakeholders to work together and having a well-designed work plan;
- 6- Disagreements may occur and they are perfectly normal. Camille Chaize in her introduction stated that transparency is very important for the MoI. Eric Piolle, on the contrary, claimed that the national government was not transparent enough. No system is perfect and sometimes stakeholders do not see things the same way. It is a common thing in a plural and democratic society. Dialogue mechanisms are designed to solve those disagreements.



This project is funded by the European Union.
Bu proje Avrupa Birliđi tarafından
finanse edilmektedir.

List of Abbreviation/Acronyms

CCTV	Closed-Circuit Television
CIPDR	Interministerial Committee for Crime and Radicalization Prevention
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EU	European Union
FIPDR	National Crime Prevention Fund
ISF	Internal Security Forces
LPSB	Local Prevention and Security Boards
MoI	Ministry of Interior
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime



I. Introduction

The study tour in France was designed to have an overview of Local Prevention and Security Boards (LPSB) and their functioning. The case of France is interesting and relevant for the project, as its institutional structure is fairly similar to Turkey. A major aspect of the program revolved around the need to coordinate various administrative and organizational levels: local and national, public and private, law enforcement and civilian. Therefore, representatives from various bodies were invited: two Governors, one working at the central level, the other one holding a position in a French province, two representatives of municipalities (Paris and Grenoble), one representative of a province, one representative of a civil society organization. They all explained from their point of view how local prevention plans can be designed and implemented and what is the input of each of those organizations.

II. Methodology

The Study Visit occurred via remote tools in line with the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. Due to health and safety reasons, travel and quarantine restrictions and encouragement of the EU, all the visits, including informative speech, presentations and Questions & Answers sessions had to take place on Zoom.

III. Opening Speeches

The session was opened by Sevcan Kilic Akinci in the name of UNDP Turkey. Then Camille Chaize, spokesperson of the French Ministry of Interior delivered a speech in the name of the French government. She insisted on the importance of prevention, partnerships, transparency in French security policies. Then Levent Gazi Kurtođlu, head of KIHBI thanked the French MoI for its involvement in the study tour and underlined the important step that Turkey will take with the implementation of pilot sites for LPSB. He stated that this study tour would be a great opportunity to listen to how things are done in France.

IV. Presentations

I. Presentation 1: Mathieu Zagrodzki, political scientist and UNDP STE

Mathieu Zagrodzki's presentation was centered around the institutional framework of the French Republic and the functioning of national and local security policies. He first explained the unitary nature of the French Republic, which enforces the same law across its territory. He described the three existing administrative subdivisions: regions, departments (equivalents of provinces in Turkey) and municipalities. In France, law enforcement is delivered by two national agencies: the national police, working in cities, and the national gendarmerie, working in rural areas and on roads. The Préfets (governors) are the civilian authority in every province in charge of supervising and coordinating their work.

In spite of the national nature of law enforcement in France, Mayors have policing powers. First of all, they may create a municipal police force, additionally to the national police or national gendarmerie working on their territory. There are over 4500 municipal police forces in France, the largest ones being



Nice, Marseille and Lyon. Second of all, they have the power to take local regulations in order to maintain security, tranquility and cleanliness in their municipality (i.e. alcohol bans, speed limit...). Third of all, Mayors are at the head of LPSBs, which were created in 1983 in France. Local Prevention and Security Plans have existed since 1997 and boards were made mandatory in 2007 in each municipality with a population of over 10000 residents. The Mayor, the Governor and the Prosecutor are by law members of the boards, which are comprised of three types of actors: national (ISFs for instance), municipal (deputy mayor in charge of prevention and security...) and external partners (transportation companies, social housing company, local residents representatives...).

A few questions were asked after the presentation. A concern was expressed about the transparency of crime statistics described by Camille Chaize in her opening speech as for their consequences on fear of crime, reputation of some areas and real estate prices. Mathieu Zagrodzki responded that there is a cost/benefit ratio and that in a democracy, transparency is considered a central value, which supersedes the potential costs of it. Furthermore, the fact that statistics are published does not change the fact that people already know what areas are dangerous and which are not, a fact that is reflected in real estate prices. Another question was about whether or not the Mayor is the hierarchical authority of the national police or gendarmerie. The answer was no, the national police and gendarmerie have their own chain of command that goes all the way up to the MoI. Finally, a question was asked on the possible overstepping on one other's territory between the national police, the gendarmerie and the municipal police. Mathieu Zagrodzki replied that there are no overlaps between the police and the gendarmerie when it comes to patrol. Municipal police forces may patrol on the same territory as national ISF, but if they arrest someone, they have to deliver the person to national ISF as they cannot conduct any judicial act. If there is a crime that concerns an area covered by the police and another one covered by the gendarmerie (i.e. drugs manufactured in one area and sold in another), it is the prosecutor that decides who is in charge.

II. Introduction to presentation 2: Sebastian Roché, Chief Technical Advisor

Sebastian Roché gave a foreword to Eric Piolle's, Mayor of Grenoble, presentation. He presented how the role of the Mayor has evolved for the past few years in France in the field of security and prevention. Partnerships are the key of crime prevention, as it generates a joint effort between organizations that would not work together otherwise and ISFs are not the only relevant actor in security. Mayors have progressively been placed at the heart of prevention policies since 1977, due to their political legitimacy and their knowledge of the local situation.

France has a centralized, unitary system, quite similar to the Turkish one. The challenge for France was to find the right balance between the central State and local officials. In 2002, the steering of local security partnerships was given to Mayors, which shifted that balance between the local and the national level. Mayors do now place security issues on the political agenda, follows those issues thanks to the deputy mayor in charge of prevention, to LSPB and to municipal police forces. Solving the security issues identified by local citizens has become a priority for Mayors.



III. Presentation 2: Eric Piolle, Mayor of Grenoble

Eric Piolle started with a presentation of his city, with a population of 160 000 residents, 450 000 in the metropolitan area, which makes it the 11th largest in the country. He has a municipal police force of 100 officers. It is a student city and a socially mixed city, with 18 % of residents below the poverty level. The main issues are domestic violence, street crime, road safety, cannabis consumption and sale, night life disturbances. The national government is in charge of those security issues, but the city has prevention duties and policies, through social policies, education, physical activity, mediation. The Mayor tries to involve various actors, such as social housing, transportation, welfare organizations.

The municipal LSPB is the official cooperation mechanism, but it has limited effects in terms of policy designing and implementation in the eyes of Eric Piolle. It has some benefits, such as talking, exchanging points of view, listen to civil society. Nevertheless, there are useful tools besides this. Eric Piolle has created neighborhood LPSBs, which gather once a month and are very focused on operational aspects. Each neighborhood or sector has a monthly priority. Also, there are specialized working groups, on juvenile violence, on bars and restaurants, on public space use. They meet once a month with the Governor, once every two months with the Prosecutor. It is not something official, it has been informally created. The municipality also meets with residents on demand, when they have security issues.

Eric Piolle considers that the mechanisms could be improved through a more in-depth coproduction of security with the central government, where the latter would perform its policing tasks, but municipalities would play a greater role in the identification of priorities and strategies and have better access to information. The government in France is very centralized and does not share information.

After the presentation, Sebastian Roché asked Eric Piolle what happens if there is a disagreement during a local board meeting and what are those disagreements generally about. Mr Piolle replied that it can be about resources allocation for instance, the Governor asks sometimes that the municipal police do more. On the other hand, he is not getting information besides monthly stats from the Governor. Sevcan Kilic Akinci asked why sector/neighborhood boards work better than the official LPSB. Eric Piolle responded that it is because it is more operational, with actors working on the field and a less political aspect. The LPSB has a lot of members, so it takes time for everyone to speak and make decisions. It is only useful to hear different points of view. Mathieu Zagrodzki was curious to know how the municipal police force is used by Eric Piolle. He answered that it was a form of community policing, with priorities around tranquility, fighting disturbances, alcohol abuse in the public space, parking issues. Their work is about being known and recognized, to prevent and regulate. He wants the municipal police to act on issues neglected by the national police, such as nighttime disturbances, and contacts with local residents. The national police respond only to emergency calls. On the contrary, the municipal one tries to solve problems. For instance, when they encounter homeless people, they try to offer them sheltering and veterinary assistance for their dogs. The homeless are not scared of them and they know them. The Deputy Mayor of Sincan asked what the selection criteria regarding the recruiting of municipal police officers were. Eric Piolle said there are no specific ones, only that many are former gendarmes. Sincan's Kaymakam asked about the antidiscrimination policies promoted by the LPSB in the context of the migrant crisis. Eric Piolle stated that it is very important. He develops initiatives to promote interreligious dialogue and Grenoble is part of an international network of cities welcoming migrants.



IV. Presentation 3: Gilles Clavreul, Préfet and former Head of the Interministerial Delegation against Racism

Gilles Clavreul spoke about the roles national and local actors in the field of security and of the Interministerial Committee for Crime and Radicalization Prevention (CIPDR). After a brief history of security policies and ISFs in France, he explained how security policies are decided mostly at the local level. The main responsible for security at the local level on a daily basis is the Préfet. The MoI sets the global strategy and objectives, but it is the Préfet that handles daily operations.

Another actor in this general architecture is the CIPDR. It is not part of the MoI, as it is an interministerial structure, working with the entire government and coordinating the prevention efforts of several departments: Interior, Education, Sports, Culture, Transportation. A Préfet is at the head of the CIPDR. Since 2016, the committee has also been in charge of combatting political and religious radicalism. The role of the CIPDR is not about giving Préfets orders or recommendations about what they are supposed to do or determining what the prevention strategy should be in each and every town. It publishes a national prevention strategy document, which is a general framework for local prevention policies. It also provides training and resources to support local prevention efforts. The national crime prevention fund (FIPDR) is designed to subsidize municipalities and other local actors in their crime prevention efforts. The yearly amount is 60 million euros: 30 for crime prevention, 15 for radicalism prevention, 15 for CCTV. In the 2020/24 prevention strategy, radicalization has become a major priority.

Mathieu Zagrodzki asked how the funds are allocated. Gilles Clavreul said it was the Préfet in each département that decides how the money is distributed and to whom. There are no direct discussions or negotiations between national and local authorities on this matter. Fatih Dogan asked about initiatives regarding migrants. Gilles Clavreul said it was a good example of good practice with a coordination between local authorities, ISFs and NGOs.

V. Presentation 4: Christine-Louise Sadowski, Head of Prevention in the département of Essonne

Christine Louise-Sadowski works currently for Essonne, but had previous experiences as head of prevention in the cities of Strasbourg and Argenteuil. She spoke extensively about the Mayor's role in crime prevention. First of all, she explained that security is a daily challenge for the Mayor, as he/she gets a lot of complaints from local residents on noise, squatting, conflicts between neighbors... The powers of the Mayor are limited nevertheless; he or she cannot solve everything. However, it is always possible to use administrative powers and the municipal police to enforce regulations.

She gave the example of Argenteuil, where relations between the national police and the city were difficult. The city authorities were unhappy with the lack of involvement of national authorities in the security of Argenteuil. She realized that she had tools she could use and that it was necessary to meet local partners. She made a security analysis sector by sector, invited all local partners and set objectives. When the plan was presented to the Governor, he decided to join the collective effort and a beneficial cooperation with the national police started.



Strasbourg is another case, as it is a metropolitan area of 33 municipalities. There is a metropolitan governance structure on top of the 33 municipalities, which each have security and prevention duties. Nevertheless, the handling of the CCTV system was given to the metropolitan authority, as it guaranteed a more coherent and global coordination of the system, which helped solve rather than just displace problems.

Finally, the level of the département (or province) is not usually the level where crime prevention is handled. But as it is in charge of social policies and middle-school, it has access to fragile populations, which can contribute to crime prevention. Also, it has to make the buildings it is in charge of safe.

Sebastian Roché asked Mrs Sadowski what works and what does not in her experience. She replied that what does not work is when a Mayor waits for the Governor to take the initiative of generating a cooperative effort. The Mayor must do a local security analysis, design a plan, and then submit it to the Governor. The initiative has to come from the Mayor, which requires political will.

VI. Presentation 5: Elizabeth Johnston, Director of the French Forum for Urban Security

Elizabeth Johnston spoke about local and national crime prevention strategies. She began by explaining the role of the French and European Forums for Urban Security, which is a network of local governments created in 1987. It promotes a balanced view of security policies, between prevention, repression, cohesion and solidarity. Security is not only the matter of the police; it involves all urban actors. The network provides support to its members in conducting and evaluating their security policies. It is involved in European and global governance through collaborations with UNDP, UN Habitat, UNODC, European Parliament and Commission.

The forum considers that security is a right that is not contradictory with fundamental rights, with a strategic and rational approach, advocating long-term solutions rather than short-term reactions to events. There are local governments from various political backgrounds, but they all work well together as they share the same set of values. Also, the academic world is involved in the activities of the forum. Public space security, nightlife problems, radicalization and violence against women are the main problems addressed recently by the forum.

The forum is convinced that civil society involvement is necessary, as it is in the best position to identify problems and that its cooperation is necessary to the success of public policies. Citizens should be active parts of those policies, not only passive beneficiaries. There are several ways of involving citizens. First of all, they need to be informed and trained to the complexity of the issues, which requires the participation of academics and experts. Also, there is the possibility to involve them in LPSBs or other prevention-related meetings or organizations. There are initiatives in Rennes, Saint-Denis, Bordeaux of involving citizens in prevention boards, identifying public space problems or monitoring the use of CCTV.

All of this is reflected at national level with a prevention policy that is led by the CIPDR, which sets the national framework. The forum was involved in the designing of the 2020-24 national prevention strategy. Five priorities were set: juvenile crime, vulnerable persons, public space issues, civil-society involvement and renewal of local governance of security policies.



After the presentation, Elizabeth Johnston answered several questions. She addressed one asked by the representative of the Federation of Turkish Women on domestic violence, explaining that it is a massive problem but that is slowly become a priority on the political agenda and that municipalities have a prevention role by educating men. Regarding a question by Deputy Mayor of Sincan on the involvement of citizens in the evaluation of prevention policies, she said France has progress to make, given that it is always the same elderly and educated people for the most part that take part in the meetings. There is a need to make prevention and security meetings more accessible and inclusive, to young mothers for instance, by using new technologies.

VII. Presentation 6: Michel Felkay, Direction of Security and Prevention of the City of Paris

Michel Felkay started his presentation with explanations about the legal framework in France, which will soon allow Paris to have its own municipal police, which was not possible so far. The objective is to have 5000 officers by 2024, with a predominantly preventive approach.

The current Paris local security plan was signed in 2015, then district plans were signed in the 20 districts of Paris. The Paris local security plan revolves around several priorities that are in line with the national strategy. First of all, juvenile violence, especially knife fights between groups of young men, are a problem in Paris. Social services are fully involved in the dealing of this issue. Also, young convicts do community work for the city of Paris as part of their penalty. On top of this, a CSO in Paris delivers training to youth on radicalization that is funded by the city. Protecting vulnerable persons and women is another aspect of the Paris prevention and security plan. Children begging in the street are taken into account by social services and placed in shelters. Also, there are social workers paid by the city in police stations to assist victims. Finally, public spaces issues, such as physical violence are addressed by several partners, such as the private security agency working in social housing complexes, and city mediators.

Questions were asked about the evaluation of those policies, begging and homelessness, and drug addiction. On the first aspect, Michel Felkay said that an observatory of public tranquility is going to be created in March, with academics, surveys, meeting points with Parisians. It will publish statistics and analyze data. On the second one, begging is predominantly a juvenile problem. They are placed in shelters and assisted by social workers. Begging is not a felony, so they are treated under the prevention and social aspect. On drugs, the city is hosting a supervised injection site.

VIII. Presentation 7: Thomas Lavielle, Deputy Governor and Chief of Staff of the Governor of Yvelines

Thomas Lavielle described the role of the Préfet in security and crime prevention. He or she is in charge of public order and security in the province. Also, the Préfet handles the provincial crime and radicalization prevention board alongside the head of the provincial assembly and the Prosecutor, which is the tool to enforce prevention strategies.

The Préfet steers ISFs on a daily basis through informal meetings and contacts. He/she participates in LPSBs in the municipalities of the province. There are also operational working groups, involving ISFs



and citizens. The provincial board develops a strategy that is then implemented by municipalities through the LPSBs. On terrorism, the provincial board serves an information-sharing purpose, but not an operational one. Municipalities have their own radicalism detection mechanisms and dedicated working group, which can gather information on people who join or support radical groups.

After this, a question was asked by Mathieu Zagrodzki about the link between the national and the provincial prevention strategy and also the use of the national prevention fund. Thomas Lavielle explained that the provincial strategy is an implementation of the national one, as it addresses the priorities of the latter: vulnerable persons, juvenile violence, public space issues... The new strategy will be presented in March during the next provincial board meeting. The prevention fund is used for this, as it is the Préfet who distributes its subsidies at provincial level. For instance, one initiative is to take care and provide activities to juveniles during the summer. Then, a question was asked about the identification of racial profiles by municipalities and the definition of radicalization. Thomas Lavielle answered that municipalities may communicate information they get to know about, but they do not play the role of intelligence services. Concerning radicalization, it is the promotion or participation to violent actions.

V. Conclusion: Lessons Learned

Based on the presentations and the discussions held during the two days of the study visit, several lessons can be learned:

- 1- The Governor/Mayor relationship is extremely important in the transition between the national and the local level. They both work in order to adapt national priorities and strategies to the local environment and needs;
- 2- It is important that the Mayor takes initiatives and involves other stakeholders, including the Préfet, as the Mayor has political and local legitimacy;
- 3- Flexibility is the key: there are formal mechanisms, but they need to be adapted if necessary. Two examples were given. Eric Piolle created neighborhood prevention boards, as he considered the LPSB too formal. Elizabeth Johnston suggested that new technologies are used for meetings with citizens, as some of them cannot attend physically due to their schedule or family life;
- 4- National and Local Funding Mechanisms for prevention: There is a national interministerial committee and fund for crime prevention. The money from the fund is distributed by "Préfets" (Governors) to prevention projects developed mostly by municipalities, so that the decision making is delivered at local level and to the most relevant projects.
- 5- Money is not the only factor of success. The national prevention fund has an important role in developing local initiatives, but what matters the most is the will of stakeholders to work together and having a well-designed work plan;
- 6- Disagreements may occur and they are perfectly normal. Camille Chaize in her introduction stated that transparency is very important for the MoI. Eric Piolle, on the contrary, claimed that the national government was not transparent enough. No system is perfect and sometimes stakeholders do not see things the same way. It is a common thing in a plural and democratic society. Dialogue mechanisms are designed to solve those disagreements.



This project is funded by the European Union.
Bu proje Avrupa Birliği tarafından
finanse edilmektedir.

VI. Annexes

- PowerPoint Presentation by Mathieu Zagrodzki, “France’s administrative organization and security governance”
- PowerPoint by Sebastian Roché, “The role of Mayors in Local Security”
- PowerPoint Presentation by Gilles Clavreul, “The making of territorial security policies. Who does what?”
- PowerPoint Presentation by Christine-Louise Sadowski, “The coproduction of security for local territories and residents”
- PowerPoint Presentation by Michel Felkay, “Local security policy”
- PowerPoint Presentation by Elizabeth Johnston, “Involving Civil society in local security strategies”