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ACCOUNTABILITY, TRUST AND LEGITIMACY

• These three elements are fundamental in urban safety and security initiatives, if we want success and that cities and citizens benefit.

• Greetings from the ESC (European Society of Criminology) conference sessions (Urban security management in Europe / comparative research & New trends in community safety = 16 papers!)

• Community policing innovations in Finland: *local safety planning, virtual community policing, reconciling cp and ILP*
URBIS: Managing Urban Security (*EU Leonardo funded project*)

some general and preliminary observations:

• urban security – what is meant by it, what it is in practice, who is responsible – varies a lot in Europe

• the role of the police (and the state)

• the responsibilities of other authorities

• the elusive field of many kinds of partnerships and networks

• comparative approach: research results to be completed in 2013 (special issue of the EJC)
New Trends in Community Safety (2 sessions)

• from the Netherlands, France
Community Policing innovations in Finland


• I have been involved in practical development projects, strategy making processes and evaluations of community policing in Finland since 1995.

• I have teached and conducted research on community policing since 1993 (Police College of Finland, University of Tampere, CEPOL / European Police College since 2000)

Community policing innovations in Finland

- Local safety planning (since 1997), first as a part of community policing strategy
- Evaluation report 2002 (Virta 2002): 228 local safety plans (implementation successes and failures)
- First national Internal Security Strategy 2004: the main way of implementing the strategy at local level (city and municipal authorities take bigger role in leading the processes)
- Today: continuing processes, integrated into cities’ welfare strategies
- Evaluation of 9 big cities’ strategies: working partnerships (strategy level), more operational co-operation and collaboration needed, more involvement of residents and citizens in general needed (lack of proper structures, access, arrangements… still too much project based)
Virtual community policing – working proactively online

- virtual community policing team (at HPD) started 2008: ”working online is the most promising new cp method” (community? community / communities of young people are in internet)
- cp web pages and personal profiles for Facebook, IRC-gallery and Twitter
- videos (prevention, advice) for YouTube
- interactive means to share and exchange information, to chat and get to know each other, advice, and create trust towards the police (young people voluntary tell the police their worries, what is going on, .. and the police can advice, support, and if necessary, investigate)
- the police can also inform about criminal activities in social media (identity theft, credit card fraud, sexual abuse, wrong identities’ risks ...) prevent school bullying, give advice (driving licenses, driving regulations, how to deal with drug dealers, how to report crime online et c.
Virtual community policing – working proactively online

- according to the survey conducted 2011 in internet among the fans of the cp online sites “virtual community policing is very good quality police service” ("it is also so good to know that you are there for us")
- In August 2011 the police had 172269 fans in Facebook, 25% of them under 18 years old.
- The Police Board of Finland decided to invest into virtual cp in 2011, so that there were 13 new ”Net cops” trained. Some of them work online part-time, but most of them most of the time.
- Results have been good, not just in internet but in ”real world” – visibility in internet, ”contracts” and mutual understanding, easy access in reporting domestic violence, sexual abuse, … also, due to anonymity possibility, for children and young people from ethnic and immigrand backgrounds.
reconciling cp and ILP – complementary (not competitive)

• reconcilable? ILP as a management tool and a way to gather information – CP as a strategy and way of doing the job

• ILP should support CP initiatives and street level police work (using intelligence both at strategic and operational management)

• Community policing is about building trust – intelligence gathering should not spoil this (it should be open: for what purposes, for the benefit of the particular community…)
"Generalized trust" as a special mentality and phenomenon

- Trust is partly a pre-condition for successful community safety initiatives (96% of the Finns trust the police)
- Partly this is generalized trust: we do trust each other, our neighbors, government,..
- but also an outcome of community policing style, peaceful and rather low crime society, still quite well functioning welfare society and social security
- BUT community policing and community safety initiatives also produce and create trust and confidence
- Loyalty to society / belonging, inclusiveness and integration
Accountability / community safety partnerships and initiatives

- performance management: who is accountable, for what, to whom and how?
- not very well developed yet (evaluations, measurement of results, should be part of all public sector initiatives, but for instance in Finland at local level they are rare)
- how to measure common achievements, success / failures, results, outcome? (citizen surveys, panels, feelings of safety, fear of crime…)
Public value, shared value (significant both locally and in whole society)

- value for money, public value, shared value -> legitimacy, trust in the police and the authorities in general
- **Public value** (Mark H. Moore 1995): public value as an outcome of social innovations like community safety initiatives, projects and programs (public-people-partnerships)
- **Shared value** (Michael E. Porter 2012): (in public-private-partnerships) integrating societal improvement into economic value creation (of, for instance, private security businesses)