

Improvement of Civilian Oversight of Internal
Security Sector Project

**LOCAL SECURITY PLANS
PILOT IMPLEMENTATION BOOKLET**

Ministry of Interior General Directorate of Provincial Administration

2010
ANKARA



Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior is the main beneficiary of the Improvement of Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector Project. The project is funded by the European Commission and executed by the Ministry of Interior with the technical assistance of United Nations Development Programme.

Main Beneficiary:
Ministry of Interior
General Directorate of Provincial Administration

UNDP Technical Assistance Team
Prof. Dr. Sebastian Roche, Chief Technical Adviser

Short Term Experts Assigned for the Production of the Booklet:

François Yves Boscher, Senior International Expert in Charge of Implementation of the Pilot Models
Nazlı Yıldırım, Local Junior Expert in Charge of Implementation of Pilot Models

Serra Titiz, Local Senior Expert in Charge of Implementation of the Pilot Models in İstanbul

Aziz Tuncer, Local Junior Expert in Charge of Implementation of Pilot Model in Eyüp

Murat Yücer, Local Junior Expert in Charge of Implementation of the Pilot Model in Kadıköy

Sevcan Kılıç Akıncı, Local Senior Expert in Charge of the Implementation of Pilot Model in Erzurum

Kemal Günler, Local Junior Expert in Charge of Implementation of Pilot Model in Erzurum

Nafiz Tok, Local Senior Expert in Charge of the Implementation of Pilot Model in Niğde

Dyfan Jones, Senior International Expert on Editing the Selected Publications of the Project

Asst. Prof. Dr. Cemalettin Karadaş, Local Legal Expert in Charge of Preparing the Booklet for Printing

We would like to thank the MoI personnel
for their support on preparation of this booklet.

May 2010

ANIT MATBAA / ANKARA

Tel: 0312 232 54 77

İÇİNDEKİLER

1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1. About the Booklet.....	5
1.2. What are the Objectives of the Improvement of Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector Project?	5
1.3. Background: Where Do the Pilot Models for Implementation of Local Security Plans Originate?.....	7
1.4. Objectives and Methodology of the Booklet.....	10
2. PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS FOR ESTABLISHING LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS	11
2.1. The United Nations Norms and Standards in Crime Prevention.....	11
2.2. Samples of International Good Practices	11
2.3. Modern Police Standards.....	13
3. THE LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS - MECHANISMS TO ASSIST GOVERNORS WITH THEIR DUTIES	15
4. THE TURKISH PILOT MODELS - ESTABLISHING LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS	17
4.1. On the Niğde Pilot Model:.....	17
4.2. On the İstanbul-Kadıköy Pilot Model :	17
4.3. On the Erzurum Pilot Model:.....	18
4.4. On the İstanbul Eyüp Pilot Model:	18
5. THE LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS	19
5.1. Setting Up of the Local Security Commissions	19
5.2. The Functioning of the Local Security Commissions	20
5.3. Local Security Commissions in Large Cities: A Special Case.....	21
5.4. The First Meeting: Agenda and Talking Points	22

6. LOCAL SECURITY PLAN	25
6.1. The Structure of a Local Security Plan	25
6.2. The Phases of Production for a Local Security Plan	26
6.3. An Executive Committee to Support Establishing and Implementing the Plan	27
7. THE SECURITY DIAGNOSIS PHASE.....	29
7.1. The Elements of the Security Diagnosis Phase.....	29
7.2. Conducting the Local Security Survey for Citizens.....	31
7.3. The Local Security Survey for Citizens.....	32
7.4. Trialling the Survey	35
8. THE PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES PHASE	37
8.1. The Priorities of the Local Security Plans	37
8.2. The Objectives of the Local Security Plan.....	38
8.3. Examples of Objectives in the Local Security Plans	40
9. THE COMMITMENTS AND ACTIONS PHASE.....	41
9.1. Forms of Commitments by Stakeholders	41
9.2. Preventive Actions to Reach Objectives.....	43
9.3. Examples of Preventive Actions in the Local Security Plans.....	45
9.4. Deterrent Actions to Reach Objectives	46
9.5. Budget of the Local Security Plans.....	48
10. THE ANNOUNCEMENT PHASE OF THE LOCAL SECURITY PLAN ...	49
11. THE ASSESSMENT PHASE OF THE LOCAL SECURITY PLAN	51
11.1. Possible Assessment Methods	51
11.2. The Actors Involved in the Assessment Phase	51
ANNEXES	53
INDEX.....	70

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. About the Booklet

The Improvement of Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector Project (ICOISS) has the Ministry of Interior of Turkey as the main beneficiary and the General Directorate of Provincial Administration as its focal point. Its executive agency is the UNDP Turkey country office. The project is funded by the Delegation of the European Commission.

The project commenced in November 2007 and ended in May 2010. This booklet was produced as one of the activities of the project.

1.2. What are the Objectives of the Improvement of Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector Project?

- i. Guaranteeing of exercise of democratic rights and human rights and freedoms by citizens,
- ii. The provision of efficient exercise of audit and oversight powers of Ministry of Interior, governors and district governors,
- iii. Establishment of a transparent, participatory and citizen focused civilian oversight.

Project aims at:

- i. Providing unity of understanding of the concept of civilian oversight among the internal security forces and civil society,
- ii. Establishing a legal framework for effective civilian oversight based on comparative studies including Turkey, Spain, the UK and France,
- iii. Improving the institutional capacity of MoI to efficiently oversee all internal security forces.

The realisation of these three basic objectives depends on the inclusion of fundamental civilian oversight principles into constitution, establishment of new civilian oversight mechanisms through laws, and ensuring the functioning of these mechanisms.

1.2.1 Why is Civilian Oversight Needed?

Internal security forces are entrusted with extraordinary powers (stopping, searching, spy communication etc.) that can limit individual rights and freedoms. It is essential to control the forces that exercise these powers at both policy level orientations and agents at the individual level. The ultimate goal is the protection of human rights and freedoms and improvement of democratic rights.

1.2.2. What is Civilian Oversight and Who are Responsible of it?

Even though the concept of “civilian oversight” has a history of 40 years in Europe and the USA, it has been recently discussed in Turkey. Internal security forces (police, gendarmerie, coast guards and other policing agencies) frequently misunderstand the concept as the direct exercise by citizens, civil society organisations or NGOs of the oversight of the internal security forces.

There is no unique and internationally accepted definition of civilian oversight. However, it can be summarized as follows: the notion of “civilian oversight” refers to the “ongoing multi level monitoring by civilian authorities of policing activities and forces (police, gendarmerie, border guards) and the policies that they operate under”. The word civilian here means “non police, non army”. The civilian authorities include the Parliament, the government, the judiciary and in some countries the “non-governmental organizations” (the defender of rights, the ombudsman, Independent Police Complaint Commissions etc...) and sometimes again groups of citizens accredited by public authorities to carry out limited inspections (for example of detention premises).

As understood from the definition above, civilian oversight is not only concerned with violation of human rights at the individual level (misbehaviours of agents as excessive use of force or illegitimate action) but also with the policy level.

1.2.3. Two Dimensions of Civilian Oversight

Two main dimensions of civilian oversight can be distinguished: the horizontal and the vertical one. The vertical oversight is enforced by organizations that have a legal power of direction and sanction over the internal security forces and of monitoring the policies that they operate under. For example, the Minister of Interior, governors, district-governors, judicial authorities and Parliament as well as the “non-governmental organizations” (whose

powers are entrusted by law and whose membership is defined by law) are responsible for vertical oversight.

The horizontal oversight refers to the promotion of participation and contribution of citizens and of civil society to the design of local security policies, cooperation with local administrations and transparency to media. The bodies that can be established in relation to horizontal oversight are not “hierarchical” but rather making a contribution to a better cooperation between internal security forces and other organizations and transparency to the public.

As an example of horizontal oversight, temporary and advisory Local Security Commissions were established under the leadership of the governorates in pilot provinces with the participation of relevant stakeholders.

The next section will explain the basis of the Local Security Commissions and Local Security Plans.

1.3. Background: Where Do the Pilot Models for Implementation of Local Security Plans Originate?

This booklet is the result of a participatory process started in three pilot provinces in February 2009.

In September 2008, Erzurum, Niğde and İstanbul were selected as pilot provinces by the Mol and initial meetings were held in early 2009 with each deputy governor to discuss the development of structures and systems to increase civilian oversight in these pilot provinces. It was decided to establish working groups in pilot governorates with different themes: Strengthening Human Rights Boards, Media and Communication, Citizen Focus and Interagency Coordination. This participatory approach allowed each province to highlight their areas of interest and concern and discuss potential ways to improve effective civilian oversight in their provinces. High level attendance was observed from different law enforcement agencies as well as from the media, academics and NGOs.

Based on the problems identified and solutions proposed in all working groups, and based on experiments made in selected EU countries facing the same challenges, the technical assistance team drafted a report containing guiding principles for the implementation of pilot models. A second phase dedicated to practical implementation of the pilot models was launched

with a national one-day conference in İstanbul in September 2009. This conference brought together more than 100 participants from all three pilot provinces. It was used as a platform for embracing the concept of civilian oversight at the local level, sharing experiences and presenting the roadmap for the implementation period from October 2009 onwards.

At the end of the September conference it was decided that the most effective way of developing “horizontal” civilian oversight (based on the principles of transparency and inter agency coordination) at the local level was to establish temporary and advisory “Local Security Commissions” in order to promote planning, consultation with civil society and interagency coordination in the pilot provinces. From this point onwards, a trialling process started.

The commissions were intended to be close to the on the ground realities and provide guidance to the authorities. The remit of these commissions was regarding LOCAL needs, and they focused on PREVENTION and used PARTNERSHIPS as their means of action, which implies the need for efficient coordination. The intention was that:

- the governorate office can learn about citizens’ need and ensure that the police is “citizen focused”;
- the commissions provide the governor with a mechanism to plan short-term local security policy and, in the medium term (the commission will produce local security plans for 3 years), steer the development of preventive policing which is one of their duties (law no 5442);
- And finally the governor can make sure that preventive policing is implemented through partnership and cooperation. Therefore security issues such as traffic and street crimes are solved by the internal security forces with the participation of stakeholders.

By the end of 2009, the actual implementation of the decisions taken in September started with the establishment of temporary and advisory Local Security Commissions in three provinces (İstanbul, Erzurum, Niğde) and in two districts in İstanbul thus creating four pilot areas. The challenge was to improve the fight against local crime in the cities by developing preventive and deterrent measures addressing the needs of the public in terms of security and implementing them through partnerships among the relevant stakeholders. These steps would be taken after a local security diagnosis had been undertaken.

Using methods developed and used since the 1980s in many EU countries, the trialling in these four pilot-models (Erzurum and Niğde cities, Kadıköy and Eyüp districts) aimed to build and manage Local Security Plans through Local Security Commissions. Despite drawing from EU practices and experiences, the practices developed for Turkey were unique and tailor made in order to dovetail into Turkey's administrative and legal systems. By developing Local Security Plans it was possible in a short period of only 4 months to develop plans that included preventative and deterrent measures for implementation by local stakeholders who had committed to working in partnership measures in these large cities or districts.

This method of developing Local Security Plans is used in many democratic and modern countries, especially in Europe, requires several phases:

1.3.1. Phases of Establishing Local Security Plans

i. Security Diagnosis Phase

The first phase is to undertake a diagnosis or analysis of the local security situation, the local security policies, the resources available and the security needs of the population in the defined geographical area.

ii. The Priorities and Objectives Phase

The second phase is to select the priorities that can be addressed and define the objectives or targets common to several stakeholders that can be reached within the duration of the plan.

iii. Commitments and Actions Phase

The third phase is to develop the preventive and deterrent actions that need to be undertaken in order to reach the objectives and to decide which partners will give a commitment to be responsible for supporting or implementing every defined activity or measure.

In sum, in the second and third phases, the plan aims to define priorities (general problems that should be addressed), objectives (precise quantified targets in relation to the general problems) and finally actions (a set of steps to be taken on the ground).

iv. Announcement Phase of the Local Security Plan

The fourth phase is to make this common agreed strategy official by signing the Local Security Plan and to publicize the part of the plan that aim to reassure and engage local citizens. This public document is therefore an official declaration of intent and a summary of actions envisaged for the geographical area.

v. Assessment Phase of the Local Security Plan

The fifth phase is dedicated to monitoring, assessing and eventually modifying the plan. The structure responsible for these duties operates at the provincial level and is called the Local Security Commission. It is chaired by the governor and works in a participatory way with the security sector agencies and voluntary local stakeholders. It meets twice or three times each year.

Due to the hard work and commitment of the governors, the public servants, the citizen stakeholders and the representatives of NGOs, within the period of December 2009-April 2010, four Local Security Commissions and four Local Security Plans have been produced.

1.4. Objectives and Methodology of the Booklet

Within the context of ICOISS project, in addition to vertical oversight it is aimed at strengthening horizontal oversight mechanisms. As mentioned above, the most effective way to strengthen horizontal oversight is to consult citizens in formulating internal security policies. In this context within the scope of the project several pilot provinces were selected, temporary Local Security Commissions were set up, and Local Security Plans were established.

This booklet aims to equip the governorates and district governorates with the necessary tools to establish advisory Local Security Commissions, develop Local Security Plans and implement the relevant actions that they will decide for the prevention of crime in partnership.

This booklet provides a quick and easy yet complete overview of the process of creating Local Security Commissions and making Local Security Plans. The booklet aims to be relevant for everybody concerned with developing these local models. The booklet is not a theoretical document. Although it has sound conceptual foundations, it is based on the actual trialling process that took place in the Turkish provinces and the lessons learnt at the end of the trialling process.

In the following sections, firstly the theoretical background of the Local Security Commissions will be explained. Then each chapter goes into further detail of the phases for practically establishing the Local Security Commissions and developing and implementing the plans. Each chapter includes the necessary practical steps needing to be taken at each phase along with real life examples and experiences derived from the three Turkish pilot provinces.

2. PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS FOR ESTABLISHING LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS

2.1. The United Nations Norms and Standards in Crime Prevention

Within the duration of the pilot implementation process, United Nations Norms and Standards in Crime Prevention were taken as a basis for establishing Local Security Commissions, holding Local Security Commission meetings and drafting the necessary reports. These norms are based on developments that have taken place in a large number of countries (mainly in the EU) during the last 25 years.

As part of these standards and norms, guidelines were set for cooperation and technical assistance in the field of urban crime prevention.

These guidelines include two fundamental principles:

- i. “Local Approach to Problems” which indicates the importance of acting locally in accordance with local realities and in close contact and consultation with citizens residing in those areas,
- ii. “Integrated Crime Prevention Action Plan” which indicates a focus on the prevention of crime together with a multi-agency, comprehensive approach and coordinated response at local level.

2.2. Samples of International Good Practices

In terms of international good practices, it is worth examining the developments that have been taking place in both the UK and France with regards to improving interagency coordination and creating improved and increased coordination between the security sector and civil society represented both by NGOs, and the general public.

In France, in the early eighties, the decision to create Local Councils of

Security and Prevention of Delinquency at the municipal level was recognition of the need to move towards partnership policing and the realization that within decentralized governance structures, by including an input from local society, crime prevention and local security can be improved. The local Councils of Security and Prevention of Delinquency develop and agree the implementation of local security contracts. When initially launched, the creation of such councils was not mandatory. The aim of the local security contracts is to develop plans that reflect the local security priorities of all local stakeholders, and then the implementation of such local security contracts is overseen by the local security council. According to the latest legislation passed in 2007, all cities and towns with over 10,000 citizens are required to have a local security contract, and there were around 650 in existence. The local security contract is developed by a vast array of different stakeholders depending on the context of the area for which the contract is being developed. In all cases, the municipal Mayor and the Prefect as well as the judiciary are involved as are members of the security units (police and gendarmerie). However, a neighbouring municipality may choose to include different stakeholders. It is in this way that the development of local security contracts in France is flexible and able to bring around a table the local stakeholders most appropriate for the area rather than from a centrally prescribed list.

Local security contracts in France have allowed local security strategies to tackle local security needs and ensured that the solutions provided by a number of different agencies working together are more effective and long lasting than separate agencies pursuing separate security strategies.

In England and in Wales, interagency coordination in the form of partnerships has been ongoing for over twenty years. In England this form of partnerships working together has been called 'Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships', and a similar concept in Wales is called 'Community Safety Partnerships'. The aim of both of these interagency coordination mechanisms, is to ensure that stakeholders work together in tackling security issues, and to ensure that local communities are involved in shaping the local security priorities and strategies. These partnerships are responsible not only for identifying local security issues, but they are also ultimately responsible for preparing and implementing a strategic assessment and partnership plan to tackle these issues.

Unlike the French model, the number of core partners is limited to the Police, the Police Authority, the Local Authority, Local Health Boards, and the Fire and Rescue services. Although these are the organizations by legislation that

must be involved in the partnerships at all stages of the process, a number of additional stakeholders including NGOs and private companies can, and are, involved in the partnerships and in making strategic assessments during parts of the process.

These two international examples highlight how these countries address the issue of engaging civil society in the development of local security plans that are responsive to the needs and challenges of the local community. Although the aims of the partnerships are similar, the models used differ in order to reflect the different administrative structures, social and cultural issues that are prevalent in the respective countries.

2.3. Modern Police Standards

In parallel with the crime and safety partnerships, police forces have changed and modernized. In the 21st century, the delivery of public security, especially in the big cities, demanded changes in the way the police was organized and the development of new policing techniques through the establishment of new modern police standards.

Since the 1960's different names have been given to different efforts by policing agencies to adapt to new norms. The expression "Community Policing" stems from the US example after the realization that too much distance between the police and the population can lead to dramatic events and even large scale riots. After its dissemination in the USA, the UK was the country making the largest use of such a doctrine. Today, the expression "community policing" is less used and was abandoned by the UK in favour of "partnership policing". In France, the expression most commonly used is "proximity policing".

The main components of these developments over the last 40 years are summarized in the table below. A number of trends can be observed in the EU and the USA:

- i. Community or proximity policing which means to be "citizen focused" (attentive and responsive to the needs of citizens and victims);
- ii. Working in partnership, which means to combine the actions of police forces and other public or private services to prevent crime;
- iii. Involving citizens in preventive policing, often in a framework defined by the public authorities and the police, for example when associating them with neighbourhood watch schemes.

Proximity or Community Policing	Partnership	Policing With Civil Society
1. New Values: - To Establish Links with Inhabitants, Transparency, Accountability, and to Collect Information on Security Needs	1. New Structures for Cooperation: - Local Security and Prevention Councils	1. New Goal: - To Make the Citizens Work for Security
2. New Police Organization: - Beats or Sectors - Versatile Officers - Management by Objectives	2. New Actions Framework : - Security Plans - Local Security Contracts - Commitments and Agreements with Security Partnerships	2. New ‘Policemen’: - Special Constabularies (GB) - Volunteers (NDL) - Adjoints De Sécurité (France)
3. New Tasks: - Deterrent and Protection Improvement - Promoting victim support - All Preventive Techniques, Including Situational Crime Prevention (Target Hardening),	3. New Action Means: - Partnership Security Activities - Street Cameras - Social and Situational Prevention	3. New Techniques: - Neighbourhood Watch - Volunteer Security Services
Québec, USA, France, Spain, Italy	Belgium, Holland, France, UK	UK, Holland , USA

Each of these models contains a shared idea which is developing preventive and deterrent actions to reduce crime. Fighting crime is not limited to improving techniques to search, to identify and to arrest after a crime is committed. Preventive policing cannot be undertaken by police agencies alone, it needs a partnership between all the public and private stakeholders existing in the city and the state and its law enforcement agencies. In that way, partnership is a democratic process.

3. THE LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS - MECHANISMS TO ASSIST GOVERNORS WITH THEIR DUTIES

The Local Security Commissions were led by the governorates at local level. Although in the commission meetings some stakeholders questioned the legal position of the commissions, it is clear that consulting several institutions and civil society is a part of the duties of the governor.

The constitution entrusts the government with the duty of protecting citizen rights. The state has the responsibility of guaranteeing the life and safety of citizens, as well as providing the necessary environment to ensure that their rights and freedoms are exercised. At the local level, the governor represents not only the Ministry of Interior but also the government.

In fact, according to article 11 of the Provincial Administration Law the governor is the head of all general and specific policing forces within the borders of the province, and all of these forces can be employed by the governor. The duties of the governors include preventing crimes and taking necessary precautions to protect public order and security.

Administrative policing falls within the duties of the governors and district governors since it is not possible to guarantee public order and security without overseeing the administrative work of policing agencies.

The powers and duties of governors and district governors are considerable:

- i. They are in charge of maintaining public order and security - a very broad task of utmost importance and they also are given by law the power to instruct policing forces chiefs;
- ii. Governors and district governors can promote “citizen security” by, after consultation, integrating the citizen’s view into the formulation of local security priorities for preventive policing and also by

establishing swift and accurate transmission of information to the media while respecting the secrecy of ongoing investigations. This can only be carried out by governors.

In addition to this, a recent trend is observed in Turkey which emphasizes the role of the governor in monitoring the administrative duties of the internal security forces. According to articles 59 and 60 of the Community Policing Regulation, a Provincial Executive Board is meant to be established in the provinces to determine the community policing policies and to make decisions relating to civil society oriented policing, to periodically evaluate the implementation of civil society oriented policing services, to detect any problems or issues, and to make proposals to improve these services.

Taking into consideration the above articles of the mentioned laws and regulations, within the scope of this pilot implementation phase of the project, Local Security Commissions were established in the pilot provinces. The establishment and functioning of these commissions will be explained in detail in the next sections.

4. THE TURKISH PILOT MODELS - ESTABLISHING LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS

General information regarding the Local Security Commissions established in the pilot provinces and the opinions of deputy and district governors are explained below:

4.1. On the Niğde Pilot Model:

Deputy governor of Niğde stated that the process of developing the Local Security Plan and the functioning of the Local Security Commission has been an important experience throughout which all stakeholders have understood the importance of cooperation, and preventive and deterrent actions in ensuring local security. He also added that expanding the experience of the pilot provinces to the whole country will be useful.

The model in Niğde is interesting as it combines two districts with a population of less than 150,000 inhabitants. The Local Security Commission in Niğde has 21 members and an executive committee which consists of 5 members. The Local Security Plan is noticeably oriented towards improving security in the city by attempting to prevent misconduct and injuries against people. There are 10 priorities, and the plan contains 8 objectives and 20 actions.

4.2. On the İstanbul-Kadıköy Pilot Model:

5 priorities were identified in Kadıköy Local Security Plan and the plan contains 6 objectives and 10 actions.

The model developed in Kadıköy was specific for a large district which contained almost around 600,000 citizens and the commission has 23 members.

4.3. On the Erzurum Pilot Model:

This model perfectly fits into the theoretical model for a medium size province with approximately 600,000 inhabitants. By the end of the process, membership of the Local Security Commission eventually reached 22 members including important participation from the gendarmerie, the media and the municipality. The Local Security Plan focuses on certain “crime hot spots” and insecure areas. In the Erzurum plan there are 10 priorities, and it contains 10 objectives and 15 actions.

4.4. On the İstanbul Eyüp Pilot Model:

Deputy Governor of Eyüp stated that the Local Security Commission has a complementary function to the Peace Meetings. Deputy governor added that due to the Local Security Commission meetings, with the participation of NGO representatives and mukhtars, the ideas of citizens were taken into consideration when security policies are determined.

This model is a good illustration that in big cities the Local Security Plan has to be very specific to a part of the city. In Eyüp, the plan focuses on leisure areas and parks and issues that arise during the pilgrim period.

5. THE LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS

5.1. Setting Up of the Local Security Commissions

Creating the first Turkish Local Security Commissions did not require any specific legal directive although the Ministry of Interior developed a predetermined list of proposed institutions to be included. These are:

- i. Governorate
- ii. Police
- iii. Municipality
- iv. Mukhtars
- v. Local Media
- vi. Academics, and
- vii. NGOs

As stated by a stakeholder in Kadıköy; “During the course of implementation, different actors were discovered and invited to join the commissions. In this sense, the initial membership structure may be seen to be insufficient and a one-sided selection from the side of the governor is not advisable in future”.

The final number of participants of Local Security Commissions have been increased taking into regards local needs and according to their interest in citizen security. Some institutions, especially the policing agencies, were represented by two or three members.

As the process developed, the list of participants grew longer and by the end of the pilots most of the Local Security Commissions had a membership of around twenty members under the chairmanship of the deputy governors. Participants included:

- i. Public Prosecutor,
- ii. Gendarmerie,

- iii. Human Rights Board,
- iv. Provincial Administration,
- v. Health Directorate,
- vi. Zabıta (Municipal Police) ,
- vii. Chamber of Commerce,
- viii. Bar Association,
- ix. Artisans and Small Traders Union,
- x. Private Security Companies,
- xi. Other Key Groups.

5.2. The Functioning of the Local Security Commissions

The first steps of the pilot process was defining the remit of the Local Security Commissions. Defining its remit does not require a specific regulation because it will be only used for periodic consultation meetings and does not constitute a decision making body.

Chairing the Local Security Commissions is a district governors' (in very large cities local security commissions are established at the level of the district) or deputy governors' task. However, everyone agrees that participation to the Local Security Commission in the debates should be organized in a democratic way.

As was said in Niğde pilot province: "If the Local Security Commission wants to work properly and to fulfil its mission, the members must see themselves as having equal status in terms of their membership. When they have different opinions and perspectives to the governorate or the police, they must have the opportunity and power to express themselves and outline their case".

The pilot implementation period, especially in İstanbul, allowed the opportunity to concretely define the following remit of the Local Security Commissions:

5.2.1. The Remit of the Local Security Commissions

- i. To analyse local security issues and security needs
- ii. To set local security priorities that can be tackled through partnership working
- iii. To define the content of the Local Security Plan and its objectives

- iv. To specify the preventive and deterrent actions that need to be taken
- v. To ensure stakeholders engagement through their commitment and to take action
- vi. To review and revise the actions of the Local Security Plan

5.2.2. Meetings of the Local Security Commissions

The time line for meetings will be different in different provinces according to the specific timetable for the production of the Local Security Plan developed in each province and should be decided by the district and deputy governor.

In order to develop an effective Local Security Plan, it is advisable to hold 4 to 6 meetings.

After the plan is developed and has been published, two or three meetings each year are needed.

5.3. Local Security Commissions in Large Cities: A Special Case

In large cities (defined as 500,000 inhabitants or more), there is a significant risk that Local Security Plans focus on national security issues rather than on specific local issues and therefore the plans are not able to tackle specific local security public needs.

Two options are often observed in EU countries. The first is to have only one plan for the entire large city, however this has not proved very efficient. In many EU countries, Local Security Commissions in very large cities can function as if they are formal security forums for top chiefs to meet (from governorate, municipality, police and sometime justice) without deciding and implementing any concrete action. The second option is to have several neighbourhood plans if the city is divided into administrative areas such as districts or sub-municipalities. Due to the size of these administrative areas, these districts can have their own specific characteristics and therefore have their own local security issues and needs.

The participants of the two pilot districts in İstanbul considered both of the above options and decided to develop a third way of working. They decided to make local security plans at district level but they also created a Provincial Local Security Commission to supervise these plans and to sustain the process. The Provincial Local Security Commission is assisted by an executive committee.

5.3.1. The Provincial Local Security Commission

The Provincial Local Security Commission is the supervisory authority whose remit is:

- i. To assess the legality of district action plans presented by the district governors
- ii. To enable inter-district activity sharing through creating dialogue and holding meetings
- iii. To funnel resources to support the districts' action plans
- iv. To generate a pool of best practice

5.3.2. The Executive Committee

In the Provincial Local Security Commission, the executive committee will:

- i. Act as the secretariat for the Provincial Local Security Commission;
- iii. Mediate between the District Local Security Commissions and;
- iv. Assess the Local Security Plans coming from the districts
- v. Assess which actions need further consideration by the Provincial Local Security Commission, comment and advise on those selected plans for the provincial commission

During the implementation process, the İstanbul model proved effective and efficient. The İstanbul model would be appropriate to replicate in all the Turkish cities with over 500.000 inhabitants.

5.4. The First Meeting: Agenda and Talking Points

Setting up the commission, the roles of the participants and this new participatory approach may naturally cause several questions. The meeting held must thus be steered carefully. Therefore, the public authority in charge of setting up Local Security Plan should take into consideration of the following issues in order to make sure that participants understand easily the content of the first meeting.

i. Opening Speech - Reasons for the Establishment of the Commission

Our government is aiming at the better exercise of civic democratic rights and the structural integration of democratic oversight of internal security to the Turkish oversight system and public administration.

In order to contribute to the above mentioned objectives, with the purpose of ensuring transition from bureaucratic and legislation based policing oversight to the human centred security understanding and security sector governance based on transparency and cooperation with civil society and citizens, the Ministry of Interior is taking the necessary steps for establishing the framework conditions for governors and district governors.

The ministry gives utmost importance to the issues of ensuring better accountability and transparency in internal security services, institutionalisation of the relations between civil society and internal security sector, improving citizen satisfaction through increasing service quality, developing policy and measures to ensure wider exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms.

Besides, ensuring transition from the concept of “state security” to “citizen security”, and from “reactive security service” to “proactive security service” and thus further improving security services is also important.

In addition, acceleration of the transition from “bureaucratic administration” to the “democratic administration” and creation of the necessary mechanisms and implementation of them supported the work undertaken within the context of “zero tolerance to torture and ill treatment” policies which was given high importance by Turkish Government.

ii. Participants Introduce Themselves

iii. What is a Local Security Plan?

Outlining the table of contents of a local security plan

iv. How to Prepare a Local Security Plan in an Implementation Process?

Outlining the four phases

v. With Whom to Prepare a Local Security Plan ?

Stakeholder discussion and the issue of the executive committee

vi. Beginning of the Security Diagnosis Phase

Remarks of the Directorate of Police on the context of local crime and participants’ views on the local security situation.

Brief information on the methodology to be used when undertaking the diagnosis phase.

vii. A Tool for Gauging Public Opinion

The survey and its use

viii. Timetable

Durations of the scheduled work and the date of the second meeting.

6. LOCAL SECURITY PLAN

6.1. The Structure of a Local Security Plan

A Local Security Plan is the description of the partnership strategy for local security and outlines commitments to implement actions for preventing and deterring crime over a three year period. It is formulated by the public authorities and stakeholders from local civil society that sit together as a Local Security Commission.

In concrete terms, a Local Security Plan shall consist of two documents: a long and detailed document, which is technical and confidential in nature, and another document in the shape of a short and public declaration.

1. **The technical and detailed document consists of:**
 - i. A description and definition of the population and the territory that the plan covers;
 - ii. Available resources and personnel in charge of preventing and deterring crime and if the public prosecutor participates, for reintegration of criminals;
 - iii. The crime context: the level of criminality, the main trends and special problems in public order that are the main local security issues;
 - iv. An identification of the needs and desires of the public, of the police, of the municipality and of NGOs and their proposals for improving local security;
 - v. An analysis of the 3 points listed above in order to develop objectives that will constitute the strategy of the Local Security Plan;
 - vi. A description of the actions (1"action sheet" for each and every action) with the commitments that the local stakeholders have promised to undertake;
 - vii. A description of the remit of the Local Security Commissions and the process for the monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the plan.

2. The short and public document consists of:

- i. A one page declaration of intent of the commission members
- ii. A brief summary of the situation, the priorities, the objectives, and the commitments of the Local Security Plan
- iii. The scope of the inputs of the stakeholders
- iv. The signatures of participants

6.2. The Phases of Production for a Local Security Plan

DIAGNOSIS PHASE

PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES PHASE

ACTIONS AND COMMITMENTS PHASE

ANNOUNCEMENT PHASE OF THE PLAN

MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT PHASE

6.3. An Executive Committee to Support Establishing and Implementing the Plan

The diagnosis phase requires a detailed and complete analysis which is then a component on which to base the Local Security Plans.

The diagnosis or analysis should be undertaken in eight steps as described below in order to obtain a security diagnosis with precise priorities and to analyse and transform them into concrete objectives in the plan. In all the pilot provinces, this work took between two and three months because this important task requires time and special skills.

To do this, an executive committee was established by selecting from the Local Security Commission a few members (generally two people, for example one from the district governorate and one from the municipality, or one from the police and one from the municipality). In these initial pilots, experts from academia were recruited and paid to support the functioning of the executive committee.

In some foreign models, consultancy firms are used and paid for by the municipality in order to undertake this analysis.

Another possible option is to use temporary assistance of civil servants from the governorate or police to undertake this task along with representatives from the municipality or from the mukhtars' association.

Executive committees of the Local Security Commissions in pilot provinces

In İstanbul (Kadıköy)	The executive committee had 6 members and composed of the district governor, deputy chief of police, deputy mayor, representative from health directorate, and two mukhtars
In İstanbul (Eyüp)	The executive committee had 8 members: district governor, deputy chief of police, sub-commander of gendarmerie, director of protocol from police, one mukhtar, one academic, one NGO representative and one local media representative
In Erzurum	The executive committee had five members: deputy governor one civilian secretary from governorate, one from the police, one from the zabita (municipal police) and one from the gendarmerie
In Niğde	The executive committee had five members: one from the municipality, one from the Human Rights Boards, one from the police, one from the media and one from an NGO

Members of the executive committee will support the development and implementation of the different components of the diagnosis: chairing public meetings, finalizing surveys, making appointments for members involved in parts of the analysis and following the methodology described in the eight boxes, drafting the report and presenting it to the governor and to the commission for discussion and approval.

7. THE SECURITY DIAGNOSIS PHASE

7.1. The Elements of the Security Diagnosis Phase

The most critical phase of development of a Local Security Plan is the security diagnosis. This phase should be carried out thoroughly. In order to undertake a detailed local security analysis of the situation in the province, different methods should be applied such as conducting a survey, holding focus group meetings and organizing one to one interviews with stakeholders. Presented below are the 8 elements of the security diagnosis phase. Each box explains the method to be followed for each institution and what the members of the commission should do.

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE TERRITORY AND POPULATION

To be undertaken by: Executive committee

To define the geographical area covered by the plan involves dealing with some administrative questions. Then, the characteristics of the territory and the population have to be connected to security issues (e.g. are there difficult urban districts, problematic city centres, many unemployed citizens, isolated areas without police and so forth).

2. STATE OF THE EXISTING INTERNAL SECURITY FORCES

To be undertaken by: The Police Directorate

The state of the existing resources (personnel and other means) to prevent and to deter local criminal activity must be described at this stage of the analysis. This step should look for the answers of the following: Are there any people assigned to working to prevent crime? How many policemen are there in public security units? How many patrols are there during the day and night? Are there prevention programmes? Are there street cameras and are they effective? What is the cost of preventive and deterrent measures? Who is engaged in the process?

3. ANALYSIS OF LOCAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES

To be undertaken by: The Police Directorate

Local criminal activity must be analysed by the Police Directorate in five sections:

1. What are the existing trends for some important local crimes (violence against people, crime against property, car theft, shoplifting, street crime, burglaries, use of weapons, drugs, violence against the police, etc)
2. What is the national rate for all these crimes?
3. Profiles of offenders and victims of local crimes
4. “Low Crime” and “High Crime” areas
5. Main security issues in the opinion of the police and other stakeholders.

4. THE PUBLIC NEEDS

To be undertaken by: Executive committee

They can be collected and reported under five headings:

- Victimization,
- Fear of crime,
- Knowledge about criminality,
- Opinions on police agencies,
- Participation in public life.

5. NEEDS OF THE POLICE

To be undertaken by: The Police Directorate

To ensure better local security, police may need to change some of their practices and need some equipment/resources. This can be learned during meetings or interviews with police officers.

6. THE OPINION OF THE MUNICIPALITY

To be undertaken by: Executive committee with municipality

To ensure better local security, municipality can provide their views, information about their concerns and some proposals to the civilian member of the executive committee in a written format if possible.

7. OPINIONS OF MUKHTARS

To be undertaken by: Mukhtars' association

Mukhtars are well positioned stakeholders to raise questions on security issues and express opinions about the main priorities of the public that can be summarised during a meeting.

8. INDICATIONS OF JUDICIARY

To be undertaken by: Executive committee with Prosecutor

If the public prosecutor (or his deputy) is present in the committee, his analysis must be asked especially about the prevention of re offending. Developing alternative sanctions can also be included in the Local Security Plan.

7.2. Conducting the Local Security Survey for Citizens

The use of questionnaires to study the public needs in terms of local security is a democratic approach so that those needs and concerns are reflected in the local policies plan. Hence, it is a contribution to civilian oversight over law enforcement agencies. Surveys constitute the most sophisticated tool commonly used as a contribution to the “renewal of policing policies”.

Only few countries like Canada and Great Britain are consulting regularly their citizens on local security subjects. In the Turkish model of Local Security Plan, the systematic use of public surveys proved a fundamental step in the diagnosis security phase.

7.2.1. Principles:

Many questions could be asked through this instrument. According to its purpose to be an element for local security analysis, questions are separated in five sections following the concept of prevention through partnership:

- i. **Victimization:** to know the victimization rates (including crimes unreported to the police)
- ii. **Fear of Crime:** to measure the emotional impact of security issues
- iii. **Knowledge About Criminality:** to know the level of information of the public
- iv. **Opinions on Police Agencies:** to know police and how police efficiency are perceived
- v. **Participation to Public Life:** to understand the strength of civil society

7.2.2. On the Ground Implementation:

The Ministry of Interior approved the questionnaire. Upon the request of participants it was decided that more questions should be added to the questionnaire such as age, gender, educational level and neighbourhood of residence. Reason for these additional questions is due to the fact that crime perception may change according to these variables.

A distribution of questionnaires were to be made by members of the Local Commission to avoid focusing on one special sub population only (note that people coming to make a complaint at police stations make up a particular sub sample and should be analysed separately). The handing out had to be made by each organization with a return sheet indicating the process used to the operative secretary.

A minimum number of 500 questionnaires with valid results was expected and obtained. Apart from specific conditions gender balance should be kept.

7.3. The Local Security Survey for Citizens

An example of the survey to be conducted in security diagnosis is below.

“The Ministry of Interior is working to improve your local security. For this reason, our Governorate is working together with all the provincial stakeholders in order to develop a Local Security Plan. They want to know better the needs of the public and these questions are prepared for this purpose. Please tick the question that suits you most. After filling the form, please give it back to your surveyor. Thank you.”

1. PERSONAL DETAILS
SEX: MALE <input type="checkbox"/> FEMALE <input type="checkbox"/>
AGE: UNDER 20 <input type="checkbox"/> BETWEEN 21-59 <input type="checkbox"/> ABOVE 60 <input type="checkbox"/>
NEIGHBOURHOOD:
EDUCATION : PRIMARY <input type="checkbox"/> HIGH <input type="checkbox"/> GRADUATE <input type="checkbox"/> POST GRADUATE <input type="checkbox"/>
2. Have you been the victim of a crime or an attempted crime in the past 5 years?
YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Did you report these acts or attempts to the police?
YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you feel safe when walking in the streets?
During the day: YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
During the night: YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
4. In the past 3 years, for which one of the following did you take protective measures?
For Yourself : YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO: <input type="checkbox"/>
For Home: YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO: <input type="checkbox"/>
For Car: YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO: <input type="checkbox"/>
5. If it was possible, would you actually move to another province for safety reasons?
YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
6. Are you aware of any activity to prevent crime in your city?
YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NO ANSWER <input type="checkbox"/>
7. Do you have any information on the crime trend in the last 3 years?
INCREASED <input type="checkbox"/> DECREASED <input type="checkbox"/> NO ANSWER <input type="checkbox"/>
8. In comparison to the other provinces, how would you qualify the crime level?
LOW <input type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM <input type="checkbox"/> HIGH <input type="checkbox"/>

9. What are the 3 main criminal problems for your city social life?
.....
.....
.....
10. What is your opinion about the police efficiency on overcoming the local security issues?
ENOUGH <input type="checkbox"/> NOT ENOUGH <input type="checkbox"/>
11. If you or one of your acquaintances recently contacted the police or gendarmerie how would you qualify their attitude ?
HELPFUL <input type="checkbox"/> NOT HELPFUL <input type="checkbox"/>
12. In your opinion, your local police or gendarmerie:
<i>Respect Fairly Well the Laws</i>
LOW <input type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM <input type="checkbox"/> HIGH <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Respond Quickly to Public Demands</i>
LOW <input type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM <input type="checkbox"/> HIGH <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Are Easily Accessible and Have an Open Attitude</i>
LOW <input type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM <input type="checkbox"/> HIGH <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Inform the Public on Crime Prevention</i>
LOW <input type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM <input type="checkbox"/> HIGH <input type="checkbox"/>
13. In the last year, did you participate in activities undertaken by local organizations?
YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NO ANSWER <input type="checkbox"/>
If your answer is "YES" how many have you attended ?
14. If you were invited to a meeting about the local security issues:
I would certainly attend <input type="checkbox"/> I may attend <input type="checkbox"/> I would not attend <input type="checkbox"/>

7.4. Trialling the Survey

The trialling of the surveys in the pilot areas can be outlined as follows:

7.4.1. Description

In Niğde, the number of participants were 557. Questionnaires were handed out by the police (about 210 questionnaires out of the total 557 questionnaires) to shopkeepers, residents of apartment blocks and citizens on the streets, in cafes etc.; citizens coming from the police stations were not included.

In Erzurum, the questionnaires were distributed to 350 people, and then using a random sampling principle, the final version was distributed to an additional of 380 people. The questionnaires were not distributed through police agents to ensure reliability, as citizens visit police stations to report crime and therefore this would be against the random sampling principle.

400 questionnaires were distributed through the main stakeholders of the Kadıköy Local Security Commission. As the population size is around 535,000 people, it was recommended to conduct an equally weighted number of interviews in all neighbourhoods, that is around 25 interviews in each. Around 500-550 questionnaires in total were distributed.

7.4.2. Assessment

While assessing the surveys it was observed that the survey results were trusted in Local Security Commission meeting and members of the Local Security Commission said that asking citizens their opinion was a good idea, as it gave an idea about public opinion on security issues. Besides it was founded out that the findings from the survey matched security priorities that came to the forefront during the analysis phase, and were very useful as a basis for discussion during the commission meetings.

It was seen that sometimes the survey results drew critical reactions from certain members. This was especially true with regard to findings that touched upon culturally or politically sensitive topics, such as violence against women and other gender-based groups which stakeholders are reluctant to take on board.

In order to ensure healthier survey results, it was suggested that some questions should be adapted to our society's dynamics and questions on

complaints mechanisms and human rights should be integrated into the questionnaire. It was also recommended that partnership with a university could be developed in order to create the questionnaire. Lastly, undertaking professional sampling involving inhabitants from various districts, from different age ranges, from various socioeconomic levels would be more efficient.

8. THE PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES PHASE

8.1. The Priorities of the Local Security Plans

When the security diagnosis is made, analysed and adopted, Local Security Commissions must select their priorities. In such large meetings, the agenda must be strictly managed. The works can easily drift off. At the end of the diagnosis phase, in all the experiment models, three permanent risks had to be avoided:

Risk 1: Focusing on National Rather than Local Issues

In the implementation process of a Local Security Plan, a risk is that the commissions forget the results of their own security analysis and consider national issues raised in the media such as drug trafficking, terrorism, serial killers and so forth. This can happen especially if the members of the commissions did not carefully read the results of the diagnosis or only have limited information about it.

Some of the national issues must be taken seriously if they are relevant to the local context (for example domestic violence). In sum, the issues should be considered according to the importance that they have at the local level and in relation with the security needs of each particular city.

To ensure that this happens, four essential points must be combined:

- the local crime rates must be compared to other comparable districts in other cities (or if this is not possible, to the national crime rates) in order to evaluate its salience,
- developing preventive and deterrent actions emphasising the impact of the national security priorities at local level could be made possible
- the abilities of the Local Security Commission to contribute significantly to fight a problem usually tackled through central level orders must be taken into account. It is useless to make an issue a

priority if the Local Security Commission does not have the practical means to address it.

- the possibility to get together a majority of Local Security Commission members to decide, to prevent or deter a national criminal issue with particular importance at the local level.

Risk 2: Neglecting Local Security Issues and Local Public Security Needs:

Public security needs identified during the diagnosis should be taken as priorities. Some of these may be concrete and specific such as the need for information about police activities and results (which are often ignored by the public), or the cognizance of existing local security policies. Others may be subjective and perhaps not based on facts such as the fear of walking in the streets at night. All must be addressed as priorities of the Local Security Plan.

Risk 3: Focusing on the Judicial Duties of the Police

The duty of the commissions is to develop preventive and deterrent actions in cooperation with the internal security forces. These actions should not contradict with the judicial powers of the internal security forces.

The institutions represented in the commissions should completely focus on the issues of preventive policing. For instance in the pilot implementation process, public prosecutor was a member of Eyüp Local Security Commission but is only contributing to the development of preventive actions (for the projects regarding the prevention of recidivism support of the prosecutors' office could be sought).

8.2. The Objectives of the Local Security Plan

Priorities do not make a plan. For example, some of them might already be dealt with by the relevant institution in charge without the need for a plan. To design a strategy for the Local Security Plan implies the need to specify objectives. An objective can be summarized in a short sentence that describes the situation you aim to achieve in any given and precise moment in the future. Often, different objectives have to be combined in order to deal in practice with a priority.

In concrete terms, the chairman of the Local Security Commission will prompt the participants to express their opinions in the form of a "wish list" that they can have for every security issue or security need (or two or

three of those combined together). Issues and needs were identified during the diagnosis phase. For example, their wish could be: “In order to create better security for citizens in our area, it would be good if we can...” and then follows detailed and numbered descriptions of the improved situation in the future. If they transform the “wish” into an “order” that uses an infinitive verb, an objective is created.

When this rule is adopted, participants to the Local Security Commission will give many proposals and the chairman can be satisfied after he obtains between 6 and 12 objectives. If necessary, additional time can be given to participants to send their objectives in between the meetings.

8.2.1. Which Areas Should the Objectives Cover?

For the Local Security Plans, many domains of action can be explored to prevent or deter crime. An overview of international experiments could list more than twenty domains such as:

- **To reinforce reassuring measures**
- **To develop urban improvements**
- **To reduce the fear of crime**
- **To reduce litter in urban areas**
- **To improve public transportation services**
- **To develop social activities**
- **To develop social mediation**
- **To prevent addictive misconducts**
- **To prevent and deter child abuse or domestic violence**
- **To increase access to rights guaranteed by law**
- **To increase the teaching of duties linked to citizenship**
- **To prevent and deter school truancy or fight against failing schools**
- **To give prominence to helping parents in disturbed families**
- **To prevent and deter violence in schools, in sport and other leisure activities**
- **To prevent delinquency on public transport**
- **To support community policing**
- **To adopt situational crime prevention**
- **To promote social prevention**
- **To institutionalize partnerships to fight youth delinquency**
- **To study the local crime trends**

8.3. Examples of Objectives in the Local Security Plans

Using examples of some objectives selected in the pilot areas is a good way to highlight that the objectives should both indicate a point to be reached and the way in which to reach this point. Below are examples of objectives in the Local Security Plans.

“To decrease in one year the number of traffic accidents resulting in injury by 20% relative to the March-April period of the previous year, by mobilizing the police and zabita to increase the number of surveillance cameras, increase controls, prompting citizens to park in auto parks and to promote the presence of voluntary staff in front of school zebra crossings or other road crossing points.”

“To diminish the potential drug abusers’ inclination towards crime by making a list of abusers and selecting ten disadvantaged young people from this list to take part in a free pilot vocational training course and to allow them to work for a local business.”

“To decrease tire slashing, paint scratching and thefts related to cars by providing car owners with four different well lit municipal car parking areas and installing camera systems in the five hot spots designated by the police”.

“To decrease the carrying of knives and weapons, the use of firearms during traditional wedding receptions or after football matches and reckless car driving, through a media and brochures campaign calling for the need to act ‘against out-dated behaviour in order to create better security in a modern city’, through the systematic confiscating policy of weapons by police, through issuing systematic warnings in public meetings and by increasing the actions of the police.”

“To decrease the fear of crime at night in places mentioned above with a common preventive and deterrent action plan coordinated between the police and the municipality. The results of the action plan must be published in the local press every six months during the period of implementation.”

“ To decrease thefts from homes by holding information meetings about home thefts with the participation of the police, apartment managers, porters and residents, by increased cooperation between the police and local press in publishing and distributing leaflets and brochures about the measures to be taken against home thefts, and by increasing patrols in the locations and neighbourhoods where thefts from houses are commonly seen.”

9. THE COMMITMENTS AND ACTIONS PHASE

9.1. Forms of Commitments by Stakeholders

The Local Security Plans must be the result of “shared security production or coproduction”. It means that all the partners must commit themselves to undertake the actions in the plan. These commitments are diverse but they can be broken down into categories depending on which stakeholders they stem from. The forms of commitments are given as an example below.

9.1.1. The Police and the Gendarmerie

After the diagnosis phase, in the actions of the Local Security Plans, police agencies can contribute wherever it is necessary, for example:

- i. to identify and analyse data about “who, when, where” (people, places, times) in relation to a security problem;
- ii. to increase deterrent activity by making more or different patrols (for example more visible), mobilizing private guards and so forth;
- iii. to improve some of its actions (welcoming victims, helping victims to reach hospital, etc) or extend periods of activity during which the doors of police stations are open;
- iv. to develop “proximity policing” or to engage in partnership for security
- v. to participate in social prevention by giving information on laws or training, organizing youth leisure to establish positive relationships, etc;
- vi. to develop prevention of crime for victims or potential victims and repeat crime victims;
- vii. to undertake situational prevention studies about the effectiveness of video surveillance systems.
- viii. to develop training sessions within the context of the action in Local Security Plans.

9.1.2. The Municipality

Within a Local Security Plan, the municipality can take its place in many instances, for example:

- i. to mobilize funds to improve the quality of life (street lighting, traffic conditions, public markets and leisure areas, abandoned buildings, etc);
- ii. to finance NGOs to undertake specific actions outlined in the Local Security Plan;
- iii. to deal with public transport security needs;
- iv. to study local crimes and to point out public needs to the police;
- v. to protect poor or isolated people from crime;
- vi. to engage in preventive actions with its staff and its equipment.

9.1.3. Academics

Within a Local Security Plan, academics can undertake special tasks, for example:

- i. to reassure pupils and teachers;
- ii. to secure educational buildings;
- iii. to share or to lead all social and behaviour preventive measures towards youth;
- iv. to contribute to undertaking opinion surveys or legal studies needed for the actions;
- v. to promote information on the law and rights and to help NGOs acting in that field.

9.1.4. The NGOs

If they have the capacity, NGOs should participate or lead some of the actions included in a Local Security Plan in their respective field of competence.

9.1.5. The Health Authorities

Health authorities can be included in a Local Security Plan and can participate in some actions, for example:

- i. to propose contributions to drugs or addict preventive measures;
- ii. to make agreements with the police and justice sector for victims support especially in cases of domestic and sexual violence;
- iii. to offer psychological help to victims of crime.

9.1.6. The Media

When they are involved in Local Security Plans, the local media can play an important role, for example:

- i. to decide, by themselves, security campaigns on actions that they identify;
- ii. to contribute to some actions especially when Local Security Commissions want to inform the public about the Local Security Plans or to inform about some specific security actions.

9.1.7. The Private Security Sector

The private security sector can sometimes be a partner in Local Security Plans. They can be used in partnership with police agencies or municipalities but their contribution must be free from any financial reward in order to avoid any conflict of interests.

9.1.8. The Mukhtars

In Turkish society, the mukhtars have a specific role that allows them to build up in depth knowledge of the interests of the public in many fields including in the security field. In the actions of the local security plans, they can contribute to dispatch information or to participate in the actions they choose to support.

9.1.9. The Business Sector

The attendance of the stakeholders from the business sector is interesting in the local security plans. They may be present in some actions, for example in two different ways:

- i. with the police, to make common agreements to prevent crimes affecting the business sector (for example the small retail sector);
- ii. with other members, to finance some actions through corporate sponsorship.

9.2. Preventive Actions to Reach Objectives

The actions of the Local Security Plans are preventive. It is important to note that in the first instance, the partners of the Local Security Commissions must have a basic knowledge of crime prevention strategies and practices in order to work effectively together. Because some of the stakeholders may be better informed than others, the governors in charge of the Local

Security Commissions should share common notions with all stakeholders and organize training sessions as necessary.

Two types of vocabulary are used when disusing crime prevention practices. The first uses traditional terms that stem from medical science and the second type is a more modern one, currently used as the international standard.

9.2.1. The Classical Forms of Prevention Practices:

The crime prevention practices used by public security partners can be listed in a classical way according to medical science:

Primary prevention: it concerns all actions made long before the crime takes place (e.g. educational measures, upbringing, etc);

Secondary prevention: actions to stop relatively immediate offences (e.g. self-defence, etc);

Tertiary prevention: to prevent new offences by an offender after the first has been committed.

The New International Standards	Beneficiaries	Activities
Social Prevention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups (Community Prevention) • Families (Developmental Prevention) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve the quality of life, social cohesion of groups and knowledge levels of individuals (e.g. how to handle a crime prone child)
Situational Prevention	Public space, specific targets (shops, banks, apartments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce profit of crime or; • To increase risk arrest or; • To prevent easy access to crime targets
Behavioural Prevention	Persons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victims, potential victims • Repeat offenders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To teach basic protection rules to potential victims. • To change the dangerous behaviour of offenders by rewarding efforts (positively) and deviations (negatively) and modifying their cognitive biases (for example that a victim will not suffer from a theft).

9.3. Examples of Preventive Actions in the Local Security Plans

Many types of preventive actions (social, situational or behavioural) were designed for the first Turkish trials of security through partnership. All of the plans were presented in line with the same agreed standard model that was approved for the Local Security Plans. It contained eight headlines:

- 1) Name of the action
- 2) Target group
- 3) Activities
- 4) Stakeholders cooperating
- 5) Time line
- 6) Expected results
- 7) Person in charge of monitoring and assessment
- 8) Budget

9.3.1. An Example of Social Prevention Action in Niğde:

Action: Education and information about women rights, equality between men and women, and violence and abuse against women and children.

Target Groups: Secondary and High School Students.

The institutions to cooperate: Academics, Education Volunteers, Directorate of National Education, Secondary and High School principals and teachers.

Time planning: April-May 2010.

Expected results: Increasing the awareness of students about women's rights, equality between men and women, and violence and abuse against women and children.

Assessment: Sharing monthly information with the commission about the number of schools in which education is given, and about the impression and feedback received through this education.

The institution(s) to oversee: The academic member of the Commission oversaw the implementation of the educational activities and executive committee.

9.3.2. An Example of Situational Prevention in Erzurum:

Action	Taking preventive measures around the buildings that have been under construction for a long time, taking the necessary measures against weakness in security
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping respective restored buildings clean and maintained, and illuminated at night • Cleaning the surroundings of destructed building, redesigning the areas as empty or green areas • Destructing abandoned and unusable buildings, which are not deemed to be built or renovated in a short term, without harming the environment • Cleaning the rests and to evaluating the respective area as an empty or green area • Taking measures around building which will be replaced by a new building or be renovated in close future with making impossible to enter into
Institutions in Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governorship • Metropolitan, Yakutiye, Aziziye and Palandöken Municipalities
Time Line	Beginning in March 2010
Expected Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To eliminate locations which constitute a crime risk - Increase feeling of safety from local citizens - To prevent criminals and potential criminals from living in abandoned buildings or surrounding areas

9.4. Deterrent Actions to Reach Objectives

The Local Security Plans cannot clamp down on crime because it is a partnership structure established for the prevention of crime and not a judicial body with responsibility for investigating crimes and punishing criminals. However, members of the Local Security Commissions may prepare actions to deter potential criminals.

There are many examples of deterrent measures:

Increased presence can be achieved through the development of protocols of cooperation between the police, gendarmerie, municipal police and even private security agencies.

Deterrence can also be achieved through increasing information. Street cameras are not the only way in which to have a “permanent watch”. Ways to achieve the regular exchange of information exchange can be agreed in the Local Security Plans among some partners and the police. Measures to increase the amount of information collected from the public can also be included as was the case in the Erzurum pilot model.

An example from the Erzurum Local Security Plan:

Security Priority	Safety in front of schools
Objective	To ensure the safety of students in front of primary and high schools and decrease the number of fights in front of schools
Action	To prevent people who are not students of the school hanging around the school, especially during class and after class, and ensuring that the students of the school stay inside the school area during school time if they have no valid reason for leaving the premises
Beneficiaries	Students, parents

Working with the “proximity police” within the Local Security Plan remains the best way to develop deterrent measures. It is also the opportunity to apply “problem solving methods” that requires partnerships to stop group crime.

PROBLEM	SOLVING	POLICY	ANSWER
Group acts of delinquency	Usual and classical police techniques are inefficient	Multipart Analysis + Participation of the external police partners	

9.5. Budget of the Local Security Plans

Many participants in the local implementation processes thought that the financial aspect was fundamental to success and asked for a special budget to implement their plan.

Of course additional resources are always welcome for any organization. However, the budget is not a mandatory component for starting a Local Security Plan because many organizations already have a budget to operate and because the objectives defined fall within their remit.

Specific funds are not necessary because many partners already have a budget:

Many stakeholders involved with the Local Security Plans already have funds to undertake preventive or deterrent actions in their day to day activities. For example, civil servants from Police agencies and Education and Health services must already undertake social or behavioural prevention activities for the public as a way to fulfil the state's duties.

Funds are not specific because many stakeholders profit from local prevention:

Most of the stakeholders in the Local Security Commissions have a direct interest in investing in preventive measures. For example, if they work efficiently, the Police have less to do, public transportation can earn more and municipality function better. Local Security Plans are an investment for many city stakeholders they can finance from their own pocket.

Municipal or provincial funds can be used for some actions:

When municipalities or provincial councils are interested in some of the actions included in the Local Security Plan, they have ability to vote for these activities to be undertaken by transferring funds for NGOs to do the task, for the administration in charge to undertake the task themselves or to create a new agency to fulfil the task.

Funds may be given by other members of Local Security Commissions:

Corporate sponsorship is possible within a Local Security Commission provided that it is approved by the governor and allocated to fund a specific action decided in the commitment phase of the plan.

10. THE ANNOUNCEMENT PHASE OF THE LOCAL SECURITY PLAN

The last phase of making a Local Security Plan must be steered by the governor. It consists of presenting a brief summary of the plan to be signed in public with the municipality and other key stakeholders that are making important commitments in the plan.

At this occasion, a press release can be arranged to inform the public on the main points of the Local Security Plan to be present by the Local Security Commission.

This pilot-model example can be seen below:

Kadıköy Local Security Commission's Decision Regarding the Implementation of Local Security Plan

Within the context of Improvement of Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector Project, it is aimed at improving interagency coordination in regards security issues, increasing the civil society participation and developing solutions at local level. To this end, in the pilot implementation period, under the leadership of Kadıköy District Governorate, Kadıköy Local Security Commission is established. The aim of this commission is to identify the local security priorities and develop three – year Local Security Plan with the participation of various institutions.

Under the leadership of the district governorate, with the participation of municipality, policing forces, mukhtars, civil society institutions and local media, the plan includes security issues that are specific to the district and contains preventive and deterrent actions addressing that issues.

Between the dates of January – May 2010, under the leadership of Kadıköy district governor, the Local Security Commission is established and started functioning. Within this context, the local security analysis was undertaken, security problems were identified and prioritised, the objectives and actions that will address these problems were developed, institutions made commitments and eventually implementation process has started.

Kadıköy Local Security Plan prioritise the problems of theft from home and workplaces, pick pocketing, drug addiction, street children and lack of information regarding the security measures among the general public. The commission is aiming at implementing the ten actions which address those problems in three years.

Implementation of the first actions started in April 2010, public meetings are organised for informing the citizens and listening their security needs and informative brochures are distributed in the meetings.

Kadıköy Local Security Plan, is an example of participative local security policy based on partnership. Thus citizen participation to the actions implemented by the commission is essential.

Regarding the implementation of the actions in the Local Security Plan, it was decided that the institutions, NGOs and all other relevant units will work in full harmony and coordination.

11. THE ASSESSMENT PHASE OF THE LOCAL SECURITY PLAN

There is an increasing trend to assess policies with the aim of saving public finance but it is also an important democratic rule to be accountable to citizens. In the case of making local security policies through the Local Security Plans, the assessment is much more useful in terms of the second point raised, that is to ensure accountability.

For these reasons, the assessment of the Local Security Plans must be built into the process from the beginning. Although the importance of effective assessment is undeniable, there are a number of different methods that can be used.

11.1. Possible Assessment Methods

A first method that can be used to assess the Local Security Plans is to outline the objectives with indicators of expected results. It is easy to see if the anticipated decrease or increase in crime has been reached (efficiency indicator).

A second technique that can be utilized it to outline quantity of effort in each “action sheet” (for example such an activity indicator could be the number of patrols).

Another technique is to make annual use of a public questionnaire that can highlight developments in public opinion (public satisfaction indicator).

11.2. The Actors Involved in the Assessment Phase

The Local Security Commissions must be in charge of the process of assessing the actions that have been implemented. Some of the Local Security Commissions may create, with stakeholders’ funding, a local security think tank or research committee (a forum where information is systematically

gathered and analysed). In all cases, at every new meeting, the governor must obtain an assessment of the information from those responsible for the actions or for the whole the plan from the Local Security Commission executive committee.

There are also additional options available if it felt that it would be more pertinent to undertake an external assessment and therefore recruit an outside agent to make a final overall assessment. There are three possible options open to the governorate:

- i. If a university is participating in the Local Security Commission, the governor may ask them to recruit and fund criminologists or public policy expert to undertake an assessment.
- ii. the municipality or the governor wishes to recruit consultants from the private sector to undertake the assessment.
- iii. The governor may also ask the Minister of Interior for assistance for the Inspectorate corps.

The provinces that already have Local Security Plans with an agreed assessment systems in place will be ready to share best practice, or international examples can be found by gathering information from international networks for crime prevention.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I

CONTENT OF A LOCAL SECURITY PLAN

1. Description of the Area/Territory

- 1.1 Geographical Features
- 1.2 Demographic Features
- 1.3 Sociocultural Profile
- 1.4 Economic Profile
- 1.5 Educational Profile

2. Local Criminality, Main Trends and Special Issues in Maintaining Public Order

- 2.1 Existing Problem Areas
- 2.2 Vulnerable Groups
- 2.3 Crime Statistics and Criminal Profiles

3. Existing Security and Community Safety Mechanisms

- 3.1 Existing Direct and Indirect Security Agencies/Institutions
- 3.2 State of Official Security Measures and Practices
- 3.3 Existing Programs and Projects of Institutions
- 3.4 Suggestions and Recommendations of Institutions
- 3.5 Projects that Could be Developed/Improved with the Help of the Local Security Commission.

4. Local Security Needs

- 4.1 Needs of the Public
- 4.2 Needs of the Police/Gendarmerie
- 4.3 Needs of the Municipality
- 4.4 Needs of NGOs
- 4.5 Needs of Security Related Institutions

5. List of Security Problems/Issues

6. Security Priorities

7. Prioritized Security Objectives

8. Capacities and Commitments of Stakeholders

9. List and Detailed Descriptions of Action Plans with Commitments of Institutions

10. Monitoring and Evaluation Methodology of the Local Security Plan

11. Signatories

ANNEX II

POINTS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR THE EFFECTIVE FUNCTIONING OF THE LOCAL SECURITY COMMISSIONS

- i. To maintain ownership and effectiveness in the commissions, the objectives and remits of the Local Security Commissions and expected results from the process should be well explained to the participants.
- ii. As well as the police statistics which will be used for the establishment of local security plans, the security diagnosis described in 8 boxes should be done carefully.
- iii. The commission members should feel free to express their opinions. The members should be given equal representation.
- iv. The commission members should be high level and able to make decisions at the institutions they represent.
- v. The institutions should be represented by the same people at every commission meeting. Otherwise there will be a lack of communication and efficiency.
- vi. In the commissions, mukhtars and NGO representatives reflects the needs of the people thus high participation from this institutions must be ensured.
- vii. Gender equality should be watched in the commission membership structure.
- viii. The action plans agreed should fall under the remit and capacity of the commissions. The commission should make sure that action plans address local problems.
- ix. In order to improve interagency coordination it should be ensured that all the institutions contribute to the Local Security Plan and take part in the implementation of actions.
- x. The responsibility and the implementation of the actions should not be left only to the Internal Security Forces. Other institutions should make commitments, take responsibility and put effort into the implementation.
- xi. The executive committee should actively take part in the implementation of the actions that were agreed on by the commission members and included in the plan.
- xii. The local security survey which is used throughout the local security

diagnosis process is a useful tool to measure crime perception of citizens. When developing the Local Security Plan, the commission should consider the survey results.

- xiii. The content of the local security survey could be improved by asking the support of academics if seen necessary.
- xiv. Applying random sampling principle in the implementation of the local security survey would lead to more accurate results. Besides, to ensure credibility, the survey should not be applied by the police agencies. The reason for that is, the people who apply to the police stations are usually recent victims and this is against the random sampling principle.

ANNEX III

CRIME PREVENTION WEB SITES

Crime prevention is often improved through sharing best practices. Web sites are becoming increasingly important vehicles for providing information to all stakeholders involved in crime prevention. For this reason, knowledge of some of the most important crime prevention web sites can be useful.

[www.unodc.org/ crime prevention](http://www.unodc.org/crime-prevention)

It is the UN web site where United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention can be consulted in Compendium 2006.

www.crime-prevention-intl.org

The International Centre for Criminal Prevention is located in Montreal and well informed about European and international projects.

www.eucpn.org

This is the web site for crime prevention created by Sweden and France.

www.fesu.org

This web site focuses more on local security and outlines examples of best practices from several cities.

www.crimeprev.eu

This site is used by thirty one universities from ten European countries and coordinated by the French CNRS.

[www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crime prevention](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crime-prevention)

This is the official web site of UK Home Office (Ministry of Interior).

www.sgciptd.interieur.gouv.fr

This site is the French Ministry of Interior web site for criminal prevention and local security contracts.

www.ncpc.org

This American web site is from the National Crime Prevention Council.

www.crimepreventionottawa.ca

This is a university web site well informed on crime prevention research.

www.libertysecurity.org

The official European security web site.

ANNEX IV

COMPENDIUM OF THE UNITED NATIONS NORMS AND STANDARDS IN CRIME PREVENTION

Guidelines for cooperation and technical assistance in the field of urban crime prevention

1. Design and Implementation of Cooperation and Assistance Activities

Cooperation projects for urban crime prevention should take account of the principles set out below.

1.1. Local Approach to Problems

Urban crime is characterized by a multiplicity of factors and forms. A multi-agency approach and a coordinated response at the local level, in accordance with an integrated crime prevention action plan, will often be helpful.

This should involve:

1.1.1. A local diagnostic survey of crime phenomena, their characteristics, factors leading to them, the form they take and their extent;

1.1.2. The identification of all the relevant actors that could take part in compiling the above-mentioned diagnostic survey in crime prevention as well as in the fight against crime, for example public institutions (national or local), local elected officials, the private sector (associations, enterprises), the voluntary sector, community representatives etc.;

1.1.3. The establishment, wherever appropriate, of consultation mechanisms promoting closer liaison, the exchange of information, joint work and the design of a coherent strategy;

1.1.4. The elaboration of possible solutions to these problems in the local context.

1.2. Integrated Crime Prevention Action Plan

1.3. The authors of an integrated crime prevention action plan, in order for it to be comprehensive and efficient, should:

1.3.1. Define:

- (i) The nature and types of crime problems to be tackled, such as theft,

robbery, burglary, racial attacks, drug-related crimes, juvenile delinquency and illegal possession of firearms, taking into account all the factors that may directly or indirectly cause such problems or contribute to them;

- (ii) The objectives being pursued and the time by which they should be attained;
- (iii) The action envisaged and the respective responsibilities of those involved vis-à-vis the implementation of the plan (for example, whether local or national resources are to be mobilized);

1.3.2. Consider involving a range of actors representing in particular:

- (i) Social workers and education, housing and health workers, in addition to the police, the courts, public prosecutors and probation services etc.;
- (ii) The community: elected officials, associations, volunteers, parents, victims' organizations etc.;
- (iii) The economic sector: enterprises, banks, business, public transport etc.;
- (iv) The media;

1.3.3. Consider the relevance to the crime prevention action plan of such factors as:

- (i) Relationships in the family, between generations or between social groups etc.;
- (ii) Education, religious, moral and civic values, culture etc.;
- (iii) Employment, training, measures for combating unemployment and poverty;
- (iv) Housing and urbanism;
- (v) Health, drug and alcohol abuse;
- (vi) Government and community welfare aid for the least fortunate members of society;
- (vii) Combating the culture of violence and intolerance;

1.3.4. Consider providing for action at various levels:

- (i) Primary prevention by:
 - a. Promoting situational criminal prevention measures, such as target hardening and opportunity reduction;

- b. Promoting welfare and health development and progress and by combating all forms of social deprivation;
- c. Promoting communal values and respect for fundamental human rights;
- d. Promoting civic responsibility and social mediation procedures;
- e. Facilitating the adaptation of the working methods of the police and the courts;

(ii) Prevention of recidivism by:

- a. Facilitating the adaptation of methods of police intervention (rapid response, intervention within the local community etc.);
- b. Facilitating the adaptation of methods of judicial intervention and implementation of alternative remedies:
 - Diversification of methods of treatment and of measures taken according to the nature and seriousness of the cases (diversionary schemes, mediation, a special system for minors etc.);
 - Systematic research on the reintegration of offenders involved in urban crime through the implementation of non-custodial measures;
 - Socio-educational support within the framework of the sentence, in prison and as preparation for release from prison;
 - Giving an active role to the community in the rehabilitation of offenders;

(iii) After the sentence has been served: aid and socio-educational support, family support etc.;

(iv) Protection of victims by practical improvements in their treatment by means of the following:

- a. Raising awareness of rights and how to exercise them effectively;
- b. Reinforcing rights (in particular the right to compensation);
- c. Introducing systems of victim assistance.

2. Implementation of the Action Plan

2.1. Central authorities

The central authorities, to the extent consistent with their competence, should:

- i. Provide active support, assistance and encouragement to local actors;
- ii. Coordinate national policy and strategies with local strategies and needs;
- iii. Organize consultation and cooperation mechanisms between the various administrations concerned at the central level.

2.2. Authorities at All Levels

Competent authorities at all levels should:

- i. Be constantly mindful of respect for the fundamental principles of human rights in promoting these activities;
- ii. Encourage and/or implement appropriate training and information to support all professionals involved in crime prevention;
- iii. Compare experiences and organize exchanges of know-how;
- iv. Provide a means of evaluating regularly the effectiveness of the strategy implemented and provide for the possibility of revising it

ANNEX V

1. BECCARIA-STANDARDS FOR ENSURING QUALITY IN CRIME PREVENTION PROJECTS

Preface

Quality criteria for planning, implementing and evaluating crime-prevention projects have hardly existed up to now. The professional exchange on this complex of topics is also still at the very beginning nationally as well as throughout Europe.

Standards as a yardstick for checking project scheduling and implementation are an initial step on the way to checking the effectiveness of crime-prevention projects and to an increased quality orientation.

The present Beccaria standards have been developed in the framework of the “Beccaria Project: Quality Management in Crime Prevention”. This project was supported by the AGIS programme of the European Commission.

The Beccaria standards are intended as a recommendation for an increased quality orientation in prevention work. They are an initial outline for discussion and should be consistently improved and developed further through the widest possible debate.

Working aids (7 steps) for the concrete implementation of the Beccaria standards can be downloaded for free at www.beccaria.de

The Beccaria standards include measures and requirements for quality planning, execution and assessment of crime prevention programmes and projects:

- i. Description of the problem. They apply to the following seven key steps of a project
- ii. Analysis of the conditions leading to the emergence of the problem
- iii. Determination of prevention targets, project targets and targeted groups
- iv. Determination of the interventions intended to achieve the targets
- v. Design and execution of the project
- vi. Review of the project’s implementation and achievement of objectives (evaluation)
- vii. Conclusion and documentation.

The Beccaria standards offer a manual for developers, players in the field and other people with responsibility in crime prevention to ensure the quality of their crime prevention work. Whoever is responsible should ensure that

- i. They align the planning, implementation and review of crime prevention projects with the quality criteria outlined in science and literature.
- ii. projects are designed in such a way that they can be evaluated.
- iii. scientific experts, advisors, contracting bodies and sponsors are at hand to provide a technical basis for judging the project's targeting of objectives and quality.

The Beccaria standards describe an overall programme of requirements to ensure quality. A satisfactory guarantee for the quality of a project can only be achieved by complying with the overall programme. The individual requirements are always in step with each other. Selective attention or inattention to particular steps of the Beccaria standards would be detrimental to the level of quality.

The following points are to be considered and implemented along with the Beccaria standards:

1.1. Beccaria Standard: Description of the Problem

1.1.1. The existing problem is recognised and precisely described in its current state. It is thus explained:

- i. What exactly the problem comprises, how it manifests itself, what kind of crime it covers.
- ii. Where the problem arises in the defined area, over what time scale and to what extent.
- iii. Who is directly or indirectly affected by the problem (description e.g. by age, gender, social characteristics, background).
- iv. What direct and indirect effects the problem has.
- v. How long the problem has existed and whether it has changed (especially recently – e.g. growth, special reasons).
- vi. Whether the solution to the problem is being worked on in a specific place. Who is working on it at present or who should work on it in the future (youth help, teachers, police, state prosecution service)? Which methods were chosen to solve the problem and with what degree of success?

1.1.2. Information is provided on who the initiative for the project came from as well as what prompted the project (e.g. complaints/reports from the public, approaches from the Youth Welfare Office or suggestion by the police).

1.1.3. It has been well established by research that action is needed to solve the problem.

1.2. Beccaria Standard: Analysis of the Conditions Leading to the Emergence of the Problem

1.2.1. To explain the problem in question, appropriate theoretical as well as empirical findings are taken into consideration.

1.2.2. The variables thought to significantly influence the incidence of the problem are considered and labelled - risk factors as well as protective factors

1.3. Beccaria Standard: Determination of Crime Prevention Goals, Project Goals, and Targeted Groups

In determining goals, a basic distinction must be made between crime prevention and project goals. The crime prevention goals and project goals of every project must be specified clearly and precisely.

Crime Prevention Goals (sometimes referred to as overall goals, global goals or general goals) are always directed towards the actual crime prevention concerns of the project. These concern the (objective) containment of crime (prevention and/or avoidance of criminal acts) or the improvement of subjective security (strengthening the feeling of safety as well as reducing the fear of crime). For example, the crime prevention goal of a project could be a 30% reduction in youth assaults in the school area of city A.

Project goals, on the contrary, are the direct objectives for which a project aims. The following project goals could exist for a project with the crime prevention goal of reducing youth assaults in schools: Improvement of the general school atmosphere, strengthening of pupils' social skills especially regarding fights, and a higher level of social control in school.

Project goals must have a theoretical connection with crime prevention goals: in achieving a project goal, it must be possible to work towards the existing crime prevention goal at the same time.

The project goals can be demonstrated using criminological theories as well as theory-based assumptions or experimental findings: (to stay with the same example) “improvement of the general school atmosphere”, “strengthening of pupils’ social skills especially regarding fights” as well as “a higher level of social control in school”, in each case building an applicable crime prevention approach to achieve the crime prevention goal of “reducing youth assaults in schools”.

1.3.1. The crime prevention goals are specified. They are developed from the description of the problem, precisely formulated, measurable, and describe the ideal situation.

1.3.2. A decision is made regarding any particular groups the crime prevention goals are targeting.

1.3.3. There are definitive, measurable indicators that show whether (and to what extent) the crime prevention goals will be achieved.

1.3.4. Strategies or crime prevention approaches are chosen which are judged appropriate to achieve the adopted crime prevention goals. The choice of strategies or crime prevention approaches is explicitly justified. Perceptions from literature as well as practical experiences should be taken into account. The project goals are defined in concrete terms on the basis of the chosen strategies or crime prevention approaches.

1.3.5. The target groups to which the achievement of the project goals relates are specified. In this context, target groups are precisely specified (e.g. by age or social characteristics).

1.3.6. The time frame as well as the end date (duration of the project) for achieving the desired project goals is determined.

1.4. Beccaria Standard: Determining Measures to Achieve the Objectives

1.4.1. Appropriate measures are derived and justified to achieve the project goals.

1.4.2. The measures are considered appropriate for reaching the determined target groups of the project goals (e.g. can this be assured through the participation of the target group?).

1.4.3. The availability of important time, personal, expert, financial and physical resources for implementing the measures is realistically set out.

1.4.4. Particular indicators can be validated that show whether (and to what extent) the project goals will be achieved.

1.4.5. Particular indicators can be validated that show whether (and to what extent) the target groups can be reached.

1.5. Beccaria Standard: Project Design and Implementation

1.5.1. The project design is set out in writing. It covers all the relevant considerations and plans which are essential for the establishment, running and review of the project.

1.5.2. The likelihood of collaboration (with partner organisations) as well as synergies are clarified. The networking is target-oriented, sustainable and well invested.

1.5.3. A resource plan is prepared which sets forth which time, personal, professional, financial and physical resources are likely to be needed to implement the measures.

1.5.4. The duration of the project is determined.

1.5.5. The project is appraised and checked by an external expert in the field and by a group (external or part of their own organisation).

1.5.6. The cost benefit of the project, how it arises from the project plan and the expected results and effects (and the targeted project goals) are checked and found to be beneficial as well as sustainable by those involved with the project and/or by some external, professional person/group. Practicable alternatives to the planned project can be appraised as an option.

1.5.7. Responsibilities for implementing the individual measures are determined. Agreements are put in writing between the participants (contractors, project planners, if necessary the target groups, and co-operation partners).

1.5.8. A project work plan is prepared with a detailed depiction of the individual work steps for those responsible and the time schedule.

1.5.9. A review of the implementation of the project (monitoring) as well as a review of the effects of the project (evaluation of impact, if it is intended) is included from the beginning of the project plan.

- i. A process evaluation needs to be carried out. A plan for the review of the running of the project as well as reaching the target groups is prepared and included in the project design.

- ii. The case is made for whether the attainability of the project goals and crime prevention goals of the project should be appraised (advance appraisal of effects). In the event that the evaluation is carried out, a plan of investigation is drawn up, and the evaluation plans are taken into account in the project design.
- iii. The case is made for whether a self evaluation and/or an external evaluation is planned. In the case of a self evaluation, the requirement for external professional methodological advice is assessed.

1.5.10. The running of the project is documented from the very beginning; every step of the project is set out and justified, as are deviations from the original plan.

1.5.11. The structure of the project can adapt to changing conditions. Methods for improvement are determined and implemented if shortfalls appear.

1.6. Beccaria Standard: Review of the Implementation of the Project and the Achievement of Its Goals (Evaluation)

1.6.1. The extent to which the designated target groups are reached is determined (number, proportion). Attempts are made to account for the degree to which the target groups were or were not reached

1.6.2. What changes occurred and to what extent they occurred are determined. How far were the targeted crime prevention goals achieved (from comparison between the actual and expected situations)? How far were the targeted project goals achieved (from comparison between the actual and expected situations)?

1.6.3. Whether and to what extent the observed changes can be attributed to the implemented measures is determined and reported. What can the achievement or failure to achieve the crime prevention goals be connected to? Likewise for the project goals?

1.6.4. The occurrence of any unforeseen side effects is determined: If so, what effects and to what extent?

1.7. Beccaria Standard: Conclusion and Documentation of the Project

1.7.1. A thorough project report is prepared at the end of a project. The main findings from the project are edited, conclusions are made, the end report is drawn up, and the project documentation as well as project results are made accessible to a professional audience.

1.7.2 The main project findings are brought together and edited:

- i. To what extent were the targeted goals achieved (project and crime prevention goals)?
- ii. What do the results imply for the project?
- iii. What can the achievement/failure of the project goals be attributed to?
- iv. What difficulties emerged in the planning and implementation stages; which positive and negative lessons can be drawn?
- v. What other main findings could be deduced?

1.7.3. Conclusions are drawn from the experiences, results and findings of the project:

- i. Did the chosen approach prove of value? Is the approach applicable elsewhere?
- ii. Which suggestions for improvement, recommendations for action or possible solutions for known flaws can be deduced?
- iii. Are there particular problems which should be a.) The subject of future projects as well as b.) The subject of evaluation for future projects?
- iv. Which project partners or other organisations could especially benefit from the results?
- v. Do the findings apply to an adaptation/modification of the existing project or to a further development of a possible continuation of the project?
- vi. How could it be guaranteed that the project can be sustained for its planned life span (e.g. by integration in an existing set of arrangements)?
- vii. Can the project be transferred to other target groups and social conditions?

1.7.4. A project report is written which outlines:

- i. Project design
- ii. The implementation of the project
- iii. Project results
- iv. Results of evaluation
- v. A plan of evaluation, if necessary analysing a range and quantity of samples as well as indicators and criteria to review the achievement of the project goals.
- vi. Conclusions.

1.7.5. The project documentation is accessible to others. The results of the project are published.

INDEX

- Academics 42, 45
- Beccaria Standard 64, 65, 66, 67, 68
- Border Guards 6
- Citizen Focus and Interagency
 - Coordination 7
- Civilian Oversight 5, 6, 7, 8, 31, 49
- Civil Servant 6, 27, 48
- Community Policing 3
- Community Safety Partnerships 12
- Democratic Rights 5
- District Governor 5
- England 12
 - Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships 12
- Erzurum 7, 8, 9, 27, 35, 46
 - Local Security Plans 9
- EU 7, 9, 11, 13
- Europe 6, 9, 63
- European Commission 5, 63
- Executive Committee 27, 52, 56
- Eyüp 9, 27
- Fire and Rescue Services 12
- France 14
 - Local Security Contracts 5, 11, 12, 14, 58
 - Proximity Policing 13
- Gendarmerie 6, 12, 27, 34, 41, 55
- Governor 5, 43
- Governorate 32, 49
- Human Rights 5, 6, 36, 61, 62
- Independent Police Complaint
 - Commissions 6
- Inter Agency Coordination 8
- İstanbul 7
- Kadıköy 9, 27, 35, 49, 50
 - Pilot Implementation 49
- Local Authority 12
- Local Health Boards 12
- Local Security Commission 10, 27, 38, 39, 48, 49, 52
- Local Security Commissions 8, 9, 10, 37, 43, 46, 48, 51
- Local Security Plan 9, 31, 32, 38, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 55, 56
- Local Security Plans 8, 9, 10, 13, 27, 37, 40, 41, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, 56
- Media and Communication 7
- Ministry of Interior 5, 7, 32, 58
- Mukhtars 27, 43
- Municipality 27, 40, 42, 48, 49, 52, 55
- Neighbourhood Watch Schemes 13
- Neighbouring Municipality 12
- NGOs 7, 10, 11, 13, 42, 48, 50, 55
- Niğde 7
- Ombudsman 6
- Pilot Implementation 38
- Pilot Models 7
- Pilot Provinces 7, 8, 10, 27
- Police 6, 8, 12, 13, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 55, 56, 57, 60, 61, 64, 65
- Principles of Transparency 8
- Strengthening Human Rights Boards 7
- The UK 11, 13
- The US 13
- Turkey 5, 6, 9
- UNDP 5
- Wales 12

