CCi

CUTTING CRIME
IMPACT

Cutting
— Crime
Impact

www.cuttingcrimeimpact.eu

University of
Salford
MANCHESTER

DSP

university of
groningen

POLITIE

Greater Manchester
POLICE

Estonian Police and Border Guard Board

POLICIA
MUNICIPAL
LISBOA

LANDESKRIMINALAMT
NIEDERSACHSEN

Contact Us . info@cuttingcrimeimpact.eu

Generalitat de Catalunya
Departament
d'Interior

DPT-i
Institut für angewandte
Präventionsforschung

LOBA CUSTOMER
EXPERIENCE
DESIGN

www.cuttingcrimeimpact.eu

DELIVERABLE 5.1

Review of ethical, legal & social issues impacting Community Policing

Deliverable Type
Report

Work Package
WP 5

Dissemination
Public

Month and Date of Delivery
Month 11, August 2019

Leader
RUG

Authors
Dr Oskar J. Gstrein, RUG
Anno Bunnik, RUG
Prof Andrej Zwitter, RUG

CONTRIBUTORS

NAME	ORGANISATION
DR OSKAR GSTREIN	RUG
ANNO BUNNIK	RUG
PROF. DR. ANDREJ ZWITTER	RUG

PEER REVIEWS

NAME	ORGANISATION
PROFESSOR CAROLINE L. DAVEY	USAL
ANDREW B. WOOTTON	USAL

REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	DATE	REVIEWER	MODIFICATIONS
1.0	07/08/2019	PROFESSOR CAROLINE L. DAVEY	Formatting and minor edits

Table of Contents

1   Executive Summary

- While the 'Peelian principles' as basis of modern Community Policing (CP) seem to be uncontested in the Cutting Crime Impact (CCI) consortium, a more detailed and maybe timely definition is hard to come by.

- There seem to be commonalities and differences of the concepts used in Portugal and Spain ('Proximity Policing'), the United Kingdom ('Neighbourhood Policing'), and in Germany ('Citizen-oriented police work' or 'Territorial police work'). Nevertheless, in absence of a precise definition, the three values trust, confidence, and legitimacy provide the essential building blocks for modern community policing.

- The CCI community policing state-of-the-art review reveals three issues that are discussed in this report: police presence in communities, citizens engagement, as well as prioritising community concerns.

- Despite the fact that community policing seems to be a traditional concept, its current shape is heavily influenced by wider developments taking place in recent years, such as the re-definition of the relationship between the individual and society which is catalysed by globalisation and digitalisation.

- Arguably, the persistent ambiguity around the terms 'community' and 'good governance' are of particular interest for community policing. We submit that a detailed and more granular understanding is worth while exploring, especially in the context of digitalisation.

- We suggest that LEAs adopt community policing to increasingly consider communities of memory as well as psychological communities, rather than merely communities of place.

- The main ethical concerns relating to community policing circle around the issue of trust in LEAs, the use of discretion by frontline officers, and the problem of stigmatisation of environments and community areas.

- The social concerns of community policing are closely linked to the ethical concerns, such as fairness and trustworthiness of police among all communities and groups.

- The strength of community policing is its strong focus on a proactive problem-solving mentality.

- The primary weakness of community policing is the lack of systematic review and evaluation of the underlying premise that upholds community policing.

.

2 Introduction

In European Union (EU) member states, Community Policing (CP) is closely tied to trust, confidence and legitimacy (Davey et al. 2019, p. 6). These three values are central to the relationship between state (agencies) and citizens. Therefore, it is perhaps no surprise that community policing has a long history, tracing back to the principles developed in 1829 in the United Kingdom (UK) under the leadership of Sir Robert Peel. Although the term 'Community Policing' sees different variations such as 'Neighbourhood Policing', 'Proximity Policing', 'Public Service Policing', or 'Citizen-oriented Policing/bürgernahe Polizeiarbeit' throughout historical developments and in different states such as the UK, Portugal, Spain, and Germany (Davey et al. 2019, p.9, p. 24, p.36, p. 46) the common denominator of law enforcement through 'policing by consent' (Association of Chief Police Officers 2012) and engagement with the community remains. What all of these approaches to create an 'ethical police force' (Davey et al. 2019, p. 9) seem to have in common is the intention to create safe space by close interaction with the community, inclusion of community expectations, as well as requiring actions of the general population that is subject to the activities of law enforcement agencies (LEAs). Hence, community policing focuses first and foremost on public engagement, which evokes several social, ethical and legal questions that are addressed in this report.

Davey et al. (2019, p. 6) identify three aspects that are central to community policing: "providing a visible police presence; actively engaging with local citizens; and prioritising the concerns of local communities." These aspects raise pertinent questions, such as: How should active engagement with citizens look like? What are the consequences of heavy police presence in certain communities? How can LEAs, with their own mandate and targets, prioritise local concerns? These and related questions are analysed and discussed in this report. It is submitted that the ethical, legal and social issues of community policing cannot be addressed in a vacuum, but touch upon similar challenges relating to the use and deployment of proactive policing models such as (open-source) intelligence-led policing, problem-oriented policing, and predictive policing. Additionally, all of these are linked to an ongoing trend towards digitalisation of LEA activities, as well as the digitalisation of societal life in general (Bayerl and Jacobs 2017, p.247-248).

Finally, the Cutting Crime Impact (CCI) state-of-the-art review (Davey et al. 2019) provided an overview of **community policing** approaches in four European regions: Catalonia, Greater Manchester, Lisbon and Lower-Saxony. Each of these regions have their own distinct societal make-up, LEAs and security problems. While aiming at identifying common themes, this report recognises these differences.

2.1   Scope

We base our observations on a literature review plus the state-of-the-art report produced by the CCI consortium. Consequently, this deliverable consists of a conceptual (section 3) and empirical investigation (section 5). We combine those with suggestions for creating a holistic approach consisting of the three lenses focusing on ethical, legal and social concerns (section 4). This setup will enable us to develop our findings from scratch and apply them in an empirical setting based on the observations of the consortium. Finally, conclusions and recommendations seek to improve the development of community policing through the production of toolkits, the intended end-result of CCI.

As already mentioned, while the 'Peelian principles' as basis of modern community policing seem to be uncontested in the CCI consortium, a more detailed and maybe timely definition is hard to come by. The commonalities and differences of the concepts used in Portugal and Spain ('Proximity Policing'), the UK ('Neighbourhood Policing'), and in Germany ('Citizen-oriented police work' or 'Territorial police work') are certainly worthwhile to explore in detail, but this task goes beyond the scope and purpose of this report. Nevertheless, as concluded by Davey et al. (2019) there seems to be widespread consensus that in absence of a precise definition, the three values trust, confidence, and legitimacy provide the essential building blocks for modern community policing.

2.2   Approach

This report deals with the social, ethical and legal implications of community policing and is scheduled for completion in the early stages of the toolkit design process. Hence, the approach of this paper is in between a conceptual and empirical investigation. We begin with exploring questions such as: What is at stake for our police forces, citizens and communities when LEAs start developing and implementing community policing? This is based on a literature review. Following on, an in-depth analysis of the state-of-the-art report (Davey et al. 2019) underpins the empirical investigation.

2.3   Purpose

This report serves as starting point to inform the participants of the DesignLab about salient social, ethical and legal considerations. The design process will include LEA officers, LEA staff, experts as well as academics. By including a conceptual and empirical review in the early stages of the design process, the project consortium seeks to 'frontload' ethics in the design of new technologies, systems and toolkits (Van den Hoven 2007). The reason for setting up the process in this way is grounded in literature on human-centred 'design-thinking' and value-sensitive design. Human-centred design thinking as an approach is based on, amongst others, consideration and involvement of the user in the design process (Giacomin 2014). Direct stakeholders (e.g. law enforcement) are involved in the design process, whereas the interests of indirect stakeholders (e.g. citizens and communities) are considered

in this report. Value-sensitive design is complementary as it is based on the mutually constitutive relationship between humans and/or human values with technologies, which are increasingly part of policing approaches.

3 Conceptual investigation – General ethical and HR concerns based on literature review

3.1 Why do ethics and human rights matter for CCI and Community Policing?

Community policing is about fostering trust, confidence and legitimacy. All of these objectives promote social cohesion which is essential for the success of the work of LEAs (Sučić and Karlović 2017, p. 11,12). They require long-term visions, decisions based on values, strategic policies, and sufficient resources to put them into action. In the legal order of the EU, these fundamental values are expressed in more detail through human rights, democracy and the rule of law. Starting to elaborate on those at the very beginning of the primary sources of EU law, the preamble of the treaty on the European Union (TEU) expresses that states adhere 'to the principles of liberty, democracy and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and of the rule of law.' Article 2 TEU sentence 1 clarifies that the 'Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities.' This should be considered together with Article 10 TEU paragraph 1, which clarifies that the 'functioning of the Union shall be founded on representative democracy.' Hence, these provisions express that LEAs in the EU are bound by the rule of law, promote human dignity as expressed in detail through individual fundamental rights and freedoms, and are controlled through representative democracy. All of these principles seem to go very well together with the original ideas of Sir Robert Peele, who arguably aimed at putting the community at the basis of law enforcement, rather than considering community policing a top-down activity in which force is used to tame the masses and extinguish crime (Davey et al. 2019, p. 9-11).

Nevertheless, the work of LEAs in the context of community policing and the concrete dimension of a proactive approach raises the question on the appropriate relationship between the community, the individual, and the state. While it is obvious that police need to monitor and be present in communities, it is difficult to decide how much presence is enough, and whether too much monitoring and state-led action is resulting in the creation of a 'police state', which can be facilitated by the use of modern technology (Osborne and Cutler, 2019). For example, when using community policing as a measure to counter terrorism (Sumpter 2016, p. 10-14), there is on the one hand the need to thoroughly understand a community that might be diverse and deprived of opportunity, which at the same time raises the risk that the increased LEA activity leads to stigmatisation of individuals and

groups. Hence and as elaborated upon in the CCI state-of-the-art review, such activities are complex and require to be able to command a sufficiently high number of agents carrying out the bonding and trust-building with the community (Davey et al. 2019, p. 22).

In theory, it seems easy to reconcile what has been stated in the two paragraphs above by concluding that LEAs operating on the basis of democratic decisions, the rule of law, and human rights express those values through proactive action and collaboration with communities. However, the more we move away from this abstract observation to the level of concrete individual application, the more it will be difficult to find those common values in individuals that may not wish to specifically engage in society, or who want to live their lives being left alone by LEAs. It is difficult to bridge this obligation to care and prevent on the one hand, with the necessity to provide individual autonomy on the other. In essence, we can therefore state that much of the success of community policing depends on the ability of LEAs to persuade individuals to become active members of a community and law-abiding citizens, making direct enforcement of the law the exception rather than the norm.

3.2   Proactive action, networked governance and the state-society relation

Despite the fact that community policing seems to be a relatively traditional concept, its current shape is heavily influenced by wider developments taking place in recent years, such as the re-definition of the relationship between the individual and society which is catalysed by globalisation and digitalisation. To understand this changing reality better, Hazenberg and Zwitter propose to distinguish three modes of governance:

- Mode 1 governance: traditional command and control structures mostly embedded in the state.

- Mode 2 governance: more horizontal forms of governance that include private actors and can be distinguished into (a) public-private governance, (b) non-autonomous self-governance, and (c) autonomous self-governance.

- Mode 3 governance: governance structures outside and governance processes within network structures characterised by changing and multiple roles of actors, and the necessity to identify roles depending on network clusters and policy domains (Hazenberg and Zwitter 2017, p. 184-209).

Hence, from fighting crime to providing health care and across the board, we can identify two relevant patterns:

- The increasing focus by governmental actors to taking proactive measures with the objective of preventing future problems, such as crime, and;

- The rise of networked mode 3 governance in contrast to traditional mode 1 or 2 governance.

Put together, a timely and relevant interpretation of community policing by government agencies could be to consider it as an investment in proactive approaches that are oriented towards preventing future problems. Often, this involves a network of partners collaborating on a shared mission, cooperating predominantly in mode 3 governance, rather than mode 1 or 2. The attention to invest in proactive policies goes back several decades, such as a critical government report in the UK that called for more proactive law enforcement in the early 1990s (Audit Commission 1993). The trend towards digitalisation, the use of big data, and the opportunities provided through automated decision-making have further increased the opportunities for state agencies to take preventative action based on data-driven insights (Mayer-Schönberger and Cukier 2013). Proactive action is closely linked to networked governance and the availability of large amounts of (personal) data, the velocity of transfer, as well as the increased capabilities of processing and analysis. Hence, networked approaches have gained more traction over traditional bureaucratic governance models in recent years (Castells 2011). Considering community policing in this light, it could become an interesting example of how traditional fields of law enforcement are adapting to challenges and themes of their time, as it brings police, other (public) actors and citizens together to co-produce safety and security.

3.3   What concepts and theories apply?

Arguably, the persistent ambiguity around the terms 'community' and 'good governance' are of particular interest for community policing. As Correia (2000) explores the roots of community policing he elaborates convincingly that the notion of community in community policing is often ill-defined. For example, do we speak of the geographical community residing in the precinct of territorial police force X or Y? And do we approach particular neighbourhoods that have a high number of migrants or minority groups through these prisms, as a minority or migrant community? This issue gets even more complex when considering that with the use of digital tools and statistical analysis individuals can be (sub-)divided into groups while being unaware of this fact, or the assumptions made on the organisational structure and their role within the group (Taylor, van der Sloot & Floridi, 2017). While avoiding at this stage to open up a deep philosophical discussion on the individual and the group in the context of community policing, Communitarianism allows us to classify three types of communities (Bell 2016):

- Communities of place

- Communities of memory

- Psychological communities.

Police forces by default have a territorial scope, mindset and mandate. Consequently, policing approaches in this domain often focus on the 'community of place', regardless whether this might be appropriate from the point of view of the respective individuals. The geographical area that they serve is broken down in different neighbourhoods in which community policing approaches are

implemented. It is no surprise that this first conceptualisation of community is mostly invoked in community policing. However, communities of memory and psychological communities are important to take into account. Communities of memories consist of nations (such as the Brits or Germans, with a shared history and collective memory) but also of ethnic or religious minorities (such as the Kurds or Shia Muslims, with an equally shared history and collective memory). Community policing invokes questions how these communities are approached and included. The third category of psychological community is invoked when groups of people collaborate and have high levels of trust. Examples of this include the family, work, school and sports teams. This category differs from the other two insofar as it is not necessarily based on geographical location and typically involves more face-to-face interaction (Bell 2016). This category is closely linked to community policing, which also seeks to increase trust and co-operation.

The second relevant concept for community policing is 'good governance', which is gaining increasing traction in both academia and global politics in recent years. Parameters for good governance have been adopted by the United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commission (OHCHR n.d.):

- Transparency

- Responsibility

- Accountability

- Participation

- Responsiveness (to the needs of the people).

All of the above factors are of relevance to community policing approaches, and especially participation and responsiveness: visible police presence that engages with the public is a form of participation, or participatory governance. Prioritising the needs of communities and taking a problem-oriented approach is akin to responsiveness to the needs of the people. At least on paper, community policing has significant overlap with modern ideas on good governance as adopted by the United Nations (UN).

4 Holistic approach: ethical, legal and social concerns

4.1 Ethical

This section addresses several ethical concerns related to community policing, notably the issue of trust in police, the use of discretion by frontline officers and the problem of stigmatisation of environments and community areas. This list is not conclusive. Yet it allows for providing an overview of salient aspects that should be addressed when designing community policing toolkits.

Police fairness and trust in policing

One of the primary ethical concerns deals with the relationship between the police and the local community that it collaborates with. Coombs (1998) warns that community policing can result in the unfair targeting of lower social classes and minorities, with the potential to undermine trust in policing among these communities. Consequently, being fair and trustworthy to all is one of the foremost ethical concerns for community policing. For the scope and purpose of this report it seems inappropriate to get into a deep philosophical discussion about the meaning of fairness and trust (see e.g. Geert, Craig and Pelsmaekers, 2014). However, we wish to highlight that the (full or partial) automatisation of LEA activities related to community policing (e.g. Predictive Policing, automated surveillance using facial recognition, etc.) increasingly requires the management of LEAs to develop a better, more granular, and more transparent understanding of these terms in order to being able to communicate such internally and externally. Evidently, a simple 'computer says no!' (Lucas and Williams, 2004) will not suffice to meaningfully explain decisions that were supported by automated processes or findings. This benign statement is important to remember however, since in order to avoid over-reliance on technology and a 'black box society' (Pasquale, 2015) it is necessary to have detailed policies on the selection, combination, analysis, use, and communication of the use of (personal) data and consequential actions in place (Richardson, Schultz and Crawford, 2019, p. 225–227).

Discretion of first line officers

Community policing brings front line officers in close contact to the public and often involves dealing with non-serious crimes and disruptions of public space. Most people, however, do not want the enforcement of the law all of the time, such as for jaywalking (which the authors have done numerous times). Therefore, community policing invokes a high degree of discretion of first line officers, which is subject to potential misuse (Coombs 1998). In practice, minority groups could be unfairly treated, or perceive this to be the case, with the potential that segments of society have little faith in the police.

Stigmatisation of areas

In the CCI deliverable on ethical, legal, and social issues of Predictive Policing (4.1.) we have already discussed this issue intensely (Gstrein, Bunnik and Zwitter, 2019, p. 19). Hence, it should be sufficient to restate that increased LEA activity in certain areas can potentially have stigmatising effects for an area and the individuals living in it. As already outlined, this can be a particular concern if 'traditional stigmas' are increasingly supported by badly selected or prematurely used data sourced from private or public parties. Additionally, we would like to note that the state-of-the-art report on community policing highlighted that stigmatisation of community policing was primarily an ethical concern (Davey *et al.* 2019, p. 49). While it is largely unclear which kind of ethical dimension is alluded to and in which context, we wish to add that the stigmatisation of areas can have very tangible and material consequences for individuals. For example, the houses or businesses they own might decrease in value, or they might not be hired for a job or gain other opportunities for individual development since their existence is tied to a certain address in a deprived area (Gstrein & Ritsema van Eck 2018, p. 75-79).

4.2   Legal

Community policing is at the core of the national security domain and therefore the law of the EU has practically no applicability at first sight. Despite what has already been stated earlier on the relationship between LEAs and society when reading and interpreting constitutional EU law provisions and the legal order of the EU as such, there is no direct applicability of these provisions to the concrete activities of LEAs in member states. Rather, they have to be understood as a manifestation of European heritage that is shared among member states – similar to the fundamental rights provision in Article 6 paragraph 3 TEU which is the nucleus of fundamental rights law in the Union. Hence, as stated in Article 4 paragraph 2 TEU the EU '[…] shall respect […] essential State functions, including ensuring the territorial integrity of the State, maintaining law and order and safeguarding national security. In particular, national security remains the sole responsibility of each Member State.' Even when reading this together with the principle of sincere cooperation in Article 4 paragraph 3 TEU that means that per se community policing is a clear member state domain.

However, and as we also outlined in this report when discussing new trends in governance and the way digitalisation affects community policing, cooperation within the EU and across national borders does become relevant when addressing 'innovative' forms of crime, new tools for LEAs, and cross-border threat scenarios affecting community policing such as online-radicalisation, or terrorism. Therefore, a more holistic approach reveals that community policing might be affected by sector specific EU regulation, such as for example when considering the use of biometrical data initially collected by private parties used subsequently for LEA purposes (Jasserand 2018).

4.3   Social

The primary social concerns of community policing are rooted in the ambiguity of the term (Herbert 2001). How can police forces define and understanding the community and their needs? What community or communities are we talking about in the first place? And what if a community has particular desires and expectations that come at the costs of other individuals and groups? Coombs (1998, p. 1371) posits the hypothetical case in which the community in an affluent area desire to get "undesirables", from lower classes or other racial groups, off the streets. This example highlights that the action on the needs of a community can have negative consequences for others. Hence, these social concerns of community policing are closely linked to the previously discussed ethical concerns, such as fairness and trustworthiness of police among all communities and groups. If certain groups perceive unfair treatment, this would undermine community policing.

5 Empirical investigation

5.1 State of the art review

The state-of-the-art review by the CCI consortium (Davey et al., 2019) provides an overview of four regions that are engaged in community policing: Catalonia, Greater Manchester, Lisbon and Lower-Saxony. The comparative analysis of the four community policing models is approached through the framework of the three common issues of community policing:

- Visible police presence in communities;

- Citizens engagement;

- Prioritising community concerns.

Visible police presence

The presence of police officers and staff is a key feature in all four models. Typically, this entails police officers on patrol in neighbourhoods ("the bobby on the beat"). An interesting case study that stands out in the review is the Safe School Programme (PES) in Portugal. 'Proximity Agents' are employed at schools to be in close contact with students and improve the relationship with the general public (Davey et al. 2019). What makes this example special is that it is not targeted at a community of space (geographical location) as most community policing approaches, but instead at a psychological community (schools). It would be interesting to see how such a concept could also be expanded to the digital space, where minors could have the opportunity to be educated and exchange with LEAs, which in turn need to avoid to limit the space for personal development in manner that is unnecessary and disproportionate.

In this and other contexts it is important to remember, that Police presence does not always equal having officers and staff on the ground. A good example here is the 2018 "Operation Valiant" by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to educate the public on risks of personal robberies. Part of this operation included working with Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) to post warning signs across its network. As such, police presence takes the form of signs and publics messages, signifying to the public that the police are aware of certain dominant crime types and are actively pursuing its reduction. As such, visible police presence is not an objective in itself but closely linked to the other two features of community policing, citizen engagement and prioritising citizen concerns.

Citizen engagement

Citizens engagement is the second ingredient of community policing. It is also a logical consequence of having visible police presence in communities. To paint a picture: imagine having significant, visible police presence that does not talk to, or otherwise engage, with local citizens. This would perhaps stir

up a perception of military occupation instead of policing – and undoubtedly erode trust and legitimacy. In all four case studies under review here, citizen engagement is a major element of community policing. A good example is the implementation of a Mediation Unit at the Public Order Policing Brigade in Catalonia. The unit is tasked to keep open channels of communication with radical groups with the objective to prevent (political) demonstrations from escalating (Davey et al. 2019, p. 41).

There is evidence that participation of the public in co-producing safety and security can be problematic. For citizens to be willing to take part in this process, they must trust the police as a prerequisite. However, trust is supposed to be the outcome of community policing meaning that in the absence of trust this model becomes a catch 22 situation (Davey et al. 2019, p. 50). The state-of-the-art review does not allow us to deal with this concern in more detail: in lieu of evidence of significant trust deficits in the four countries under review it is not possible to explore if such a problem either exists, and possibly deters certain communities or groups from collaboration with policing.

Another realm of citizen engagement concerns the online space (Bayerl and Jacobs 2017, p. 247-268). Engagement with citizens on social media such as Facebook, Twitter or Instagram is underdeveloped in most of Germany. However, Lower Saxony is more active in this domain that other regions (Davey et al. 2019, p. 50). In the United Kingdom, online engagement by the police skyrocketed following the 2011 London riots. For the sector, it proved to be a 'critical moment' to make better use of social media for intelligence gathering as well as community engagement (Bunnik n.d.).

However, the success of online citizen engagement also seems to hinge on understanding the added value of the tools and their relationship with the existing environment. In other words, it seems critical to blend in existing societal structures when thinking about the digitalisation of communication. To elaborate on this point, the importance of local or urban security councils was outlined in the state-of-the-art review (Davey et al. 2019, p. 43). Those councils are venues to discuss security related concerns in a public forum. Whereas throughout the state-of-the-art review it seemed as if these bodies have the trust of the community and are able to tie it closer together with LEAs, this must not always be the case. For example, in the city of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil the Institute for Technology and Society (ITS) has developed a chatbot with whom the population of an area can share its concerns (ITS, 2018). The idea behind the mediation of a chatbot called 'Ada' is that concerns are coming to light that would otherwise not be on the agenda of the council since they are too sensitive or problematic for the people who steer the proceedings. Whether this initiative is successful or not remains to be seen, but it is certainly an interesting example for citizen engagement and how it can be shaped using modern technologies.

Prioritising concerns of citizens

Prioritising the concerns of communities is the third and final aspect of community policing. As explained earlier, this relates closely to modern ideas on good governance. In the case studies

discussed here, we witness ample evidence of police forces that are keen to take the concerns of citizens serious. In Catalonia, for instance, the Generalitat Police-Mossos d'Esquadra has a Central Services division that focuses on the needs of vulnerable groups and monitors specific areas of citizens security. This is accompanied by proximity policing which gets tailored to the situation at a local level. In our view, more research is needed here to understand better how citizens are included in the process of prioritising their concerns.

The Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP), meanwhile, has created a 'Security Group' in 2010 for the neighbourhood Alta de Lisboa. This group is founded on six principles related to community policing, including "consultation and engagement of local community in the process of planning, implementation and valuation of the community policing should be supported" (Davey et al. 2019, p. 30). This was operationalised through focus groups with residents and partner organisations. As indicated in the section above mentioning the example of Rio de Janeiro, such a process might also benefit from the involvement of digital tools such as chatbots, messaging apps, or online forums. As it has been shown in the case of Lisbon, one of the outcomes of this process is more attention to prevent crime occurring to vulnerable people, such as the elderly and youngsters. This outcome is also witnessed in Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom. Community policing, as a policing model, often leads to more attention to vulnerable groups.

5.2   Potential Strengths and weaknesses

The main strength of community policing, and the case studies presented here, is its strong focus on a proactive problem-solving mentality. Despite numerous and diverse challenges, from austerity to terrorism, LEAs are keen to implement projects with and for communities. The co-production of safety and security with citizens and communities is hard to oppose, at least in European societies where inclusion and participation are important values. Furthermore, the outcome of community policing is repeatedly more attention to crime prevention for vulnerable groups.

The primary weakness of community policing is the lack of systematic review and evaluation of the underlying premise that upholds community policing. The uncertainty of the effectiveness of community policing is linked to ongoing debates about the validity of 'broken windows theory' or 'broken windows policing' – a philosophy that posits that visible signs of crime and damage in an area will lead to further crime. Once the police deal with these visible issues, the local community can take back control and act as guardians of the neighbourhood (Herbert 2001). The validity of this theory remains contested. This translates well to the review of community policing projects: despite some positive results that community policing can reduce victimisation (Davey et al. 2019), it remains unclear the extent to which community policing contributes to reducing crime.

6 Conclusion and Recommendations

Considering that community policing is one of the core activities of LEAs across Europe and the world, it is not surprising to see that cultural context and societal differences are important in its execution. Nevertheless, we can clearly identify common themes and principles. From a traditional perspective, the 'Peelian principles' developed in the UK in the 19th century seem to be relevant for all LEAs when discussing and carrying out community policing. Analysing the CCI state-of-the-art review these principles can be tied to the values trust, confidence, and legitimacy. From a contemporary perspective, it is interesting to see how LEAs need to address the same overarching trends.

We have focused particularly on globalisation and digitalisation, as they are catalysts for the re-definition of the relationship between the individual and society. We have elaborated on this in the context of proactive action and the shift towards networked governance, moving increasingly away from command and control structures or horizontal forms of governance. Additionally, community policing is affected by global issues such as (online-)radicalisation or terrorism. Hence, the diminishing importance of territorial restrictions combined with the digital space as an important venue of interaction requires LEAs to be both: aware of how these developments affect the communities they work with and become savvy actors capable of innovating in their practices. We suggest that LEAs integrate these findings in their work, increasingly considering communities of memory as well as psychological communities, rather than merely communities of place. This together with a recognition of a networked society might help LEAs to continue to make community policing a fruitful exercise.

Finally, despite the need to constantly adopt community policing to a rapidly changing society, particularly this changing landscape seems to require an emphasis on the traditional values of community policing. For most individuals, community policing will be one of the most prominent areas where they interact with the state. Hence, visible police presence in communities, engaging citizens, and the ability to effectively prioritise concerns in communities is not only essential for LEAs to co-shape the creation of a society worth living in. Rather, it is an essential question for society in general. Therefore, the success of community policing is vital for society at large, and deserves the allocation of appropriate resources.

7 Bibliography

Audit Commission (1993) *Helping with enquiries: Tackling crime effectively*. London: HMSO.

Bayerl, P.S. and Jacobs, G. (2017) "Evaluating the Design and Implementation of COMMUNITY POLICING-Support Technologies: A Participatory Framework", in Bayerl, P. S. et al. [eds] *Community Policing – A European Perspective*, Springer 2017.

Bell, D. (2016), "Communitarianism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), retrieved from: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/communitarianism/

Bunnik, A. (n.d.) *Policing the Future? Assessing the implementation of Big Data by UK Law Enforcement*, PhD Dissertation, University of Groningen.

Bunnik, A. (2016) "Countering and Understanding Terrorism, Extremism, and Radicalisation in a Big Data Age", in A. Bunnik, A. Cawley, M. Mulqueen & A. Zwitter (eds), *Big Data Challenges: Society, Security, Innovation and Ethics*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 85-96.

Castells, M. (2011). *The rise of the network society* (Vol. 12). John wiley & sons.

Coombs, M. I. (1998) "The constricted meaning of community in community policing", *St. John's Law Review*, 72 (Issues 3-4), pp. 1367-1375.

Correia, M. E. (2000) "The conceptual ambiguity of community in community policing–Filtering the muddy waters". *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23(2), pp. 218-233.

Davey, C., Wootton, A.B., Guillén, F. Diniz, M. and van Soomeren, P. (2019) *"D2.4. Review of State of the Art: Community Policing"*, Cutting Crime Impact, June 2019.

Geert, J., Craig, R., Pelsmaekers, K. (2014), *Trust and Discourse: Organizational Perspectives*, Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2014.

Gstrein, O.J., Bunnik, A., Zwitter, A.J. (2019) *"Review of ethical, legal, and social issues impacting Predictive Policing"*, Cutting Crime Impact, June 2019.

Gstrein O.J., Ritsema van Eck G.J. (2018) "Mobile devices as stigmatizing security sensors: the GDPR and a future of crowdsourced 'broken windows'" *International Data Privacy Law*, Volume 8, Issue 1, February 2018, Pages 69–85, https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1093/idpl/ipx024

Hazenberg, J. L. J., Zwitter, A. (2017). "Network Governance im Big Data- und Cyber-Zeitalter". *Zeitschrift Für Evangelische Ethik*, 61(3), 184–209. https://doi.org/10.14315/zee-2017-0305

Herbert, S. (2001) "Policing the contemporary city: fixing broken windows or shoring up neo-liberalism?" *Theoretical criminology*, 5(4), pp. 445-466.

ITS (2018), *Conselhos Conectados de Segurança* via https://itsrio.org/pt/projetos/conselhos-conectados-de-seguranca/ - accessed 29 July 2019.

Jasserand, C. (2018) "Law enforcement access to personal data originally collected by private parties: Missing data subjects' safeguards in directive 2016/680?", *Computer Law & Security Review* 34 p. 154–165.

Lucas, M., Williams, D. (2004) *"Little Britain: The Complete Scripts and Stuff: Series One"*, HarperCollins Entertainment

Mayer-Schönberger, V. and Cukier, K. (2013) *"Big Data: A Revolution That Will Transform How We Live, Work, and Think"*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Osborne, H. and Cutler, S. (2019) "Chinese border guards put secret surveillance app on tourists' phones", *The Guardian* 2 July 2019 via https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jul/02/chinese-border-guards-surveillance-app-tourists-phones – accessed 29 July 2019.

Pasquale, F. (2015) *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Richardson, R. and Schultz, J. & Crawford, K. (2019) "Dirty Data, Bad Predictions: How Civil Rights Violations Impact Police Data, PP Systems, and Justice" (February 13, 2019). *New York University Law Review Online*, Forthcoming. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3333423

Sučić, I. and Karlović, R. (2017) "Community Policing in Support of Social Cohesion", in Bayerl, P. S. et al. [eds] *Community Policing – A European Perspective*, Springer 2017.

Sumpter, C. (2016) *"Community Policing to Counter Violent Extermism: Evident Potential and Challenging Realities"* S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Policy Report.

Taylor, L. van der Sloot, B. & Floridi, L. (2017) "Conclusion: What do we know about group privacy?", in L. Taylor et al. (eds), *Group Privacy, Philosophical Studies Series* 126, Springer.

The United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commission (n.d), *Good Governance and Human Rights*, retrieved from:
https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/Development/GoodGovernance/Pages/GoodGovernanceIndex.aspx

.