

**PROSPECTS FOR DEVELOPING GUARDING SERVICE ACTIVITIES ON THE
PREVENTION OF OFFENCES WITHIN PROTECTED FACILITIES****Shokirov Farruxbek, post doctorate****University of Public Safety of the Republic of Uzbekistan**

Abstract: This article explores the main directions and future prospects for developing guarding service activities aimed at preventing offences within the territories of protected facilities. It substantiates the need to modernise guarding functions in the context of contemporary threats, including terrorism, vandalism, cyber-attacks and offences related to mass events. The study analyses possible ways to improve the normative-legal framework of offence prevention, the introduction of digital and intelligent technologies (CCTV, intelligent analytics, automated access control systems), the application of a risk-based management approach, the development of public-private partnership mechanisms and enhanced cooperation with civil society institutions. Particular attention is given to the role of democratic policing standards, protection of human rights and freedoms, as well as increasing transparency and public accountability of the guarding service. On this basis, the paper develops practical recommendations for modernising administrative powers, staff training and in-service professional development within the guarding service.

Keywords: Guarding service; protected facility; offence prevention; development prospects; public safety; digital technologies; risk-based approach; public-private partnership; civil society; democratic policing; legal reforms.

**ҚЎРИҚЛАШ ХИЗМАТИНИНГ ҚЎРИҚЛАНДИГАН ОБЪЕКТЛАР
ХУДУДИДА ХУҚУҚБУЗАРЛИКЛАРНИНГ ОЛДИНИ ОЛИШ ФАОЛИЯТИНИ
РИВОЖЛАНТИРИШ ИСТИҚБОЛЛАРИ****Shokirov Farruxbek Odiljon o'g'li, mustaqil izlanuvchi****O'zbekiston Respublikasi Jamoat xavfsizligi universiteti**

Аннотация: Ушбу ишда кўриқлаш хизматининг кўриқланадиган объектлар худудида хуқуқбузарликларнинг олдини олиш бўйича фаолиятини янада ривожлантиришнинг асосий йўналишлари ва истиқболлари илмий жиҳатдан ёритилади. Замонавий хавф-хатарлар, жумладан, терроризм, вандализм, киберхужумлар, оммавий тадбирлар билан боғлиқ

бузилишлар шароитида кўриқлаш хизматининг институционал салоҳиятини ошириш зарурати асослаб берилди. Мақолада ҳуқуқбузарликлар профилактикасини такомиллаштиришга қаратилган норматив-ҳуқуқий ислохотлар, рақамли ва интеллектуал технологиялар (видеокузатув, интеллектуал аналитика, кириш-чиқишни автоматлаштирилган назорат қилиш тизимлари), рискларга асосланган бошқарув, давлат-хусусий шериклик механизмлари ҳамда фуқаролик жамияти институтлари билан ҳамкорлик истиқболлари таҳлил этилади. Шунингдек, демократик полиция стандартлари, инсон ҳуқуқларини ҳурмат қилиш, очиклик ва жамоат олдида ҳисобдорлик тамойилларига асосланган ҳолда кўриқлаш хизматининг маъмурий ваколатлари, кадрлар тайёрлаш ва хизмат тайёргарлиги тизимини модернизация қилиш бўйича амалий таклиф ва тавсиялар ишлаб чиқилади.

Калит сўзлар: Кўриқлаш хизмати; кўриқланадиган объект; ҳуқуқбузарликларни олдини олиш; ривожлантириш истиқболлари; жамоат хавфсизлиги; рақамли технологиялар; рискларга асосланган ёндашув; давлат-хусусий шериклик; фуқаролик жамияти; демократик полиция; норматив-ҳуқуқий ислохотлар.

ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ СЛУЖБЫ ОХРАНЫ ПО ПРЕДУПРЕЖДЕНИЮ ПРАВОНАРУШЕНИЙ НА ТЕРРИТОРИЯХ ОХРАНЯЕМЫХ ОБЪЕКТОВ

Шокиров Фаррухбек Одилжон угли, самостоятельный соискатель

Университет общественной безопасности Республики Узбекистан

Аннотация: В данной работе раскрываются ключевые направления и перспективы развития деятельности службы охраны по предупреждению правонарушений на территориях охраняемых объектов. Обосновывается необходимость модернизации охранной деятельности в условиях современных угроз, включая терроризм, вандализм, кибератаки и правонарушения, связанные с проведением массовых мероприятий. Анализируются возможные пути совершенствования нормативно-правовой базы профилактики правонарушений, внедрения цифровых и интеллектуальных технологий (видеонаблюдение, интеллектуальная аналитика, автоматизированные системы контроля доступа), применения риск-ориентированного подхода, развития механизмов государственно-частного партнёрства и сотрудничества с институтами гражданского общества. Особое внимание уделяется роли демократических стандартов полиции,

обеспечению прав и свобод граждан, повышению открытости и подотчётности службы охраны. На этой основе формулируются практические рекомендации по модернизации административных полномочий, системы подготовки кадров и служебной подготовки сотрудников службы охраны.

Ключевые слова: Служба охраны; охраняемый объект; предупреждение правонарушений; перспективы развития; общественная безопасность; цифровые технологии; риск-ориентированный подход; государственно-частное партнёрство; гражданское общество; демократическая полиция; нормативно-правовые реформы.

In the current global security environment, ensuring public safety in areas housing **strategically and socially significant protected facilities**—such as government administration institutions, energy and transport infrastructure, financial and banking organizations, and public trade and entertainment centers—is recognized internationally as a **priority issue**. The United Nations, through its **Guidelines on Crime Prevention** and the **Economic and Social Council Resolution 2002/13** (“Action to Promote Effective Crime Prevention”), emphasizes the need to shift from reactive measures to **preventive, evidence-based, and comprehensive policies** that involve all relevant stakeholders. From this perspective, the **security services operating in the territories of protected facilities** must be reformed in accordance with international standards and **reconceptualized as an integral element of the national crime prevention system**, which emerges as a pressing task.

International legal and normative sources broadly consider security-related structures as part of the “**law enforcement agencies**”. According to the **UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials**, such agencies are obligated to serve society, protect all individuals from unlawful acts, and respect human dignity and rights. Furthermore, the **Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms** stipulate that force must be applied **only when strictly necessary and to the extent required for performing official duties**, establishing universality of necessity and proportionality principles across all police structures. The OSCE’s **Democratic Policing Handbook**, prepared by K. Carty, advocates for organizing police activities within a **democratic model**, grounded in respect for human rights, the rule of law, accountability to the public, and partnership with civil society. Similarly, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime’s **Handbook on Police Accountability, Oversight and Integrity** interprets the implementation of **internal and external oversight, accountability, and transparency mechanisms** as a key guarantee of public trust and legality in the operations of police and similar services.

Based on this corpus of international standards, the **development of preventive functions** of security services in protected facility areas assumes **significant scientific and practical relevance**. On one hand, viewing the security service as an **integral element of the democratic policing model** requires harmonizing its **preventive powers, the use of force and special means, and any legal restrictions on citizens' rights and freedoms** with international human rights standards. On the other hand, as protected facilities increasingly become **“hotspots” with high risk of violations**, it is essential to **institutionally strengthen the preventive functions of the security service, incorporating risk assessment, evidence-based planning, and cooperation with local communities and the private sector**, as outlined in the UN Guidelines on Crime Prevention.

Therefore, investigating the **prospects for developing the preventive activities of security services in protected facility areas**—grounded in international norms—emerges as a crucial scientific and practical direction. Such research simultaneously facilitates the **integration of national legislation with global policing standards** and enhances the **effectiveness of the public safety system**.

In this context, considering the relevance of the issue outlined above, the question of **which normative-legal instruments and international standards have been adopted by international organizations to guide the preventive activities of security services in protected facilities** emerges as a **distinct research area of scientific and practical significance**.

Current scholarly research indicates that **UN and other international organization instruments** in the field of crime prevention—particularly regarding preventive activities in protected facility areas—do not merely establish **general principles**, but also provide **operational, institutionally “actionable” mechanisms**. For example, the **United Nations Economic and Social Council Resolution 2002/13: Action to Promote Effective Crime Prevention**, together with the annexed **United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime**, frames crime prevention as a **continuous policy** that relies on **risk assessment at national and local levels, multi-sector cooperation, and community participation**.

Based on these Guidelines, the **UNODC Handbook on the Crime Prevention Guidelines: Making them Work** offers step-by-step algorithms for **conducting risk audits, designing comprehensive prevention strategies, implementing them within protected facilities and surrounding areas, and evaluating their effectiveness**. Similarly, the **UNODC Compendium of United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal**

Justice consolidates all relevant UN standards and norms, defining their role as a **regulatory framework** for national legislation reform, and for developing anti-crime strategies and programs.

The UN General Assembly's Resolution 34/169, "Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials," along with the 1990 Eighth United Nations Congress-approved "Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials," constitute the **primary international standards** governing the **professional ethics of security service personnel and the use of coercive measures**. The operational mechanism of these standards is such that they guide states to adopt **internal codes of ethics, service regulations, and force-use directives** for police and security services in compliance with these international norms. They also ensure that **training programs are based on these principles**, and that activities such as **identity checks, apprehension, removal from premises, and the use of weapons or special tools within protected facilities** are conducted in strict accordance with **legality, necessity, and proportionality criteria**.

Furthermore, **human rights treaty bodies and the universal periodic review mechanism** assess national practices against these standards, thereby establishing an **international legal oversight framework** over security services.

The OSCE's "Guidebook on Democratic Policing" establishes the **political-legal framework and practical standards** for the democratic policing model. According to this Guidebook, police and related security units are not merely reactive structures responding to crime; rather, they are interpreted as **democratic institutions** that operate based on **respect for human rights, the rule of law, accountability to the public, and cooperation with citizens**. In practice, these standards are implemented in OSCE participating states through **technical assistance missions for police reforms, training programs, capacity-building courses, and assessments of national legislation**.

Within the framework of the European Union and the Council of Europe, the **Committee of Ministers' Recommendation Rec(2001)10, "European Code of Police Ethics"**, serves as an **ethical code** for police authorities—including units specialized in facility protection—incorporating principles of **human rights, transparency, accountability, and proportionality in property protection**. This Code is gradually implemented into **national laws, internal service regulations, and police training programs**, ensuring that public safety and security services operate in accordance with **European standards**.

From the perspective of **private and hybrid security services**, the **Montreux Document on Pertinent International Legal Obligations and Good Practices for States related to**

Operations of Private Military and Security Companies during Armed Conflict holds a special status. It consolidates states' **international legal obligations** concerning private military and security companies and outlines a system of **"best practices."** Its operational mechanism encourages states to **align national legislation on licensing, oversight, contracting, and accountability procedures with the models described in the Montreux Document.**

Furthermore, international organizations and civil society rely on this Document to **monitor and evaluate the private security sector.** Additionally, the **International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers (ICoC)**, adopted in 2010 and updated in 2021, along with the **International Code of Conduct Association (ICoCA)**, establishes **self-regulatory mechanisms for private security companies.** Under this framework, companies protecting facilities undertake to comply with ICoC principles and obtain ICoCA certification, thereby ensuring their operations adhere to **international standards on human rights, use of force, personnel selection, and grievance mechanisms.** Notably, **state authorities and large clients** can enforce compliance with these standards through **contractual requirements**, utilizing a "contract-based governance" approach.

The **legal regulation of promoting and explaining security activities** is of particular importance from the standpoint of the **modern democratic policing model.** Both the OSCE's **Guidebook on Democratic Policing** and Council of Europe documents on police ethics emphasize that police (including security units) should **not be limited to reactive responses to crime**, but must be structured as institutions that **respect human rights, uphold the rule of law, are accountable to the public, and cooperate with citizens.** In the democratic policing model, preventive activities in protected facilities should be carried out **transparently, with public participation, and in alignment with institutional accountability mechanisms.**

From this perspective, a comparative analysis of the **Law "On Security Activities" (Article 7, Chapter 29)**, adopted on June 15, 2022, indicates that the provisions on **promoting and explaining security activities** are formulated in general terms. According to the law, the **National Guard and other relevant authorities** are tasked with ensuring compliance, communicating the law to implementers, and explaining its essence and significance to the public. However, from a **comparative legal standpoint**, this Article contains several **normative-legal gaps**:

1. The law does not specify a **clear legal mechanism** for public reporting on **preventive measures, use of force and special means, and outcomes of citizen complaints and appeals** in protected facility areas.

2. Provisions regarding **cooperation with civil society institutions, local community structures, business entities, and mass media** remain **declarative**, lacking legal norms that ensure their **participation in designing and evaluating preventive programs**.

3. The law does not establish the **possibility of creating public councils or advisory bodies** responsible for overseeing security activities, nor does it define their **status, authority, and operational procedures** at the legislative level.

In the recommendations of the OSCE, the Council of Europe, and other international institutions, **transparent accountability mechanisms in policing**—including regular public reporting, procedures for independent and community-involved review of complaints, and the possibility of raising issues through public councils—are recognized as integral features of democratic policing. Compared to these international standards, **Article 29 of the Law “On Guarding Activities”** is limited to establishing a general responsibility for explaining and promoting guarding activities. It does not include clear normative guarantees ensuring transparency, openness, and public participation. Consequently, the current wording of the article functions as a **declarative provision**, and does not fully encompass the “transparency–accountability–public participation” institutional chain required by the democratic policing model.

Accordingly, based on international legal standards and the practices of developed states, the scientifically grounded directions for improving Article 29 are as follows:

First, the law should establish a **legal obligation to publish at least annual public reports** on preventive measures implemented in protected areas, instances of use of physical force and special means, as well as the results of citizens’ complaints and appeals. Such reporting should include specific legal safeguards to protect personal data, state and service secrets, trade secrets, and other information protected by law, thereby ensuring a **measured balance between transparency and security**.

Second, the law should **legally institutionalize cooperation with civil society organizations, local communities, entrepreneurs, and the media**. In particular, the procedure for involving these actors in the development, implementation, and evaluation of preventive programs—through public discussions, joint working groups, consultations, and other forms—should be clearly established. This aligns with the **community policing principle**, enabling preventive measures in protected areas to be implemented as a **multilateral process involving both the state and the community**.

Third, the law should provide for the **possibility of establishing public councils or other advisory bodies** within the National Guard system to oversee guarding activities. The organizational structure, formation procedures, authority, and mechanisms for reviewing public reports, considering community opinions, and issuing recommendations should be regulated by a separate statute. This institutional approach would, on the one hand, **strengthen the accountability of guarding bodies to the public**, and on the other, **enhance citizens' role and responsibility** in ensuring public safety.

Fourth, it is necessary to **expand the scope of entities responsible** for explaining and promoting guarding activities in Article 29. While the current wording generically refers to the National Guard and “other interested organizations,” the revised version should **legally define the specific responsibilities of all state bodies and organizations involved in guarding activities** regarding public reporting, information policy, and interaction with the community, including systematic information dissemination through official websites, social media, and mass media.

Thus, the **revision of Article 29**, titled “Ensuring the explanation, communication, essence, and significance of this Law,” in the directions outlined above—by establishing an **institution of transparent accountability**, legally guaranteeing **cooperation with civil society**, providing for the creation of **public councils**, and reinforcing requirements for **information disclosure while safeguarding personal data and national security**—would transform this article into a **normative institution with firm guarantees** in line with international democratic policing standards. This, in turn, would contribute to **enhancing crime prevention in protected areas, strengthening the legitimacy and public trust in guarding bodies, and aligning national legislation with OSCE and European policing ethics standards**.

Based on the above scientific-theoretical reflections and practical analyses, it is considered appropriate to present **Article 29 of the Law “On Guarding Activities”**, titled “Ensuring the implementation of this Law, and communicating and explaining its content, essence, and significance to the broader public,” in the following revised form. Specifically:

Article 29. Promotion, Public Cooperation, and Transparency in Guarding Activities

1. The primary objective of promoting and explaining guarding activities is to **increase awareness among citizens, legal entities, and administrations of guarded facilities** regarding the legal foundations of guarding activities, the rights and responsibilities of guarding service subjects, and the guarantees for the protection of citizens' rights, freedoms, and legitimate interests.

2. Promotion and explanation of guarding activities shall be carried out through the following forms:

- dissemination of information via mass media, the Internet, social networks, and information portals;
- meetings, open dialogues, “open door” days, and other events held in protected areas, educational institutions, workplaces, and local communities;
- distribution of informational materials presenting the functions of guarding services, citizens’ rights, and their obligations to comply with lawful requirements in a simple and accessible manner.

3. The process of explaining guarding activities must pay particular attention to:

- the legal grounds and limits of administrative powers, the use of physical force, special means, and service weapons by guarding service subjects;
- citizens’ rights and freedoms within protected areas, the circumstances under which limitations may be imposed, and procedures for filing complaints against such limitations;
- compliance with universally recognized principles, including human rights, rule of law, necessity and proportionality, and non-discrimination.

4. State bodies and organizations implementing guarding activities, including the **Guarding Main Directorate of the National Guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan**, shall ensure transparency of information on guarding activities while protecting personal data, state secrets, and service secrets by:

- publishing on their official websites **general information on the main directions of guarding activities** and measures taken to ensure the security of protected facilities;
- providing at least **annual public reports** on preventive measures implemented in protected areas, instances of use of physical force and special means, incoming complaints, and the results of their review.

5. Promotion and explanation of guarding activities may be carried out jointly with civil society institutions, local self-governing bodies, non-governmental organizations, employer associations, and mass media. Initiatives aimed at **public oversight of guarding activities** shall be supported.

6. The Guarding Main Directorate may, in accordance with legislation, **establish a public council or advisory-expert body** to collect public opinion on compliance of guarding activities with human rights and public safety standards. This body shall participate in the

development and evaluation of programs and strategic documents aimed at preventing offenses in protected areas.

7. The promotion and explanation of guarding activities must **not infringe upon citizens' rights and lawful interests, cause fear or undue concern, nor be used as a means to advance the interests of political parties or religious organizations.**

The implementation of this proposal is expected to produce the following scientifically grounded results in the medium and long term:

- **First**, systematically promoting information on the legal foundations of guarding activities, the rights and obligations of guarding service subjects, and citizens' lawful interests will significantly increase public awareness. This will contribute to the development of legal consciousness and culture among citizens in protected areas, thereby enhancing the legal-psychological effectiveness of preventive measures.

- **Second**, the introduction of public reporting mechanisms and information dissemination via mass media and online platforms will institutionalize accountability of state bodies, strengthen public trust, legitimacy, and shape a **social image of guarding activities in line with the democratic policing model.**

- **Third**, emphasizing universally recognized principles—such as human rights, rule of law, necessity and proportionality, and non-discrimination—in explaining guarding activities will facilitate the **humane, legally compliant, and democratic use of force, special means, and service weapons**, thereby strengthening legal safeguards in the practical application of coercive measures.

- **Fourth**, establishing systematic cooperation with civil society institutions, local councils, NGOs, and the media will enable broad public involvement in developing and evaluating preventive measures. This collaboration will help identify risks and “hot spots” around protected areas and increase the effectiveness of crime prevention through public participation.

- **Fifth**, the establishment of a public council or advisory-expert body within the Guarding Main Directorate will allow public opinion, independent expert assessments, and scientific analysis to be considered in the development and implementation of normative acts, sectoral programs, and strategic documents. This institutional approach will contribute to a **modern, scientifically grounded, transparent, and balanced model of guarding activity management.**

- **Sixth**, maintaining open and analyzable statistical data on complaints, appeals, and instances of force and special means will enhance internal control, evaluation, and self-

improvement mechanisms within guarding services. This ensures accountability in cases of misconduct and provides an empirical-analytical basis for future legal, organizational, and methodological reforms.

In conclusion, the proposed revision of Article 29 of the Law “On Guarding Activities” will transform the prevention of offenses in protected areas from a simple “guarding” model into a **higher-quality system grounded in legal awareness, transparency, and public participation**, fully aligned with democratic policing standards.

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. Isломов, 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.