Abstract

Starting from the main purpose of functioning and organization of public administration, namely satisfying the general interests of the community by offering public services, this paper aims to analyse the Local Police service, as the service having an important impact in the social life of the community. Benefits ranging from public order and citizen safety are currently provided, locally, by Local Police, administrative structure decentralized, established by local councils, developing its activity under the authority of the mayor, in order to implement the tasks of maintaining order and safety, strictly oriented to the local community.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Public order and citizen safety are currently provided, locally, by Municipal Police, an administrative structure decentralized, established by local councils and developing its activity under the authority of the mayor, in order to implement the tasks of maintaining order and safety, strictly oriented to satisfy the needs of the local community.

Article 1 of Law 155/2010 stipulates that local police "shall be established in order to exercise the powers on fundamental rights and freedoms of individuals, private and public property, preventing and detecting crime."

Areas where acting local police are the public order and security of goods, public roads, environmental protection, discipline in constructions and street, environment, trade and records of persons and other areas established by law.

II. FROM MUNICIPAL POLICE TO LOCAL POLICE

Initially, decentralizing service to ensure public order and safety of citizens has been achieved since 2004, when the administrative and financial powers in this area were taken locally. The Law no. 371/2004 on the establishment of the Municipal Police was adopted, subsequently amended and supplemented. The financial resources necessary for the functioning of the public service were also provided throughout the decentralized local budgets.

At that time, the institution of Municipal Police, public service locally, with juridical personality, was regarded as a success of the decentralization program of state institutions, having a great impact in society by decentralizing this service and promoting the idea of a new partnership between citizens and police. It has gone from the idea that the local police and community have expectations from each other and they must work together as equal partners to identify, evaluate and solve together within their powers the real problems faced by the community².

Police decentralization was an important means of installing closer relations between police and the population. (According to the

---

² www.jiuvalley.com, accessed in December 2015
same law, one of the tasks of the mayor was the establishment, organization and functioning of the Municipal Police).

But in the functioning of the Municipal Police a number of major shortcomings were gradually found.

First it was reported the lack of a transfer of resources to local authorities which establishes Municipal Police and the ineffectiveness of a body set up by simply transforming public guardians in Municipal police officers. The Romanian state has not conducted a genuine decentralization of Municipal Police Service because it has not transferred local funding sources. In this case, most of the budgets of municipalities were not able financially to support the expenses incurred by Municipal Police Service.

Secondly it was found that the workload of the local police was not unitary in different administrative-territorial units, with large gaps (for example, according to the Institute for Public Policy in Bucharest\(^3\), the number of penalties imposed by a police community in a year in Piatra Neamț was 8.68 compared to 46.01 sanctions applied by a community policeman in a year in Bacau).

Due to deficiencies identified we can say that the decentralization of public Municipal Police Service has not led to the expected results, having to find new solutions for decentralization of public order and security at the local level. Thus, the local police was established by Law 155/2010\(^4\).

The establishment through reorganization of the local police aimed to achieve a real decentralization of the work of the public order police and an approaching to the community.

The transfer of those services under the authority of mayors came with assurance from the state budget of a part of the funds necessary for their operation. Financial support is absolutely imperative, the success or failure of the decentralization process standing, especially, in its financial side.\(^5\)

---

\(^3\) www.ippp.ro, accessed in December 2015
\(^4\) Republished in Official Monitor, Part I no. 339 from 08.05.2014

We can say that the initial decentralization of Municipal Police Service failed, the deficiencies in its functioning have been demonstrated by practice, this formula was not appropriate to the needs of local government. It was required a resizing of this service under the formula reconsidered as the local police so that its functioning be uniform throughout the country\textsuperscript{6}.

III. TYPES OF INDICATORS FOR MEASURING DECENTRALIZATION OF MUNICIPAL POLICE SERVICE

To avoid ending up with the flawed situation within Municipal Police, we believe that for Local Police a number of indicators must be measured permanently to identify possible discrepancies in the service. Thus, to quantify the decentralization of the service by the local police in the table below we have proposed a number of indicators provided as general indicators measuring decentralization of public services. These indicators are grouped into five categories; they can be considered autonomous and should be monitored to see to what extent the decentralized functioning improves the quality of public service of local police.

\textsuperscript{6} Pascariu Liana-Teodora, Aspects regarding making public services through administrative contracts, European Journal of Law and Public Administration (European Journal of Law and Public Administration), 1/2015.
\textsuperscript{6} www.ippp.ro, accessed in December 2015
\textsuperscript{6} Republished in Official Monitor, Part I no. 339 from 08.05.2014
\textsuperscript{6} Pascariu Liana-Teodora, Aspects regarding making public services through administrative contracts, European Journal of Law and Public Administration (European Journal of Law and Public Administration), 1/2015.
### Table no. 1 Indicators that measure the performance of decentralized service of Local Police

**A. Indicators aimed at creating a stable framework for decentralization of the local police service by developing strategies, policies, strategic plans and the extent to which they have been implemented locally.**
- The existence of the legislation on decentralization local police service;
- The existence of a strategy of local police service conducted by the local authority which operates the service;
- The existence of a regulation of organization and functioning of the local police service;
- The existence of a public security and order plan approved by the mayor where local police service works;
- The existence of monitoring service.

**B. Indicators measuring performance in decentralized public service provision - which demonstrates the ability of the local authority to provide better service than at central level**

- **Indicators relating to coverage of public service with local police**
  - Number of citizens served by a local policeman in each municipality
  - Number of objectives and public and private goods for which security is provided.

- **Indicators on the efficiency of the Local Police**
  - The number of actions organized and carried out in the area: public order and tranquillity, street trade, environment, sanitation, public transport, the discipline of construction, abandoned cars, census of domestic animals, etc.;
  - The average number of penalties imposed by local police for offenses such as disturbing the peace and public order, not respecting the cleanliness of localities, street commerce or violating environmental protection rules, etc.;
  - The number of complaints about dysfunctions of Local Police Service;
  - The average time for resolving complaints received by the local police service;
  - Accessing external funds (pre-accession funds, public-private partnerships, bank loans, structural funds, etc.) to improve local police service;
  - The existence of a performance audit of local police service;
  - The number of investment projects on the local police service to be developed during the next year.

**C. Indicators that monitor changes in the human resources with competence in the process of decentralizing the local police service**
- The total number of local police employees;
- Distribution of employees within local police service (number of employees: local policemen, security guards, civil servants, contract security personnel);
- Number of jobs created locally after local police service decentralization;
- Strategic plans for human resources management adopted and implemented within local police service.

### D. Indicators measuring existent financial resources of the local police service, to monitor financial and fiscal transfers which support decentralization of new competencies.
- Financial resources allocated for effective decentralization of local police service;
- Local administration expenditure on decentralized competencies of local police service;
- The revenues’ collection performance within local government distributed to the local police service.

### E. Indicators measuring the involvement of interested parts in the decentralization of the local police service.
- Events to inform about the decentralization of local police service;
- Citizens’ satisfaction with local police services;
- Existence of an evaluation instrument of citizens’ satisfaction with local police services.


Of the indicators proposed in the above table must be seen which indicators are fulfilled, being without problems those relating to stable legal framework for decentralization of local police service (there are policies, strategies for decentralization of service) and those related to involvement of interested parts in the process of the decentralization of Local Police Service (there are monthly and quarterly reports on the work of the local police service on sites in each municipality, and the opportunity to make online complaints about deficiencies). In our opinion, indicators that can present some problems are those that monitor the fulfilment of the decentralized powers of local police service, as well as those regarding the parallel existence of a financial decentralization.
IV. CONCLUSIONS

Our research reveals that the decentralization of the local police service may not yield the expected results similar to Municipal Police, unless envisages the correction of deficiencies that appear organizationally and functionally, tested formulas having to be adequately reported to local community needs.

In the process of decentralization of a public service it is important to constantly measure service performance indicators, to have concrete information on decentralization and an accurate estimate of the costs involved in this service. If this is not done or there is no impact analysis or a minimum estimate of the costs involved in the decentralization process, the service operation may fail.

But we can say that one positive thing is the fact that by establishing local police were transferred under the authority of mayors of cities and towns structures from the Romanian Police carrying out the duties of ensuring public order and tasks related to road traffic, whose local management will bring greater efficiency and higher levels of agreement on how to ensure these services and meet the interests of local communities.

REFERENCES

Law 195/2006 on decentralization.
Law no. 155/2010 on Local Police.