

**GUARDING SERVICE ACTIVITIES ON THE PREVENTION OF OFFENCES
WITHIN PROTECTED FACILITIES: CHARACTERISTICS, FUNCTIONS AND
SPECIFIC FEATURES**

Shokirov Farruxbek, post doctorate

University of Public Safety of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract: This paper examines the role and place of the guarding service in preventing offences within the territories of protected facilities, focusing on its administrative-legal status and organizational structure. It highlights the importance of guarding activities in ensuring public safety and protecting state and other critical facilities, and analyses the normative-legal framework of offence prevention, including the mechanisms for applying administrative measures and administrative coercion. Special attention is given to modern preventive tools used in and around protected facilities, such as video surveillance, access control systems, technical security means, and risk-based approaches. The legal and organizational aspects of cooperation between the guarding service, internal affairs bodies (police), the National Guard, and the private security sector are explored. Based on democratic policing standards and the need to safeguard the rights and freedoms of citizens, the paper develops proposals and recommendations aimed at improving the effectiveness of offence prevention within protected facilities.

Keywords: Guarding service; protected facility; offence and crime prevention; public safety; administrative coercive measures; risk-based approach; National Guard; internal affairs bodies (police); private security sector; democratic policing.

**ҚЎРИҚЛАШ ХИЗМАТИНИНГ ҚЎРИҚЛАНДИГАН ОБЪЕКТЛАР
ХУДУДИДА ХУҚУҚБУЗАРЛИКЛАРНИ ОЛДИНИ ОЛИШ ФАОЛИЯТИНИ
ТАВСИФИ, ВАЗИФАЛАРИ ВА ЎЗИГА ХОС ЖИХАТЛАРИ**

Shokirov Farruxbek Odiljon o'g'li, mustaqil izlanuvchi

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Jamoat xavfsizligi universiteti

Аннотация: Мазкур ишда кўриқлаш хизматининг кўриқланадиган объектлар худудида хуқуқбузарликларни олдини олиш соҳасидаги ўрни ва роли, унинг хуқуқий мақоми ҳамда ташкилий-буғинли тузилмаси таҳлил қилинади. Кўриқлаш фаолиятининг жамоат хавфсизлиги ва давлат объектлари муҳофазасини таъминлаш тизимидаги аҳамияти, хуқуқбузарликлар профилактикасининг норматив-хуқуқий асослари, маъмурий таъсир ва маъмурий мажбурлов чораларидан фойдаланиш механизмлари илмий жиҳатдан ёритилади.

Шу билан бирга, кўриқланадиган объектлар периметрида видеокузатув, кириш-чиқишни назорат қилиш, техник муҳофаза воситалари ва рискларга асосланган ёндашув каби замонавий профилактика усуллари таҳлил этилади. Кўриқлаш хизмати, ички ишлар органлари, Миллий гвардия ва хусусий хавфсизлик субъектлари ўртасидаги ўзаро ҳамкорликнинг ҳуқуқий ва ташкилий жиҳатлари кўриб чиқилиб, фуқароларнинг ҳуқуқ ва эркинликларини ҳимоя қилишга таянадиган демократик полиция стандартлари асосида кўриқлаш фаолиятини такомиллаштириш бўйича таклиф ва тавсиялар ишлаб чиқилади.

Калит сўзлар: Кўриқлаш хизмати; кўриқланадиган объект; ҳуқуқбузарликларни олдини олиш; жамоат хавфсизлиги; маъмурий мажбурлов; рискларга асосланган ёндашув; Миллий гвардия; ички ишлар органлари; хусусий хавфсизлик; демократик полиция.

**ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ СЛУЖБЫ ОХРАНЫ ПО ПРЕДУПРЕЖДЕНИЮ
ПРАВОНАРУШЕНИЙ НА ТЕРРИТОРИЯХ ОХРАНЯЕМЫХ ОБЪЕКТОВ:
ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА, ЗАДАЧИ И СПЕЦИФИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ**

**Шокиров Фаррухбек Одилжон угли,
самостоятельный соискатель**

Университет общественной безопасности Республики Узбекистан

Аннотация: В данной работе анализируются место и роль службы охраны в системе предупреждения правонарушений на территориях охраняемых объектов, её административно-правовой статус и организационная структура. Раскрывается значение охранной деятельности в обеспечении общественной безопасности и защите государственных и иных важных объектов, исследуются нормативно-правовые основы профилактики правонарушений, механизмы применения мер административного воздействия и административного принуждения. Особое внимание уделяется современным инструментам профилактики на территориях охраняемых объектов, таким как видеонаблюдение, контроль доступа, технические средства охраны и риск-ориентированный подход. Анализируются правовые и организационные аспекты взаимодействия службы охраны с органами внутренних дел, Национальной гвардией и субъектами частной охранной деятельности. На основе демократических стандартов полиции формулируются предложения и рекомендации по совершенствованию деятельности по предупреждению правонарушений при сохранении и защите прав и свобод

граждан.

Ключевые слова: Служба охраны; охраняемый объект; предупреждение правонарушений; общественная безопасность; меры административного принуждения; риск-ориентированный подход; Национальная гвардия; органы внутренних дел; частная охранная деятельность; демократическая полиция.

In recent years, profound geopolitical transformations in the global security system, the increasing complexity of transnational crime, the rise of offenses in the digital environment, and the expansion of illegal activities under conditions of economic competition have necessitated a fundamental improvement in states' internal security policies and the functioning of law enforcement agencies. This process has particularly elevated the role and significance of security (guarding) services in ensuring public safety to a qualitatively new level.

The Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated January 3, 2025, No. PQ-1, "On Measures to Create a Safe Environment in the Mahallas of the Republic in 2025 and to Further Improve the Effectiveness of the System for Early Prevention of Offenses," identified as a priority task the creation of a safe environment at the mahalla and territorial levels, the strengthening of cooperation between state and public institutions in crime prevention, and the introduction of digital governance elements. The Resolution emphasizes the relevance of establishing modern monitoring systems and rapid information exchange in the activities of security services, as well as the formation of an intelligent security management model.

At the same time, the Resolution of the President of August 18, 2025, No. PQ-253, "On Introducing Amendments and Additions to Certain Decisions of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Aimed at Further Increasing the Effectiveness of the System for Early Crime Prevention in Mahallas," introduced new organizational and legal mechanisms in the field of public safety through the initiatives "Model Safe Street" and "Model Residential Building." These measures created a foundation for expanding the activities of security services based on state-public partnership and for strengthening their preventive and supervisory functions in practice.

From a legal perspective, the main directions of security activities are enshrined in the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Security Activities," which stipulates that security services are not limited solely to the protection of state property, but also encompass ensuring safety at private and public facilities, early detection of risk situations, implementation of preventive measures, and cooperation with internal affairs bodies. The practical implementation of this law has contributed

to the formation of a new legal model of cooperation between the state and non-state sectors in the field of security.

In the context of New Uzbekistan and the reform of public administration based on the principles of human security, the security service emerges as a key component in the full and effective implementation of the principle of a “Prosperous and Safe Mahalla.” Its activities are directed not only toward the protection of material objects but also toward enhancing citizens’ legal awareness, expanding public participation, strengthening discipline and order, and preventing offenses.

At the same time, offenses occurring within the territories of guarded facilities may, by their nature, relate to property relations, labor relations, public order, or constitute criminal acts. The early prevention of such situations requires the decisive involvement of security services that possess specialized training and are equipped with modern technical and technological means. Therefore, a systematic and methodologically grounded scientific analysis of the organizational and legal relations in this field, the functional characteristics of security activities, and their effectiveness constitutes an urgent scholarly task.

The relevance of the topic is manifested, first and foremost, in the necessity to scientifically and legally improve the existing regulatory framework governing the activities of security services—particularly their preventive orientation aimed at preventing offenses. This, in turn, requires the identification and elimination of existing legal gaps, as well as the integration of fragmented functions and powers expressed in dispersed legal norms into a coherent and harmonized mechanism. These objectives fully correspond to the strategic priority areas defined in Presidential Decree No. PF-60 of January 28, 2022, of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, as well as to the principles of the Development Strategy aimed at building a “New Uzbekistan.”

In particular, Goal 8 of the Strategy focuses on “modernizing the lawmaking process and ensuring the strict implementation of legislative acts.” This goal necessitates ensuring the systemic consistency and stability of the legal regulation of security services and the development of effective institutional mechanisms that promote uniform and integrated application of legal norms within public administration and the judicial and legal systems.

A number of legal scholars have advanced theoretical views on the issues of lawmaking in this context. According to A.Sh. Sodiqov, in every independent state, the normative legal acts developed through the lawmaking process constitute an important criterion reflecting the state’s democratic approaches, level of civilization, and cultural development. Indeed, for legal norms to

function effectively in practice, the implementation of priority tasks such as strengthening information and analytical bases, institutionalizing legal information exchange, and widely introducing information and communication technologies (ICT) ensures a stable mechanism for the application of legal norms in the long term.

In this regard, Sh.A. Saydullaev places particular emphasis on the problem of identifying “legal gaps” in lawmaking and law enforcement practice. If an authorized subject, in the process of applying the law, is unable to find a clear solution to an existing problem within legislative acts, this situation indicates the presence of a legal gap. This approach serves to practically reveal the real needs of legal regulation and necessitates the scientific substantiation of subsequent lawmaking steps.

Russian legal scholars V.N. Likhachev, E.I. Spektor, and F.R. Uransky note that the correct application of methods for identifying gaps in law makes it possible to achieve the following results:

1. preventing erroneous conclusions regarding the alleged existence of gaps in legal acts and limiting unjustified attempts to “fill” them;
2. determining, based on established criteria, whether law enforcement bodies possess the authority to fill such gaps;
3. assessing the objective necessity of eliminating gaps in legislation in accordance with the level of development of social relations;
4. planning the elimination of legal gaps when formulating tasks aimed at improving relevant legal acts and developing new legal constructions.

V.V. Lazarev, from a theoretical and methodological perspective, emphasizes that primary attention should be paid to the task of identifying legal gaps. Correctly determining the existence of a gap constitutes a fundamental prerequisite for ensuring legality and for properly directing efforts aimed at improving the system of legal regulation.

Methods for identifying legal gaps depend, first and foremost, on the extent to which the lawmaker has formed a clear understanding of the essence of the phenomenon of a “gap” and its various forms. From this standpoint, these methods may be characterized as a structural element within the system of categories of legal methodology. In national legal scholarship, M.K. Nazhimov outlines the theoretical and organizational foundations of the lawmaking process, emphasizing the necessity of ensuring information support and analytical work in a “relevant, step-by-step” manner, including strict adherence to the criteria of legal drafting technique and linguistic coherence.

D.B. Abushenko, in turn, notes that a legal gap manifests itself in practice when the scope of social relations requiring legal regulation exceeds the coverage of the corresponding legal norms. He further emphasizes that, in such situations, the issue of the limits and legal grounds of discretion in judicial and administrative practice acquires particular significance.

In our view, the process of identifying legal gaps should be divided into two interrelated stages:

a) “Indication” of a legal gap — the scientific and practical identification of a problem by various subjects (the academic community, practitioners, citizens);

b) “Establishment” of a legal gap — the formal legal recognition of the gap by authorized state bodies and the activation of mechanisms for its elimination.

In this context, the legal significance of acts of “indication” carried out by different subjects varies. Although the identification of a legal gap by the academic community does not directly produce legal consequences, it nevertheless serves as a methodological foundation for initiating lawmaking processes. By contrast, the lawmaker, through the process of “establishment,” generates concrete legal consequences. A similar distinction is important in debates concerning the role of courts: as a rule, courts adopt final decisions based on specific cases; however, stages such as the detection of administrative offenses, the formalization of procedural documents, and the submission of cases to court are carried out by specially authorized bodies.

In this regard, according to the methodological proposal of V.V. Lazarev, the identification of a legal gap requires a systematic analysis of the following elements:

- a) the content of the existing legal system;
- b) the substantive social relations for which a legal act was adopted (or is required);
- c) volitional relations in lawmaking;
- d) the lawmaking practice of state bodies;
- e) law enforcement practice;
- f) legal consciousness.

Only under these conditions, he argues, is it possible to draw a well-founded conclusion as to whether a legal gap exists and to eliminate it effectively.

Indeed, the lawmaking process must comply with the criteria of democratic legitimacy and legal culture, be grounded in information and analytical support, and be methodologically well-structured. Such an approach primarily presupposes the accurate diagnosis of legal gaps, the identification of their socio-legal genesis, and the mapping of the normative and institutional

causes of the problem. Furthermore, it requires the drafting of the structure, disposition, and sanction of legal norms in accordance with universal requirements of legal drafting technique, ensuring linguistic clarity and terminological coherence, as well as guaranteeing effective implementation mechanisms (including allocation of powers, monitoring and accountability measures, and impact assessment).

The success of this model is ensured through the integrative application of the scholarly legacy of representatives of the national legal school (A. Sodiqov, Sh. Saydullaev, M. Nazhimov) and foreign researchers (V. Likhachev, E. Spektor, F. Uransky, V. Lazarev), achieved by synthesizing ideas and methods through comparative analysis. As a result, the stability of legal regulation, the predictability of norms in law enforcement practice, and their social effectiveness are enhanced.

Based on the foregoing scientific analysis, it is appropriate, for the purposes of this paragraph, to address the following questions in an academic manner. In particular: what constitutes the essence and content of preventive activities aimed at preventing offenses within the territories of facilities protected by security services today? What are the main functions of these services, and which areas do they encompass? How are these functions закреплены (enshrined) in national legislation? What theoretical approaches have been advanced by domestic and foreign legal scholars in this field? Through which institutional mechanisms are the crime prevention functions of security services implemented in the practice of developed countries? These questions naturally arise and require comprehensive scholarly examination.

In our view, providing consistent and logically structured answers to these questions enhances the scientific and methodological potential of the paragraph. In particular, if the concept of “preventive activities aimed at preventing offenses within the territories of facilities protected by security services” and the crime prevention–related functions of security services are substantiated through an analysis of existing regulatory legal acts, the scientific and theoretical approaches of legal scholars, and the positive practices of developed countries in this field, the scholarly solutions to the problem become clearer and more well-defined.

From this perspective, the analysis of domestic and foreign scientific and theoretical views on the prevention of offenses within the territories of protected facilities constitutes a pressing scholarly task. In particular, A. Rahimov, S. Abrorbek, and A. Umarov, in their academic article entitled “Issues of Liability for Offenses Committed at Facilities Protected by the National Guard Security Service,” focus specifically on improving the legal and practical mechanisms of liability for offenses committed at protected facilities. In this study, the authors propose measures aimed

at clarifying and optimizing the procedure for applying administrative liability, simplifying procedural processes by eliminating excessive bureaucratic stages, and increasing the institutional and practical effectiveness of preventive measures. These approaches contribute to strengthening legal certainty, operational efficiency, and accountability in the activities of security services, as well as to the systematic organization of offense prevention within protected territories.

H. Adashov, in his academic article “Ensuring Cooperation in the Organization of Early Prevention of Offenses by the National Guard Security Service,” substantiates the necessity of systematizing interagency cooperation and interaction with the public within a unified institutional and legal mechanism as a key condition for increasing the effectiveness of early prevention. According to the author, early prevention is ensured through the timely identification of risk factors, rapid information exchange among authorized entities, coordination of resources and powers, and the planning and implementation of joint measures. Institutional sustainability, in turn, is achieved when outcomes are reinforced by continuous monitoring, evaluation, and accountability mechanisms.

R.B. Rakhimjonov, in his research, systematizes the legal foundations of the offense prevention system and distinguishes types of prevention—general, special, and individual—on the basis of scientific criteria. Applying this framework to the practice of security services, the author links the “elimination of conditions” approach as a methodological basis, substantiating that the diagnosis and consistent elimination of factors generating risk within the environment of protected facilities—such as engineering and technical, organizational and procedural, information and communication, and human factors—can significantly reduce opportunities for committing offenses. Measures such as optimizing perimeter and access-control regimes, strengthening lighting and natural surveillance, introducing technological monitoring tools, clarifying service regulations, and providing targeted staff training serve to enhance the institutional and practical effectiveness of early prevention.

F. Abdullaev and S. Karamatova, in their work entitled “Directions for Preventing Offenses and Eliminating Conditions Conducive to Their Commission,” associate internal environmental factors of protected facilities—such as regulating entry and exit, ensuring continuous surveillance, and enforcing strict regime discipline—with the preventive model of “reducing enabling conditions.” According to the authors, organizational and technical measures, including identification and access permit procedures, visitor flow management, optimization of perimeter and access points, and clarification of regulations, significantly reduce the likelihood of committing crimes or offenses. In this context, the introduction of risk mapping (risk audits), rapid

information exchange, and monitoring and evaluation indicators (such as probability of unauthorized access, time-delay factors, and levels of obstruction at entry points) ensures the early and situationally adaptive effectiveness of preventive activities.

Among foreign scholars, O. Newman, in his seminal work “Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design,” advances the theory of “defensible space,” linking territoriality and natural surveillance integrally with the presence of a guard/guardian and spatial design. When applied to the practice of protected facilities, the creation of a “self-defending” space is achieved through clearly defined perimeters, functional zoning, rationalization of entry and exit points, and the enhancement of visual surveillance. According to Newman, such spatial organization reduces criminal opportunities and encourages the active participation of staff and citizens in preventive activities.

C. Ray Jeffery, in his work “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design,” focuses on reducing criminal opportunities through the proper design of the physical environment, identifying access control, increased visibility, and functional–territorial separation as core principles. When implemented at protected facilities in conjunction with identification and access control systems, lighting and surveillance infrastructure, movement corridor design, and the minimization of blind spots (e.g., doors, windows, and concealed areas), these principles ensure early, situationally adaptive, and effective prevention.

Russian legal scholars have likewise advanced theoretical and legal approaches aimed at improving the foundations of maintaining public order in and around protected facilities. In particular, M.V. Burakova, in “Organizational and Legal Foundations of the Activities of Non-Departmental Security Services,” places special emphasis on improving mechanisms for ensuring public order in the vicinity of protected facilities based on lawful grounds. A.V. Shipulin, in “The Procedure and Grounds for Bringing Individuals and Legal Entities to Administrative Liability by Employees of Non-Departmental Security Services,” provides a scholarly analysis of the legal procedures governing administrative enforcement measures applied in response to regime violations within protected facilities.

An analysis of the cited domestic and foreign literature, as well as an examination of the current regulatory framework—specifically, the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. ORQ–778 of June 15, 2022, “On Security Activities,” and Presidential Resolution No. PQ–4997 of February 20, 2021—demonstrates that the specific legal and organizational content of preventive activities aimed at preventing offenses within the territories of protected facilities has not been clearly or directly defined. At the same time, taking into account that Presidential Resolutions No.

PQ-1 of January 3, 2025, and No. PQ-253 of August 18, 2025, establish tasks related to creating a safe environment in mahallas, ensuring early prevention of offenses, and strengthening cooperation and accountability among relevant actors, it becomes evident that security services play a key role as preventive subjects in the practical implementation of these objectives.

For this reason, it is considered appropriate to introduce the following authorial definition into paragraph twelve of Article 3 (“Basic Concepts”) of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. ORQ-778 “On Security Activities”:

“Preventive activities aimed at preventing offenses within the territories of facilities protected by security services” refer to a комплекс (complex) of programmatic, organizational, technical, and legal measures directed toward reducing opportunities for offenses in and around a protected facility, ensuring the early identification and neutralization of risks and threats, establishing legally grounded access control and movement regulation, fostering systematic cooperation with the public and interested state bodies, and applying proportionate preventive measures, all based on the principles of the rule of law and respect for human rights.

In the future, a prevention model based on this definition may evolve into a data-driven, cyclically managed system operating within an institutional framework that guarantees the rule of law and human rights. Through the chain “identification → analysis → measures → implementation → monitoring → improvement,” such a system enables the early identification of risks, regulates environmental factors, and ensures lawful order and control. On this basis, information exchange and coordination among preventive actors (security services, relevant state bodies, and the public) become institutionalized.

In addition, at present, the legal sources governing the duties of security services related to the prevention of offenses within the territories of protected facilities are not systematized within a single article or institutional framework. Instead, these duties are dispersed across the content of multiple normative legal acts. In particular, Article 8 of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Security Activities” defines the powers of the National Guard in the field of security activities; however, it does not explicitly enumerate specific tasks directly related to the prevention of offenses within the territories of protected facilities. These specific tasks are, in practice, reflected in the Regulation “On the Main Directorate of Security of the National Guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan,” approved by Annex 2 to Presidential Resolution No. PQ-4997 “On Measures to Elevate the Activities of the Main Directorate of Security of the National Guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan to a Qualitatively New Level.” In particular, paragraphs 4–7 of Clause 13 of the Regulation set forth the following duties:

- a) implementing measures to prevent and eliminate offenses at duty locations;
- b) ensuring the preservation of traces of criminal and administrative offenses at protected facilities;
- c) identifying causes and conditions conducive to offenses and taking measures to eliminate them;
- d) providing first medical and other assistance to victims and persons in vulnerable situations.

Furthermore, the general legal status and principal functions of the National Guard are enshrined in Article 3, paragraph 13, of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On the National Guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan,” which establishes the duty to conduct patrol activities in public places within populated areas for the purpose of preventing, detecting, and suppressing offenses. In a corresponding manner, Article 9 (paragraph five) of the Law “On the Prevention of Offenses” explicitly includes National Guard bodies within the system of authorities directly implementing preventive activities. Thus, from a functional perspective, employees of the Security Service do perform tasks related to the prevention of offenses; however, the legal sources of these tasks remain fragmented across legislative and subordinate normative acts.

In practice, this fragmentation may lead to the interpretation of Article 4 of the Law “On Security Activities” (“Main Tasks of Security Activities”) as a general disposition. As a result, the specific preventive duties of a special subject—namely, employees of the Main Directorate of Security within protected facilities—may be detailed not at the legislative level but rather at the departmental (statutory or regulatory) level. This situation increases the risk of divergent interpretations when assessing task allocation, accountability, and effectiveness, particularly from the standpoint of the principles of normative hierarchy (*lex superior*), specialization (*lex specialis*), and legal certainty.

In this regard, the following scientific and practical solutions are proposed:

- a) to elevate the “preventive tasks within the territories of protected facilities” to the level of a separate article in the Law “On Security Activities,” aligning its content with paragraphs 4–7 of Clause 13 of the Regulation;
- b) within this article, to clearly define legal linkages and boundaries of competence in relation to the general powers set forth in the Law “On the Prevention of Offenses” (Article 9) and the Law “On the National Guard” (Article 3, paragraph 13);

c) to reinforce guarantees of human rights, proportionality, and accountability (including preservation of evidence, provision of first aid, and elimination of causal conditions) through clearly defined procedural rules;

d) to establish performance indicators in a normative annex—such as the cycle “identification → analysis → measures → implementation → monitoring → improvement”—for the purpose of evaluating effectiveness.

Such codification would enhance the stability of law enforcement practice and increase transparency in the distribution of powers among institutions.

Current practices in developed countries demonstrate that ensuring the security of protected facilities relies on a comprehensive prevention cycle encompassing design, implementation, and monitoring stages. Within this framework, risks are first identified through systematic risk assessment; access and movement are regulated on a legally grounded basis; natural and technical surveillance of perimeters and internal areas is strengthened; personnel are trained in de-escalation and first aid skills; and incidents are documented, analyzed, and continuously improved upon.

In the United Kingdom, this approach is supported by state oversight and licensing mechanisms. Training modules linked to the Security Industry Authority (SIA) licensing system are regularly updated in accordance with contemporary requirements and are designed to enhance guards’ competencies in first aid, conflict management, and on-site risk assessment, thereby ensuring preventive effectiveness.

In France, private security activities are regulated at the national level by the CNAPS (Conseil national des activités privées de sécurité), which ensures the “professionalization” and “ethical regulation” of the sector through licensing, oversight, and disciplinary measures. This regulatory framework directly influences the quality of patrol activities, video surveillance, visitor management, and preventive inspections at protected facilities.

In Germany, security activities are strictly regulated by §34a of the Trade Regulation Act (GewO) and the Ordinance on Guarding Activities (BewachV). These instruments establish qualification examinations for personnel, clearly define their rights and obligations, and regulate standard operating procedures, thereby strengthening the normative legal foundation of preventive security activities.

At the level of the European Union, the Critical Entities Resilience (CER) Directive adopted in 2022 obliges critical entities to conduct continuous risk assessments, implement resilience measures, report incidents, and ensure interagency coordination. These requirements

significantly strengthen institutional preventive security management and preparedness at protected facilities.

This trend is also reinforced by international standards. In particular, the Security Operations Management System (SOMS) framework requires the integration of risk-based management, compliance with human rights, and accountability principles into operational activities. This directly supports the preventive function of security services through early warning mechanisms, proportional responses, and systematic documentation.

At the same time, democratic policing standards—such as accountability, respect for human rights, and partnership with the community—are regarded as essential conditions for strengthening preventive impact in security practice, especially in areas involving public interaction. UN and OSCE guidelines promote integrated prevention-oriented approaches (social and situational prevention, cooperative mechanisms, and evidence-based decision-making), which provide methodological support for security service operations within protected facilities.

Based on a comparative scientific analysis of national legislation, the practices of developed countries, and international legal standards, it is proposed to restate Article 8 of the Law “On Security Activities,” entitled “Powers of the National Guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the Field of Security Activities,” in a new edition that systemically consolidates the duties of security services related to the prevention of offenses within the territories of protected facilities. This proposed revision integrates national regulatory requirements, prevention-oriented approaches of developed states, and international standards of legality, proportionality, accountability, and human rights into a unified preventive system.

Draft: Article 8. Functions of the Main Directorate of Guarding

1. Legal status and general provision.

In accordance with the purposes of this Law, the Main Directorate of Guarding (hereinafter referred to as the Main Directorate) is an authorized structural unit of the National Guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the field of guarding activities and, on behalf of the National Guard, performs the functions of implementing state policy, coordination, and oversight in this field.

2. General functions of the Main Directorate:

a) ensures coordination and institutional alignment in the implementation of state policy in the field of guarding activities;

- b) economically substantiates, designs, and submits for approval, in the prescribed manner, tariffs for guarding services provided by the National Guard; monitors the implementation of approved tariffs;
- c) organizes and coordinates the guarding of state facilities, especially important and classified facilities, as well as other facilities and the property of individuals and legal entities;
- d) ensures, in accordance with legislation, the guarding of diplomatic, consular, and other missions of foreign states and international organizations;
- e) pursues a unified technical policy in the application of guarding means and systems, exercises control over the efficiency of their use, and introduces modern information and communication technologies;
- f) prepares samples of uniforms and distinguishing insignia for employees of militarized guarding and watch units that are not institutionally subordinate, and submits them for approval in the prescribed manner;
- g) develops standard forms of contracts for the provision of guarding services and submits them for approval in the prescribed manner;
- h) ensures methodological guidance and coordination over the provision of guarding and guarding-technical services through line units, as well as militarized guarding and watch units that are not institutionally subordinate;
- i) establishes minimum requirements, procedures, and conditions for equipping facilities entrusted for guarding with engineering and technical means;
- j) ensures the preparation, expert examination, maintenance of a register, and supervision of permits for the provision of guarding-technical services at especially important and classified facilities of the Republic of Uzbekistan;
- k) exercises control over compliance with the notification procedure for commencing/terminating guarding-technical service activities;
- l) organizes the activities of departmental militarized guarding and watch units and periodically inspects compliance with access-control regimes and the state of engineering and technical equipment at guarded facilities;
- m) prepares and submits, in the prescribed manner, proposals on the maximum authorized staffing levels of departmental militarized guarding units;
- n) develops draft normative legal acts in the field of guarding activities or provides methodological guidance for their development;

o) carries out international cooperation in the field of guarding activities and ensures the introduction of best practices.

3. Priority functions of the Main Directorate in the prevention of offenses:

a) conducts continuous risk and threat assessments based on the characteristics of facilities; develops and implements comprehensive prevention programs incorporating situational prevention, environmental control, and access management;

b) organizes the maintenance of public order, prevention, and suppression of offenses within guarded areas; upon detection of signs of offenses, takes measures provided by law and immediately notifies competent authorities;

c) in cooperation with facility administrations, implements measures to ensure compliance with regime requirements and to organize control over access and the movement of goods/cargo in order to prevent crimes related to misappropriation of property;

d) regulates the preventive use of video surveillance, alarm systems, perimeter control, intelligent analytics, and other technical means; maintains incident records, prepares analytical reports, and continuously improves security measures;

e) introduces mandatory training modules for guard personnel covering de-escalation, communication, first aid, actions in emergency situations, human rights, and the principle of proportionality;

f) establishes criteria for assessing the effectiveness of prevention (frequency of regime violations, dynamics of illegal entry attempts, response time, audit results, etc.) and exercises internal control over their implementation;

g) establishes cooperation mechanisms with local state authorities, internal affairs bodies, fire safety and emergency services, facility administrations, and public associations;

h) ensures the protection of personal data and service secrets during preventive activities, as well as the legality and transparency of information use;

i) provides design recommendations on reducing the risk of offenses through architectural and engineering solutions (CPTED) and, together with facility administrations, conducts monitoring of their implementation.

4. Functions of the Main Directorate related to methodological guidance, standardization, and information systems:

a) establishes and approves corporate standards, standard operating procedures (SOPs), templates for prevention programs, and KPI criteria for offense prevention;

b) accredits training and professional development programs for guard personnel, sets educational standards and modules, and provides educational and methodological guidance;

c) establishes minimum requirements for engineering and technical equipment, as well as unified formats and registers for access management, video surveillance, and incident recording;

d) introduces and develops integrated electronic information systems with relevant state bodies and facility administrations to ensure prevention and accountability.

5. Functions of the Main Directorate related to control, audit, and monitoring:

a) conducts scheduled and targeted audits to verify compliance with preventive requirements and the proper organization of access-control regimes at guarded facilities;

b) issues instructions to eliminate identified deficiencies and monitors their implementation;

c) in cases provided for by legislation, submits proposals on the application of measures to responsible officials or, in the prescribed manner, forwards materials to competent authorities.

6. Functions of the Main Directorate related to special means and security safeguards:

a) establishes rules for the acquisition, transportation, storage, accounting, repair, and disposal of special means authorized for use by departmental militarized guarding and watch units, and oversees their implementation;

b) ensures that the use of special means is carried out only in cases established by law, with strict observance of the principles of necessity and proportionality, and that each case is subject to mandatory documentation and internal service review.

7. Functions of the Main Directorate related to accountability and transparency:

a) prepares an annual consolidated report on the effectiveness of guarding activities and submits it in the prescribed manner;

b) determines the scope and procedure for disclosure of statistical data, technical regulations, and standards (except for information protected by law).

8. Cooperation and coordination.

The Main Directorate ensures cooperation with local state authorities, internal affairs bodies, fire safety and emergency services, the State Security Service, sectoral ministries and agencies, as well as civil society institutions, and carries out joint plans, training exercises, and outreach activities.

Implementation of the above proposals will, in the medium and long term, strengthen the legal and institutional foundations of guarding activities and enhance effectiveness through clearly measurable indicators. The results are systematized below in an academic style.

1. **Clarifies the boundaries of authority and responsibility.**

When the hierarchy of powers, functions, and accountability points is structured in the regulatory framework in accordance with the requirements of legal drafting technique, legal conflicts, duplication, and “gaps” are significantly reduced. This is reflected in greater stability of administrative decisions and a lower proportion of decisions overturned by courts.

2. **Ensures the institutionalization of prevention.**

The introduction of a unified prevention cycle (“identification → analysis → measures → implementation → monitoring → review”) based on risk assessment, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and key performance indicators (KPIs) enables the measurement of performance outcomes and continuous improvement.

3. **Contributes to the reduction of public order and property-related risks.**

By increasing compliance with regime rules at facilities and implementing prompt preventive measures, the frequency of offenses and regime violations is reduced.

4. **Strengthens audit and oversight mechanisms.**

Systematic application of internal and external audits, corrective measures, and the “value–effectiveness” chain shortens the average time required to eliminate deficiencies and reduces the recurrence of shortcomings.

5. **Promotes technical standardization and interoperability.**

Integrating alarm systems, video monitoring, identification, and information systems based on unified technical regulations improves data exchange and reduces the proportion of false alarms.

6. **Enhances personnel quality and process ethics.**

Modular training in de-escalation—covering human rights, lawful and proportionate use of force, and effective communication—strengthens competencies. As a result, incidents involving the use of force and injury rates decline.

7. **Ensures a unified electronic register and accountability.**

Maintaining incidents, preventive measures, access logs, and audit results in a centralized electronic register increases data transparency and shortens rapid decision-making cycles.

8. **Improves economic efficiency.**

Allocating resources in line with risk profiles and standardizing operations optimizes “cost-per-incident” and operational expenditure per square meter (OPEX/m²), leading to increased marginal efficiency.

9. **Facilitates CPTED-based design.**

Integrating Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and Defensible Space

principles—natural surveillance, territoriality, and legitimate use—into facility design reduces risks at their source.

10. Ensures alignment with international standards.

Compliance with ISO, EN, and law enforcement ethics standards improves external audit outcomes, enhances partnership ratings, and expands opportunities for cross-border cooperation.

11. Strengthens human rights guarantees.

Strict adherence to the principles of proportionality, necessity, and accountability, along with clear and transparent complaint-handling procedures, increases public trust and reduces the number of claims and complaints.

List of used literature

1. **Administrative Procedures Act.** — Republic of Korea, 2017.
2. **Civil Defense Framework Act.** — Republic of Korea, 2021.
3. **Code de la Défense.** — République Française, 2004.
4. **Code de la Sécurité Intérieure.** — République Française, 2012.
5. **Code of Administrative Responsibility of the Republic of Uzbekistan.** — Tashkent: Adolat, 2023.
6. **Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan.** — Tashkent: Adolat, 2023.
7. **European Commission.** Public Security and Crisis Management Framework. — Brussels, 2021.
8. **Farmer, D. J.** Public Administration in Perspective: Theory and Practice through Multiple Lenses. — New York: Routledge, 2010.
9. **Guidelines on Democratic Control of Armed Forces.** — Vienna, 2019.
10. **Islomov, Z. M.** The Legal Status of the National Guard of Uzbekistan and Its Role in Public Safety. — Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2022.
11. **Janowitz, M.** The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait. — New York: The Free Press, 1960.
12. **Kadirov, B. A.** Administrative and Legal Activities of Law Enforcement Agencies. — Tashkent: TGYuI Publishing House, 2021.
13. **Karimov, I.** The Role of the National Guard in Ensuring State and Public Security. — Journal of Public Safety and Jurisprudence, No. 4, 2022.
14. **Khayrullaev, M. N.** Management System of the National Guard of Uzbekistan and Analysis of Foreign Experience. — Law and Security, No. 2, 2023.

15. **Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On the National Guard.”** — Astana, 10 January 2015.
 16. Law No. 2803 on the General Command of the Gendarmerie. — Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey, 1983.
 17. Law No. 5326 on Misdemeanors. — Republic of Turkey, 2005.
 18. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan on the National Guard. — Tashkent, 2017.
 19. **National Defense Act.** — United States, 1916.
 20. **National Defense Act.** — Republic of Korea, 2022.
 21. **Posse Comitatus Act.** — United States Code, Title 18, §1385, 1878.
 22. **Shields, P. M.** Civil–Military Relations and Democratic Control. — Public Administration Review, Vol. 74, No. 2, 2014.
- United Nations (UN).** Handbook on Police Accountability, Oversight and Integrity. — New York, 2020.