



## Module 10

### Security Governance, Accountability & Performance

Security is a public good. Local ownership and oversight of the security sector is a public duty. Modules 1 and 2 outlined all the potential stakeholders in the security sector. Module 3 outlined the five elements of civil-military-police coordination, including joint capacity building, assessment, planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Module 3 also emphasised the benefits of local ownership and multi-stakeholder coordination. This module concludes the *Handbook* with a lesson outlining how civilians, military and the police can work together to monitor and evaluate security governance, accountability and performance.

This Module is part of the *Handbook on Human Security* found at [www.humansecuritycoordination.org](http://www.humansecuritycoordination.org). It contains a summary of the S-GAP toolkit written by Partners Global. The complete tool can be found online at: <http://securitygovernance.org>.

**Please cite lesson number and title along with this citation.** Schirch, Lisa (editor). *Handbook on Human Security: A Civil-Military-Police Curriculum*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Alliance for Peacebuilding, GPPAC, Kroc Institute, March 2016.

©2015 Creative Commons – Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)



## Lesson 31

# Assessing Security Governance, Accountability & Performance

### **Learning Objective:**

At the end of the lesson, participants will be able to:

- Identify three principles of security sector assessment
- Identify three potential uses of the S-GAP tool to improve security
- Define characteristics of security governance, accountability and performance

This lesson introduces a security sector assessment and review framework. The Security — Governance Accountability and Performance (S-GAP) Toolkit provides local and national civil society, government leaders, and members of the security sector a foundation for security policy-making that promotes a comprehensive planning strategy. The S-GAP provides a guide for research, dialogue, and advocacy on security governance, accountability and performance designed by Partners Global (formerly named Partners for Democratic Change). The tool also provides a framework for monitoring implementation as reform initiatives evolve.

*This lesson contains a summary of the S-GAP toolkit. The complete tool can be found on-line at: <http://securitygovernance.org>.*

### **1. Security Governance, Accountability and Performance (S-GAP)**

Security is a public good. Local ownership and oversight of the security sector is a public duty for all people in a society. Module 3 outlined the five elements of coordination, including joint capacity building, assessment, planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Coordination mechanisms for police, military, civilian government and civil society to provide such joint monitoring and evaluation have been weak.

Security reforms are frequently carried out in the frenzied days following conflict or political transition, or in the midst of an on-going security threat. These high-intensity conditions mean that the process for designing reform initiatives is often highly politicised and frequently focused primarily on addressing immediate challenges. These initiatives are rarely comprehensive because they are so focused on immediate political or security gains.

The S-GAP Framework is a tool for assessing the functioning of a security sector and broader security system. There are myriad factors involved in supporting the proper functioning of a strong system for ensuring security. There are many different ways of categorising a review of the security sector. The S-GAP Framework is organised into three main categories - Governance, Accountability and Performance.

<b>Governance</b>	Governance of the security sector is the process by which citizens and the state define security, public safety, and justice needs, and establish and implement laws and policies to address those needs. This process must include the proper allocation of resources, promote the rule of law and human rights norms, and result in professional, effective, legitimate and equitable institutions.
<b>Accountability</b>	Accountability of the security sector is the compliance of state security, public safety and justice actors with robust internal and external conduct review mechanisms as well as with the laws and policies governing their institutional missions; the transparency of these actors to the population they serve; and the ability of non-state actors (media, civil society organisations, and citizens) to publicise violations and seek redress in cases of alleged wrong doing by security, public safety and justice actors.
<b>Performance</b>	Performance of the security sector is the effective execution of the mandates of the various security, public safety and justice institutions as defined by the civilian leadership and accordance with domestic and international laws, policies, and regulations, in order to meet the various security, public safety, and justice needs of the population.

## 2. Multi-stakeholder Research, Dialogue and Reform

A key feature of S-GAP is its emphasis on an inclusive policymaking process. Institutional reforms too often fail because they lack local support or buy-in or are otherwise unsuited to a given context. This is particularly true in the case of improvements to security institutions, which are often developed in capital cities through the participation of a relatively small number of experts. Partners believes that effective reform initiatives must secure input from all the major stakeholder groups, including those from civil society, the government, the security sector, and even the international community. In order to be successful, those whom the reform is meant to serve must be involved.

Most existing security sector assessment tools are directed at international audiences as part of a larger SSR or security assistance effort. While the S-GAP Toolkit can be useful for these international actors, it is primarily intended for local and national actors from civil society, government, and the security sector. S-GAP is designed to help local actors to assess the quality of their own security system and identify windows of opportunity to improve its functioning.

The purpose of S-GAP is to guide assessment and planning around improvements to the security sector and the broader security system. In the ideal scenario, S-GAP is used to guide a multi-stakeholder working group composed of civil society, government, security sector, and, in some cases, international actors through a comprehensive assessment process. It further provides a platform for planning reforms and for conducting continuous monitoring and re-assessment.

### 3. Principles for Security Assessments

Security system assessments should be:

*Comprehensive*, reviewing the security system as a whole for areas of potential weakness and strength to build upon. This includes — but is not limited to — all defence, security, public safety, and justice institutions of the state, as well as relevant non-state actors in justice and security.

*Inclusive*, integrating the experiences and perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders, including civil society, government, security services, and others in order to ensure on-going support and promote sustainability of reforms.

*Transparent*, so that the public understands any changes that might occur as a result, and are therefore better able to support those changes.

*Recurring*, on an on-going basis so that the security system is able to respond effectively to ever-evolving contexts. “Reform” should be thought of as simply “adaptation,” a natural process that the security services are continually engaged in.

### 4. S-GAP Methods

The S-GAP frameworks and worksheets in the next lesson can be used in a variety of ways:

S-GAP can be used as a *research tool*, providing a particular sector an opportunity to analyse current and potential security provision.

S-GAP can also be used as an *educational tool*, to enhance understanding of current and potential security provision. This education could take place within a particular sector, for example security services, or within a particular location, for example in a local community context with significant security needs.

S-GAP can be used in a *multi-stakeholder process* for security reform if a variety of factors are addressed and coalesced for a “ripe moment,” but it can also be a multi-stakeholder process for dialogue across sectors about security provision. S-GAP can also be used to support advocacy, whether by members of the security services or civil society organisations. Ultimate application and use of S-GAP depends upon the particular context and opportunities available.

To successfully transform a security system into one that is well governed, accountable and highly performing requires a strong vision, a commitment over time, resources and the support of a range of actors. No matter how reformers choose to make use of the S-GAP Framework they will be best served by creating an inclusive and comprehensive process that draws on the capacities and expertise of all stakeholders. Using the S-GAP Framework will help reformers identify the windows of opportunity for reform and how it impacts the larger security governance, accountability and performance system. Reformers can employ the Framework using a range of different strategies.

### 5. Guiding Questions and Framework Tools

The S-GAP Framework’s three main categories - Governance, Accountability and Performance - are organised into three sub-categories and then a further three secondary components for a total of 27 elements. These are found in the chart on the next pages.

Each secondary component is accompanied by a set of guiding questions. The chart here only contains one question, as an example of the type of questions asked.

After familiarising themselves with the guiding questions, participants will likely need to spend a significant amount of time collecting relevant information in order to answer the questions. This may take anywhere from several hours to several weeks, depending on the complexity of the issue being analysed and the familiarity of the participants with that issue. Outside experts with specific expertise may need to be engaged. Some guidance on where to find this information is included in the Framework itself, though participants will likely have to gather information from additional sources including surveys, polling, social media, and media analysis.

Upon gathering the information, participants will engage in facilitated discussion of the elements of the Framework based on the guiding questions and will attempt to come to an agreement on detailed answers to the questions. This is likely to be a time-consuming, complicated and contentious process. It is

to be expected that participants will have divergent opinions about the appropriate response to many of the guiding questions, particularly as it relates to the quality of the laws, policies, procedures and structures in place. This is particularly the case for stakeholders coming from different sectors. Many of these opinions will be strongly held, and there is a danger that some groups could become defensive. It is up to the facilitator to guide conversation around these questions and avoid allowing the conversation to become stalled or derailed by vested interests or defensive attitudes. In many cases, the dialogue around these disagreements will be as useful as the product of the S-GAP process itself.

The complete S-GAP tool contains worksheets useful for scoring group responses to the complete set of research questions identified in each category. Scoring is not required nor prescribed by the answer to any one question; instead it is the product of a negotiated agreement between participants in a reform process that is informed by the guiding questions. Participants will work through the guiding questions and begin taking note of responses and examples.

## **6. Developing Goals and Objectives**

If reformers use the S-GAP Framework as part of an assessment and planning process a necessary step would be to develop a plan for how to proactively improve their security system. Participants would develop objectives or progress markers, as well as timelines for achieving them. The objectives or areas of reform that participants develop can be informed by and reflect the guiding questions and assessments for each sub-component. This process is almost certain to unfold as a negotiation between participants with divergent interests and points of view. It will be up to the facilitator to help guide this discussion so that concrete objectives are developed and a diversity of interests are represented.

Due to the likely contentious nature of developing objectives for reform, it may be tempting for participants to focus on “low hanging fruit”—that is, reform initiatives that are relatively politically palatable and agreeable among the diverse participants. This is again where a skilled facilitator is critical. In some cases, focusing on “quick wins” in the short term may be required to develop momentum in highly contentious environments, particularly in the early stages of reform. As the reform process evolves, however, increasing focus should be placed on making substantive reforms and significant strides toward the ideals accompanying each secondary component and the definitions provided for each of the three main components.

## **REVIEW**

This lesson introduced the Security-Governance Accountability and Performance (S-GAP) Toolkit. The S-GAP provides a guide for research, dialogue, and advocacy on security governance, accountability and performance. The complete S-GAP Toolkit, designed by Partners Global, can be found on-line at <http://securitygovernance.org>.

# GOVERNANCE

GOVERNANCE		
<b>Institutional Mandates</b>		
	<b>Guiding Principles for Defence and Security, Public Safety &amp; Justice</b>	What are the policies and laws regarding the roles and responsibilities of the security sector?
	<b>Separation of Security Management Responsibilities</b>	Who has decision-making authority (formal or informal) for security sector organisations?
	<b>Guiding Principles for Emergency Response and Extraordinary Circumstances</b>	How is a state of emergency or declaration to use force determined and put into action?
<b>Policy Environment</b>		
	<b>National Security Strategy</b>	How are priority security issues identified, and plans for addressing them articulated? Is there a defined national security strategy?
	<b>Budget Process</b>	How are defence, security, public safety and justice sector budgets developed?
	<b>Civilian Engagement and Participation Definition</b>	How are civilians engaged and participating in security management? How do they collaborate with the security sector?
<b>Legal Environment</b>		
	<b>Civil, Criminal and International Law</b>	To which international human rights treaties is the country a signatory? Have these treaties been domesticated in national (and sub-national, as appropriate) law?
	<b>Courts Governing Security Sector Conduct Definition</b>	What policies are in place that prescribe how the military is to perform its operations and what procedures are to be followed if those policies are broken (such as a military code of conduct and code of justice)?
	<b>Governance of Non-state and Non-statutory Security and Justice Actors</b>	What role do non-state and non-statutory security and justice actors play in security in the country? What security or justice needs do non-state actors most often attempt to address? To what extent do their activities enhance security in the country?

# ACCOUNTABILITY

ACCOUNTABILITY		
<b>Supervising and Monitoring Processes</b>		
	<b>State-based External Review and Oversight Mechanisms</b>	What are the legislative oversight mechanisms (e.g. committees on armed services, intelligence, foreign affairs, defence, etc.) that have authority to supervise or monitor defence, security, justice, and public safety organisations and their activities? How often and in what ways do they exercise their authority?
	<b>Internal Review Mechanisms</b>	What internal review and monitoring mechanisms exist within security sector organisations?
	<b>Independent Review and Monitoring</b>	What security sector review mechanisms are conducted outside of security sector organisations, and outside of state or government-run monitoring programmes?

<b>Transparency</b>		
	<b>Availability of Information</b>	How does the public access information about the security sector?
	<b>Right to Freedom of Information</b>	Is there a national (and sub-national, as appropriate) Freedom of Information (or similar) law?
	<b>Clarity for Disclosure of Sensitive Intelligence Information</b>	How are intelligence priorities made known to the public?
<b>Remedy</b>		
	<b>Courts and Tribunals</b>	If misconduct or wrongdoing occurs by or against the security sector, how is it addressed?
	<b>Transitional Justice Processes</b>	If there have been widespread human rights violations, how has the country acknowledged and addressed the offenses?
	<b>Informal Justice Processes</b>	How do informal or indigenous justice processes interact with formal or state processes?
<b>PERFORMANCE</b>		
<b>Police Performance</b>		
	<b>Adequacy of Human Resources (Police)</b>	What standards and policies exist for personnel composition in the police? How are these standards and policies developed? How are they enforced?
	<b>Financial and Technical Resources and Preparedness (Police)</b>	How are needs assessments conducted to ensure that equipment and other resources available to the police are sufficient for the police to effectively fulfill their mandate?
	<b>Police Effectiveness</b>	In what ways do police activities reduce levels of violence and crime and promote rule of law?
<b>Defence Sector Performance</b>		
	<b>Adequacy of Human Resources (Defence Sector)</b>	What standards and policies exist for personnel composition in the military and other defence institutions?
	<b>Financial and Technical Resources and Operational Preparedness (Defence Sector)</b>	How are needs assessments conducted to ensure that equipment and other resources available to the military and other defence institutions are sufficient for them to effectively fulfil their mandate?
	<b>Defence Sector Effectiveness</b>	In what ways do military activities promote stability and national security?
<b>Justice Sector Performance</b>		
	<b>Adequacy of Human Resources (Justice Sector)</b>	Are there an adequate number of judges to ensure efficient processing of cases?
	<b>Financial and Technical Resources (Justice Sector)</b>	Is there a central ministry or other body for ensuring that courts perform adequately regardless of location (urban or rural), and does this body have adequate resources for performing this function?
	<b>Justice Sector Effectiveness</b>	To what extent are courts able to operate independent of interference from political, economic, social, criminal and transnational pressures?

## Lesson 31

## Learning Exercises

### Anchor

10 minutes

To begin the lesson, anchor the content in this lesson with an open question for discussion in small groups of two or three people:

- Do you see security as a “public good” or service that the government provides to the population?
- What in your experience is a way that the public tells the government if the security sector is performing that public service appropriately?

### Add

15 minutes

Present the PowerPoint slides or ask participants to discuss the lesson readings in a small group.

### Apply

30 minutes

Each scenario stakeholder team is given an opportunity to submit a report on security governance, accountability and performance. Based on the scenario lessons in other modules, each team can rate the security sector in some or all of the categories listed in the table at the end of this lesson.

Each stakeholder team has 15 minutes to highlight the three areas of weakest and strongest areas in each of the subcategories under governance, accountability and performance. Each team turns their rating into the facilitator.

The facilitator tallies the score and shares the highest and lowest scoring categories with the whole group.

Debrief this exercise in the large group.

- Is the final scoring accurate? Or do some groups disagree with it?
- Was every team’s voice heard?
- What are the benefits of a process to examine the security governance, accountability and performance?

See the “Scenario-based Learning” section in the [Handbook on Human Security: A Civil-Military-Police Curriculum](#) for explanation of the scenarios and teams.

### Away

5 minutes

To end the lesson, the trainer can ask participants to divide into groups of 2 or 3 people. Participants can share with each other their reflections on this lesson.

This Lesson is part of the *Handbook on Human Security* found at [www.humansecuritycoordination.org](http://www.humansecuritycoordination.org)

**Please cite lesson number and title along with this citation.** Schirch, Lisa (editor). *Handbook on Human Security: A Civil-Military-Police Curriculum*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Alliance for Peacebuilding, GPPAC, Kroc Institute, March 2016.

©2015 Creative Commons – Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)



New generations of security sector leaders recognise that civil society is an important stakeholder for sustainable security. At the same time, a rapidly growing number of civil society organisations also recognise the need to engage with the security sector as key stakeholders for sustainable peace. Human security depends on fruitful civil-military-police understanding and coordination. No one group can achieve human security on their own without working with others. Civil society, military and police all have roles to play in achieving human security.

This innovative, first-of-its-kind integrated civil-military-police training curriculum aims to provide practical guidance and a shared understanding of terms and concepts to enable civil-military-police coordination to support human security. The *Handbook on Human Security* was designed for senior and mid-level leaders in national, regional and international organisations, government, military, police and civil society. Ideally, training and education centres for military, police, and civil society organisations including NGOs, universities, and religious organisations will use the curriculum in integrated civil-military-police courses to enable joint learning and relationship building.

This publication is a result of a consortium initiative led by the Alliance for Peacebuilding in collaboration with the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict and the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies. It is a collaborative product drawing on the expertise of people from forty countries and over one hundred organisations consulted over a span of three years. The *Handbook on Human Security* has a companion publication entitled *Local Ownership in Security: Case Studies of Peacebuilding Approaches* that documents nearly 40 examples of civil society-military-police coordination.

*The project was made possible with the generous support from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The opinions and views of the authors do not necessarily state or reflect those of the Fund.*