

Chapter 8 Strategic alliances in governance for the resolution of the public problem of citizen security and public security: Analysis of the case of the European Union, Colombia and Mexico

Capítulo 8 Alianzas estratégicas en la gobernanza para la resolución del problema público de seguridad ciudadana y seguridad pública: Análisis del caso de la Unión Europea, Colombia y México

ANCER-NEVÁREZ, Cristina†* & VILLARREAL-MARTÍNEZ, María Teresa

Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Institute of Social Research

ID 1st Author: *Cristina, Ancer-Nevárez* / **ORC ID:** 0000-0002-7295-7544, **CVU CONACYT ID:** 616098

ID 1st Co-author: *María Teresa, Villarreal-Martínez* / **ORC ID:** 0000-0001-9873-4931

DOI: 10.35429/H.2021.2.100.119

C. Ancer & M. Villarreal

*cancern@uanl.edu.mx

A. Marroquín, J. Olivares, D. Ventura and L. Cruz (Coord) Social Sciences. Handbooks-©ECORFAN-México, Querétaro, 2021.

Abstract

The importance of public governance is analyzed through alliances between public-private actors at the state level to ensure the well-being of citizens through citizen security and public security, by developing a common front through strategies and actions focused on confrontation and combat. of delinquency and criminality. The objective of this study is to highlight the need for the government to reinforce and execute efficient long-term security strategies through the collaborative action with different social actors such as businessmen, universities, students, neighborhood judges and the police.

Sustainability, Governance, Citizen security, Public security, Citizen participation

Resumen

Se analiza la importancia de la gobernanza pública mediante alianzas entre actores público – privados a nivel estado para asegurar el bienestar de los ciudadanos a través de la seguridad ciudadana y la seguridad pública, al desarrollar un frente común mediante estrategias y acciones enfocadas al enfrentamiento y combate de la delincuencia y la criminalidad. El objetivo de este estudio es destacar la necesidad que tiene el gobierno para reforzar y ejecutar estrategias de seguridad eficientes a largo plazo mediante la acción colaborativa con diferentes actores sociales como empresarios, universidades, estudiantes, jueces de barrio y la policía.

Sustentabilidad, Gobernanza, Seguridad ciudadana, Seguridad pública, Participación ciudadana

1. Introduction

At present, most citizens are constantly concerned about various public problems that have not been effectively and definitively solved by governmental agencies, including public safety, citizen security, unemployment, poverty, neglect of the health sector, among others related to sustainability such as public transport and education, and those related to the environment such as pollution, lack of urban planning, drug trafficking, among others. Given the recognition of the problem of violence and crime in any country, region or city, the first question that arises is whether it is only the responsibility of the national and local government, or only the police and justice agencies to solve these problems, or whether organised civil society must also take action to contribute strategies and actions to solve them. The second question asks whether the judicial system and the police are fully capable of solving the public problem of insecurity, or whether, on the contrary, these are complex problems that require the intervention of other types of public-private organisations and actors in order to be solved. Finally, the third question is the institutional and social capacity to achieve this type of alliance and solve these criminal problems (Acero, 2008).

For this type of problems, it is usually assumed that they must be solved by the government at different levels of authority. In view of this, the question arises as to why do we talk about the same problems year after year without seeing a tangible solution to the problems of public safety and citizen security? It is important to recognise that the government is not able to assume full responsibility for addressing all public issues due to a lack of human capital and economic resources, which is why it increasingly requires the support and participation of other private and social agents to present proposals and strategies that can help to resolve each of them (Aguilar, 2007).

In 2003, the United Nations Foundation defined Public-Private Partnerships for Development (PPPD) as "the creation of common agendas and the pooling of resources, risks and benefits. They are voluntary collaborations that build on the respective strengths and competencies of each partner, optimising the allocation of resources and achieving mutually beneficial results in a sustainable manner. They involve interactions that increase resources, scale and impact" (United Nations Foundation, 2003). The need to work on different models of cross-sectoral collaboration is a consequence of three fundamental aspects that have changed the way the institutional environment operates: 1) the large dimension that global challenges have taken on; so large that solutions cannot be assumed by governments and/or international organisations alone, 2) the increasing role, which private initiative and civil society have acquired in the distribution of goods and services, both local and global, and 3) the need to establish new forms of governance in the management of various goods and services, due to the growing power, both political and economic, of new non-state actors (Casado, 2007).

In recent years, PPPDs have shown great interest among development actors, as countless initiatives have been launched in different countries to promote them as a means to achieve sustainable development goals (SDGs) through an effort based on strategic alliances with effective results. The SDGs are unique in that they call on all countries, regardless of their size or economic status, to take action to promote prosperity while protecting the resources that the planet usually provides. They recognise that proposals and strategies to end poverty must go hand in hand with activities that promote economic and human growth by addressing a range of stakeholder needs, including education, health, social protection and employment opportunities, while combating climate change and promoting environmental protection through a range of sustainable development actions. Although the SDGs are not legally binding, governments are expected to adopt them as their own and set national targets for their achievement (United Nations, 2019).

In Mexico, the main objective of the SDGs in terms of governance is to promote the involvement and participation of the private sector, and one of its main achievements is that AMEXCID established the Alliance for Sustainability as a platform for dialogue and action, which includes 80 Mexican and multinational companies operating in Mexico, to exchange information on the integration of the SDGs into business models and design international cooperation projects around the 2030 Agenda, among other actions. The first SDG to be addressed in this research is Goal 16, which refers to Peace, Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Among the different types of violence that affect citizen security and integrity, threats of intentional homicide, child assault, human trafficking and sexual violence are important issues that must be addressed in order to create peaceful, healthy and inclusive societies. Such actions undermine access to justice for all and make it impossible to build effective and accountable public and private institutions at all levels. Cases of homicide and human trafficking have seen significant progress in recent years; however, there are still thousands of people at higher risk of intentional homicide in various parts of the world, such as Latin America.

The second SDG to be addressed in this study is Goal 17, which refers to Partnerships to achieve the goals. In order to carry out a successful sustainable development programme, partnerships involving government, private initiative and the different actors belonging to civil society are required. These alliances allow sharing a vision with different principles and values, whose main objective is to prioritise the needs of the planet and the people in their immediate social environment; carrying out local actions that have an impact at a global level.

In addition, it is important to raise awareness among companies of different sizes belonging to the private sector, so that they can direct part of their private resources to actions and strategies included in their annual budget to meet the objectives of sustainable development. Investment in social and environmental responsibility actions are needed in critical sectors, especially in developing countries. These include public safety, citizen security, sustainable energy, infrastructure and transport, as well as information and communication technologies. The review and oversight of the schemes of work, regulations and incentive structures, which enable these investments, must be re-enforced to attract new investments and strengthen sustainable development. National control mechanisms such as supreme audit institutions and oversight functions by legislative bodies must also be strengthened (United Nations, 2019).

When there is a synergy of three main actors, namely government, society and private initiative, public-private partnership schemes are generated, better known as governance, which may have different characteristics in each particular case. These three actors are linked to provide different resources for the resolution of public problems such as citizen security and public safety. There are many needs in the world, which we can see not only globally, but also within our own community. In order to solve these problems, the government has not been left to act individually and independently, but citizens and private initiative through various actions and strategies, have managed to create an optimal partnership with the government, achieving more effective solutions, better quality, with greater impact and solutions that are carried out in a shorter time than in the past.

The objective is to analyse the governance schemes that have been built to address the public problem of citizen security and public safety, through public-private partnerships, in order to review the role of the different actors involved, to assess the relationship between these governance schemes and social responsibility and the paradigm of sustainability, in its social and political dimension.

The methodology to be used is qualitative, using the case study technique and documentary research as an instrument. For an author such as Yin (1994), case studies are a research strategy aimed preferably at answering certain types of questions (the hows and whys). It is a view that underlines the potential of this method to answer questions of a descriptive and explanatory nature (Durán, 2012). The aim is to understand why and how private initiative influences public safety and citizen security indices under the schemes of governance and social responsibility, by analysing under what conditions social actors influence with their active or non-active participation to increase the perception of security. The cases to be studied have been carried out in the European Union, Colombia and Mexico.

2. European Union Case

The European Union is characterised by multilateral governance processes, in a global system, developed within the United Nations, through which solutions are sought to emergencies and collective problems, by means of programmes with social solutions and the creation of public policies. One of the collective problems faced by citizens living in the European Union is the insecurity caused by actions derived from violence (Attinà, 2007). The lack of security, which leads to violence and criminality, is one of the main concerns of the members of society, leading to social and urban problems. In recent years, this public problem has manifested itself in different magnitudes and nuances, generating a network of diversification with strong impacts on society, culture, politics and the economy (Carrión, 2005). European countries are the creators of important changes in the traditional approach to judicial, police and penitentiary institutions. Security, being one of the main concerns of the citizens living in the European Union, was constantly threatened by different types of violence and criminality due to the presence of gangs, assaults, robberies and homicides, among others. These types of social problems are often associated with different social, collective and individual maladjustments that have accompanied the processes of urban development. Such development and modernisation of different cities have presented inherent changes in their organisation, which have been implemented through the updating of public furniture and the transformation of the urban behaviours of different social actors of public and private initiative (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

As a result of preventive and remedial actions to reinforce security fronts, the European Union developed the most representative collective integration processes in the world, as well as the implementation of governance processes. The term governance was born in the 1990s to designate the effectiveness, quality and good orientation of state intervention, which provides much of its legitimacy in what is sometimes defined as a "new way of governing" in the globalisation of the world after the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989) (Rivas, Trujillo and Lambarry, 2015, p.573).

Today, good governance is required to ensure: 1) that the security of citizens and respect for the law are guaranteed, especially through the independence of the judiciary, i.e. the rule of law; 2) that public bodies manage public expenditure correctly and equitably: good administration; 3) that political leaders are accountable to the population for their actions: accountability; 4) that information is available and easily accessible to all citizens: transparency. (Campos, Calderón and Rosas, 2012).

As a consequence of the above, the government has become involved with new actors, which have innovated in the way of interacting and cooperating to guarantee the integrity of citizen security and public safety of citizens, leaving in the past the total responsibility of the government for this social and urban problem, developing a new method of collaborative work, with common objectives and functions, which generate competences belonging to the model of governance for security, which is represented in Table 8.1, (Sotillo, 2017).

Table 8.1 Governance model for security

Tools and Actions to be carried out	Actors involved in collaborative actions		
	Government	Private initiative	Leaders or representatives of neighbourhoods and/or communes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local police - Public policy - Criminal prosecutions - Judicial actions - Crime prevention experience - Consent to participation of new actors in security issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involvement in actions traditionally carried out by the government sector - Contribution of economic resources - Contribution of human capital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involvement in actions traditionally carried out by the government sector. - Participation of actors such as neighbourhood leaders, neighbourhood judges, members of universities and citizens in general. - Prioritised detection of the need for new programmes focused on citizen security and public safety at the local level. 	
Common Goal: Security			

Source: Own Elaboration, 2021

Government relations with society must give way to a model of social action, in which government should not be just another actor in the network but should aim to bring different sectors into interaction and maximise the contribution that each sector can make. Innovation within security governance revitalises the leadership role of policy makers and the capacity to produce and translate new ideas into actions to solve public problems (Hartley, 2005: 30).

European countries such as the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Spain, Italy and Germany have, over the last thirty years, implemented various strategies to strengthen citizen security and the public safety of their inhabitants, making them ideal cases for learning from the analysis of public-private partnerships in a governance model for security. They have promoted the collaboration of different public and private actors for the planning, development and execution of comprehensive intervention strategies, while carrying out specialised work in public spaces, schools, public transport, as well as coordination, cohesion, social integration of minorities and meeting social demands for the reduction of insecurity.

2.1 Public policies and crime prevention programmes in European Union countries

Belgium, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom have been the first to develop new prevention policies through governments with a strong neo-liberal influence and a policy of re-evaluation of the state responsible for the needs of its welfare citizens. Since the 1980s, they have oriented their criminal policies, using new field instruments and new discourses for crime prevention. In France, the current crime prevention policy differs insofar as it stems from the impulse given at the local level (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

Netherlands

Today, the Netherlands is a country that is characterised as liberal and tolerant, a permissive and attractive destination for tourists, with free access to drugs and prostitution, and a lax penal system. A survey was carried out in 2003, the results of which reveal that 56% of Rotterdam's citizens consider youth groups, drug users, beggars and vagrants to be a major nuisance in the public sphere. They also mention that they display behaviour that becomes aggressive and intimidating, causing a high level of anxiety among the population. As a result, in 2003, the local authority of Rotterdam established a ban on begging (NRC Handelsblad newspaper, 2003).

It was in 1979 that the Netherlands created the National Prevention Bureau within the Police, and it was in the early 1980s that the debate on crime prevention began. Political parties recognised the importance of strengthening links with society, especially youth groups, and developing an action plan to address the social causes of crime (van Swaaningen, 2005). The most prominent activities in the 1980s, starting in 1983 with the work of the Roethof Commission, insisted on the creation of a national prevention policy, the incorporation of civil society representatives in prevention policies, and the need to foster cooperation and coalition at the local level. By 1985, the "Society and Crime" programme, which was part of this approach, had financed almost 200 crime prevention projects at the local level.

The following year, in 1986, the "Five Towns Initiative" was launched under Margaret Thatcher's government. Two years later, in 1988, the Safer Cities Programme was created to fund crime prevention activities at the local level. It marked a turning point in UK policy, encouraging a resurgence of crime prevention policy (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

Government and political parties in the early 1990s began to see the limitations of crime prevention for society, government and the state. Crime was only one cause of the feeling of insecurity; a complete overhaul of urban and social policy was required. It is at this point that the discourse of a comprehensive security policy (uit Beijerse & van Swaaningen, 1993) began, and with it a massive process that was characterised by David Garland (2001) as "the strategy of responsabilisation". In 1991, the Morgan report, which in some ways echoed the Bonnemaïson report from France (1982), was recognised as the most important political turning point, highlighting the need for a partnership approach to crime prevention, and pointing out the lack of local prevention policies due to the absence of elected members in monitoring structures.

Seven years later, in 1998, the report's conclusions were rejected by the government. It was important and necessary for the new Labour government to commit itself to a policy by enacting the Crime and Disorder Act, which partly took up the Morgan report's conclusions and introduced two important innovations that have changed the crime prevention landscape. On the one hand, it introduces new Youth Offender Teams (YOTs) to be implemented by each local authority. On the other hand, it stipulates that local authorities and local police (the responsible authorities) must implement a local strategy to reduce crime and "disorder" (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

In 2002, the Community Safety Partnerships (about 375) are based on a crime analysis and the establishment of a local coalition action plan, to be reviewed every three years. A review of the actions implemented shows that the local partners reflect more the orientations defined at the national level (fight against domestic violence, robbery and drug-related crime) than at the local level; certainly because the funding comes largely from the national level, which thus retains the power to decide on priorities.

Adam Crawford has analysed in detail the subsequent "local governance of crime" by calling for citizen participation and the presence of public and private partners. Instead of maintaining an exclusively criminal approach, a multi-agency approach was proposed. Different institutions were invited to take responsibility for the fight against crime on the basis of their specific tasks and competencies. They were also to cooperate more intensively with each other. In the Dutch case, this cooperation mainly involved public institutions, such as the police, social welfare, youth welfare, schools, municipal housing, and especially local authorities, rather than the private sector (van de Bunt & van Swaaningen, 2005). It is in this way that the Netherlands is considered a pioneer in being one of the first countries in the European Union to implement collaborative crime prevention programmes, policies and actions.

Belgium

The Belgian government in 1985 came in for strong criticism of its police apparatus for an increase in crime and violence. It therefore began a national crime prevention policy, starting with the creation of the National Council for Crime Prevention at the national level, and Crime Prevention Commissions at the provincial level. Subsequently, in 1988, a new action programme - known as the Pentecost Plan - was launched. In the early 1990s, it followed the Bourgeois report for the government to encourage the deployment of a crime prevention policy with a greater social and local content. This programme envisaged the establishment of systematic consultation at the provincial and local levels between mayors, public ministers, the three police services (pentagonal consultation) and the local development of crime prevention. Two years later, the Belgian government was once again highly criticised for its institutions and police apparatus, which led it to adopt an Emergency Programme on Societal Problems to ensure public safety by reinforcing prevention and the fight against petty crime. Shortly afterwards, the adoption by the Council of Ministers of a political report on citizen security on 9 June 1992 was followed by the implementation of the Security and Society Contracts, concluded in September 1992 with the country's five main cities and seven municipalities in Brussels (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004). For the government and all public and private actors involved in the planning, development and control of crime prevention programmes, it is important to consider one of the most important links, which is the administration and control of the fulfilment of the established objectives.

It is because of this that the Security Governance Assessment broadens the scope of the traditional security audit to include a wider range of factors, such as those related to terrorism, corruption, transnational illicit flows, the prevention of violent extremism, and health-centred drug prevention, treatment and care. Such an assessment is based on the recognition that security challenges in cities arise from a complex interplay of risk factors (at local, national and global levels) and that these factors need to be examined together rather than in isolation, as, acting together, these risks greatly increase levels of vulnerability in urban areas (UNODC, 2016).

In 2002, the Permanent Secretariat for Prevention Policy (SPP), a department of the Ministry of the Interior, was created shortly afterwards to monitor and manage local initiatives. These contracts are articulated around a prevention dimension and a policing dimension. The provision of Prevention Contracts (in which the police part had been eliminated) was added by municipalities with minor insecurity problems. The objective proclaimed by these provisions was to help municipalities fight insecurity by subsidising projects implemented by them, and to participate in improving the living conditions of neighbourhoods and their inhabitants. This provision, extended annually by the federal authorities, has been modified several times and unified under the name of Security and Prevention Contracts (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

New challenges of citizen security and public safety arose in Belgium, which was the victim of terrorist attacks at the beginning of 2016. Its government and police structure presents certain fractures with the division between 6 police zones and 19 autonomous mayoralities in Brussels, with coordination problems between them, the 193 local police forces that are distributed throughout the country and that show a very complex federalist structure generating a divided police. A new security governance model will have to be implemented through a process that will have to be accompanied by strategies that go to the roots that motivate this type of extremist phenomena, seeking to modify socio-economic contexts, guarantee basic aspirations and propitiate real processes of social insertion. The participation of private initiative is crucial with financial resources, as it is recognised that Belgium has neither adequate intelligence capacity, nor the technical means to confront the current levels of threats, nor adequate financial resources. Citizen participation is also necessary, by participating in a citizen vigilante programme, as numerically, the officers in charge are outnumbered by the sheer volume of suspects in the country, many of whom would require detailed 24/7 observation and monitoring (Mesa, 2016).

France

France is a country that has acted swiftly in tackling the problem of crime and violence. The French government engaged in the creation of a new policy for the prevention of violence and crime, inspired by principles common to those implemented by the United Kingdom and Belgium in favour of distressed neighbourhoods. The French model for tackling insecurity was based on crime prevention and social cohesion. In France, cultural and social activities, which presuppose an improvement of the quality of life in neighbourhoods, are seen as strategies aimed at prevention. In the early 1980s, since Bonnemaison's report (1982), several local and national initiatives have accompanied these programmes based on public-private partnerships between various professionals and institutions (De Maillard, 2008). Some authors have critically argued that local crime prevention councils were not sufficiently focused on crime prevention, but rather shifted towards the fight against social exclusion, thus promoting an inaccurate approach to prevention (ENA, 1999). In 1983, the Consejos Comunales de Prevención de la Delincuencia (Communal Councils for Crime Prevention) were launched, which are real bodies for consultation and planning of crime prevention programmes at the local level, and which remain to this day, and are the body that monitors policies in the municipalities. Subsequently, in 1988, prevention policy was for a long period the responsibility of a more global policy, the policy of the city, coordinated by a body, the Interministerial Delegation of the City, which has a prevention unit and is now under the authority of the Ministry of the City (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

Crawford (2002: 220), argues that the French model is the opposite of the English model: a broad social approach to crime in France versus a restricted, police-led, situational crime prevention approach in England; experiences based on the role of popularly elected officials in France versus the displacement of local structures of democratic representation in England; the absence of concern for measuring results in France versus the strong emphasis on performance monitoring in England.

The 1990s were marked by a profound transformation of the French security scene, especially with the creation of a specialised body for internal security issues: the Institut des Hautes Etudes de la Sécurité Intérieure. 1995 saw the promulgation of the Law on Security Orientation and Programming, which underlined the importance of the involvement of local authorities in crime prevention measures. Immediately after, in 1996, a number of security-related measures were launched, mainly oriented around the organisation of police forces: reorganisation of the national police force, and in 1997 the French government launched the Local Security Contracts, which are based on a preliminary analysis of criminality and the feeling of insecurity. They comprise two parts, one relating to crime prevention and the other to the coordination of police forces. Finally, in 2000, the law on municipal police forces was created, a generalisation of the community policing reform. (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

France is internationally recognised for having promoted a social crime prevention model, often associated with G. Bonnemaïson. Today, this model continues to influence the way in which local policies are developed, has come under increasing criticism, and has undergone many changes. The result is more of a mixed model of local strategies, combining social and situational prevention. In this way, it is possible to distinguish different local strategies: those that promote "social peace" and those that promote "public tranquillity" (De Maillard, 2008).

Spain

The Spanish police system has a complex structure, in which the various police institutions compete for a hegemonic position in their areas of competence and geographical positions. The increasing fragmentation of political power in Spain at local, regional and central level underlines this trend. The National Police Corps (CNP) perceives a decline in political-institutional influence vis-à-vis the Guardia Civil, due to the latter's expansion towards urban centres, affecting its privileged access to political decision-making levels. Finally, a lesser threat is the expansion of the responsibilities of the local police in carrying out judicial police functions (Jaime, Folguera, Peñaranda and Torrente, 2019).

The intervention in terms of public policies developed for the reinforcement of citizen security and public safety in Spain is considered a late democratic one, in relation to other European countries. These policies have suffered great tensions at the state level, due to decentralisation and lack of coordination. It is the policies aimed at "greater security" ("sécuritaire") that are implemented and concern by definition actions and strategies carried out by the police. These policies concern primarily the field of terrorism, but also drug addiction and juvenile delinquency. However, there is no development of common strategies (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

There has been no government in Spain with an absolute majority in Parliament since 2015, which is not expected to change in the short term. Between 2015 and 2019 there have been four general elections and two prime ministers. This situation makes it difficult to pass laws, including the fundamental budget, without which no foreign policy commitment can be expected (De Carlos, 2020).

The Spanish government must recognise that the main strategies and projects structuring security must have significant social support, and this will be more effective if it promotes and guarantees citizen participation on a bilateral basis as a guarantee that their main challenges and expectations in the strategies are tempered and as a condition for their social capital-producing social responsibility and involvement (Pascual, 2010). It should also recognise the efforts and results of its neighbouring countries with the new security governance model, to implement programmes with crime prevention strategies, through collaborative actions that are carried out in the governance triangle: government, private initiative and society in general.

Italy

The importance of the role of the government in a social and democratic state governed by the rule of law goes hand in hand with the attribution to the government in various legal systems of the power to issue regulations with the status of law. These, together with the laws created by parliaments, find the same source of legitimacy in the Constitution, which makes it necessary to rethink the relations that were designed between the different branches of government under the prism of the legal rule of law (Balaguer, 1991).

This has led to a great effort on the part of the doctrine to achieve greater precision in the scope of action of what is nothing more than an exception to the general rule of attribution to the legislative power. This situation takes on particular importance in Italy, due in part to the profuse use that has been made of that normative instrument in recent years (Naranjo, 2017).

Italy has pursued similar security strategies in Spain by focusing its security and crime prevention policies on terrorism, organised crime and the fight against juvenile delinquency such as gangs. The development of crime prevention policies has long suffered from a highly accentuated centralised conception of security. In 1981, Law 121 was passed, reforming the statute of the State Police and establishing the prefect as the provincial authority for public security. This same law set up the Provincial Public Security Committees, which bring together, under the authority of the Prefect, the State services in charge of these matters, with the exception of the judicial services.

In 1991, it was not until the election of the mayor by direct universal suffrage in 1991 that a breach was opened in this traditional order, and local elected officials demanded the exercise of real power in crime prevention policies at the local level. One year later, in 1992, the security protocols signed between prefects and municipalities concerning some 60 cities, the first of which was signed in Modena, are the result of this reorganisation of powers and responsibilities for the benefit of locally elected officials. Although they do not organise a transfer of powers, they allow for the coordination of different competencies between mayors and prefects. At the end of the 1990s, an evolution was recognised with the law of 27 July 1999 opening the Provincial Security Committee to the mayor of the capital city of the province and the elected provincial president (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

A final achievement on the part of the Italian government comes after more than fifteen years of expressing the need to pass legislation on citizen security. Citizen security in a broad sense refers to a multidimensional policy to reduce situations of risk (Beck, 2008) and social vulnerability, i.e. it is aimed at reducing the chances of an individual or group being disengaged or blocked from participating in a social sphere in which they consider it appropriate to intervene. Our societies have been characterised as societies of risk and vulnerability due to their intense processes of change, which also occur on a global scale, with greater unpredictability and, therefore, less capacity for anticipation or foresight.

It was on 20 February 2017 that Decree Law number 14, on urgent provisions on citizen security, was finally approved. The new regulation is applicable throughout the country; it is approved as an instrument of cooperation between the State, the regions and the local level; generating an appropriate and necessary governance for the country. This governance is focused on objectives aimed at strengthening citizen security at different territorial levels by carrying out cooperation agreements in this area (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2017).

Germany

For Germany, the federal system naturally orients the construction and implementation of security policies towards each of its sixteen constituent states, which does not favour the homogeneity of crime prevention practices and policies. The reinforcement of strategies to reduce insecurity rates, long considered to be the responsibility of the police, the absence of specialised bodies, and the low level of involvement of local society in prevention have led some to describe Germany as a developing country in terms of public safety and public security. Some states, such as Schleswig-Holstein, followed by Hesse and even Lower Saxony, have been forerunners, implementing Crime Prevention Councils (Kriminalpräventivräte), bringing together in particular representatives of the Ministries of Education, Social Affairs and Justice. Since 1995, the prevention scene has changed significantly, the annual German Crime Prevention Day ensures an exchange between prevention actors and brings together almost 2000 local crime prevention councillors and similar bodies (Kommunale Präventionsgremien). The German Forum for Crime Prevention (Deutsches Forum für Kriminalprävention), implemented in 2001, is responsible for developing a common strategy and ensuring cooperation between the Federation, the states and the communes (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

2.2 Security strategies in public policies at the local level

The European Union consists of 27 countries considered to be developed countries, which throughout history have not been exempt from acts of crime and violence, placing their inhabitants in a vulnerable state of insecurity. It is important to understand the extent of the complexity of citizen security and public safety in each of these countries, as each has a different culture, not all speak the same language, and their justice systems and police organisation may have some similar characteristics, but they are not the same. Under this precept, it must be recognised that even if the strategy were easier to carry out, it is not ideal to generate homogenous work plans for security in each of these countries, as it would be difficult to solve the root of the public problem, given that their needs and environments are different.

As we read above in the cases of the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Spain, Italy and Germany, each of these countries has recognised the importance of an action plan and have presented different security strategies from the 1980s to the present, based on their local needs in time and form, with the collaboration of different actors (discussed in point 6 on convergences and divergences), creating the enactment of some laws, launching new public policies and/or carrying out crime prevention action programmes.

The implementation of the common good in the area of security requires the collaboration of actors belonging to the governance triangle (government, private initiative and members of society) to carry out collaborative actions that are not usually carried out jointly. There are various institutional settings where prevention actions can take place: the family, schools and child development centres, municipalities, health centres, police and prosecutor's offices. On the other hand, there are places where violence can occur on a recurrent basis, including residential areas, places where money is transacted, warehouses and other public places used for the sale of drugs (Fuentes, 2004).

There are actions to be considered in the structure of a strategic action plan to reinforce citizen security and public safety, which should be carried out under common priorities, needs and objectives, and which should include the following indicators: 1) innovative in relation to precedents, 2) high degree of benefit and impact on security, 3) a minimum duration of five years, and 4) resolution of problems that are specific to the local level. Many countries such as the Czech Republic (Crime Prevention Committee under the Ministry of the Interior), Denmark (National Council for Crime Prevention, with 80 members) and Belgium (Charleroi Municipal Commission for Prevention and Safety) have implemented instruments allowing for contracts between different public and private actors at different levels of government. Under the name of contract or protocol, they aim to guarantee the continuity of commitments by providing them with a financial basis. These instruments allow for optimal governance with transparent public actions for the general population. There are cities that use more organised structures, such as neighbourhood committees with neighbourhood leaders, to bring about a democratic debate on urban safety. Currently, it is still difficult to identify and formalise the modalities for capturing social demand and turning inhabitants into real "co-producers of security" (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

A collaborative and interactive model between the main actors must take into account: a) The challenges and demands of contemporary development, which makes it possible to face inevitable conflicts with flexibility and confidence in reaching mutually beneficial agreements. b) The correlations of power or balances of power between them. c) Organisational practices that promote respect and mutual knowledge and are oriented towards action on the basis of reciprocal commitments. The pattern of interaction between economic, social and political actors is key to determining the security of a city. The inflexibility of the model and relations between the few leads to mistrust and thus to a lack of medium- and long-term strategy. An open and flexible model favours trust and business and social commitment, which translates into significant economic and social development (Pascual, 2010).

3. Case: Bogotá, Colombia

There are 41 countries located in Latin America, Colombia is geographically located in South America. Latin America is a developing area in the world, as it is in a constant struggle to overcome economic, health, employability, education and human development factors, among others. To a certain extent, these factors are the root cause of situations that break the stability of any country by generating zones of conflict and favouring their permanence.

Regularly, when a situational analysis of Latin American countries with insecurity problems is carried out, it is identified that in most of them it is barely recognised that there is a problem corresponding to the lack of public safety and citizen security and that there is a certain type of lag; there are no political advances or involvement of other areas necessary to face it and solve it adequately. There is still a belief that it is still the responsibility of the government and the police to put criminals in jail. It is important to start by recognising that citizen security and public safety is a complex problem that requires the development of different strategies through the partnership of public and private actors. Faced with these problems, the private sector, in its different sizes and industries, must show its interest in contributing to the solution of the growing violence and crime in the countries of the region, which not only affect the well-being of citizens, but also threaten the economic competitiveness of the most important countries and cities in Latin America, where these problems are mostly concentrated (Acero, 2008).

The rate of violence in homicide rates is very high; at the end of the 1990s, according to the World Health Organisation (2002), at least ten countries in the American continent registered homicide rates higher than the world rate of 8.9 and at least four countries registered homicide rates higher than 20, out of a total of 19 countries, as can be seen in Table 8.2. It is estimated that in Latin America and the Caribbean between 110,000 and 120,000 people die of homicide each year (Concha and Villaveces, 2001). The high average homicide rate for Latin America masks important differences between countries. Guatemala and El Salvador in Central America and Colombia in the Andean region had homicide rates above 50 during the 1980s and 1990s (Buvinic, Morrison and Orlando, 2005).

Table 8.2 Homicide rate index for the Americas.

Homicide rates (per 100,000 inhabitants) in the americas, comparison between countries and with global homicide rate			
	End of 1970s Beginning of 1980s a	End of 1980s Beginning of 1990s a	Med. Fin 1990s b
Central America			
Guatemala		150	..
El Salvador		138.2	55.6
Nicaragua		18.3	8.4
Honduras		9.4	..
Costa Rica	5.7	5.6	5.4
Panama	2.1	10.9	10.9
Andean Countries			
Colombia	20.5	89.5	61.6
Venezuela	11.7	15.2	16.0
Peru	2.4	11.5	..
Ecuador	6.4	10.3	15.3
Brazil And Guianas			
Brazil	11.5	19.7	23.0
Guyana			6.6
Caribbean			
Cuba			6.2
Puerto Rico			20.6
Trinidad And Tobago	2.1	12.6	12.1
Dominican Republic		11.9	
Jamaica		35.0	
North America			
Mexico	18.2	17.8	15.9
Canada		2.2	
United States	10.7	10.1	6.3 (c)
Southern Cone			
Argentina	3.9	4.8	4.7
Uruguay	2.6	4.4	4.4
Paraguay	5.1	4.0	12.3
Chile	2.6	3.0	3.0
World Level (D)	5.5	6.4	8.9

Source: a) Pan American Health Organization (1997). b) World Health Organization (2002). c) US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (2000). d) Buvinic and Morrison (2000) (*Living in a More Violent World*)

Note: the rates for each country are for a specific year within the period indicated and the same year is not available for all countries.

It is common for the inhabitants of Latin America, especially in urban areas, to live with a constant and permanent feeling of insecurity. This feeling is reflected in public opinion surveys such as those of Latinobarómetro (Latinobarómetro, 2002), in which crime appears as one of the most important problems in each country, along with unemployment, inflation, poverty and corruption.

There are significant challenges to achieving an environment of peace and tranquillity in Colombia, and security sector reform (SSR) has been one of the most sensitive, controversial and least discussed aspects. There have been changes in the roles of the armed forces, their adaptation to new dynamics posed by post-conflict, the need to incorporate actions to build control of citizen security and public safety into public spending, and to reduce military personnel. The urgency of creating an optimal environment for dialogue and coordination between different sectors of society on the future of the country's security sector is recognised. High priority is given to objectives that ensure citizen security, with actions that include the fight against organised crime, bilateral international cooperation, participation in multilateral peace operations and programmes, and the refocusing of military resources towards purely security actions (especially local actions) (FES, 2019).

3.1 Social capital: a necessary coordination between the state and the private sector

Social capital, which is largely reflected in the various forms of citizen organisation, is an important element in improving levels of coexistence, social cohesion and citizen security. A society that presents a high level of organisation within and outside its community, in broad organisational networks, is a society that is less susceptible to violence and delinquency, as it is able to resolve these problems by acting collectively (Cuellar, 2000).

There are recent findings on the economic development of prosperous societies in first world countries, in which violence does not occur to the same extent or nature that we can recognise in Latin American countries, as they show that this development is proportional to the existing social capital. This means that the most developed countries have a high degree of social capital and, consequently, a low level of violence. Social capital is in itself incompatible with violence, as it leads organised communities to act together in a continuous search for the improvement of conditions of healthy coexistence and solid and permanent security. Given this evidence, it is necessary and opportune to think about implementing a public strategy of associated and coordinated work between the state and the private sector, which identifies, produces and strengthens preventive, dissuasive and coercive factors against the problems of violence, crime and delinquency, in order to improve the levels of coexistence, citizen security and public safety (Acero, 2008).

3.2 A call for social cohesion, incorporating the analysis of certain characteristics of private initiative collaboration

Under the clear recognition of the government's lack of capacity to solve each of the public problems that society presents, it is necessary to develop comprehensive actions, ranging from deterrence and prevention to the legitimate use of force by state institutions; through the collective and coordinated intervention of the public and private sectors, it is possible to obtain important and lasting results. In order to achieve the desired and necessary change in security issues in Colombia, institutional actors are required to restructure their roles and responsibilities, accepting responsibility with new actions that involve them in issues that were previously exclusive to the government, the police and the judicial system (Carrión, 2005).

3.3 Social Responsibility in actions carried out by the Private Initiative

The actions that are carried out jointly and integrally through the triangle of governance (government, private initiative and society) improve the conditions of coexistence, reinforcing citizen security and public safety, making it necessary and opportune to execute a strategy of collective, coordinated and complementary work among the actors involved, which identifies, produces and strengthens public policies to confront violence and delinquency. There are minimum criteria that should govern the participation and coordination between the state and private initiative, such as: solidarity, realism, opportunities, regularity, propositional character, argumentative character, transparency, relevance and efficiency.

The participation of private initiative actors was categorised in three ways: indirectly through the payment of taxes; sporadically, by demanding security when criminal actions affect their economy; and finally, permanently and qualified, when they organise and create bodies or organisations that analyse, reflect on and propose security programmes and projects to governments; they also monitor the actions developed by states in this area (Acero, 2008).

The programme implemented in 1998 in the city of Bogotá in Colombia called "Bogotá Cómo Vamos", has provided an important experience in the field of permanent and qualified participation, which was born as a citizen initiative of the newspaper *El Tiempo*, the Corona Foundation, the Chamber of Commerce of Bogotá (grouping all the economic guilds of the city) and the FES Leadership Institute, to evaluate the quality of life of the city, through permanent measurements of the results of the city's performance, the Bogotá Chamber of Commerce (which brings together all the city's economic associations) and the FES Leadership Institute, to evaluate the city's quality of life through permanent measurements of the results of government management and citizens' perceptions of those managements and their results in terms of well-being (Bogotá Cómo Vamos, 2000).

The most relevant learning from this programme is that it provides a qualified perspective in the field of security, with diagnoses and measurements carried out, evaluated and presented by experts. Analytical and proactive communication was developed when presenting their studies, proposing alternative solutions to the problems detected. Collective strategies were proposed that complement the analysis and definition of public security policies, with the important participation of citizens, managing to focus on those places considered by them as unsafe and conflictive, managing to detect the hidden figure of crime through victimisation surveys, among other issues.

4. Tijuana Case, Mexico

Mexico has also been a country riddled with violence, crime and delinquency over the last 10 to 12 years, which has forced the government authorities, in collaboration with new actors, to act in an agile, rapid and efficient manner in the search for the recovery of its territory, in order to avoid an irreversible crisis that includes three main axes: economy, security and sustainability. In this way, Mexico has also been the scene of success stories in the birth of a new model of governance for security. The first case to analyse in Mexico is that of the city of Tijuana, whose geographical location as a border city has made it a key transit point for goods, people and drugs. This territory is strategic for criminal organisations involved in the illegal drug trade because of its access to the US market. Violence levels were unprecedented in the city, with the rate of intentional homicide doubling between 2006 and 2007. Tijuana became the most dangerous city in Mexico and came to be compared to cities like Baghdad. Tijuana has experienced a reduction in intentional homicides and crime incidence; the number of intentional homicides decreased from 1082 in 2010 to 826 in 2012. The favourable results in the Tijuana peace process have to do with citizen protest, the implementation of the federal strategy of Operativo Tijuana, the coordination between the different levels of government, the commitment or political will demonstrated by actors such as Governor Osuna, Lieutenant Colonel Leyzaola and Generals Aponte and Duarte, as well as the leadership and involvement of the private sector.

The success of the process in Tijuana is largely due to the leadership taken by Tijuana's business sector in demanding the attention of the authorities, both local and federal, in the face of the escalating violence in the city. The constant pressure and participation of Tijuana's industrial sector in meetings and security roundtables with the different authorities, creating strong public-private alliances, ensured that the fight against insecurity in the city enjoyed a certain legitimacy among Tijuana's citizens (CIDAC).

5. Fuerza Civil Case in Nuevo León, Mexico

The second Mexican case to be analysed is that of the state of Nuevo León, with the birth of the Fuerza Civil (Civil Force). During the years 2009 to 2011, the crisis of governance in Nuevo León was very visible; a period in which Rodrigo Medina served as governor of the state (2009 - 2015). During this period, organised crime had the capacity to violently subdue the authorities of rural municipalities, assassinating public officials, police officers and innocent citizens, seriously affecting the state's economic activity.

The state of Nuevo León had not been an important space for organised crime; it was considered a financial centre for criminal organisations and a place where the leaders of different organisations could reside without attacking each other, as Astorga (2007 and 2015), Valdés (2013), Ravelo and Salas (2006) and Campos (2012), among others, have shown in their research; Consequently, it has been a peaceful space, only altered by infrequent violent events associated with conflicts between criminal organisations that have their greatest expression in the neighbouring state of Tamaulipas, due to the fact that the three main borders of northeastern Mexico with the United States are located in that state.

There were different demands from different social actors in the state towards the government, the police and its judicial system, which led to the creation of an Alliance for Security in early 2011, where the participation of businessmen, universities and representatives of civil society was integrated in the reconfiguration of security control actions, which had always been managed and controlled exclusively by the government, excluding the participation of citizens (Montero, 2013, p. 228).

New security actions and strategies were developed, presenting the development of a new police model to guarantee citizen security and a new form of relationship between society and government. This process allowed for the creation of new governance relations in the security policy network, moving from monopolies or iron triangles to broader networks with the participation of diverse actors; the result involved the creation of the new state police force *Fuerza Civil*, whose design involved universities and the local business sector, configuring the traditional triple helix for innovation (Montero, 2017).

Confronting, combating and controlling organised crime requires the development of strong police institutions at the local level. In the face of emergencies of violence in the states, which have required subsidiary assistance from the federal government, it is essential to remember that the federal government's presence is not permanent and, consequently, requires states to develop their own police institutions to assume responsibility for security once the federal government must withdraw, which is an additional lesson from the case of Nuevo León.

6. Results

Around the world, for many years now, there have been several cases of citizen insecurity and public insecurity, which have been addressed either by government, government and business, or in a governance model involving government, business and local representatives. Several cases of countries in the European Union, Colombia and the city of Tijuana and the State of Nuevo León in Mexico were mentioned previously; among which they have worked under different objectives, implementing different instruments to control and reduce the level of insecurity.

In Mexico, through the cases of Tijuana as a border zone and *Fuerza Civil* in the State of Nuevo León, it was possible to observe the need for joint work that makes up the triangle of governance (government, private initiative, social actors) in order to achieve a common front and thus maximise the level of citizen security and public safety.

In Tijuana, in a period of two years, from 2010 to 2012, the number of intentional homicides was reduced by 23%; on the other hand, Nuevo León was able to innovate both in processes and in new institutions to ensure public safety and citizen security for its inhabitants, leaving as a lesson the importance of replicating these programmes for the rest of the country to ensure the well-being of all Mexicans.

In Table 8.3 below, we will analyse the convergences and divergences of each of the cases, which will allow us to later relate them to the case study of this research.

Table 8.3 Security strategies and public policies in the European Union, Colombia and Mexico

Country	Instrument	Involved	Programmes
Netherlands	Prevention policy through the National Prevention Office	- Government - Police - Civil society representatives	"Society and Crime" in 1985
United Kingdom	Funding crime prevention activities at the local level	- Government - Private sector - Local community	"Five Cities Initiative" in 1986 "Safer Cities" in 1988
Belgium	National crime prevention policy through the National Council for Crime Prevention and Crime Prevention Commissions. Project grants in different municipalities to reduce insecurity.	- Government - Police - Local community	"Pentecost Plan" in 1988 "Permanent Secretariat of the Prevention Policy (SPP)" in 1992 "Safety and Prevention Contracts" in 2002
France	Report "Confronting crime: prevention, repression and solidarity". Organisation of the police forces and reorganisation of the national police force in 1996	- Government - Local police	Launch of the Communal Councils for Crime Prevention in 1983. Creation of the Institute for Advanced Security Studies in 1991. Promulgation of the Law on Security Planning and Programming in 1995. Local Security Contracts in 2002
Spain	Policies that primarily concern the field of terrorism, drug addiction and juvenile delinquency.	- Government - Police	
Italy	Security and crime prevention policies on terrorism, organised crime and juvenile delinquency	- Government - Local elected officials	"Provincial Public Security Committees
Germany	Building and implementing security policies	- Government - Local members	"Crime Prevention Councils" bringing together Ministries of Education, Social Affairs and Justice in 1995. "German Forum for Crime Prevention in 2001.
Denmark	245 local councils in the country that work on criminogenic factors from childhood and adolescence.	- Government - Doctors - Police - Teachers - Social workers - Lawyers - Sociologists	"National Council for Crime Prevention" with 80 members representing public and private organisations.
Colombia (Bogotá)	Public policies to tackle violence and crime	- Government - Private Sector - Community	Development of the "Bogotá Cómo Vamos" Programme in 1998
Mexico (Tijuana)	Dialogue tables between the government and the private sector on economic and security issues.	- Government - Military - Private Initiative - Members of society	Operation Tijuana in 2009
Mexico (Monterrey)	Establishment of a Security Alliance in early 2011	- Federal Government - Private Initiative - Universities - Civil society representatives	Creation of Fuerza Civil in 2011

Source: own elaboration with information obtained from *Políticas de seguridad ciudadana en Europa y América Latina* (2004)

6.1 Convergences in security strategies

The implementation of the common good - which is security - requires the cohabitation of services that are not used to working together or consider that they have a certain authority over the others: police, justice, municipal services, charitable and religious organisations, private security organisations, residents, etc.

The constitution of the partnership is based on a number of common tools, such as the elaboration of a common diagnosis for all participants and, if possible, in consultation with the inhabitants. The establishment of an action plan with implementation agendas is another tool, along with evaluation indicators (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

According to Table 8.3, it can be seen that each of the countries has implemented different programmes, committees and councils to increase the level of citizen security and public safety. Likewise, new laws have been enacted and new public policies have been approved, for which one of the most successful factors of these strategies has been to convene nationally, creating models that allow for the implementation of different local formal practices, collaborating with what we know as neighbourhood police and representatives of the different communities. Finally, social responsibility on the part of the private initiative through its owners and/or shareholders has allowed them to develop successful collaborative actions with society and the government.

6.2 Divergences in security strategies

Likewise, as mentioned in the previous point, the main divergences that we can observe are with the countries belonging to the European Union, which began to elaborate security strategies in the 1980s in the launching of public policies to strengthen citizen security and public safety, with the main actors being the government at different levels, the police at different levels and local representatives.

In the cases of Colombia and Mexico, we can observe that they are more recent, which reminds us that the birth of governance is also recent. In these cases, we can see actors that involve private initiative playing an important role in the solution of the public problem of insecurity, providing economic investment, human capital investment and, above all, strong pressure on the government to increase security indicators.

Numerous countries have implemented different instruments, allowing for contracts between different partners and different levels of government. Under the name of contract or protocol, they aim to guarantee the continuity of commitments by providing them with a financial basis. These instruments give visibility to the local coalition, which can justify its actions in the eyes of the population through evaluation (Buffat, Lunecke, Marcus, Vanderschueren, 2004).

7. Conclusions

Citizen security and public safety require the involvement of new actors when security is considered a social right and the prevention of crime and violence is understood to be a priority way to guarantee this right, not only the possibilities for action are broadened, but also the range of sectors responsible for promoting citizen security. Clearly, the main body responsible for promoting citizen security continues to be the public authorities. Private initiative, through the possibility of managing additional economic capital to invest in new public programmes, allows it to become an important actor in achieving this task. In the same way, the involvement of society through its leaders and mediators allows the government and the business sector to be the voice of society in general by sharing their needs and priorities.

In addition, programmes should be included that not only guarantee the reduction of security rates, but also allow citizens in general to feel safe when carrying out their daily activities in their personal, family, educational and work lives.

What we can conclude from this chapter is that the success stories in Europe, Colombia and Mexico have been developed by achieving a balance between the common objectives of the governance triangle, allowing for good governance, with strategies that have made it possible to address the different social problems by prioritising them at the local level, and in the same way have acted locally with the main leaders or representatives of the different sectors of the community, the police and the private initiative.

This document is the result of a part of the literature exploration of the doctoral thesis project in Social Sciences with Orientation in Sustainable Development of the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales of the Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León and its Academic Body.

8. Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología for the support of the doctoral grant No. 616098.

9. References

- Acero, H. (2008). La Seguridad Ciudadana, entre lo Público y lo Privado: Experiencia de Bogotá, Colombia. Recuperado el 15 de octubre del 2019 de: <https://fundacaofhc.org.br/files/papers/406.pdf>
- Aguilar, L. F. (2007). *Gobernanza y gestión pública*. (2a ed.) México. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Astorga, L. (2007). Seguridad, Traficantes y Militares: el Poder y la Sombra. México: Tusquets.
- Astorga, L. (2015). *¿Qué Querían que Hiciera?* México: Grijalbo.
- Attinà, F. (2007). *El papel de la Unión Europea en la gobernanza global*. Recuperado el 2 de junio del 2021 de: <https://www.recercat.cat/bitstream/handle/2072/204360/12%20cap%208.pdf?sequence=12>
- Balaguer, F. (1991). *Fuentes del Derecho. I. Principios del ordenamiento constitucional*. Tccnos, Madrid.
- Beck, U. (2008). *La sociedad del riesgo mundial: En busca de la seguridad perdida*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Bogotá Cómo Vamos, (2000). *Elementos para construir una agenda ciudadana*. Bogotá, agosto de 2000.
- Bornstein, D. (2004) *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Buffat, J.P., Lunecke, A., Marcus, M. y Vanderschueren, F. (2004). *Políticas de seguridad ciudadana en Europa y América Latina*. Chile.
- Buvinic, M., Morrison, A. y Orlando, M. B. (2005). Violencia, crimen y desarrollo social en América Latina y el Caribe. Recuperado el 12 de junio del 2021 de: http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1405-74252005000100008#c3
- Campos, L. (2012). De Poder a Poder. En Rodríguez Castañeda, R. (Coord.), *El México Narco*, México: Planeta.
- Campos-Alanís, H., Calderón-Maya, J. R. y Rosas-Ferrusca, F. J. (2012). *Elementos conceptuales para el análisis de la gobernanza territorial*. *Quivera*, vol. 14, núm. 2012-2, julio-diciembre, 2012, 113-136.
- Carrión, F. (2005). *La seguridad en América Latina y Europa*. Quórum. Revista de pensamiento iberoamericano, núm. 12, otoño, 2005, pp. 21-28 Universidad de Alcalá Madrid, España. Recuperado el 4 de junio del 2021 de: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/520/52001203.pdf>
- Casado, F. (2007). *Alianzas público-privadas para el desarrollo*. Fundación Carolina.
- Centro Internacional para la Prevención de la Criminalidad (CIPC), el Banco Mundial y la Cámara de Comercio de Bogotá. (2011). *Alianzas Público-Privadas y Seguridad Ciudadana: Guía para la Acción*.
- CIDAC (Centro de Investigación Ciudadana). El sector privado y la seguridad ciudadana: el caso de Tijuana. Recuperado el 15 de octubre de: <http://cidac.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Sector-Privado-y-Seguridad-Ciudadana-caso-Tijuana.pdf>
- Concha, E. y Villaveces, A. (2001). Guías para la vigilancia epidemiológica de violencia y lesiones. Organización Panamericana de la Salud, Washington.

- Conejero, E. (2016). *Innovación social y nuevos modelos de gobernanza para la provisión de bienes y servicios públicos*. Revista Estado, Gobierno y Gestión Pública. N° 27 (2016), 5 – 39
- Crawford, A., (1997). *The Local Governance of Crime*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Crawford A. (2002). *Introduction: governance and security*. A. Crawford (ed.), *Crime and insecurity. The governance of safety in Europe*, Willan Publishing, pp. 1-23.
- Cuéllar, M. M.(2000). *Colombia: un proyecto inconcluso. Valores, instituciones y capital social*. Ed. Universidad Externado de Colombia, Bogotá. Tomo I, P. 47.
- De Carlos, J. (2020). *El Triángulo de Weimar y la gobernanza europea*. Recuperado el 9 de junio del 2021 de: <https://www.unav.edu/web/global-affairs/detalle/-/blogs/el-triangulo-de-weimar-y-la-gobernanza-europea>
- De Maillard, J. 2005. *The governance of safety in France: Is there anybody in charge?* *Theoretical Criminology*, Aug 2005; 9: 325 - 343.
- De Maillard, J. (2008). *El gobierno local de la seguridad pública en Francia: fragmentaciones y nuevas orientaciones*. URVIO, *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios de Seguridad*, (6),83-98. Recuperado el 8 de Junio de 2021 de: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=552656559006>
- Diario NRC Handelsblad, edición del 11 de junio de 2003.
- Durán, M.M. (2012). *El estudio de caso en la investigación cualitativa*. Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica.
- ENA. (1999). *Sécurité, gouvernance locale et contrats de ville*. Report of the group “Social issues”.
- Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES). *La gobernanza del sector seguridad en el posconflicto en Colombia*. Bogotá, Marzo del 2019. Consultado el 12 de junio del 2021 de: <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/kolumbien/15470.pdf>
- Fuentes, D. F. (2004). *Políticas públicas y seguridad ciudadana: la violencia como problema público*. Recuperado el 12 de junio del 2021 de: http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0187-69612003000200001
- Fuentes, C. & Fuentes C., 2006. *Gobernabilidad del sector seguridad en América Latina*. Informe FLACSO Chile. Santiago de Chile. 98 p. Fundación Naciones Unidas, 2003.
- Generalitat de Catalunya. (2017). *Llega la esperada ley de seguridad ciudadana a Italia*. Recuperado el 9 de junio del 2021 de: <https://notesdeseguretad.blog.gencat.cat/2017/05/08/llega-la-esperada-ley-de-seguridad-ciudadana-a-italia/>
- Gobierno del Estado de Nuevo León. 2011. *Segundo Informe de Gobierno*, México: GENL.
- Gorgeon, C.; Estèbe, Ph. & Leon, H., 2000. *De la prevention sociale à la tranquillité publique. Glissement sémantique et recuveau de l’action publique*. *Les cahiers de la sécurité intérieure*, No 39. IHESI. Paris.
- Hartley J. (2005) *“Innovation in Governance and Public Services: Past and Present”*. *Public money & Management*, pp. 27–34.
- Hope, T., 2005. *The New Local Governance of Community Safety in England & Wales*. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*.
- Jaime, O., Folguera, L., Peñaranda, V. y Torrente, D. (2019). *La nueva gobernanza de la seguridad en España*. Recuperado el 8 de junio del 2021 de: http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1405-14352019000300002

- Krahmann, E. 2003. Conceptualizing Security Governance. *Cooperation and Conflict: Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*. Vol. 38(1): 5–26.
- Latinobarómetro. (2002). Informes opinión pública latinoamericana.
- La Jornada. 2010. “Presentan en NL el programa Alianza por la Seguridad”. *Diario la La Jornada*, 14 de septiembre.
- Mendoza, H. E., y Montero, J. C. (2015). Gobernanza para la gobernabilidad. *La construcción de “fuerza civil”, la nueva policía de Nuevo León*. *Revista Mexicana de Análisis Político y Administración Pública*. Volumen IV, número 1, enero-junio 2015, 103-128.
- Mesa, L. (2016). Bruselas, el Estado Islámico y los retos de seguridad. Recuperado el 7 de junio del 2021 de: <https://revistafal.com/bruselas-el-estado-islamico-y-los-retos-de-seguridad/>
- Montero, J. C. (2010). “La estrategia contra el crimen organizado en México: análisis del diseño de la política pública”. *Perfiles Latinoamericanos*, núm. 39, pp. 7-30.
- Montero, J. C. (2013). “El concepto de seguridad en el nuevo paradigma de la normatividad mexicana”, *Región y Sociedad*, Año XXV, núm. 58, pp. 203-238.
- Montero, J. C. (2017). *Innovación pública para la seguridad: El caso Nuevo León, México*. *Revista de Gestión Pública | Volumen VI, Número 1 | Enero-junio 2017*, 111-144.
- Moore. M. H. (2006). Creando valor público a través de asociaciones público-privadas. Publicado en la *Revista del CLAD Reforma y Democracia*. No. 34. (Feb. 2006). Caracas
- Naciones Unidas, *Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible*. Recuperado el 15 de octubre del 2019 de: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/es/>
- Naranjo, R. (2017). La reiteración de los decretos-leyes en Italia y su análisis desde el ordenamiento constitucional español. Recuperado el 9 de junio del 2021 de: <file:///Users/ediie/Downloads/Dialnet-LaReiteracionDeLosDecretosLeyesEnItaliaYSuAnalisis-27526.pdf>
- Pascual, J.M. (2010). *La Gobernanza Democrática de la seguridad en las ciudades*. Recuperado el 8 de junio del 2021 de: <file:///Users/ediie/Downloads/218748-Text%20de%20l'article-298909-1-10-20110121.pdf>
- Ravelo, R. y Salas, A. (2006). De Paraíso a Cubil de Narcos. *Proceso*, 27 de marzo.
- Rivas, L. A., Trujillo, M. y Lambarry, F. (2015). *La gobernanza. Conceptos, tipos, e indicadores internacionales: Los retos para México*. (1a ed.). México.
- Roché, S., 2005. “Prevention and Security: A New Governance Model for France Through a ContractBased Territorial Approach.” *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*.
- Salazar, Horacio. 2013. *Fuerza Civil*. México: GENL.
- Selmini, 2005. Towards Città sicure? Political action and institutional conflict in contemporary preventive and safety policies in Italy. *Theoretical Criminology*, Aug 2005; 9: 307 - 323.
- Sotillo, J.A. (2017). La Unión Europea y la gobernanza global del desarrollo. *Araucaria. Revista Iberoamericana de Filosofía, Política y Humanidades*, vol. 19, núm. 37, pp. 427-454, 2017. Universidad de Sevilla. Recuperado el 4 de junio del 2021 de: <https://www.redalyc.org/jatsRepo/282/28250843021/html/index.html>

UNODC. (2016). Enfoque de Gobernanza de la Seguridad para Ciudades Seguras, Inclusivas y Resilientes: Guía Práctica para la Realización de Evaluaciones de la Gobernanza de la Seguridad Urbana. Recuperado el 7 de junio del 2021 de: https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal_justice/UrbanSafety/Enfoque_de_Gobernanza_de_le_Seguridad.pdf

Valdés, G. (2013). Historia del Narcotráfico en México. México: Debate.

Van Swaaningen, R. (2005). La política de seguridad ciudadana en Holanda: Traficando con el miedo. Universidad Erasmus de Rotterdam - Holanda.

Velásquez, E. (2006). La Governance de la seguridad ciudadana. Hacia una propuesta operacional. En Consolidación de los gobiernos locales en seguridad ciudadana: Formación y prácticas. Unión Europea - Programa Urb-AI, 60-87.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.