



# A New Reality for Police Leadership in Canada

***“I was asked to go to Europe and find what was interesting and applicable to a Canadian Policing environment - what I found was a model that was locally embedded to address local issues, with an over arching structure to allow national coordination to address trans-border and international events”***

***ISIS Team Member Supt. Mike Burns, Halifax Regional Police***

**The Report from the CACP’s**

**Institute for Strategic International Studies**

***ISIS 2006***

## Overview

The following “discussion paper” is the compilation of the collective experiences and observations made by the ISIS 2006 Research Teams during their classroom work in Canada and field study in Europe. The report’s structure mirrors the thought process utilized by the group in tackling the research question proposed.

The paper begins with a high level review of the present state of policing in Canada and flows from the presentations made to ISIS 2006 by various subject matter experts, independent research and the personal experiences of the ISIS 2006 team members and provides the groundwork for our study.

The paper next explores the observations, insights and assessments on policing across a number of countries in Europe and culminates in an analysis on how these models address the concept of integration and meet the tests of affordability, accountability, sustainability and ethics.

We then overlay our European experiences and findings on the current Canadian situation. The paper concludes with a discussion and recommendations on how ISIS 2006 believes policing in Canada can be better positioned for the future through an enhanced role of the CACP and the national police leadership community. **ISIS 2006 is calling for the development and adoption of a national policing strategy, built by police leaders and based upon a system of national standards of police service delivery.**

ISIS 2006 was asked to create “a turning point document” that advances thought on policing in Canada. Our product may not represent the definitive answer, but it is our hope that it stimulates the Canadian policing and criminal justice community to continue the discussion, and moreover, to advance the discussion to new levels.

### The ISIS 4-Phase Model of Problem-based Learning

#### Phase 1:

In the first phase of the program, participants examined and selected from among the most critical of themes and issues facing Canadian justice agencies, and identified exemplary models and practices from the international community.

#### Phase 2:

The next phase of the program focused on mission planning and team building. Participants developed skills and techniques for objective analysis and research.

#### Phase 3:

The third phase, the field study phase, had participants travelling in teams to conduct in-depth research and analysis on the selected study sites in Europe.

#### Phase 4:

The final results from the program were assembled and recommendations shared across the Canadian criminal justice sector. This document is the result of this process.

***"It is time for a clear agreement among all the players in the law enforcement community – in the federal, provincial and municipal governments – on level of service, funding arrangements, user input management and accountability."***<sup>1</sup>

Report of the Auditor General, Chapter 7.3, 2000

***"Will policing/governments suffer change or embrace the change and manage it?"***<sup>2</sup>

MacInnis & Associates: "Toward an Integrated Policy Framework", 2004

***"Police leadership must embrace the realization that it is their responsibility to come together and create the Canadian Policing team. Leadership must determine the strategic approach to ethics, or in the vacuum, the situation will make that determination for you."***<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Brian Grainger, Ethics Consultant, 2006

***"Every emergency is a local event, and for the first 72 hours, local must hold the fort."***<sup>4</sup>

Ontario Commissioner of Emergency Management Julian Fantino, 2006

***"Simply put, integrated policing sees police agencies for all jurisdictions working together at the ascending tactical, operational and strategic levels to provide seamless, effective police and law enforcement services that achieve the desired outcome of safety and security for Canadians."***<sup>5</sup>

Sussex Circle - An Integrated Policing Policy Framework - A Feasibility Assessment, 2005

***"The organisation of service delivery must be on a scale large enough to respond dynamically, but local enough to understand the diverse context within which it operates ... this will place new demands on leadership, oversight and support from government."***<sup>6</sup>

Closing the Gap: A Review of the 'Fitness for Purpose' of the Current Structure of Policing in England and Wales  
HM Inspector of Constabulary Denis O'Connor CBE, QPM, 2005

***"There is only one citizen and one dollar"***<sup>7</sup>

Chief Edgar MacLeod, Addressing ISIS 2006

## ABOUT ISIS 2006

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police developed and approved the Institute for Strategic International Studies (ISIS) in August 2004. ISIS 2006 is based upon a problem-based learning model that combines academic sessions and independent study with global field research into a variety of operational and management aspects of policing and justice administration.

ISIS 2006 has provided an exciting and unique executive learning opportunity, designed to develop Canada's current and future leaders in policing and related justice agencies, and to enhance the operating capabilities of the organizations that comprise the Canadian criminal justice community. The multi-phase program commenced in January 2006.

### Participants

The ISIS 2006 team consists of seventeen (17) senior police officers from across Canada divided into four study teams. The team make-up was as follows:

Agency	# of Candidates
Canadian Forces	1
Durham Regional Police	1
Halifax Regional Police	2
Ontario Provincial Police	2
Ottawa Police	1
RCMP-GRC	6
Sûreté du Québec	1
Toronto Police	1
Waterloo Regional Police	1
Winnipeg Police	1

### Program Director

Norm Taylor

### Program Advisory Committee

Chief Jack Ewatski, President CACP  
Commissioner Gwen Boniface, OPP  
Chief Larry Gravill, Waterloo Regional PS  
Commissioner Giuliano Zaccardelli, RCMP  
Trevor McCagherty, CACP Sr. Program Advisor  
Peter Cuthbert, CACP Executive Director

ISIS 2006 believes that the ability to sustain the present police model in Canada is facing major challenges. The challenges presented come from many directions and although they may impact services differently based on the make-up of the agency and the local environment, all contribute to the decreased ability of “policing in Canada” to operate effectively and efficiently.

The Canadian policing community, together with others in the criminal justice system and all levels of government are seeking a newly articulated model for policing that is affordable, accountable, sustainable, and ethical.

Again, there exists a multitude of drivers that affect police agencies. In an attempt to consolidate them for comprehension, the following represent 4 significant sources of pressure that continually arose throughout the sensing processes that led to the ISIS theme:

- Changing roles amid non-police partners, resources and agencies;
- Shifting expectations among community members, individual taxpayers, and governance bodies at various levels;
- Evolving judicial decisions and legislative impacts, and
- Integration, interoperability, and the effects of globalization and technology on police operations.

### Changing Roles

The emerging role of police in the 1990's is one characterized by expansion and change. Therefore, “there is considerable uncertainty on the part of both the police and public about the role of the police in Canadian society”<sup>8</sup>. This is further exacerbated by a system in which there is disconnect between roles and the funding sources of three separate levels of government.

Conflicting messages from the community on what they want provides an environment where clarity of direction is made more problematic. An informed public is looking more closely at the value they receive for their money. The taxpayer must get the value for what they are paying for regardless of whether they are paying taxes at the municipal, provincial or federal levels.

The trust the citizens place in us must not be taken for granted, and we cannot afford to lose it. Ethics must form the basis of our decision making. Police leadership must embrace the realization that it is their responsibility to come together and create the Canadian Policing team.

Human Resource Management is a major issue now and all indications point to the staffing situation becoming worse over time. The Mini-Survey of Human Resources Practices - August 2005, conducted by the Canadian Police Sector Council indicates a number of vulnerabilities, some of which are:

- no sharing of best practices
- no strategic sector wide approach
- more research needs to be done to fully map-out the HR “topography” – we need to drill down on a number of areas<sup>9</sup>

## The Police Capacity Box

These drivers collectively are impacting our capacity to deliver services to the citizens. If we use the analogy of a box to describe the collective capacity of the policing resources in Canada and the expected deliverables define the contents, it has been suggested that the box is presently full and our capacity to respond has eroded tremendously<sup>10</sup>. New initiatives will not fit in the box and in order to handle these emerging issues we must look strategically at our capacity.

“ There is only one  
citizen and one  
dollar <sup>7</sup> ”

We have options. Some will suggest that all we need is a bigger box. This could be accomplished by adding more police resources to meet the need. Others advocate making hard decisions and removing things from the box in order to make more room for the new items. A third option may be to look at how the box is packed and see if it can be repacked in a more efficient and organized fashion.

There is certainly a push to increase the size of the box and this approach has merit, but do our communities have the fiscal capacity to do this? And if so, would this be sustainable?

The suggestion that items be removed from the box has not been without its detractors as it is seen as reducing service to the public. Everything the police do must be done in the public interest. Is the public well served when services are reduced based on a lack of capacity by the agency<sup>11</sup>?

## The ISIS 2006 Research Question

Can the answer be found in the third option? Could repacking the box in a different fashion make policing better in Canada?

The discussion of these issues led ISIS 2006 to focus its research efforts on the following study questions, which were conveyed to the European host agencies in advance of the site visits.

***Canadian police leadership is seeking a means of more effectively and efficiently deploying 85,000 police service members - within the overall context of Public Safety - in the future. The concept of “integration” has been offered as a means of achieving this.***

- *How have European models of deployment impacted on sustainability, accountability, affordability and ethics in European Police Agencies?*
- *Do these models begin to present or validate a workable definition of “integration”?*
- *If so, is integration the means to achieving the desired model in the Canadian context?*
- *What framework is required for this to be successful?*



## Europe

Informed by its initial research, ISIS 2006 identified locations throughout Europe where policing models might provide insight on ways to address affordability, accountability, sustainability and ethics. Further, efforts were made to determine if concepts of integration were used to meet these challenges.

### **Canadian Policing in Context**

**The ISIS 2006 research was premised on the following set of assumptions concerning the present state of policing in Canada:**

- *Policing in Canada is organized on historical and Constitutional lines*
- *It is aligned with municipal, provincial and federal government levels*
- *Funding flows along these lines*
- *Patterns of crime and needs for public safety do not adhere to these lines*
- *The core of the police-public relationship occurs at the local level.*
- *Canadians must be safe and protected from threats from all levels of crime*
- *Canada does not have a national approach to handling local, multi-jurisdictional, national and international crime*
- *To the citizen, the relative importance of local versus national-international is one of the moment*
- *Local perceptions and fears will drive the citizen's expectations of policing*
- *Service delivery in Canada is fragmented which limits the ability to respond effectively*
- *Public safety issues have been historically defined as being municipal, provincial or federal. Local is interpreted as municipal and national has been interpreted as federal*

### Integration

The governance of European policing has been subjected to important changes in the past two decades as a result of various political and economic drivers that are bringing the continent closer together. Mergers between national, regional and municipal police forces have triggered massive reshuffling of police organizations and the redefining of individual mandates. Vehicles for change in the governance of policing have created new and complex difficulties for the distribution of power and for police competencies alike.

Integration of police forces has taken many forms across Europe. Many European officials were reluctant to use the word "integration". Fusion, amalgamation or harmonization were used to describe the changes occurring within their country's police delivery. No matter, they were all describing similar consolidation or unified standards of police delivery.

***"Integration is just a word for political control – a consolidation of power that also serves to transfer responsibility and control from police to politicians"<sup>12</sup>***

A striking observation was, with rare exception, the move to integrate policing in European countries was not driven by police to address operational efficiencies. Integration typically flowed from the political direction of the various Ministries of the Interior, or in England's case, the Home Office.

At one end of the continuum, the answer was to merge police agencies into one national police force. In Austria, 45 separate police forces, distributed throughout 9 provinces, were joined into one. Similar trends can be found elsewhere. Conversely, Germany has maintained its 16 state police forces and federal police units and concentrated on an internal reallocation of roles and resources.

England is struggling with the Home Office goal of reducing the 43 separate police forces to a strategic force model of 8 to 12 agencies. Most notably, England is in the process of adopting national standards for policing. These standards define three distinct levels of criminality and establish the specific level of expertise and resources needed to investigate each. Furthermore these standards require information and intelligence sharing, establish protocols for incident command, and include national performance measures for evaluating police force effectiveness.

The experience in the Netherlands demonstrates that major structural reforms may achieve some administrative aims, but in the absence of a police-driven model of effectiveness, they will do little to enhance service delivery. In 1993, the Dutch Bill reorganized policing in the Netherlands along the lines of 25 regional police forces and one national policing service. The law provided latitude to police to harmonize their practices in order to be better integrated. Police leaders did not respond in a coordinated enough fashion to satisfy legislators. In 2005, the Netherlands police were once again confronted with state intervention intended to normalize procedures along national lines. The Leemhuis report of 2005 notes that without an “over-arching structure” police were basically left on their own and did not work well together to optimize police service delivery<sup>13</sup>. The threat of a political solution aimed at creating one national service forced police agencies to react. They are now working closer together to integrate information networks and procedures. Nonetheless, a political momentum is underway that will set the stage for the creation of one centralized police agency as was done in Austria. This approach does not enjoy the full support of police leaders, many of whom have concerns about the impact on local service delivery.

### Police Leadership and Coordination

Dr. Monica den Boer, Chair Professor of the *Internationalisation of the Police Function* at the *Politieacademie* – Police Academy of the Netherlands, argues that the ethical question about the integrity of government is omnipresent in an era where law enforcement accountability becomes fragmented between diverse agencies that produce many different actions<sup>15</sup>. It is in this context that the responsibility of police organizations to lead and coordinate their efforts in an optimal manner must be seen. The reformulation of ethical frameworks and accountability mechanisms in a complex environment should not wait until the wheels come off.

Professor den Boer mentions that democratic and legal accountability must be strengthened at national levels. On the other hand, it would be a fallacy to believe that accountability can be improved only through laws and regulations. Police organizations therefore have a commensurate responsibility to instill a subculture of working procedures and norms. National governments, which will be the prime center of activity for administering internal security governance, have to pursue actively a mix of accountability mechanisms ranging from governing at a distance (‘steering’) to co-production (‘networking’)<sup>16</sup>.

“ Like riding a bike, policing is the sort of activity that is thought about mainly when the wheels come off ”<sup>14</sup>

In Germany, the Conference of the Ministers of the Interior was created in 1954 in order to stimulate cooperation between the *Länder* (states) in the areas covered by domestic policy which includes policing. This governing body acts in a coordinating function on state and federal levels. Police working groups regularly meet to standardize police procedures, to propose legislative amendments and to coordinate police efforts. Subcommittees treat a

wide array of subjects which address management, operations and law enforcement, law and administration, information and communication technology, and matters concerning criminal investigations. The findings of the subcommittees and working groups are then tabled at the Conference of the Ministers of the Interior which meets twice a year.

**“ The police working groups of the Standing Conference of the Ministries of Interior are the keys that link police with government at the state and federal levels in Germany. Two-thirds of the work of this Standing Conference concerns police matters. Without this working body, there would be no coordination of police mandates on a national level in Germany<sup>18</sup>. ”**

*Dr. Axel Buschendorf  
Head of Public Security and Order Dept (Section III B) Berlin Senate of the Interior*

Ken Jones, president of the United Kingdom's ACPO – *Association of Chief Police Officers*, in his address to the ACPO 2006 annual conference, mentioned that the future of police service delivery is for police organizations to describe, to lead and to deliver. A vision and a voice are needed to bring this through. All this amounts to the way in which *police leadership is prepared to define itself*. Chief Jones calls for ACPO to be recognized as a statutory body by Government in order to affirm its true place in the traditional structure of policing in Great Britain<sup>17</sup>.

### Public Interest

Another important message of Chief Jones' address is the role of the public. He notes that the British system of policing is rooted in communities, and that it is accountable to these communities. Any police organizations, structures and reforms that are put in place must reinforce the local nature of policing. This principle must not be weakened, no matter how large the agencies are. Jones states that,

***“Policing, politics and vested interests make for a toxic mix. We must set aside narrow interests for the common good. Everything we do must be done in the public interest. Theirs must be the loudest voice.”<sup>19</sup>***

This principle was outlined by the British Intelligence and Security Committee's *Report into the London Terrorist Attacks on 7 July 2005*:

***“Whatever the outcome of the debate on the merging of police forces, we are concerned to ensure that standards on strategic and national issues – such as counter-terrorism – are improved and that policing is not removed from its local roots, thereby undermining attempts to improve knowledge at the local level. We will continue to monitor these developments.”<sup>20</sup>***

**“ All Politics and Policing are Local<sup>21</sup> ”**

Dr. den Boer is of the same opinion when she mentions that,

***“Internationalization, or even the formation of a national police force, does not necessarily have to be at the expense of local policing. On the contrary, in a context in which the subsidiary criterion is applied with some consistency, the***



***responsibility for dealing with transnational crime and security can be pushed towards the central level, while the responsibility for public disorder and petty crime can be devolved to the local level.<sup>22</sup>***

### Political Interests

When ISIS 2006 looked at the lessons learned in Europe and how they could be applied in Canada, it was agreed that any attempt to drive integration for reasons other than enhanced operations and service delivery will not survive the affordability, accountability, sustainability, and ethics test.

## **“ Politics has failed policing in Northern Ireland<sup>23</sup> ”**

In Ireland, it is clear that the state can only sustain their new model of policing with the continued influx of funds from the national government. In England, the vision of strategic restructuring of policing has a cost estimate in excess of half a billion pounds yet will not result in the hiring of any additional police resources. In the Netherlands, inaction on the part of police leaders to coordinate their actions has led to state intervention, driven by politics.

Amalgamation or integration should not be driven by politics. It should be the result of police leaders identifying operational efficiencies and coordinating policing efforts at all levels. Any attempts to implement a National Policing Strategy through the political process will not necessarily achieve the results that standards developed by police leaders would hope for.

## **The Momentum for Change in Canada**

ISIS 2006 examined several ongoing initiatives and developments across Canadian policing. Taken collectively, current trends suggest an environment exists that is well positioned to learn from the European experience, and one which might readily accept a new and enhanced level of police leadership in the development of a national policing model.

To bring the European experience into a Canadian context, ISIS 2006 refers to a research paper by the strategic policy consulting firm, Sussex Circle:

### A Canadian Governance Structure

***“Simply put, integrated policing sees police agencies for all jurisdictions working together at the ascending tactical, operational and strategic levels to provide seamless, effective police and law enforcement services that achieve the desired outcome of safety and security for Canadians.<sup>24</sup>”***

ISIS 2006 examined some of the ongoing domestic efforts in this regard with a view to their success and effectiveness in achieving an affordable, accountable, sustainable and ethical model of modern policing in Canada.

### The FPT Committee

The Government of Canada ultimately depends on local, provincial and federal police agencies to fulfill its policing mandates and responsibilities. These various jurisdictions create a wide variety of ways in which policing is viewed and applied in Canada. Considered on a national level, there presently is no formal structure or legislation which has a strategic vision to bring policing actions together in a coordinated fashion.

One government body which has been putting some attention to policing matters is the Federal / Provincial / Territorial (FPT) Heads of Prosecutions Committee. This working group was created in 1995 and brings together those who are responsible for criminal prosecutions in Canada. It is comprised of the Head of Prosecutions for each province, the Head of the Federal Prosecution Service – who also acts as permanent co-chair – as well as the local directors of prosecutions of each of the three territories. Ministers meet from two to three times a year to hold substantive discussions on a host of issues of importance to Canada's justice system such as sentencing, wrongful convictions, mega-trials, legal aid, the protection of vulnerable persons, the proceeds of crime, etc.

An inherent problem with this working group is that police leaders are not part of the formal structure. They are consulted on an occasional basis and in an inconsistent fashion. Compounding this is the fact that the ten provincial policing responsibilities vary significantly across the country. This fragmented situation creates a void between government and police leadership throughout the country which prevents an integrated policing structure, with a coordinated approach, from taking shape on a national level.

The province of Québec has developed and acted upon a strategic vision for policing on a provincial level. Like other major reforms which have occurred in Europe, the development of the Québec model was partly driven by political processes arising out of the Poitras Commission. The standards developed by this model have considerably enhanced police service delivery in the province and have proven to be affordable, accountable, sustainable and ethical. But, because Canadian policing mandates are not accountable to the federal level of government, the Québec model is not required to meet any Canadian standards. Other provinces could develop their own models of policing on a completely divergent level of governance. This in turn could lead to a situation similar to the Netherlands, where 25 regional agencies each approach policing in the manner they deem suitable for their population.

### The CACP's 'New Deal for Policing' Initiatives

In August 2004 the CACP membership passed Resolution #11-2204, addressing the issue of police governance. It called for...

*“...all levels of government in Canada to join together with police and governance associations in a public policy discussion on policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, with the intention of defining the roles and responsibilities of each order of government and establishing a governance structure to support police agencies and their bodies in operating Canada's multi-level policing environment.”<sup>25</sup>”*

In August of 2005, building on the intent of Resolution #11-2004, the CACP membership passed Resolution #1-2005, requesting both the federal and provincial governments to:

1. *Study and analyze the costs and operational and strategic implications of current policing arrangements*
2. *Confirm the roles and responsibilities of each order of government*
3. *Establish, with municipal governments, a policy framework to support police agencies, and*
4. *Define integrated policing as a concept and analyze the implications at the tactical, operational and strategic levels<sup>25</sup>.*

It is apparent from the content and tone of the resolutions noted above that the CACP is keenly aware of the challenges facing policing in Canada, now and in the future. It is interesting to note that their evaluation of the scope and complexities of these challenges over the past few years dovetails so well with the conclusions reached by ISIS 2006 following the overseas research portion of the program. It is apparent that geography and borders notwithstanding, the business of policing throughout the world is being shaped by very similar drivers and barriers.

ISIS 2006 would now suggest that the greatest opportunity for addressing these challenges lies in a persistent, even aggressive attention to the fourth point in CACP Resolution 1-2005. It speaks to the development of the very fundamentals upon which all other related initiatives must flow. Absent a workable, acceptable definition of 'integrated policing' and without absolute clarity around the strategic, tactical, and operational roles and responsibilities that naturally arise from that understanding, policing in Canada will continue to labor under the yoke of uncertainty and a lack of preparedness.

To date, it appears that most efforts to develop a national policy framework for policing in Canada have been based on the notion that 'government' – however defined – must be the moving force behind the initiative. This view persists even in the face of a demonstrated reluctance on the part of the various levels of Canadian government to become engaged in the process. As noted by Chief Edgar A. MacLeod, Past President of the CACP in his presentation to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities in June of 2006:

*"We were advised a few days ago that governments do not see integrated policing as a pressing issue<sup>26</sup>".*

Notwithstanding this challenge, ISIS 2006 strongly supports the continuing efforts of the CACP to engage all levels of government in the crafting of a "New Deal for Policing". There are certain aspects of police governance which governments cannot abdicate. A nationally coordinated, locally effective policy and funding framework is essential to the lasting success of any model, given the constitutional structure of Canada, its provinces, territories and municipalities.

### An Enhanced Role for Police Leadership

Why have governments remained unmoved by the diligent efforts of the CACP? Is it perhaps because Canadian police leaders, reluctant to have their efforts to influence public policy regarded as lobbying, have taken a prudent and somewhat restrained approach to government? While not advocating an irresponsible stridency, ISIS 2006 believes, based on European examples, that it may well be time for more pointed and multi-faceted messaging that catches and holds the attention of those who can act on policing's behalf.

Perhaps more to the point, governments' aversion to becoming actively involved in efforts to establish a workable governance structure to support so-called 'integrated policing' efforts may also derive from a perception that the concept itself remains too nebulous to be embraced. Government officials may be calloused by years of wrestling with problematic and divided proposals arising from varying police voices. Such an unclear environment may provide reason enough for some officials to avoid tackling their own tough decisions, perhaps until such time that the policing community arrives at their door with a well-defined, rationally articulated and widely accepted and supported policing proposal for the future. ISIS 2006 believes that the job of creating that package belongs to the subject matter experts with the greatest stake in its acceptance and success – the police.

Police leaders across Canada will quickly recognize that creating such a foundation piece will be a huge undertaking that will involve a myriad of complex and time-consuming tasks. Nonetheless, building on the validity of the precepts contained in the CACP Resolutions, ISIS 2006 is calling for a National Policing Strategy. Founded on a collective determination to deliver policing excellence across Canada, free from partisan interest, and truly reflective of our diverse strengths, the National Policing Strategy envisioned by ISIS 2006 will lead to a "New Reality" in Canadian police leadership.

The National Policing Strategy will be based upon clearly defined, consistent and professional policing performance standards, created in consultation with police leaders and all levels of government across Canada. The consultative process will, at the onset, delineate the discrete yet mutually supportive roles to be assumed by police and government in this constantly evolving initiative. Fully committed to being accountable for providing quality services to our communities, the National Policing Strategy will provide realistic performance goals and benchmarks for results and serve to:

- Define policing for all Canadians;
- Ensure adequate and consistent service delivery and response for all Canadians and to all levels of crime and threats to public safety;
- Embed all policing activities at the local level, and
- Ensure a self-stabilizing rationalization of national police resources.

#### Alignment of CACP Efforts

ISIS 2006 believes that these goals and objectives align with those articulated by the CACP in its recent presentation to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, wherein the issues to be addressed by a policy framework for Canadian policing were set out as follows:

Priority setting;  
 Strategic and operational planning;  
 Design and implementation of change;  
 Operational coordination;  
 Resource management;  
 Information management, and  
 Standards.

Thus, police leaders have an opportunity to lead on two fronts. The policing community must continue to appeal to governments to ensure that policing in Canada can ultimately occur at all levels within a sensible and agreed framework that protects the public interest and the public purse. At the same time, experiences abroad indicate that it is equally if not more critical for police leaders to take the lead in creating a national policing framework, and to commit to the concept that the police own the job of defining police effectiveness.

Notwithstanding the creative and diligent efforts of the CACP, the challenge will continue for police leaders to move politicians and government officials to respond to the need for clarity at the necessary pace. Most police leaders are not content to wait, nor to allow the next major public safety crisis to shape national efforts to match policing to the modern world. As the voice of progressive change in policing, the CACP and its membership have the national perspective and the ability to influence how the public is served. By taking immediate responsibility for creating a National Policing Strategy, the CACP will define the standards for how modern policing is practiced in Canada. Once this is in place, police leaders may have a greater ability to involve an educated public in the process of influencing change, thus ensuring that the concepts of modern policing are matched by and supported by the national and local systems of governance that will emerge.

“ *The organization of service delivery must be on a scale large enough to respond dynamically, but local enough to understand the diverse context within which it operates.*

*This means significant rationalization of protective services and support processes to put them on a more efficient footing.*

*In turn this will place new demands on leadership, oversight and support from government*<sup>27</sup>.

”

### **ISIS 2006 Observes ....**

The Canadian public expects security at all levels for their tax dollar.

Police leaders must determine how to deploy the 85,000 police members to deliver excellence.

Service Delivery must be well and consistently defined by the experts: the police.

Funding must align with local service delivery.

***Locally Driven - Nationally Coordinated - Maintaining Police Independence***



## Summary

### ISIS 2006 is recommending that:

1. The CACP take immediate steps to fully mobilize the Canadian police leadership community to become the legitimate “architects” of policing in Canada.
2. Built upon the adoption of independent and consistent professional standards and driven by the active participation of all of the nation’s police leaders, CACP become the recognized guiding body that defines and self-regulates police service delivery in Canada at all levels. (i.e. “The College of Police Professionals in Canada”)
3. The CACP assume the leadership role in defining national standards: to create standardized operational guidelines that will serve as the basis of service delivery and quality assurance at all levels of threat to public safety.
4. The CACP establish well-defined and uniform national performance measures to ensure all Canadians are served at all levels of policing.

This combined framework of standards and performance measures must serve to:

- define policing for all Canadians;
  - ensure adequate and uniform response to all levels of crime and threats to public safety;
  - embed all policing at the local level; and
  - enable a self-stabilizing rationalization of national police resources.
5. And, that the CACP continue in its efforts at engaging governments at all levels towards the formation of a “new deal” for policing in Canada.

### **Proposed Principles to Guide the Development of the National Policing Strategy**

There must be a Canadian national standard for each level of service delivery.

The standards must be national in scope as opposed to federal, provincial or municipal as policing spans all three levels of government to provide safety to the public.

The standards will augment the local police authorities and the present legislative controls and review bodies.

This is about creating standards of service delivery, and not about setting policy. Policy must be created locally to reflect the local environment and the needs of the community.

Individual police services do not have to provide services at all levels, but every area in Canada must have access to policing at all levels.

For a police agency to provide any particular level of service, they must meet the established standard for that level of service.

The standards are to be created with input from all levels of police agencies in Canada.

The standards will require a review function to provide accountability.

Policing, as a provincial responsibility, does not preclude this model.

With strong participation and broad CACP membership, national standards can be implemented without having them legislated.

### **From the European experience, some projected outcomes are:**

- Rationalization of Police Services
- Linear reduction of Police Services
- Improved Program Design
- Enhanced Accountability
- The adoption of the standards will help to drive the funding model

## The ISIS 2006 Team

This report was authored by the participating members of ISIS 2006. They are:

Superintendent Dan Anderson	Waterloo Regional Police Service
Superintendent Michael Burns	Halifax Regional Police Service
Capitaine Alain DeBonville	Sûreté du Québec
Inspector Michael Ennis	Durham Regional Police Service
Inspector Jamie Jagoe	RCMP
Major Martin Laflamme	Canadian Forces
Superintendent Gilles Laroche	Ottawa Police Service
Bureau Commander Angela Lockridge	Ontario Provincial Police
Superintendent William Moore	Halifax Regional Police Service
Inspector Harold O'Connell	RCMP
Inspector Alan Scott	Winnipeg Police Service
Inspector Michael Sekela	RCMP
Superintendent Todd Shean	RCMP
Det. Chief Superintendent Ken Smith	Ontario Provincial Police
Program Director, Norm Taylor	The Cobourg Academy
Superintendent Larry Tremblay	RCMP
Superintendent Christopher White	Toronto Police Service
Superintendent Stephen White	RCMP

## Notes

1. Report of the Auditor General for Canada (2000). Chapter 7.3.
2. MacInnis & Associates (2004). *Toward an Integrated Policy Framework*. Report to the CACP.
3. Professor Brian Grainger, Ethics Consultant, addressing ISIS 2006, February 21, 2006 in Toronto.
4. Ontario Commissioner of Emergency Management Julian Fantino, addressing ISIS 2006, February 20, 2006 in Toronto.
5. Sussex Circle (2005). *An Integrated Policing Policy Framework - A Feasibility Assessment*. Ottawa.
6. Denis O'Connor CBE, QPM, HM Inspector of Constabulary (2005). *Closing the Gap: A Review of the 'Fitness for Purpose' of the Current Structure of Policing in England and Wales*.
7. Chief Edgar MacLeod, Cape Breton Regional Police, addressing ISIS 2006, February 20, 2006 in Toronto.
8. Griffiths & Verdun-Jones (1994), *Canadian Criminal Justice*. Toronto, Harcourt Brace, p. 70
9. The Mini-Survey of Human Resources Practices - August 2005, conducted by the Canadian Police Sector Council.
10. Dr. Darryl Plecas, addressing ISIS 2006 February 23, 2006 in Toronto.
11. Chief Officer Ken Jones, President of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) in the United Kingdom, addressing ACPO's Annual Conference, May 2006.
12. An Austrian Police Leader, ISIS 2006 meetings.
13. Ministry of Interior and Kingdom Relations – Netherlands (2005). Leemhuis Report.
14. Robert Reiner (2000). *The Politics of the Police*. Oxford, Oxford Press. p.9.
15. Monica den Boer (2004). *Out of the Blue: Police Perspectives on Europe, Governance and Accountability*, Vrije Universiteit (Vrije University), Amsterdam; Politieacademie (Police Academy of the Netherlands). p. 17

**Notes (continued) ....**

16. Monica den Boer, *ibid* p.17
17. Chief Officer Ken Jones, *ibid*.
18. Dr. Axel Buschendorf, Head of Public Security and Order Department (Section III B), Berlin Senate of the Interior, ISIS 2006 meetings in Berlin.
19. Chief Officer Ken Jones, *ibid*.
20. Intelligence and Security Committee (2006). *Report into the London Terrorist Attacks on 7 July 2005*; Chairman: the Right Honourable Paul Murphy, MP. Presented to the British Parliament May 2006. p. 38.
21. MP Ian Lucas, Wales UK, ISIS 2006 meetings.
22. Monica den Boer, *ibid*. p.13.
23. Al Hutchinson, Oversight Commissioner, Northern Ireland, ISIS 2006 meetings.
24. Sussex Circle, *ibid*.
25. Resolutions of the Board of Directors, Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, from [www.cacp.ca](http://www.cacp.ca) (2006).
26. Chief Edgar MacLeod, Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (2006). *A New Deal for Policing*. Presentation to the Federation of Municipalities, June 2, 2006.
27. Denis O'Connor CBE, QPM, HM Inspector of Constabulary (2005), *ibid*.

**Organizations and Agencies**

The following is a list of organizations and agencies that hosted the four ISIS Field Study Groups in April and May of 2006.

**Austria**

Federal Ministry of the Interior  
Austrian Police  
Austrian Criminal Intelligence Service  
Austrian Crisis Management  
BKA – Federal Criminal Police  
Vienna Organization of Safety and Security  
Jewish Security Council  
Vienna Chief Executive Office  
Austrian Ambulance Service

**England and Wales**

Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO)  
Canadian High Commission, London, UK  
Community Alliance for Renewal, Inner South Manchester Area, (CARISMA), Manchester UK  
Dover Port Police, Dover, UK  
Dover Port Authority, Dover, UK  
Greater Manchester Police, Manchester UK  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), London, UK  
Home Office, London UK  
Joint Terrorism Analysis Centre (JTAC), London, UK  
Kent Police  
Mr. Ian Lucas (MP Wrexham, Wales)  
Metropolitan Police, New Scotland Yard, London, UK  
National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA), Home Office, London, UK  
Serious and Organized Crime Agency (SOCA), London, UK  
South Wales Police  
Thames Valley Police  
The Welsh Rugby Union Limited, Millennium Stadium, Cardiff, Wales

**France**

Police Nationale  
Inspection General de la Police Nationale  
Service de Cooperation Internationale Technique de Police  
Direction des Libertes Publiques et des Affaires Juridiques  
Institute Nationale des Hautes Etudes de Securite  
Police aux Frontieres – Police Nationale

**France (continued)**

Gendarmerie Nationale  
Syndicat de Commissaires et Hauts Fonctionnaires de la Police Nationale

**Germany**

Federal Ministry of Interior  
BKA – *Bundeskriminalamt* (Federal Criminal Police)  
BP - *Bundespolizei* (Federal Police)  
Berlin Senate of Interior  
Berlin Police  
Brandenburg Ministry of Interior  
Brandenburg Police  
*Brandenburg Landeskriminalamt* (Brandenburg State Criminal Police)  
Bavarian Ministry of the Interior  
BLKA – *Bayerisches Landeskriminalamt* (Bavarian State Criminal Police)

**Ireland**

*An Garda Siochana* (Ireland's Police Service)

**Netherlands**

Netherlands Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations  
Netherlands Ministry of Justice  
Crown Law Office Rotterdam  
KLPD - Netherlands Police Agency  
Netherlands Center for International Police Co-operation (NCIPS)  
Rotterdam-Rijnmond Police  
City of Vlaardingen  
Amsterdam-Amstelland Police  
Leemhuis Report Consultants  
*Politieacademie* – Police Academy of the Netherlands  
Police Region Zeeland

**Northern Ireland**

Police Service of Northern Ireland  
Police Ombudsman for Northern Ireland

## ISIS 2006 Partial Bibliography

### **Boer, Professor Dr. Monica den (2004)**

*Out of the Blue: Police Perspectives on Europe, Governance and Accountability*, Vrije Universiteit (Vrije University), Amsterdam; Politieacademie (Police Academy of the Netherlands).

### **Butler Tony (2006)**

*Opinion: Closing the Gap – Is the real problem the Home Office?* Police Professional, 26 January

### **Griffiths & Verdun-Jones (1994)**

*Canadian Criminal Justice*. Toronto, Harcourt Brace.

### **Harrad, Dr. Lucy (2006)**

*Are larger police forces better than smaller forces ?* Police Professional, 26 January 2006.

### **HMIC – Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (2005)**

*Closing the Gap. A Review of the Fitness for Purpose of the Current Structure of Policing in England and Wales*. Chairman: HMIC Dennis O’Connor, CBE. Presented to the Home Office Secretary in September 2005, London.

### **Home Office (2004)**

*The Bichard Inquiry Report. An Independent Inquiry into Child Protection Measures*. Chairman: Sir Michael Bichard. Presented to the British Parliament (House of Commons) in June 2004, London.

### **Home Office (2004)**

*Building Communities, Beating Crime: A better police service for the 21st century*; Police Reform white paper, November 2004, London.

### **House of Commons / United Kingdom Parliament (2005-2006)**

*The Proposed Restructuring of the Police Forces in Wales*; House of Commons debates, November 2005-July 2006, London.

### **Intelligence and Security Committee (2006)**

*Report into the London Terrorist Attacks on July 7, 2005*. Chairman: the Rt Honorable Paul Murphy, MP. Presented to the British Parliament in May 2006, London.

### **Interpol. European Police and Judicial Systems**

*Police Organizations and Judicial Systems – General information about the police and judicial systems of individual countries in the European region.*

<http://www.interpol.int/Public/Region/Europe/pjsystems/Default.asp>

### **Lawrance, Professor A.J. (2005)**

*A statistically-based opinion on the issue ‘Does Size Matter?’* sought by the West Mercia Police Authority in connection with the HMIC Review *Closing the Gap*. University of Warwick.

### **Loveday, Barry (2006)**

*Size Isn’t Everything: Restructuring Policing in England and Wales*. Policy Exchange. London.

### **Loveday, Barry (2005)**

*Police Reform: Problems of Governance and Accountability*. Police Journal, Volume 78, University of Portsmouth.

### **Loveday Barry and Reid Anna (2003)**

*Going Local: Who Should Run Britain’s Police?* Policy Exchange, London.

### **Loveday Barry (1999)**

*The Impact of Performance Culture on Criminal Justice Agencies in England and Wales*. International Journal of the Sociology of Law, Volume 27.

### **Lawrance, Professor A.J. (2005)**

*A statistically-based opinion on the issue ‘Does Size Matter?’* sought by the West Mercia Police Authority in connection with the HMIC Review *Closing the Gap*. University of Warwick.

## ISIS 2006 Partial Bibliography (continued)

**Miliband, MP David (2005)**

*Putting the public back into public services*, Minister of State, Cabinet Office, speech to Guardian Public Services Summit, 2 Feb 2005, London.

**Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations – Netherlands (2005)**

*Stuurgroep Evaluatie Politieorganisatie – Lokaal verankerd, Nationaal versterkt / Police Organization Evaluation Steering Group – Locally anchored, Nationally coordinated; Chairperson – Mrs. J.M. Leemhuis-Stout, Utrecht, June 2005.*

**Moore, Mark H., Braga, Anthony A. (2004)**

*Police performance measurement: a normative framework*, Criminal Justice Ethics, New York, January 2004.

**Nancoo, Stephen E. (2004)**

*Contemporary Issues in Canadian Policing*. Canadian Educators' Press, Mississauga, Ontario.

**Plecas, D., Malm, A., Pollard, N., Brantingham, P., Tinsley, P., Brantingham, P., Cohen, I., & Kinney, B. (2005).**

*A 30 Year Analysis of Police Service Delivery and Costing: "E" Division*. School of Criminology and Criminal Justice University College of the Fraser Valley. Abbotsford, British Columbia.

**Prefecture de Police de Paris**

*La Préfecture de Police au service des Parisiens.*  
<http://www.prefecture-police-paris.interieur.gouv.fr>

**Punch, Maurice; Hoogenboom, Bob; Williamson, Tom (2005)**

*Paradigm Lost : The Dutch Dilemma*. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, Volume 38, Number 2, pp. 268-281.

**Reiner, Robert (2000)**

*The Politics of the Police*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition.

**Roché, Sebastian (2004)**

*Réformer la police et la sécurité : Les nouvelles tendances en Europe et aux Etats-Unis*. Odile Jacob, Paris.

**Sabatier, Magali (2001)**

*La coopération policière européenne*. L'Harmattan, Paris.

**Superintendents' Association (2004)**

*Moving Policing Forward-Proposals for the future*. Police Superintendents' Association of England and Wales.

**Sussex Circle (2005)**

*An Integrated Policing Policy Framework - A Feasibility Assessment*, Ottawa, Canada, March 31, 2005.

**Tupman, Bill ; Tupman, Alison (1999)**

*Policing in Europe : Uniform in Diversity*; Intellect, Exeter, England.

***The complete bibliography of ISIS 2006 research sources is available from the CACP National Office.***



**Published by The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP)**

582 Somerset St. W., Ottawa, Ontario K1R 5K2 (613) 233-1106 [www.cacp.ca](http://www.cacp.ca)