



INTELLIGENCE LED POLICING: A VALUABLE LAW ENFORCEMENT PHILOSOPHY

Intelligence Led Policing (ILP) is an emerging paradigm shift for local law enforcement that appears to have some real merit. It is a proactive rather than a reactive approach to modern policing. Intel Led Policing can be referred to as a philosophy, business model or a theory, which focuses on the collection and analysis of crime and social data to support on-going investigations, as well as identify criminals and crime trends. Intel Led Policing supports law enforcement leadership in efficiently and logically managing their personnel and assets.

The Evolution of ILP:

During the mid and late 1980's a new program emerged in local law enforcement known as Community Oriented Policing or Community Policing. This program stated that to increase effectiveness, police agencies and the community had to work together to solve issues of public safety and crime prevention. This program had some merit and was successful in bringing the community and the police closer together, it also had several weaknesses.

Opponents of Community Policing cited the technique as resource intensive, overly bureaucratic and difficult to assess. For example, as a result of Community Policing new programs and policies were created which in turn resulted in additional paperwork, processes, and responsibilities. Community Policing was labor intensive and required greater numbers of officers to provide focused attention to specific problems. This is a luxury that many agencies could not afford due to staffing shortages and budgetary constraints.

Several new acronyms came to light during the Community Policing era such as the SARA model, the process of scan-analyze-respond-asses. Another was POP or problem oriented policing. Numerous new terms surfaced such as partnerships, empowerment, POP projects etc. Many officers's looked upon Community Policing with disdain as they felt that this new paradigm was nothing more than being a good street cop who knew his or her beat and policed it with pride and professionalism.

Community Policing did bring local law enforcement and the community closer together and had an overall positive effect on police-community relations. In some ways it also had an impact on the perception of crime and its reduction.

Intel Led Policing has appeared for a variety of reasons. Community Policing in some ways was a precursor to the emergence of Intel Led Policing. Community Policing addressed public safety and quality of life issues by identifying the root causes of these problems and then removing or addressing them. This process utilized a short term and tactical level of intelligence that addressed the immediate problem. This worked well for these types of issues but was not strategic in nature and fell short of being integrated into the entire agencies way of doing business. This was a beginning as police management began to realize the importance of being more proactive as opposed too reactive.

The use of a similar concept in the United Kingdom, which relies heavily on an intelligence product to direct police resources, has had an impact on the emergence of Intel Led Policing. Law enforcement has become acutely aware of the new challenges faced as a result of global terrorism and the need to use intelligence in a more realistic and integrated manner. Facing the present economic situation police managers have to look to new ways to make better use of their personnel and technology. Intel Led Policing will allow law enforcement to accurately identify and analyze a problem or threat and leverage resources to efficiently address it. Again, the key benefit that Intel Led Policing offers law enforcement is the ability to be proactive instead of reactive.

What is ILP?

In recent years this new paradigm has emerged and is rapidly becoming the next evolution in modern law enforcement. This concept has some real merit and can certainly bring some real benefits to the state, local, and tribal law enforcement (SLTLE) community.

Intel Led Policing prescribes a new way of doing things when it comes to the area of true intelligence process. Intel Led Policing utilizes intelligence collection and analysis to direct resources in an efficient manner. Some call it a business model others a philosophy. It really depends on the needs, size, and structure and of each particular agency.

J.H. Ratcliffe, a prominent researcher in this area, authored the following definition. Intelligence-led policing is a business model and managerial philosophy where data analysis and crime intelligence are pivotal to an objective, decision making framework that facilitates crime and problem reduction, disruption and prevention through both strategic management and effective enforcement strategies that target prolific and serious offenders. Ratcliffe also introduced the 3i model of ILP that stands for *interpreting* the environment, *influencing* management, and creating the desired *impact* on the crime issue. This model can provide management and commanders with an actionable Intelligence product that will allow them to understand and effectively respond to the issue at hand.

One strategy that has merit is the blending of an agency's crime analysis and Intel sections into one hybrid model. This model would share information freely in an effort to produce a product that commanders can utilize to direct their resources in an efficient and effective manner. This would of course be done in concert with those concepts of Community Oriented Policing that each agency believes beneficial to its unique environment. Intel Led Policing is really a new way of organizing and conducting the business of intelligence and crime analysis. Community Oriented Policing is more tactical in nature as it addresses specific crime or quality of life issues whereas ILP looks at the bigger picture by blending crime analysis and intelligence.

The Evolution of ILP: Merging Crime Analysis and Intelligence

A little history at this point might help illustrate the concept of ILP and some possible explanations for its birth. In years gone by those agencies that were fortunate enough to have both an intelligence and crime analysis function held these sections apart from each other as a matter of bureaucracy and protocol at the time. The crime analysis function was usually comprised of civilian employees who were trained in crime mapping, trend analysis, and other comparative studies. On the

other side of the equation was the intelligence section. Sworn officers who gathered intelligence on criminals, gangs, and other criminal enterprise usually staffed this area.

Crime analysis was more concerned with geographic and crime type indices whereas intelligence was concerned more with individuals. Each entity was housed apart from the other and usually did not share information. One could say that intelligence dealt with people and analysis dealt with places and crimes. The problems with this sort of distribution of efforts and responsibilities are obvious. The officers on the intelligence side of the equation tended to hold the information close to the vest and not share it with the crime analysts. At times there could be a sort of us against them as the crime analysts were for the most part civilian employees and the intelligence analysts were sworn officers.

Law enforcement must realize that the arena has changed in significant ways when speaking of intelligence, crime analysis and how they relate to terrorism. Gone are the days when these two very important facets of law enforcement could function in two different worlds. Now more than ever they must blend together so that relevant, timely, and actionable intelligence is available to local law enforcement. Equally important is the ability of local law enforcement to cultivate that one piece of the puzzle that can be pushed into the intelligence system and prevent a major terrorism event on U.S. soil.

The Impact of ILP

Also of great importance is the positive impact this new paradigm can have on crime prevention and enforcement in general. Of great value is the all crimes, all hazards concept of ILP. Intel Led Policing deals with all information whether pertaining to crime, terrorism or natural disaster. When used properly ILP has dual roles that can impact crime on the local level as well combat terrorism. Police Chiefs, District Commanders and Shift Sergeants can utilize the different levels of intelligence products best suited for their specific needs, whether it is tactical intelligence which targets a very specific area and need or operational intelligence which deals with the identification of crime trends or larger issues and how to effectively address them. The last area of intelligence is known as strategic intelligence and involves a longer look into the future in the hopes of addressing larger problems in the long term. It deals more with planning and policy issues as well as placement of personnel and the involvement of outside agencies that can assist with the problem at hand.

ILP at the Tactical Level

What does this all mean for the cop on the street? Two areas immediately come to mind. As first preventers street cops have probably the most important responsibility in this process. They will often be in the best position to identify, interpret, and document suspicious activity and most importantly push it into the intelligence process. After all there are roughly 700,000 police officers on American streets. A working cop will have the opportunity to make that one observation which may prevent an attack or lead to the closure of a serious crime. The working street cop who knows their beat and has relationships with the citizens and business owners can serve as a familiar conduit for information to flow freely from the public into the intelligence structure. Again, the boots on the ground folks are almost always in the best position to make it all happen.

Secondly, an aggressive working street cop wants timely, accurate, and actionable intelligence products that allow them to do their job in an efficient manner. If this process allows an officer to make

good, solid arrests thus getting criminals off the street all the better. It goes without saying that the intelligence product can also contribute to officer safety, which is paramount.

It is clear that this is a new time for SLTLE and that the rules, players, and risks have changed. Local law enforcement is in the best position to locate, identify, and document threats and information. It is no surprise that many pundits are now referring to local law enforcement officers as first preventers as opposed to first responders. Good street cops given the proper tools, training, and ability to easily push valuable intelligence into an intelligence system will return great results and enhance the safety of their communities. The proper application of ILP will effectively prevent crime and terrorism rather than just reacting to it.

TECHNOLOGY

At present, information is still captured by the usual means, observations, reports, notes, etc. With the advent of ILP and the evolving Suspicious Activity Reporting (SAR) and Fusion Center systems technology is in a state of fine tuning. All states possess at least one Fusion Center in addition to many major cities that also have a Fusion Center.

Intel captured by SLTLE is first vetted at the local level by each agency according to their own regulations. It can then be pushed into their own unique Intel system. Under current pilot programs within the SAR system, information can be moved into the Fusion Centers and then into the FBI's E-Guardian data system. Some SLTLE are able to communicate directly with the E-Guardian system. This system allows participating members to share and search valuable Intel.

Fusion Centers appear to make the most sense for moving information from and between SLTLE and Federal LE. Current thinking on the issue of information sharing would suggest this.

ILP and SAR are concepts that require further development and fine tuning before they reach mainstream use in modern LE.

Mr. Auger is a senior analyst with Innovative Analytics & Training located in Washington, DC. He is a retired law enforcement officer with over twenty-five years experience in a major northeastern police agency. During his career he attained the rank of lieutenant and served in uniform, investigative, and tactical assignments.