

ROM: MRS C COLLINS
Police Division
10 April 1996

cc PS/Secretary of State (B&L) *
PS/Michael Ancram (B&L) *
PS/PUS (B&L) *
PS/Sir David Fell
Mr Thomas *
Mr Bell
Mr Blackwell
Mr Daniell
Mr Steele
Mr Shannon
Mr Leach
Mr Watkins
Mr Wood (B&L)
Mr Cornick
Mr Smyth
Mrs Madden
Mr Maccabe
Mr Stephens
Mr Marsh
Mr Perry
Dr Power
Mr Beeton
Mr D J R Hill
Mr Campbell-Bannerman
HMA Dublin
Mr Lamont

652/4
15 APR 1996
CENT SEC
C

* With copies of SDLP and Sinn
Fein Papers

1. MR LEGGE * [This is a very valuable analysis, for which Police Division are to be congratulated. It demonstrates a surprising degree of congruence between many of the proposals in the draft Policing Structures White Paper and the emerging conclusions of the Fundamental Review (leaving aside the emotive issues of name, oath, flags etc). The fact that so many other parties have now put forward their proposals on policing underlines the vacuum left by the non-publication of the Government's own proposals.
Signed JML 12/4/96]

2. PS/SIR JOHN WHEELER *

POLICING DISCUSSION DOCUMENTS: ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON

Given the plethora of policing documents published recently, you might find the attached summaries and analysis of the SDLP paper of November 1995, the Sinn Fein policing paper "Policing in Transition", and the Labour Party paper "Policing in Northern Ireland - A Service for All People" interesting. Copies of the original documents are available from the Policing Directorate Joint Support Group, on extension 27553.

. The key point to emerge from the comparative analysis on the main issues (at Annex D) is the degree of consensus which exists around key principles such as the importance of impartial, professional policing, which is responsive and accountable to the local community, free from political interference, and able to build a normal relationship with the community in a way which has been impossible in an environment dominated by terrorism.

3. Equally, it clearly emerges that the Nationalist experience of policing, as the heavy hand of an alien state, remains a fresh memory and that there is a strong demand for some "dramatic" change, if only to mark a discontinuity with that past experience, and a step forward into a new and different era. This is an issue which can only be finally resolved through political talks, building trust and eventually reconciliation. Symbols will play a part in all of this; and will doubtless be one of the overt manifestations of discussion. I have no doubt there will be a lot of grief and anger to be worked through, from all sides.

4. However, it is clear that this can (and should) be separated from the pragmatic issues, as there is a broad degree of consensus about the principles, even if there may be disagreement about precise mechanisms to achieve the objectives, or a lack of precise understanding and thinking on them. For example, there is strong support for both accountability, and for impartiality and independence, in the police service. Quite how to achieve either is left undefined; and the White Paper proposals are likely to provide (at least) a useful starting point.

Dictated by Mrs Collins
and signed in her absence by
Peter May

C COLLINS

JW POB 21358

SDLP POLICING PAPER: POLICING IN NORTHERN IRELAND

This minute offers a summary and analysis of the SDLP's policing paper "Policing in Northern Ireland" published in November 1995 at their Party Conference. The document represents a refinement of the Mallon agenda first set out in the course of the 1992 Talks.

2. The main areas covered by the document are as follows:

- that the policing and political problems of Northern Ireland are interlocked, and therefore HMG must ensure any short-term proposals do not pre-empt the outcome of such negotiations;
- the need to address policing politically was recognised at Sunningdale and in the Anglo-Irish Agreement. It remains essential;
- a system of policing is needed which has the support and active involvement of both Unionists and Nationalists. This would involve Nationalists granting allegiance to the system of policing for the first time;
- the key historical difference between the RUC and other police forces was its need to defend the 1920 constitutional arrangement as well as perform 'normal policing duties'. Nationalists remain uncomfortable with the RUC's role in upholding emergency legislation and with its uncompromising Unionist ethos;
- 'Policing in the Community' had been a peripheral document which did not address the fundamental questions;
- operational independence is too broadly defined and the Police Authority need 'effective control' over the Chief Constable to secure accountability. PANI remains an

JW POB 21358

irrelevance and as such the SDLP will not revise their approach to it;

- There should be a separation between civilian and 'military' policing;
- Specialist police units which do not operate under local police control (such as DMSUs) should be disbanded;
- Regional policing structures akin to Boards areas for Health and Social Services should be introduced. Such an approach is common in European countries and the forces in GB are generally smaller than the RUC;
- The North South dimension needs to be recognised but the way policing arrangements would be involved is not spelt out;
- The SDLP remains unconvinced of the value of CPLCs which are seen as talking shops;
- The Hayes review is welcomed, and extra powers should be given to the ICPC;
- The issues surrounding the ethos of the police force cannot be resolved in isolation from political talks. However, the name, uniform and flying of the flag should be changed and the police force become unarmed.

Analysis

3. The political difficulty faced by Nationalists in signing up to the police service is the underlining motif of this paper. The SDLP recognise the need for them to do so as a result of any political settlement but require significant change to the status quo in order to allow such a move to be justified to the Nationalist electorate. The importance of not pre-empting political talks is thus paramount
JW POB 21358

(although the SDLP implicitly recognise HMG could still bring proposals forward in the meantime) and policing must be seen as a political issue.

4. Throughout the document it is not the analysis of the problem which is particularly controversial but the prescriptions the SDLP offer to remedy the problems identified. They, reflecting the position in the Republic, have no attachment to the concept of operational independence and argue the Chief Constable ought not to have such independence if he is to be accountable. Given the difficulties of Nationalists under a politically-controlled RUC pre-1972, that is hard to reconcile with the more general political concerns of the SDLP.

5. The proposal to split Northern Ireland between a number of police forces and to have different levels of police dealing with civil and anti-terrorist duties is the most difficult of all the SDLP's proposals. The logistical, efficiency and practical disadvantages are all considerable, and practice in Europe indicates a great deal of respect for the unitary policing arrangements in the UK. On size, the Republic of Ireland have one police force and the recent establishment of regional structures (as the RUC already have) does not stop the Garda Siochana from being a unitary force. The Labour Party's recent paper rejects the SDLP's idea of increasing the number of forces.

6. Much of the basis for the regionalisation of policing appears to be the potential for local control over each force thereby allowing one or more areas to be under a Nationalist local 'Police Authority'. This does not sit particularly comfortably with the SDLP's wider rejection of greater powers for local councils.

7. The major change from the 1992 Mallon agenda is the significant toning-down of the idea of an all-Ireland anti-terrorist unit. This change is likely to be the result of Irish Government resistance to the idea, and has been replaced with a bland reference to the need to recognise the North/South dimension in some way in future policing arrangements.

JW POB 21358

Conclusion

8. The SDLP paper indicates that the party has refined its thinking since the 1992 talks, but its central theme of a multi-tiered regional police force remains hard to see as the basis of policing structures in the future. Looking ahead to talks, the paper does however offer scope for Government to show how it is addressing SDLP concerns through the White Paper, the Hayes review and the Fundamental Review.

JW POB 21358

SINN FEIN POLICING PAPER: "POLICING IN TRANSITION"

This minute offers a summary and analysis of the recently released Sinn Fein discussion document on policing entitled "Policing in Transition: A Legacy of Repression; An Opportunity for Justice" attached which was discussed at the recent Sinn Fein Ard Fheis. The paper had as its stated aim 'to prepare a discussion document on an acceptable police service, within a short term scenario'.

Summary

2. The document covers the following main areas:

- Sinn Fein grievances and accusations about the past behaviour of the RUC (section 2);
- 'Practical' measures HMG should introduce immediately (section 3). This replicates motions passed by the 1995 Ard Fheis;
- The importance of 'practical community policing' with examples and an assertion the RUC are trying to undermine these initiatives (section 4);
- The response to petty crime and anti-social behaviour by local communities (with the assistance of republicans) without reference to punishment beatings (section 5);
- Interim proposals for policing (section 6) which largely focusses on the case for the disbandment of the RUC, but states the need for a 'new' independent police complaints body and an unarmed police service free from political control;
- Three proposals to flesh out their interim proposals (sections 7-9) which advocate the replacement of PANI by a police commission which would oversee the replacement of the RUC by a new police service; the formation of a localised

police service based on district council boundaries; and the creation of local advisory committees (it is not clear how these would differ from existing CPLCs).

Analysis

3. The document appears to fulfil two separate purposes for Sinn Fein. It pays homage to stated party policy on the disbandment of the RUC backed by propagandist references to the supposed past iniquities of the current system and force; and it attempts to develop a Sinn Fein negotiating position on the future of policing concentrating particularly on the interim measures (probably because it views the essential outcome either as doctrinally set or as a given. The document refers to 'when a new all-Ireland police service emerges from negotiations'.)

4. Leaving to one side the rhetoric, there is a strong sense from the document that what is required is change, but not that future structures would necessarily look very different from what currently exists. Detail on many of the proposals is lacking but the short-term Police Commission to oversee change still looks quite like PANI without political appointees, the local advisory committees describe the current CPLCs perfectly, and bringing local police boundaries into line with district councils would mirror the findings of the RUC's Fundamental Review (although on another reading this section could be advocating separate police services for each council area). The analysis underlying the document is basically that it is not the structures which are at fault but the actions of the RUC under Unionist and Government control. It is, in that sense, far less radical than it seems.

5. The section on immediate 'practical' measures (section 3) looks distinctly out-of-date in the post ceasefire era, but those sections advocating community educational initiatives and action to reduce 'anti-social' behaviour are basically unexceptionable and broadly in tune with Government policy. There is, however an underlying sense that these sections are designed to prevent rather than encourage the police service from working in partnership with the community to

JW POB 21358

address these difficulties. Their talk of dealing with these problems peaceably does not of course sit very well with reality.

6. In contrast to the SDLP's view that nothing should be done in the policing area which might pre-empt political discussions, Sinn Fein's rather more pragmatic approach is that "any proposals are clearly interim and transitional since final structures would be the product of an overall political settlement". The proposals would also be reviewed as part of 'peace negotiations'.

7. Interestingly, aside from one mention of an all-Ireland police service, the sole role of the Irish Government in the proposals would be to appoint representatives to the Police Commission. Sinn Fein recognise it is for HMG to make any 'transitional changes'.

Conclusion

8. The document shows signs of being more pragmatic than usual, albeit under the veil of the customary rhetoric, and appears to have been written as a negotiating stance for talks. In a number of areas, as with the SDLP, it is possible to argue the proposals are in line with Government thinking. These include the principles of policing, (accountability, openness, representativeness etc) the need for structures to allow local responsiveness to community priorities and in terms of community education. Unsurprisingly, the big difference lies in where Sinn Fein assess the current police service against those ideals. Their mindset leads them to demand wholesale change, even if what replaces the status quo differs little in substance.

LABOUR PARTY POLICING PAPER: "POLICING IN NORTHERN IRELAND: A SERVICE FOR ALL PEOPLE"

This minute offers a summary and analysis of the recently published Labour Party consultation paper entitled "Policing in Northern Ireland: A Service for all People". It covers much the same ground as the proposed White Paper, and is broadly in tune with its approach.

Summary

2. The main points of the paper are:

- That talks should not prevent consultation on the function and control of the police in Northern Ireland.
- That severance issues should be considered by the Fundamental Review.
- The importance of a community and gender balanced police force.
- That only one police force is needed for Northern Ireland but that it should have fewer tiers of management and local command units should fit in with District Council and CPLC boundaries.
- In terms of an all-Ireland dimension, regular meetings and collaboration North and South would meet the requirement.
- The role of PANI in the tripartite structure is underdeveloped, and there should be discussion of PANI's place in relation to security and public order issues which have a direct impact on the community. The Secretary of State should not choose all the members of PANI, as well as continue with the current role of his post in policing.

- The Secretary of State's role would be broadly that envisaged if the White Paper proposals were implemented although he would have to have regard to PANI views on security issues.
- The Chief Constable would retain operational independence (but the Labour Party believe the concept needs to be clarified) and take control of civilian staff, land and buildings to avoid duplication.
- PANI would be made up of nominees for representative bodies, including CPLCs and some Secretary of State appointees to remedy imbalances. It would appoint its own chair, and have powers similar to those envisaged by the White Paper.
- There is added emphasis on the importance of CPLCs and how their priorities are reflected in local policing.
- The Hayes Review is welcomed. The paper suggests RUC officers be seconded to the ICPC to investigate complaints and the ICPC should have the power to investigate individual aspects of policing without a complaint having been made.
- On symbols, the paper suggests these issues are peripheral to matters of substance such as structural change. The symbols issues cannot be resolved outside political talks.

Analysis

3. The consultative paper, as can be seen from the summary, shows a remarkable degree of correlation with the proposals in the White Paper. Interestingly it also advocates a broadening of the debate and the development of thinking on policing in advance of talks - recognising that political talks will play an important part in attaining any agreement on the future of policing, and in particular on symbolic issues.

4. In rejecting the idea of a number of regional police forces for Northern Ireland, the paper takes the SDLP's main proposal head-on and finds the case not proven. There is no significant all-Ireland dimension either, with the proposal for contacts and collaboration already reflected by existing arrangements.

5. On the appointment and composition of PANI, the proposals in the paper are similar to the revised White Paper which reflects a number of options including allowing bodies to nominate direct to the body. The Secretary of State's role would be to appoint only some members in such a case. The consultative paper does not refer to political (local councillor) membership of PANI which may reflect a difference of emphasis in that area.

Conclusion

6. From the content of this paper, it seems likely the Labour Party would be broadly supportive of the Government's White Paper proposals. There is no discernible SDLP influence in the paper although their particular concerns are acknowledged. Care is also taken to acknowledge and give credit for work in which the RUC and PANI are already engaged.

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF POLICE REFORM ISSUESTRIPARTITE STRUCTURE

Irish Govt (Paper, 21 December 1995)	Fundamental measures required before the nationalist community will feel able to identify with the police service and related bodies ... reflected in non participation policy of SDLP and SF towards Police Authority. Any future arrangements for local political control of a police service in NI must be on the basis of the joint and full involvement of political representatives of both communities.
SDLP (Party Conference, November 1995)	Dubious about value of tripartite structure, about concept of operational independence as a safeguard against politically controlled policing; about role of Secretary of State, especially in security matters. More comfortable, apparently, with notion of small forces under local political control, with a central force under "Department of Justice" control to deal with serious issues.
Sinn Fein (Policing in transition, March 1996)	Don't use the term, but describe a fully independent monitoring agency (Police Commission) to oversee policing arrangements as <u>"essential if these are to secure the confidence of the whole community"</u> . Regard both PANI and ICPC as flawed by lack of perceived independence. At local level, see role for advisory committees, with some limited delegated powers, to work with police service based on District Council boundaries. These are 'transitional arrangements' - there is no mention of how the ultimate all Ireland police service is to be organised, despite a swipe or two at the Garda and Irish Government.
Labour (British) (Policing in Northern Ireland, April 1996)	Support the tripartite structure, but want to see it better balanced, by reducing the role of the Secretary of State, especially over Police Authority appointments, and enhancing the role of PANI through strengthening the role of CPLCs and through giving it a specific function of commenting on aspects of policing, including security, which have implications for the protection of human rights. Support other White Paper reforms to the tripartite structure.

<p>White Paper (April 1996) (Foreword; Chapter 3)</p>	<p>Retains Tripartite Structure, as essential to the preservation of an impartial and politically independent police force, which s accountable to the community and ultimately to Parliament. Role of Police Authority strengthened by powers to set objectives and targets for police service; endorses strengthening role of CPLCs; open to change in method of appointment/selection of PANI members; flexible over how 'hands on' the Secretary of State's role needs to be; and (potentially) over where the dividing lines are, between the roles of any new NI institutions and the Secretary of State. Chief Constable given control over all police resources, subject to delegations and finance instructions.</p>
---	---

ACCOUNTABILITY (WHITE PAPER)

Irish Govt	Policing structures and mechanisms for accountability should be brought as close as possible to the communities they serve. Mechanisms for accountability should be fully transparent.
SDLP	"A hallmark of Western democracies is that the police are accountable for their actions ... the common thread is that the police are required to take account of the views of democratically elected leaders, at local or national level." Silent on how this is to be achieved (without a tripartite structure, or something very like one) without risking political direction and control of the police, (if done directly) or how it is to be done at all in a situation where there are deep political differences, and consensus is impossible on how a particular matter is to be dealt with (e.g. parades).
Sinn Fein	Sees need for accountability, but silent on 'accountability' mechanisms at the NI level, except for the Police Commission, which must not have any political appointees, although it will have representatives of the British and Dublin governments. (This body looks like an analogue of one of the post war commissions to rebuild Germany, with great and good outsiders brought in to 'run' services, and 'vet' those who have been involved under the previous regime.) Sees <u>democratic</u> accountability residing at the local level, through the local advisory committees with limited delegated powers, comprising elected representatives and other community representatives, working with 'localised' police service/department, based on district council boundaries.
Labour (British)	Supports the accountability mechanisms in operation in the rest of the UK under the Police and Magistrates Courts Act, so supports the White Paper proposals to extend these to NI. Keen to see further development of CPLCs, and suggests making the Chief Constable and the Police Authority report on how they have taken account of views expressed by CPLCs. Recognises the variety of different accountabilities which exist - eg to the law, etc.

<p>White Paper (Foreword, Chapters 3, 4 and 5)</p>	<p>Sees transparent accountability as an essential element in building acceptability. Recognises that there are already many dimensions to accountability - eg to the law for criminal acts, or for civil torts; to the ICPC for complaints; to PANI and the Secretary of State and to the media. BUT recognises the lacuna - there is no existing visible mechanism for influencing the thrust of policing policy/policing priorities: no method by which the community, or its democratically elected representatives, can systematically and publicly make their views known, have then taken into account by the police; and call the police to account for their performance. Fills this gap by the system of assessing community needs and wishes; setting objectives and targets; and then reporting on the results. 'Hidden powers' include the end of security of tenure for all senior officers, and performance related pay for all except the Chief Constable.</p>
--	--

OPERATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Irish Govt	No comment on operational independence.
SDLP	'The situation in NI where the Chief Constable insists on "Operational independence" to a degree unknown elsewhere ... does not provide a basis on which accountable policing can be established.'
Sinn Fein	Don't use the term, but say <u>both</u> that a police service must be under the democratic control of the community, and that it must be 'free from political control, in the sense that the RUC has been politically directed by the Unionist establishment and the British Government'. Silent on mechanisms to achieve this; a logical outcome is the White Paper recipe - or something very close to it, with operational independence further strengthened from the existing position to prevent the feared political direction.
Labour (British)	Restates commitment to operational independence of Chief Constable; asks for comments on the proper limits and freedoms of operational decision making.
White Paper (Chapters 3, 4 & 5)	Restates role of operational independence as part of essential safeguard against political direction of the police, and so for preserving police impartiality. Recognises and stresses the balancing need for strong and effective accountability mechanisms, and ways for the community to shape and influence the direction of policing.

IMPARTIALITY

Irish Govt	At core of RUC's inability to gain full acceptance is predominant identification with unionist political ethos. Police training and management should instil full understanding and respect for both traditions; symbols and name should reflect in an inclusive way the identities of both traditions.
SDLP	No specific mention - although clear that the chief charge against the RUC is one of perceived, institutionalised bias. It must be regarded as implicit that the kind of police service capable of gaining community support would have to be impartial. No mention either of how to achieve this in police actions, but a lot on the symbols and ethos points, which bear on perceptions of impartiality, or of parity of esteem.
Sinn Fein	No specific mention - but says that the new police service should attract civic minded and public spirited individuals, as opposed to sectarian or politically motivated ones; and is clear that the RUC at present is far from impartial, being part of the repressive apparatus of the state, under the political direction of the government.
Labour (British)	No specific mention.
White Paper (Foreword, Chapter 3)	Spells out impartiality as one of the bedrock principles for the police service; describes Guiding Principles which will bind the policing partners together in pursuit of common over-arching goals, and sets out that constables must carry out their duties (which do not include upholding any particular political party) impartially. Specifically leaves flags and other symbols to be dealt with in talks.

SYMBOLS ETC - (TALKS)

Irish Govt	Symbols and name should be adjusted so they reflect in an inclusive way both traditions in Northern Ireland. Flying of flags and the display of other symbols at police buildings should be in a context acceptable to both traditions.
SDLP	Name should be Northern Ireland Police Service. Symbols should be devised with which both communities can identify. Flying of Union Flag should stop. Police Service should be civilian in character, free from military overtones. Oath should be recast; Code of Ethics should be revised to take account of needs of divided society.
Sinn Fein	Not mentioned, save as a criticism of the RUC, described as 'provocatively flaunting ... solely British and unionist symbols'. Implicit that a totally new set of symbols will be required; probable that the more political end of the party will be distinctly uncomfortable with any form of symbolism - save perhaps for a red flag with green edges. Accepts that these are matter for talks.
Labour (British)	Recognises the focus on symbols as easy issues to focus on; but regards this as potentially counter-productive, since it turns into a 'victory or defeat' argument. If rapid progress can be made on defined issues, such as the oath, well and good; but symbols must not be allowed to get in the way of substance - it is the structural reforms which are fundamental. Symbolism is unlikely to be resolved outside a general political agreement, because only then, in line with the Downing Street Declaration, will there be agreement on the legitimacy of the state and its laws; and so on its symbols.
White Paper (Chapter 1)	Explains these are matters for Talks; recognises importance, sensitivity, and need for agreement.

PANI COMPOSITION AND METHOD OF APPOINTMENT

Irish Govt	Any future arrangements for local political control of a police service in Northern Ireland must be on the basis of the joint and full involvement of political representatives of both communities. Policing structures and mechanisms for accountability should be brought as close as possible to the communities they serve.
SDLP	Not mentioned specifically, but implied that current system - especially powers of PANI - are insufficient to make it a credible body and so to allow SDLP participation.
Sinn Fein	Says PANI lacks perceived independence. Police Commission idea specifically excludes "political appointments", instead calling for representatives of the British and Dublin Governments, external monitoring representatives, perhaps from the European Commission, and legal experts, including lawyers, magistrates, criminologists and human rights specialists.
Labour (British)	Regards it essential to take the opportunity to improve the Police Authority, recognising that there will need to be further changes when a full constitutional settlement is found. Wants to strengthen the role of CPLCs, giving them roles in crime prevention and victim support; and in acting as a conduit to the local communities. Wants greater openness on the part of the Authority. Stays with current structure of PANI, but wants to move to appointment rights by names bodies, to reduce the democratic deficit; sees merit in representatives from the CPLCs; and would retain Secretary of State appointment rights so as to allow balancing in terms of gender, religion, geographic spread or other features. would allow PANI to elect its own Chair.
White Paper (Chapter 6)	Promises a more open appointment process, and more flexibility over numbers and groups to be represented. Leaves open the question of whether something approaching appointment rights could be granted to specific bodies, preferring to go for nomination rights, with the Secretary of State keeping the power to appoint, and the duty to achieve balance. This is in practise, a lot more difficult than it appears at first sight. <i>[In the absence of an NI wide, democratically elected body to provide a source of elected representatives for the Police Authority, this has proved to be the most intractable area to resolve although some councillors are members of PANI already.]</i>

	Options tend to involve potential Sinn Fein membership or the involvement of a selection of Mps - who are disproportionately male and Unionist - and there are no easy answers.]
--	--

ACCEPTABILITY/ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS (WHITE PAPER)

Irish Govt	Police service should be acceptable to and responsive to both traditions; policing structures and mechanisms for accountability should be brought as close as possible to the communities they serve; accountability mechanisms should be fully transparent.
SDLP	Acceptability of a police service will be determined by ... the extent to which it is responsive and accountable to the community it serves.
Sinn Fein	'Any new all Ireland police service must be democratic, accountable, and responsive to the community'. the proposed Police Commission would be responsible for arranging public consultation at the PC level; for assisting and co-operating with local police advisory committees; and for organising local police services and special police sections to deal with serious crimes, sex offences, and drugs. Beyond identifying the PC as the body to do these things, there is no indication given as to how the necessary accountability or acceptability is to be achieved. The PC is remarkably undemocratic for a body which is to secure accountability on behalf of the community - even less so than PANI!
Labour (British)	Recognises that some aspects of acceptability will not be resolved outside a political settlement in accordance with the principles of the Downing Street Declaration, and that such a political settlement itself depends in part upon the existence of a police service able to earn the support of all sections of the community. Also recognises that police accountability and acceptability depend upon fair laws, and that the review of the emergency legislation will play an important part in addressing concerns in this area. supports the reforms proposed in the White Paper, especially in terms of police plans - does not mention objectives, but this may be implicit in the notion of plans.

<p>White Paper (Foreword, Chapters 1, 3, 4 & 5)</p>	<p>Sets out in detail a solution to the problem of safeguarding operational independence, in the interests of impartiality, whilst giving the community a systematic, tangible influence over policing policy and priorities, and a means of holding the police to account for their performance. Recognises the importance of local links, and also the need for acceptability to embrace allegiance issues, which can only be dealt with as part of political talks.</p>
---	--

RESOURCES/EFFICIENCY (WHITE PAPER AND FUNDAMENTAL REVIEW)

Irish Govt	Reduction in size of police service and resources allocated to it should not be treated as a conventional management and budgetary exercise [but] in terms of the goal of creating a police service capable of gaining the full support of both communities ... and thus as part of the fundamental consideration of policing issues to be initiated in all party talks.
SDLP	Efficiency should be subordinated to building acceptability. Multi-tiered arrangements would allow new officers to be taken on, while maximising opportunities for current officers, because of overlaps.
Sinn Fein	Not specifically mentioned - except to seek disbandment of the RUC, removal of fortified police stations in Nationalist areas, and to suggest that local ad hoc committees already active in countering anti social activities should be able, once the shadow of harassment by the RUC is lifted, to join established community organisations to lobby for resources and facilities.
Labour (British)	Comes out strongly against splitting the RUC, but supports devolution of authority to local levels within the force. Also supports the transfer of all support services to the Chief Constable - anything else leads to wasteful double banking.
White Paper (Foreword, Chapters 1 & 4)	One of original driving forces behind the reforms was the need to secure improved efficiency in the police budget. The resources allocated to policing represent a considerable cost to the NI Block, and whether or not there is a resumption of violence, it is important that the best possible value for money is obtained. Some savings will however not be realised unless/until there is an established peace, permitting the Fundamental Review to be implemented in full.

COMPLAINTS - (HAYES REVIEW, AND STRUCTURES LEGISLATION)

Irish Govt	Procedures for investigating complaints must be impartial and command the full confidence of both traditions.
SDLP	Key element in accountability. Recognises Hayes.
Sinn Fein	Places great emphasis on complaints - a police service needs to be open and transparent about its operation, and allow for genuinely independence examination of complaints against it. ICPC is rejected as flawed in terms of its perceived independence; Sinn Fein envisage a new police complaints body, with clear legal authority and powers, totally independent from the Police Commission. This body would be distinct from the internal complaints department, under the auspices of the Police Commission. Sinn Fein rely heavily on the CAJ (whom they quote in an appendix) on this subject.
Labour (British)	Recognises the valuable work of the ICPC, and supports the Hayes review. Regards the central issue as that of independent investigation of complaints; and the problem that of ensuring independent but thorough investigation, which it takes for granted requires police skills. Suggests secondment of police investigating officers to the ICPC; and an independent call in power in non complaint cases for the ICPC.
White Paper (Chapter 1)	Refers to the Hayes Review; says that the recommendations from it will be taken into account in the structures reform, as appropriate.

REGIONALISATION

Irish Govt	Police service must be acceptable and responsive to both traditions and structures should be tailored to this over-riding imperative; adjustments to the present unitary structure should be considered in all party talks; policing structures and mechanisms for accountability should be brought as close as possible to the communities they serve; members of the police service must be drawn from and be representative of the communities they serve.
SDLP	Seen as way of overcoming "policing of one community by the other". If we are to bring policing closer to the community, there is a need for the police to reflect more closely the community which it is tasked with policing; rationalisation must be subordinate to the need to foster links with local communities, and local loyalties. Seamus Mallon feels strongly that the police force should be split into three or four regional forces, dealing with most ordinary crime, with a central force dealing with serious crime, including terrorism. This central force would have a strong all Ireland dimension, and be under central Government control - ideally, jointly by London and Dublin. The regional forces would in his analysis help to break down the distance from the community, presumably because each would recruit local people, who would stay put, and because each would have its own Police Authority, consisting predominantly of elected representatives, and with stronger power over the regional commander than PANI has.
Sinn Fein	Seems to envisage a single police service, with elements at local level under the influence of local advisory committees, backed by special units dealing with serious crime, the whole under the aegis of the Police Commission. Is clear that there must be gender and community background quotas, to ensure that the service reflects the broader community, and to prevent local units developing sectarian compositions reflective of their local environs. This seems to be diametrically opposed to the SDLP position!
Labour (British)	Unconvinced that there should be more than one police force in Northern Ireland. Considers that while police should be responsive to local needs, there is a requirement for equality and for consistent standards, and for effective co-ordination of activity throughout NI, especially where crime is 'mobile', where there are economies of scale, or where particular skills are needed. Looks for maximum possible

	devolution of local commanders - along lines likely to be proposed in the Fundamental Review.
White Paper (Chapter 1 & 5)	The White Paper does not mention regionalisation in the Mallon sense of 4 or more separate police forces, since this would be both extremely unwelcome to Unionists, and resource consuming rather than saving, as well as reducing effectiveness. Instead, it adopts the approach of encouraging genuinely local arrangements for close community/police liaison and accountability. No specific legislative proposals are made at this stage, but if it became clear that statutory backing would be beneficial (eg perhaps some kind of registration scheme for CPLCs) then it could be considered.

RUC COMPOSITION (FUNDAMENTAL REVIEW)

Irish Govt	Members of the police service must be drawn from and be representative of the communities they serve.
SDLP	Policing system needs to command support: more than getting the religious head count right. Means active participating granting of allegiance.
Sinn Fein	RUC should be disbanded. But regard the UDR as having been disbanded; in addition clearish that one of functions of the Police Commission will be to deal with unresolved complaints against RUC officers, on transfer to the new service. Regard it as important that there should be gender and community background quotas, to ensure that the new service is not sectarian and is representative of the wider community.
Labour (British)	The force must become balanced - recognise that this is difficult against the historic background of lack of recruits from the minority community, and the need to reduce numbers if peace is established. Also recognise that this is a matter for the Fundamental Review - hopes that work is being done to ensure that existing officers are treated with consideration and generosity.
White Paper (Chapter 1)	Spells out that issues of composition and gender balance will be tackled as part of the Fundamental Review; stresses that recruitment and promotion must be on the strict basis of merit and ability.

COMMUNITY POLICING (FUNDAMENTAL REVIEW)

Irish Govt	Not mentioned.
SDLP	Not mentioned specifically.
Sinn Fein	Reams on the subject - a lot of it from a radical perspective, that individuals and communities should take ownership of their own problems, and try to resolve them; and that a convenient law enforcement response is not always the most appropriate. If it were not for the reality that, in practice, means children with their legs and arms beaten to a pulp for shoplifting, by concerned and civic minded members of the local community - it would be tempting to say we could support Sinn Fein's ideas in this area.
Labour (British)	Does not get into detail - but generally warm towards notions of policing, finely tuned to local needs, within a centrally maintained framework of consistency, effectiveness, and equitable treatment.
White Paper (Chapters 1 & 5)	The White Paper does not go into detail on this, because the question of how the police service is delivered is a matter for the Fundamental Review. But strong endorsement for community involvement in policing, and for initiatives to develop this further.