

WORK PACKAGE 3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



URBAN MANAGER

FOR SECURITY
SAFETY AND
CRISIS MANAGEMENT

State of the Art Recognition in Managing Urban Security

Aims and key deliverables

The URBIS project is funded by the European Union's Leonardo da Vinci Lifelong Learning Programme. Its aims and objectives are to:

- Recognise the 'state of the art' in managing urban security;
- Identify any need for the further professionalization of this role, specifically through higher educational qualifications;
- Design a higher educational programme of teaching and learning about managing urban security; and
- Test out this programme amongst current and prospective urban security managers.

Work package 3 (WP3), which Cardiff University are leading, is specifically concerned with the first objective, to recognise the state of the art. In turn, this recognition exercise has three objectives or 'deliverables' which are to:

- Describe the current national and EU legislative frameworks empowering municipal authorities to manage urban security and other relevant aspects of the institutional context for this role;
- Report on the emerging needs, existing profiles and training courses for urban security management across Europe; and
- Provide a checklist comparing these statutory powers, needs, profiles and training courses.

The scope and method of the inquiry

Early on in this comparative research inquiry it became apparent that the very concept of 'urban security management' was unfamiliar in some parts of Europe, particularly in Northern Europe. As a consequence, and rather than presuming the existence of established profiles and training courses specifically in 'urban security management', it was argued that the state of the art needed to begin with a more rudimentary question about whether the concept is meaningful in different European regions and, where it is used, what it is taken to mean, who is thought to be responsible for it and what kinds of expertise is relevant for meeting this responsibility. As such, the initial, presumptuous focus on emerging needs, existing profiles and existing training courses was re-framed in terms of the following questions:

- What can 'urban security management' mean? (PROBLEMS)
- Which authorities are, or ought to be, empowered and legally obliged to manage urban security? (RESPONSIBLE ACTORS)
- What skills and competencies do they have, or could they have, to undertake this responsibility? (EXPERTISE)
- What educational and training provision currently exists, or should exist, in support of their work? (TRAINING)

The research methods underpinning this innovative comparative inquiry were as follows. First, desktop research was undertaken of all the available documentary evidence on the current national and EU legislative and policy frameworks alongside any training courses (where applicable). Second, and most innovatively and importantly, a mixed method, deliberative research design (the Delphi method) was employed to explore the knowledge base with regard to the above four questions of three expert communities, namely those of national-level policy makers, local practitioner-managers and scientific experts from the academy. Throughout this research the aim was to both describe the existing 'state of the art' around urban security management and its potential future development. The focus was thus not restricted to the descriptive representation of the existing nature of the field of policy and practice but also to offer prescriptive insights and recommendations for future developments in what remains a nascent and unevenly developed but increasingly important area of work across Europe.

Key findings

- There have been significant developments at both EU and country-specific levels in legislative and policy developments in crime prevention and urban security;
- The provenance of ‘urban security management’ as both a policy term and set of institutional practices remains unevenly developed across Europe, with marked differences in experience, expertise and resources between regions, countries and cities;
- Crime prevention rather than urban security remains the more commonly used term in policy discourses in Europe to describe the problems of urban security and its management;
- There now exists a legal framework for EU-level crime prevention. In particular the Hague Programme (2005-9) emphasized that crime prevention is now an indispensable part of creating an ‘area of freedom, security of justice’ (AFSJ). Furthermore, the Stockholm Programme (2010-14) declared that there is a need for an ‘internal security strategy’ involving the enhancement of actions at the European level together with better coordination with actions at regional and national level against trans-national threats.
- Within this crime prevention framework several European-wide policy networks have been established to facilitate the accumulation of knowledge and best practice, including the European Crime prevention Network (EUCPN) and the European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS). Evidence regarding the impact of these networks on member countries remains to date limited.
- Most member countries of the EU now have formal, legally-constituted crime prevention strategies.
- Despite the difficulties of translating urban security across the regions and countries of Europe, there is evidence of common referents regarding (1) the problems of urban security and policy responses to, and management of, these problems; (2) the types of actors responsible for the management of urban security; and (3) the types of expertise and future training required to undertake such work.

(1) PROBLEMS

- It is possible to identify seven major problems of urban security across different expert communities (academic, policy and practice): namely
 1. violence against the person (including domestic violence);
 2. property theft;
 3. social exclusion and youth unemployment;
 4. incivilities and anti-social behaviour;
 5. alcohol and drug misuse;

6. immigration and social cohesion;
 7. criminal gangs and organized crime.
- It is possible to identify four major types of policy response to problems of urban security across these different expert communities: namely,
 1. criminal justice;
 2. risk management;
 3. restorative justice;
 4. social justice approaches.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES

- The responsibility for urban security management remains primarily with actors at the state level (national and municipal);
- There is broad support for the development of multi-agency partnership working across Europe and the development of anticipatory, problem-solving expertise beyond that of the criminal justice system;
- There is uncertainty over the balance of operational and strategic management responsibilities;
- There is uncertainty over the respective roles of local elected political leadership, civil servant/administrative leadership and scientific leadership in this still nascent field of policy and practice.

(3) EXPERTISE

- Formal training and specialist expertise in urban security management and in multi-agency, strategic problem-solving is unevenly institutionalized and for the most part very poorly developed across most countries and regions of Europe;
- There remains a major gap in specialist 'problem-solving' postgraduate training and education courses in urban security management at European Qualifications Framework (EQF) levels 6, 7 and 8 for current and, more importantly, future urban security managers.
- Mapping the 'state of the art' of urban security management and crime prevention across Europe in 2013 has revealed considerable development over the past two decades in the range of problems and approaches adopted and the multiplicity of responsible authorities. However, the research undertaken in this work package also highlights that multi-agency, problem-solving still remains peripheral in many European contexts. In particular, there remains much scope for the development of such new multi-disciplinary expertise (in part generic, in part context-specific) through the development of 6, 7, 8 EQF level training and curriculum programmes. A key contribution to this task will be made in the subsequent Work Packages 4-7 of the Urbis project.

Contacts

Adam Edwards, Gordon Hughes and Nicholas Lord
Cardiff University Urbis Project Research Team

For further information and queries about the full research report, please contact
Professor Gordon Hughes: hughesgh@cardiff.ac.uk

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.