

## **PROSPECTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL GUARD**

**Nazarov Ganisher Bahodirovich,**  
**post doctorate**

**University of Public Safety of the Republic of Uzbekistan**

**Abstract:** The following article provides a scholarly analysis of global changes in the international security environment and their impact on national security systems. It offers a detailed examination of security sector reforms undertaken by international organizations such as the UN, OSCE, EU, NATO, and DCAF, as well as normative documents that ensure civilian oversight and human rights-based models of democratic governance (including the Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, Guidebook on Democratic Policing, EU Security Union Strategy 2020–2025, NATO Policy on Human Security, and the DCAF Accountability Cycle Model). Furthermore, based on international best practices, the article substantiates strategic directions for developing the administrative activities of the National Guard of Uzbekistan, including the implementation of human security-oriented democratic governance; the establishment of digital monitoring and accountability systems; the promotion of gender equality; the enhancement of public participation; and the strengthening of international cooperation.

The article also offers recommendations for improving personnel capacity within the National Guard system, drawing on the community policing model, DCAF-proposed civilian oversight methods, and NATO educational standards.

**Keywords:** National Guard, administrative activity, security sector reform, UN, OSCE, EU, NATO, DCAF, human security, democratic oversight, accountability, public participation

## **MILLIY Gvardiya organlarining ma'muriy amaliyot faoliyatini rivojlantirish istiqbollari**

**Nazarov G'anisher Bahodirovich, mustaqil izlanuvchi**  
**O'zbekiston Respublikasi Jamoat xavfsizligi universiteti**

**Annotatsiya:** Ushbu maqolada jahon xavfsizlik muhitida yuz berayotgan global o'zgarishlar va ularning milliy xavfsizlik tizimlariga ta'siri ilmiy asosda tahlil qilingan. BMT, YEXHT, YEI,

NATO va DCAF kabi xalqaro tashkilotlarning xavfsizlik sektoridagi islohotlari, inson huquqlariga tayangan demokratik boshqaruv modellari hamda fuqarolik nazoratini ta'minlash bo'yicha me'yoriy hujjatlari (jumladan, "Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials", "Guidebook on Democratic Policing", "EU Security Union Strategy 2020–2025", "NATO Policy on Human Security", "DCAF Accountability Cycle Model") chuqur o'rganilgan. Shuningdek, maqolada xalqaro amaliyot asosida O'zbekiston Milliy gvardiyasining ma'muriy amaliyotini rivojlantirish yo'nalishlari — inson xavfsizligiga yo'naltirilgan demokratik boshqaruvni joriy etish, raqamli monitoring va hisobdorlik tizimini shakllantirish, gender tengligini ta'minlash, jamoatchilik ishtirokini kengaytirish va xalqaro hamkorlikni kuchaytirish — ilmiy jihatdan asoslangan. Shuningdek, Milliy gvardiya tizimida "community policing" modeli, DCAF taklif etgan fuqarolik nazorati usuli va NATO ta'limiy standartlari asosida kadrlar salohiyatini oshirish bo'yicha tavsiyalar ilgari surilgan.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Milliy gvardiya, ma'muriy amaliyot, xavfsizlik sektori islohotlari, BMT, YEXHT, YEI, NATO, DCAF, inson xavfsizligi, demokratik nazorat, fuqarolik jamiyati, hisobdorlik.

## **ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ АДМИНИСТРАТИВНОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ОРГАНОВ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ГВАРДИИ**

**Назаров Ганишер Баходирович, самостоятельный соискатель  
Университет общественной безопасности Республики Узбекистан**

**Аннотация:** В данной статье научно проанализированы глобальные изменения в международной среде безопасности и их влияние на национальные системы безопасности. Детально исследованы реформы в секторе безопасности международных организаций, таких как ООН, ОБСЕ, ЕС, НАТО и DCAF, а также нормативные документы, обеспечивающие гражданский контроль и основанные на правах человека модели демократического управления (в частности, «Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials», «Guidebook on Democratic Policing», «EU Security Union Strategy 2020–2025», «NATO Policy on Human Security», «DCAF Accountability Cycle Model»). Кроме того, в статье на основе международной практики обоснованы направления развития административной деятельности Национальной гвардии Узбекистана: внедрение демократического управления, ориентированного на безопасность человека; формирование

систем цифрового мониторинга и подотчетности; обеспечение гендерного равенства; расширение участия общественности; укрепление международного сотрудничества. Также предложены рекомендации по повышению кадрового потенциала в системе Национальной гвардии на основе модели «community policing», методов гражданского контроля, предложенных DCAF, и образовательных стандартов НАТО.

**Ключевые слова:** Национальная гвардия, административная деятельность, реформы сектора безопасности, ООН, ОБСЕ, ЕС, НАТО, DCAF, демократическое управление, общественный контроль, подотчётность, человеческая безопасность.

### Introduction.

In recent years, the global security environment has undergone profound transformations, characterized by the proliferation of transnational criminal networks, emergent cyber threats, the evolution of terrorism and extremist activities, recurrent public disorder, and intensified migratory pressures. These dynamics have precipitated the imperative for a comprehensive restructuring of national internal security frameworks and a systematic enhancement of the operational capacities of law enforcement and security institutions. The phenomenon transcends purely domestic considerations, representing a critical issue of international significance, and thereby necessitates the rigorous advancement of institutional reforms aimed at strengthening resilience, accountability, and adaptive governance within security sectors globally<sup>1</sup>.

The statement delivered by United Nations Secretary-General António Guterres at the “Future of Global Security Architecture” summit in New York in 2024 signifies a paradigmatic shift in global security governance. He underscored that institutions tasked with ensuring internal security constitute a fundamental pillar of state resilience, with their operational effectiveness being pivotal not only for the resolution of domestic security challenges but also for the maintenance of international stability. In the contemporary global environment, multidimensional phenomena—including transnational organized crime, terrorism, cyber threats, large-scale migration, ecological crises, and socio-political instability—necessitate a systematic and comprehensive reevaluation of national security strategies.

Guterres’ observations further highlight that the strategic adaptation of state security apparatuses—including National Guards, gendarmeries, and internal security forces—to emerging security threats constitutes a transnational imperative, essential for safeguarding human security and promoting sustainable development. Accordingly, international organizations such as the

---

<sup>1</sup> United Nations. (2024). *Global Crime and Security Threats Report*. New York: UN Publications.

United Nations (UN), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF) consistently advocate that security sector reforms be harmonized with principles of human rights, rule of law, transparency, and civic participation.

**Literature review.** These global dynamics provide a critical framework for shaping security sector reforms in Uzbekistan. Under the strategic leadership of President Shavkat Mirziyoyev, current administrative reforms prioritize the modernization of the National Guard's operational mandate, enhancement of its administrative and functional capacities, and optimization of inter-agency coordination. This reform agenda is aimed at establishing an innovative, human-centered, and standards-compliant public security model that aligns both with domestic imperatives and international security norms.

Consequently, the Secretary-General's pronouncement functions as both a conceptual and operational reference point for the evolution of administrative practices within the National Guard of Uzbekistan. The integration of its activities into the broader international security architecture, alongside the implementation of robust institutional and legal mechanisms capable of addressing contemporary and transboundary threats, represents an urgent and strategic priority for the advancement of Uzbekistan's national security framework<sup>2</sup>.

In the context of New Uzbekistan, the systematic modernization of the state governance apparatus and the alignment of governmental operations with international legal and institutional standards have emerged as pivotal strategic imperatives for national development. Current administrative reforms underscore the necessity of conducting rigorous, evidence-based analyses of structural and procedural factors constraining the efficiency of state institutions, while simultaneously ensuring their harmonization with globally recognized legal frameworks. Such an approach constitutes a foundational element in the construction of a contemporary, resilient, and accountable governance model. Scholarly and jurisprudential inquiry, therefore, serves as a critical mechanism for integrating international best practices into Uzbekistan's administrative and institutional frameworks.

From this vantage, the normative instruments and policy recommendations formulated by leading international organizations, such as the United Nations (UN), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), NATO, and the Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF)—represent essential methodological and analytical

---

<sup>2</sup> Mirziyoyev, Sh. M. *New Uzbekistan Development Strategy – 2030*. – Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 2024. – 350 pp.

resources. These instruments facilitate the advancement of security sector governance, the institutionalization of crime prevention strategies, and the democratization and accountability of law enforcement agencies. For instance, the OSCE's 2023 Vienna Forum promulgated the Community-Oriented Policing and Human Rights framework, which emphasizes the integration of human rights protections, participatory engagement with civil society, and operational transparency as central principles in the conduct of internal security institutions<sup>3</sup>.

In a complementary vein, DCAF's 2024 report delineates internationally recognized standards for enhancing civilian oversight, institutional accountability, and procedural transparency within paramilitary and gendarmerie-type organizations<sup>4</sup>. These frameworks collectively highlight the imperative of modernizing the administrative and operational practices of the National Guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan in conformity with international norms.

Within this scientific and methodological framework, a comparative analysis of the National Guard's functions—specifically its role in crime prevention, the maintenance of public security, and the safeguarding of citizens' rights and freedoms—against international legal and institutional benchmarks is both timely and necessary. Such an analytical approach enables the formulation of empirically grounded conclusions and actionable policy recommendations. Beyond optimizing administrative efficiency, this process supports the progressive alignment of Uzbekistan's security architecture with contemporary global standards. Specifically:

**a) The United Nations' global normative framework for security and crime prevention.**

The UN continues to serve as the principal global institution in promoting international security, peace, and human rights, having developed a comprehensive corpus of normative instruments governing crime prevention and the democratization of law enforcement practices. Notably, the United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (2016), promulgated under the UN Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme, articulates the imperative of grounding the activities of state security institutions in human rights principles, transparency, and the rule of law. The framework further advocates for a proactive, preventive approach to crime that addresses its underlying social determinants, safeguards civil liberties, and prioritizes preventative strategies over punitive measures<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). 2023. *Community-Oriented Policing and Human Rights*. Vienna: OSCE Publications.

<sup>4</sup> Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF). *Annual Review of Security Sector Governance*. Geneva, 2024.

<sup>5</sup> United Nations. (2016). *United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice*. New York: UN Publications.



Concurrently, a series of normative instruments adopted by the United Nations General Assembly have codified international standards governing the operations of law enforcement agencies. Of particular significance is the Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials (1979), which unequivocally mandates that law enforcement personnel engage with individuals in a humane manner and prohibits the use of torture, cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment under any circumstances<sup>6</sup>. This instrument situates the principles of the rule of law and respect for human dignity at the normative center of law enforcement practice.

In addition, the Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials (1990) institutionalizes the principles of proportionality and necessity as foundational tenets of international law. Under these principles, the application of force or firearms by state actors is permissible only as a measure of last resort and exclusively for the purpose of safeguarding human life and physical integrity. These principles are particularly salient for internal security institutions—including National Guards, police forces, and military structures—where they underpin the development of a legally informed, ethically accountable, and operationally responsible culture of public engagement<sup>7</sup>.

Furthermore, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) advanced international guidance through the publication of the Handbook on Police Accountability, Oversight and Integrity (2020). This handbook provides a comprehensive synthesis of best practices for instituting mechanisms of civilian oversight, reinforcing public accountability, and embedding professional ethical standards within law enforcement and National Guard-type organizations.

The handbook explicitly recommends establishing independent internal oversight bodies, ombudsman institutions, and citizen advisory councils to ensure transparency in the operations of internal security agencies<sup>8</sup>. It also identifies three core principles of accountability: legal responsibility, ethical obligation, and institutional transparency. These recommendations are closely integrated with the broader framework of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goal 16, which emphasizes “Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions,”

---

<sup>6</sup> United Nations General Assembly. (1979). *Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials*. Resolution 34/169, adopted on 17 December 1979.

<sup>7</sup> United Nations. (1990). *Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials*. Adopted by the Eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Havana.

<sup>8</sup> United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2020). *Handbook on Police Accountability, Oversight and Integrity*. Vienna: UNODC Publications.

thereby linking operational standards of internal security with global development and governance objectives<sup>9</sup>.

**b) International Normative Frameworks of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in the Context of Security Provision and Crime Prevention**

The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) constitutes one of the principal regional institutions in Europe responsible for ensuring comprehensive security, promoting the democratization of law enforcement institutions, and strengthening civil society structures. Foundational documents of the OSCE, including the Helsinki Final Act (1975) and the Paris Charter (1990), establish an intrinsic interdependence between security, human rights, adherence to the rule of law, and mutual trust among participating states. These instruments provide the normative and legal basis for aligning internal security practices with internationally recognized standards<sup>10</sup>.

The OSCE operationalizes its mandate across three primary dimensions: politico-military, economic-environmental, and human (the “human dimension”). Within the human dimension, the organization has developed a series of normative instruments and policy frameworks aimed at institutionalizing respect for human rights, enhancing mechanisms of civilian oversight, and fostering participatory engagement between law enforcement agencies and the broader public<sup>11</sup>.

Significantly, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) promulgated the Community-Oriented Policing and Human Rights concept in Vienna in 2023<sup>12</sup>. This framework advances the integration of civil society into internal security operations, emphasizing that principles such as transparency, accountability, openness, and the protection of human dignity must constitute the operational core of police and National Guard-type institutions.

The framework further posits that sustainable security is achieved not solely through the rule of law, but also through the development of citizens’ legal awareness and their trust in state institutions. Accordingly, community-oriented policing is promoted as a strategic paradigm within national internal security policies<sup>13</sup>.

Additionally, the OSCE’s Guidebook on Democratic Policing (2018) provides empirically grounded recommendations for the institutional implementation of the rule of law and human

<sup>9</sup> United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015.

<sup>10</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (1975). Helsinki Final Act. Helsinki.

<sup>11</sup> OSCE. (1990). *Charter of Paris for a New Europe*. Paris.

<sup>12</sup> OSCE. (2023). *Community-Oriented Policing and Human Rights*. Vienna: OSCE Publications.

<sup>13</sup> OSCE/ODIHR. (2021). *Community Policing Strategies: Enhancing Trust and Security*. Warsaw: ODIHR Publications.

rights within law enforcement agencies. The guidebook delineates methodologies for establishing robust civilian oversight mechanisms, operationalizing internal accountability structures, and ensuring that personnel are trained in accordance with internationally recognized legal and ethical norms. These measures collectively contribute to the professionalization, legitimacy, and transparency of internal security institutions<sup>14</sup>.

At this stage, conducting a rigorous and systematic analysis of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe's (OSCE) scientific and practical experience in the domains of human rights protection and police accountability would substantially enhance the analytical depth and scientific value of this section. The corpus of normative instruments elaborated by the OSCE with respect to human rights compliance and the democratic oversight of law enforcement institutions serves as a vital mechanism for consolidating the principles of transparency, institutional accountability, and participatory governance within the security sector. The inclusion of these instruments in the analytical framework of the present research would markedly augment its theoretical significance and applied relevance.

In the context of the OSCE's operational practice, the principles of civilian oversight and police accountability constitute foundational pillars of its security governance model. The OSCE Police Missions deployed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and several other states have implemented comprehensive capacity-building programs aimed at fostering the democratization of security structures and promoting community-oriented policing. These missions have operationalized the human security paradigm as a core conceptual framework for the protection of public safety, thereby reinforcing the responsiveness and accountability of state institutions vis-à-vis the citizenry<sup>15</sup>.

Furthermore, the OSCE's 2020 publication entitled *Manual on Police Accountability and Human Rights Compliance* provides empirically grounded and methodologically substantiated guidelines concerning professional police ethics, the principle of proportionality in the use of force, and evidence-based strategies for enhancing police–community cooperation in the prevention of unlawful conduct, particularly during episodes of public disorder<sup>16</sup>.

### **c) The European Union's International Normative Framework in the Field of Security and the Fight against Crime**

<sup>14</sup> OSCE. (2018). *Guidebook on Democratic Policing by the OSCE*. Vienna: OSCE Secretariat.

<sup>15</sup> OSCE. (2020). *Police Mission Reports: Democratic Oversight and Human Security*. Vienna.

<sup>16</sup> OSCE/ODIHR. (2020). *Manual on Police Accountability and Human Rights Compliance*. Warsaw: OSCE Publications.



In this context, the European Union (EU) presently occupies a central position as one of the most authoritative supranational actors in the global architecture of security governance, rule-of-law promotion, and human rights protection. The EU's politico-legal foundation was institutionally consolidated through the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 and the Lisbon Treaty of 2007, which collectively institutionalized a framework for policy integration in the spheres of security, crime prevention, and law enforcement cooperation<sup>17</sup>. Accordingly, a concise yet systematic examination of the legal foundations of the EU's security policy is warranted.

The Maastricht Treaty established the normative and legal basis for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), conceptualizing security as a multidimensional construct to be achieved through interstate cooperation, conflict prevention, peace consolidation, adherence to human rights standards, and the advancement of democratic governance. The subsequent Lisbon Treaty refined and expanded this institutional architecture through the establishment of the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP), thereby reinforcing the EU's strategic autonomy and institutional capacity to act as an independent and coherent security actor in the international system<sup>18</sup>.

Within the framework of the European Union's (EU) security policy, non-military determinants — notably the supremacy of law, the protection of human rights, and the stability of democratic institutions — are conceptualized as core and inseparable components of comprehensive security. This paradigm reflects the EU's distinctive approach to security governance, which prioritizes normative and institutional dimensions over purely coercive measures. Consequently, it has given rise to the EU's law-based security model, grounded in universal humanistic values, rule-of-law principles, and normative legitimacy as the foundation of sustainable peace and stability.

In pursuit of a coherent and integrated security architecture, the EU has elaborated and adopted a series of normative and strategic frameworks designed to deepen supranational and intergovernmental cooperation across the security domain. The most salient among these include:

1. EU Security Union Strategy 2020–2025.

This strategic framework establishes a comprehensive, multidimensional, and cross-sectoral approach to addressing transnational security challenges. It reflects the recognition that contemporary threats — including terrorism, organized crime, cyberattacks, and hybrid risks — transcend national borders and thus require coordinated, intelligence-driven, and legally

---

<sup>17</sup> Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty), 1992.

<sup>18</sup> Treaty of Lisbon, 2007.

harmonized responses. The Strategy delineates key priority areas, namely: counterterrorism and radicalization prevention; strengthening cybersecurity and digital resilience; protection of external borders; and the optimization of information-sharing, intelligence exchange, and inter-agency coordination mechanisms<sup>19</sup>.

2. EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy (2020–2024).

This policy instrument codifies the normative foundations of the EU's external and internal security governance, emphasizing human dignity, institutional accountability, transparency, and civilian oversight as essential conditions for legitimate security practices. The Action Plan explicitly mandates that all entities engaged in the maintenance of public order and collective safety operate in full conformity with human rights standards and international humanitarian law, thereby embedding the principles of democratic control and proportionality into the operational logic of EU security policy<sup>20</sup>.

3. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000).

**Object of the research and used methodologies.** Functioning as the constitutional cornerstone of the EU's human rights regime, the Charter articulates binding obligations for public authorities, including law enforcement and national security bodies, to uphold human dignity, equality before the law, and procedural fairness. It establishes a normative framework within which the exercise of coercive power must be consistent with principles of justice, proportionality, and respect for fundamental freedoms, thereby anchoring security policy within the broader paradigm of constitutional legality and democratic legitimacy<sup>21</sup>.

From an institutional standpoint, the EU's contemporary security architecture is operationalized through a network of specialized agencies designed to ensure strategic coordination and judicial cooperation among Member States. Of particular importance are Europol (the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation) and Eurojust (the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation).

❖ **Europol** performs a central and integrative role in the EU's collective response to transnational criminal phenomena. Through the systematic collection, processing, and analytical dissemination of criminal intelligence, Europol functions as the principal hub for intergovernmental law enforcement cooperation. Its functional mandate encompasses the

<sup>19</sup> European Commission. (2020). *EU Security Union Strategy 2020–2025*. Brussels.

<sup>20</sup> European External Action Service. (2020). *EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy (2020–2024)*. Brussels.

<sup>21</sup> *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union*, 2000.

prevention and suppression of cybercrime, drug trafficking, human trafficking, money laundering, financial and economic crimes, and terrorism. In this capacity, Europol not only enhances the analytical and operational capacity of Member States but also serves as an institutional embodiment of the EU's principle of shared responsibility in the field of internal security<sup>22</sup>.

❖ **Eurojust — The European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation** operates as a pivotal supranational mechanism facilitating the coordination and harmonization of prosecutorial and judicial activities among Member States. It serves as an institutional intermediary designed to enhance procedural efficiency, coherence, and interoperability within the transnational criminal justice system of the European Union. Through the systematic facilitation of mutual legal assistance, the exchange of evidentiary materials, and the alignment of investigative practices, Eurojust contributes to the acceleration, fairness, and legal integrity of cross-border judicial proceedings. In doing so, it strengthens the functional unity of the EU's judicial space and reinforces the principle of mutual trust among national legal systems<sup>23</sup>.

The institutional evolution of the EU's security policy framework thus reflects a paradigmatic shift from a traditional, state-centric conception of security toward a comprehensive, multidimensional model that equally prioritizes state and societal security. This approach embodies the concept of human-centered security governance, wherein the legitimacy of state power and coercive authority is predicated upon democratic accountability, the protection of fundamental rights, and the normative supremacy of law.

Within this context, the "EU Police Cooperation Code of Conduct" (2018), jointly adopted by the European Commission and the European Parliament, codifies a normative framework for ensuring legality, transparency, and proportionality in policing. It establishes legally binding behavioral and operational standards obligating law enforcement agencies to adhere to principles of restraint in the use of force, legal proportionality, procedural transparency, and participatory engagement with the citizenry<sup>24</sup>. By institutionalizing these norms, the Code operationalizes the principle of democratic policing as a core component of EU internal security governance.

In parallel, the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL) functions as the primary capacity-development and knowledge-transfer institution in the EU's security ecosystem. Its training and professionalization programs are specifically aimed at strengthening police officers' ethical competence, enhancing their awareness of human rights obligations, and

<sup>22</sup> Europol. (2024). *European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation Annual Report*. The Hague.

<sup>23</sup> Eurojust. (2023). *Annual Report on Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Matters*. Luxembourg.

<sup>24</sup> European Parliament & European Commission. (2018). *EU Police Cooperation Code of Conduct*. Brussels.

promoting compliance with international legal and operational standards<sup>25</sup>. These initiatives collectively represent the institutional embodiment of the EU's Integrated Security Governance model — a framework emphasizing systemic coordination and functional balance between the military, administrative, and civil dimensions of security policy. Within this model, civil society engagement, accountability, and transparency are regarded as indispensable preconditions for sustainable and legitimate security governance.

d) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO): Global Normative and Institutional Foundations in the Sphere of Security and Law Enforcement

In the contemporary international security system, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) constitutes one of the most consequential military-political entities, exerting substantial influence on the evolution of both global and regional security architectures. Established under the Washington Treaty of 4 April 1949, NATO institutionalized the principles of collective defense, political solidarity, and military integration among its members, thereby inaugurating a new era in the institutionalization of international security cooperation<sup>26</sup>. The strategic mandate of NATO extends well beyond the classical notion of collective defense. The Alliance's mission is grounded in the advancement of democratic governance, the rule of law, and the protection of human rights as normative foundations of global peace and stability<sup>27</sup>. In this regard, NATO's contemporary operational agenda encompasses not only defense and deterrence but also an expanding array of non-military initiatives, including the reform of law enforcement institutions, the modernization of national guard structures, and the strengthening of civil security systems within partner and member states.

A central policy instrument guiding NATO's multidimensional security agenda is the "Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization" (2010)<sup>28</sup>. This document articulates the organization's political, legal, and humanitarian priorities and delineates the conceptual framework within which collective security is to be maintained. The Strategic Concept underscores that sustainable security cannot be achieved solely through the projection of military power; rather, it requires the entrenchment of democratic governance, adherence to the rule of law, and the systematic protection of human rights as integral components of the security paradigm.

<sup>25</sup> CEPOL. (2023). *Training Catalogue on Human Rights and Police Ethics*. Budapest.

<sup>26</sup> NATO. (2020). *Founding Principles and Democratic Values*. Brussels.

<sup>27</sup> NATO. (2010). *Strategic Concept for the Defense and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization*. Lisbon.

<sup>28</sup> NATO. (2015). *Comprehensive Approach to Security: Policy Guidelines*. Brussels.

Within this strategic framework, NATO identifies a series of priority policy orientations, including:

- ✓ Rule of Law and the Zero-Tolerance Doctrine: Strengthening the integrity and resilience of the security system through the rigorous enforcement of anti-corruption measures, the elimination of impunity, and the promotion of ethical governance within defense and law enforcement institutions.

- ✓ Accountability and Transparency: Institutionalizing mechanisms of public and parliamentary oversight, ensuring procedural openness in governmental decision-making, and fostering international accountability within defense and security structures.

Through these normative commitments, NATO has progressively redefined itself from a predominantly military alliance into a comprehensive security organization embodying both coercive and normative dimensions of power. Its evolving role reflects the broader transformation of global security governance — from force-based deterrence to law-based, cooperative, and value-oriented security management.

- ✓ Institutional Cooperation between Military and Civil Structures.

This principle is predicated upon the systematic integration of military and civilian capacities to enhance the coherence, responsiveness, and efficiency of security management processes. It ensures interoperability across defense, law enforcement, and administrative domains, thereby strengthening the structural resilience and strategic adaptability of the broader security architecture.

- ✓ Promotion of Civil Society Participation. NATO's security governance model acknowledges the indispensable role of non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, and public associations in the design, implementation, and evaluation of security policy. The principle aims to embed democratic inclusivity and societal accountability within decision-making processes, thus reinforcing the legitimacy of security governance and the public trust upon which it depends.

Building upon these foundational tenets, NATO formulated its “Comprehensive Approach to Security” strategy, which conceptualizes sustainable security as a multidimensional construct grounded in political stability, the rule of law, human rights protection, and effective governance. This approach transcends the traditional military paradigm, emphasizing that long-term stability is contingent upon the integration of legal, institutional, and human security dimensions<sup>29</sup>.

---

<sup>29</sup> NATO. (2015). *Comprehensive Approach to Security: Policy Guidelines*. Brussels.



In operational terms, NATO assigns considerable strategic weight to the civilian components of security provision. In parallel with its collective defense functions, the Alliance pursues an extensive agenda of institutional reforms and capacity-building programs directed at the democratization and professionalization of policing, law enforcement, and public safety governance. Among the most illustrative initiatives are the following:

1. NATO Stability Policing Centre of Excellence (COE). Situated in Vicenza, Italy, this specialized institution serves as a transnational knowledge and training hub dedicated to reforming and modernizing police, gendarmerie, and national guard structures. Its mission encompasses the enhancement of public order management, the institutionalization of community-oriented policing, and the dissemination of advanced methodologies and normative standards in stability policing across member and partner states<sup>30</sup>.

2. NATO Building Integrity (BI) Programme. The BI Programme constitutes a comprehensive global framework for the prevention of corruption and the promotion of integrity within the defense and security sectors. It aims to institutionalize transparency, fiscal responsibility, and ethical accountability in defense governance. Through technical assistance and policy guidance, the Programme strengthens oversight mechanisms, personnel ethics, and anti-corruption compliance across participating jurisdictions<sup>31</sup>.

3. NATO Defence Education Enhancement Programme (DEEP). This initiative combines academic rigor with practical implementation to support human capital development within both military and civilian segments of the security sector. DEEP promotes the diffusion of international standards of professionalism, human rights observance, and ethical conduct<sup>32</sup>. It also serves as an instrumental platform for developing modern educational models of security sector training and cooperation in partner countries, including Uzbekistan.

Collectively, these institutional mechanisms have contributed to the formation of democratically accountable and community-responsive models of internal security governance within NATO member states. Such models are characterized by transparency, participatory oversight, and adherence to normative principles of legality and human rights.

A particularly significant advancement within NATO's normative evolution is the adoption of the 2022 "Policy on Human Security." This document redefines the Alliance's strategic paradigm by situating the protection of human dignity and individual rights at the nucleus of its

<sup>30</sup> NATO Stability Policing Centre of Excellence (COE). (2023). *Annual Activity Report*. Vicenza.

<sup>31</sup> NATO. (2021). *Building Integrity in Defense and Security Sectors: Implementation Report*. Brussels.

<sup>32</sup> NATO. (2022). *Defense Education Enhancement Programme (DEEP) Compendium*. Brussels.

security agenda. It codifies binding obligations for the prevention of torture, ill-treatment, and discrimination within both military and law enforcement operations<sup>33</sup>. Furthermore, it mandates adherence to the principles of proportionality, precaution, and compliance with international humanitarian law in the use of force, thereby embedding human rights compliance into the operational ethos of the Alliance.

Similarly, the 2021 “NATO Concept on Women, Peace and Security (WPS)” institutionalizes gender equality as a critical determinant of security resilience and conflict prevention<sup>34</sup>. The Concept emphasizes the mainstreaming of gender perspectives into peacebuilding, crisis management, and human rights protection processes. In doing so, NATO positions gender inclusion not merely as a moral imperative, but as a strategic variable in the pursuit of durable peace and institutional legitimacy.

Through these frameworks, NATO has established a global normative model that integrates military capability with human rights observance, thereby consolidating democratic values and rule-of-law principles within both its military and civilian security systems.

#### **e) The Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF): Scientific and Legal Foundations of International Security Governance**

The Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF), founded in 2000 under the auspices of the Swiss Federal Government, represents a cornerstone institution in the global system of Security Sector Reform (SSR) and Security Sector Governance (SSG)<sup>35</sup>. Headquartered in Geneva, DCAF has evolved into a multidisciplinary center of excellence that integrates research, policy innovation, and technical assistance to support states in developing security institutions that are effective, accountable, transparent, and grounded in democratic legality. From a conceptual standpoint, DCAF defines the security sector as a comprehensive constellation of institutions — including the armed forces, national guard, police, border protection agencies, intelligence services, judicial and prosecutorial authorities, and civil oversight mechanisms. Within this analytical framework, security is interpreted not merely as the protection of state sovereignty, but as the assurance of human security, premised upon respect for human rights, access to justice, and civilian control over the use of coercive power<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>33</sup> NATO. (2022). *Policy on Human Security*. Brussels.

<sup>34</sup> NATO. (2021). *Women, Peace and Security Policy and Action Plan 2021–2025*. Brussels.

<sup>35</sup> Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF). (2000). *Founding Charter*. Geneva.

<sup>36</sup> DCAF. (2017). *Security Sector Governance: Concept and Definitions*. Geneva.

**Obtained results and their analysis.** DCAF's mission thus entails providing scientifically informed policy guidance, normative frameworks, and capacity-building programs to assist partner states in implementing SSR and SSG principles. Its activities are underpinned by comparative research, evidence-based assessment, and policy harmonization with international instruments such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 16), the OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, and the EU's Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP).

Through its research and advisory initiatives, DCAF plays a pivotal role in advancing a scientific paradigm of democratic security governance, where the effectiveness of security institutions is evaluated not solely in terms of operational capacity, but in relation to their compliance with human rights standards, rule-of-law norms, and principles of civilian accountability.

In 2019, the Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF) formally adopted the concept "Security Sector Governance and Reform: Principles and Frameworks," which delineates the scientific and theoretical foundations for effective governance, accountability, and normative compliance within the security sector<sup>37</sup>. The framework posits that the stability and resilience of security institutions cannot be ensured solely through coercive capacity or political directives; rather, it necessitates the institutionalization of democratic oversight, adherence to human rights norms, and structured public participation.

The conceptual framework identifies the following core principles:

- ✓ **Rule of Law and Human Rights Compliance:** Security institutions are required to operate in strict alignment with domestic and international legal regimes, ensuring the protection and promotion of fundamental human rights.
- ✓ **Institutional Accountability:** Security actors are accountable to representative legislative bodies and to civil society, thereby embedding mechanisms of transparency, oversight, and responsiveness within security governance.
- ✓ **Transparency and Operational Openness:** Security sector activities must be conducted under conditions of maximal transparency to enhance institutional legitimacy, public trust, and normative compliance.
- ✓ **Gender Equality and Inclusive Governance:** Governance structures must integrate gender perspectives and foster the participation of diverse social groups in decision-making processes, thereby strengthening inclusivity and representativeness.

<sup>37</sup> DCAF. (2019). *Security Sector Governance and Reform: Principles and Frameworks*. Geneva.

✓ Human Security as a Strategic Objective: Security policies should prioritize the protection and welfare of individuals and communities, extending the notion of security beyond the state-centric paradigm to encompass the multidimensional aspects of human security.

This normative approach is harmonized with international governance frameworks, including those of the United Nations (UN), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), and the European Union (EU), consolidating DCAF's status as a leading global institution for research, policy development, and operational guidance in security sector governance<sup>38</sup>.

A central operational focus of DCAF is the strengthening of civilian oversight and accountability mechanisms within security institutions. The DCAF-published "Handbook on Security Sector Oversight and Accountability" provides an authoritative and empirically grounded reference, systematizing international best practices for the legal and institutional regulation of security sector activities<sup>39</sup>.

The Handbook elaborates the functional roles of legislative bodies, human rights ombudsmen, national commissions, and civil society organizations in monitoring and supervising security institutions. DCAF conceptualizes this oversight process through an "accountability cycle" model, which comprises four sequential and interdependent phases:

1. Legislative Definition of Authority: Establishing legally codified mandates and competencies for security institutions to ensure clarity of function and jurisdictional legitimacy.
2. Implementation Monitoring: Systematic observation and evaluation of operational activities to verify compliance with legal, normative, and procedural standards.
3. Public Engagement: Structured interaction with citizens, non-governmental organizations, and other societal stakeholders to integrate participatory feedback into policy and operational decision-making.
4. Reporting, Analytical Assessment, and Public and Parliamentary Accountability. The accountability framework ensures that security sector institutions are not solely answerable to executive authorities but are also subject to scrutiny by legislative bodies and civil society<sup>40</sup>. This dual accountability mechanism operationalizes a democratic governance model within the security sector, reinforcing institutional legitimacy and enhancing transparency in state security operations.

<sup>38</sup> DCAF. (2020). *International Standards and Good Practices in Security Sector Governance*. Geneva.

<sup>39</sup> DCAF. (2021). *Handbook on Security Sector Oversight and Accountability*. Geneva.

<sup>40</sup> DCAF. (2022). *Accountability Cycle: Strengthening Civilian Oversight Mechanisms*. Geneva.

DCAF's Annual Review of Security Sector Governance provides a methodologically robust assessment of global trends in security sector reform, human rights adherence, and rule of law compliance. The 2024 edition identified a recurring structural deficit across multiple states: the inadequate establishment and implementation of civilian oversight mechanisms for national guard and police institutions, representing a critical impediment to accountable governance<sup>41</sup>.

Complementing this analytical approach, DCAF's Human Rights and Security Sector Governance Toolkit delineates seven empirically grounded indicators essential for ensuring human rights compliance and normative alignment within security sector operations:

- **Legal Foundation:** Systematic incorporation of national and international human rights norms into statutory frameworks, operational mandates, and procedural protocols of security institutions.
- **Accountability Mechanisms:** Functioning internal and external oversight structures, encompassing both formal regulatory bodies and participatory mechanisms, to ensure adherence to legal and ethical standards.
- **Capacity-Building and Training:** Institutionalized, continuous, and evidence-based human rights training programs for security personnel to cultivate normative and operational competence.
- **Standards for Use of Force:** Rigorous compliance with established principles of proportionality, necessity, and precaution in all operational deployments, in accordance with international humanitarian and human rights law.
- **Transparency and Information Disclosure:** Systematic public reporting on security sector policies, operations, and outcomes to enhance procedural transparency and societal confidence.
- **Community Engagement:** Development of structured, trust-based interfaces between security institutions and civil society to facilitate participatory governance, stakeholder consultation, and feedback integration.
- **Gender Inclusivity and Social Equity:** Integration of gender-sensitive approaches and promotion of participation for socially marginalized groups, ensuring that governance and operational processes reflect diverse societal needs<sup>42</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> DCAF. (2024). *Annual Review of Security Sector Governance*. Geneva.

<sup>42</sup> DCAF. (2022). *Human Rights and Security Sector Governance Toolkit*. Geneva.



Contemporary scientific models provide a framework for structuring security and law enforcement institutions as human-centered, transparent, and accountable systems, thereby operationalizing normative principles of governance within the security sector.

A systematic analysis of the theoretical constructs and empirical practices advanced by international organizations—including the United Nations (UN), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF) - offers significant methodological insights for the optimization of administrative practices in National Guard institutions. In the context of the current complex and globalized security environment, the evidence-based organization and reform of security sectors has emerged as a strategically prioritized domain within the international community.

Specifically, the normative instruments and conceptual frameworks developed by these organizations constitute a scientifically grounded operational architecture for configuring the administrative and operational practices of national security institutions—including the National Guard, gendarmerie, and internal troops - along the axes of human rights compliance, accountability, rule of law, and democratic oversight.

The principal objectives of these scientifically derived approaches are to: Facilitate structured civil society engagement in security sector governance and reform processes; Strengthen transparency and openness in law enforcement and public security operations; Ensure systematic compliance with human rights standards in all operational and administrative activities; Enhance institutional capacity and professional competence of security organizations entrusted with safeguarding public order and societal security.

**Discussions.** From an analytical perspective, the scientific and theoretical value of these international frameworks is twofold: they provide an empirically validated basis for integrating human rights-based governance models into the administrative praxis of National Guard institutions, and they enable the alignment of national public safety management systems with recognized international norms and best practices in the modern Uzbek context.

Consequently, the methodological principles developed by entities such as the UN and OSCE function as a rigorous scientific substrate for the enhancement of legal, organizational, and ethical standards within National Guard administrative operations. This enables the institutionalization of a human-centered, accountable, and effective security governance system, which is both normatively coherent and operationally resilient. Drawing upon this scientific evidence and the empirically grounded practices of international organizations, the design and

implementation of security sector reforms can be systematically optimized to meet contemporary challenges in public safety and governance.

Firstly, the normative instruments adopted by the United Nations, including the United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (2016), the Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, and the Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials, establish universal standards for law enforcement that are grounded in the principles of humanitarianism, rule of law, and accountability. These documents articulate key operational and ethical principles for law enforcement institutions, including national guard units and internal security structures, such as:

- Strict adherence to the principles of proportionality and necessity in the use of force;
- Ensuring humane treatment of citizens in all interactions;
- Strengthening legal accountability mechanisms and internal oversight systems.

In addition, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), a specialized UN body, published the Handbook on Police Accountability, Oversight, and Integrity (2020), which provides evidence-based, practical recommendations for enhancing civilian oversight, public accountability, and operational transparency within police and security institutions.

A key scientific conclusion from the UN model is that it shifts the paradigm in national security from a purely repressive approach to a preventive, rights-based orientation, thereby advancing the concept of human security. This approach provides a methodological basis for integrating human rights and community-centered practices into the operational framework of the National Guard, enabling a governance model in which public safety is aligned with the protection of individual dignity and rights.

Secondly, the OSCE's conceptual frameworks, including Community-Oriented Policing and Human Rights and the Guidebook on Democratic Policing, provide the scientific-theoretical foundations for managing security systems with active civil society participation. These instruments emphasize transparency, accountability, and democratic oversight as guiding principles for the operation of internal security institutions.

The practical application of OSCE police missions in countries such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan have empirically validated the effectiveness of the human security model. These missions implemented systematic reforms aimed at strengthening civilian oversight, enhancing police accountability, and ensuring respect for human rights, demonstrating that security institutions can operate efficiently while upholding democratic and humanitarian norms.

As a positive outcome, the OSCE has developed a democratic governance model for the security sector, emphasizing citizen participation in the formulation and implementation of security policies.

The scientific relevance of this model for Uzbekistan lies in its potential to introduce community-oriented policing within the National Guard. This approach fosters trust-based relationships between law enforcement and the public, enhances citizens' social responsibility in maintaining security, and provides the methodological basis for implementing an innovative participatory security governance model.

Thirdly, the European Union's security strategies—specifically the EU Security Union Strategy 2020–2025 and the EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy—place human dignity, accountability, and cybersecurity at the core of national and regional security policy.

Institutions such as Europol and Eurojust have established integrated mechanisms for cross-border crime prevention, facilitating unified information exchange and judicial-prosecutorial cooperation. This integrated system enables effective management of security-related information flows and enhances analytical and operational capacities.

The scientific and practical significance of the EU model lies in its implementation of a rule-based security framework, integrating military and administrative operations with civilian governance principles. For the National Guard of Uzbekistan, this experience provides methodological guidance for enhancing information exchange and digital security systems, expanding specialized cybersecurity units, and strengthening predictive and analytical capacities for national security management.

Fourthly, NATO programs such as the Building Integrity Programme (BI) and the Defence Education Enhancement Programme (DEEP) have established international best practices for transparent governance, corruption risk mitigation, and personnel professionalization within the security sector.

Through these programs, comprehensive educational and institutional reforms were implemented to promote ethical responsibility, professional conduct, and a culture of public engagement across military and law enforcement institutions.

A key scientific conclusion from NATO's model is that it places human security and gender equality at the center of security governance. These principles facilitate inclusive management, ensuring the participation of all social groups, particularly women, in security sector governance and operational decision-making.

The practical significance for Uzbekistan lies in the potential to strengthen a human-centered governance model within the National Guard by advancing gender policies, increasing women's participation, and enhancing citizen engagement and communication within the security sector.

Fifthly, the Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF) has developed the manuals Security Sector Governance and Reform: Principles and Frameworks and Handbook on Security Sector Oversight and Accountability, which establish the scientific foundations for democratic oversight and accountability in the security sector.

**Conclusions.** DCAF's proposed "accountability cycle" model outlines a four-stage system of accountability within the security sector, comprising: legislative compliance, monitoring, public engagement, and reporting. This model ensures that security institutions are accountable not only to executive authorities but also to the public and parliament.

A key scientific achievement of DCAF is the development of a paradigm that integrates human rights and the rule of law into security sector governance.

For Uzbekistan, the practical implication is that the National Guard can implement parliamentary oversight, public councils, and independent audit centers based on the DCAF model. This would create an effective institutional framework for ensuring transparency and accountability in public security organizations.

In conclusion, the analysis of the scientific and normative practices of international organizations demonstrates that the effectiveness of modern security systems is determined not solely by military or administrative capacity, but by democratic oversight, human rights compliance, and accountable governance mechanisms.

From this perspective, the scientific and normative models developed by the UN, OSCE, EU, NATO, and DCAF provide an international legal and methodological foundation for enhancing the administrative practices of National Guard institutions. Based on these models, the introduction of a human security-oriented democratic governance framework within Uzbekistan's security sector represents a crucial pathway for ensuring state stability and strengthening public trust in national security institutions.

#### **List of used literature**

1. Bayley, D.H. Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

2. Born, H., Caparini, M. Democratic Control of Armed Forces and Security Sector Reform. Geneva: DCAF, 2007.
3. DCAF. Handbook on Security Sector Oversight and Accountability. Geneva: DCAF, 2019.
4. DCAF. Annual Review of Security Sector Governance 2024. Geneva: DCAF, 2024.
5. Decrees of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan on the Organization and Reform of the National Guard. Tashkent, 2018–2024.
6. Donnelly, J. Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013.
7. European Union. EU Security Union Strategy 2020–2025. Brussels: European Commission, 2020.
8. European Union. EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy. Brussels: European Commission, 2021.
9. Fluri, P., Schneckener, U. Security Sector Reform and Democratization: Comparative Analysis. Berlin: Springer, 2014.
10. Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF). Security Sector Governance and Reform: Principles and Frameworks. Geneva: DCAF, 2018.
11. Hänggi, H. Civilian Oversight of the Security Sector: Governance and Accountability. Geneva: DCAF, 2003.
12. Kettunen, P., Ficker, H. Rule of Law, Security Governance and Public Accountability. Helsinki: University Press, 2018.
13. Laws and Resolutions of the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan: Normative Legal Acts in the Field of National Security and the Legal Protection of Citizens. Tashkent, 2019–2023.
14. Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Concept for the Development of the Internal Security System. Tashkent, 2021.
15. NATO. Defence Education Enhancement Programme (DEEP). Brussels: NATO, 2020.
16. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Building Integrity Programme (BI). Brussels: NATO, 2019.
17. O'Neill, W. Police Accountability and Human Rights: Global Perspectives. London: Routledge, 2015.



18. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). Community-Oriented Policing and Human Rights. Vienna: OSCE, 2017.
19. OSCE. Guidebook on Democratic Policing. Vienna: OSCE, 2018.
20. United Nations. United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. New York: UN, 2016.
21. United Nations. Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials. New York: UN, 1979.
22. United Nations. Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials. New York: UN, 1990.
23. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Handbook on Police Accountability, Oversight and Integrity. Vienna: UNODC, 2020.