

Deliverable 4.2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



URBAN MANAGER

FOR SECURITY
SAFETY AND
CRISIS MANAGEMENT

Selected best practices in Turkey, UK, Italy, Slovenia and other EU countries

Modern threats and forms of violence make security nowadays one of the biggest priorities as well as the challenges of local, national, and international environments. The safety of one's person and security of one's property are fundamental human rights and have influence on quality of life. When citizens do not feel safe in their environment, police, security managers and local government have many difficulties in restoring safe conditions again. Social vulnerabilities are raising demands for higher security and therefore, increase the amount of people being interested in this particular field. To respond effectively to contemporary security threats and risks the state needs effective security system and functioning and responsive structure that also understand the needs of citizens.

Crime prevention is essential in order to maintain and develop sustainable development, since the prevention of problems is linked to poverty, health, education, and urban development. Even more, dynamic communities are not possible without safety and social cohesion (Sagant, 2009)

Public authorities, particularly at a local level, encounter many challenges in dealing with prevention and community safety. A number of innovative approaches have been developed which help to increase sense of security and safety itself either through supporting institutions traditionally assigned to this task (such as the police) or by providing additional social control and mediation services. All these initiatives aim to improve services to the population by being more available locally, increasing human presence in the evenings and at night, and promoting understanding and dialogue with authorities.

The role of local authorities and community actors including the private sector is now more frequently recognised by international and national organisations than in the past. Yet, actual progress in this area does not appear to live up to the stated

goals. While local authorities are best placed to be able to identify the needs and potential of the local population, their legal status and financial resources are still largely limited. The participation and involvement of residents and community groups is still often restricted to more or less informal consultation, and is hindered by instability and a lack of sustainable resources. Finally, public sector commitments are often in conflict with the need to integrate non-economic partnerships.” (Sagant, 2009).

Ambitions of higher education institutions go beyond the present social reality in the field of providing capable professionals who can successfully deal with local safety/security and crime problems. In reality, the majority of local crime and safety/security problems are dealt with in a common-sense way by ‘experts’ who know little about crime and security issues. Therefore, safety/security, disorder and crime prevention remain a matter of the police which are mainly the only professional organisation in the field of crime control, involved in local efforts for more safe and secure communities.

In WP 3 researchers undertook a research aimed to verify which public authorities are empowered and legally obliged to manage urban security, what skills and competencies they have to undertake this responsibility and what educational and training provision currently exists in support of their work as well highlighting the complex and multi-faceted nature of the problems of urban security themselves. Namely, the URBIS project questions the possibilities for ‘urban security management’ given the increasing freedom of movement of people, goods and services across national borders, an increasingly austere economic climate and consequent pressures on governing capacity in European cities.

In the last few years, European countries have developed different projects classified in terms of “good practices”, focused on preventing a specific harm, crime and/or disorder. Knowledge about those different projects is important for the competences of urban security manager. This Work Package offers also an overview and analysis of so-called transferable ‘good practices’ and presents the findings and

discusses how knowledge of these exemplars may help to play a role in preventing crime and other harms in the urban environment in the future.

Urban security policy transfer refers to knowledge on the comprehension of criminality, responses on criminality, and separate policies and institutions (domestic and foreign). The source, circumstances, legislation and socioeconomic context of a certain idea, policy or practice are very important. We must be aware of the fact whether such an idea was originated by the authorities, civil society, as the result of efforts of criminology experts, or in common cooperation by all of these.

Starting from the results of Work Package 3 (WP3), the main aim of the analysis is to identify exemplary cases of projects/programmes providing security in urban settlements as an example for each of the 28 possible combinations (categories) emerging from the union of the seven targeted problems of urban security and the four different responses, highlighted in WP3 (see Table 1).

It is suggested that, despite the difficulties of translating urban security across the regions and countries in Europe, there is evidence of common elements regarding the problems of urban security, the policy responses to and management of these problems. Specifically, seven major problems of urban security and four major types of policy responses to problems of urban security have been identified by different groups of experts involved (academicians, governmental actors and practitioners).

Table 1: Typology of Responses and Targeted Problems of Urban Security

Targeted problems:

- 1) Violence against the person, including domestic violence
- 2) Social exclusion and youth unemployment
- 3) Incivilities and anti-social behaviour
- 4) Property crime
- 5) Alcohol and drug misuse
- 6) Immigration and social cohesion
- 7) Criminal gangs and organised crime

Typology of Response:

- CJ: Criminal Justice
- RJ: Restorative Justice
- SJ: Social Justice
- RM: Risk Management

The four participating countries (Turkey, UK, Italy, and Slovenia) in project Urbis selected good practices in urban security and crime prevention, while the selection of best practices on EU level was made on the basis of the data collected by EUCPN.

UK has well developed community responsibility in community safety and crime prevention. Usually 'Anglophone' (English-speaking) practice (especially UK and US based) serves as a model in crime prevention policies across other European countries. Namely, contemporary discussions on the transfer of ideas in the field of crime control policy emphasise the re-interpretation of UK/US models (at least in the European culture) more than seeking original solutions for the problem of criminality and other numerous problems in continental countries and contexts (Castells, 2001).

Fifteen cases of good practices in safety/security provision in UK are presented for the purpose of this study. Most common response method is risk management, followed by criminal justice, and social justice. Restorative justice is not often used as a method for respond to the targeted problems, but it is certainly becoming more popular in the UK. The best practices are focused in the following targeted problems: property crime, violence against the person, including domestic violence, alcohol and drug misuse, and incivilities and anti-social behaviour. Countering the problems there is a shortage of programs dealing with criminal gangs and organised crime, social exclusion and youth unemployment, and immigration and social cohesion.

In most cases the partnerships are in charge of the implementation of particular good practices; police itself only in few cases. Partners of the project are normally: NGO's, social services, community safety units, advisory groups, probation services, police, prosecution, municipalities, schools, community centres, fire brigades, universities, immigration service, health services, government agencies and departments, transport providers, and entrepreneurs.

The typology of responses that are most used by Italian local authorities are social justice and risk management. This typology of responses is in fact the most various and the most numerous. In particular, social polices play a predominant role of social

integration, promotion of a culture of legality, and redevelopment and improvement of degraded living areas. In these cases, a close collaboration among different actors like associations, institutions, private and public supporters is always present. In many cases, Local Authorities committed to promote as much as possible a direct involvement of citizens into urban security management under the concept of 'combined security' or 'participated security'. Citizens' involvement has been achieved through:

- Increasing citizens' responsibilities as to the management of public spaces and the organization of social events and activities addressing social cohesion and integration among different social groups. This kind of action is mainly based on the concept of 'common good'.

- Encouraging citizens to actively support the Local Police. Although there are still very few experiences of Neighborhood Watch Programme, voluntaries and selected citizens may often in fact have the possibility to absolve a watchman and assistant role: voluntaries are for example used in different Municipalities to supervise parks or recreation grounds. The most problematic group was the one connected again with restorative justice.

From the point of view of the targeted problems, 'incivilities' and 'anti-social behaviour' are the problems most frequently addressed by Local Authorities (Municipalities in particular) since they are tightly connected to the perception of citizens' insecurity, even if no major crimes are committed on the territory.

Eleven cases of good practice were selected to study in Turkey. The most common approach to problem solving (or used in combination of approaches) in Turkish practice of security/safety provision is risk management. Restorative justice, social justice and criminal justice are uncommonly used respond methods. The cases are dealing mostly with incivilities and anti-social behaviour, and social exclusion and youth unemployment. In most cases the police is in charge of the implementation of particular good practice. Other organisations are: Municipalities, Universities, and

Ministry/government. Partners of the projects are normally: municipality and regional governments, other state/region government agencies, entrepreneurs, universities, police & local police, NGO's. There are also single cases of partners of neighborhood units, public education centres, civil society and media, citizens, hospitals. The programs normally cover regions, municipalities, districts, which are in most cases also responsible also for the founding of the programs. The budget is also provided from the central government mostly for policing tasks, partly the founding is provided by EU.

For the Slovenian case study there are selected 28 cases of security/safety provision. Since the police have criminality as its main sphere of activity, their central role in the development of local crime prevention seems natural (Wikström & Torstensson, 1999). In Slovenia police is among all organizations the most involved in local efforts for providing security (Meško et al., 2007), which was confirmed also by results of the recent nationwide research on local safety provision (Meško, Sotlar, Lobnikar, Jere, & Tominc, 2012).

In prevention of crime on national level the police are an integral or even a permanent part of it. Police serve as an initiator, as a partner and as a supporter in more than 100 preventive activities that have taken place or are still on-going.

In their efforts to improve community policing CPOs cooperate mostly with local communities, educational institutions and social services. Police are also part of the preventive activities that are initiated by the other public administration agencies (like ministry responsible for transport, ministry responsible for social affairs etc.), by local administrations (mayors, local security councils), by schools and NGOs.

The prevention activities are mainly focused on the following problem areas: traffic safety, public order and security, crime, personal and property safety. Preventive activities in provision of public order and security are focused in vandalism and pyrotechnics that is used during the new-year holydays. Safety of skiers and mountaineer are another set of preventive activities. However, the crime prevention

is mostly the concern of the police and as well the citizens who should undergo also self-preventive measures.

European-wide developments

Recent trends in crime prevention and community safety in Europe have been characterized by the influence of ideas of crime prevention in Western societies, especially with the idea of community responsabilisation and involvement of local administration in setting priorities in community safety/security efforts and the prevention of everyday criminal offences.

The changes in the development of the concept of policing considerably determine the development of security provision as well. An increasingly complex array of public, private and municipal bodies - as well as public police forces - are engaged in the provision of regulation and security since policing is changing rapidly and radically (Newburn & Jones, 2006)

However, the aim of multi-agency approaches is a reduction of police-dominated approaches. Despite EU recommendations, there are no stable or long-term formal networks among stakeholders on national and local level (state, regional and municipality governments, other state/region government agencies, police & local police, immigration service, prosecution, probation services, health services, fire brigades, community centres, schools etc.) and as well from private sector and civil society (entrepreneurs, universities, NGO's, advisory groups etc). In general, the participation in the projects depends on the interest of the agencies and organisations. Through a multi-agency approach, more can be done regarding social and restorative justice. A focus of this project is to raise awareness of the importance of multi-agency approach, and this could be well managed through the new profile of Urban Security Manager.

The approaches to security provision differ not only from state to state but also among regions and cities. Accordingly the needs of local actors have to be identified

and problem solving should be tailor-made. Therefore a new framework for urban security management is needed. A wide range of competencies and knowledge is required because of the specificity of urban areas. The set of best practices allows the selection and adjustment of it to local circumstances and needs.

Best practices can be developed only by teams and team work. Therefore, a collection of examples of good practice can be used in decision making on how to solve specific local security problems.

Contacts

Gorazd Meško, Bernarda Tominc, Andrej Sotlar
University of Maribor, Urbis Project Research Team

For further information and queries about the full research report, please contact
Professor Gorazd Meško: Gorazd.Mesko@fvv.uni-mb.si

EUROPEAN
MANAGER SECURITY
URBAN URBIS
SECURITY POLICE
URBIS
QUALIFICATION
MOBILITY
EUROPEAN
QUALIFICATION
TRAINING COMMUNITY
COOPERATION
CITIZENS
COMMUNITY
CITIES URBIS
CITIZENS SAFETY
URBIS SAFETY POLICE
URBAN

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission.
This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author
and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use
which may be made of the information contained therein.



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

www.urbisproject.eu

